



Table of Contents

Page

2 – Table of Contents

3 – Introduction

4 - 5 – History

6 - 7 – Past Expense/Revenue & New Proposed

8 – 15 – MN Statute 103F.361 through 103F.377

16 - In Conclusion

Introduction

Please consider the following report in support of the Mississippi Headwaters Boards funding request.

The Mississippi Headwaters Board (MHB) would first like to thank you for the collaborative efforts over the past years. Due to time and funding issues, it has been difficult to keep in touch with those that have provided this board long standing support. As time moves forward however, the fear that the loss of history as legislative members change is always a concern, because with them often goes memory of hard won battles by this board. This is especially true where MHB is concerned and with the issue we will be addressing in our presentation.

The MHB will be presenting its biennial report again in August '09, as required by MN Statute to the appropriate committees. Enclosed within this packet is much of the same documentation that will appear in the Biennial Report. A majority of the information highlights our history and effective implementation of the Plan as administered by the Mississippi Headwaters Board. It was not until days before the '08 session closed, that we learned of the drastic reduction in support (HF1812) and the added requirement of holding several Public Input Meetings by January '09. The year 2009 will be critical. As with the cut we suffered in 2003, we again want to express that although everyone is facing budget cuts, the MHB has always done its best in past years to be a good steward of all its resources.

Since inception in 1980, the MHB has worked hard to fulfill our obligations as outlined in MN Statute 103F.361 – 103F.377. In 1980 our annual operation budget was \$130,000 including county contributions, in-kind and various grants. At times, our State funding ran as high as \$190,000/yr but has dropped consistently after 2000 to the level we were given in 2003 of \$65,000/yr. Now, we will again be forced to make some unfortunate program and staffing changes due to the latest cut to \$27,000/yr starting in 2009. At this new level, it will be nearly impossible to consistently maintain the work necessary to satisfy our very important mission.

The Mississippi Headwaters Board has from its inception, enjoyed a long standing positive working partnership with various environmental groups from the start of the Mississippi to the Twin Cities. We believe it was Senator Lessard's and others intent in 1980 to create a unified local level of government to oversee the first 400 miles of the Mississippi through assistance, cooperation and partnership.

The Board feels that the past 28 years of dedication to this important directive has helped sustain habitat and water quality at very acceptable levels. This is very apparent when one notes the condition of the Minnesota River in contrast. The benefit of our hard work is visually evident by the change in water clarity where these two rivers converge. In comparison, it would cost the State far more to reverse the damage done then to have maintained good stewardship of this natural treasure. Due to localized governing of the Plan, the MHB has had a direct impact on the Mississippi River from its headwaters in Lake Itasca in Clearwater County, to the southern boundary of Morrison County and beyond; keeping this great river fishable and swimmable for generations to come and accomplishing this locally, inexpensively, effectively and efficiently. For this reason, we come asking for your assistance and cooperation. Thank You

History

The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (Public Law 90-542, October 1968, 16U.S.C.1271 et seq.) established a policy that certain rivers or segments of river possessing ‘....outstanding remarkable scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, histories, cultural, or other similar values...’ should be in free flowing condition and protected for the public’s benefit and enjoyment.

January 3, 1975 - President Ford signed P.L. 93-621 authorizing possible designation of the first 466 miles from Lake Itasca to Anoka as a National Wild and Scenic River.

October 1975 - Draft Plan by the U.S. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (BOR) is completed.

May 1977 - Assistant Secretary of the Interior Robert Herbst submits Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to Congress and President Carter.

June 15, 1977 - Senate bill 1697 containing the BOR plan is introduced to the United States Senate.

October 31, 1977 - H. R. 9855 amending the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate the Upper Mississippi segment as a Wild and Scenic River is introduced.

January 1978 - Congressman Oberstar succeeded in amending the bill to require a more complete study. As a result, the Upper Mississippi River of Minnesota was deleted from the Omnibus Parks and Recreation Bill passed by Congress.

July 1979 - MN State Senator Robert Lessard declines President Carter’s personal request to allow the designation.

August 1979 - President Carter called for another study to “determine the specific requirements for protecting the River corridor, providing public access, campgrounds, and other recreational facilities.”

February 22, 1980 - The counties of Clearwater, Hubbard, Beltrami, Cass, Itasca, Aitkin, Crow Wing and Morrison signed a joint powers agreement organizing the Mississippi Headwaters Board for the purpose of providing an alternate strategy for protecting the Mississippi River by regulating private lands through shoreland regulations and public lands through cooperative agreements (MN Stat. 103F. 367 Subd. 8.) with other agencies.

April 1980 - The National Park Service was directed to complete the study.

Summer, 1980 - MHB completed the Alternative MHB Plan and it was adopted by reference (MN Stat. 103F. 361 Subd 2). MN Stat. 103F. 367 Subd. 1 established MHB as a “permanent board.”

August 1980 - The National Park Service releases its Draft Conceptual Master Plan for the Upper Mississippi River as a National Wild and Scenic River which is held in abeyance pending alternative strategies by the Counties through MHB.

August 29, 1980 - Assistant Secretary of the Interior Robert Herbst suggests MHB adopt provisions that “would make the Mississippi Headwaters Board a strong comprehensive mechanism for the protection and management of the River,”

September 1980 - MHB initiates action through the legislature to follow Herbst’s suggestions.

October 22, 1980 - MHB sends detailed response to Herbst summarizing changes to the Plan.

- November 26, 1980** - Herbst endorses local management of the Upper Mississippi River recognizing efforts of the Mississippi Headwaters Board. Herbst points out “potential problem areas” of the MHB Plan, specifically:
- a. Authority to deny actions (MN Stat. 103F. 361-377)
 - b. Routine funding, (\$169,000 pass through grant from DNR, 1983)
 - c. Cooperative agreements with other levels of government with special attention to the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe (Cooperative agreement of 1983).
- 1984** - Minnesota legislature amends MHB Plan to ensure state agencies are consistent with goals of the MHB Plan.
- 1991** - MHB Plan amended to allow veteran’s cemetery.
- 1986-1988** - MHB and Advisory Committee Review for resorts and campgrounds, corridor boundaries, erosion control and vegetative management controls.
- 1992** - MHB Plan revised and adopted by legislature and counties after five-year review.
- 1998** - Increase in MHB funding from \$110,000 to \$170,000 sponsored by Representative Larry Howes for the purposes of cost of living increases over the previous ten years, revision of the Plan, and for Plan implementation. At that time the counties started to contribute a cash match in addition to their in-kind match of approximately 200% (50% is required).
- 2000** - Decrease to \$130,000 in MHB funding as recommended by DNR, included a revision of the termination clause agreement with MHB essentially giving DNR authority to dissolve MHB as a permanent board by withdrawal of funding
- July 2002** - Approval of MHB Plan amendments after five-year comment and review period.
- January 2003** - DNR proposes a budget omitting MHB from the funding designated to it. The purpose DNR has in mind is commendable, that of balancing a budget. However, the funds they are absorbing were intended for the Mississippi River. Balancing the DNR budget risks pollution prevention and protection of values maintained uniformly and consistently by MHB implementation of the minimum standards in the eight Counties. In the eleventh hour the MHB was saved but with a reduced level of annual funding (\$65,000)

An itemized budget going back to 2000 is included with is packet. MHB has always been a **bargain for the taxpayers** comparing the amount of work done for the dollars spent. MHB achieves this through the support of local county agencies, the Leech Lake Band and other partnering groups. At the \$170,000/yr level, expenditures associated with the protection of the river ran about **\$184/Mile** of shoreline.

The MHB protects as much shoreline as the coast of California with the Lakes and both sides of the River considered, about **925 miles**. Population served includes more than just the 8 counties of the headwaters that are increasing rapidly in population. It impacts about 2,000,000 square miles of watershed (PCA, 2000) and **drinking water** supplies for rural wells hydrologically connected and the downstream urban areas of St. Cloud, Minneapolis and St. Paul are considered, since all draw water out of the Mississippi River.

Minnesota Statutes 103F.361 through 103F.377

Mississippi Headwaters Planning and Management

103F.361 FINDINGS AND INTENT.

Subdivision 1. **Findings.** The legislature finds that:

- (1) the Mississippi River from its outlet at Lake Itasca, Clearwater County, to the southerly boundary of Morrison county, Minnesota, possesses outstanding and unique natural, scientific, historical, recreational and cultural values deserving of protection and enhancement;
- (2) the counties of Clearwater, Hubbard, Beltrami, Cass, Itasca, Aitkin, Crow Wing and Morrison have entered into a joint powers agreement pursuant to law to develop a plan for the protection and enhancement of the foregoing values; and
- (3) the plan adopted by the counties pursuant to the joint powers agreement establishes guidelines and minimum standards for cooperative local management of this segment of the Mississippi River.

Subd. 2. **Legislative Intent.** It is the intent of Sections 103F.361 to 103F.377 to authorize and direct the board and the counties to implement the plan for the Mississippi headwaters area.

History: 1990 c 391 art 6 s 41; 1992 c 476 s 1

103F.363 APPLICABILITY.

Subdivision 1. **Generally.** Sections 103F.361 to 103F.377 apply to the counties of Clearwater, Hubbard, Beltrami, Cass, Itasca, Aitkin, Crow Wing, and Morrison.

Subd. 2. **Leech Lake Indian Reservation.** Sections 103F.361 to 103F.377 do not alter or expand the zoning jurisdiction of the counties within the exterior boundaries of the Leech Lake Indian Reservation. The plan and the county ordinances adopted pursuant to section 103F.369, subd. 4, apply only to areas within the zoning jurisdiction of the counties as provided by law in effect prior to May 20, 1981.

History: 1990 c 391 art 6 s 42; 1992 c 476 s 2

103F.365 DEFINITIONS.

Subdivision 1. **Applicability.** The definitions in this section apply to sections 103F.361 to 103F.377.

Subd. 2. **Board.** “Board” means the Mississippi headwaters board established under 103F.367.

Subd. 3. **Counties.** “Counties” means the counties of Clearwater, Hubbard, Beltrami, Cass, Itasca, Aitkin, Crow Wing and Morrison.

Subd. 4. **Plan.** “Plan” means the comprehensive land use plan approved by the board and dated July 1, 1992.

History: 1990 c 391 art 6 s 43; 1992 c 476 s 3

103F.367 MISSISSIPPI HEADWATERS BOARD.

Subdivision. 1. **Establishment.** The Mississippi headwaters board established by the counties of Clearwater, Hubbard, Beltrami, Cass, Itasca, Aitkin, Crow Wing, and Morrison by agreement entered into on February 22, 1980, pursuant to section 471.59 is established as a permanent board with authority to prepare, adopt and implement a comprehensive land use plan designed to protect and enhance the Mississippi River and related shoreland areas situated within the counties.

Subd. 2. Membership.

- (a) The board shall consist of eight members. The governing body of each county shall appoint one of its members to serve on the board.
- (b) The terms of board members are two years commencing on the first Monday in January of odd-numbered years.
- (c) Vacancies on the board shall be filled for the remainder of the term by the governing body that made the original appointment.
- (d) The governing body of a county may designate another member of the governing body or a county officer to act as an alternate for the member appointed by the county.

Subd. 3. Officers.

- (a) The board shall annually appoint from among its members a chair, vice-chair, and secretary-treasurer who shall serve for concurrent one-year terms.
- (b) The chair shall preside over all meetings of the board and may call special meetings at reasonable times and upon adequate notice when necessary.

- (c) The vice-chair shall preside over the meetings of the board in the absence of the chair.
- (d) The secretary-treasurer or the designee of the secretary-treasurer shall keep a record of all proceedings of the board. The secretary-treasurer shall provide for the property receipt and disbursement of funds.

Subd. 4. **Meetings.**

- (a) The regular meetings of the board shall be held at times and places prescribed by it.
- (b) A majority of all members of the board shall constitute a quorum and a majority vote of all members shall be required for actions taken by the board.

Subd. 5. **Staff and contracts.** The board may employ staff and contract for goods and services as necessary to implement sections 103F.361 to 103F.377. Contracts are subject to the statutory procedures and restrictions applicable to county contracts.

Subd. 6. **Funding.** The board shall annually submit to each county for its approval an estimate of the funds it will need from that county in the next fiscal year to prepare and implement the plan and otherwise carry out the duties imposed upon it by sections 103F.361 to 103F.377. Each county shall, upon approval of the estimate by its governing body, furnish the necessary funds to the board. The board may apply for, receive, and disburse federal, state and other grants and donations.

Subd. 7. **Advisory committees.** The board shall appoint advisory committees representing a broad geographical area and diverse public interests, and conduct public meetings and hearings necessary to afford the public an opportunity to become fully informed of all deliberations in the preparation and implementation of the plan.

Subd. 8. **Contact with government agencies.** The board shall initiate and maintain contacts with governmental agencies as necessary to properly prepare the plan and shall negotiate cooperative management agreements with the United States Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management and the state department of natural resources. The board, Beltrami, Cass, Hubbard and Itasca counties shall initiate and maintain contacts with the governing body of the Leech Lake Indian Reservation and shall negotiate a cooperative management and jurisdiction agreement with the reservation governing body.

History: 1990 c 391 art 6 s 44; 1992 c 476 s 4

103F.369 PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Subdivision 1. **Implementation required.** The plan shall be implemented by the board as provided in this section and section 103F.373.

Subd. 2. **Plan provides minimum standards.** The standards set forth in the plan are the minimum standards, which may be adopted by the board and by the counties for the protection and enhancement of the natural, scientific, historical, recreational and cultural values of the Mississippi River and related shoreland areas subject to the plan. Except for forest management, fish and wildlife habitat improvement, a veterans cemetery that complies with subdivision 5, and open space recreational uses as defined in the plan, state or county lands within the boundaries established by the plan may not be offered for public sale or lease. The board with the agreement, expressed by resolution adopted after public hearing, of the county boards of Clearwater, Hubbard, Beltrami, Cass, Itasca, Aitkin, Crow Wing and Morrison counties may amend the plan in any way that does not reduce the minimum standards set forth in the plan.

Subd. 3. **Implementation.** The board shall develop and establish a schedule for implementation and common administration of the plan by the counties. The schedule shall be binding upon the counties subject to approval by the governing bodies of the respective counties.

Subd. 4. **County land use ordinance must be consistent with plan.** The counties shall adopt land use ordinances consistent with the plan.

Subd. 5. **Veterans cemetery.** A veteran's cemetery may be located within the boundaries established by the plan if a site plan approved by the county zoning authority addresses each of the following items:

- (1) the name of the cemetery;
- (2) a legal description of the property affected;
- (3) names and addresses of applicant, owner, surveyor, and designer of the plan;
- (4) graphic scale;
- (5) an arrow depicting north on the plan
- (6) date of preparation of the plan;
- (7) total acreage of property;
- (8) square footage for each proposed site;
- (9) existing soil conditions, depth of water table, and topographic contours;
- (10) roads and proposed roads showing right of way widths;
- (11) proposed location and type of on-site sanitary treatment facilities and domestic water supply;
- (12) accessory facilities, existing or to be constructed, by type and location;
- (13) all streams, creeks, ponds, wetlands, and swamps;

- (14) burial only on site with no embalming or other related activities on site;
- (15) no placement of graves or accessory facilities within the designated flood plain; and
- (16) each burial must be in a vault or an appropriate liner as determined by the board.

History: 1990 c 391 art 6 s 45; 1991 c 158 s 1, 2; 1992 c 476 s 5-7

103F.371 RESPONSIBILITIES OF OTHER GOVERNMENTAL UNITS

All local and special governmental units, councils, commissions, boards and districts and all state agencies and departments must exercise their powers so as to further the purposes of sections 103F.361 to 103F.377 and the plan. Land owned by the state, its agencies, and political subdivisions shall be administered in accordance with the plan.

Actions that comply with the land use ordinance are consistent with the plan. Actions that do not comply with the ordinance may not be started until the board has been notified and given an opportunity to review and comment on the consistency of the action with this section.

History: 1990 c 391 art 6 s 46; 1992 c 476 s 8

103F.373 REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION OF LAND USE ACTIONS.

Subdivision 1. **Purpose.** To assure that the plan is not nullified by unjustified exceptions in particular cases and to promote uniformity in the treatment of applications for exceptions, a review and certification procedure is established for the following categories of land use actions taken by the counties and directly or indirectly affecting land use within the area covered by the plan:

- (1) the adoption or amendment of an ordinance regulating the use of land, including rezoning of particular tracts of land;
- (2) the granting of a variance from provisions of the land use ordinance; and
- (3) the approval of a plat, which is inconsistent with the land use ordinance.

Subd. 2. **Certification.** Notwithstanding any provision of Chapter 394 to the contrary, an action of a type specified in subdivision 1, clauses (1) to (3), is not effective until the board has reviewed the action and certified that it is consistent with the plan. In determining consistency of ordinances and ordinance amendments, the provisions of the plan shall be considered minimum standards. An aggrieved person may appeal a decision of the type specified in subdivision 1, clauses (1) to (3), that is reviewed by the board under this section in the same manner as provided for review of a decision of a board of adjustment in section 394.27, subdivision 9, but only after the procedures prescribed under this section have been completed.

Subd. 3. **Procedure for certification.** A copy of the notices of public hearings or, when a hearing is not required, a copy of the application to consider an action of a type specified in subdivision 1, clauses (1) to (3), must be forwarded to the board by the county at least 15 days before the hearing or meetings to consider the actions. The county shall notify the board of its final decision on the proposed action within ten days of the decision. By 30 days after the board receives the notice, the board shall notify the county and the applicant of its approval or disapproval of the proposed action.

Subd. 4. **Disapproval of actions.**

- (a) If a notice of disapproval is issued by the board, the county or the applicant may, within 30 days of the notice, file with the board a demand for a hearing. If a demand is not filed within the 30-day period, the disapproval becomes final.
- (b) If a demand is filed within the 30-day period, a hearing must be held within 60 days of demand. The hearing must be preceded by two weeks' published notice. Within 30 days after the hearing, the board must:
 - (1) affirm its disapproval of the proposed action; or
 - (2) certify approval of the proposed action.

History: 1990 c 391 art 6 s 47; 1992 c 476 s 9, 10

103F.375 INCORPORATION AND ANNEXATION.

Subdivision 1. **Moratorium on certain activities.** If land subject to the plan is annexed, incorporated, or otherwise subjected to the land use planning authority of a home rule charter or statutory city, a moratorium shall exist on:

- (1) all subdivision platting and building permits on the land until zoning regulations are adopted for the land that comply with the provisions of the plan; and
- (2) construction, grading and filling, and vegetative cutting as those activities are defined in the plan.

Subd. 2. **Exception for work under prior permits.** This section does not apply to work done pursuant to lawful permits issued before the land became subject to the land use planning authority of the city.

History: 1990 c 391 art 6 s 48; 1992 c 476 s 11

103F.377 BIENNIAL REPORT.

During the first year of each biennial legislative session, the board shall prepare and present to the appropriate policy committees of the legislature a report concerning the actions of the board in exercising the authority granted by the legislature under sections 103F.361 to 103F.377. The report must include an assessment of the effectiveness of the plan and its implementation in protecting and enhancing the natural, scientific, historical, recreational, and cultural values of the Mississippi River and related shore lands situated within the member counties.

History: 1990 c 391 art 6 s 49; 1992 c 476 s 12

Two Public Input meetings were held as required in HF1812.
(see attached)

- 1) August 11th, 2008 in Brainerd**
- 2) August 18th, 2008 in Bemidji**

In conclusion....

This board would like to voice their concerns about the latest reduction in funding. Although it is a constant concern of this board that there may be a negative perception that the MHB is an unnecessary layer of government, it is not evident by the Public input we recently received. We have made a positive environmental impact and we are eager to continue our work and help support area organizations and local government with the heavy burden of their work load, all in the effort of protection. This can be accomplished by consistent administered regulations as outlined in our Management Plan and through partnering with others on cost-sharing of new and on-the-ground projects around the corridor.

The MHB is asking the Minnesota State Legislature to revisit the funding issue and re-establish for the next biennium, via a 'tier approach', our level for 2011/2012 at \$200,000/yr. and \$1,200,000/yr. for 2013/2014 so that some duties can continue, new programs be developed and others re-energized. Without your help, protection and enjoyment of the first 400 miles, the most pristine portion of the Mississippi River, may cease to exist as we know it. Reclaiming the resource may cost more than we could afford. Prevention of this tragedy is the most cost effective measure.

Thank you for your consideration, your partnership, and for helping us address the hard work that is before us. Together we can preserve the amenities that make north central Minnesota a great place to live for generations to come.

Together in Public Service

Outline for Public Informational MHB Meetings
Brainerd - August 11, 2008
Bemidji – August 18, 2008

Agenda

- I. Welcome –Clearwater County Commissioner Chairman, Dean Newland
- II. Introduction of MHB Board Members, guests, i.e. legislators, staff – Chairman
- III. Overview of purpose of HF 1812 and the required meetings to present MHB Program and receive public comments - Chairman
- IV. MHB Board Member gives overview of reason for MHB, Joint Powers Board, legislature action 103 f. 361.377
 - Brainerd – Crow Wing County Commissioner – Paul Thiede
 - Bemidji – Beltrami County Commissioner – Jack Frost
- V. Process of Joint Planning and development of a standard eight count ordinance for the upper 400 miles of the Mississippi River, statutory requirements – Staff: Technical Advisory Committee Chair, William Patnaude
- VI. Time for Public Comment
- VII. Conclude Public Informational Meeting
- VIII. Inform public they could use the yellow forms to submit written comments if they choose to do so - Chairman
- IX. Thank everyone for attending - Chairman

Comments: Name / Response (if any)

1) Present - Dale & Derek Newland - Pequot Lakes - Just traveled the river from head and wants to keep river clean but realizes w/o funding it is difficult

2) Present - Daryl Hartman - former Citizen Advisory Committee member - Pine Shores Road - Wondered about MHAC meetings, have not had any in awhile and thinks it was an important thing but possibly too many members. Also realizes that w/o past activities/funding there is no need to meet

3) Present - Lavonne Thesing - Brainerd - Had concerns about shoreland ordinances, not sure where to go w/her questions - rsp @ mtg: Unrelated to the MHB but gave her a card to contact

Suggestions: Name / Response (if any)

1) Present - Mike Carroll/DNR - Bemidji - Believes the MHB was able to do great things in the past but w/o funding it would be very hard. He will do all he can do to work w/board on this and future issues/concerns

Comments: Name / Response (if any)

Present - Joe Vene - Beltrami County Commissioner - It appears that there are things that are being done 'right' when it comes to water quality. Prime example of this is evident when you look at where the Minnesota and Mississippi Rivers converge. He wonders what is the cause for the reduction of the funding for this board? Have the funds been redirected, where and why? Is there a shift in State priority? - rsp @ mtg: The MHB has not been singled out in this latest cut, there have been cuts across the board. The State has to find a way to balance the budget and unfortunately some areas were vulnerable. What this board needs to do is bring the MHB story back to the State Capital and re-familiarize some of the newer Senators with who and what the MHB is. It is hard however to defend ones actions/service when critical funding has been cut.

Present - Alice Dreyer - former Citizen Advisory Committee member for the MHB - She remembers this board was original formed at the time when the Federal Government wanted to take control of the first 400 miles of the Mississippi River (Wild and Scenic River Act). When the State took it over and passed it down to the MHB per Statute, she thought that meant the State would be mandated to fund this board as well. Is this not the case? - rsp @ mtg: The State was not mandated to fund this board at a consistent level (dollar amount). They agreed the allocated dollars would come to this board per pass-through for board operation provided each of the 8 counties were able to match that dollar amount per in-kind and those funds would then be reimbursed.

Present - Robert Treuer - Bemidji resident - He fully supports this board and the work it has done, however meek the funding. He believes it is the responsibility of the State to continue to support this board as mandated and provide the necessary funding to conduct the business of protecting the river. If not done adequately, he fears that the Federal government will take that responsibilty back

Suggestions: Name / Response (if any)

Present - Bob Becker - former Citizen Advisory Committee member for the MHB - He had hoped to come to this meeting to find out that the Advisory Committee was going to be re-established. It was disaapointing to hear in the first 5 minutes that that is not the case. He feels it was a very important community networking part of this board in the past and he was very proud of past Committees and board accomplishments

DETAILED ANNUAL BUDGET '08-'09

Approx. Expenses	Approx. Budgeted Annually	Approx. Monthly
Salary	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 2,500.00
FICA	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 167.00
Pera	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 125.00
Health Insurance	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 584.00
Insurance Liability	\$ 2,320.00	\$ 193.00
MHB Per Diem / Ins.	\$ 4,200.00	\$ 350.00
MHB Mileage (IRS rate) Max monthly round trip allowed as follows: Aitkin - 185 Beltrami - 75 Cass - 60 Clearwater - 110 Crow Wing - 84 Hubbard - 52 Itasca - 180 Morrison - 180	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 334.00
State Audit ' (\$5,600 / 2 - Biennium)	\$ 2,800.00	\$ 234.00
Office Operations: accounting, payroll, auditor, banking svc, (\$350/m approx.), phone, + copies + suppl + postage (\$150/m approx.)	\$ 5,950.00	\$ 496.00
MHAC Per Diem (\$35) & mileage (donated by counties)	\$300.00	\$ 25.00
Equipment (maint/repair) ' (capital improvements)	\$1,000.00	\$ 83.00
Oral History \$100/m stipend for volunteer coordinator	\$100.00	\$ 9.00
River Watch	\$1,000.00	\$ 83.00
Staff Mileage	\$200.00	\$ 16.00
Prof. Service	\$2,000.00	\$ 167.00
WEB Site	\$630.00	\$ 53.00
TOTAL	\$ 65,000.00	\$ 5,419.00

Approx Income	
DNR	\$ 65,000.00
Minnesota Power	\$ 1,119.00
Interest	\$ -
Sales	\$ -
Annual County Appropriations	\$ 12,000.00
INCOME TOTAL	\$ 78,119.00
Misc Grant expenses	\$ -
	\$ -
	\$ -
	\$ -
	\$ -
	\$ -
EXPENSE TOTAL	\$ -
TOTAL	\$ 78,119.00

DETAILED ANNUAL BUDGET '09-'10

Approx. Expenses	Approx. Budgeted Annually	Approx. Monthly
Salary	\$ 11,500.00	\$ 958.00
FICA	\$ 800.00	\$ 67.00
Pera	\$ 600.00	\$ 50.00
Health Insurance	\$ -	\$ -
Insurance Liability reduced by \$320/yr	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 167.00
MHB Per Diem / Ins. reduced to \$25/ea	\$ 1,800.00	\$ 150.00
MHB Mileage (IRS rate) Max monthly round trip allowed as follows: Aitkin - 185 Beltrami - 75 Cass - 60 Clearwater - 110 Crow Wing - 84 Hubbard - 52 Itasca - 180 Morrison - 180	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 250.00
State Audit ' (\$5,000 / 2 - Biennium)	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 208.00
Office Operations: accounting, payroll, auditor, banking svc, (\$350/m approx.), phone, + copies + suppl + postage (\$150/m approx.)	\$ 3,400.00	\$ 292.00
MHAC Per Diem (\$35) & mileage (donated by counties)	\$0.00	
Equipment (maint/repair) ' (capital improvements)	\$0.00	\$ -
Oral History \$100/m stipend for volunteer coordinator	\$0.00	\$ -
River Watch	\$1,119.00	\$ 93.00
Staff Mileage	\$0.00	\$ -
Prof. Service	\$150.00	\$ 17.00
WEB Site	\$131.00	\$ -
TOTAL	\$ 27,000.00	\$ 2,252.00

Approx Income	
DNR	\$ 27,000.00
Minnesota Power	\$ 1,119.00
Interest	\$ -
Sales	\$ -
Annual County Appropriations	\$ 12,000.00
INCOME TOTAL	\$ 40,119.00
Misc Grant expenses	
	\$ -
	\$ -
	\$ -
	\$ -
	\$ -
	\$ -
EXPENSE TOTAL	\$ -
TOTAL	\$ 40,119.00