

**MINUTES
STATE PRESERVES ADVISORY BOARD
STARR'S CAVE NATURE CENTER
BURLINGTON, IOWA
MARCH 7, 1994**

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Shirley Schermer, Chairperson
Diana Horton
Robert Kindwall
Martha Maxon
Jonathan Steege
Larry Wilson

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Joel Hanes

ADVISORS PRESENT

Jean Prior

ADVISORS ABSENT

Dorothy Baringer
Rebecca Conard
Kathy Gourley
Daryl Smith

STAFF PRESENT

Daryl Howell
John Pearson

STAFF ABSENT

Mike Carrier

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Schermer called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The following adjustments were made to the minutes:

- Add: notation at end of minutes to reflect that the Board held a day-long Prairie Management Session the day after the December meeting.
- Add: bottom of Page 8, insert "the" before Missouri and "River" before Valley.

Diana Horton brought up the assignment of staff to the preserves program and inquired as to whether there should be mention of Daryl Howell and John Pearson as a temporary situation to deal with the current lack of ability to hire a person specifically for the preserves.

Director Wilson stated that in approving the minutes the Board should limit discussion to topics that pertain to discussion taken up at the previous meeting.

Motion was made by Larry Wilson to approve the meeting minutes of December 14, 1993, as amended. Seconded by Martha Maxon. Motion carried unanimously

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The following additions were made to the agenda:

- Item #8 - Report from Seed Harvest Committee (Steege)
- Item #9 - Planning for Future Preserves Discussion (Kindwall)
- Item #10 - Prairie Management Session Follow-up Report (Hanes)
- Item #11 - Wittrock Indian Village (Schermer)
- Item #12 - Preserves Related Work Summary (Howell & Pearson)
- Item #13 - White Pine Hollow (Pearson)
- Item #14 - Proposed Swine Research Facility near Toolesboro (Howell)
- Item #15 - Rockford Quarry and June Meeting (Maxon & Schermer)

Motion was made by Robert Kindwall to approve the agenda as amended. Seconded by Jonathan Steege. Motion carried unanimously.

Larry Wilson announced that he received a call that Joel Hanes will not be able to attend the meeting because he is ill.

LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

Martha Maxon distributed copies of minutes from the Long Range Planning Committee meeting held on February 22, 1994. She noted that the last Comprehensive Plan for Preserves was written in 1978 but the geological portion was updated in 1983. The committee decided to focus on what resources the preserves system has and what it represents. Using that as a baseline the committee will identify the gaps and then target those priorities for acquisition. Immediate goal is to update and produce a matrix for the historic, archaeological, geologic, and natural features in the preserves. Jean Prior volunteered to update the geologic portion and to provide a matrix for same. Shirley Schermer volunteered to do the same with the archaeological and historic portions.

Ms. Maxon stated that the committee recommended to the Research Committee that part of the research funding for the next year be used to fund an intern to update the natural portion of the matrix. Additionally, the intern would be responsible for compiling all of the research, both public and private, that has been done on state preserves. She noted that the Research Committee has concurred with this recommendation. She indicated that the committee would be willing to cost-share this with the department on a 50/50 basis.

The committee set goals to complete the baseline survey and to set priorities for the different preserves in terms of quality so that management aspects can be met. The proposed schedule is to have a draft ready for the September meeting and a final by the December meeting.

RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT

Jonathan Steege reported that the Research Committee met on February 22, 1994. He noted that the following categories were identified as needing study using research funds: 1) inventory; 2) management issues; 3) interpretation; and 4) other. He related that three proposals were sent to the committee members prior to the meeting. Also, the Long Range Planning Committee made a recommendation to the Research Committee to fund a seasonal employee to work on Preserve Board assignments. The committee felt that an overall needs assessment would be valuable to show which issues were most important to study. Some needs are to identify potential preserve sites not already known; an inventory of what research has been done on preserves and a means of categorizing that information; and a study of land use and availability adjacent to preserves.

Mr. Steege stated that the Committee recommendations are: 1) offer dollars to the department for 50% funding of an employee to work on preserves gathering and categorizing information; and 2) continued biological inventory of vascular plants. He related that a list of specific preserves was discussed and

John Pearson agreed to provide an updated list according to need. Shirley Schermer will look at archaeological needs and Jean Prior will identify some geological needs for research. Mr. Steege stated that in visiting with Mike Carrier it was felt that funding for a part-time employee could come from departmental funds before July 1, and Research Committee funds could be used after July 1 when those funds become available.

Diana Horton distributed copies of a list of concerns she has with soliciting research proposals for the summer since there are already three proposals in. She related that she felt there might be some sentiment among members of the committee and Board members to accept those three proposals. She added that if that is true the Board should not send out letters soliciting proposals saying there is twenty-some thousand dollars to spend when in reality there is \$3,000. Ms. Horton reiterated a concern she expressed at the committee meeting about the amount of funding being awarded. She related that she feels the Board should be looking at funding five to eight proposals out of \$25,000. She noted that, as she understood it, the Research Committee agreed that biological inventories should be the priority proposal, but proposals for the other three categories should also be solicited. Ms. Horton also expressed a desire to give consideration to doing some in-depth studies at some of the preserves where there is already some information. She added that, for example, there is a species list for Williams Prairie but it does no good in terms of interpreting the effects of last summer's flooding without a basic vegetation map for the area.

Chairperson Schermer stated that the Research Committee discussed setting up a long range priority list in terms of type of research and the areas for research, and a more immediate concern was recommendations for the coming fiscal year.

Ms. Horton stated that she understood the list of priorities developed by the committee as follows: 1) biological inventories; 2) archaeological inventories; 3) management issues; 4) interpretation; and 5) other. She added that she thought that was for the proposal letter for this year.

Jonathan Steege reiterated that the priority list prepared by the committee was for 1) Inventory; 2) management issues; 3) interpretation; and 4) other.

A lengthy discussion followed regarding how the proposals should be handled for this year, whether to look at all of the proposals and then choose or to put a priority on the three that are already in.

Daryl Howell noted that staff would need to solicit proposals between April 1 and May 15, and the review committee would then need to look at the proposals. Subsequently, they would be brought before the Board for approval in June.

Also discussed was the work that would be done by an intern and that approximately \$2,000 would be needed from both committees to fund this position.

Chairperson Schermer stated that she would like to see the three proposals put on hold and the Board solicit proposals based on the priorities discussed in the Research Committee meeting. She added that following solicitation of proposals all of them should be put together and evaluated on an equal basis, based on the list of priorities.

Martha Maxon agreed with Chairperson Schermer adding that just because the three proposals were the first received does not mean they are the best proposals.

Discussion followed regarding the order of priorities for proposals; each preserve having individual characteristics and blanket priorities possibly not being good for all preserves; having several areas in the same vicinity studied at one time; and the crucial need for baseline data in regard to biological aspects.

Jonathan Steege stated that the committee's top identified recommendation was continued biological inventory of vascular plants. The committee developed a list of the following 12 preserves to be considered as priorities for biological inventory proposals:

Bluffton Fir Stand	Turkey River Mounds
Hardin City Woodland	Nestor Stiles
Bixby	Searryl's Cave
Fallen Rock	Cheever Lake
Mossy Glen	Little Maquoketa Mounds
Mann Wilderness	Anderson Prairie

Chairperson Schermer commented that she does not want biological inventories to take away from the other three types of priorities, adding that the quality of the proposal itself should be considered as well as how it fits into the needs of the Board.

Motion was made by Jonathan Steege that the Board continue to explore hiring a part-time employee on a 50/50 funding basis with the department, and to solicit proposals using Inventory as the number one priority and that the period of April 1 - May 15 be the period of time for submitting proposals. Also, that the committee subsequently meet to review the proposals and come back to the June meeting with recommendations. Priority would be given to the list of 12 preserves. Seconded by Robert Kindwall.

Diana Horton offered an amendment to the motion to specify Biological Inventories as the primary priority and to modify the list of 12 preserves to include some of the "better known" preserves. Also, that the baseline data is needed for some of the preserves for which there is no data, and on some of the better known preserves there would be interest in having more detailed data such as vegetation maps.

Mr. Steege stated that he would agree with the first part of the amendment but not the second part. He added that the committee already identified those preserves they felt were the most advantageous to look at. He noted that the committee never made a decision on whether it is more important to do follow-up on a preserve that already has information rather than one where no data is available.

John Pearson suggested using language to state that the Board will solicit biological inventories to include a range of topics anywhere from baseline studies to in-depth studies with mapping and quantitative analysis. He read the list of 12 preserves identified by the committee as priority for proposals.

Discussion followed regarding categorizing information and identifying areas most in need of study; whether to add Williams Prairie to the priority list; and doing inventory on areas where there is no information at all.

John Pearson summarized the friendly amendment as follows: the Board will solicit research proposals for biological inventories ranging in nature from simple baseline studies to complex, in-depth studies which may include species listing, vegetation mapping, quantitative analysis, etc., for the 12 preserves identified by the Research Committee. The Board concurred that Mr. Pearson's summarization captured their intent for research proposals.

Chairperson Schermer noted that the Board accepted the friendly amendment as summarized by Mr. Pearson, but the question to decide on is whether or not to add Williams Prairie to the priority list.

Jonathan Steege stated that he does not like the idea of adding it because at one time the committee had it on the list, then removed it for a particular reason. He added that there may be other areas to simultaneously look at when researching Williams Prairie.

Vote on Jonathan Steege's motion as amended carried on a vote of 5-Yes to 1-No, with Larry Wilson voting "No."

Director Wilson stated that he understands setting a priority to focus financial and other resources to a particular part of a program that may have been neglected.

He related that there is nothing wrong with setting priorities but he does not agree with it in this particular instance because there is a Research Committee and a number of scientists on the Board who can make those decisions as they come before them in the requests for research. He added that whenever you set a priority as was just done, you take away some of that flexibility.

Discussion followed regarding the number of proposals to be funded and how the proposals will be evaluated.

Daryl Howell explained the proposal process and the amount of time involved with each proposal. He related that a maximum of five proposals would be reasonable.

Consensus of the Board was to go with 3 to 6 proposals.

REQUEST TO CONDUCT RESEARCH ON KALSOW PRAIRIE

Daryl Howell stated that the Board received a request from Ben Klaas, a graduate student at Iowa State University, to conduct a study on effects of gopher disturbance on tallgrass prairie vegetation. He related that Mr. Klass would like to do his research on Kalsow Prairie but may also need to work at Anderson and Cayler prairies. He noted that Mr. Klass will try to primarily work at Kalsow Prairie.

Motion was made by Jonathan Steege to approve the request to conduct research on Kalsow, Cayler and Anderson Prairie for pocket gopher disturbance. Seconded by Larry Wilson. Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MANAGEMENT PLAN AND PRESERVE DEDICATION FOR MALANAPHY SPRINGS

Chairperson Schermer expressed frustration with the whole process noting that the Board has been working on dedication/management plans for two years to try to get wording that meets approval of the F & W Division as well as the Preserves Board. She noted that now public opinion and outcry seems to have carried more weight than recommendations by the Preserves Board. The public impression is that it was the Preserves Board who was advocating cutting trees at Malanaphy Springs. Chairperson Schermer related that several Board members felt that the wording agreed to at the last meeting was the the best compromise they could hope to get, and if they wanted to see Malanaphy Springs dedicated they needed to agree to it. She related that the public impression is that F & W Division is coming back and asking the Board to reconsider, as if it were the Board's idea in the first place.

Chairperson Schermer distributed copies of a memo from Al Farris and Mike Carrier regarding the management plan and pointed out that in one sentence they state that if a preserve manager or owner undertakes a practice that alters or disturbs the natural features of the area, prior consultation with the Preserves Board is recommended. She noted that they go on to say they do not feel it is necessary to have wording to that effect in the management plan. She stressed that she feels it should be reinserted into the management plan and she then distributed copies of her memo with proposed language to that effect. She related that her request is that they consult with the Preserves Board prior to any harvest of trees with the exception of those that need to be removed because they are diseased or dead, or are in imminent danger of falling over the trail itself.

Martha Maxon concurred wholly with the frustrations expressed by Chairperson Schermer.

Larry Wilson stated that he discussed this with Mike Carrier and Al Farris and they understood that the target for the preserve interest on Malanaphy Springs was only for the algific talus slope and the moderate cliff, not the whole area.

A lengthy discussion followed regarding the harvesting of trees on state areas and when it is or is not appropriate.

Following discussion of the language proposed by Chairperson Schermer, the Board agreed to modify it to read as follows:

B. Management Practices

1. Woodlands. Any woodland management undertaken on the algific talus slope or moderate cliff will be directed to the preservation or enhancement of the algific talus slope or moderate cliff. The remaining woodlands (those not located on the slope or cliff) will receive appropriate management practices. If any management practice will alter or disturb the natural features of the preserve, the Preserves Advisory Board will be consulted prior to initiating that practice with the following exception. Removal of diseased, dead or dying trees or trees that have fallen or are in imminent danger of falling over the trail will be removed as needed. Presently, there are a number of dead or dying elm trees along the trail. Those that fall over the trail will be cleared using DNR staff or volunteers.

Motion was made by Martha Maxon to approve the proposed language as modified. Seconded by Jonathan Steege. Motion carried unanimously.

Jeff Bergman, Des Moines County Conservation Board, discussed possibly doing future woodland management at Starr's Cave.

Director Wilson stated that Starr's Cave is owned by the state and the County Conservation Board does a very good job of managing it. He added that the

department would certainly endorse any plans they have for woodland management on the area. He related that if it is not addressed in the the Articles of Dedication, it would have to come before the Preserves Board for approval.

INDIANA BAT SUMMER HABITAT PROTECTION

Daryl Howell reported that the Indiana bat is a federal and state listed endangered species and occurs in southern Iowa during summer. It occurs in forested areas and along wooded stream and river courses. Although the major wintering sites for this species have been protected the population in the western portion of its range has continued to decline (over 85% of the entire population winters in just 7 sites). Based on the declining winter counts there may be problems for this species on the summer range. Mr. Howell distributed a set of guidelines established by DNR for evaluating the suitability of areas in the 24 county area considered to be the range of the species in Iowa. The guidelines will be used to determine if public projects which require cutting of trees during the period May through August might inadvertently destroy maternity colonies.

Brief discussion followed.

Diana Horton inquired as to who will receive copies of the guidelines.

Mr. Howell stated that the guidelines will be sent to county engineers, cities, county conservation boards, and other interested individuals.

REQUEST FOR ADVICE FROM ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE

At the September Board meeting several questions arose as to the responsibility of a preserve owner and the State to ensure that a preserve is maintained according to the articles of dedication. Advice was sought from the Attorney General's Office on this issue.

Chairperson Schermer noted that all Board members received a copy of the letter from Mike Smith, Assistant Attorney General.

Director Wilson commented that there are several key sentences in Mr. Smith's letter and pointed out the second paragraph which indicates that the Board, the Director, and the Governor are trustees for the State on all preserves. The State, as trustee, has the ultimate responsibility for enforcing the articles of dedication. He noted that the letter also states that the statutory authorization to create a trust necessarily implies the duty and ability of the trustees to seek enforcement of the conditions of the trust. He related that he interprets this to say that limitation for enforcement of the provisions of a trust does not stop at county, city, or state properties, but is applicable to privately owned preserves as well. The

letter also states that if the owner of property dedicated as a preserve violates the articles of dedication, the owner is potentially liable to restore the preserve to its condition which immediately preceded the violation. The State, as trustee, would have standing to sue for injunctive relief to seek abatement of a continuing violation and compel restoration after damage. Mr. Wilson noted that the final paragraph states that if damage to a preserve is caused or aggravated by acts of a third-party person or organization, The State, as trustee, would have standing to seek injunctive relief.

TRAIL STUDY UPDATE - BRUSHY CREEK STATE PRESERVE

John Pearson stated that several years ago the Board gave permission to continue trail use while a study of impacts to the trail was being done. He noted that data from a former staff person was not available, so last year he started a new study. Last May he set up new stations along the trail and, ironically, three days after those were set up he received the former employee's data. He related that he was able to make use of some of that data because two of the stations were the same as his. He distributed copies of his trail study update and gave a detailed explanation of methods used, results and discussion, and a chart showing changes in profile of station number one. In summary, he noted that soil loss ranging from zero to four inches occurred in the trail corridor during the 31 month study period, depending on exact location among stations and within individual profiles. Soil loss was manifested in three modes: 1) initiation or deepening of trenches in the traveled portion of the corridor; 2) widening of the trail by sloughing of soil at the edge of trenches; and 3) sidehill erosion immediately above the trail proper. Mr. Pearson noted that he will return to the 15 stations next month and will provide a full report in June.

Brief discussion followed.

REPORT FROM SEED HARVEST COMMITTEE

In Joel Hanes' absence, Jonathan Steege reported that the two of them are on opposite sides of the fence on the issue of seed harvesting adding that Joel sees more of an opportunity for it, and he sees less of an opportunity for it. He added that no one on the committee is concerned with allowing The Nature Conservancy or Community Colleges, etc. to harvest when they are using small amounts of seed or using it to enhance or expand a preserve. The only objection was that several people were opposed to Walnut Creek using seed from the preserves. He noted that some concerns were that Walnut Creek had hired someone to harvest seed from a preserve, and then the individual sold the seed to Walnut Creek.

Chairperson Schermer asked Mr. Steege to exchange notes with Mr. Hanes and draft recommendations to be sent to the Board members.

John Pearson stated that there is an apparent misunderstanding circulating among growers because no one has been allowed to harvest seed off a preserve and then sell it. He related that the Board has not granted permission to anyone except the finite list who have done their own projects.

Mr. Howell stated that Walnut Creek may have paid Gene Kromroy for the work he did as a package, but not for the seed.

PLANNING FOR FUTURE PRESERVES

Robert Kindwall stated that in May 1992, the Des Moines Register printed a list of "Iowa's Hidden Treasures," a listing of unique areas in Iowa. He asked what happens to these pieces of land and related that people probably do not know how to get these areas into the preserve system.

Director Wilson stated that the Des Moines Register provided the department with a listing of these areas, they were divided into categories for state, county, and city, and then sent to the appropriate entity letting them know about the unique areas in their vicinity. It was suggested to these entities that they may want to give consideration to setting the areas aside as something special.

Mr. Kindwall asked if there is a list of possible preserves pending before the Preserves Board.

Director Wilson replied that the Board does not have this type of list.

Mr. Howell commented that the Board has three areas in mind for preserve status and those are Cedar Bluffs, Malanaphy Springs and Rockford Quarry.

Chairperson Schermer pointed out that the Long Range Planning Committee will be determining where there are voids in the system and address those areas later on.

Mr. Steege commented that some people have problems with opening private owned areas to the public.

Director Wilson stated that the Board would consider anything worthy of preserve status that is brought to the Board.

PRAIRIE MANAGEMENT SESSION FOLLOW UP REPORT

John Pearson reported that he, Joel Hanes, Paul Christiansen, John Fleckenstein, Tom Rosberg, Dennis Schlicht, and Ray Hamilton met on

January 9. He noted that Ray Hamilton has written a prairie management brochure and the group decided to use that brochure as a basis for revision. He related that they spent one day and progressed one-third of the way through the brochure when they ran out of time. Mr. Pearson related that a second meeting will take place in March and they hope to have something ready for the June Board meeting.

WITTRUCK INDIAN VILLAGE

Chairperson Schermer distributed copies of a Draft Preliminary Flood Impact Assessment of Selected Iowa Archaeological Sites Damaged in 1993, written by Richard Fishel. She stated that Mr. Fishel received a call from a landowner near Wittrock Indian Village who is concerned that Waterman Creek is eroded into his property. He was also concerned that the preserve was being eroded away. Chairperson Schermer noted that several people from her office as well as the DNR have visited the area and determined that there has not been any direct impact on the village itself, but felt that in time it would begin to cut into the village.

Director Wilson stated that Midwest Gas has a pipeline running across the area and they were interested in getting a channel change permit. The landowner was also interested in getting a channel change permit.

Chairperson Schermer stated that there was a meeting in the Governor's Office on March 3 regarding possible rechanneling to protect the landowner's property and divert the stream away from the Village. She related that there will be an on-site meeting on this issue on Friday, March 11.

PRESERVES RELATED WORK SUMMARY

Daryl Howell stated that both he and John Pearson worked on portions of the Preserves Board agenda this time, but will coordinate their effort more closely for the next meeting. He asked the Board to submit agenda items two to three weeks prior to the mailing date, which is one week before the meeting. He related that it simplifies the process by including them on the original agenda rather than adding them at the time of the meeting. This also allows Board and staff members time to review the items beforehand.

John Pearson stated that he and John Fleckenstein met with the Prairie Management Committee and also worked up the results of the Brushy Creek Trail Study.

Chairperson Schermer stated that one concern is that the preserves do not get slighted with the reorganization and reassignment of duties. She asked Daryl

and John to provide a summary/report of their preserves related work accomplishments at the next several meetings.

Diana Horton asked if the present situation should be regarded as an interim means of dealing with the unfortunate situation of not having sufficient funds to hire a preserves ecologist. She related that when the economy picks up she would hope the Board will be able to hire a preserves ecologist, as stated in Chapter 465C of the Code.

Martha Maxon stated that she regards John and Daryl as a job-share preserves ecologist with each of them doing a portion of the work.

Discussion followed regarding positions that have been lost within the department and bureau.

The majority of the Board agreed that since they now have two people who can do the work of a board ecologist they should let them handle the job for a year and give it a chance to work. Review can be made next year to evaluate how the reorganization is working.

Director Wilson commented that John and Daryl also receive support from John Fleckenstein and supervisory advice from Mike Carrier. Mr. Wilson asked Daryl and John what portion of their work is related to Preserves Board work.

Daryl Howell stated that his preserves related work has increased from 25% to 50% of his job.

John Pearson stated that when there is more than one person doing the work it is difficult to pull out the hours for specific work. He asked to let the program run for a year over which time tallying can be done and accomplishments can then be viewed. He related that Preserves Board is a major portion of his work.

Director Wilson explained staffing levels and how they have to fit into the budget. He noted that an additional ten staff people were requested to keep the drinking water program in the state of Iowa. The department will be adding those staff, if approved, so that EPA does not take over the program.

Chairperson Schermer asked if the department would be willing to request an additional person for the Preserves Board when submitting the next staffing proposal.

Director Wilson stated that he would consider that a year from now, after giving the present program an opportunity to work.

WHITE PINE HOLLOW

John Pearson reviewed that John Pleasants was doing a study at White Pine Hollow, and at the same time the U.S. Forest Service had initiated an old growth forest study project spanning several midwest states. He related that Stephen Shifley of the Forest Service has expressed interest in taking over John Pleasants' plots located in White Pine Hollow. If it suits their purpose, they would like to mark those plots permanently and do follow-up study in ten years. Mr. Pearson added that more details will be provided at a later date but he wanted to inform the Board of their interest in these plots.

PROPOSED SWINE RESEARCH FACILITY NEAR TOOLESBORO

Daryl Howell reported that there is a proposal for a swine confinement to be located one-half mile southwest of Toolesboro Mounds. He related that the waste disposal site is closer to the preserve than the basin itself, and there is concern with the land application of animal wastes. The Board will visit the preserves area tomorrow.

ROCKFORD QUARRY AND JUNE MEETING

Martha Maxon reported that back in 1992 the Rockford Quarry was identified by Jean Prior as having geologic preserve quality. She related that she wrote to Wayne Meyer at the Floyd County Conservation Board, and also talked to him about how to get the quarry into the preserves system. She related that she never heard back from him so she recently called him to see if there is any interest there, and he indicated that he has been busy but offered to meet with the Board. He indicated that his top priority is to develop it for use, and they will use an ISTE A grant to install trails, an education center, and a museum. Ms. Maxon added that they had 7,000 visitors to the area last year. She noted that Joel Hanes has some prairie on his property which abutts the Rockford Quarry property and he has agreed to coordinate with Mr. Meyer any future dealings on this.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the State Preserves Advisory Board will be held in the afternoon on Monday, June 13, in Charles City. A tour of the Rockford Quarry and nearby areas of interest will be held Tuesday morning, June 14.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Schermer thanked Jeff Bergman, Sharon Kaufman, and the Des Moines County Conservation Board for providing the meeting facilities and for their hospitality.

Motion was made by Jonathan Steege to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Martha Maxon. Motion carried unanimously.

With no further business to come before the State Preserves Advisory Board, Chairperson Schermer adjourned the meeting at 5:10 p.m., Monday, March 7, 1994.

BOARD TOUR

The Board was scheduled to tour Starr's Cave Preserve, Malchow Mounds Preserve, and Toolesboro Preserve on Tuesday, March 8, 1994 beginning at 8:30 a.m. from Starr's Cave Nature Center.