

## Appendix L Unresolved Conflicts from Draft Report Outline

Overall:

- a. *We should consider the Metro regional parks as the equivalent of state parks in an area where a large part of the population has non-proportional access to state parks. [Conflicts with b.? ]*
- b. *I do not think that metro regional parks should be considered the equivalent of state parks. State parks receive a large portion of visitors from both Greater Minnesota and the metro area. Metro parks seem to get relatively few visitors from Greater Minnesota. If they are going to be considered the equivalent of state parks, regional parks in Greater Minnesota should also be considered the equivalent of state parks, and be funded accordingly. [Conflicts with a.? ]*

Financing Issues and Options:

- f. *We need to make sure that we do not make any recommendation that would transfer existing funding from one park system to another park system. I would look forward to increasing funding for non metropolitan regional park systems, but not at the expense of taking money from state parks or metropolitan regional parks. [Conflicts with g. ? ]*
- g. *Metro regional parks have received hundreds of millions of dollars in subsidies in the past few decades, while Greater Minnesota regional parks have by comparison received virtually nothing. It would be fair to reduce funding to metro regional parks and transfer this support to Greater Minnesota regional parks for a time to make up for this past inequity. [Conflicts with f. ? ]*
- j. *We should look at ideas for increasing statewide funding for state and regional parks and trails such as S.F. 401 (Sams) and H.F. 1166 (Hackbarth) which propose a constitutional amendment dedicating an additional ¼ of one percent sales tax for natural resource purposes. [Conflicts with k. ? ]*
- k. *We should not look at constitutionally dedicated taxes such as the proposed 3/16s amendment. Such dedicated funds are bad public policy because they tie the hands of future legislators who may need greater flexibility to deal with budget difficulties. [Conflicts with j. ? ]*

- l. O and M \$ should only be extended to non-metro regional parks if they meet the same criteria as metro in terms of size and usage and the level of support should be proportional. I think acquisition seems to be a higher priority here. [Conflicts with m. ? ]*
  
- m. O and M for Greater Minnesota regional parks should be provided if such funding is going to continue to be provided to metro regional parks. There should be some proportionality in the level of funding to use, however, it is unrealistic to require Greater MN regional parks to have the same acreage as some metro parks since the number of people using them is smaller. The definition of a regional park that has been used for the grant program generally seems to be a reasonable measure for what qualifies as a regional park. [Conflicts with l. ? ]*

User Fees:

- a. Encourage the park systems to come up with their own ideas / suggestions for raising more money and making their programs more cost effective. [See the model for 2003 legislation where the Minnesota Lottery was directed to cut costs by XX%.] [a. & c. conflicts with e. & f.]*
  
- c. We need to be careful about prescribing specific fees that regional parks should charge, since not all fees will work in some parks. Perhaps we should just set an expectation that a certain percentage of support will come from fees, and let local governments choose the source of the fees or even choose to waive fees and instead levy additional taxes or obtain support from other sources if they so choose instead of having the fees. [Also listed under "Recommendations" above.] [a. & c. conflicts with e. & f.]*
  
- e. Standardization of facility rental fees (park pavilions and group camping). [a. & c. conflicts with e. & f.]*
  
- f. Fee standardization [a. & c. conflicts with e. & f.]*