

# **The 2004-2005 Minnesota Budget A Fiscal Policy Review**

## **Environment, Natural Resources and Agriculture**



**Minnesota State Senate  
Office of Fiscal Policy Analysis  
G-9 State Capitol - Saint Paul, Minnesota**

**January, 2004**

## Environment, Natural Resources and Agriculture

### Overview

The total available budget for Environmental, Natural Resources and Agricultural activities for the 2004-2005 biennium is approximately \$1.12 billion. Less than half of this budget comes from the General Fund. In addition to the General Fund, there are a large number of smaller funds and accounts that hold fees and other receipts dedicated to specific activities. Approximately \$774.7 million (69%) is directly appropriated in 2003 session law (Chapter 128) and approximately \$344.3 million (31%) is authorized by existing statutory language. Table 1 identifies different funding sources and appropriation types that make up the budget.

<b>Table 1: Appropriations By Source and Law Type</b>			
	Direct: Uncodified Law	Statutory: Codified Law	Both Types
Taxes, General Revenues (General Fund)	\$ 373,291,000 (33.4%)	\$ 59,328,000 (5.3%)	\$ 432,619,000 (38.7%)
Dedicated Fees and Receipts (Other Funds)	\$ 401,401,000 (35.8%)	\$ 284,930,000 (25.5%)	\$ 686,331,000 (61.3%)
Both Sources	\$ 774,692,000 (69.2%)	\$ 344,258,000 (30.8%)	\$ 1,118,950,000

Appropriations made in statute are the more fundamental, ongoing spending commitments of the state. These are generally forecasted amounts, based on levels of activity expected to occur in each activity. The three large General Fund statutory spending commitments are: \$25 million for payments in-lieu of taxes (PILT) made by the state to local jurisdictions for state-owned natural resources lands, \$19 million for emergency firefighting activities and \$15 million for treaty payments made to tribes for limiting the use of their harvest rights in various treaty areas. The largest non-General Fund statutory amounts are expected to be:

- \$92 million in Federal money,
- \$81 million from the Special Revenue Fund (mostly fee revenues),
- \$44 million from the Remediation Fund  
(mostly money from the Solid Waste Management Tax),
- \$40 million from the Agricultural Fund (agricultural fees),
- \$7.6 million from the Game and Fish Fund (hunting and fishing licenses),
- \$5 million from the Environmental Fund (pollution control fees), and
- \$5 million in dedicated gift money.

Much of this money has restrictions on how it may be spent that go beyond what can be easily changed by amending statutes. For example, Federal money has Federal

**Table 2: Direct Appropriations  
for the 2004-2005 Biennium, by Fund**

Fund or Account	\$ thousands	%
General	373,291	48 %
Game and Fish	164,642	21 %
Natural Resources	102,662	13 %
Environmental	77,612	10 %
Remediation	23,714	3 %
State Government	96	-
Env. & Natl. Res. Trust	30,100	4 %
LAWCON Account	2,000	-
Oil Overcharge Account	519	-
Great Lakes Account	56	-
	774,692	100 %

restrictions prescribing activities to be accomplished; Agricultural Fund monies are mostly payments for the costs of specific services provided by the Department of Agriculture; and hunting and fishing fees and pollution control fees have fiduciary obligations on them beyond the specific guidelines placed on the dollars in statute.

Direct appropriations for Environmental, Natural Resources and Agricultural activities for the 2004-2005

biennium total approximately \$775 million. Table 2 lists directly appropriated amounts by fund. Approximately 48 percent of the directly appropriated budget comes from the General Fund. Most of the non-General Fund budget comes from dedicated license and permit fees. The Environment and Natural Resources Trust Fund and three smaller accounts are appropriated via the recommendation process of the Legislative Commission on Minnesota Resources (LCMR).

### Historical Context

Several trends within the Environmental, Natural Resources and Agricultural areas have influenced budgetary needs over the past few bienniums. Most fundamentally, a growing population means more people wanting to use the natural resources of the state, yet more pollution being generated. It also means a continuation of the fragmentation of natural habitats and a loss of agricultural land around urban areas. In addition to there being more people, more of them are retired, have more free time and more disposable income. These trends exponentially increase demands on lakeshore and other recreational areas. Beyond this, there are increasing complexities to the problems being faced. Pollution problems are no longer concentrated in several large sources such as factories, but come from “non-point” activities such as car exhaust and stormwater runoff. The pollutants that threaten human health are smaller particles and, in agriculture, more exotic diseases. Also, there are increasing demands for food safety activities because of more exotic pathogens and the potential for terrorist activities on our food supply. And the infrastructure we have in place to address all these issues is, in many areas, beyond its expected lifetime and in need of replacement.

Given the fact that nearly half the budget for Environmental, Natural Resources and Agricultural activities has come from the General Fund and the fact that broad economic trends and state’s tax structures have resulted in severe drops in revenues to the General Fund, budgetary cuts have naturally followed. While some activities could be scaled back and some fees could be increased to offset General Fund losses, some activities have had to be abandoned.

## Fiscal Summary

Table 3 compares direct appropriations for the 2004-2005 biennium with direct appropriations for the 2002-2003 biennium. Appropriations for 2002-2003 include those made in the original budget act (Laws of 2001, First Special Session Chapter 2) and the directly enacted changes made in Laws of 2002, Chapters 220, 355, 374 and 376. Not included are one-time hiring and contract freezes apportioned out from the Laws of 2002, Chapter 220 (as amended by Chapter 374) or one-time unallotments made by the Pawlenty Administration in February, 2003. The emergency, across-the-board and one-time nature of these reductions puts them in a different category from the more thoughtful and directly enacted changes made to the bill. An alternative and more meaningful comparison is that between the anticipated "base" 2004-2005 budget and the 2004-2005 appropriations enacted. The base is calculated by continuing the 2003 appropriation amounts into 2004 and 2005, unless language enacted clearly indicates that the amounts

(\$ thousands)	<u>2002-03</u>	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>Change</u>
<u>Pollution Control Agency</u>			
General Fund	33,851	29,430	-13.1%
Environmental Fund	45,119	53,624	18.9%
remediation funds	24,821	22,808	-8.1%
State Government Fund	<u>95</u>	<u>96</u>	<u>1.1%</u>
Total	103,886	105,958	2.0%
<u>Office of Environmental Assistance</u>			
General Fund	29,785	23,520	-21.0%
Solid Waste, Env. Funds	<u>25,106</u>	<u>23,988</u>	<u>-4.5%</u>
Total	54,891	47,508	-13.5%
<u>Minnesota Zoo</u>			
General Fund	14,730	13,114	-11.0%
Natural Resources Fund	<u>304</u>	<u>248</u>	<u>-18.4%</u>
Total	15,034	13,362	-11.1%
<u>Department of Natural Resources</u>			
General Fund	217,962	183,336	-15.9%
Game and Fish Fund	159,032	164,642	3.5%
Natural Resources Fund	92,956	101,434	9.1%
Remediation Fund	<u>200</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>0.0%</u>
Total	470,150	449,612	-4.4%
<u>Board of Water and Soil Resources</u>			
General Fund	36,236	30,863	-14.8%
<u>Department of Agriculture</u>			
General Fund (incl. ethanol)	114,163	82,022	-28.2%
Remediation Fund	<u>700</u>	<u>706</u>	<u>0.9%</u>
Total	114,863	82,728	-28.0%
<u>Small Agencies</u>			
Ag Utilization (AURI)	7,609	3,200	-57.9%
Board of Animal Health	5,836	5,606	-3.9%
Science Museum	2,535	1,500	-40.8%
Conservation Corps	0	1,680	(was DNR)
Mn/Wisc Border Comm	393	0	-100%
Horticulture Society	148	0	-100%
<u>Minnesota Resources (LCMR) Projects</u>			
Env. & Natl. Res. Trust	34,481	30,100	-12.7%
Future Resources Fund	14,046	0	-100%
LAWCON Account	1,064	2,000	88%
Oil, Great Lakes Accts	<u>267</u>	<u>575</u>	<u>115.4%</u>
Total	49,858	32,675	-34.5%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>861,894</b>	<b>774,692</b>	<b>-10.1%</b>

should change in the following biennium. If this is the case, these intentions are honored as a starting point. Since the base is the most accurate continuation of existing budget plans, comparing it with the enacted budget is usually the most meaningful measure of how budgets changed. The relationship to base will be focused on in the individual sections below.

It should be noted that the 2002-2003 General Fund amount for the Department of Agriculture in Table 3 includes the open appropriation for ethanol. This is to keep an apples-to-apples comparison with the 2004-2005 biennium, in which the appropriation for ethanol is made directly.

**Policy Review**

***Pollution Control Agency***

Direct Appropriations:		Statutory Appropriations:	
General Fund	29,430,000	Federal Funds	48,596,000
Environmental Fund	53,624,000	Remediation Fund	40,211,000
Remediation Fund	22,808,000	Special Revenue Fund	23,532,000
State Government Fund	<u>96,000</u>	Other Funds	<u>2,477,000</u>
	105,958,000		114,816,000

The Pollution Control Agency (PCA) is charged with the protection of Minnesota’s air, land, and water from pollution. The agency accomplishes this through evaluation, education, assistance, and enforcement activities.

For the 2004-2005 biennium, the PCA’s General Fund appropriation was cut by \$3.34 million. This is a reduction of 10.2 percent from base-level funding. The main change was made by cutting almost \$1.3 million per year for water quality compliance and enforcement and replacing it with an appropriation for the same amount from the Environmental Fund. Similarly, a \$224,000 per year appropriation for hazardous waste response activities was shifted onto the Environmental Fund. In addition, \$62,000 per year for mercury reduction was eliminated and the General Fund appropriation for administration was reduced by \$104,000 per year.

The most significant changes in the PCA’s budget were made in the Agency’s fee-supported funding structure. Based on years of discussions with stakeholder groups and the recommendations of a broad-based funding options working group, the Agency’s funding structures were simplified and made more flexible. Revenues from existing taxes on solid waste collection activities were redirected from the Solid Waste Fund (which was then abolished) to the Environmental Fund, which is where most pollution-related fees are already collected. Authorized uses of the money in the Environmental Fund were broadened to allow for more flexibility in addressing the main permitting, compliance, enforcement, monitoring and other ongoing activities of the Agency. Funding for activities that are of a more long-term cleanup nature were moved out of the Environmental Fund and into a newly-created Remediation Fund, dedicated solely to cleanup/remediation activities.

In addition to adding flexibility to the Environmental Fund, revenue to the fund was bolstered by increases in water quality permit fees, stormwater permit fees and hazardous waste fees. A new fee was also added (see M.S. 115A.551) for the installation

of individual sewage treatment system (ISTS) tanks. With these new fees available, the total directly-appropriated 2004-2005 budget for the PCA increased by nearly \$6 million, which is approximately 5 percent over the base.

***Office of Environmental Assistance***

Direct Appropriations:		Statutory Appropriations:	
General Fund	23,520,000	Environmental Fund	4,416,000
Environmental Fund	<u>23,988,000</u>	Other Funds	<u>106,000</u>
	47,508,000		4,522,000

The mission of the Office of Environmental Assistance (OEA) is to encourage waste prevention and resource conservation, including recycling activities. The OEA works with counties, businesses, schools, community organizations and individual citizens. In addition to research and education, the OEA uses grants and loans as financial incentives to accomplish its mission.

For the 2004-2005 biennium, the OEA’s General Fund budget was cut by over \$13 million. This is a reduction of approximately 36 percent from the base. Because over two-thirds of the Office’s General Fund base budget was in recycling grants, the largest General Fund reduction fell on these grants. Approximately \$5.4 million per year in recycling grants was shifted from the General Fund to the Environmental Fund. These grants were historically made with General Fund money made available by the millions of dollars from the Solid Waste Management Tax deposited in the General Fund. For the Environmental Fund to be able to absorb this shift, the Environmental Fund appropriation for the solid waste processing payment program was reduced by \$3.5 million per year and qualification requirements for the program (see M.S. 115A.545) were tightened. The other third of the Office’s General Fund base was cut by \$1.124 million per year, which is a cut of approximately 19 percent of the base. Among the changes this reduction will bring about are fewer or scaled-back public education and information activities, such as the State Fair booth and the waste reduction campaign.

The main statutory appropriation to the OEA is approximately \$2.2 million per year from metropolitan solid waste fees for metropolitan landfill abatement activities.

***Minnesota Zoo***

Direct Appropriations:		Statutory Appropriations:	
General Fund	13,114,000	Special Revenue Fund	20,029,000
Natural Resources Fund	<u>248,000</u>	Other Funds	<u>2,196,000</u>
	13,362,000		22,225,000

The Minnesota Zoo is a state recreation, education and conservation resource. While it is a state agency, the Zoo has a statutory goal of operating independently. Toward this end, revenues from admission fees, food and beverage sales, retail sales, special programs and gifts are statutorily appropriated for Zoo operations.

For the 2004-2005 biennium, the Zoo’s base General Fund appropriation was reduced by \$728,000 per year, which is a 10 percent reduction. One result of the reduction is the closing of the hands-on Zoolab in the Zoo’s main building. To partially make up for the reduction, the Zoo raised parking fees and was legislatively authorized

(see M.S. 85A.02, subdivision 17) to have reduced, rather than free, admission for school students. With these changes, the General Fund portion of the Zoo's estimated budget is reduced from approximately 40 percent to approximately 37 percent.

**Department of Natural Resources**

Direct Appropriations:		Statutory Appropriations:	
General Fund	183,336,000	General Fund	59,262,000
Game and Fish Fund	164,642,000	Special Revenue Fund	31,659,000
Natural Resources Fund	101,434,000	Federal Funds	27,573,000
Remediation Fund	<u>200,000</u>	Game and Fish Fund	7,592,000
	449,612,000	Natural Resources Fund	2,934,000
		Remediation Fund	3,099,000
		Other Funds	<u>4,487,000</u>
			136,606,000

The mission of the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) is to manage the state's public lands, parks, timber, waters, minerals and wild animals for their commercial and recreational use.

For the 2004-2005 biennium, the DNR's General Fund budget was cut by nearly \$26 million. This is a reduction of approximately 12.4 percent from the base. Table 4 shows how much in dollars and percentage was cut in each division within the agency. As noted in the table, part of the reduction to the Parks and Recreation division was offset

by an increase in State Park entrance fees, made available by an increase in the division's appropriation from the Natural Resources Fund. The cut to the Waters Division was also ameliorated by over \$1.4 million made available by increased water use fees deposited in the General Fund. Without this, the Water division's cut would have been over 14 percent. Most of the General Fund reductions will result in reduced levels of core services performed by each division. Some pass-through grants were also cut, such as money for Red River valley and Mississippi River headwaters water management activities.

<b>Table 4: Net Reductions in General Fund Base Direct Appropriations for 2004-2005</b>		
<u>DNR Division</u>	<u>\$ thousands</u>	<u>percent below base</u>
Lands and Minerals	-1,604	-11.1%
Waters	-1,848	-7.9%
Forestry	-7,072	-9.7%
Parks & Recreation	-7,040	-15.3%*
Trails & Waterways	-1,344	-35.3%
Fish	-102	-10.1%
Wildlife	-314	-10.0%
Ecological Services	-1,310	-17.5%
Enforcement	+500	+7.2%
<u>Operations Support</u>	<u>-5,846</u>	<u>-19.4%</u>
Entire Department	-25,980	-12.4%
<i>*entrance fee increase reduces this to -9.7%</i>		

In addition to State Park entrance and water use fee increases, several hunting, fishing and other recreational fees were increased. Table 5 lists the increased revenues generated by these fees. Fee increases for Off-Highway Vehicles (OHVs) were initiated mainly to address enforcement activities involved with All-Terrain Vehicle (ATV) use. This subject is controversial and will certainly be addressed again in the future.

<b>Table 5: Net New Natural Resources Revenues</b>		
source	main changes	\$ thousands
<b>Hunting Fees</b>		
deer license	from \$25 to \$26, ½ price youth	-\$2
small game license	from \$12 to \$12.50, etc.	\$111
wildlife surcharge	from \$4.00 to \$6.50	\$1,131
waterfowl stamp	from \$5.00 to \$7.50	\$347
pheasant stamp	from \$5.00 to \$7.50	\$293
Camp Ripley archery fee	from \$6.00 to \$8.00	\$22
wild rice harvest license	from \$12.50 to \$25.00, etc.	\$30
<b>Fishing Fees</b>		
trout and salmon stamp	from \$8.50 to \$10.00	\$278
commercial licenses	from \$90 to \$120 for netting, etc.	\$272
aquatic plant mmt fees	from \$20 to \$35, cap to \$700	\$250
winter aeration permits	new fee of \$250	\$70
<b>Park, Trail Fees</b>		
State Park entrance	annual sticker from \$20 to \$25	\$2,580
camping fees	from \$8 to \$10, \$12 to \$15, etc.	\$1,444
OHV registrations, fines	ATVs from \$18 to \$23, etc.	\$1,255
<b>Other</b>		
water use fees		\$2,524
utility crossing fees		\$370
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$10,975</b>

In addition to General Fund and fee dollars, one significant source of funding for the DNR is the in-lieu-of sales tax on lottery game sales. The base level of dedication of this tax for 2004 and beyond (see M.S. 297A.94) was 87.1 percent. In order to make more

of this revenue source available for the General Fund, however, the dedication was lowered to 72.43 percent. This change redirected over \$3.7 million away from game and fish management, parks and trails (both state and metro), local trails, and zoos. This amounts to a reduction of almost 17 percent from the base level of dedication.

***Board of Water and Soil Resources***

Direct Appropriations:		Statutory Appropriations:	
General Fund	30,863,000	Special Revenue Fund	267,000

The mission of the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) is to help local units of government manage and conserve soil and water resources. Over 70 percent of the Board’s budget passes through to local units of government. For the 2004-2005 biennium, the Board was appropriated \$30.863 million from the General Fund. This is a reduction of 9.5 percent from the base budget. Natural resources block grants to local units of government were cut by \$784,000 per year (16 percent of the base), which will reduce local water planning activities. Grants to soil and water conservation districts (SWCDs) for cost-sharing assistance were cut \$650,000 per year (16.5 percent of the base), which will reduce the amount of assistance districts can provide for feedlot management and other water quality management activities. General services grants to SWCDs were cut \$471,000 per year (11.7 percent of the base), which will mainly reduce assistance for Reinvest In Minnesota (RIM) easement activities. Additions to the base



budget were \$100,000 per year for Red River basin planning and coordinating activities and \$105,000 per year for Minnesota River area 2 floodplain management activities. Also, wetland banking fees (see M.S. 103G.2242) were enacted. These fees are expected to generate \$128,000 per year for the General Fund, so the same amount was also added to BWSR's base budget to administer the wetland banking program.

***Department of Agriculture***

Direct Appropriations:		Statutory Appropriations:	
General Fund	82,022,000	Agricultural Fund	39,739,000
Remediation Fund	<u>706,000</u>	Federal Funds	12,974,000
	82,728,000	Special Revenue Fund	6,491,000
		Other Funds	<u>3,946,000</u>
			63,150,000

The mission of the Minnesota Department of Agriculture (MDA) is to protect public health and safety regarding the content and quality of food and agricultural products and to insure and promote orderly commerce in agricultural and food products.

For the 2004-2005 biennium, the MDA was appropriated just over \$82 million from the General Fund. This is 25 percent decrease from the base budget. The largest item of reduction was a cut of approximately \$22.3 million (33.4 percent of the base) in ethanol producer payments. Chapter 128 provides that producer payments for fiscal years 2004 through 2007 will be made at a rate of 13 cents per gallon and will return to the statutorily set rate of 20 cents per gallon (see M.S. 41A.09, subdivision 3a) in fiscal year 2008. In the mean time, if appropriations become available, statute provides that deficiency payments should be made to producers who received less than 20 cents per gallon due to the lower appropriation in Chapter 128 or the unallotment of the ethanol appropriation that was made in fiscal year 2003.

The General Fund appropriation for Protection Services was reduced by \$987,000 per year (10 percent of the base) but fee increases for food, dairy, seed, nursery and phytosanitary activities were made, allowing for an increase of \$1.3 million per year (approximately 7.7 percent over base) in statutory appropriations from the Agricultural Fund. The General Fund appropriation for Marketing and Development was reduced by \$878,000 per year (7.2 percent of the base) by eliminating money for the value-added livestock program, the Ag in the Classroom program, the Minnesota Institute for Sustainable Agriculture and beaver damage control grants and by reducing several other programs. The General Fund appropriation for Administration and Financial Assistance was reduced by \$694,000 per year (12.8 percent of the base) by making a variety of service cuts.

***Agricultural Utilization Research Institute***

Direct Appropriations:	
General Fund	3,200,000

The mission of the Agricultural Utilization Research Institute (AURI) is to help develop new uses or value improvements for Minnesota agricultural commodities and to identify and expand markets for new or existing commodities, ingredients and products.

AURI works with clients to help determine the feasibility and potential scope of new uses, focusing on expanding value-added processing activities within the state. For the 2004-2005 biennium, the Institute's General Fund base budget was cut by 57 percent. As a result, AURI closed its offices in St. Paul and Waseca and closed its pilot plant in Crookston. In addition, it reduced its work with smaller, so-called "cottage industries" to focus on projects that may succeed in larger commodity and ingredient markets, such as biodiesel, ethanol processing co-products and livestock processing co-products. One of the main focuses of this work is technical assistance. In addition to the General Fund cut, AURI's base appropriation of \$200,000 per year from the Agricultural Fund was eliminated, ending AURI's Pesticide Reduction Options (PRO) program. The PRO program had for years funded projects intended to reduce the use of petroleum-based pesticides in production agriculture.

***Board of Animal Health***

Direct Appropriations:		Statutory Appropriations:	
General Fund	5,606,000	Federal Funds	2,550,000
		State Government Fund	<u>122,000</u>
			2,672,000

The Board of Animal Health seeks to protect, maintain and improve the health of the state's domestic animals. For the 2004-2005 biennium, the Board's General Fund Budget was cut \$400,000 per year (14 percent of the base) by closing the brucellosis lab and reducing some administrative activities. After making these cuts, however, the same amount of General Fund money was appropriated to the Board to perform inspections of cervidae (mainly elk and deer) farms. These inspections are especially concerned with monitoring for chronic wasting disease. To supplement the General Fund appropriation for farmed cervidae inspections, a \$10 per head fee was imposed on cervidae farms (see M.S. 17.452) and the revenue was statutorily appropriated to the Board. It is estimated that this fee will provide approximately \$61,000 per year.

***Minnesota Resources Projects***

Direct Appropriations:		Every two years, the Legislative Commission on Minnesota Resources (LCMR) issues a request for proposals to identify new, innovative or accelerative natural resources projects that help sustain, enhance and wisely utilize the state's natural resources. This
Envir. Trust Fund	30,100,000	
LAWCON Account	2,000,000	
Oil Overcharge Acct.	519,000	
Great Lakes Account	<u>56,000</u>	
	32,675,000	

request is open to anyone, but groups that typically pursue LCMR funds include local units of government, private/non-profit organizations, state agencies and higher education institutions.

The two main sources of funding for LCMR projects have for many years been the Minnesota Future Resources Fund and the Environment and Natural Resources Trust Fund. Trust Fund money comes from the sale of Minnesota Lottery games. Future Resources Fund money traditionally came from cigarette tax revenue. However, in order to help address the state's General Fund deficit, cigarette tax revenue that had been deposited in the Future

Resources Fund was redirected (see M.S. 297F.10, subdivision 1) to the General Fund. This amounted to a \$13.8 million cut from the expected LCMR package, which is a reduction of approximately 30 percent from what would have been spent on Minnesota resources projects. Table 6 lists appropriation levels for the 2004-2005 biennium by topic. A detailed list of LCMR projects can be found on the LCMR web page at [www.commissions.leg.state.mn.us/lcmr](http://www.commissions.leg.state.mn.us/lcmr).

	<u>\$ thousands</u>	<u>%</u>
Fish and Wildlife Habitat	12,446	38.1 %
Recreation	11,492	35.2 %
LAWCON Recreation	2,000	6.1 %
Water Resources	2,097	6.4 %
Land Use and Natl Resource Info	1,382	4.2 %
Ag and Natl Resource Industries	622	1.9 %
Energy	740	2.3 %
Environmental Education	470	1.5 %
Children's Environmental Health	563	1.7 %
Administration	<u>863</u>	2.6 %
	32,675	

***State-Private Partnerships***

Direct Appropriations:

General Fund	2,200,000	For the 2004-2005 biennium, \$3.18 million was appropriated to non-state organizations. These appropriations represent state partnerships with organizations that have
Natural Resources Fund	<u>980,000</u>	
	3,180,000	

played significant roles in the environmental and natural resources activities of the state. The Science Museum of Minnesota received \$1.5 million for the biennium. This amount is approximately 39 percent less than the base-level appropriation to the Museum would have been. The Minnesota Conservation Corps (MCC) received \$700,000 from the General Fund and \$980,000 from the Natural Resources Fund. The MCC previously existed as a program within the DNR but was transferred (see M.S. 84.991), with its existing assets, to a non-profit corporation as of the beginning of Fiscal Year 2004. The Minnesota Horticultural Society, another non-state organization that had received state support for many years, did not have its base appropriation of \$82,000 per year continued for the 2004-2005 biennium.

For more information on this report contact  
 Steve Ernest  
 651-297-8057  
[Steve.Ernest@senate.mn](mailto:Steve.Ernest@senate.mn)