

Minutes of a Meeting of the Outdoor Heritage Advisory Board
Held on June 15, 2021, at 8:00 a.m.
Harvest Room, State Capitol

Present: Robert Kuylen, OHF Advisory Board Chairman
Randy Bina, OHF Advisory Board
Tyler Dokken, OHF Advisory Board
Jay Elkin, OHF Advisory Board
Brad Erickson, OHF Advisory Board (Remote)
David Dewald, OHF Advisory Board
Daryl Lies, OHF Advisory Board
Wade Moser, OHF Advisory Board
Kent Reiersen, OHF Advisory Board
Rachel Retterath, OHF Advisory Board
Rhonda Kelsch, OHF Advisory Board
Terry Steinwand, OHF Advisory Board
Randy Kreil, OHF Advisory Board (Remote)
Tom Claeys, OHF Advisory Board
Tom Hutchens, OHF Advisory Board
Andrea Travnicek, OHF Advisory Board

Also

Present: A complete list of attendees is available in the Commission files. The meeting was also available by Teams so not all attendees are known.

Chairman Robert Kuylen called the meeting of the Outdoor Heritage Fund Advisory Board (“Board”) to order at 8:00 a.m. with a quorum being present.

It was moved by Bina and seconded by Hutchens to approve the October 27, 2020, and March 10, 2021, minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Fine provided a financial summary which included the following cash balance report: (A copy of the entire financial summary is available in the Outdoor Heritage Fund files.)

Outdoor Heritage Fund (294)
Financial Report - Cash Balance
2019-2021 Biennium
June 15, 2021 OHF Advisory Board Meeting

	Cash Balance	
July 1, 2019 Balance	\$	30,662,352.54
Interest Revenue through April 30, 2021	\$	100,917.76
Revenues through May 18, 2021	\$	15,000,000.00
Returned funds	\$	32,720.20
Grant Expenditures through April 30, 2021	\$	(9,109,456.65)
Administrative Expenditures through April 30, 2021	\$	(109,977.01)
	\$	36,576,556.84
Outstanding Administrative Expenses	\$	(65,022.99)
Outstanding Project Commitments as of April 30, 2021	\$	(27,644,419.00)
Balance	\$	8,867,114.85

She noted that the \$15,000,000 appropriated by the Legislature from oil revenues had been received. There would be some additional interest income during the 2019-2021 biennium but there would no further revenues from oil taxes. She also provided a list of funding awards that had been returned.

Mr. Kuylen called on the first applicant to make their ten-minute presentation.

18-12 (B) NDSU - North Dakota Forest Service; North Dakota Statewide Windbreak Renovation Initiative 2.0; \$300,000

Project Summary: This project will continue the ND Forest Service and Outdoor Heritage Fund Windbreak Renovation Initiative and provide financial assistance to landowners to renovate dead and deteriorating windbreaks.

Ms. Liz Smith gave a presentation (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available in the Commission files.)

In response to questions, the applicant stated:

- Do you tear out whole shelter belts and replace or do you leave the living trees? Every renovation is different, and the foresters do a one-on-one with the landowner to assess the windbreak condition and come up with a set of recommended practices that are appropriate for each individual site. Occasionally, that is the only option, but very often a portion of the windbreak can be preserved.
- What is the minimum criteria for a windbreak renovation to be done? There is not a minimum criterion. Windbreaks are specifically engineered to serve a purpose. The landowner is asked if the windbreak is working or not and depending on their response will let them know how much the renovation needs to bring it back to functionality.
- Are plastic tubes put up for certain trees or can they be put up for any tree? The tubes are only used for certain trees, generally deciduous trees and not shrubs nor evergreens. The tubes create a greenhouse effect which helps the tree to establish more quickly and protect the tree from deer degradation.
- You stated a total of 247 were completed and how many were awarded? A total of 76 projects have been awarded and are in progress. Currently, there is \$750,000 unspent from the first grant so what is the estimate for those 76 projects? Approximately \$400,000 has been committed to the in-progress projects.

18-21 (B) North Dakota Natural Resources Trust; Grazing Resiliency in the Bakken (GRB); \$1,290,000

Project Summary: Increase water supplies to livestock and implement fencing for rotational grazing systems to provide future drought resiliency.

Mr. Jesse Beckers and Ms. Sarah Tunge gave a presentation (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available in the Commission files.)

In response to questions, the applicants stated:

- Regarding the drought, how quickly can the project start once approved? Once the agreement is in place with the Industrial Commission, agreements with the landowners can start the same day. But all soil disruptions receive an archeological review with samples sent to the State Historical Society. Depending on the review, some pipelines have had to be rerouted, but the majority have been approved.
- What is the rate for trenching pipelines? The NRCS rate for trenching is \$4.44/foot, but it's generally much lower in the \$3.25-\$3.50 range.

- In this agreement, will water be provided without a grazing plan? No, a grazing plan is required to be included for any developments done for either the conservation benefit or the landowner.
- What is the difference between the Bakken II and this project? The Grazing Resiliency project is an extension of the grazing portion of the Bakken II project. Those funds are already obligated with the cost shares being paid out. There has been a lot of success with the grazing program through the soil conservation districts.
- Has the \$3.3 million approved all been committed? No, the total of \$660,000 for grazing systems in the prior Bakken II award has been committed.
- The request shows \$20,000 for staffing. The OHF can grant those funds provided a need is shown. Does the Trust need the full \$20,000 to make the program run? Could the Trust make the program run without the funds? Yes, if needed the program could run without the funds, but it would be very beneficial considering the amount of time spent on each of these programs.
- Is there a system to prioritize those who allow access for sportsmen? All agreements include a statement indicating participants are aware of the PLOTS program available through the Game and Fish Department. As this is a Game and Fish Department program, questions are forwarded to them. NDNRT does not always know who has enrolled in PLOTS. In the areas NDNRT is working in, interest in the PLOTS program does not seem to be high. Participants that have indicated willingness to put their land into PLOTS to develop grazing systems have all received funding.
- If there is high demand, why is priority not given to those willing to participate in PLOTS? These are public funds, there should be prioritization for those interested in PLOTS. NDNRT could implement that if the Board wishes. There is more interest in PLOTS in the native grass seeding versus the existing grazing development areas where people currently have cattle in pastures.
- You stated there is a waiting list of 125 people, so will that utilize all your funds at \$16,000 each right away? Yes. It is anticipated that the funds will be utilized right away.

18-18 (B) Little Missouri Grazing Association; Little Missouri Grazing Association - Deep Creek Watershed Conservation Project; \$227,102

Project Summary: Preserve 8,314 AUMs of livestock grazing, implement prescribed grazing strategies to improve native grasses and forbs, enhance wildlife habitat, and improve water quality.

Mr. Chad Erickson and Ms. Maxine Rasmussen gave a presentation (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available in the Commission files.)

In response to questions, the applicants stated:

- This project is tackling a major ecological challenge using innovative techniques. The only issue is cost share. What will the actual match be from the lessees through the Association? Each member has to contribute 25% in cash which matches the Association's conservation practice.
- What is the US Forest Service contributing? The US Forest Service is contributing \$160,000 in-kind for technical assistance to clear and approve projects. The Forest Service also has money through the Natural Resources Trust that can be concentrated outside of the Deep Creek Watershed. Cost share is through both the Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) and Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) projects which will fund 60%.
 - If the in-kind of \$164,000 from the Forest Service is all in-kind, how is that documented? A worksheet is received from the Forest Service breaking down the costs. The 75% of the actual cost comes from grazing fees maintained for conservation practices of the Association.
- The \$206,000 matching in cash from the Grazing Association, is that the producers amount? Yes.
- How are the trees going to be protected in the woody draw replanting areas? With tree tubes that are four feet and higher with steel stakes to withstand the wind.

- This application was to preserve 8,314 AUMs grazing area. The study stated there were three options: eliminate grazing, leave as is (not preferable), or improve management practices. Is that correct? Yes.
- Is everyone on board in the Grazing Association? Yes.
- How much money will be used for leafy spurge protection in the State? Nothing from the grants received either through RCPP or the OHF. The Grazing Association receives federal funds from the Forest Service used to spray for leafy spurge. These funds received are declining every year. Also, each year the Grazing Association donates between \$10,000-12,000 of chemical for members to spray within a mile of both Federal, State, and private land.
- Is there a concern that if too much State funding is used on Federal lands that the responsibility will then be moved from the Federal Government to the individual grazing associations? Yes, that is a possibility, but there are not many other options.
- Will the Federal Government accept the archeologists hired by the grazing associations? The Forest Service has to approve their findings.
- Concern was expressed regarding the potential for success on these woody draws.
- Appreciate the effort to repair the riparian areas. There have been failures regarding these past repair attempts that can be learned from. Along with the great list of partners, the ND Forest Service should be added as a resource.
- Will the OHF request be used to supplement areas not covered within the RCPP? The RCPP funding has been received so the OHF request would be used to enhance additional funding to those practices.

18-19 (B) Medora Grazing Association; Medora Grazing Association-Water Well Development Program; 245,800

Project Summary: To develop four partially plugged oil/gas wells in Billings County into water wells to preserve livestock grazing, enhance wildlife habitat, and improve water quality.

Mr. Wes Obrigewitch gave a presentation (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available in the Commission files.)

In response to questions, the applicant stated:

- The average depth is 1,600 feet so how large of pumps will be needed? That will vary according to the size of the pipeline.
- There is power at all four sites, so it just needs to be run to the well head.
- If the power is within 300-400 feet, why does it cost close to \$100,000 to run power to all four wells? The power is being brought from the meter to the wellhead which includes the pump and pipe going into the hole and a soft start control box. The control box allows it to start at a slower rate, so it does not burn up the pump.
- The control box and pump are between \$5,000-7,000 along with the power connected to the meter. If you chose to go solar vs. electric it would be the same situation, correct? Yes.
- If you are going to expand the use to reach other allotments, that would require a large pump. How are you planning the size of the pump? We are in the process of completing a pipeline route to determine how far the pipeline is going and where the tanks will be located.
- How long will the wells last and who will be responsible for the wells? The wells are expected to last 30 years. When NDIC did the plugging, the casing was tested, and all the production casing was pulled out to eliminate contamination. All that remains is surface casing that was cleaned out. There was also a pressure test on the casing and the testing on the four wells in this proposal did extremely well.

- Who will be responsible for the electrical? All maintenance responsibilities are with the Medora Grazing Association and its members.
- Regarding matching funds, there was value given for the electrical reservation and also the boreholes none of which was paid by the Grazing Association, correct? Yes. The value was determined using costs from a recently finished well in northern Billings County in which the power had been discontinued between the Forest Service and the oil company. To restore the power coming into this well the cost to the Grazing Association was a total of \$60,000. This is why value was placed on reserving power to the well. If the power was not reserved to the borehole, it would be between \$100-110 per foot.
- There is no conservation plan with this proposal, correct? Yes, this is just to get the water well developed. The tank will be taken from the location which will be the first step. A vegetation management plan will be done through the Forest Service for that entire area which does include cross-fencing and pipeline. The point is to spread out the cattle within the grasslands. The plan will be implemented within the next five years.
- Is there an obligation to implement the conservation plan? The plan is optional, but the members see the value with limited water options and are on board.
- Will the roads be reclaimed going to these sites? The site is very close to a county road. A gravel road is not ideal, but access is needed for equipment, so it was asked to leave the approaches in to allow a two-track trail to the site.
- Due to the current dry weather conditions, could the Fire Departments have access to these sites? Yes, that is a possibility they would like to see happen. With a lot of these water wells, a fire resource is included within the wellhead so the Fire Department could tap into it.

18-20 (B) North Dakota Conservation District Employees Association (NDCDEA); ND Conservation District Employees Association Statewide Tree Planting Initiative; \$2,550,000

Project Summary: Continue funding for the 2022-2024 tree planting season for conservation tree installation to include both trees and fabric.

Ms. Sarah Tunge gave a presentation (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available in the Commission files.)

In response to questions, the applicant stated:

- With the number of trees planted, what is the survivability rate? The Association does not track totals, but the districts do. It is a ten-year contract and there is a maintenance and operations agreement stating it will be maintained. Each district goes out at the end of the current planting season and conducts counts. Speaking within her own county, it is between a 75-86% success rate depending on the weather.
- Is there a requirement for how many rows of trees will be put in a single shelterbelt? No, all plantings must meet current NRCS field operating technical guidelines for whatever type of planting it entails.
- Regarding plantings on cropland versus native prairie, do you know what percentage of plantings are going to those specific land uses? The Association tries to avoid plantings on native prairie which is against the specifications unless it is specific for livestock usage.
- Are you getting any applicants interested in the PLOTS program? They do visit with each applicant about the program in the planning process, but some plantings are not conducive to that program.
- Of all the OHF programs, Mr. Kuylen stated he receives the most feedback from this project.
- Is the process sustainable over 20 years? A ten-year agreement with landowners requires maintenance of the plantings. After ten years, the growth of the trees may be variable based upon weather conditions. Do you think the ten-year agreement is long enough? Some landowners with

tree plantings allow livestock in that area and then a few years later the trees are non-functional. We believe ten-years is long enough for maintenance. There is a question on the application regarding whether livestock will be fenced out of the tree planting area. Once trees reach the ten-year mark, there is much more resilience. Also, with weeding and mowing the success rate improves dramatically.

18-22 (C) North Dakota Natural Resources Trust; Wildlife and Livestock Dams - Wetlands Creation, Restoration and Enhancement; 250,000

Project Summary: Cooperate with private landowners to create, enhance, and restore 20 wetland habitats covering 112 acres in North Dakota for the benefit of wildlife populations and livestock production.

Mr. Rick Warhurst gave a presentation (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available in Commission files.)

In response to questions, the applicant stated:

- A grant from Round 12 is not listed on the spreadsheet and needs to be corrected.
- What are the contract arrangements or parameters? There is a trust agreement with each landowner for ten years. Most are on grazing land and although that is not dictated, it is encouraged.
- So there are no long-term commitments with to stay in wetlands? It is a ten-year agreement, but it is expected to last between 20-30 years with proper design.
- With the first round completed, it was estimated between 3,000-4,000 acres surround those grasslands.

18-8 (C) Glen Ullin Park District; Bringing Fish to Glen Ullin; \$56,042

Project Summary: The Park District intends to have the town dam dredged and stocked with fish.

Ms. Vicki Horst gave a presentation (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available in the Commission files)

In response to questions, the applicant stated:

- How many acres is the water? Between approximately 20-25 acres.
- What types of fish will be stocked? Crappie, Bluegill, Bass, and Perch
- Can the low estimate provide a deep enough dredge to sustain a fishery? The depths shown will probably not sustain the fish through the summer. Dredging can be very expensive and will probably entail the usage of a long arm backhoe vs. a hydraulic dredge which is much cheaper. This is a small pond, and the backhoe will deepen the pond to sustain fish through the summer. Ms. Horst stated the numbers were provided by the Game and Fish Department.
- Why such little local support? The Park Board has a very small budget, so in-kind is being used more than cash.
- What type of work needs to be done to fix the dam and why is this not part of a comprehensive project? The dike could use some concrete work and rip rap on the underside. It receives the runoff from Eagle's Nest and after 3-4 inches of water the dam is full. The dam used to be full of fish, but now there is none. The county sometimes uses the dam to pump water up for roads. This proposal was the easiest solution. The goal is also to make it handicap accessible in the future. Last year due to Covid, approximately \$8,800 was lost in wages. There are a lot of extra costs as a result of ordering supplies and building projects, such as the archery range.
- The idea is good, but would also like to see an estimate for dam repair which is critical. This year the focus would be on dredging out the dam and provide sheeting. The Game and Fish Department

estimated \$200,000 for dam repair, but the Park District was not prepared to complete that part of the project this year.

- How would the \$200,000 for dam repair be funded? Additional grants will be sought. Once money is received by the park, it will start funding what it can.
- The issue is that the dam is still very functional but will need some work within the next ten years.
- How long will the dredging last? Hopeful it will last at least 30 years. The dam has not been dredged in recent history.
- This would be a start to get the Park Board going in the right direction.
- Also, no-till farming creates less run-off in fields and there are no fields that border the dam.
- There is a creek nearby that runs into the dam.

18-1 (C) Audubon Dakota; Urban Woods and Prairies Initiative Expansion Phase II; \$620,760

Project Summary: Restore idle urban flood lands and riparian areas to create healthy habitat for birds and other wildlife, reduce public landowner maintenance output, and provide unique outdoor recreation and education opportunities. The goal is to create a nature park within walking distance of 70% of ND's population by 2023.

Ms. Sarah Hewitt gave a presentation (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available in Commission files.)

In response to questions, the applicant stated:

- Are all these sites in all four cities currently park property? Yes, both Jamestown and Fargo are park property. In Valley City, the land is moving from a private landowner to the Park Board. In Minot, a site is being identified as greenway work and the hope is to complete some grassland restoration there.
- Regarding the 160 acres in Fargo, what was happening with this park property and why was it not maintained? This is a brand-new site being created in south Fargo which was originally a drainage area. The goal is to transform it into recreational area with trails along with grassland restoration and restored wetlands.
- How much of OHF dollars in the budget will be spent on chemical spraying? This will be more detailed in the follow-up management. The majority of OHF dollars will be used for front end restoration costs, such as paying for the seed and then seeding. Long-term management will entail a smaller portion.
- Will the original expansion be completed, and those funds expended this year? Yes.
- What is the status of the other two prairie management projects? There were some delays and challenges due to Covid last year which restricted how contractors could work on the site. One project has been granted an extension, but the other should be completed later this year. Ms. Pfennig clarified that some reports have been submitted with reimbursement requests but have not been processed yet which would affect the outstanding funds. There have been numerous requests for extensions due to Covid delays. Ms. Hewitt stated there has been a lot of interest in the prairie management projects which have spurred on additional projects lined up for the following year.
- The species referred to in the project such as Kentucky Bluegrass and Canadian Thistle are difficult to remove and reinvade very quickly. Beyond those three years, how will these species continue to be maintained? A lot of effort is put into guiding our partners through site prep. The advisement is to mow, till, and complete two herbicide sprays. Within that three-year time frame will be strategic mowing and site spraying. If challenges arise after those three years, funding will be extended for additional management of the site. There are also management plans for each site as the guiding document for our partners after ten plus years.

- Regarding the Monson Park application in Valley City, what dollars will be used for that particular site? The goal is to use funds just for 20 acres of the site which is currently invaded with Russian Olive and Buckthorn. This is the first phase in enhancing that site and prepping it for grazing and accessibility. Funds for this phase, would just be used for removal of the Russian Olive and Buckthorn. An estimate was included with the application, which has the specific pricing.
- Is weed control included in the other Monson Park application in Valley City? No, that is just for trail development.

18-5 (A) City of New Town; Edgewater Country Club Boat Dock; \$60,000

Project Summary: Add a floating dock on Lake Sakakawea with a pathway extending from the dock to the Edgewater golf course to allow recreational boaters access to the golf course and country club.

Mr. Patrick Samson gave a presentation (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available in Commission files.) There were no questions asked of the applicant.

18-16 (A) Barnes County Park Board; Sheyenne River Water Trail; \$170,000

Project Summary: Develop a 180-mile water trail with 19 paddle landings through 3 counties (Richland, Ransom, and Barnes) from Baldhill Dam to the Sheyenne National Grassland.

Mr. Bobby Koepplin gave a presentation (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available in Commission files.) Mr. Koepplin noted one correction in the application which is that there are 38 and not 32 bridges that require signage.

In response to questions, the applicant stated:

- Are these landing improvements on private or public land? All but two are on public land. Pending approval of funding, the two landings on private land will have a 25 year renewable easements.
- Regarding the 180 miles, are there any issues of private property rights and how will those issues be addressed? There will be kiosks stating to respect private land property. Maps will also be provided. Once it receives national designation as a trail, hopefully people will respect private land property rights more.
- Impressed with all the partners signed onto the project. Are there any numbers on the amount of people who have used this trail in the past or projections for future use? It is difficult to determine or project with trails. With the kayak rental kiosks being installed, a better determinization can be made at a later time. On a side note, two years ago there were 137 watercraft or 167 people during a water fundraising event for byways which did receive a national award.
- Are beavers an issue along with trail? This is not really an issue on the Sheyenne River. The biggest problem is the six low head dams. The Water Resource Board is working on low head dam removal. This is why the signage will be critical because two are needed on each side of the river.
- Farmers and ranchers putting up barbwire along the river's edge does not seem to be an issue.

18-15 (D) Barnes County Park Board; Monson Park and Trail; \$42,525

Project Summary: Development of a 42-acre County Park on the west side of Valley City and a 1.4-mile trail on a former railroad bed connecting to an existing shared use path for a 2.8-mile path to downtown along with an orchard and pollinator plot.

Mr. Bobby Koepplin gave a presentation (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available in Commission files.)

In response to questions, the applicant stated:

- Is the land a donation to the park board? Yes, it will be a donation of the land directly to the Park Board.
- The local match is only \$1,000 so was there not a lot of buy in? The challenge is that all the partners are non-profit groups. County parks stated it will maintain the project through mowing because it has the employees, but did not commit taxpayer dollars. The landowner contribution is the match.
- Are the orchard and pollinator plots within these 42 acres? Yes, those were already planted with OHF support and under the advisement of the Game and Fish Department.
- How long is the railroad bed that would be included in the 42 acres? Just under one mile.
- Does the trail go to a dead end? With the current easements and improvements within the grant, it will allow connection to a 1.4-mile shared use path on the other side of business loop 94. Sign crossings and possibly a crosswalk will be needed as a result which will be completed with other funding. People can park on a boulevard on the southside of the shared use path. Technically, the trail could go all the way to downtown or a total of 2.8 miles.
- Will someone be grazing the Monson property just acquired? Audubon Dakota wants to remove the Russian Olive and Buckthorn and has advised flash grazing to be completed which is why funding is requested for grazing. Orchard trees will also be grazed during the correct season.

18-23 (D) State Historical Society of North Dakota; Writing Rock State Historic Site Playground Facilities Update; \$10,000

Project Summary: Remove the old equipment and purchase and install a nature-inspired, playground structure and its ground cover at Writing Rock State Historic Site in Western Divide County.

Mr. Chris Dorfschmidt gave a presentation (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available in Commission files.)

In response to questions, the applicant stated:

- There was a comment appreciating the desire to make improvements to the older playground.
- Being state appropriated, is spending authority needed or will it need to be granted next session? No spending authority is needed. The money will come out of capital improvement funds.
- Is the playground under the State Risk Management Program? Yes.
- How did the playground pass under the State Risk Management Program being it is so old? People forgot the playground was even there so no one has really looked at it. Typically, people do not look for playground equipment at a historical site, but it is there and needs to be revised before someone gets seriously hurt.

18-13 (D) NDSU Dickinson Research Extension Center; Dickinson Research Extension Center Virtual Arboretum and Crop Tour; \$18,440

Project Summary: Create a self-guided virtual tour of the arboretum, horticulture, agriculture, and wildlife habitat demos by using signage paired with smartphone technology.

Dr. Christopher Augustin gave a presentation (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available in Commission files.)

In response to questions, the applicant stated:

- Comment on attesting to the increased usage of the area and how well it is maintained.
- Dr. Augustin stated this is a good opportunity to educate the public.

18-2 (D) Bottineau Winter Park, Inc.; Bottineau Winter Park Infrastructure and Program Improvements; \$923,575

Project Summary: Improvements to the infrastructure of Bottineau Winter Park, including: new T Bar lift, parking lot, additional magic lift, tube operator shack, new snowmaking equipment, and an additional groomer.

Mr. Daniel Fett gave a presentation (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available in Commission files.)

In response to questions, the applicant stated:

- According to the application, there is a match of \$923,575, but only \$250,000 has been identified so where is the remainder coming from? This is a multi-year project, and the current focus is on the T-bar portion of the project. The cost for this portion is approximately \$500,000 and over \$200,000 has been raised from individuals, businesses, and foundations. No money will be borrowed for each portion of the project, but rather from the support of the community. Approximately \$1 million was raised for these buildings and \$300,000 for the T-bar over ten years ago.
- Who owns the land? Portions of the land are owned by the city of Bottineau to which there is a Memorandum of Understanding. The Bottineau Winter Park, Inc. is a nonprofit with nine volunteer board members who care about recreational activities in this portion of the state. There is not a lot of population base, so donations are primarily through grants. This adaptive program is unique, especially in this rural landscape. People come from all over the state to access our hills and use the adaptive program.

18-3 (D) Bowman Parks and Recreation; Southwest Shooting Club Range; \$219,401

Project Summary: To purchase land, construct berms and a facility, install fencing and a locked gate, and purchase equipment for a shooting range in the Bowman and Rhame area.

Mr. James Harriman gave a presentation (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available in Commission files.)

In response to questions, the applicant stated:

- Who owns the 16 acres purchased and what was the cost? The cost was just over \$20,000 with \$5,000 from a challenge grant, \$10,000 from a private donation, and the remainder was from membership collections. The acreage is owned by the Southwest Shooting Club which is a 501c3.
- What is the 20 feet by 80 foot shooting structure? A covered structure with benches for shooting throughout the range. The covered structure will be used for shooting competitions because anyone under ten years of age uses the shooting position.
- What is the setup plan for shotgun shooting? To host trap shooting for competitions. Also, a total of six clay pigeon throwers were purchased for the competitions.

18-11 (D) Mountrail County; Clear Lake Park - Grain Bin Gazebos and Tree Planting Project; \$57,870

Project Summary: Provide shelter through the planting of trees and construction of a gazebo at Clear Lake Park.

Ms. Joan Hollkiem gave a presentation (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available in Commission files.)

The comment was made that a lot of communities would probably like to adopt this project too.

18-10 (D) LaMoure Lions; Sunset Park Revitalization Project; \$35,000

Project Summary: Development and installation of approximately 25,000 square feet of concrete walking paths which are 8 feet wide at Sunset Park in LaMoure ND.

Ms. Caroline Homan gave a presentation (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available in Commission files.)

In response to questions, the applicant stated:

- What is the other fundraising for matching funds? Does it include money from other businesses or from raffles and feeds, etc.? It is a combination. With the Lions, it is a brick and bench fundraiser.

18-6 (D) Dunn County Park Board; Lake Ilo Natural Playscape; \$6,471

Project Summary: Creation of a nature play area in the County Park located at the Lake Ilo National Wildlife Refuge which includes a pollinator plot, animal trail, water feature, climbers, gathering place, and ability to construct and deconstruct an eagles nest and various shelters.

Ms. Cari Boster and a group of Girls Scouts from Killdeer gave a presentation (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available in Commission files.)

In response to questions, the applicant stated:

- The budget states \$5,000 for signage, but nothing is shown for the playscapes material so how will funding for that material be raised? The majority of this material will be scavenged from intertwined branches with some lumber costs included. Most is made out of playscape materials that are natural to the area in which it is being built.

18-7 (D) Enderlin Park Board; Maple River Bank Stabilization Project – Enderlin; \$55,250

Project Summary: Stabilize the west bank of the Maple River along Patrick Pierce Park with rock rip rap to prevent erosion to provide a more welcoming and safer place for recreation.

Mr. Ross Berglund gave a presentation and there were no questions of the applicant.

18-9 (D) Grafton Parks and Recreation; Leistikow Park Outdoor Community/Event Center, \$28,386

Project Summary:

Mr. Bill Dahl gave a presentation (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available in Commission files.) There were no questions of the applicant.

18-17 (D) Geographical Center Historical Society; Prairie Village Museum Edible Green Space, \$17,066

Project Summary: Create an edible park of fresh fruit to benefit people at no cost and provide a park setting.

It was noted that the applicant withdrew the application.

18-14 (D) Valley-Edinburg School District #118 – DPI; Crystal Playground Project; \$10,000

Project Summary: Remove the 40 year-old playground equipment and build a safer, better quality playground system for students, grades 4-8, in the Crystal Middle School.

It was noted that the applicant was unable to give a presentation but would still like to be considered for funding.

18-4 (D) Center Park Board; Center Park Board Lehmkuhl Park New Equipment; \$10,000

Project Summary: New playground equipment for the Lehmkuhl Park in Center.

The applicant was unable to give a presentation but would still like to be considered for funding approval.

18-24 (D) City of Dunseith; Dunseith Park Plan; \$41,000

Project Summary: To enhance city park by purchasing and installing a new commercial playground and rest room facilities to serve both the local youth and patrons.

Mr. Les Thomas gave a presentation.

In response to questions, the applicant stated:

- On the application, there is not a bid for the restroom facility or picnic harbor. The total bid is approximately \$103,000 and looking at the tribe and other funding sources to assist with some of the amenities. This area is very family oriented with both volleyball and basketball courts. Students will assist with artwork on the building. Partnerships with the college are also being examined. Some of the other prior projects that received funding by the OHF actually provided employment for tribe members.

Upon completion of all the presentations, Chairman Kuylen opened the meeting for public comment on any of the projects. No comments were made.

There was general discussion by the OHF Advisory Board on Grant Round 18 applications as follows:

18-12 (B) NDSU - North Dakota Forest Service; North Dakota Statewide Windbreak Renovation Initiative 2.0; \$300,000

- A well-used project with a line of people interested in participating again.

18-21 (B) North Dakota Natural Resources Trust; Grazing Resiliency in the Bakken (GRB); \$1,290,000

- This project fits in with past enhancement types of programs. It seems like the OHF should be asking to prioritize those willing to participate in public access, although it is not a requirement. When funds are being utilized, there is no reason not to prioritize access. This project is supported and believed it will be good for conservation and farming/ranching communities.
- In general, and not with this particular application, there are several requesting funding for staff. Staffing was intended for small struggling organizations that have volunteers and need additional assistance. Some financially sound organizations are asking for staff assistance and that should be removed from the respective budgets when the motions are made.

18-18 (B) Little Missouri Grazing Association; Little Missouri Grazing Association - Deep Creek Watershed Conservation Project; \$227,102

- Support for this project was expressed. National grasslands are open to hunting, hiking, and recreation. Having that water distributed will enhance the productivity of the livestock and wetlands. Also, this project will be completing the project for less money than some of the other proposed projects.
- There was concern over the tree planting in woody draws. Typically, tree plantings in woody draws do not do well. Historically grasslands are not woody areas. A suggestion was made that the tree planting portion of the project be removed.
- The 79% high-cost share percentage versus some of the other projects that come in at 25%.
- Like this project and it should be supported. The Forest Service does try and address woody draw restoration. Riparian restoration and maintaining crested wheat is always a good idea.

- Both the Little Missouri Grazing Association and the Forest Service prioritized riparian restoration. It is very difficult to establish trees in woody draws for a variety of reasons and so this portion of the project probably needs more thought such as planting native trees in those riparian areas. Would like to see the Association come back with a stronger proposal for how to plant those trees with some other natural resource agency input.
- Has the OHF ever paid NEPA costs before and is there a limit or parameters that need to be set? NEPA costs have been paid by the OHF. There has not been a limit set by the board, but that can be discussed in the future.
- NEPA sounds like a roadblock if that is what the project needs to move forward. There are woody draws in those prairie grasslands where trees are not coming back due to both cattle and invasiveness. Woody draws provide a lot of coverage for animals in those areas and should be maintained.
- Ecological sites were not traditionally wooded and many of these areas should be prairie. Although woody draws are great for wildlife habitat, they also create a negative impact to grassland nesting birds. The riparian areas were historically wooded, and this is where the emphasis should be. A lot of money can be spent on things with no return.
- The question regarding the reestablishment of trees is a hard one because we are dealing with degraded sites with a lot of history regarding invasive species, soil, and fire. The idea of establishing trees in riparian areas is a difficult one because of all those factors. Don't disagree with the effort, but this concept really needs a strategic plan to move forward. Also, need to pick tree and shrub species with sources to western North Dakota.
- Concern is not with the overall project, but with the tree planting part of the project and that trees are going into places that are historically riparian vegetated. This would be the river bottoms and not the draws.
- Also, deer and rabbits are hard on small trees and will eat all the leaves within reach.
- The tree issue may be something promoted more by the Forest Service and not the Association. Maybe the tree portion of the project can be removed so the remainder of the project can receive funding.
 - The applicant confirmed that the trees are a tactical strategy by the Grazing Association. The Forest Service is not strictly requiring the Association to restore woody draws in the initial phase of the EA. If the Forest Service monitoring efforts show that cross fencing and water developments do not move these woody draws towards the grassland planned objectives, adaptive actions could be initiated. One of those actions is to cut the animal units or completely exclude livestock. The Association wanted to be proactive and show the Forest Service that human intervention regarding these woody draws would increase woody species.
- The Association is trying to stay ahead of an issue that is not their responsibility.
- Each Foundation seems to have a different objective on where trees need to be planted which can be confusing.

18-19 (B) Medora Grazing Association; Medora Grazing Association-Water Well Development Program; \$245,800

- Support for this project was expressed and feel it is long overdue because it is about trying to get water out from the source.
- Like that old well sites and the casing from those sites is being used. Normally, it is \$100 per foot to drill a well.
- Concern was express that the Association does not have any money invested in this project. The electrical was reserved which did not cost anything. Also, these wells were plugged and abandoned for uses such as this project. There is no commitment or enhancement with any conservation. All

this project is about is purchasing water wells. Would support this project if it came back with a conservation plan.

- Removing critters from the water source down at the river bottom will be better for hunters. This project is only about purchasing water wells for the association; it states nothing about removing critters from the water source.
- This is part of a phased project where the Association is trying to distribute that water to a rotational grazing model.
- The Forest Service does require a conservation plan and measurements to be taken around the grasslands. Cattle do need to be removed from the riparian areas or the Forest Service will no longer support. The distribution of water is the biggest part of the conservation plan.
- The Forest Service will own the wells but have no responsibility. If there is a problem with the wells, who will fix it? The Grazing Association.
- The field office tech guide cost share for electricity to an area is not allowed. This a practice component that NRCS does not allow, although it may be needed in certain areas. This is why the Grazing Association put a value on reserve electrical because that was the cost of getting the electrical to certain areas.
- Part of why electrical is not allowed was because people would turn it into homesteads versus maintaining as water wells.

18-20 (B) North Dakota Conservation District Employees Association (NDCDEA); ND Conservation District Employees Association Statewide Tree Planting Initiative; \$2,550,000

- Great project because as many trees as possible are needed in North Dakota. This Association has already spent prior funds and are ready to go onto the next round.
- This project has received the most positive feedback.

18-22 (C) North Dakota Natural Resources Trust; Wildlife and Livestock Dams - Wetlands Creation, Restoration and Enhancement; \$250,000

- This is a good because it consists of 20 projects estimated to last ten years. It also makes new water and restores additional water for water birds as well as livestock use.
- Approximately half of the projects in the previous project were in the PLOTS program.

18-8 (C) Glen Ullin Park District; Bringing Fish to Glen Ullin; \$56,042

- Concern that this project is being pieced together. If there is a dam issue, it seems like that should be done first. A comprehensive plan would be better.
- It's an old railroad dam and used to be managed as an active fishery until 15-20 years ago because the depth was not there. Right now, there are 15 community fisheries across the state. Not worried about a blowout on the dam, but there is not enough runoff. Probably between a \$200,000-300,000 fix.
- Can an extendable reach meet the needs to be fixed? A long reach track hoe can reach approximately 50 feet.
- Fantastic project, but there is concern regarding if the Park District comes back requesting more money to dredge the lake to make it deeper. Great project, but maybe a little premature.
- If the Park District come back requesting additional funds, it would be for hydraulic dredging which is very expensive. It would almost entail dredging the entire river.
- Portions of the project were good such as the dredging, seeding, and access, but not the parking lot.

18-1 (C) Audubon Dakota; Urban Woods and Prairies Initiative Expansion Phase II; \$620,760

- This project is about paying for the non-control and moving of invasive species that have been allowed to grow in that area which should not be supported.

- Would like to see more projects come forward to remove Russian Olive from the prairie and increase grazing for cattle. Russian Olive is an invasive tree and any projects that assist in removing them from our ecosystem is a positive. Both Russian Olive and Buckthorn are difficult and expensive to remove which is why most landowners have not removed them. Not all trees are good trees.
- Russian Olive trees have not been recognized as an invasive species, but the trees are, and they affect grazing.
- The areas specified in this project are within city limits, so it involves people not used to dealing with noxious weeds/species. Because it deals with urban areas, let's not punish these people who did not know any better and are now trying to do the right thing.
- One issue is the low match of funds for being in Fargo, Minot, Jamestown, and Valley City.

18-5 (A) City of New Town; Edgewater Country Club Boat Dock; \$60,000

- Struggling to find a directive this project meets.
- This is an unusual project because most people do not drive to golf courses in a fishing boat.

18-16 (A) Barnes County Park Board; Sheyenne River Water Trail; \$170,000

- Over half of the request is for signage so not sure if this is an appropriate fit for the program. Signage should be used as an enhancement of the conservation project completed. Signage just to receive a national designation does not cut it.
- This is a great project and signage is needed in this area. The trail is already there which could have national significance. The sport gets people outdoors and requires some physical activity.
- This is a good project, and the signage is needed to inform users on where they need to go.
- Signs should be placed in low water areas for safety reasons.
- From a safety perspective, signage is needed. Signage is also important to draw people into recreational areas.
- If an area is properly signed, liability goes down. It is a wonderful project and signage is needed to keep it safe.
- The State Parks and Recreation will be watching this project closely as it goes to the National Park Service.

18-15 (D) Barnes County Park Board; Monson Park and Trail; \$42,525

- Is the trail closed where the cattle are grazed in? If it isn't, it probably should be.
- This project includes management, and it is a great trail system.
- This is more of a natural trail and does not require paving.

18-23 (D) State Historical Society of North Dakota; Writing Rock State Historic Site Playground Facilities Update; \$10,000

- This is a good project and there have not been a lot worked on in that direction.
- This is the heart of where the funds come from.

18-13 (D) NDSU Dickinson Research Extension Center; Dickinson Research Extension Center Virtual Arboretum and Crop Tour; \$18,440

- This is a great facility and can target people already utilizing their phones and get them interested in the outdoors.
- Is the scanning of QR codes considered recreation? This may be the future of how people learn about the outdoors and agriculture.

- A lot of these QR codes are being incorporated into the state parks so it is the future for outdoor recreation.
- This project seems to be more educational than recreational. The QR codes are helpful and take the person directly to the project information.
- This project does not fit the scoring sheet, so is that a flaw on the scoring sheet or a flaw in the application of the grant?
- The job of NDSU is outreach and education and, as a result, should already have the money to complete the project.
- People are outdoors and learning things about trees which then makes them want to plant trees themselves. There does not seem to be anything bad that can come from supporting this project.
- As a board, we need to be more flexible and open to new technological advancements.
- Using technology does not mean you are not engaging in outdoor recreation. Lots of people use technology to determine their location on the trail system. Also, the public is asking that technology be used more in outdoor recreation.
- Back in the beginning of the OHF, a project was funded that involved mapping for hunting boundaries utilizing technology.
- This could also be designated as an extenuating circumstance if there is concern over whether this is meeting a directive.
- Hen Houses don't score well either and yet there are so many benefits for waterfowl.

18-2 (D) Bottineau Winter Park, Inc.: Bottineau Winter Park Infrastructure and Program Improvements; \$923,575

- This project should not be supported because it is not a good fit for the program. Although Annie's House and the adaptive program are awesome. Back in 2013, this project was strictly conservation related, but now there is no conservation which is why it should not be supported.
- Parks and recreation projects should be funded where the proper sources are available and not through an outdoor conservation type fund. Great project and like the concept, but not all are meant to be funded through the OHF.

18-3 (D) Bowman Parks and Recreation; Southwest Shooting Club Range; \$219,401

- This is probably a much-needed project in the community, I just don't think OHF is the appropriate funding source. This is where the sportsman clubs, shooting organizations, and Game and Fish Department should provide the funding.
- Like this project, but Bowman Parks and Recreation never came to the Game and Fish Department for assistance which would have probably funded the project.
- Issues with the buildings, but the outdoor shooting and archery ranges do fit within the scope of OHF. The buildings and shooting cover can go through the Game and Fish Department for support.
- If the shooting/archery range was funded, it would be a great draw for the OHF.
- In the application, it is difficult to determine funding needed just for construction of the shooting/archery range.
- Berm construction would be needed for safety on the shooting/archery range.
- With removal, design, and surveying of the buildings, the total for the shooting/archery range is \$69,651.
- Recreational fundings of \$1.5 million from the Game and Fish Department for shooting/archery ranges has been drawn down so it would be two years before funding would be available to apply for a grant.

18-4 (D) Center Park Board; Center Park Board Lehmkuhl Park New Equipment; \$10,000

- No comment.

18-6 (D) Dunn County Park Board; Lake Ilo Natural Playscape; \$6,471

- This seems like a great project.

18-7 (D) Enderlin Park Board; Maple River Bank Stabilization Project – Enderlin; \$55,250

- Looks like it needs to be done.

18-9 (D) Grafton Parks and Recreation; Leistikow Park Outdoor Community/ Event Center; \$28,386

- Although the request includes a building, the project has been well planned. If the OHF wants to fund a building, this is a project that should be considered. It will provide shelter and that area of the community will see a lot of users. It would be a good return on investment.
- It's a building for a park district without any conservation. A good project, just not a good fit for OHF.

18-10 (D) LaMoure Lions; Sunset Park Revitalization Project; \$35,000

- This project seems to be more of a sidewalk.

18-11 (D) Mountrail County; Clear Lake Park - Grain Bin Gazebos and Tree Planting Project; \$57,870

- This community put a lot of work into revitalizing a lake.
- These types of funding requests are difficult because it is hard to know where the line is regarding recreation.
- Could we look at just funding the trees, labor, and equipment?
- The problem is that trees are not needed without the gazebos.
- Regarding the prior work completed, the park is on a good path to complete its vision.
- OHF has the discretion to only fund specific parts of a project.
- If just the 25 trees were funded, how would that affect the match. The suggestion is that it would be the same proportion or 32.21%, but at least a 25% match.
- Does an extenuating circumstance need to be considered separately? In this instance, only the trees are being funded so there would be no extenuating circumstance. If one is identified as an extenuating circumstance, that should be identified in a motion to the Commission.
- If OHF is just funding the trees and the park will fundraise for the gazebos separately, then that does not need to be included in the contract for the scope of work and the only match needed would be for the trees.
- If OHF just funded the trees and the match remained the same, it would have to be contingent on the raising of the other funds or if the park only wanted to purchase one gazebo, for example, the match would cover that cost.

18-14 (D) Valley-Edinburg School District #118 – DPI; Crystal Playground Project; \$10,000

- It was noted that the applicant stated “The school and city are not formally working together on this project; however, the city would benefit greatly as it does not currently have its own functional city park. We, unfortunately, do not have a design plan at this time; our plan is to exchange our old equipment with new equipment if funds are allocated. This includes a play system, new swings, and a shaded recreation area.”
- Although the city does not have its own playground, the public would be allowed to use this playground.
- This is the first time a school district has requested funds for a park.
- There was a similar request in an earlier grant round that did not receive funds.

18-24 (D) City of Dunseith; Dunseith Park Plan; \$41,000

- A lot of items included in the application did not actually pertain to the application which made it confusing. Also, there were not any bid proposals for the cost of the restroom facilities. There also is no proposal for the playground or picnic arbor. The primary discussion included in the application is about asphalt, basketball, and volleyball. Maybe this application needs to go back to the applicant so the correct bids can be included. The application does not seem to be complete.
- Seems like a project proposal for a different project and it does not fit. This application needs more work for clarification purposes.
- OHF could just fund the playground which could be easily monitored.

Chairman Kuylen asked the voting Board members to complete all scoring sheets and turn them in to Ms. Fine and Ms. Pfennig.

Ms. Pfennig noted that there were no conflicts of interest.

Chairman Kuylen listed the six applications that received less than seven votes for funding which include application numbers: 18-2, 18-5, 18-9, 18-10, 18-14, and 18-24.

It was moved by Moser and seconded by Bina that the following applications not be forwarded to the Commission for funding:

- **18-2 (D) Bottineau Winter Park, Inc.; Bottineau Winter Park Infrastructure and Program Improvements; \$923,575**
- **18-5 (A) City of New Town; Edgewater Country Club Boat Dock; \$60,000**
- **18-9 (D) Grafton Parks and Recreation; Leistikow Park Outdoor Community/ Event Center; \$28,386**
- **18-10 (D) LaMoure Lions; Sunset Park Revitalization Project; \$35,000**
- **18-14 (D) Valley-Edinburg School District #118 – DPI; Crystal Playground Project; \$10,000**
- **18-24 (D) City of Dunseith; Dunseith Park Plan; \$41,000**

On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Dokken, Elkin, Erickson, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Lies, Moser, Reiersen, and Retterath voted yes; no one voted nay. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Elkin left the meeting at approximately 1:15 p.m.

18-1 (C) Audubon Dakota; Urban Woods and Prairies Initiative Expansion Phase II; \$620,760

It was moved by Bina and seconded by Dewald that the Urban Woods and Prairies Initiative Expansion Phase II Project, submitted by Audubon Dakota be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$620,760.

Discussion included the following:

- In that total was \$29,560 for staff. Guidelines show there must be a need for those costs versus just including that in the budget.
- Staffing costs were denied based on not meeting guidelines so should the Board allow the applicant time to meet that guideline.
- If the applicant was given time to meet those guidelines, the Board would have to be specific in whether or not that would be justified.
- Curious as to the wording of the guidelines pertaining to staffing costs.

- Depending on the size of the grant, an applicant is allowed a certain percentage for staffing provided.
- Regarding the Century Code on the powers and duties of the Commission: The Commission is granted all powers necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this chapter including the power to approve expenditures for staffing or an outside consultant to design, implement, and approve projects based on the documented need of the applicant and the expenditures may not exceed 5% of the grant to the grantee if the grant exceeds \$250K. Expenditures may not exceed 10% if the grant is \$250K or less.
- Based on this grant, the percentage is less than allowed so then it goes back to the justification of whether it is needed so what is the standard on that?
- The statute allows for staffing so when an organization requests staffing, it is being requested because it is needed to complete the project. When there are projects that entail working with county entities, landowners, etc., it is because there is a need to complete these projects.
- There have also been larger projects working with numerous people that have not requested staffing. If it is an organizations mission to deliver programs through its membership, than that should be expected of the organization to pay for staffing costs. Also, that then allows the OHF additional funds to put towards conservation projects versus staffing.
- This amendment seems arbitrary considering there is no baseline, guideline or range to follow. Currently, staffing decisions are based upon whether the OHF believes the organization should have it or not which is not fair.
- Only one statewide tree planting project was approved funding for staffing.
- What was the basis for approving staffing for the statewide tree planting project? It was because there was no formed organization or entity and no full-time staff versus others. This was also a new project and there was not a source of funding available to administer the project.
- Staffing is already included in a lot of these applicants' budgets for the year.
- Also, entities that already have biologists on staff and requested staffing for biologists were denied those costs.
- The SCD's are a taxable entity that receive money from taxpayers already for staffing.
- If entities are requesting staffing costs, the OHF should be approving those costs up to the limit under the law.
- The idea is that this money is to be used for projects already on the ground. The OHF should not be required to double pay when an organization already has qualified staff on board. On the other hand, if an organization does not have the staff available to administer a project, it will be approved.
- The statute states staffing is based on the documented need so then the applicant needs to justify that need within the application or in person during the presentation phase.
- Then going forward the applicant needs to be aware that staffing costs must be justified.
- It is not the SCD's, but the employee's organization that does not have staff or receive government dollars.

It was moved by Moser and seconded by Lies to amend the motion, decreasing the amount by \$29,560 with the contingency that OHF funds may not be used for staffing costs for a total award of \$591,200.

On a roll call vote, Dokken, Erickson, Hutchens, Kuylen, Lies, Moser, Reieron, and Retterath voted yes, and Bina, Dewald, Kreil voted nay. The motion carried.

On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Moser, Reieron, and Retterath voted yes, and Dokken, Erickson, and Lies voted nay. The motion carried.

18-3 (D) Bowman Parks and Recreation; Southwest Shooting Club Range; \$219,401

It was moved by Reierson and seconded by Lies that the Southwest Shooting Club Range Project, submitted by Bowman Parks and Recreation be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$69,115 with the contingency that OHF funds cannot be used for buildings. On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Dokken, Erickson, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Lies, Moser, Reierson, and Retterath voted yes; no one voted nay. The motion carried unanimously.

18-4 (D) Center Park Board; Center Park Board Lehmkuhl Park New Equipment; \$10,000

It was moved by Retterath and seconded by Bina that the Center Park Board Lehmkuhl Park New Equipment Project, submitted by Center Park Board be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$10,000. On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Erickson, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Reierson, and Retterath voted yes; Dokken, Lies, and Moser voted nay. The motion carried 8-3.

18-6 (D) Dunn County Park Board; Lake Ilo Natural Playscape; \$6,471

It was moved by Dewald and seconded by Retterath that the Lake Ilo Natural Playscape Project, submitted by Dunn County Park Board be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$6,471. On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Dokken, Erickson, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Lies, Reierson, and Retterath voted yes; Moser voted nay. The motion carried 10-1.

18-7 (D) Enderlin Park Board; Maple Riverbank Stabilization Project – Enderlin; \$55,250

It was moved by Retterath and seconded by Kreil that the Maple Riverbank Stabilization – Enderlin Project, submitted by Enderlin Park Board be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$55,250. On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Dokken, Erickson, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Lies, Moser, Reierson, and Retterath voted yes; no one voted nay. The motion carried unanimously.

18-8 (C) Glen Ullin Park District; Bringing Fish to Glen Ullin; \$56,042

It was moved by Bina and seconded by Dokken that the Bringing Fish to Glen Ullin Project, submitted by Glen Ullin Park District be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$56,042.

Discussion included the following:

- The vault toilets, parking lots, and shelters do not fit, but the dredging, seeding, landscaping, and dock do fit. So, there is some difficulty in funding those parts of the project that do not fit without some discussion.
- This project is facing serious fundraising needs to repair the dam in the future and this should be the primary focus. A shift to prioritize the Park District's direction is much needed.

It was moved by Reierson and seconded by Moser to amend the motion to include only costs for the dredging, seeding, landscaping, and dock for a total of \$21,605.

On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Dokken, Erickson, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Lies, Moser, Reierson, and Retterath voted yes; no one voted nay. The motion carried unanimously.

On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Dokken, Erickson, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Lies, Moser, Reierson, and Retterath voted yes; no one voted nay. The motion carried unanimously.

18-11 (D) Mountrail County; Clear Lake Park - Grain Bin Gazebos and Tree Planting Project; \$57,870

It was moved by Kreil and seconded by Retterath that the Clear Lake Park - Grain Bin Gazebos and Tree Planting Project, submitted by Mountrail County be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$25,370 with the contingency that OHF funds may only be used for tree plantings. On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Dokken, Erickson, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Lies, Moser, Reierson, and Retterath voted yes; no one voted nay. The motion carried unanimously.

18-12 (B) NDSU - North Dakota Forest Service; North Dakota Statewide Windbreak Renovation Initiative 2.0; \$300,000

It was moved by Hutchens and seconded by Bina that the North Dakota Statewide Windbreak Renovation Initiative 2.0 Project, submitted by NDSU - North Dakota Forest Service be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$300,000.

Discussion included the following:

- Clarified no staffing was requested.

On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Erickson, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Moser, Reierson, and Retterath voted yes; Dokken and Lies voted nay. The motion carried 9-2.

18-13 (D) NDSU Dickinson Research Extension Center; Dickinson Research Extension Center Virtual Arboretum and Crop Tour; \$18,440

It was moved by Kreil and seconded by Hutchens that the Dickinson Research Extension Center Virtual Arboretum and Crop Tour Project, submitted by NDSU Dickinson Research Extension Center be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$18,440. Extenuating circumstance – new technology that gives people an opportunity to understand the natural world, agriculture, and plants in the arboretum can fit on the landscape. New way of people being able to understand the value of conservation. On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, and Retterath voted yes; Dokken, Erickson, Lies, Moser, and Reierson voted nay. The motion did not pass 6-5 as 7 votes are needed for passage.

18-15 (D) Barnes County Park Board; Monson Park and Trail; \$42,525

It was moved by Dewald and seconded by Kreil that the Monson Park and Trail Project, submitted by Barnes County Park Board be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$42,525.

Discussion included the following:

- Between this project and the one submitted by Audubon Dakota, how much funding is being spent on that 40 acre parcel? \$28,800 is just for 20 acres and not the 42 acres originally.

On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Erickson, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Moser, Reierson, and Retterath voted yes; Dokken and Lies voted nay. The motion carried 9-2.

18-16 (A) Barnes County Park Board; Sheyenne River Water Trail; \$170,000

It was moved by Retterath and seconded by Bina that the Sheyenne River Water Trail Project, submitted by Barnes County Park Board be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$170,000. On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Erickson, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Reierson, and Retterath voted yes; Dokken, Lies, and Moser voted nay. The motion carried 8-3.

18-18 (B) Little Missouri Grazing Association; Little Missouri Grazing Association - Deep Creek Watershed Conservation Project; \$227,102

It was moved by Kreil and seconded by Dokken that the Little Missouri Grazing Association - Deep Creek Watershed Conservation Project, submitted by Little Missouri Grazing Association be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$227,102.

It was moved by Dewald, and seconded by Kuylen to amend the motion to reduce the amount by \$30,746 with the contingency that OHF funds may not be used for the woody draw tree planting portion of the project for total funding of \$196,356.

On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Dokken, Erickson, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Lies, Moser, Reierson, and Retterath voted yes; no one voted nay. The motion carried unanimously.

On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Dokken, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Lies, Moser, Reierson, and Retterath voted yes; Erickson voted nay. The motion carried 10-1.

18-19 (B) Medora Grazing Association; Medora Grazing Association-Water Well Development Program; \$245,800

It was moved by Bina and seconded by Lies that the Medora Grazing Association-Water Well Development Program Project, submitted by Medora Grazing Association be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$245,800. On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Dokken, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Lies, Moser, and Retterath voted yes; Erickson and Reierson voted nay. The motion carried 9-2.

18-20 (B) North Dakota Conservation District Employees Association (NDCDEA); ND Conservation District Employees Association Statewide Tree Planting Initiative; \$2,550,000

It was moved by Dokken and seconded by Hutchens that the ND Conservation District Employees Association Statewide Tree Planting Initiative Project, submitted by North Dakota Conservation District Employees Association (NDCDEA) be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$2,550,000.

Discussion included the following:

- Would this project be handled exactly like the current program? Yes

On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Dokken, Erickson, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Lies, Moser, Reierson, and Retterath voted yes; no one voted nay. The motion carried unanimously.

18-21 (B) North Dakota Natural Resources Trust; Grazing Resiliency in the Bakken (GRB); \$1,290,000

It was moved by Moser and seconded by Lies that the Grazing Resiliency in the Bakken (GRB) Project, submitted by North Dakota Natural Resources Trust be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$1,270,000 with the contingency that OHF funds may not be used for staffing.

Discussion included the following:

- As an organization, the OHF needs to look hard at staffing in the future.

On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Dokken, Erickson, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Lies, Moser, Reierson, and Retterath voted yes; no one voted nay. The motion carried unanimously.

18-22 (C) North Dakota Natural Resources Trust; Wildlife and Livestock Dams - Wetlands Creation, Restoration and Enhancement; \$250,000

It was moved by Hutchens and seconded by Dewald that the Wildlife and Livestock Dams - Wetlands Creation, Restoration and Enhancement Project, submitted by North Dakota Natural Resources Trust be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$250,000.

It was moved by Moser and seconded by Lies to amend the motion, reducing the amount by \$10,000 with the contingency that OHF funds may not be used for staffing for a total of \$240,000.

On a roll call vote, Bina, Dokken, Erickson, Hutchens, Kuylen, Lies, Moser, Reierson, and Retterath voted yes, and Dewald and Kreil voted nay. The motion passed.

On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Erickson, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Moser, Reierson, and Retterath voted yes; Dokken and Lies voted nay. The motion carried 9-2.

18-23 (D) State Historical Society of North Dakota; Writing Rock State Historic Site Playground Facilities Update; \$10,000

It was moved by Reierson and seconded by Hutchens that the Writing Rock State Historic Site Playground Facilities Update Project, submitted by State Historical Society of North Dakota be recommended to the Industrial Commission for Outdoor Heritage Fund funding in the amount of \$10,000. On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Erickson, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Moser, Reierson, and Retterath voted yes; Dokken and Lies voted nay. The motion carried unanimously.

Selection of OHF Board member to serve on Clean Sustainable Energy Authority (CSEA)

Brad Erickson and Rachel Retterath both expressed interest in representing OHF on the Clean Sustainable Energy Authority. Mr. Erickson serves on the Lignite Energy Council and has experience in dealing with how different energy sources contribute to the state overall. Ms. Retterath represents the Chamber, but also works on energy product development. The Lignite Energy Council can name two voting members. The purpose here for this vote is to select someone to serve on the technical committee as a non-voting advisor.

Discussion was held in which it was clarified that other technical advisors include the Commissioner of Commerce, Director of DEQ, Director of DMR, Director of Pipeline Authority, Director of Transmission Authority, Director of SERC, and President of the Board of ND. A question was raised as to why OHF was included as a non-voting advisor on the technical committee. The legislative intent was to have conservation and agriculture represented in providing technical assistance. It was noted that since Lignite is already being represented, it might be nice to have someone from the Chamber serve.

Bio of Rachel Retterath:

Ms. Retterath stated she works for Great River Energy and works on business development projects such as coal fired plants, ethanol plants, and renewables. She also manages the fly ash use program and looks at new projects and what can be beneficially used.

Bio of Brad Erickson:

Mr. Erickson has worked in energy for approximately 20 years. He also worked in oil and gas before moving on to assistant land manager and manages about 70K acres for energy development. He also has experience with pipelines.

It was moved by Bina and seconded by Hutchens that Rachel Retterath be appointed to represent the Outdoor Heritage Fund as a nonvoting technical advisor on the Clean Sustainable Energy

Authority for a term of two years. On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Dokken, Erickson, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Lies, Moser, Reiersen, and Retterath voted yes; no one voted nay. The motion carried unanimously.

Resolutions of Appreciation

It was noted that Mr. Wade Moser, Mr. Kent Reiersen, and Mr. Terry Steinwand will be leaving the Advisory Board. All three have served on the Board since the program's inception.

It was moved by Bina and seconded by Hutchens that the following resolutions be adopted.

**OUTDOOR HERITAGE FUND ADVISORY BOARD
Resolution of Appreciation**

Whereas, Wade Moser was appointed by Governor Jack Dalrymple to serve on the Outdoor Heritage Fund Advisory Board in 2013; and

Whereas, Wade served as the first Chair of the Advisory Board and devoted many hours to working with Industrial Commission staff, interested citizens, and legislators in the development of the program during the program's first two years; and

Whereas, Wade has been an active advocate for the program providing outreach and education about the program at numerous events, including briefings at legislative meetings; and

Whereas, Wade went "above and beyond" when analyzing applications, demonstrating mindfulness of fiscal responsibility when assessing the benefit of projects on behalf of the people of North Dakota;

Now, therefore, the Outdoor Heritage Fund Advisory Board hereby thanks Wade for his eight years of service to the Outdoor Heritage Fund Program and to the citizens of North Dakota and wishes him the very best.

**OUTDOOR HERITAGE FUND ADVISORY BOARD
Resolution of Appreciation**

Whereas, Kent Reiersen was appointed by Governor Jack Dalrymple to serve on the Outdoor Heritage Fund Advisory Board in 2013; and

Whereas, Kent provided valuable input and was a key participant in the development of the Outdoor Heritage Fund program and application process; and

Whereas, Kent was dedicated to the mission of the Outdoor Heritage Fund, serving as a strong advocate for identifying conservation opportunities, promoting opportunities for access to North Dakota's outdoors, and expanding habitat in North Dakota;

Now, therefore, the Outdoor Heritage Fund Advisory Board hereby thanks Kent for his eight years of service to the Outdoor Heritage Fund Program and to the citizens of North Dakota and wishes him the very best.

**OUTDOOR HERITAGE FUND ADVISORY BOARD
Resolution of Appreciation**

Whereas, Terry Steinwand, Game and Fish Department Director, was appointed by Governor Jack Dalrymple to serve on the Outdoor Heritage Fund Advisory Board in 2013 as an ex-officio member; and

Whereas, Terry provided valuable input and was a key participant in the development of the Outdoor Heritage Fund program and application process; and

Whereas, Terry has been an advocate for the program, offering resources to promote the Outdoor Heritage Fund; and

Whereas, Terry provided expert technical advice and counsel to the Board and the Industrial Commission that was very beneficial and helpful in the decision making process, often having first hand background knowledge of various sites across the state as well as other funding programs; and

Whereas, Terry has announced his retirement after 39 years of service to the State of North Dakota (with 15 years as the Director of Game and Fish);

Now, therefore, the Outdoor Heritage Fund Advisory Board hereby thanks Terry for his eight years of service to the Outdoor Heritage Fund Program and to the citizens of North Dakota and wishes him the very best in his retirement.

On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Dokken, Erickson, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Lies, Moser, Reieron, and Retterath voted yes; no one voted nay. The motion carried unanimously.

Election of Chair and Vice Chair

What is the length of term of the chairman? The current chairman has served for two years, but the prior chairman served for three years. There are no specific term limits.

Based on the fact that Randy Bina only has one year left to serve and had been on the OHF board since its inception, Mr. Bina was nominated to serve as Chairman.

It was moved by Kreil and seconded by Kuylen that Bina serve as the OHF Chair and for a term of one year. On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Dokken, Erickson, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Lies, Moser, Reieron, and Retterath voted yes; no one voted nay. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Hutchens and seconded by Dewald that Kuylen serve as the OHF Vice Chair for a term of one year.

No other nominations for OHF Vice Chair.

On a roll call vote, Bina, Dewald, Dokken, Erickson, Hutchens, Kreil, Kuylen, Lies, Moser, Reieron, and Retterath voted yes; no one voted nay. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Lies and seconded by Dokken to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried.

With no further business, Chairman Kuylen adjourned the meeting at 4:48 p.m.



Bob Kuylen, Chairman