

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Agenda Item Memo

DATE: August 1, 2013

SUBJECT: **Update:** Biennial vs. annual recommendation study

Ralph Brown & Kirby Anne Pitman, Dept. of Administration, Management Analysis and Development

Background:

The Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council (Council), a program of the Minnesota Legislature, is responsible for gathering and evaluating proposals and recommending expenditures from the Outdoor Heritage Fund. By law, the Council operates an annual recommendation process (M.S. 97A.56). In its 2013 session, the Legislature requested that a biennial recommendation process be considered:

Sec. 3. BIENNIAL RECOMMENDATIONS STUDY.

The Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council, in consultation with the house of representatives and senate committees and divisions with jurisdiction over environment and natural resources and the outdoor heritage fund, shall examine transitioning to a biennial recommendation process beginning with fiscal year 2016. The council shall submit its recommendations on the biennial process with its recommendations for outdoor heritage fund spending due January 1, 2014, to the chairs and ranking minority members of the house of representatives and senate committees and divisions with jurisdiction over environment and natural resources and the outdoor heritage fund.

The Council has asked MAD to facilitate consideration of the pros and cons of annual vs. biennial recommendations and prepare a recommendation for delivery to the ranking members of the committees and divisions presiding over the Outdoor Heritage Fund

Suggested Motion: This is not an action item so there is no motion

Suggested Procedure: Mr. Brown of MAD will provide an overview of the facilitation team's understanding of their goals and their approach to reaching their goals. They will respond to Council questions.



Management
Analysis
& Development

■ PROPOSAL

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Biennial Recommendations Study

July 23, 2013

Proposal prepared by

Ralph Brown
651-259-1311
Ralph.Brown@state.mn.us

Kirby Anne Pitman
651-259-3817
Kirby.Pitman@state.mn.us

This information will be made available in alternate format — for example, large print or cassette tape — upon request at 651-259-3800, or Minnesota Relay 711, or 1-800-627-3529 (voice, TTY, ASCII).

Background

Thirty-three percent of the sales tax revenue from Minnesota's Clean Water, Land and Legacy constitutional amendment are set aside for the state's Outdoor Heritage Fund and used exclusively to restore, protect and enhance wetlands, prairies, forest and habitat for fish, game and wildlife. The Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council (Council), a program of the Minnesota Legislature, is responsible for gathering and evaluating proposals and recommending expenditures from the Outdoor Heritage Fund. By law, the Council operates an annual recommendation process (M.S. 97A.56). In its 2013 session, the Legislature requested that a biennial recommendation process be considered:

Sec. 3. BIENNIAL RECOMMENDATIONS STUDY.

The Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council, in consultation with the house of representatives and senate committees and divisions with jurisdiction over environment and natural resources and the outdoor heritage fund, shall examine transitioning to a biennial recommendation process beginning with fiscal year 2016. The council shall submit its recommendations on the biennial process with its recommendations for outdoor heritage fund spending due January 1, 2014, to the chairs and ranking minority members of the house of representatives and senate committees and divisions with jurisdiction over environment and natural resources and the outdoor heritage fund.

The Council has asked Management Analysis & Development, a division of Minnesota Management & Budget, to propose an analysis of a biennial process and its potential impact and implications, to inform the Council prior to its recommendations to the Legislature.

Products

MAD would prepare a report regarding the possible transition from an annual to a biennial recommendations process. Report elements would include: a comprehensive model of the current annual process and cycle, comparisons with other funds including the Environment & Natural Resources Trust Fund and other Legacy amendment funds, and an assessment of advantages and disadvantages of annual and biennial recommendations.

Activities

Activity	Hours
Documentation review. MAD would review pertinent core documents for the Outdoor Heritage Fund and related funds such as authorizing legislation, strategic plans, operational manuals, grant history, and applicant materials.	20
Process and cycle reviews. MAD would guide up to six small stakeholder groups through a review of their interaction with current approach, identifying strengths and weaknesses from their perspective, and consideration of potential differences in a biennial approach. Each small group would be limited to grant applicants (both public and non-government sector), council members, council staff, or legislative staff.	24

Interviews. MAD would interview up to 12 key individuals regarding the rationale of the current approach and its “fit” with other government practices (including grantmaking and bonding), as well as probing further the issues identified in stakeholder groups. Interviewees would include initial innovators and architects of the fund’s process and cycle, and staff of other public funds.	36
Analysis and report writing. MAD would conduct its analysis of the data, and compile a report including its findings, conclusions and recommendations. The first draft of the report would be shared with the Council staff; a refined version would be shared with the Council members.	60
Presentation. MAD would be available to present the report at one of the Council’s Fall 2013 meetings, and would also be available to meet with legislative policy and finance committees addressing legacy and environment concerns.	15
Communication. MAD would maintain contact and consultation with Council staff throughout the project.	26
Total hours	181

Timeframe

The project can begin immediately after completion of an interagency agreement. The Council has a legislative deadline of Jan. 1, 2014, to report its recommendations. The following is a proposed timeframe:

- July 25:* project is initiated.
- Sept. 19:* data collection completed
- Oct. 10:* Analysis completed; initial draft report submitted.
- Oct. 31:* Revised draft report submitted.
- Nov. 14:* Presentation at regularly scheduled Council meeting.
- Nov. 21:* Final report submitted.

Documentation

Management Analysis & Development would provide the draft copy and the final document in Adobe Acrobat (PDF) format. If requested, the division would provide one paper copy of the draft document and up to four bound paper copies of the final document. Additional bound paper copies of the final document could be provided at a per-document cost.

Project liaisons

The client would be the Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council. Client liaisons would be William Becker, executive director, and Heather Koop, project analyst manager; MAD liaisons would be Ralph Brown and Kirby Anne Pitman, senior consultants.

Responsibilities

Information provided by interview, focus group, or survey participants would be confidential and subject to the Minnesota Data Practices Act, Minnesota Statutes Chapter 13. Client staff would not be present at others' interviews. Information reported to the client would not indicate sources by person or organization. All written reports would be public information. In addition, written reports documenting summary results of public interviews, focus groups, or surveys would be public information and would be submitted by the client to the Legislative Reference Library at the close of the project.

Costs

Management Analysis & Development bills at the Minnesota Management & Budget-approved rate of \$125 an hour. At 181 hours, the cost of this project would be \$22,625. If costs were to exceed the total of this estimate, without pre-agreed amendments, the client would not be billed for excess hours. If hours required were fewer than this estimate, the client would be billed only for actual hours worked. Should the scope of the project expand after the work is begun, an interagency agreement amendment would be required to cover the anticipated additional hours and/or to extend the end date of the contract.