Welcome and Administrative
Chairman Woodman called the meeting to order at 9:05 am Central Time and the group proceeded with introductions.

Woodman asked for agenda modifications. None were provided.

Czaplewski made a motion to approve the minutes from the October 8, 2010 LAC meeting. The motion was seconded by Wingfield and passed unanimously.

GC Meeting Update
Czaplewski gave the LAC an update on the latest GC activity. The GC met on two conference calls since the last LAC meeting. The topic of the first call was discussion of tract 0918. On that call, the GC approved proceeding with the purchase. The topic of the second call was to go over the FY2011 Program budget. No action was taken on that conference call.

The GC meets next on December 7 & 8, 2010 in Denver, CO.
Other Committee Coordination Information

Farnsworth gave a brief update on recent TAC activities. The TAC has been discussing 2011 tern & plover monitoring activities, as well as going over the adaptive management/research & monitoring portion of the 2011 Program budget. In addition, the TAC supported the sole-source proposal for PBS&J to assemble as-needed peer review panels for the Program. The TAC has received early drafts of the mock report and AM implementation plan and will begin the review process. The next TAC meeting is December 7, 2010 in Denver, CO.

Wingfield reported that the WAC is moving forward with groundwater recharge feasibility investigations for two sites: one site near Gothenburg, NE and one site along the Phelps Canal in Phelps County. Sackett is assisting the contractor with landowner contacts for this project.

Update on Land Management

Tunnell distributed a document to the LAC that provided a tract-by-tract update of ongoing, planned, and completed management activities.

Platte River Caddisfly Experiment

Farnsworth informed the LAC of a potential upcoming PRCF research opportunity that the Program may pursue in 2011. The research proposal is from the University of Nebraska – Kearney and is intended to assess impacts to the PRCF from manipulation of habitat. The proposal will go before the TAC and if approved in the budget, may begin in the spring of 2011.

Sellers inquired about the reasons that the Program would undertake this study. Farnsworth stated reasons to conduct study. First, the results of this study would help the Program decide whether or not to clear trees where caddisfly populations and/or potential caddisfly habitat exist. In addition, conducting this study allows the Program to be involved in information gathering related to the caddisfly, which is being considered for listing by the USFWS. Listing of another species in the Program’s area would have significant impact on the Program. Sellers asked how this study could help or hinder a potential listing of the caddisfly by the USFWS. Farnsworth said it is unknown at this point, as the 12-month finding has not yet been initiated.

Sellers asked if the Program were to wait and do nothing, leaving in place the stands of woody growth where caddisfly populations have been identified on Program lands, how would Program target species goals be affected. Farnsworth said it must be determined case by case. If woody growth exists and is detrimental to target species, doing nothing has an impact on Program goals. If acceptable target species habitat exists already and woody growth is peripheral to the areas of the tracts used by target species, doing nothing may not have an impact.

Sellers asked how widespread are caddisfly population on Program lands? Farnsworth said a few Program properties have caddisfly populations, and some have no populations but contain what is considered potential habitat. Caddisflies have been found in a slough on the McCormick Tract.
Sellers asked who else is likely to do research of this type. Farnsworth said USFWS and UNK are the only ones that would have the interest or expertise, and they currently do not have the funding to perform caddisfly research.

**Executive Session**
Heaston moved to go into executive session with LAC members, alternates, and technical staff to review details of land offerings. The motion was seconded by Shadle. The motion carried and the committee entered executive session at 10:17 a.m.

Heaston moved to come out of executive session. Wingfield seconded and the motion carried. The committee came out of executive session at 10:50 a.m.

Heaston made a motion to support the exchange of services for land on tract 2009008 and 1017. Motion seconded by Czaplewski and passed unanimously.

**Public Comment/Next Meeting**
Chairman Woodman asked for public comments, none were offered.

The next meeting of the LAC will be held in Kearney, Nebraska at the Executive Director’s Office on Wednesday, February 9, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. central time.

**Outdoor Recreation Policy Discussion**
Heaston provided a summary of topics discussed by the ad hoc recreation policy workgroup. The group felt that the Program could allow (to start with) the following activities: mushroom collecting, deer hunting, fishing, bird watching/hiking, and turkey hunting. These activities would all be subject to blackout areas and dates defined by target species needs, and all would require written permission. Peyton asked if public must pay for access. Sackett said no, because if you charge a fee you lose coverage under the Nebraska Recreational Liability Act. Heaston recommended that approved access activities could be kept up to date on the Program website. LaBonde said those uses should also be documented in the GC approved policy, recognizing that things can be added or removed according to Program needs.

Farnsworth said that $50,000 has been included in the FY2011 Program budget to procure services related to creating and enforcing an outdoor recreation access policy. Chairman Woodman asked that the ad hoc workgroup reconvene to further refine the policy into something that can be brought to the GC, and asked that Matt Steffl or Ted LaGrange, representing the Nebraska Game & Parks Commission, provide a proposal by the February 9, 2011 LAC meeting outlining how NGPC might implement public access for the Program. The ad hoc workgroup set a meeting date of December 16th, 2010 and 9 a.m.

Heaston made a motion to show LAC support for inclusion of the $50,000 in the FY2011 Program budget for recreation policy implementation. Seconded by Thorburn. LaGrange abstained. Motion carried.
Review Management Plans for LAC Recommendation for Tracts 2009006, 2009007, 2009008, 2010001 and Cottonwood Ranch Complex

Copies of final drafts of the management plans were distributed to the LAC the week prior to the meeting. Farnsworth said significant comments were received after these drafts were distributed, which was after the formal comment period. Farnsworth gave an overview of the structure of the land plans which were approved in early 2010. This structure includes tract-specific plans covering operations & maintenance activities and any tract-specific research & monitoring not covered under the complex plan. The structure also included complex plans which covered most research & monitoring activities and species habitat construction activities. Tract-specific plans and annual budget work plans are included as appendices to complex plans. Shadle said he appreciated the usefulness of the current division of tract and complex plans, but is receiving pressure from GC membership that the Program document currently asks for all-inclusive tract-specific plans unless the GC approves otherwise.

Heaston said one thing that could be considered is the creation of a Program-wide operations & maintenance policy/plan that provides for approved property maintenance and good neighbor activities that must be undertaken on any property.

One of the comments received asked for more detail for projects that are planned, where this detail cannot be reasonably included in the management planning time frame. Farnsworth said that baseline habitat creation maintenance activities can be developed for known projects, but development for unknown activities could be deferred. Jenniges would like the plans to state what information is outstanding, and address when these topics or planning efforts would be completed. Farnsworth also said that Program staff needs guidance on if/what activities could occur outside the envelope of adaptive management, whether necessary for upkeep, provide general benefit, or for other reasons, versus what activities must carry through the full adaptive management process. Jenniges said if work is planned for some goal, be it for target or non-target species, monitoring or assessment should take place to determine if the activity was a success. Jenniges also believes that the Program should not be spending a great deal of time or money creating habitat for non-target species. Farnsworth said that the USFWS, NGPC, and other organizations will want some benefits for other species, as allowed by the Program document. Jenniges said those projects should be accompanied by defined goals and monitoring.

Heaston moved to recommend to the GC that the current plan structure – tract operations and maintenance plans, in conjunction with complex plans – satisfy the Program document requirement that management plans be created within one year.

Presentation of 2011 Work Plans and Budget

Prior to the meeting, the LAC was presented with the work plan and budget overview for land-related activities in the 2011 Program budget. Farnsworth said there are approximately $2M in expenses and $200K in income. Budget line LP-2 encompasses species related actions and has a budget estimate of $483,000. Budget line LP-4 encompasses operations and maintenance activities and has a budget estimate of $365,000. Other expenses and incomes are covered in the distributed overview document.

This document is a draft based on one person's notes of the meeting. The official meeting minutes may be different if corrections are made by the Land Advisory Committee before approval.
Shadle mentioned that sediment augmentation costs are associated with one or two tracts, where the cost may better be distributed across all tracts that will assume the benefit. Farnsworth said the cost is listed where the bulk of the activity will occur. Heaston said that although the major cost occurs on one property, it should be clear that the cost effects are shared across all downstream properties.

Heaston moved to recommend GC approval of the land budget & work plans as presented. Motion seconded by Wingfield and passed unanimously.

Closing Business

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned by Chairman Woodman at 1:40 p.m.