

HARTWELL: I will therefore call this virtual meeting of the Lessard-Sams outdoor heritage Council to order. It is November 19th at 8:02 AM this meeting is being held in accordance with a memo dated April 21st, 2000 from the FCC vice chair regarding commission meetings being held remotely you may have seen or heard of these procedures; however, for those of you who are unfamiliar mute yourself if you're not speaking use your raised hand if you need to be recognized, and other than the agenda and the minutes will be using rollcall voting. Everything was sent to you via the website and notes from Amanda thank you very much Amanda. Unless there are any questions, I think we will go forward. Seeing no questions I would like to have a motion to approve the agenda that was sent to you in advance.

FABIAN: So moved Mr. Chair.

HARTWELL: Any discussion? Any additions or deletions? Any concerns all those in favor, raise your thumb. Those opposed, the motion carries. Can I get a motion to approve the minutes that were previously sent to you.

MCNAMARA: I will move those Mr. Chair.

HARTWELL: Any discussion corrections comments? All those in favor signify with a thumbs up, those opposed, the motion carries. Does anyone have any conflicts of interest to report today that if not been previously reported regarding our proposals? Good enough so noted. The previous reports of conflicts still stand, my comments are that it's so unfortunate were still not meeting in person I miss seeing all of you in person. We will get through this, and it will be interesting to see our discussion on the accomplishment plans and figure out how we want to best do that there are a number first let me thank the staff for reading them and making the comments that let us hone in on where there are differences between the proposed amounts and the amounts in the adjusted taking into consideration the adjusted amounts we have indicated for each proposal. It's a huge task and so to the staff a huge thank you for that. It will be interesting to see virtually how we want to handle the exceptions and discuss them we do have virtually all program managers in the waiting room so if there are specific questions for specific managers, we can let them into the room and ask them those questions. I imagine it will be a little cumbersome but we will get through it. I think that's pretty much my comments to you thanks for being on time this morning, and I look forward to hearing from everyone. With that I will turn it over to you Mark.

M. JOHNSON: Thank you Mr. Chair good morning everyone nice to see all of your faces. It's always nice to come back to a meeting like David said I'm definitely prefer the in person so we can see and talk to each other one-on-one but it's good to see you all again. Just a couple of things for your information today, first of all we had received after the last meeting we received requests for closed captioning so Amanda has been working with the LCC and their technicians have figure out a way to get it done. If you see close captioning going across your screen on the bottom and if it's distracting to you in any way you can go down to the bottom of the screen and clicked on the closed caption and have the options to hide that or allow it to continue I think the default it's hidden. At least those who wish to have the closed captioning in the viewing will be able to get that now. Today is the first experiment of this I looked at it a while ago it appears it's working well. I guess I met Tom this morning at the state office building Tom is the guy doing the closed captioning thank you Tom wherever you are in the background somewhere. The other thing on I want to bring your attention to is it's that time of year again where we have terms that are going to expire in January for councilmembers. There are I haven't spoken with I haven't spoken with all of you who have terms coming up, to find out if you are going to reapply or not and that's totally up to you, but if you are I would love you to give me an email or call sometime. The two terms positions for the Gov.'s office the Gov.'s appointees that are up for reappointment or replacement are Jerry Hartwell and Jamie Swenson there is one house public member also for reappointment or replacement that's Danny McNamara and then one in the Senate is Mark Holston and Mark is only been with this about a year but he was feeling the remainder of Bob Anderson's terms. For each of you if you wish to reapply the Secretary of State website has the application form ready in fact we received I think about five or six applicants already for the different openings. Let's see, also representative Fabian is retiring so we definitely will see we will miss him, but we definitely will see someone else coming in in that appointed position from the house legislators then as far as the other legislators who are with us representative Becker Finn Sen. Lang and Sen. Tomassoni will be finding out from the appointing authorities who continues there. What I should say is congratulations Sen. And also president of the Senate Tomassoni, so congratulations on that. Mr. Chair that is unless there's questions that's all I have.

TOMASSONI: Thank you Mark it will be the shortest term shortest serve term tenure of any president in the history of the Senate that's how proud of it I am.

MCNAMARA: McNamara will be glad to retire just so everyone knows thanks it's been a good run, there won't be any

application from me so thanks guys.

HARTWELL: Thank you for your service. And with that we've had a request to get a briefing on chronic wasting disease Jamie Becker Finn is indicating that will be helpful to all of us as we think about projects going forward which I think would be a good I think is a good thing for us to have more knowledge of. We have brought in a couple of experts and Mark if you want to introduce them you've had interaction with them and maybe you can set this up for us.

M. JOHNSON: I would love to introduce her, Dr. Michelle Carstensen is a good friend and I met her ran into her about 20 years ago when the TB outbreak up in Dan Fabian's district by Grygla North of Greg love it was in the capital and the subsequently founded in deer, and I think that's maybe actually I did run into Michelle before that when she was a grad student and she has continually amazed me with her work. A consummate professional and she definitely is on top of the CWD and I believe yesterday she was tough to get a hold of because she was out in the field and chill maybe give you some more update on that. Dr. Carstensen thank you for giving us some of your time I know you're really busy you're up to your elbows in the various lymph nodes and we are very pleased to have you with us.

CARSTENSEN: Thank for that wonderful introduction Mark. You're dating me now thinking about how long it's been since we've met each other way back when through numerous disease fronts now. I'm happy to be here and share some information about CWD in Minnesota and where we've been in recent years and where we are today. Is it all right if I start sharing the screen? All right let me try to do that.

HARTWELL: Thank you for taking the time.

CARSTENSEN: You bet. Let me know when everyone has this up. Great. We already know who I am, I am Michelle I been with the department for 16 years and I run a wildlife health unit currently acting research manager as well focusing on the wildlife health for game species is what I do. We built our program in recent years due to unfortunately finding diseases that we worked on including TB-avian influenza and the chronic wasting disease so I have seven staff working on this full time around the state. I will talk to you about CWD giving a brief overview to make sure were all in the same page for basic understanding about the disease some of the challenges with the waste streams which has been I never knew I would learn so much about landfills in this career but I'm learning. That falls into our dumpster program I will talk about, I'll give you a recap of last year's work and unfortunately talk about new areas where we have disease that increased our task load for this fall and then basically how we've approached this fall with the ongoing pandemic and

changes we need to make to keep our staff and students safe and are hunters safe. Then give an update on where we aren't for the fall of this year. Briefly about CWD, this is a slowly progressive disease it takes quite a bit of time from first exposure to actually succumbing to the disease. An average of two years or one – three is the window this is a disease of cervid so were talking about for Minnesota elk deer and moose. It's very similar to some other prion diseases that are in cattle mad cow folks have heard of that, in sheep it's prion disease they are Nero logic form holes in the brain and lead to allotted neurologic symptoms in the disease it's a tough one because it isn't a normal pathogen prions are proteins, they missed shape and they're not typical things like viruses or bacteria or fungus that we have a better handle on how to attack.

The spread is typically animal to animal although there is some contamination in the environment that contributes to the spread in this slide you see two positive deer you can see the marked differences and how they appear to the hunters who may be encountering them. Both are positive just different stages of the disease. I talked a little about prions already there a misshapen protein it's kind of a hard thing for people to grasp like what is this? We have it in our bodies as humans there normally doing just fine but when they have they ingest one or exposed to one that has dismissed shaped protein it causes a cascade of all the normal prions to converge into this shape and that's the pathogen we are working with. It is tough to denature it survives in the environment for years if not decades, you have to destroy it you have to heated to over 1500° or you can destroyed in alkaline digester that we have at the University diagnostic lab normal things like bleach don't kill prions so it's a tough one for us to tackle for many reasons. We talked about neurologic signs because this is a disease that affects the brain this is our positive deer this photo from Pine Island the first one we found Minnesota back in 2010. This is her you can see the loss of condition you can see the definition interface and that from being in poor condition from the disease there's no treatment for this disease it's always fatal. Remaining in the environment is really tricky because we don't know how long there's a study with the sheep disease that found 16 years after a pen was cleared of sheep that died of the disease sheep are brought in and got the disease again so prions are so stable that we don't really know exactly how long they can last and especially in different environmental conditions.

I talked about incubation of 1/2 to three years on average it's two years but once they get to the disease it's pretty quick usually it's several months until they die from it. The other hard part about it is deer that are exposed effected with the disease can shed prions just months after being exposed even though they look normal for the next year or year and a half so they're leaving prions behind and there's a lot of their feces and urine and there's no genetic

immunity to this disease although there has been some advances in that area looking at reduced susceptibility of certain genotypes and that research in that area is ongoing. Humans there's a lot of talk about the human risk of chronic wasting disease I will start reminding folks this is not a disease of humans this is a disease of cervids there's no known cases of chronic wasting disease in humans but there's a similar type of disease that humans can get called CJD that's also prion based. It's about one in 1 million getting this disease it's sporadic when it pops up and it's not the same as chronic wasting disease there's no link between the two. However, because prion diseases have some uncertainties the center for disease control has recommended humans basically a consumption advisory that says if you basically hunt in an area that has the disease you should get your deer tested and if it's found to be positive don't consume the venison this is precautionary because of these uncertainties some recent work that is accord with Canada suggested that certain conditions these primates could become affected with CWD and that's a lot closer to us than most models so that consumption advisory is really a precaution and we promote that within the DNR as well if we have hunters who have positive we share the recommendations and encourage them not to consume the venison and take the precautions seriously. The trends genetic my study shows humans can't really get CWD but again as I mentioned some of the more recent studies have led to more questions than answers there. When you think about mad cow in the UK that was a disease that did leave the species barrier likely from sheep to cattle and eventually to humans so there is some history there with prion diseases being able to change and that again is where a lot of this caution comes from for CWD. Back to wildlife again the Number 1 way to prevent wildlife disease is the Number 1 way to deal with it is prevent them from coming. Once you have a disease in a wild population it's really difficult to not impossible to get rid of because of the nature of wildlife where they roam and don't roam, and trying to get them all is never really a realistic scenario. We focus on prevention whenever we can with wildlife diseases when it comes to chronic wasting disease we believe the biggest risks for spreading this across the US and we have all of North America because this is in Canada has been basically the movement of live animals both through cervid industry and through wildlife agencies that restock animals in historic areas so your moving animals outside of their native ranges you're also moving carcasses so where the infectious material can remain viable for long times in these parts that can move disease as well. With the disease has started here in the western part of the US Colorado and Wyoming you could look at the map and see how it now is in 26 states and has moved across the US and this is done by the help of humans moving animals around. To address this risk and prevention part in Minnesota we have a blanket ban since 2016 that does not allow carcasses to come into Minnesota

from any place outside of our border and we have the ban in place for allowing carcasses and from areas known to have the disease for a long time before then but the problem is not all states or provinces are able to conduct surveillance equally due to lots of reasons between the finances and staff so there's a lot of uncertainty to know where the disease really is or is not for example Arkansas recently found the disease at high rate in the northern part of the state having our hunters hunt there and not know there's disease or not and bring those animals back home brings a risk into Minnesota so we created this blanket rule that says you can bring back parts quarters clean taxidermy mounts but not the whole animal to try to reduce the risk.

Bringing you up-to-date with where we are where in Minnesota we found CWD since we been looking into thousand 2/90,000 wild deer have been tested and through last year we had 88 cases total. Here you can see the counties where we found the disease it's primarily Southeast Minnesota with the exception of finding one sick wild animal in Crow Wing County and one in Dakota County when we look at where we've had positive cervid farms we've had now 11 farms there's a new one this year that I added with a star on the map I didn't have a chance to update the basic graphics so bear with me, we've had 11 farms positive since 2002 and three were elk seven were Whitetail or Whitetail mix and one red deer facility in the current one now is in Houston County that was just found in 2020.

HARTWELL: Michelle if I can interrupt for a moment, Jamie Becker Finn has a question for you.

BECKER-FINN: Dr. Carstensen I was wondering if you can clarify the difference in the issue on import restrictions of Hunter harvested deer versus Penn shooting deer in other states and sort of the issue going on there to clarify for folks.

CARSTENSEN: Sure our rules focused on carcasses the importation of carcasses and we had originally drafted this rule focusing on Hunter harvested animals coming into Minnesota from anywhere hunting moose in Ontario versus mule deer in Wyoming and what we realized by using the term Hunter harvested in the initial rule is it left an opening for animals that are brought in under other circumstances. For example a roadkill collected in Hudson sometimes people get salvage tax for roadkill's you can bring an animal into Minnesota under that initial rule because it wasn't harvested by a hunter but it has the same risk so the same happened when we realized folks that are traveling out of state to facilities and other states that have animals and pens in the shooting them there they can bring those animals back whole because they weren't again Hunter harvested because they were agricultural livestock products in the states we had that loophole we didn't think about initially that we recently try to tighten up so we are trying to focus on the whole animal; however,

it's killed whether it's a roadkill I Hunter or shot at a preserve, the risks are the same so the goal now is to close that loop by saying any carcasses coming in; however, they are taken as the same risk does that answer your question.

Back to testing for CWD, we take lymph nodes and we send them to two different labs the University of Colorado and now without a second lab the Wisconsin diagnostic lab is part of our contract now. We send the samples to them it takes about three or four business days to run the screening test we get a result that says either a suspect or not then there's the confirmation test that takes another roughly a week or so to get that done and that's the definitive diagnostic test that calls an animal positive or not that's used throughout the captive side in the wild side around the states. Whenever we do have a confirmed positive deer we try to recover that carcass in the Hunter orbits one found dead or a roadkill and bring the known positive animals to the diagnostic lab for digestion when we can I wanted to talk about disposal because it's become a forefront of our challenges with this disease in recent years. When we think about what are we requiring hunters to do? We have three things the required to do one is registering your deer after harvest you have to register the deer you can do it in a variety of ways phone or online or walk-in to big-game station. Secondly is to comply with the testing it's been mandatory in the last couple of years we've shifted it this year due to the COVID pandemic but complying with our testing whether it's through self-service sampling stations that we have through archery and muzzle loader seasons or in person sampling that we have during firearms complying with this is another thing we require hunters to do then we also do not allow hunters in our zones to take intact carcasses outside of his own without having a non-detective test or they have to have quarter the animal or otherwise left the infectious parts in the zone they have those options as well you can drop off the deer at a meat processor you can leave it hanging at If your camp is in a zone and no big change how you probably done it for decades, and that's fine but it you need to leave we have dumpsters we will talk about in quarter stations in place to allow hunters to get the meat off and leave the same day if that's what they wish.

Managing these waste streams we have three main methods for disposing of CWD positive deer I mentioned the alkaline digester at the University Minnesota which is a process that the nature's prions and has a low throughput this is meant for confirmed diseased animals and there's some capacity issues with this. Lined landfills and incineration we talked about that a little trying to get the temperatures of over 1500° we want deer that have risk of CWD to go into one of these three ways for disposal and not be left on the landscape. I have a breakdown of what we've learned from the 88 positives we've had since 2010 and we have been able to recover a whole animal 23 times to the digester we brought both meat and butcher remains whole animals means got intact the whole

carcass butcher remains means they've already been illustrated in the meet was surrendered by the Hunter after they realized it was a suspect or confirmed Case 47 of those deer came to us that way. Meat processor weight stream had six animals go through we've had 11 that a been left on the landscape by the hunters mostly scavenged by the time were told about the detective case and then we gone out and scraped up soil and bones in any scraps we could find with those folks but that's the least favorable option of what we stress with hunters to not do that right away and give the testing a chance to let us have confidence that carcass can be put back to nature we had one buried we've also had six hunters choose to consume positive venison even with the recommendations that we provide from the CDC and had department of health staff follow-up of these hunters directly and still the choices they made to consume that venison.

Getting these carcasses disposed of his key we believe the landfills are the best solution to contain disease so it provides containment from other deer interacting with the carcasses and we had a lot of concern with landfills that learn about CWD not wanting to take on the risk instantly reacting to stay not in my landfill find something else. There isn't a human health risk associated with landfilling the carcasses we are trying to prevent a disease of wildlife from being available to other wildlife so we been working diligently with a landfill community to increase understanding about the disease and the help with the buy-in that this is still the most viable solution for our state to contain the prions in landfills and remove them from the landscape. Again we try to do the testing as timely as we can to pull animals out of the way stream but if we cannot we want them to be in a line landfill or incinerated and not left on the landscape so that's what really started with the focus on trying to provide a doctor program to give hunters more options about controlling the waste stream and that started last year through some legislative action to help direct the programs initial start and now it's continuing this year so we have dumpsters set up along with quartering station you can see a tripod in the photo and the table so hunters can hang the deer take the hide off often there's a hide box from MDH a nearby to put the hide in and there's some garbage bags and had wipes and stuff for hunters to use a saw so they can get these quarters off leave the remains in the dumpster and go on their way. As I mentioned we had legislation to help initiate the program last year so that's how we started it, the whole concept is it ends up being taken over by sporting groups or any other stakeholder groups who want to help support this and it isn't state subsidized but the first year we did this the cost was high so working with partners to try to take on dumpsters adopting dumpsters but we started this through state funding solidly. Here is the dumpsters that we had last year in place in our zones we have north-central on the bottom and the southeast

you can see we had 200 tons of deer waste brought through the program and then disposed of at lined landfills that would accept the waste and it cost about \$200,000 to do this so it's not low-cost it's shifting some of the costs again to some of our sporting groups or add commodity groups anyone wants to help manage CWD risk in the environment is going to be a process to take that on. In the meantime we are continuing to pay for those processes going back to last year about, I will talk about what we learned so we did a lot of testing last year through our mandatory sampling programs we tested over 17,000 Hunter harvested derived samples we found 23 positives in our fall hunting all in the Southeast we didn't find any positives in our North central zone the one around Brainerd, and nothing in our central area which was the third year of doing sampling around the positive deer farm in Meeker County that area was be able to be discontinued after three years of surveillance were in year two in the North central of sampling post finding of disease in the finding which was found about a half a mile from a positive game farm in Merrifield we did additional sampling in the Southeast the whole season because of finding additional positives and that included special hunt, some land owner permits that were given and then agency culling with a contract with the USDA wildlife services that's another thousand deer that were taken in those areas with ten more positives, and those positives were directly related to working in areas where the disease was found that's what we do the calling within a mile or two of where we find disease to try to focus on those family groups and limiting disease persistence in the landscape.

HARTWELL: Michelle we have a question from Dan Fabian.
Dan go ahead.

FABIAN: Thank you Mr. Chair and thank you Dr. Carstensen it's interesting. Two questions the \$200,000 were talking about in the program is that also then including the tipping fees at the landfill.

CARSTENSEN: Yes, that's including all costs associated with the dumpster program.

FABIAN: The next question thank you, Rep. Lueck expressed some serious concerns about some herds in the area with waste haulers can you give us the status of that.

CARSTENSEN: Sure yes the last year when we started this was our first year getting the dumpsters in place and we did have initially we have a state contract with waste management, at the last minute they backed out of taking deer carcasses literally at the last minute. They said it was too much of a risk for them to in court with the uncertainties of CWD we had to scramble to find other haulers off contract that would be able to manage the waste stream and get them to the lined

landfills we did get that in place but it was a last-minute effort to try to get that to happen and we learned from that experience this year we bid the sites individually with waste management wasn't even approach their off the list because they won't take deer, and we had those contracts in place more timely this year so I think we went through without much issue this fall getting everything in place we had a lot of local vendors now hauling the waste to the waste streams in landfills and we divided the workload more within the hauling communities.

FABIAN: So did those bids that came in for hauling did those come out more expensive this year or less expensive if you can give me an idea of what to look for in the future.

CARSTENSEN: I think it was kind of a mix we have the new area in the South Metro we were able to find a landfill locally to take the waste but the Southeast we have no landfill option in Minnesota yet we are working with Olmsted County but were not there with them allowing deer waste in so everything in the southeast have to get hauled to La Crosse Wisconsin that's only landfill lined willing to take the waste stream currently. That is increased hauling fees from our control areas in the western part of the Southeast management area so I think our fees are still pretty high there, it would probably be consistent in the North central from what we've seen last year I haven't heard of any increases and jumps in fees there for hauling.

FABIAN: Thank you Mr. Chair.

CARSTENSEN: Okay, circling back to testing from last year I wanted to point out we do make an effort statewide to respond to reports of sick animals or any sort of found animals and weird conditions where they look emaciated we screen the animals for CWD around the state and we have found additional cases that way all were in the southeast but that's an important component of our testing that we do around the state every year that were keeping up. Today we had over 90,000 deer we have tested and again 88 positives. The taxidermist have become an important component of our sampling as well, we been building our partnerships with taxidermist in different surveillance areas we that at some new ones this year these animals there bringing an extremely valuable to our surveillance because it's typically adult males that are older and they have a higher risk of having chronic wasting disease given their social behaviors they are the age class that three times more likely to have the disease than a young adult for example we do have taxidermist we pay \$15 per set of samples in the management zones to collect this for us last year we had 1,400 samples come back through taxidermist and that included for positive last year and seven total since we started the program we continued that this year we think that's a valuable partnership with

our taxidermy community to try to work together to get the samples and allow the hunter to have the trophy mount. I did mention the 2019 results here's the sampling you can see all the green dots represent animals that were tested that were not detected the other colors represent where we have the disease.

The Fillmore County outbreak is our persistent outbreak on the landscape we've been monitoring and managing since 2016 when we first found it then we have another area developing in Winona County we had a farm positive there and we also have deer around that facility that are positive and that areas continuing to produce positive results I think were going to see more of a persistent outbreak in 646 looking similar to what we have in the Fillmore County area as we move forward. That's been a focus area for culling work as well. Our prevalence and what used to be 603 which is really 647 and eight now this is how we started managing CWD in Fillmore County and keeping those spatial areas the same helps in communicating what's going on with the disease when we first found it it was at 6/10 of a percent then it went down a little to 2017 we did some winter work that you're feeling confident perhaps we can drive this backwards we throttled back a bit in 2017 we didn't do agency culling that year I think that was a mistake looking back we started the calling program again and we been removing a lot of positives off the landscape were at about 1% in the area which is still super low prevalence on the landscape compared to Wisconsin at 50% and therefore County Main area, we are talking about 1% of deer which is still a rare finding but we really want that to go down we want to continue with our work to try to keep that at a minimum perhaps until more tools are available for us to manage the disease on the landscape. Overall spending for CWD just to remind folks this is a superexpensive effort to manage diseases whether it's TV or CWD, the amount of dollars needed to fight these things broadly and aggressively are very high.

We spent \$2.7 million in fiscal year 20 to do this here is the breakdown of the costs that I have here, are funding sources came from general fund the game and fish and other DNR dedicated accounts. Going into this year we had about the same projections for what we would need to spend if we had done the same approach as last year probably was increased costs due to the added areas in the pine County area in Douglas County but that is changed because of our adjusted surveillance approach. What happened in 2020 was three new areas came on the scene unfortunately, for us to try to collect information and understand what's happening with the disease in these areas to work result of detections in farmed cervid's in Douglas County had a farm cervid detection that was linked to a farm in pine County. Then we had a wild deer reported by a member of the public in Dakota County that was positive for chronic wasting disease these three new areas developed between last year and this year where we are not working and we continue to work in the

Southeast where we have the persistent infection and were working in the North central Brainerd area but we did drop the Meeker County surveillance area after three years with no detections.

HARTWELL: We have a question from representative Jamie Becker Finn.

BECKER-FINN: Thank you Mr. Chair. Dr. Carstensen I was wondering if you divide the money spent between those are triggered by private landowners in deer farm situation and wild deer.

CARSTENSEN: I think I can break that down a little bit our costs typically we call it precautionary testing, for example with the Meeker County farm when that was positive we did three years of precautionary testing around the facility trying to get a 15 mile radius we tend to bump it out to the boundaries to make it easier for everyone to understand where were working at cost about \$150,000 a year to do that and we did that for three years and if we find disease in the wild during that that it becomes a management zone in the costs markedly increase because now we have a lot more sampling we bring in different restrictions we bring in agency culling and added hunts so our managing where we have the disease in the wild is a lot higher, and it's on average precautionary testing is about 150 I'd say we spent \$1 million alone in the Southeast last year just to contrast a bit about the costs if that answers the question. Along with finding new disease areas we bring along some of our tools to try to mitigate that and we expanded our deer feeding and attractant band use in response to these new areas. Where we have disease in the wild we have the attractants added in as something so it's not a statement saying the product that your purchasing is contaminated if you use them it's really trying to get at what they do. They're meant to draw multiple animals into your hunting area to have an opportunity for harvest, and that brings in more animals that could be sharing disease so our focus on attractants is about what they do not about the product itself I wanted to clarify. Then where we don't have the disease in the wild but we have risk on the landscape because of cervid farms in those areas in Carleton and Pine we had feeding bands we hadn't added the attractant unless we find the disease in the wild.

The changes we did for 2020 we began the year with the same plan we were going to do mandatory testing just like the year before expand into the new areas, and we have a game plan until about June when we realized the pandemic was not really subsiding and given what happens during the firearm season and how we do mandatory sampling we are condensing hunters into a very small areas with parking lots when I was at Crosby last year we did 787 samples in two days that's 780 pickup trucks sometimes with multiple deer and we had about 25 staff and students there and it's complete chaos of folks so we realized that scene to try to accommodate that many

hunters in a short timeframe would be very unlikely to keep folks safe and reduce risk of disease spread that way so we shifted gears to using ourselves sampling stations which we've had in place for archery muzzleloader's before in all of our management zones but we use that as her main tool this year and encourage hunters to use that to drop off the samples and also still kept meat processors and taxidermist where we had them in the dumpster programs in place as well as all of the other management efforts to increase harvest nothing is changed there it only changed how we went about interacting with the hunters and our staff. To try to reduce risk and circling back to Douglas County here, we tried something new there as well in this area we have a farm that was positive that was linked to the pine County farm but this animal here that was positive the only had to animals on the farm and were only there for ten months so a small window of time and the landscape around the farm revealed poor deer quality habitat very open landscape, and we did do a survey looking for deer concentrations and there really wasn't a lot.

It seemed like the timing of how long the the disease was on the farm and the situation as far as habitat around the facility led to a lower risk of nose to nose fence line type contact not impossible but lower risk so we tried different approach using risk-based surveillance to collect samples and that's basically trying to get a set of points for different age sex classes that are high risk for the disease and still achieve a high sampling rate. We rolled this out for Douglas County this year and hope that we could achieve our level of confidence that we want for the disease and have this as a model we could try on other places in the state going forward. A difference in riskier with pine County facility that farm has a different scenario it's nested and quality deer habitat along the Wisconsin the river St. Croix River bordering Wisconsin so good deer habitat the disease was likely on that farm for a longer time maybe a couple of years and there was fence line contact risk that was much higher deer tracks around the outside of the facility and a lot of wooded cover here the risk is a lot higher in my opinion and we wanted to do surveillance at a higher rate right off the bat so here we set up our sampling more traditionally to a broader area that had been initially read acquired mandatory we can only in that reduced to voluntary because of the COVID changes we talked about but this is the boundary we've created for the East central surveillance area half of the circle is in Wisconsin so we have been coordinating with Wisconsin DNR on the risk and they looked at the sampling on their side and they heighten their efforts this year in Wisconsin but again it's voluntary there as well for the same reasons were doing it so half of our question remains on the Wisconsin side for what sort of disease presence or absence we have in the wild.

Will continue to share information with our partners there and lastly this deer that showed up in Dakota County this is

the animal I have a photo here on the slide. You can see the very poor body condition of the animal that was urologic walking in circles and so forth dispatched by a conservation officer and found to be positive and we haven't done sampling in Dakota County and the surrounding area for quite some time that was part of the main sweep we did through the state in the early 2000 and some additional testing along some of the areas because of the border risk with Wisconsin since then but immediately around this area we don't have any good information in recent years. That led us to set up a zone called 605 which is basically a 50 mile radius around the positive deer and we added a surveillance area around it that's driven because we don't have recent information about this part of the state we don't know how big of a problem we have is this one deer the tip of the new iceberg or is it some dispersing animal that happened to die there? We have no idea really so we wanted to go broad and look at this area this year to see what we can learn from that and make good management decisions going forward so 605 is basically being managed the same as the other CWD management zones the carcass removal restrictions testing in all seasons from archery through the end of muzzleloader in the end of firearm, and the outer surrounding area if her going to focus on opening weekend but now we have surveillance occurring in there throughout the firearm season as well trying to get as many samples as we can to learn about this disease.

We had to expand our dumpster program as a result of the new areas and we created dumpster sites in our new South Metro Dakota County area to facilitate those carcass moving restrictions and we repeated most of the same sites in north-central and the southeast that we had dumpsters previously to continue to offer those options for hunters we talked about the vendors already so we have that in place we did a much better job this year with getting everything in place in time and making sure we have the right style of dumpsters with lids to mitigate water issues and we learned from the year before that they have everything in place this year to make that successful and those are being used very much this year by hunters. That is good. Going back to the voluntary sampling we are doing again, we change that because of COVID risks were still designed to try to get enough samples that we can understand what's happening with the disease with a high level of confidence we had a long history of sampling with hunters previous to our switch to mandatory in 2017 it was always voluntary and we've always had good cooperation when Mark was with groups like MDH a they would offer muzzleloader for all hunters who participated and we had patches that we gave out and we had good cooperation with never having to force a hunter to provide a sample always learning enough that we needed to have a good sense of where we have the disease or not. I basically relied on the partnership going into this year with the changes we made to try to get at about 30% of participation unfortunately that didn't happen we will talk about that in a moment but that

was the changes we made. We had the partnerships with taxidermist again auditor management actions are still in place the carcass movement restrictions increased the number of tags taking three box in the southeast by different license types all of that is still in place but we set up the centralized extraction sites and to go that we try to beef up our communications to try to encourage hunters to participate with press releases and social media posts we did direct mailings all hunters in the new areas to let them know there in the CWD area and where they can participate for sampling. Our webpage and everything else is updated with that we've increased communications and outreach to encourage participation but unfortunately we really haven't seen that we've seen about 16 or 18% of hunters in the management zones participating with the sampling so that's down quite a bit from the past experience with 30% in our new areas we have seen far greater few hunters participating in the East central and the West central in the sampling which is been disappointing so our sample numbers are markedly lower in these areas and I think in the West central in East central were likely not going to achieve the sampling framework sufficient to have good information about making decisions about whether or not the diseases there or not and that's going to probably add another year of sampling because we talked about the three years that we for sure have to add on another year to be sure we can achieve the type of sample sizes we need to know what's going on. In the South Metro we have recently discovered a new positive that's going to be released today in a press release so this is information that has been publicly released yet but it is within a mile of that wild positive that showed up that was sick that animal was just confirmed and we have about 728 samples so far in 605 in the North central we are at almost 800 samples we have not confirmed any cases in the North central yet this year and in the Southeast we continue to find the disease. Were at 2,600 samples so far and 11 either suspects or positives mostly in areas we have found disease the Winona County outbreak we talked about in the Fillmore County outbreak the new one that's also going to be included in the press release today is really in the city of Rochester it was an animal that was hit by a vehicle within a block of the male St. Mary campus it was found by a landowner that passed away in their yard and brought the animal to the DNR for testing it did not look according to the wildlife manager sickly it just had two broken legs from the vehicle collision but otherwise look to be of normal body condition screened for CWD because it's in the management zone and that animal has come back positive. That's a new area still in 643 where we had a positive but it marks makes a different area of that permit area it's the farthest northwest case that we have detected and we continue with our opportunistic samples we collect over 291 so far and have picked up some additional positives there again with that sampling effort in the Southeast. I want to end on advances with CWD signs and diagnostics. We

have been partnering with the University Minnesota on approving diagnostic tools for CWD and we've done we are and continue to do projects with the min group we have a link to their website for folks that are not know your group led by Dr. Peter Larsen focusing on diagnostic advances to try to have better reliable tests we can turn around more quickly and using different substrates instead of the lymph nodes to try to get our answers in a timely way and I think the biggest tool the biggest help that could be is in the environmental components to try to understand if sites are contaminated or not how long the prions are lasting in the soil, with types of mitigation we could do on a farm that's found the disease in a pan what can we do to denature those prions in that type of setting? I'm hopeful we can get to these answers and try to find more tools to manage the disease giving both wildlife side and the domestic side better options for control were also partnering with CIDRAP and that's doing a lot of education and outreach about chronic wasting disease and they have a component focused on the landfills and waste disposal side with Dr. Osterholm and I'm on it committee with his PhD student working with landfills and meat processors and taxidermist to try to increase understanding about the disease create best management practices and perhaps increase some regulatory oversight of waste streams going forward with partnerships with state agencies trying to see where we can go to tighten that up because we want to have consistency and how the carcasses are managed and I think that's someplace we can improve and reduce risks along with requiring hunters to do certain things.

There's an Avenue there we continue to work on. In summary, CWD in Minnesota remains a rare disease where we have it at her highest level in Fillmore County it still at 1% so that's I want folks to keep that in mind I think that is a good position we are in I would love to be at zero like to see that 1% declining but we have not seen that kind of logarithmic increase that the disease can do in other states and in Minnesota I believe it's because were trying to be as aggressive as we can and managing it and we need to keep doing that in my opinion we have the funding and the staffing and support to continue those efforts. We need to adapt as much as we can when new information comes out that makes us more effective more efficient and gets at managing the disease and a more efficient way. It's impossible to do it on our own we have to have the cooperation of our hunters and the buy-in this is important in the belief this helps manage the health of deer in the long-term and sometimes that's the biggest challenge we face is getting that belief system within her hunting community to go throughout that this matters this is generations of deer in the future were trying to manage not just your hunt this year and that sometimes that means we have to do things differently we have to participate in testing we have to learn where the disease is and isn't and that's a continuing challenge we face to have

the buy-in with the hunting community and other operators that this disease is important for a state we need to work together to manage it. With that I'll take any other questions.

HARTWELL: Thank you very much. I see Ron has a question.

SCHARA: Thank you Mr. Chair. I certainly appreciated this review of CWD. I have a couple of thoughts there may be several questions here one is you mention the deer farms quite often yet I'm kind of in the dark about what's the latest with shutting these down or doing something to reduce the risk of CWD expanding from these deer farms it seems there was a lot of foot dragging there that was my impression. And secondly I get the feedback from a lot of deer hunters this is a sky is falling position the DNR often takes one of them is the one deer found in Crow Wing County near a deer farm so you went in and killed dozens and dozens of deer around their any deer that run a friend of mines land he was livid about that yet there wasn't much done about the deer farm until sometime later. I just say that because if we are seeing less cooperation from hunters it may be they also feel there's been some kind of overreaction to this. That's what I am hearing and not necessarily reflective what I'm thinking.

CARSTENSEN: Thank you Mr. Schara. The deer farm question is an industry the DNR doesn't regulate as you are aware this is under the board of animal health purview. We share information with the board of animal health on participating on their process now to review their rules for that industry we been critics of the industry you can see in the OLA audit some of the issues that a been discovered for how that's been managed, and in our plans are CWD management plan we feel deer farming and elk farm and cervid farming represents a risk because were seeing disease occur these facilities despite the regulatory framework that they operate under. Along with that as a risk is Hunter harvested carcasses that are left on the landscape it's not the only risk but it's one of them and it's often putting the agency across the aisle from deer farming community as enemies from each other and I don't want that relationship to be adversarial but we do point out the risks those farms represent and the reason we have disease in the Brainerd area and the Winona County area and have done that work in Pine Island was directly related to a point source on cervid farms. We going and we don't find disease in the wild we don't find anything widespread we find one deer within a couple of miles or a half-mile from their fence and that's only animal we find. To me the data points to the fact these farms represent risk and can be a point source for disease. The reason we go in when we find the one in the wild is because were never really shorts just one you have to do the work to figure out what kind of a problem you have and we don't wanted to continue to increase.

If you don't stop it early on and it gets established in that local herd were not going to win this battle. The aggressive response that is seen whenever we find these animals positive in the wild is meant to be aggressive definitely so we can try to get ahead of it because if we don't we know what's going to happen look across the border to Wisconsin it's in two thirds of all their counties and the prevalence is 30 – 50% in the southern part of the state. I don't think deer hunters want that but the short-term sacrifice of having an increased harvest for a few years sometimes that's a difficult conversation because they don't want to give that up either and I think we have to come together and think long-term and think about your grandkids and what the herd should look like for them and realize one or two deer seasons of less deer seen from the stand is in the end of the world if that means the deer that are left there are going to be healthy. Those are hard conversations to get through to folks and to get the same type of buying and on we have people who want to test the deer because they say when you're finding it in our land you're going to kill more deer so they don't want to know for that reason they're afraid of the consequence of knowing the disease is there and what it's going to do to their short-term deer hunting instead of the long-term health of the deer.

HARTWELL: Representative Becker Finn you have a question.

BECKER-FINN: Yes, I mostly just wanted to thank you Mr. Chair and Dr. Carstensen I think this is relevant to the work we do and being a voice for hunters and also in the work we do with the different projects we have through the Council you kind of answered the question about the jurisdictional quandary we find ourselves in and I want to highlight Whitetail deer are the only species that is both a protected wild natural resource that belongs to all of us and is also something that is bred and treated as some kind of tame animal as well within the cervid industry. It is a unique problem there because it is the exact same species on one side of the fence and the other side of the fence. I was wondering if you could I think it's important for the Council would be to highlight what we know about how long prions remain in the soil and some of the work that's been done around those farms where we have multiple positives and the impacts on that land long-term as far as being a safe place for deer and to limit the spread of the disease. I was wondering if you could talk a little more about that.

CARSTENSEN: Yes, representative Becker Finn as we talked about it a little bit, unfortunately there's still a lot of uncertainty how long prions can live in the environment. When it comes to managing farms and mitigating those risks when they have the disease the USDA as a timeline for five years for herd management plans when farms are given federal indemnity and bought out for disease their depopulated than a

have an agreement that last five years where fences have to stay up to keep wild deer out of that area and there some mitigation that happens on the farm itself cleaning some of the and disinfecting with bleach with some of the equipment but we know bleach alone doesn't kill prions and we have no reason to think five years at all is meaningful in fact most of the signs to the community doubts the five years as being realistic because of the study that happened in Iceland that showed it was infected for over 16 years. The scientific community really needs to fill that gap with some additional studies of prion survival on the landscape in real-world situations and that work is occurring but of course not fast enough to get us the answers quickly so we have a better sense of how long is enough to keep a fence up. The Pine Island farm that sold to Prairie island Indian community that was in 09 they found the disease that was found to have a long-standing disease on that facility so they probably had it for a decade so how much prion loading as happened on that landscape we have no idea and it was a big farm so those fences no longer have any requirement to be up. The wild deer going in and out of that area I think have risk and I think that uncertainty is part of the difficulty in managing chronic wasting disease.

As I mentioned some of the work with min Pro is looking at environmental survivability of prions even uptake into plants because they've shown this is scary stuff in the lab plants can uptake in the root system prions that can become available in the leafy parts of the plant but we haven't proven is that wild animals are ingesting the alfalfa or those of soybeans and then becoming infected that way. That work is ongoing as well. The environmental piece has those in certainties that I don't have a solid answer for because we don't know we as a collective side to the community don't know the timelines I think five years isn't enough but I don't know what to do is I would prefer to go as far as the Iceland study went of up to 15 or 16 years but when you have those requirements on of private facility that doesn't have animals anymore who has that authority to require fencing to stay up that long? Those of the other challenges about trying to manage the risks and doing so with good scientific information in the right resources to make those regulations happened I hope I answered your questions I hope I answered as well as I know.

HARTWELL: Ron you have another question.

SCHARA: I was just reflecting on the fact your efforts in trying to do something with one hand tied behind your back because of the differences between controls deer farms and what can be done it would seem to me this is a legislature question that ought to be dealt with because you can't possibly achieve what you're trying to do when you have no control over the major source of CWD. Where is the common sense here.

HARTWELL: You of course have the answer to that. I am curious if you have recommendations for the Council on what we should be doing as we look at our projects as it relates to this issue. Is there anything we ought to be keeping in mind from your perspective.

CARSTENSEN: That is a loaded question. There are some things to be successful and managing this disease I think Ron has hit on some points I don't have the ability to address on the cervid farm side of things but that's one piece of our whole risk your of this disease. If we don't have our hunting community engaged in the hunting communities aren't super organized they're not super vocal, about CWD there are some folks who are but we have 500,000 deer hunters and we have a very small percentage of them were engaged in groups that speak up about the importance of things like herd health. Finding ways to engage our hunters and to fight what they call CWD fatigue which is when they're sick of it they're sick of dealing hearing about the disease in their area and they no longer want to deal with it and that means they stop participating in our sampling they stop following rules about movement restrictions and they just want to look the other way. We need to combat that with ways that excite and engage people about having healthy deer and long-term herd health and if the Council has ideas about supporting that kind of work through education and outreach and engaging hunters in this issue I think that's a huge help for us we can set up the infrastructure to collect samples and do the science but we can't do it without people wanting to help with us on this issue. Course there is financial resources we need to keep the program going at a higher level but more important than anything is having the partnership and cooperation with the hunting community and other cooperators to make this a priority to continue to advocate for why we need to manage this in an aggressive way where we need to and have long-term buy-in for what it means to fight CWD and to try to safeguard this resource for our future generations.

HARTWELL: Thank you, Dan you had a question.

FABIAN: Not necessarily a question but a comment. Dr. Carstensen thank you for the work you do I agree it is important. To the point Council member Schara made talking about having one hand tied behind your back, I'm not sure that's completely accurate I say that based on the fact it was three or four years ago now Commissioner Strommen sat down before the animal health and they came up with a memorandum of understanding about the communities with regard to CWD and what the two agencies could be doing. Member Schara also talks about a legislative thing he's correct this has been in the legislature short of banning cervid farms which falls into the egg committee not the environment committee, there has been an ongoing battle between the DNR

and the board of animal health and a few years ago when I was chair of the environment committee I asked Commissioner Land were to have someone work with the board of animal health because the relationship between the dealer and the board of animal health was not good at that time now Commissioner Strommen and I the board of animal health set down and had a conversation and they came up with memorandum of understanding. What concerns me more probably is in statute in chapter 35.15 subdivision seven it clearly says in that statute the DNR has the authority to inspect farm cervidae farm cervid facilities where there is reasonable suspicion and we talked to the community about that Sen. Ingebrigtsen and myself and other legislators and then Commissioner Land were deflected that and said we would we don't have the resources. I said Commissioner your say this is one of the most important things the agency is facing you need to establish the priorities.

I'm trying not to be highly critical of what's going on but I do want to make sure the people do understand the statute and you could look those up and do we need to do more? Yes, maybe but there are a number of very well run cervid farms in the state of Minnesota and when they put the travel ban on last year they ticketed Steve Porter for that he went to court and the Ramsey County attorney dismissed the charges against him. We need to have some a little bit of empathy I will say for some of these people who are doing the work they're required to do by law they're not allowing animals to be leaving in their following all procedures and I want to continue fighting CWD there is no doubt about that, I think it's showing it's important to me and other members of the deer hunting community and Dr. Carstensen you're correct there's some fatigue but the fatigue doesn't produce the results keep up the good work.

HARTWELL: Jamie you have another question.

BECKER-FINN: Thanks Mr. Chair. I just wanted to clarify to member Schara's comments about having one hand tied behind your back. I think the difference is the competing driving forces between the two agencies and the DNR is tasked with protecting the wild heard and the natural resource for everyone and what I've seen when I've attended board of animal health meetings is that the ag industry in making money off these animals is sort of the driving force behind that and I think to that we made requests in the last year for the board of animal health through the Department of Agriculture to make the same kind of movement restrictions for deer that are killed within private panda facilities and they declined to do that. Right now if you travel to Montana to do a backwoods hunt and want to bring a deer back into Minnesota you are subject to those restrictions as a hunter but if you go to Texas and pay a bunch of money to shoot a deer in a pan you aren't subject to the same restrictions because it's a difference between a hunter and being someone

who's shooting an animal in a pan. Do think there is more that can be done and I want to highlight that there are sort of differing priorities between the agencies and how important it is were open with the public about that because it impacts the natural resource that belongs to all of us.

HARTWELL: Great any last questions for Dr. Carstensen? If not thank you so much for taking the time this morning to help us better understand this challenge we do appreciate it.

CARSTENSEN: You're very welcome if you have follow-up questions I'm sure you know how to find me thank you.

HARTWELL: Thank you. The next agenda item is to review the accomplishment plans and mark before we start this do you have any comments or anyone else on the staff in terms of the work you did for us and things you think we should be talking about.

M. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair we tried we sent out a couple of spreadsheets to give a couple of different views. We tried to highlight those changes that worked for the variances that were a little larger I don't think the staff had a huge amount of heartburn on any of them but there are definitely questions that could be asked. I'm sure individual members have different areas they have questions to ask about it was interesting to see how the project managers shifted their strategies or their priorities and I think with the lesser amounts with the Council not giving them as much as they asked for giving a third or quarter or whatever it was the project managers started at least on paper it looked like they were looking at what's the highest priority items is it the enhancement is it the acquisition or whatever, and then they adjusted their budgets from there. There were some other things to look at with regards to that at first blush some project managers kept their personnel budgets at 100% or very high in those cases anytime there was an outlier with the variance we would ask them what was going on and I think generally those were in the notes in the spreadsheet as well. Normally when they kept the personnel amounts so high it was because they were going to be working they were going to continue the work but in the shorter amount of time so they would still use their full personnel budget just in a shorter amount of time for the whole project and probably more enhancement restoration.

HARTWELL: Is that also consistent with the other numbers.

JOHNSON: Yes, in most cases. If you have personnel is one of the areas that is applicable for ESS.

HARTWELL: So just to get the conversation going can I will pick on the first one on the list not because I'm picking on them but because it comes up the PAO one the DNR SNA acquisition

we allocated 37% of the request the personnel was 41% but the DSS was 62%. When you were reading this outage you understand that to be reasonable.

JOHNSON: The first thing we did was look at what was the activity that was going to continue from there I'm sorry I don't have that specific one up maybe Joe or Sandy has a comment with that but our first thing was to look at what type of activities were they going to continue and how would that relate to the DSS in this case if I remember it was very much it seemed to fall in line with the continued activity and crunching it down so there hitting some higher priorities if Joe or Sandy may have comments otherwise we have in our waiting room project manager for each one of the projects or each one of the proposals. They've all been asked to be available for questions one thing I should mention to councilmembers is it says in the memo and I think it's worth reiterating, this discussion is all revolving around progressing these accomplishment plans not necessarily approving them. If there are changes that the Council wishes for them to make they can definitely happen the approval of the accomplishment plans happens after the legislature has reviewed and passed the bill and made the appropriations in the spring so June is the approval time and the final input from the Council is definitely continues to that point.

HARTWELL: So Joe or Sandy do you have comments on that example because I want to use it as an example not as anything more than that. Then we can have a decent discussion about that issue.

PAVELKO: Mr. Chair this is Joe nice background. I think we put that on there so we didn't really decide whether or not it was acceptable but we thought it was because it was such a big discrepancy that councilmembers should be aware and have the ability to ask questions. I think this would be a perfect time to ask questions.

HARTWELL: All right, Sandy do you have any thoughts.

SMITH: I didn't have an issue with it the DR's have been before the Council talking about specifically how they calculate their DSS it's based on lots of factors whether it's contract heavy for restoration work or other types of services and I guess if the Council does not agree with a high percentage of DSS maybe a total review of all the DNR DSS should be done since they have a very specific calculation they use.

HARTWELL: Thank you, please, go ahead.
Someone was about to speak.

SMITH: I don't have anything else to share.

HARTWELL: I throw it out to the Council, how do you want to handle the discussion of the variances? I think where there are no variances or minor variances we probably don't want to spend a lot of time. The PA 01 where you have 62% against 37% of the funding or PAO to where we funded 29% and travel stated 100% of the original budget to me that's something we should understand before we get to passing it forward. I am looking to the Council as to how you want to go through it you don't want me just asking everyone questions I don't think. Maybe you do? What do you want.

M. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair if I could interject on one thing while members are thinking about what they would say if you look at the second one on the list PAO to the pheasants forever accelerated wildlife management areas there was only one outlier it was travel at 100%. Sometimes especially when you see remember the budgets are amendable and also as a reimbursement situation in this case I'm sure pheasants forever was thinking were still going to have to go around and find the properties and it may take the whole month of travel, but they probably won't use that much in which case they will amend their budget or seek an amendment of approval from the staff or the Council as we go forward so it may be a year down the road they may say we have our parcels already we didn't use 50% of our travel are going to amend that input that money into whatever else restoration or acquisition whatever it may be. That is something else to consider as we look at the outliers.

HARTWELL: The difference to make sure everyone knows NGOs get reimbursed where agencies get appropriated money. There is a process for looking at agency expenditures but it's not the same as NGOs who have to justify it before the money is sent to them.

SMITH: In the case of PAO 1 their travel line is at \$15,000 out of the \$4 million recommended amount. Sometimes you have to look at things and say it's a small amount and it may it can't be reduced \$15,000 in travel with the \$4 million recommendation may not be able to be reduced.

HARTWELL: Sure. The question is how do we understand it so we are comfortable that we won't wake up one day to a headline in the paper that we approved something that makes no sense. Jamie you are laughing at me.

BECKER-FINN: Mr. Chair some of us have to think about what the newspapers are going to say on a regular basis.

M. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair if you would like we could walk through these one at a time and have the staff mention our thoughts or point out some of the things, everything is relevant based on the amount of funding recommended by the Council for each one of the appropriations.

HARTWELL: If that is comfortable for everyone that is fine. I went through and highlighted things that stuck out to me if it's within ten or 15% it didn't bother me much when it gets beyond that you start to at least ask questions how come travel was at 100%? We don't have that it's only \$15,000 of the number here to understand that. The responsibility is ours to approve this so we ought to understand it and be comfortable with it. I think we all reviewed the original budgets and we were comfortable with the amount in the original budgets but they didn't all get the same amount of money they asked for and so we would expect the scaling back on some level that's commensurate with the funding cut back that happened and when it's an outlier you sort of say I'd like to understand that outlier and make sure it makes sense and then it's not in error it's not beyond the realm of possibility that in the process of doing this the project manager simply miscalculate's and is waiting for us to collectively say this doesn't make sense and they will say oh shoot it doesn't. That I'm sure Mark you know has happened a few times and that's what the amendment process is when it becomes obvious Ashley you have a question thank you for saving me from being the only one talking.

PETERS: I was thinking about these different projects and the staff notes. I find the staff notes really helpful thank you to the staff for doing that my question would be is there a way to capture more of the thought process or in the staff notes that we can dive into if we do have questions and want to learn more about what the conversation went like if that is possible for us to see what was the conversation with the different organizations and the resulting shifting numbers we have the numbers here but in terms of the context it would be helpful to have additional notes.

HARTWELL: Mark do you have thoughts there.

JOHNSON: Yes, also Sandy may want to chime in as well the first consideration we looked at was trying to figure out was the context the overall context. For instance on PA 03 its Minnesota Prairie recovery program was interesting because you're looking at 36.15% recommendation for the funding of the original request, they had it cut down of their budget that it cut it down by 64% basically they kept their personnel at 64% in the contracts at 46% they didn't go down to the 36% and that's the first thing we look at then we ask why or what are they doing? in the notes they said their fee title acquisition with PILT that's money going back to the DNR they cut that out they zeroed it and they were using those dollars then to finance more restoration enhancement or more than 36% of restoration enhancement and acquisition without PILT which would jibe very nicely with why the personnel and contract figures were as well as the DSS were above the 36%. We put those notes in there so you could see

that. The next one down the line the northern tallgrass prairies the tools in agreement even though it was 34.5% funding recommendation from the Council the tools and equipment was kept at 100% but the 100% is still only a \$5,000 out of the \$2.8 million recommendation. That's the bigger picture we try to look at we still wanted you to see we wanted to call out the outliers because for instance on the PA 03 if you really wanted them to continue their fee title acquisition with PILT then this would give you that information they had zeroed that out and you want to bring up your objection or your suggestion to them. If there is no notes it really meant we felt we didn't see any huge problems going on although there definitely is still room for questions I hope that answers your question Ashley.

HARTWELL: I think it's helpful go ahead Ashley.

PETERS: Thank you Mr. Chair. Yes, it's helpful it's also it would be nice in addition to the basic notes that exist here that there's a little more explanation as well to dig into but maybe that's what this is for that's the conversation were having now. I won't like there's a lot here there's a lot to remember and having some of those notes and being able to access in the context with conversations the staff had would be helpful but I'm not sure how to capture those in a way that's not overly burdensome.

HARTWELL: Maybe we should go through this and I will call out as we go down the list things that stuck out to me and let staff provide answers or not as we go through. There are many where I it didn't seem worth questioning but there were somewhere I actually couldn't figure out why it was the way it was would that be helpful to everyone? I am seeing some head nods all right so talk a little about PAO five we funded it at 44% but personnel was 78% and travel was 72% and the Cannon River partnership budget was the same as the original proposal Mark can you or Sandy or Joe at all talk about why that made sense.

PAVELKO: Mr. Chair and members I think we should if we can ask the project managers why they did that. A lot of these we didn't actually follow up and get specific reasons why it's a certain percent versus a different one we were looking more towards is there a wholesale change going on with the accomplishment plans from the first to the second year, then Mark had a different opinion versus my opinion was a lot different than his and Sandy's so were not whole we didn't all see it the same way but I think it was beneficial to call the differences and if the Council has questions everyone is on the phone and they can answer those questions. I would recommend we have project managers answer those we may or may not know, and they are the professionals with the budget.

JOHNSON: Mr. Chair if we could have Amanda can queue up the

project managers for PA05 at this point though be a slight delay in bringing them in but it shouldn't be too bad and you may want to repeat the question once the committee because they have a lag for where they're viewing in the waiting room.

HARTWELL: I will take the lead here, please, raise your hand if you want to ask follow-up questions or you feel I've missed something.

JOHNSON: It looks like we have Christie available.

HARTWELL: Please, unmute yourself Christie.

PURSELL: Good morning chair and members.

HARTWELL: The question was why did personnel stay at 78 and travel at 72 when 44% was the recommended allocation of your original request and why did the Cannon River watershed partner budget stay the same when others got cut down.

PURSELL: This is a partnership through the DJ Forbes was here for the trust for Public land and for the great River Greening collectively we decided because see W PRD is going to be managing the project the burden didn't change that much for what our part of the project to coordinate. That was the decision the other two partners they took particular parcels off the list in particular work they're not going to accomplish so their fees shifted down in accordance with the actual funding and the amount of work for my organization the coordination and outreach to the land owners etc. Doesn't change I don't know DJ or Brad would fill in any more of the gaps from what I said.

FORBES: Christie I think you covered it quite well. The administration costs and outreach doesn't change whether the partnership was awarded \$5 million or \$2 million it was a decision made as a partnership that CR W RP the request was lower than the trust for Public land in the great River Greening and what we tried to do was reduce our respective budget lines proportionately with the exception being personnel and DSS slightly due to the similar rationale will be able to do less work with less acquisition capital for example but the amount of time that goes into land acquisition of projects that are less expensive the amount of work remains the same whether you're acquiring a piece of property that's \$2 million or a half million dollars were example so we tried to do it proportionally with those two budget lines but not as much and there was also some slight rounding of numbers to make it more sensible from the reporting perspective I hope it answers your questions.

HARTWELL: Any questions from members? Thank you. Let's go back to PA 01 and talk about the DSS Amanda if you can do

that and I'll stay in order after that.

M. JOHNSON: That should be Jay Johnson coming in I believe. Mr. Chair I should mention if I may I should mention if councilmembers have questions that are answered here we can always bring back more information for the next meeting we can still forward the accomplishment plans but have further review of them in the future the forwarding allows the staff to go forward with wording the Bill and getting ready for approval in December.

HARTWELL: I see Jay is joining us now. Thanks for joining us the question if you didn't hear it is your budget was 37% of what you requested but the DSS was 62% and why is that reasonable for us.

J. JOHNSON: Chair Hartwell and members can you hear me okay after I testified earlier this year I had a little PTSD from that experience. I will explain to you how we calculated the DSS it is in fact true the proportional change to the budget is not quite in line with some of the other budget lines. In our DSS what we have is we have a calculator we use that comes to us from a person who manage this for us Michelle Mitchell internally we have a calculator that we plug in the numbers for our budget we plug-in our total funding request which was \$1.6 million and we also write off the top we take off our fee title our land payment which in this case is 1 point ion and any contracts are exempt in our budget this year we had \$115,000 in contracts that were exempt. Then we plug-in our personnel into the calculator then it does its calculation and spits out a number which in this case based on a reduced ask of \$1.6 million came out to be \$12,500 and I can't really speak super knowledgeably about all the calculations that go in terms of the people support the safety support and financial support and communication sport IT support, planning support but those are all factors of the calculator and if the Council would like a detailed sort of understanding of the calculator I'm certain I could get this from Michelle and have her displayed the detail how that DSS number is calculated. I will say that the DSS and personnel total is \$58,000 and that's 3.5% of our total request.

HARTWELL: Great thank you so much. When you see it as a percentage it feels like a lot when you hear it as a raw number it doesn't feel the same way. I do think DSS as it pertains to the DNR and BWSR as well as maybe the NGOs is something maybe we should put on our agenda to fully understand early next year at a follow-up meeting because it is a mystery as to how everyone does it and what makes sense and what doesn't and as long as I've been around I still feel mystified about it. I imagine I'm not the only person who wonders where this number comes from. Thank you Jay for explaining and putting it in context for us any questions for Jay? Great. Next would be I will pass over more DSS with

the DNR discussions because it doesn't seem that is fruitful use of our time at this point. Martin County WMA Amanda if you can pull them up next the issue that I questioned was the 45% personnel when 26% of the budget was approved and travel at 44% and professional services at 50% and DSS at 41%.

SCHNABEL: Mr. Chair and members I'm just getting we'll have two members thanks for your patience there's a lot of people in the waiting room it takes a while to wade through everyone.

HARTWELL: Maybe what I will do is give you a text that says this is who I will call next so they can get ready.

SMITTH: I noticed Sen. Tomassoni has had his hand up for a while.

HARTWELL: I am sorry. Sen. Tomassoni it's blue on blue I did not see it, please, if I do that to someone else just interrupt me.

TOMASSONI: Mr. Chair thank you I don't really have a question it was just a comment. I know I told everyone I was gonna fund all the projects at 34% that was the amount of money we had it's interesting to me the allocations came out somewhere in that area. It's also interesting to me all the people who submit projects are able to scale down their projects to the amount of money we give them and I'm fine with going through this exercise Mr. Chair, but I think in looking at something like 100% of travel for example I'm questioning why I think that means the going to fund their travel at 100% and that would make sense to me because they probably need to get to the place they're going. When you're done with all this Mr. Chair I'll be willing to make a motion suggested by staff.

HARTWELL: Thank you. Emily and John can you address the question of why the recommendation of 26 but the personnel travel and professional services and DSS were significantly above that amount.

E. NELSON: Mr. Chair and members I'm Emily Nelson with the conservation fund. There really isn't that bad of a lag from YouTube to hear that was pretty good. As far as the percentages that are listed, our recommendation ended up at \$2.4 million which we've done this for about three years or four years we think with that amount of money we can protect and restore this is a protect and restoration project in partnership with ducks unlimited and the Fox Lake conservation league with that amount of money we have about \$1.7 million in our fee acquisition line which given what we've done we have one or two acquisitions last year we were able to this speaks to the economy of scale we were able to group for acquisitions at one time they were simultaneously negotiated with four different landowners we were able to

hire our appraiser and surveyor to go out and do an economical job of one day of travel maybe two days versus separate days were able to get a pretty good deal on those services especially professional services on that line we can't guarantee we can't do that for after time again, we have been budgeted as though they're going to be individual hiring of those professional service contractors which sometimes it ends up being a little more like that. Over all looking at the bigger picture our DSS enter personnel are six % of the overall budget and we think that's in line with all of our previous requests and John Lindstrom is on I don't know if you have anything to add to that John.

LINDSTROM: Thanks Emily Mr. Chair and members of the Council, just from a DU staff perspective like Emily said were working in intensively drained part of Minnesota the acquisitions we have slated to come next are filled with drain tile and County drainage also. It takes a lot of time to survey and design restorations on those using our professional wetland engineers. When we were looking to cut back our budget we knew we had a couple of dandies in the work for lack of a better term and some of the simpler easier once fell off so we knew from a personnel standpoint we would be investing more into these bigger more complex projects versus some of the simple ones in our DSS is a reflection on our personnel budget also as Emily stated I think she said it's under 7% of the total request.

HARTWELL: Okay. Thank you I am not seeing any more questions I appreciate the insight from you. Amanda PA 11 rim grassland reserve personnel at 82% even though the funding level was 46%.

SCHNABEL: Mr. Chair and members John is ready to go.

HARTWELL: Okay great John. You have unmuted yourself if you could address why your personnel line is 82% when your project was allocated 46% of the budget that would be helpful.

VOZ: Thank you chair Hartwell and councilmembers I believe our last draft proposal fixed that problem. We adjusted our calculation to get closer to half-and-half rather than a big disparity.

HARTWELL: Okay. By having the staff pointed out you saw there was an error in your ways and you fixed it thank you very much.

VOZ: Yes.

HARTWELL: Great. I don't suspect there are any other questions Amanda let's move on to FAO one Southeast Minnesota protection and restoration.

I see we have Bob and Richard and Nick all coming in. Who would like to tackle this one? Please, unmute yourselves as you do that, please.

BISKE: Mr. Chair Rich Biske here. One of the I see on the notes.

HARTWELL: We can hear you.

BISKE: You see the one item that state higher than what the reduction was was personnel it did remain consistent with our accomplishment plans for restoration enhancement that's because we've decided to catch up on her restoration enhancement work with a crew so that's what we prioritized to maintain that to achieve those restoration enhancement acres.

M. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair you are on mute.

HARTWELL: Sorry about that you reduced your components but you didn't reduce as much in the restoration and that's what caused the personnel to go up because that's more personnel focused? Okay great thank you any questions from anyone? We appreciate the clarification. Amanda let's work on FAO2.

M. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair while that's being queued up maybe I can cover one item for you. Members just so you'll probably see and many of these where there are easements related the easement stewardship stays higher than the recommended amount from the Council. For the overall if they get 30% recommendation from the Council easement may be 50% the reason for that is in statute we have to put in how much the easement stewardship can be up to and if that's under gauged at the fund and it can't be changed without changing the law in the future it's not just an amendable portion of the budget. It's also something they have to ask for reimbursement for or they have to specifically ask for money for stewardship on each one of the easements they actually purchase. That's why that's going to be higher in most cases and it's a logical explanation for it.

HARTWELL: Thank you. I see we have Christine you are on mute.

OSTERN: Good morning can you hear me.

HARTWELL: We can hear you thank you for being with us. The question is 30% of the accomplishment was funded and personnel state exactly the same the DSS was 100% which I think was prioritized and the material was at 1:00 ask plane why personnel doesn't go down at all when you're doing a third of the work.

OSTERN: Yes, thank you for the question. First the personnel expense was very low it set 2.9% of the total budget and that translates to 25% of one FTE so it was low to start with we

have limited staff there was only one person that is myself on the program and that's down from two in two years so the coordination that administration and etc. Falls with me and then we did eliminate the fee acquisition portion of the projects and we focused more on conservation easement acquisition which does take more time and coordination and even though we do have a lot of travel expenses our program is statewide and the projects in this program will be widespread we did not put in any of our travel budget or putting any travel into the request so we are absorbing that already. I think that's my answers here unless you have more questions.

HARTWELL: Councilmembers any more questions? Great thank you very much. We appreciate you hanging out for us this morning. Next is FRE 01 travel went to 43% even though the budget was 30%. This may be an issue of dollars but we don't have visibility to that at this point. Hopefully we can get clarification.

SCHNABEL: Mr. Chair and members sorry for the delay I had a different one queued up.

HARTWELL: Did I screw you up somehow.

SCHNABEL: I am looking for Greg Houck and he will be here in a moment.

M. JOHNSON: That was my fault Mr. Chair in forwarding I missed two of your texts.

SCHNABEL: Mr. Chair and members Greg is on his way in now.

HARTWELL: We can see him. Greg you are on mute.

HOCH: Could you repeat the question, please.

HARTWELL: The question was 30% of the request of the budget was approved but travel was at 44% and can you help us understand that.

HOCH: I am sorry I have both versions going here, please, hang on a second. I am confusing myself. As Jay tried to explain there is our directed necessary the travel we reduced not quite as proportionally thinking you still have to travel to a site even if you're not going to quite as much at the site or maybe it asked hoping to do a big project at the site in you're not and you're now going to do a smaller project he still left to get there. We did reduce it some but we didn't reduce it as much as some other parts of the proposal.

HARTWELL: Okay. Thank you very much for the explanation. Next would be FRE02 floodplain forced enhancement with Audubon personnel. It came in at 60% and the DSS at 52% but only 30%

was recommended.

SCHNABEL: Mr. Chair and members we seem to be missing Andrew from the waiting room not would you like to move ahead all see if I get a hold of him and you can come back to him.

HARTWELL: That would be fine. Let's move to FRE03 which is a moose habitat collaborative where personnel was 100% and travel was hundred percent even though 20% of the funds were recommended.

SCHNABEL: Mr. Chair that group is coming in right now.

DUNHAM: Hello Mr. Chair and members.

HARTWELL: Did you hear the question.

DUNHAM: No I did not.

HARTWELL: The question was you were recommended with 27% of your original request yet personnel was 100% and travel unchanged even though the recommended amount was changed and the question was ranged why that was reasonable.

DUNHAM: Similar to other awardees that we have a lot of sites a lot of coordinating a lot of work that goes into 8,000 acres of restoration work, so really it's a very small amount of the overall project that goes into salary and percentage wise with the ruffed grouse Society put in here it's a quite small of that salary figure to begin with that represents a bare minimum to take on the project.

HARTWELL: And how much is that.

DUNHAM: I am looking for that right now.

RUDOLPH: Mr. Chair Brent Rudolph with the ruffed grouse Society I can interject there. It is now 2.3% of the recommended amount of DSS and personnel combined that was originally less than 1% of the request.

HARTWELL: In the dollar amount.

RUDOLPH: The dollar amount was \$36,000 out of the recommended \$1.5 million.

HARTWELL: That makes it easier to understand thank you I have no other questions does anyone else? Great let's move on to I think HA01 is next. I see Monica who is on mute.

ZACHAY: I am on mute thank you Mr. Chair and members would you, please, repeat your question for us there is a delay here I also have DJ forms with the trust for public lands with me and I believe the Minnesota land trust is connecting

right now as well.

HARTWELL: Okay great the question I flagged was 32% recommended funding but 58% contracts and 62% travel can you explain that so we understand it.

ZACHAY: Yes, DJ or Wayne would you like to jump in on that those of the line items you both have worked on.

HARTWELL: You are both on mute.

FORBES: DJ Forbes from the trust for public lands I will take the stab at that and Wayne can talk from your perspective similar to my previous answer on that Cannon River watershed response we try to reduce everything proportionally is much as possible there are certain line items that due to the work remaining the same regardless of the amount of coming in the acquisition capital it was not reduced to the same proportionality. I think MLT had some contracts as well maybe Wayne can speak to that one more specifically than I can.

OSTLIE: Hello, getting back to that question I missed the part of the initial question chair Hartwell.

HARTWELL: No problem I saw you were with us it was why the travel and professional services were out of whack with the reduction in the overall amount on a percentage basis.

OSTLIE: At the Minnesota land trust our proportion relative to travel is we do have to go out and work with landowners to identify the projects and so forth I don't think our proportion is wholly out of alignment with what the reductions professional services this is one of the things where we do and that kind of cascades down through how we budget out around these various programs. I think Mark Johnson mentioned the circumstance surrounding easements stewardship tending to budget out at a higher amount just because that is a hard thing to modify we also use that as the basis around a number of projects and a number tied to that expect additional possibility that we would do those higher levels of projects so there tends to be a little bit of reflection in the professional service side of it also some of these other related costs to actually getting the project done that tend to manifest themselves in some way shape or form you will see this typically and a lot of our grant programs that are budgets reflect that that we put forward to the LSOHC.

HARTWELL: Okay Wayne thank you. I will ask you to jump to your proposal HA 06 which is protecting Minnesota lakes from outstanding biological significance your contracts lines was 85% versus 25% of the recommended funding can you help us understand that.

OSTLIE: This is one where I have other staff that are specific to this proposal but I will take a leap at that this is a circumstance where our primary program manager associated with this program is a contractual cost share from the board of soil and water resources and that is why that number is higher I think it's also an artifact that I don't think we caught that in the original proposal in terms of the actual where that dollar amount would be coming from for implementation of the grant. It won't be 100% shared by Bill our shoulder men in the Mississippi headwaters program will be doing some of that work as well but that's where that dollar amount comes in.

HARTWELL: Okay. Thank you. Next we run to HA 07 riparian habitat protection Catalan snake River watersheds Amanda I skipped over a couple that I earlier indicated we should ask questions because a think will get the same answers I don't want to waste everyone's time.

SCHNABEL: Mr. Chair and members no problem just to add one moment I will skip ahead HA07.

Jacob is entering the room right now.

GRANFORS: Good morning can you hear me. I'm representing this proposal on behalf of pine County soil and water district I will what was the leading question here.

HARTWELL: The question was we recommended 41% of your original request but personnel is almost 85% and that doesn't square up can you explain that further.

GRANFORS: Members, a lot of that cost is the board of water and soil water resources personnel to process the easements and the calculation came from Bill Penney on that and he was not able to attend here that's why I am stepping in. My understanding is certain costs for the easement staff to process these easements there is just a set cost to do that we've cut everywhere else we could we reduced the contracts which is paid to the soil and water districts to complete the number of easements the easement dollars got cut stewardship dollars got caught, our direct services got cut by about half to try to align more to our 41% funding rate. There is a little bit of uncertainty being a brand-new program as well exactly how much land values were going to come in at and if we did more easements the staff time could very a lot we did keep that BWSR personnel costs little bit higher from my understanding due to the uncertainty of how many easements we really can get in that landscape we were shooting for about nine or ten here but we cut that in half we were originally planning about 18 that was my understanding I can certainly follow up with Bill Penning and get back to you if you have additional questions on that personnel line but the total personnel and the soil and water district for the

administration stayed the same and that was about \$26,000 and that stayed the same so BWSR did reduce their contract by about \$23,000 for the personnel line but with just the personal it's \$125,000 total on the 1.2 so it's about 10% as a figure for you I certainly can follow up and get a better idea if you need more.

HARTWELL: Representative Fabian you had a question.

FABIAN: Just a follow-up he mentioned Bill Penning at BWSR I think it would be appropriate to get some sort of input if you can contact him and get a written explanation for what BWSR is saying I'm not suggesting Jacob is not forthcoming but it would be in our best interest to make sure we get that from BWSR as well.

HARTWELL: I agree with you understanding why half the easements costs almost as much in personnel it doesn't completely compute to me. So Jacob if you can go back to Bill and have them explain why doing nine easements costs almost as much as doing 18 easements from a personnel standpoint that would be great.

GRANFORS: Sure I'm fairly new to the process once I get that answer do I email to Amanda how do I get you that response.

HARTWELL: Amanda would be great anyone on the staff can manage that for you. Thank you very much for being with us this morning we appreciated. Next is HA 09 targeted rim easements. We have the Crow Wing soil and water conservation District the question is 35% recommended funding and personnel is at 60% the DSS is at 78%.

Melissa we can see you it looks like you are on mute if you can unmute the question if you didn't hear was why the budget or the amount recommended was 35% of your original request but personnel was at 66% or essentially we recommended a third and personnel side was two thirds DSS.

BARRICK: Yes, one of the things I guess what we did try to reduce our personnel in the budget but the other piece was just because we would be contracting with.

HARTWELL: You went to mute.

BARRICK: Just because were going to be contracting with the northern land and water trust there would be a fair amount of time and effort trying to develop that contract and we wanted to make sure that was incorporated into it. We can definitely I guess reduce that if that is a concern some of it was the BWSR budget as well so they gave me their numbers of the board of water and soil resources based off their costs to do the easement and I think we can adjust it if that's a concern to the Council. The BWSR part was what they gave me as their numbers.

HARTWELL: It did raise a question because it didn't make perfect sense. If you can reduce it no one is going to complain.

BARRICK: Yes, I can take a look at it and see again I was more concerned about the contracting and how much time that would take to establish that contract and get that rolling with a third-party that we have not worked with before and obviously in the end we want to get as much money towards conservation as possible.

HARTWELL: Okay. Any other questions? Please, take a look at it and get back to the staff. Thank you for being with us this morning Melissa.

BARRICK: Thank you.

HARTWELL: Next is HR E02 DNR aquatic restoration and enhancement. Something obviously was quite wrong with this we recommended 37% funding and professional services went up 1200% in the DSS at 91%. I am guessing there is an error but we will hear from the DNR on that I would assume. Jamison welcome.

WENDEL: Good morning Mr. Chair.

HARTWELL: The question if you didn't hear was we recommended 37% of your request but your professional services was 1250% of your original request and DSS at 91% which when I looked at it seemed like there may be some issue there.

WENDEL: Thank you Mr. Chair this is essentially more of an amendment request we had for one of the projects \$90,000 approximately \$90,000 of design and engineering for dam repair and stream restoration project originally that was included within contracts but now we were going to be doing that engineering and design work in-house through the the DNR staff once that transition takes place then that amount simply goes to a different budget line then goes into professional services. For the DSS that's as others have mentioned that's based off a calculator the DNR uses and one of our projects when there is a project that's done in house that has a higher amount of DSS attributed to it so that's why since we are finding that project as we prioritize what projects will be funded as we scale this appropriation since that was one of the projects included the percentages still didn't change very much.

HARTWELL: So what are the dollars that changed from outside into the professional services you got 36% or 37% of the request how did it work in dollars versus percentages.

WENDEL: The actual dollar amount I can look that up quickly,

originally we had a small amount of professional services \$7,800 in the original request and we added \$90,000 to that professional services so it's \$97,000 within the amended accomplishment plan so that's the 90,000 additional dollars not really additional that was within the request originally it's budgeted within contracts richly notes separated within professional services.

HARTWELL: Okay. Any questions? I think next would be the CPL where we gave them 80% of what they asked for but the personnel line was 101% of the original request. Jamison it looks like you were waiting for us to do something.

WENDEL: I'm sorry I thought that was on CPL.

HARTWELL: Yes, on the CPL.

WENDEL: I am not the project manager for the CPL.

HARTWELL: I know that's why I was mentioning that Kathy can you explain why the personnel line went to 101% of what the original request was but we only give you 81% of the funding request.

Kathy you are on mute.

VARBLE: Mr. Chair and members, the 1% on top of the 100% was a rounding error I think on my part. I'm the only person who manages CPL now and unfortunately I cannot take myself away in any capacity so that's why personnel thought the time stayed the same we always budget for \$2 people just in case it's determined that there is another person we need on staff. In the past there were always two people just since the previous CPL coordinator left there's been one person so we still budget for \$2 just in case but it's one person and I am it and I don't have another role at the DNR because were not supplanting anything.

HARTWELL: We appreciate your work very much thank you for the explanation. Members those were the ones that I highlighted is there anything else anyone's wants to ask about before we tell everyone in the waiting room they can move on if they wish to? All right those of you who showed up and we didn't call upon you I thank you very much for being available we do appreciate it and we know that's a burden for you because sitting and waiting on zoom is so much fun. We really appreciate the partnership of all of you. Sen. Tomassoni you wanted to make a motion.

I see he is not with us.

SAXHAUG: Mr. Chair I would make that motion.

HARTWELL: And the motion is to follow the recommendations of staff and moving these forward as we draft the Bill correct.

SAXHAUG: That is correct thank you.

HARTWELL: Is there any discussion on the motion? Amanda can you call the role.

SCHNABEL: Mr. Chair and members we will be starting with Number 8 on our list today that is Mr. McNamara.

MCNAMARA: McNamara votes aye.

SCHNABEL: Peters.

PETERS: Aye.

SCHNABEL: Saxhaug.

SAXHAUG: Aye.

SCHNABEL: Swenson.

SWENSON: Aye.

SCHNABEL: Swenson votes aye. Sen. Tomassoni.

TOMASSONI: Yes.

SCHNABEL: Tomassoni votes aye. Hartwell.

HARTWELL: Yes.

SCHNABEL: Hartwell votes aye. Schara.

SCHARA: Schara votes aye.

SCHNABEL: Schara votes aye. Representative Becker Finn.

SCHNABEL: Becker Finn votes aye. Eggerling.

EGGERLING: Aye.

SCHNABEL: Eggerling votes aye. Representative Fabian.

FABIAN: Aye.

SCHNABEL: Representative Fabian votes aye. Holston.

HOLSTON: Aye.

SCHNABEL: Hoston votes aye. Sen. Lang votes absent there are 11 aye's and one absent.

HARTWELL: Sen. Lang is in a helicopter today which is why he's not with us today and sends his apologies. Thank you members for going through that I hope you found that helpful it may

have been a little cumbersome but I think it's important that we ask questions when it doesn't make perfect sense.

FABIAN: Mr. Chair quickly.

HARTWELL: Yes.

FABIAN: I see that member McNamara is in a vehicle today I'm not sure Sen. Lang's excuse is appropriate.

HARTWELL: I will let you tell him that. And then he, please, I hope you're not driving as you're talking to us. Next is the Council calendar mark do you want to say something.

M. JOHNSON: Thank you Mr. Chair. Members your calendar the October 1st we had and out a draft calendar we asked for your calendar conflicts or suggestions moving forward from that several of you did give us that information and Amanda incorporated that. There were the calendar you have in front of you has those conflicts considered from all the members who contacted us. I think there's still potentially one conflict that Kristin may have but otherwise as you look at things there may be other conflicts that have arisen and that's what we will look at and hopefully we will get this calendar approved today so we know what the dates are going to be in 2/0/21.

HARTWELL: So what is the one conflict that Kristin brought up that she sent me an email on that? With the recommended adjustment.

J. JOHNSON: Perhaps Kristin could give us that information now.

EGGERLING: I believe it's the January meeting Mr. Chair. I was looking for the document.

J. JOHNSON: I'm sorry Kristin I believe it was January 15th we had January 22nd in place there were one or two conflicts with that so the potential fix is January 15th of which Kristin has a potential conflict there. I think you had said the 13th and 14th were potential openings for you but I should verify that with you.

EGGERLING: The 14th in the morning is not an option for me but the 13th would work for me.

J. JOHNSON: With that Mr. Chair if I can ask one question of the legislative members, the session has started at that point do you believe there will be session begins on the fifth would we be running into difficulty having legislative members joining us other than say a Friday morning would a Wednesday morning work or is that something that would be problematic.

BECKER-FINN: 2020 is the year where no one knows what is happening

ever and I expect that could to continue into 2021 for the beginning generally either a Monday morning or a Friday is best generally our legislative work is during the middle of the week because of our rural members having the ability to be in their districts. Admittedly many of us will be in our homes and not traveling but the safest bet I would say would be either a Monday morning or a Friday. Then I also wanted to point out we can settle these things now but I think we have four or five or six different positions that we may have different members by mid-January so I would remind folks maybe not completely set in stone until we know who the members will be come January.

HARTWELL: I think that's a great point and typically we set a schedule then we revisited it but at least it gets it on the calendars. If I'm hearing you right if the 15th doesn't work either the 11th or the 18th would be better dates for legislators would either of those work for you Kristin.

EGGERLING: Yes.

J. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair I believe the 18th is Martin Luther King Day.

HARTWELL: We probably better not schedule a meeting that day. Sen. Tomassoni you have a comment.

TOMASSONI: I appreciate representative Becker Finn's comments those of us in rural Minnesota were normally traveling on Monday morning or Friday afternoon so I suppose I could attend via my car but I would appreciate not doing that. Maybe later in the day during the legislative session or in the morning, I don't know that money morning or Friday morning are good times for me whether not all be on the counseling and I don't know that either we will see what happens.

J. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, we don't at this point we don't dissipate there being a lot of business for that meeting that's generally a meeting where we have some last-minute things come up with regards to amendments it might be a conveyance or something of that nature. There shouldn't be too much on the agenda it should be I would think not a long meeting. An evening meeting I don't know if that's or an afternoon meeting if that's agreeable with you but that's just a thought.

HARTWELL: I was thinking maybe at 10 o'clock in the morning start for just a couple of hours we could still consider travel time does that make any sense to anyone? Let's try 10 o'clock on the 18th then.

J. JOHNSON: On the 11th Mr. Chair.

HARTWELL: The 11th is fine with me.

J. JOHNSON: The 18th is MLK day.

EGGERLING: Thank you for adjusting the schedule for me.

HARTWELL: I need a motion to approve the revised schedule which is a firm but changeable schedule based on the members. Is there a motion to approve based on that.

EGGERLING: I would make the motion Mr. Chair.

HARTWELL: Any questions or comments Amanda, please, call the role.

SCHNABEL: Beginning with Number 9 peters.

PETERS: Yes.

SCHNABEL: Peters votes aye. Saxhaug.

SAXHAUG: Aye.

SCHNABEL: Saxhaug votes aye. Swenson.

SWENSON: Aye.

SCHNABEL: Swenson votes aye. Sen. Tomassoni.

TOMASSONI: Yes.

SCHNABEL: Tomassoni votes aye. Hartwell.

HARTWELL: Yes.

SCHNABEL: Hartwell votes aye. Schara.

SCHARA: Aye.

SCHNABEL: Schara votes aye. Representative Becker Finn.

BECKER-FINN: Aye.

SCHNABEL: Representative Becker Finn votes aye. Eggerling.

EGGERLING: Aye. Representative Fabian.

FABIAN: Fabian votes aye.

SCHNABEL: Fabian votes aye. Holsten.

HOLSTEN: Aye.

SCHNABEL: Holsten votes aye. Sen. Lang absent. McNamara.

MCNAMARA: McNamara votes aye.

SCHNABEL: McNamara votes aye. 11 aye's and one absence.

HARTWELL: Great thank you all. This is a case where Zoom is certainly not efficient. We will just go forward we have a snapshot of the progress of Metro green big rivers phased program. Deb is joining us now. You are on mute. Please, go ahead thanks for being with us sorry to keep you waiting.

LOON: That is quite all right turning off the YouTube channel good morning Mr. Chair and members of the Council it's great to be here Amanda do I have screen sharing.

SCHNABEL: You do yes.

LOON: Okay I will get there. Excuse me while I get there. Are you seeing my screen.

SCHNABEL: We are.

HARTWELL: Yes we see it.

LOON: Thanks for the patient with me. The Metro big River habitat partnership is honored to be your virtual tour I think. And make a short presentation to you about snapshot of our work thank you for having us. My partners are on I think there in the zoom waiting room or maybe in the meeting in case there are questions they can help answer. The Metro big rivers partnership was established after the passage of the legacy amendment and as you know we are five conservation organizations nonprofits working together here in the Metro. Friends of the Mississippi River, great River Greening, the Minnesota land trust, the Minnesota Valley trust, and the trust for Public land. We pursue and achieve goals for the Metro urbanized area as delineated in the LSOHC 25 year framework as found in the state wildlife action plan and in other federal state and local plans. We have ramped up our organizational capacities to accelerate our work in the Metro for the OHF like other programs. We partner with local state and federal entities. As we give you a snapshot of our progress today in the Metro area we have several key messages we would like to underscore the first is the Metro area has critical habitat to protect, and many opportunities to improve habitat through restoration and enhancement. This map from the state wildlife action plan displays existing important habitat in the Metro area. Secondly there are two very important audiences that benefit from our investments in the Metro area we include both wildlife and people. We build a strong conservation ethic in Minnesota which is a goal we all share we must include Metro residence in our plan and forth we build partnerships with local communities around individual projects those in turn become partnerships between

communities and the LSOHC and they built support for the long-term protection and stewardship of our natural resources.

A couple of notes regarding habitat in the Metro, the Mississippi flyway is obviously a critical piece of habitat in our complex there are 242 miles of the Mississippi River the Minnesota River and the St. Croix River that flow through the Metro urbanized area. Obviously resident and migratory wildlife need high quality habitat along in near the rivers evidence shows even relatively small pockets of high quality habitat provide important urban stopovers for refueling on the migratory flyway. We must work to protect remaining quality habitat and create new and improved existing habitat where possible. A second obvious point is much of the Metro remaining high quality habitat is under development pressure especially in the outer urbanizing areas. Our second key message is about people we all know firsthand the benefits of connecting with nature these benefits are critical to all Minnesotans across the state and really the pandemic is made this especially clear how important our work in the Metro area is the fact is nature heals. More than 60% of Minnesotans a majority live in the Metro area consequently our investment in the Metro benefits a majority of Minnesotans. How are we doing towards our objectives? If snapshot by the members we received funding for ten phases to date we protected 3,200 acres we restored an enhanced 3,600 acres, we have 2,200 acres in progress for a total of 9,000 acres total to date. This map of the Metro urbanizing area shows all the Metro big rivers projects completed in red and in progress in yellow. The circles are protection and the squares are restoration and enhancement. But what is the impact of our work is the important question of course. We look for opportunities that hit a sweet spot that achieve multiple connected objectives. We look for opportunities that protect or create high quality habitat for wildlife and people that connect people with nature close to home and that build those partnerships with communities that will result in long-term support for and stewardship of our natural resources. We like to highlight a few examples to give you a virtual tour of how we are achieving our objectives those are identified by the circles. The first is the William H Holton conservation area this is by the city of Elk River in Sherburne County. This project builds upon existing investment and protection in air you can see the Mississippi River scenic and natural area scientific and natural area islands already protected there is the Bailey nature preserve 25 acres protected by the Minnesota land trust with our phase two funding from the OHF with a conservation easement. The trust for Public land was acquiring the larger 335 acres with our phase two and three which is known as the Holton conservation area. The friends of the Mississippi River has been undertaking a major restoration of the 335 acres using our faces five through seven grants they are restoring that 180 acres agriculture

field and building sites to Prairie and enhancing 155 acres of floodplain forest with OHF funding this property is owned by and managed by the city of Elk River much like a WMA is managed public uses include hunting fishing and passive forms of recreation.

There is terrific local support and used by the resident it's a very popular hunting and fishing destination a friends organization is formed to support this resource volunteer events have included garlic mustard poles fence line removals seeding, seed collection, and this place is become an outdoor classroom for area schools. Welcome to the William H Holton conservation area. Some examples of the restoration work underway OHF as funding buckling removal you can see this is really a buck thorn forest in this before photo, FMR contractors used for street motors mowers to obliterate the buckthorn and shred the stumps thereby decreasing the amount of chemical treatment needed. A good after photo the did also do some native seeding broadcasting. US Fish and Wildlife Service did some wetland restoration on the site restoring historic wetlands on the property. Here's a view of the crop field that is being restored as I mentioned 160 acres of Atlanta being restored to high diversity Prairie. You can see the progress of the Prairie taking hold in just two years and prescribed burns are underway both this year and next. One additional note FMR is doing some surveys there to study the impact of the restoration in just one year they have found that the number of individual bumblebees increased from 16 to 575 the number of bumblebee species increased from four to nine the number of butterfly species increased from 15 to 25 confirming literally if you build it they will come. Moving on, Truck Brook nature sanctuary is another important example of our work.

You will find sanctuary in the top center portion of the map. This is a 42 acre farm railyard located in St. Paul's North and neighborhood which is been protected by the city of St. Paul it is surrounded by industrial and dense residential areas as well as you can see to the east Interstate 35 E. Truck Brook creates natural space in an area that literally didn't have any before. The neighborhood surrounding Truck Brook is home to St. Paul's lowest income and most diverse neighborhood is home to the city's largest population of Hmong Somali and Karen refugees. After acquiring the property the city of St. Paul reached out to Great River Greening to oversee and coordinate the restoration of the site that return it to presettlement conditions and provide much-needed natural space a nature sanctuary for underserved neighborhoods. Draw Brook once flowed from the McCarran's Lake and Rolesville to the Mississippi River with industrial development the Creek was diverted underground into a storm water pipe and the abandoned rail corridor as you can see was overgrown with Siberian Elm. With funding from the OHF and other sources including the city of St. Paul, we created implementation of the 42 acre site the daylighting of the

truck Brook itself was completed by the city with financial support from the watershed district and from several private foundations. Greening used OHF funds to restore the oak savanna the Prairie and the Woodland neighborhood buffer. Greening engaged 700 volunteers at four events in this restoration project volunteers planted pollinator plots trees and shrubs and removed invasive species. This dramatic transformation as resulted in quality habitat within the Mississippi flyway migratory birds now use the site as a stopover and nesting area deer and other mammals using as part of a corridor connecting to the Mississippi River floodplain.

Songbirds pollinators and residents are all active and appreciating the restored Prairie. A third highlight for you is the Minnesota Valley national wildlife refuge which is one of the largest urban refuges in the entire refuge system in the country. It stretches 70 miles along the Minnesota River from near the airport through suburbs including Bloomington down to Chaska and into outer developing areas of the river to Henderson this map shows the rapids Lake unit on the west side of the river West and North in Carver County which is one of the newest and largest units of the refuge. It is directly across the river from the Louisville swamp unit and south of the Chaska unit which you cannot see on the map. This habitat complex stands at over 5,400 acres today. The Minnesota Valley trust is working with the US Fish and Wildlife Service to complete the rapids Lake unit by protecting and restoring properties within the unit boundaries that would otherwise be sold for residential development. We are also developing units upriver to Henderson again not included in the map. OHF grants helped us acquire three parcels totaling 109 acres which you see in the Brown color on the map to complete the rapids Lake unit I would like to zero in on the Lundquist tract at the bottom center of this map. A recent acquisition with help from OHF funds it includes a 40 acre ag field and building site that will be restored by the Minnesota Valley trust Prairie using the balance of the grants that helped us acquire the land. And 37 acres of degraded oak savanna that are being enhanced by the Minnesota land trust using the balance of some OHF grant.

In addition to protecting this from residential development this project creates significant new wildlife habitat and opportunities for public recreation it also gets all of rapids Lake into the refuge and under US Fish and Wildlife Service management. Restoration of degraded oak savanna's and prairies is a high priority for us as it is critical to reversing the decline of grassland nesting birds and waterfall production in this part of Minnesota. OHF grants both through the LSOHC and CPL have made oak savanna and Prairie restoration at multiple sites on the rapids Lake unit possible. Everyone loves a prescribed fire photo this is on an ongoing management tool of course after the initial restoration and enhancement the crew in this photo did a burn

and you can see the oak savanna in the background and the Prairie in the foreground. This is a great photo of post enhancement of an oak savanna this habitat benefits many species including nesting waterfall metal's bubble links monarchs and pollinators. Minnesota Valley refuge is valued by metro residents from urban suburban and developing areas. Residents access the refuge for all kinds of outdoor recreation schools bring students to the refuge for environmental education and Fish and Wildlife Service staff do community outreach to encourage residents to come to the refuge. Our fourth and final project we'd like to highlight is at camp Catherine Parsons on Oak Lake in Carver County. The Minnesota land trust placed a conservation easement over 85 acres on this parcel this was completed in partnership with the land owner which is the Phyllis Wheatley community center. This easement protects the longtime camp property which contains high quality natural habitat protects the water quality and has significant historical and cultural significance to urban Minneapolis communities. The Maple basswood Forest native plant committee on this project is registered by the DNR as a big Woods Heritage Forest these types of forests are in peril and vulnerable to use over 57 species of birds have been identified on this property including species and greatest conservation need such as the trumpeter Swan and the American white pelican. This conservation easement protects nearly one 1/2 miles of shoreline encompassing 15% of the lakes shoreline the easement also protects 46 acres of wetland habitat providing for the needs of a large number of year-round and migratory wildlife. Not only does this property contain great habitat it's an important resource for the safe exploration of the outdoors by the youth and families served by the Phyllis Wheatley community center. Located in North Minneapolis this committee center is on the property for over 70 years camp Catherine Parsons was one of the first outdoor camps owned by and serving the African-American community in the United States even today such amenities are uncommon in underserved communities. This easement preserves Phyllis Wheatley's ability to continue offering these opportunities to its community for future generations and protection of properties like this provides a very unique way for the LSOHC to partner with diverse urban communities. We at Metro big rivers believe the future of conservation of Minnesota depends on our collective work to build a strong conservation ethic throughout the state. The Metro big rivers partnership takes this seriously and we pledged to continue working with you to ensure support for conservation well into the future for our part Metro big rivers uses for important tools with the majority of Minnesotans living in the Metro urbanized area we work to create opportunities close to home so all metro residents can connect with high-quality natural areas and wildlife.

We recognize volunteer engagement as another important tool Metro big rivers partners annually and engages over 3,000

volunteers who give 12,000 hours on habitat projects every year volunteers removed invasive they plant native plants they collect seed they help maintain conservation areas along the way they learn about conservation and apply what they learn in their own yards and neighborhoods. Education and mentoring of young people is a third high-priority way we work to ensure strong conservation ethic for the future all Metro big rivers partners have active outreach and education programs in the schools and community we also actively mentor young people through internships and apprenticeships. Finally partnerships we build partnerships with local communities around our projects which will ensure support for conservation and stewardship of natural resources well into the future. With that I thank you for the opportunity and I'd be happy to answer some questions.

HARTWELL: Great thank you very much are there any questions from the Council? Apparently not, Deb thank you and your team for the great work that you have done and continue to do in the Metro area. I know personally it's not easy to do work in the Metro area.

LOON: Thank you Mr. Chair it's a privilege thank you so much.

HARTWELL: The next thing on our agenda is an update on the marsh Lake enhancement. Dave whose last name I will not pronounce correctly Dave will give us a presentation.

TRAUBA: David and councilmembers can you hear me.

HARTWELL: Can you, please, pronounce your last name for us so I can remember it.

TRAUBA: It's Dave Trauba.

HARTWELL: Thank you very much for being with us and thank you for being willing to give us on the marsh Lake project.

TRAUBA: You are very welcome I will share my screen and will get you going get going on the PowerPoint.

HARTWELL: We cannot see you if you can turn on your computer video we would at least see you.

TRAUBA: Okay yes you are welcome. I think you should be able to see my screen as well now. We are going to get going here Mr. Chair and councilmembers, it's an absolute pleasure to be here today with you. I am David Trauba the regional wildlife manager for the Southwest region for five years but more importantly for our presentation today I was the wildlife manager at the Lac Qui Parle WMA for 25 years so I lived and breathed marsh Lake and were going to go through 25 years of history if you will in 24 slides but what we'll do is focused

on the last three years of the construction phase and the good news for all you folks today I only have one text light otherwise it will be all pretty pictures I think it will be important to orientate people where we are at where the project occurred you can see my cursor moving were in the upper Minnesota River Valley Big Stone County Swift County Chippewa and Lac Qui Parle County were all touched if you will by this project. This is the Minnesota River cutting through the Highway 75 dam the marsh Lake in the Lac Qui Parle Dam. Historically Lac Qui Parle Lake existed it was a Delta from the Lac Qui Parle River the marsh Lake existed it was a Delta from the northern River coming in and in the 1930s it was the largest flood control project in Minnesota occurred and that's what build the Lac Qui Parle Dam they built the marsh Lake dam as part of the project and that flood control project extended from Granite Falls up to her to Bill by the Big Stone dam. That was done by the state of Minnesota and in the 1950s those projects were then turned over to the federal government so that's why we had a federal interest in federal involvement that's why we needed to work through the Corps of Engineers to get this project done because of the federal interest in the dams and from the Lac Qui Parle Dam up to the Highway 75 that's the Lac Qui Parle wildlife management area then you have the Big Stone national wildlife refuge have over 50,000 acres of public land in the Minnesota River Valley.

This is the only text light I will have for you today this I'm amazed sometimes I wake up at night in a Colts what thinking we were able to pull this off this was a formal process I was literally had this for 25 years, we will jump ahead here it's done now the feasibility study we had to do the 50-50 cost share it cost about \$1 million that was completed in 2011 there was a lot of engineering that went into the feasibility study a lot of breakdown of all the things we could do out there on marsh Lake and we would them down to the features we are going to talk about today. A lot of state cost for that were done by in-kind there wasn't a lot of cash outline if you remember the game and fish fund that was our time spent then you got to the final design and construction and that's where we have overall this was a \$13.2 million project and again the legacy amendment without the outdoor heritage funds and the Council support with legislative support we might not be talking today we were able to have \$8.6 million came from the federal government in one appropriation which was a godsend and then \$4.6 million in nonfederal dollars from the OHF in two different appropriations the first was for \$2 million and we came back and said we are further along in the dysthymic cost is going to be this and we got the remaining \$2.6 million so the final work was 65% federal and 35% nonfederal money. I would point out this was only one of three ecosystem projects approved and the reason it was supported at the federal and because of the habitat units gained compared to cost it was a really good Best Buy if you will.

I can't say enough of the upper Minnesota watershed district if you were to look at this they are the nonfederal sponsor the state of Minnesota cannot do business with the Corps of Engineers and the identification so we had to work through the upper Minnesota River watershed and they really stepped in and saved this project then a special thanks to marsh Lake team the core the DNR the watershed staff, the key to success on this if people ask me I would say it's a few things you don't take no for an answer on this you be stubborn and a lot of perseverance you get a good team of people together then you can do good things but you have to have long-term vision. While we are into the pretty slides this is the lake this is marsh Lake you are looking towards the east you can see my cursor moving here this is what we call the upper pool of marsh Lake, you have some Back Bay impoundments here this is the Minnesota River coming in and entering into marsh Lake when I was manager here in the mid-1990s on this stretch of road coming across the West half you had over 115 vehicles parked along that road on the opening day of the waterfall season for five or ten years. 262 vehicles alone just on marsh Lake hunting waterfowl this is a destination for the public as I move my cursor down this is where the dam would be this is upper Lac Qui Parle Lake entering into lower Lac Qui Parle Lake in the refuge and the destination in the upper Minnesota River Valley. Now we are looking towards the Southwest I want to point out to people this road coming in is now been abandoned if you were to come out here prior to construction this is the road you would drive down into to reach the dam the old fixed press them I will orientate you this is the northern River coming in and joining into the Minnesota River the marsh Lake impoundment this is the Minnesota River entering into Lac Qui Parle Lake this is a zoom in shot of prior to construction official rearing Pond this is the emergency spillway this is the fixed crest dam for day use area here you are seeing the river that was cut off during construction in the 1930s prior to the dam going in the water from the river would've entered in right here into the Minnesota River in that Delta formed the lake this is the only artificial stretch we had to do to bring this river back which I will talk about next.

Here is the fixed crest dam at marsh Lake prior to construction what I will say about this the work project administration in 1933 they built a lot of these they did a lot of great things for recreation but they killed a lot of lakes of fixed crest dam takes up all the variability of the shallow lake systems and shallow lakes hate stability that you've all with fluctuating water levels so marsh Lake when this was put in the decline of marsh Lake started in 1935 that's what I tell people in these old fixed crest dams are hydraulic growers there drawing machines for people anytime we can get rid of them we are happy to do so. I mentioned this was a long process I'm glad took a long time to get here we were able to bring a team together the multiple interagency team I think if we were to have done this project

in the late 80s we would've put in a water control structure we wouldn't of been talking about rewriting the river we would not talk about allowing a fish passage unhappy it took time to get us here the major project features I will start here on the left where you can see this is the new drawdown structure the added structure did not exist it's a new feature it's a drawdown structure we had to excavate to get it to move the water to the Minnesota River where the old crest dam was located that's where the fish way is today you have the staging area that they use this is the palm to tear reroute coming in these are structures to allow the water in Crossfield embankment it was pretty easy to do we had to do the structures here will talk about the toe what a little bit later do an excavation and the river formed itself at our River people were out there they were amazed at the hard gravel bottom and it's functioning beautifully.

The old route coming in has been abandoned and the new way you come in is on the new dam coming in through and across the wildlife area here. By coming in and putting in a different direction how to get down to the dam in the day use area that meant we could eliminate the bridge we were talking about building a bridge across the palm to tear River to reconnect at bridges are very expensive so when we were able to keep value added engineering and bring the river across this way and not get a bridge that saved us \$3 million and made this a Best Buy project so those are the major overviews the drawdown structure the fish way the river reroute. Here it is this is a 2019 photo again the road coming in this is the parking lot this is been ceded to prairie grass you can see the palm to tear River has been cut across there's a breach in the road to see the new embankment coming in this is a pit that has been ceded the river is flowing in following the sinuosity and here's the artificial connection here is the drawdown structure here is the fish way in 2019 it was still under construction and right here you can still see a little bit of the coffer dam that was used to isolate for the drawdown structure. All delve in a little closer here was a historic date where the backhoe breached we got water from the palm deter River moving into his old channel again we were very proud of the fact we didn't use a lot of riprap so this is the new embankment rolled this little bit of riprap there is a bend in the river what I want to point out if you look closer you can see a little bit of tree roots this is one of the tree structures we drive the trunks of the trees into the river as natural stabilization we use natural materials.

Then here is the artificial connection back by the trees here that's where the palm to tear River would stop and we needed to have the contractor move in and make that connection and I will back up a little on that, the contractor is RTS cheering out of Jamestown North Dakota Rice Lake engineering did the water control structure that's a Minnesota firm and they were a small vendor program there were some challenges with that when these folks showed up to work the high water in the

flood events began as well. The first year all we had was a coffer dam there were a small group that can only do one thing at time what I want to oppress upon the Council today at no time was quality sacrifice quality was maintained until the end that's all credit to the core oversight the Corps of Engineers hell those contractors to a very high standard we never sacrificed quality. Now we're looking at the drawdown structure under construction. This would be the coffer dam extending out you have the lake behind you the lake is flooding it came close to overwhelming the site a few times fortunately it did not happen again just another view it's a six bay water control structure 12 sluice gates control gates here these are five x six openings that right now a little bit of art and science for the staff at Lac Qui Parle and operating it how many gates do you need to open to dewater it one thing I will press upon the Council anything the ecosystem project touched if you will those features are the state of Minnesota's responsibility to maintain into the future it would be the wildlife staff at Lac Qui Parle WMA that are going out here and doing the maintenance but were on a major river system so they need to be working closely with the water control people at the Corps of Engineers on dam operation activities.

Here's the structure moving water today. This is the fish way the last project feature and I want to oppress upon people the size of these boulders my understanding all these rocks were laser gritted out to look at the different dimensions and they were selected and individually placed on purpose into this you can see this is a U-shaped elliptical design with different size rock as bedding material we are very fortunate we had the staff with the DNR River unit and he is a nationwide expert on building fish passage structures and also the core step there's a lot of science into a fish way more than you would dream of fish move up here were looking downstream when fish move up there's different velocities of current coming through then they can kind of hide move off to the siding rest before they make a way up through the structure. Here's a little bit of a side shot and here is the old fixed crest structure there's a notch and that we had to notch that out to allow water to move down and also you can see some of the rocks in the U-shaped here and then here is an earlier photo of the fish way if you will with water moving through it this is still it's done now but this was still a construction photo. As we have this will be the primary structure from moving water water control structure will be used every eight or ten years this is going to move water all the time what I want to press upon the councilmembers today is that old fixed crest structure maintained the stable water level this fish way not only is it going to get fish into the system if we have time we can talk about later, but it will also give us more variability of water two feet variability in water levels when you have a lake with maximum depth of 2.5 feet is huge this is where water will be moving most of the

time in the drawdown structure will be used when we need to kick the lake and its rear end to get it going. We did implement we were dry we had a dry trend in 2019 the marsh-like team got together with the management team and with the citizens and said hey let's move into a drawdown phase I look at the drawdown is being what we need to shock the system here are photos to the left this is in 2019 September 2019 you could see we have flood mud flat conditions they were able to maintain that overwinter and through the spring growing season we need climate to help us out in the next photo in the middle is vegetative response in July and now this is the vegetative response in September that vegetative response is drying out the bottom sediments the seed bank is coming back to life that's been waiting there for probably since the drought of 1988 that set seed I was impressed by the diversity I thought we would get it all cattails but we got bulrush we got sedges we got smart weed, cattail many different sedges I am amazed by the emergent vegetative response we got. My tip if you're a pheasant hunter go out to marsh Lake and key in on that area it's loaded with residents this is that the Lewisburg grade Road looking toward the main lake the Back Bay in September 2019 July 2020 and now September of this year if you will it's critical or going to keep water low again we have to protect that emergency own at all cost because that's going to drive productivity on this basin the emergent zone is going to help us cut down on wind on the lake and get us to the submerged zone are shallow lakes evolve with wet and dry cycles we need to kickstart the lake we need to protect this for next year and when we flood this it's going to be lights out for waterfowl were going there's going to be a lot of waterfowl use in this basin when the waterfall comes back.

The rocks, it is incredible the amount of rocks in this like it could've been called rock Lake and what that is is great glacial River worn if you been out by the W may were blessed with a large amount of native Prairie not only do those rocks exist in the lake that exist on the glacial River terraces and I probably bounce my outboard motor over many of those rocks over the years. The sure bird use has been fantastic on this Lake probably tens of thousands of shorebirds around here on the mud flats we had birds from across Minnesota probably across the upper Midwest coming here counting shorebirds and I expect the same thing with waterfowl and the fish and the connectivity with the palm to tear River getting fish to be able to respond in the new emergent vegetation I think our team is proud of the work we have done we've done everything we can to bring this lake back to good health. I have two slides remaining. Our current and future plans we got the drawdown we started in 2020 and will continue through 2021 then were going to get the Mark's Lake citizen advisory team which we have formed we have River advocates duck hunters and fishermen they're all going to be our sounding board and how we do management in the future, we have our marsh Lake adaptive management team we need to be monitoring

for ten years we need to report to the federal and state partners what we set out to do did we meet our accomplishments and it's all about adaptive management the thing I will tell people is marsh Lake didn't decline overnight right it took 50 years of decline we are don't have a magic bullet here it's going to take a number of years to build the health into the system but I think we are very proud of what we've done we gave dislike the chance to succeed and we are going to see where we go after 2021 before we bring the water back in we have learned a lot along the way and next time we need new active management will be better set.

Dave I was going to set a timer I think we pretty much stayed within 15 minutes.

HARTWELL: I think you went a little more but it was well worth it. It's absolutely great to see a project like this conceived and then finished and starting to produce. Thank you for your 25 year perseverance there were many times that it wasn't easy.

TRAUBA: Like I said I wake up at night sometimes pinch myself thinking we got across the finish line I could write a book on the federal process but things take time.

HARTWELL: But no one would read it. [Laughter.] Are there any questions from the Council? I am not seeing any Dave thank you very much we truly appreciate your hard work on this.

TRAUBA: It was a good team thank you everyone.

HARTWELL: Councilmembers we put out request for comments from the public and there were none unless there are other things anyone wants to get on the table, I am going to adjourn the meeting. Seeing nothing else I will adjourn this meeting and thank you all for your participation have a good Thanksgiving alone.