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Executive Summary

Project Description. The DNR Division of Parks and Trails together with the UMD Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation (HPER) and UMD’s Bureau of Business and Economic Research (BBER) was asked to complete a feasibility study of the potential reuse of the former MnDOT I11gen City maintenance facility property, which will become part of Tettegouche State Park. The study considered site development options ranging from no improvement to development of outpost learning center facilities. Effort focused on determining the feasibility of programmatic and economic opportunities presented by establishing an outpost learning center facility. Students from UMD’s Labovitz School of Business and Economics and from UMD Health, Physical Education and Recreation will jointly work on this project.

Site Evaluation. Three scenarios for possible development of the site were suggested: 1) No Build—which could leave or reduce what’s currently at the site; 2) Partial Build—which may or may not include the existing building and/or new facilities on site; and 3) Full Build—which may include rehabilitating existing maintenance building and/or moving a building owned by the DNR from another site, or construct a whole new facility. The HPER Team wrote an evaluation of the site in a separate report which includes a review and recommendation for mission and vision statements, geography, geological features, biological features, history of Tettegouche State Park, and zoning. Appendix B to this report summarizes the recommendations from the HPER team.

Three Scenarios. The BBER interviews identified the list of activities that recur in all scenarios as the following: Cross-country skiing, Snowshoeing, Snowmobiling, Kayaking and Canoeing, Archery, Rock Climbing, Mountain Biking, ATV, Nature Education, Outdoor Photography, Geocaching, Backpacking, Camping, Fishing, Birding Kits, Outdoor Cooking, Astronomy Programs. BBER also identified the seasonality of each activity and whether the activity, in the particular scenario, required staffing (DNR staff or hired instructors). These activities and subsequent differing levels of estimated attendance contribute to the financial break-even calculation for each scenario.

Estimating Demand. BBER interviewed representatives of target markets for the proposed Tettegouche site. General assumptions about how these and other visitors could use this site as well as assumptions about facilities, equipment, barriers for the identified target market(s) helped BBER develop estimates for suggested attendance levels and estimates for the number and kind of events possible at the site. BBER also used data from survey findings from a 2010 data collection regarding the activities and infrastructure of Lake Vermilion State Park to suggest preferred activities and further possible estimates of demand. (Note: For the break-even calculation we break out the general population from the tribal interests.)

Break-even Calculations. The ranges of break-even calculations for the three levels of usage outlined in the scenarios offer us an opportunity to provide comparisons. In general, a rule of
thumb might be that the cost will be borne by the number of events. (Note that this table most helpfully compares build scenarios, reading across rows. One can also study the comparison by column which indicates that the most efficient way to use each scenario is to emphasize facility and equipment only use.) The comparison table shows possible limits and extremes of three projected scenarios.

### SCENARIOS AND USE-LEVEL BREAK-EVEN COMPARISONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Levels</th>
<th>No Build events</th>
<th>No Build revenue</th>
<th>Partial Build events</th>
<th>Partial Build revenue</th>
<th>Full Build events</th>
<th>Full Build revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility use</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>$122,500</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>$149,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility and equipment use</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>$133,500</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>$151,500</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>$185,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility and equipment and instructor</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>$120,750</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>$136,850</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>$166,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outpost Learning Center Users.** Interviews conducted by the BBER with representatives of target markets as well as research into the background literature of demand for outdoor recreation learning programs suggested a range of possible users.

**Economic Issues and Recommendations.** On a positive note, Tettegouche is a popular destination, and opportunities are many. User demand—as expressed by target market representatives—is promising. Groups showing special interest in programs and use from tribes (Grand Portage and Fond du Lac) expressed specific interest and use for various scenarios. To take full advantage of the learning center, the Full Build ties into group interest from tribes. (We note that a survey on willingness and ability to pay would be of interest here.) Scenarios should be rolled out in a phased approach. However, current ability to pay is veering off from willingness to pay. Current economic conditions reflecting the economic downturn and recession should also be taken into consideration.
Project Description

The DNR Division of Parks and Trails together with the UMD Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation and UMD’s Bureau of Business and Economic Research was asked to complete a feasibility study of the potential reuse of the former MnDOT Illgen City maintenance facility property which will become part of Tettegouche State Park. The study considered site development options ranging from no improvement to development of outpost learning center facilities. Effort focused on determining the feasibility of programmatic and economic opportunities presented by establishing an outpost learning center facility.

Project Scope

The proposers of this project suggested that the Illgen City maintenance facility property could be reconfigured as a program-delivery facility or an “outpost learning center.” The reconfigured facility could be used for rent by groups for classroom use or possibly for overnights. The feasibility study could study demand (Is there a market here?) and opportunities (What are the possibilities?). It was also suggested that the feasibility study could incorporate drafting of a business plan for the proposed center.

Three scenarios for possible development of the site were suggested: 1) No Build—which could leave or reduce what’s currently at the site; 2) Partial Build—which may or may not include the existing building and/or new facilities on site; and 3) Full Build—which may include rehabilitating existing maintenance building and/or moving a building owned by the DNR from another site, or construct a whole new facility. Possible activities, facilities, equipment, barriers, and target markets were investigated.

The Illgen City site currently includes a concrete/brick maintenance garage. It has been suggested that development might include a move of a park headquarters building to the Illgen City site. Construction of new structures was also considered. Costs for infrastructure renovation and construction will be estimated by the MN DNR.

Estimations of demand include investigation of what kinds of groups might use the renovated facility. Demand from ethnic groups, family groups, youth groups were investigated. In addition, use of the facility was investigated. An emphasis on outdoor recreation/education vs. traditional outdoor education activities was also investigated, through nature-based activities, from physical skills development to land stewardship. It was also suggested that at this site, physical skills could be the focus of entry to the park.

Other elements of the feasibility study included personnel and/or staffing requirements, configuration of content providers, provision for rentals management, and establishment of contracts and user fees. The best approach to sharing and incentives for partners was of interest, as well as determining the best management framework for increasing access.
It was also suggested that the feasibility study could show how the MN DNR might afford this facility through partnerships, with emphasis on partners such as K-12 schools and non-agency entities doing much of the organizing.

Finally, students from UMD’s Labovitz School of Business and Economics and from UMD Health, Physical Education and Recreation will jointly work on this project.

Site Evaluation
BBER and HPER met with representatives of the DNR to discuss possible costs and infrastructure operations and investment. DNR supplied data and information for Tettegouche State Park including the 1997 Management Plan and Attendance Reports; Background Information on Parks & Trails; Current Research: Outdoor Recreation – DNR Conservation Agenda; and the DNR's Parks & Trails 10 year Strategic Plan. Throughout the project the DNR continued to work on natural and cultural resource assessments and infrastructure evaluation. For various reasons including availability of resources and changes in project funding, the cost estimate for the three scenarios remains in progress. A subsequent report including these estimates may be made available later. HPER team made several visits to the park to evaluate the site, as did the BBER team. Both teams met with DNR representatives to discuss the staging of the three scenarios and to determine possible activities, facilities, equipment needs, and barriers.

As noted in the Project Description, three scenarios for possible development of the site have been suggested: 1) No Build—which could leave or reduce what’s currently at the site; 2) Partial Build—which may or may not include the existing building and/or new facilities on site; and 3) Full Build—which may include rehabilitating existing maintenance building and/or moving a building owned by the DNR from another site, or construct a whole new facility. These scenarios include evaluation of the potential to reuse existing maintenance building. Scenarios Two and Three also attempt to give a preliminary evaluation of construction of proposed new facilities, utilities and infrastructure, as well as costs for operation and cost of improvements.

The HPER Team wrote an evaluation of the site in a separate report which includes a review and recommendation for mission and vision statements, geography, geological features, biological features, history of Tettegouche State Park, and zoning. Appendix B summarizes the recommendations from the HPER team.

Three Scenarios
Each scenario is presented in terms of programmatic possibilities (activities), possible Infrastructure needs and costs (facilities and equipment), possible obstacles to overcome (barriers), an estimation of demand for the activities and features proposed (target markets), and a break-even analysis. BBER (and HPER) interviewed representative group leaders and
individuals identified as leaders or information sources for outdoor activities in the region. Although the sample size is small, these interviews were documented and respondents' comments were organized to shed light on the elements of the three scenarios. Those interviewed were asked a series of questions about a list of possible park activities. Responses are summarized below, according to scenario.

All Season Activities
The BBER interviews identified the list of activities that recur in all scenarios as the following: Cross-country skiing, Snowshoeing, Snowmobiling, Kayaking and Canoeing, Archery, Rock climbing, Mountain Biking, ATV, Nature Education, Outdoor photography, Geocaching, Backpacking, Camping, Fishing, Birding kits, Outdoor Cooking, Astronomy programs. BBER also identified the seasonality of each activity and whether the activity, in the particular scenario, required staffing (instructors). These activities and differing levels of estimated attendance contribute to the break-even calculation for each scenario.

Tettegouche State Park is a well-known recreational destination. Recent attendance data trend show interest in the park continues to follow a seasonal pattern with a high in August of more than seventy thousand visitors, and a low in December of more than eight thousand.

Figure 1. TETTEGOUCHE ATTENDANCE TREND

Tettegouche State Park Attendance

Data Source: DNR
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Assumptions for Calculating Break-even Estimates for Scenarios and Use-level Activities

Given that one of the objectives of estimating costs for TLC is to keep costs as low as possible, BBER began by making assumptions about listing total costs, including identifying expenditures that do not change, and those that do. The variables that do change—from building scenario to scenario and within these scenarios among the different use levels—were based on staffing differences, and facility costs including supplies, depreciation, and other miscellaneous items.

To calculate the total revenue needed to break even, BBER also adjusted the number of events and attendees.

We also assumed that there could be three levels of use within each of these build scenarios: 1) Facility use; 2) Facility and equipment use; and 3) Facility and equipment and instructor involvement. For each use-level, in each build scenario, we then estimate the possible total attendance and total number of events annually, based on the estimation of activities expected to occur. We calculate a profit and loss income statement from an estimation of revenue—such as facility fees, program activity fees for staff, program activity fees for instructors, user rental fees, gift shop revenues, meals paid for. Variables such as donations, and possible state subsidy are here considered as zero in order to isolate costs and revenues associated with operations.

We also estimate expenses such as staff expenses including a DNR coordinator, two DNR seasonal 3-months employees, DNR repair and maintenance staff, and instructors/educators. We also estimate other expenses—vender equipment rental, meals provided, learning center supplies, miscellaneous expenses, and depreciation capital and equipment.

For the estimation of total attendance and total number of events, our assumption is that there are ten attendees per event. We estimate annual attendance based on the break-even number of events.

We estimate a profit and loss income statement. Next we identified the fixed and variable costs estimates from the profit and loss income statement. Finally, from the fixed and variable costs estimates we determined the contribution margin, and calculated the break-even point for operations at the Tettegouche Outpost Learning Center (TLC).

1. No Build Scenario

Estimating Demand

Assumptions

The "No Build" scenario assumes that to participate in activities users would bring their own equipment. Users would also provide their own staff for activities. This scenario assumes that lake shore access is available. The No Build scenario also assumes that the facility has a pavilion, fire pit, amphitheater, clean-up area (trash cans), parking, picnic tables, lighting in pavilion, and tenting area.
Although not quantified for analysis, a special subset of interviewing identified possible Native American group interest in blueberry picking, language reintroduction and emersion classes, moose calling, nature trails, story-telling—including seasonal stories (winter stories when lake is frozen/ground frozen), visiting burial grounds, and identifying traditional plant and tree usage cedar trees, wild rice, implements and drums.

Among those interviewed, little interest was expressed in activities such as learning the history of the park, general winter activities, backcountry experience, birding kits, environmental activity kits, or exploration of bat caves.

Facilities

The no build scenario is a design plan to have no enclosed building with surrounding walls. The planned site would include an outdoor pavilion, big enough to offer cover to large groups of visitors. The pavilion would have picnic tables underneath and would include power outlets and lighting. The pavilion would be built on the current foundation. The idea of Wi-Fi around the pavilion is also an option. With no indoor class room there will be an outdoor amphitheater used as a learning/recreation area for visitors. Vault bathrooms will be available. These bathrooms will meet basic needs, including a sink and a toilet. The restrooms will and located next to each other and would not be split by gender. There will be an area designated for visitors who are tenting. Other amenities around the park will include a fire pit, grills and clean-up area (trash cans). The no build scenario is designed for experienced campers and those who enjoy the outdoors.

Equipment

The interviews also identified that expectations of potential visitors for the No Build scenario for equipment to support outdoor activities were low. Users could expect to bring their own equipment, including possibly some snowshoes, camera kit, skis, archery equipment and GPS systems. However they indicated that the park would or should provide fire wood.

Barriers

Possible obstacles to users in the No Build scenario identified by those interviewed included transportation issues. Among all those interviewed about the No Build scenario, transportation issues were the most cited barriers to visiting the park. Particular issues were identified as gas prices, transportation rental, parking, distance from Duluth, time/travel for day use, travel with large groups, and vehicle permits.

Some obstacles identified by those interviewed include issues around money: don’t have trained staff, need grants to rent a facility and pay fees, plus the availability and cost of equipment.

Other obstacles included seasonality of the park. Summer was described as a time for mostly families; fall a time in which a majority of the visitors are retirees; and winter is when more young adults and locals might use the park. Interestingly, a comment from those interviewed
suggested that many potential visitors have misinformation or fears about nature that have been fed by cable TV.

**Target Market(s)**

BBER interviewed representatives of school age groups about potential use of the park, as well as consulted with UMD HPER student researchers on additional interviews. These groups included: the Boys and Girls Club (Teen Center); Hartley Nature Center Youth Camp (5th-12th grade); Grand Portage Park Naturalist and Director of Education for the Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa (12-17 years of age); Local naturalist (African Americans); Northern MN and WI Girls Scouts (kindergarten through high school, with some programs which target under-served children) and others as referenced below in the section titled Outpost Learning Center Users.

The potential for young adults to use the park was discussed with individuals who represent rock climbers and hikers; a Tettegouche Naturalist; UMD students, and Geology field outings/classes and college-age students at UMD. Young adults' use of the park was also discussed with Lakeview Covenant Church, representing young couples with families, and a Park Naturalist from Jay Cook State Park.

Park use could also include on-site visits by college classes in such fields as such as Geology, Biology, Ecology, Recreation, Environmental Education, and Outdoor Education, as well as community education classes such as photography. A number of colleges and universities currently take advantage of the park, but these visits are not coordinated through park administration or staff but instead are constituted as unscheduled and unannounced visitors to the park.

**Other Findings**

**Vermilion State Park Findings.** The BBER reviewed survey findings from a 2010 data collection regarding the activities and infrastructure of Lake Vermilion State Park for possible information on user demand for the proposed scenarios for Tettegouche State Park.

In general, the Vermilion survey reported that the Top 10 highest demanded activities for the proposed new park were:

- Geocaching
- Backpacking
- Camping
- Rock climbing
- Sea Kayaking
- Snowshoeing
- Outdoor photography
- Cross-country skiing
- Archery
- Bird watching
- Modern bathrooms (showers)

The Top 10 highest demanded facilities from survey were:

- Electricity
- Kitchen facility
- Amphitheater
- Running water
- Kitchen facility
- Camper cabin
- Tent camping area
- Bunkhouse
- Meeting Space
- Private Facility
In addition to the activities and facilities requested by potential park users, park material lists several activities from park brochure but not listed by survey which could be of interest at Tettegouche State Park:

- Acoustic Music
- Poetry Hike
- Primitive skills (ancient survival techniques)
- Creating arrowhead/knives from stone
- Reptile interaction
- Blacksmithing
- Candle light hikes
- Maple Syruping
- Scent tracking
- Firearms safety
- Horse camp sites
- Swimming/beach accuse
- Volleyball
- Sledding hill
- Overlook

Related to the No Build scenario for Tettegouche, potential users of the Vermilion park expressed interest in hike-in/cart-in camping (77%); exhibits (77%); naturalist-led hikes and/or boat tours (58%); equipment rentals on site (58%); outdoor skills building/how-to short courses (e.g. camping, geocaching, kayaking, ice fishing) 48%; opportunities for hunting and or fishing (50%); and non-motorized recreation (e.g. biking, hiking, canoeing, snowshoeing, skiing).

No Build Scenario Break-even Calculation
Our break-even calculation begins with the demand assumptions about what level of activity can be estimated to occur for the scenario. (We break out the general population from the tribal interests.)

Activities assumption: BBER made assumptions about what activities, in what season, and what charges including facilities and program costs would be incurred by groups and individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities for the General Public</th>
<th>Group Facility</th>
<th>Group Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w Cross-country skiing</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w Snowshoeing</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w Snowmobiling *</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s Sea Kayaking*</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s Archery *</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s Rock climbing*</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s Mountain Biking*</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s ATV *</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Nature Education</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Outdoor photography</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Geocaching</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Backpacking</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Camping</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Fishing *</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on our assumptions (above), possibilities for ways to use the no build facility according to different combinations of facility use (facility only, facility and equipment use, and facility and equipment and instructor involvement), are shown in the following table of ranges of values for break-even estimates. Although it is complicated to think of this level of changing assumptions, and how they might result in a range of attendance numbers in the break-even calculation, BBER ran these configurations because precise inputs about actual attendance and costs are not available.

Table 2. RANGES OF BREAK-EVEN ASSUMPTIONS FROM ADDITIONAL COMBINATIONS OF USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Build</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility use</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility and equipment use</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>$133,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility and equipment and instructor involvement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>$120,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note, combinations of these variables could deliver other results. A consultant with expertise in all these possible uses could estimate a mix of these assumptions for further break-even calculations.

2. Partial Build Scenario

Estimating Demand

Assumptions

The "Partial Build" scenario assumptions include the No Build assumptions. The Partial Build scenario also assumes that facilities will include(student class/walls) – running water, grills, electric hook up, tenting area/camping, clean-up area (sinks), vault/modern toilets, tent camping area, parking, playground, open field play time, Wi-Fi, electricity, RV or Trailer, Fridge, Microwave, equipment and classroom storage area.

Bureau of Business and Economic Research
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Activities
The Partial Build scenario includes the same activities as the No Build but more of them. The indoor option with the Partial Build offers a venue for more indoors events.

The Native American community expressed interest in using the Partial Build facilities at Tettegouche park for such activities as canoe building; wild rice finishing (brimson rice gathering); smoking of the white fish; snow shoe building; building a wigwam/sweat lodge; and medicine wheel activities. Camera kits and kayaking also were discussed although responses indicated a low level of interest in these pursuits.

Facilities
The partial build scenario is designed to have a basic building for an indoor learning environment. There will be a standing building which will include: a kitchen, classroom, reception/meeting area, an office, large equipment storage area and spilt gender bathrooms. The kitchen is primarily an area where visitors can prepare food and cleanup after wards. The kitchen facility will include large counter space, a stink, a microwave and trash/recycling cans. The office would be used as an area for any staff that helps maintain the building or teachers that teach visitors. The large equipment storage would be used to store any large equipment items that visitors have bought themselves or can be place visitors may rent out equipment. The bathrooms will be more modern than just vault toilets; they will have multiple toilets, urinals and sinks. The classroom would be a basic square room allowing visitors to site in desk in a row. There will be a small storage area inside the classroom for materials to help teach. The area surrounding the building site would include an area for tent campers and an area for RV camping. The partial build would be for those visitors who are used to the outdoors but prefer to eat and learn indoors.

In addition to the minimal facilities provided for visitors in the No Build scenario, for the Partial Build scenario respondents indicated an interest in amenities such as running water; grills; electric hookups; clean-up area (sinks); Wi-Fi; electricity; microwaves; and vault/modern toilets. Those interviewed also indicated an interest in upgraded accommodations such as a tent camping area; parking; RV or trailer accommodations; a playground and open field for play time; and classroom storage areas.

Equipment
In addition to the minimal expectations of potential visitors for the No Build scenario including the understanding that users would expect to bring their own equipment, those interviewed indicated that the Partial Build scenario might offer users extended services such as access to canoes, kayaks, and camera equipment.
Barriers

The barriers identified by potential users for the No Build scenario continue for the Partial Build scenario, including issues around seasonality. Transportation issues remain foremost on visitors' minds, including gas prices, transportation rental arrangements, parking, distance from Duluth, time/travel for day use, travel with large groups, and vehicle permits. In the same way, money issues suggest the need for grants to hire staff as well as to rent a facility and pay fees. If equipment such as canoes, kayaks, and camera equipment were included in the Partial Build scenario, the availability and cost of equipment would be somewhat resolved as a barrier.

Target Market(s)

Interested stakeholders and park planners have suggested in general discussions that underserved youth, park visitors who represent a more ethnically and demographically diverse population could be targeted as potential users of Tettegouche, and especially the Outpost Learning Center. As with the No Build scenario, these groups could include those listed under the No Build scenario discussion above, with special expressed interest in the Partial Build scenario by groups such as Hartley Nature Center Youth Camps (5th-12th grade); Boys and Girls Club Teen Center (age 6-18 years, 40% Caucasian, 30% African American 13% Native American, the remainder mixed); Grand Portage Park Naturalist and Director of Education for the Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa (age 12-17 years); and Lakeview Covenant Church (young adults and families); Tettegouche Naturalist; and students at UMD (college-age).

Other Findings

Vermilion State Park Findings. As with the No Build scenario, the BBER reviewed survey findings from the Lake Vermilion State Park survey for possible information on user demand for the Partial Build scenario. Several additional activities might be introduced with the expanded build option, in addition to users' expressed interest in hike-in/cart-in camping; exhibits; naturalist-led hikes and/or boat tours; equipment rentals on site; outdoor skills building/how-to short courses (e.g. camping, geocaching, kayaking, ice fishing); opportunities for hunting and or fishing; and non-motorized recreation (e.g. biking, hiking, canoeing, snowshoeing, skiing).

The Tettegouche Partial Build scenario might also align with potential Vermilion users' interest in drive-in camping (81.4%); boat-in/canoe camping (76.4%); RV camping (45%); Wi-Fi (39%); outfitting/equipment rentals (70.2%); gathering space (62.8%); equipment rentals on site (58.2%); outdoor skills building/how-to short courses (e.g. camping, geocaching, kayaking, ice fishing) (47.5%); and opportunities for hunting and or fishing (50.1%).
Partial Build Scenario Break-even Calculation
As with the No Build scenario, our Partial Build break-even calculation begins with the demand assumptions about what level of activity can be estimated to occur for the scenario. (We break out the general population from the tribal interests.)

Activities assumption: BBER made assumptions about what activities, in what season, and what charges including facilities and program costs would be incurred by groups and individuals.

Table 3. TETTEGOUCHE OUTPOST LEARNING CENTER PARTIAL BUILD ANNUAL ACTIVITIES ASSUMPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities for the General Public</th>
<th>Group Facility</th>
<th>Group Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w Winter Cross-country skiing</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w Winter Snowshoeing</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w Winter Snowmobiling*</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s Summer Sea Kayaking*</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s Summer Archery *</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s Summer Rock climbing*</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s Summer Mountain Biking*</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s Summer ATV *</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y Year Nature Education</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y Year Outdoor photography</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y Year Geocaching</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y Year Backpacking</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y Year Camping</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y Year Fishing *</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y Year Birding kits</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y Year Outdoor Cooking</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y Year Astronomy programs</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tribal Activities: (not included in break-even calculation)

| Canoe building *                          | $75.00         | $50.00        |
| Snow Shoe building*                       | $75.00         | $50.00        |
| Building a wigwam/sweat lodge*            | $75.00         | $50.00        |

*Activity needing a specialized instructor

Legend: \textit{winter} winter activity; \textit{summer} summer activity; \textit{year round} year round activity

As with the No Build scenario, and based on the assumptions laid out at the beginning of this discussion, we assumed that there could be three levels of use within the Partial Build scenario. Here are the resulting ranges of break-even estimates.
Table 4. RANGES OF BREAK-EVEN ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partial Build</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility use</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>$122,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility and equipment use</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>$151,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility and equipment and instructor involvement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>$136,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note, combinations of these variables could deliver other results. A consultant with expertise in all these possible uses could estimate a mix of these assumptions for further break-even calculations.

3. Full Build Scenario

Estimating Demand

Assumptions

The "Full Build" scenario assumptions include the No Build assumptions and the Partial Build assumptions: These include No Build assumptions that users could bring their own equipment, provide their own staff for activities, and that lake shore access is available. The No Build scenario also assumes that the facility has a pavilion, fit pit, amphitheater, clean-up area (trash cans), parking, picnic tables, lighting in pavilion, and tenting area. The inclusion of Partial Build scenario assumptions lists student/class and equipment storage facilities, running water, grills, electric hookup, tenting area/camping, clean-up area, vault/modern toilets, tent camping area, parking, playground, open field play time, Wi-Fi, electricity, RV or trailer accommodations, a fridge and a microwave.

A Full Build scenario would extend this list to also include kitchen facilities, a projection screen, heated water, modern bathrooms and showers, a sauna facility, a bunkhouse (spilt gender), a private (staff) area, meeting space, and a dome roof (like a planetarium).

Activities

In the Full Build scenario, the use of the park includes further activities such as ATV activities, snowmobiling, motorized boats, and astronomy programs.

Native American pursuits from the previous scenarios could continue, such as canoe building; wild rice finishing (Brimson rice gathering); smoking of the white fish; snow shoe building; building a wigwam/sweat lodge; and medicine wheel activities. Also, activities identified with the No Build and Partial Build would continue: kayaking (sea kayaking), outdoor photography, cross-country skiing, hunting and canoeing.
Facilities

The full build scenario is designed for visitors who are not experienced campers. The full build allows visitors to experience the outdoors but gives them the comfort of sleeping and showering indoors. This scenario includes: a modern kitchen facility and bathrooms, a reception/lodging area, bunkrooms, meeting/dining room, and circler classroom. The kitchen facility would be equipped with a refrigerator, dish washer, stovetop, microwave, sink, and heated water. The modern bathrooms would include multiple sinks, toilets and urinals, as well as individual showers. The bathrooms would be attached to each of the bunkrooms. The bunkrooms would be spilt by gender. Within the bunkrooms there would be an additional room where the supervisor’s would sleep. The circler classroom would allow the visitors to sit in a circle facing each other. The roof of the classroom would be domed shape (similar to a planetarium). Having a dome roof will give the opportunity to have a projection system for classes learning astronomy. The area surrounding the building would include an area for campers that are tenting, RV camping, private camper cabins, and water access.

For the Full Build scenario, new amenities and accommodations would be added in addition to running water; grills; electric hookups; clean-up area (sinks); Wi-Fi; electricity; microwaves; vault/modern toilets; a tent camping area; parking; RV or trailer accommodations; a playground and open field for play time; and classroom storage areas.

Potential users of the Full Build facilities identified kitchen amenities such as a dish washer, a fridge, and heated water. Also identified as part of the Full Build would be personal hygiene amenities such as modern bathrooms, showers, and a sauna facility. This final scenario also upgrades accommodations with the introduction of lodging in the form of a bunkhouse (spilt gender), a separate staff private facility, a general meeting space, a projection screen, and a dome roof.

Equipment

For the Full Build scenario, two additional equipment needs were identified by potential users of Tettegouche: motorized vehicles and telescopes. This equipment would work in addition to the minimal expectations of potential visitors for the No Build scenario where users expect to bring their own equipment, and the Partial Build equipment scenario with access to canoes, kayaks, hunting equipment, and camera equipment.

Barriers

The barriers identified by potential users for the No Build and Partial Build scenarios included issues around seasonality (summer for families, fall for retirees, winter for young adults and locals) and transportation. These issues remain foremost on potential visitors' minds for the Full Build scenario, including gas prices, parking, group travel logistics including rentals, distance
from Duluth, day use time and travel issues, transportation rental arrangements, parking, distance from Duluth, time/travel for day use, and vehicle permits.

Money issues continue to suggest the need for grants to hire staff as well as to rent a facility and pay fees. Equipment such as canoes, kayaks, hunting equipment, and camera equipment may be included in the Partial Build scenario, with the addition of motorized vehicles and telescopes in the Full Build scenario.

Target Market(s)

The Full Build scenario would continue to serve markets in the No Build and Partial Build scenarios, for example, underserved youth, and park visitors who represent a more ethnically and demographically diverse populations. These include possible participation from the nature centers such as Hartley Nature Center Youth Camps; Boys and Girls Club Teen Center; Grand Portage Park Naturalist and Director of Education for the Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa; Lakeview Covenant Church; Tettegouche Naturalist; and students at UMD. Special interest in the Full Build was expressed by those interviewed from the Director of Education for the Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa, Northern MN and WI Girls Scouts.

Other Findings

Vermilion State Park Findings

As with the No Build and Partial Build scenarios, the BBER reviewed survey findings from the Lake Vermilion State Park survey for possible information on user demand for the Full Build scenario.

With this third scenario, several additional activities might be added to the first two scenarios, and the Vermilion survey suggests the following as potential user-driven demand for activities: motorized recreation, boating, touring by vehicle, snowmobiling (32%); boat-in/canoe camping (76%); connections to area ATV trails (21%); camper cabins (64%); lodging (25%); group camping or other lodging for larger groups (47%); meeting space (21%); and naturalist-led hikes and/or boat tours (58%).

Full Build Scenario Break-even Calculation

As with the No Build and Partial Build scenarios, our break-even calculation begins with assumptions about what activities can be estimated to occur annually, by whom (we break out the general population and the tribal interests), by season (we identify activities in three possible seasonal break-outs—winter, summer, and year-round), and by revenue sources (including costs and charges, such as facilities and program costs).

Activities assumption: made assumptions about what activities, by whom, what season, and charges including facilities and program costs.
Table 5. TETTEGOUCHE OUTPOST LEARNING CENTER FULL BUILD ANNUAL ACTIVITIES ASSUMPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities for the General Public</th>
<th>Group Facility</th>
<th>Group Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w Cross-country skiing</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w Snowshoeing</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w Snowmobiling *</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s Sea Kayaking*</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s Archery *</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s Rock climbing*</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s Mountain Biking*</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s ATV *</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Nature Education</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Outdoor photography</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Geocaching</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Backpacking</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Camping</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Fishing *</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y Birding kits</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y Outdoor Cooking</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y Astronomy programs</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Activities for Tribal Programs   | Group Facility | Group Program |
| Canoe building *                 | $75.00         | $50.00        |
| Snow Shoe building*              | $75.00         | $50.00        |
| Building a wigwam/sweat lodge*   | $75.00         | $50.00        |

As with the No Build and Partial Build scenarios, and based on the assumptions laid out at the beginning of this discussion, we assumed that there could be three levels of use within the Full build scenario. Here are the resulting ranges of break-even estimates.

Table 6. RANGES OF BREAK-EVEN ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Build</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility use</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>$149,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility and equipment use</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>$185,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility and equipment and instructor involvement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>$166,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note, combinations of these variables could deliver other results. A consultant with expertise in all these possible uses could estimate a mix of these assumptions for further break-even calculations.
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Outpost Learning Center Users

BBER reviewed current users of Tettegouche State Park as well as conducted interviews with representatives of target markets. BBER also researched into the background literature of demand for outdoor recreation learning programs. A range of possible users was suggested.

Outdoor Adventure Day

The outdoor recreation day at Tettegouche State Park offered six activities in which people of all ages and capabilities could participate. The one-day event was held on a Saturday at the end of June. While the actual event was successful and numerous people attended, two issues arose that should be of note for future planning of similar events. In response to the lack of public transportation with which participants could access the event, buses were provided to Tettegouche from Duluth and back again. However, the buses were not used. Also, program staff had already worked the full five-day work week, and they were reluctant to work a six-day week. Therefore, when planning events, it is recommended to keep program staff scheduling in mind.

Lessons from the Wolf Ridge

As referenced in a letter provided to the BBER, the BBER has concluded that the potential of a Wolf Ridge Environmental Learning Center partnership with Tettegouche State Park involves two considerations. With Wolf Ridge’s current programming, approximately 80% of its participants are youth; of that, 60% come from families living in the Twin Cities, and 20% are from urban families and populations with racial diversity. Thus, users are available for program expansion to Tettegouche. Also of consideration is the request for exclusive management of the facility by Wolf Ridge with some level of negotiation available. It is the recommendation, based upon the letter, that Tettegouche State Park consider the potential of entering into a non-exclusive partnership with Wolf Ridge Environmental Learning Center.

Lessons from college outdoor programs

College students seen as potential users of Tettegouche State Park cannot be categorized into one group for purposes of this report. Today’s college students consist of a diverse group of subpopulations, with dominate subpopulations having existed since the 1700s. Some of the main subcultures include College Men, Outsiders, Rebels, and most recently College Women and Nerds. In addition, the mix of students on college campuses is composed of several generations—Millennial (Generation Y), Generation X, and Baby Boomers. Further, students comprise various subgroups—ethnicity, disabled, traditional or non-traditional, private or public college, athletic participation, sexual orientation and others. Therefore, these students of different subpopulations, generations and subgroups have different agendas, goals, ambitions, attitudes and experiences that have shaped their lives and continue to shape their lives. In light
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of these findings, they cannot be categorized and generalized into one study group for purposes of this report. Minorities that might be targeted include ethnic groups such as Asian Americans, African American, Native Americans, Latinos and Chicanos, as well as other minorities such as GLBT groups and Women’s Groups.

Other sources include Dr. Debbie Chavez, Supervisory Social Science Analyst, Urban Ecosystems and Social Dynamics, of the USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station in Riverside, California, who is a notable resource on national park usage by diverse populations. Some of her publications are as follows.


Some of Dr. Chavez’s findings include:

- A study performed Schulman Grove on the Inyo National Forest in California. Visitors were interested in having more natural history, geology, scientific information and staff interaction available. They preferred traditional interpretation without the use of technology – citing the purpose of enacting a visit to a natural area was to escape technology.
- A study on the San Antonio Canyon and San Gabriel Canyon on the Angeles National Forest. Day Visitors were comprised of white or Latino users. These users were there for more than four hours and were hiking, picnicking and swimming/wading. They wanted more information regarding camping and hiking, barbeque and picnicking areas, and when to avoid crowds. The recommendations included using on-site communication resources such as brochures, signage and bulletin board displays.
- Additionally Dr. Chavez was part of The Pacific Southwest Research Station’s Wildland Recreation and Urban Cultures development of the report, “Recreation Visitor Research: Studies of Diversity.” Sixteen individual studies are included in the final report under the categories of International Studies, Management Studies: Programs, Outreach and Employment, Synthesis of Studies, Environmental Belief Studies; Communication Studies, and Measurement Studies.

Papers of note by Dr. Chavez include:

- Serving the needs of Latino recreation visitors to urban-proximate natural resource recreation areas
• Diverse users of four urban national forests; participation, preferences and perceptions
• Physical activity among Hispanic/Latino and non-Hispanic/Latino white visitors on urban-proximate public lands
• Connecting Latinos with nature
• Physical activity patterns and preferences among Latinos in different types of public parks

Scenarios and Use-Level Break-even Comparisons
The ranges of break-even calculations for the three levels of usage outlined in the above tables (for each scenario) offers us an opportunity to provide comparisons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Levels:</th>
<th>No Build events</th>
<th>No Build revenue</th>
<th>Partial Build events</th>
<th>Partial Build revenue</th>
<th>Full build events</th>
<th>Full build revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility use</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>$122,500</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>$149,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility and equipment use</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>$133,500</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>$151,500</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>$185,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility and equipment and instructor</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>$120,750</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>$136,850</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>$166,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given an assumption about the fixed and variable costs, it would take the maximum number of events in the Full Build or highest cost scenario to break-even. The comparison table shows that the lowest number of events occurs in the No Build scenario and the highest number of events occurs in the Full Build.
Another way to look at these "what if" conditions are through the following graphs:

In general, a rule of thumb might be that the cost will be borne by the number of events. The comparison table and these graphs show possible limits and extremes of three projected scenarios. Note that a gift shop, donations, and state subsidies are not yet part of these calculations. If any of these variables are greater than zero $, the number of events that would be required to break-even would be lowered.

**Economic Issues**

**Outdoor Participation and the Economy**

42% 42% of outdoor participants say the economy impacts how often they participate in outdoor activities. The Economy and Participation Outdoor Participants Non- Outdoor Participants Cutting back on non-essentials 47.0% 44.2% Cutting back on dining/entertainment 41.9% 39.1% Earning less 25.1% 24.3% Increase in medical/healthcare expenses 25.0% 27.5% Increase in household expenses 24.0% 24.2% Cutting back on donations to charities 23.3% 23.9% Concerned about potential job loss 10.1% 8.0% Recent job loss 9.2% 8.2% Buying new home 3.8% 2.3% What was your economic situation in 2009? The economy in 2009 continued to impact the outdoor industry, with 42 percent of outdoor participants saying the economy affects how often they participate in outdoor activities. 47 percent said they cut back on
non-essentials, and 42 percent said they were cutting back on dining and entertainment. A quarter of all outdoor participants reflected that they are earning less and seeing increases in medical and healthcare expenses. Less than four percent reported buying a new home in 2009. That said, more than half of all outdoor participants said they spent about the same amount on sports, fitness and recreation activities in 2009 as they had the previous year. That is the same number as non-outdoor participants. About a fourth of both groups reported spending considerably less in 2009 than in 2008, and only a fraction of each spent more in 2009. Those cuts in spending came primarily from equipment purchases, travel for participation in sports and recreation and pay-to-play fees.

![Figure 2. REGIONAL POPULATION TREND](image_url)

**Regional Population Trend**

Stony River township, Lake County
Beaver Bay city
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Thunder Bay, Canada
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Source: US Census Bureau, Population Estimates Program
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Recommendations

BBER suggests that without further detailed data about cost, demand, and other revenue sensitive variables, the three assumed configurations provide a useful beginning for the discussion of the viability of build scenarios for the proposed Tettegouche Outpost Learning Center. As planners gather more information, these estimations can be strengthened by looking at the specific cost of construction, for example.

Based on interviews by BBER, interest in Tettegouche State Park and attendance data support the expectation that it is probable that the learning center can meet and exceed break-even goals.

On a positive note, Tettegouche is a popular destination and opportunities are many. As noted in this report, user demand is promising. Groups showing special interest in programs and use from tribes (Grand Portage and Fond Du Lac) expressed specific interest and use for various scenarios. To take full advantage of the park the Full Build scenario ties into group interest from tribes, although planners will need a survey on willingness and ability to pay. The proposed scenarios should be rolled out as a phased approach. However, ability to pay is veering off from willingness to pay. The downturn in current economic conditions and the pace of the recovery should also be taken into consideration.

BBER also recommends the following: The Coordinator position is extremely important to the success of the Tettegouche Learning Center (TLC). This coordinator will need good technical and educator skills, but also be able to build relationships with community leaders. Also, groups that are not as familiar with the outdoors will require building a trusted relationship with community leaders. Many minority groups are reluctant to get involved in activities. Therefore, this is a long-term project.

Both Fond du Lac and Grand Portage tribal communities have shown a strong interest in Tettegouche State Park and the TLC. Fond du Lac Community College has indicated that the college may be interested in using the TLC in its academic program in partnership with UMD. Planners of the strategy for rolling out the learning center should also review several joint programs with UMD and Tribes, including college courses, workshops, and other events. These could include activities for tribes only or more public access.

BBER also recommends Tettegouche create a strategy for rolling out development of the outpost learning center. Begin by targeting groups that are familiar with Tettegouche State Park. It has a long and great reputation. Current users of Tettegouche include colleges – public and private, who offer Outdoor programs – or use the park for science field work, or fine arts activities. Also in this group would be churches using the park for retreats and other outings.
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Other groups familiar with the park include visitors to Hartley Nature Center, populations at UMD and other regional and state colleges, Boy and Girl Scouts, previous Adventure Day participants, the general public including families, and the Audubon Center of the North Woods.

Additionally, groups focused on outdoor programming, such as Outward Bound, that most likely have their own equipment as well as transportation and funds, may have an interest in the outpost learning center.

Youth groups such as Boys & Girls Club, and groups affiliated with the City of Duluth must develop relationships to get them to use the center. Perceived barriers for these groups are distance (time to travel), clothing, and staffing.

Finally, the outpost learning center can cultivate a relationship with groups not specifically recognized as outdoor enthusiasts, such as international students and other students groups. Minorities that might be targeted include ethnic groups such as Asian Americans, African American, Native Americans, Latinos and Chicanos, as well as other minorities such as GLBT groups and Women’s Groups.
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Appendix A: Financial Planning

Financial planning for a Tettegouche Outpost Learning Center must include background financials as well as reasonable projections. Financial business planning must also consider long-term costs of operation, and provide for the economic sustainability of the Tettegouche Outpost Learning Center. Although the necessary information for such planning is not yet in place, a brief sketch of a possible methodology for such planning is presented here.

A traditional business plan covers key areas such as the industry definition, company’s legal structure (see DNR Mission and Vision), history, SWOT Analysis, mission, vision, goals, objectives, products/services, customers, competitors, strategies, ownership, operations, personnel, suppliers, technology, and financial projections (and associated assumptions).

A traditional business plan also typically covers financial statements, first year projected income statement (Monthly), first year projected cash flow statement (Monthly), second and third years projected income statements (Annual), second and third years projected cash flow statements (Annual), beginning balance sheet, and three years ending balance sheets.

Description of Business:

Mission and Objectives, Including Proposed Building/Refitting/Expansions

Market Analysis and Strategy:

Identifying Competition
Survey of Local Demand
Identifying Keys to Success

Financial planning for the business can include the following:

Historical documentation Tax Returns Vendor Income Financial Projections Key Assumptions
Source and Use of Funds Statement Income Statement, Balance Sheet, Cash Flow Further 2-Year Projections Depreciation calculation

Finally, the business planning process can include consideration of Non-Market Issues. For the Tettegouche Outpost Learning Center, given the nature of its affiliation with a Minnesota State Park, and the nature of its public service-oriented business model, trends and growth are possibly of more interest than fine grained, profit-oriented financial analysis.
Appendix B: HPER Recommendations

The project to study options for a Tettegouche Outpost Learning Center was presented as a partnering project between the UMD's Labovitz School research bureau (BBER) and Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation Students (HPER) in Operations and Management (EnEd 4315), Fall 2010, under the direction of Kenneth L. Gilbertson. The report filed by HPER students is available from the BBER in pdf format. For the convenience of readers of the BBER's report, recommendations from the HPER report are quoted below. Table and figure numbers refer to the original document.

Introduction to Recommendations

Upon reviewing the mission and vision of the MN DNR, Minnesota State Parks and Trails Division, and Tettegouche State Park, the natural and social history of Tettegouche State Park, and the location of the proposed Outpost Learning Center, several recommendations have been created. For establishment of the OLC, recommendations include: proposed mission and vision statement, programming, equipment, staffing, facilities development, external site development and operational costs.

Outpost Learning Center Recommended Mission Statement

The Outpost Learning Center will serve as a gateway site for youth and underrepresented populations to develop a relationship with the outdoors through skills development in recreational activities, outdoor experiences and educational opportunities along Lake Superior.

Outpost Learning Center Recommended Vision Statement

To provide outdoor recreation opportunities and education for diverse user groups by:

- Managing and operating the Outpost Learning Center in alignment with the mission of the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources and vision and strategies of Tettegouche State Park.
- Building partnerships with current and potential users to increase the access to park resources for all visitors including those with disabilities and underrepresented communities in a way that will not impair significant resources.
- Protecting and enhancing the natural, cultural and scenic resources that contribute to the unique character of the Outpost Learning Center within the park.
- Maintaining proper balance between resource protection and recreational use of the site.
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• Managing North Shore Highlands Ecosystem habitats within the site sustainably and responsibly.
• Recognizing our responsibility to the public for wise and prudent management of areas of special resource significance.
• Recognizing the Outpost Learning Center’s educational and interpretive roles in promoting a sense of stewardship among site visitors.
• Actively seeking and adopting innovative, effective and efficient management practices.
• Providing high quality public service.
• Constantly seeking public involvement and support in decision making.

Program Recommendations

The Outpost Learning Center at Tettegouche State Park will support a number of programs that range from seasonal day programs to overnight year-round activities. *Table 1* explains the current programs available at Tettegouche State Park, as well as programs that can be added at the OLC site with available staff and funding. The table also illustrates how the programs can be broken up so that groups can use the Outpost Learning Center all year. The table is broken down into day-use and overnight-use activities. Although there are not many activities in the overnight-use categories, many of the day-use activities could extend over multiple days, and resulting in the utilization of the OLC facilities overnight. Overnight-use activities could be doubled to fit day-use activities if visitors are at the OLC for a shorter amount of time. Finally, the table is divided into summer, winter, and year-round activities. Highest visitation rates to Tettegouche State Park are during the summer months. However with established winter and year-round programs, visitation rates may increase during the traditional ‘off-season.’

Programming Seasonal Use

*Table 1*: Recommended programs for the proposed OLC, divided into use and seasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day Use</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Year-Round</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rock Climbing</td>
<td>Snowmobile Interpretation</td>
<td>Geocaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. Biking</td>
<td>Cross-Country Skiing</td>
<td>Fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archery</td>
<td>Snowshoe</td>
<td>Outdoor Photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All-Terrain Vehicle (ATV)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nature Education/Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor Cooking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight Use</td>
<td>Sea Kayaking</td>
<td>Snowshoe</td>
<td>Camping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-Country Skiing</td>
<td>Backpacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor Cooking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bureau of Business and Economic Research
Labovitz School of Business and Economics
University of Minnesota Duluth
The data we collected supports potential users utilizing a day-use and an overnight-use facility at Tettegouche State Park. The activities identified in Table 1 would support a facility that was available for year-round and overnight-use. This layout of programs would decrease the potential for high- or low-use seasons at the OLC.

Survey participants listed camping and backpacking as two of the main activities that they would like to see offered at the Outpost Learning Center. These traditional activities can occur all year round and would support an overnight facility. Other activities that potential user groups supported to see were rock climbing, sea kayaking, cross-country skiing and snowshoeing. Rock climbing and sea kayaking has the potential to draw large numbers of users to the Outpost Learning Center in the summer, and while cross-country skiing and snowshoeing will likely draw users in the winter months. This combination of programs again minimizes the chance of a lull in visitation rates to The Outpost Learning Center.

While our survey did not support motorized sports activities, user surveys conducted by the MN DNR, Tettegouche management, and recreation specialises at UMD, feel this is a growing user group. Additionally ATV and snowmobile trails currently exist at the park, which provides an easy transition into managing programs. Therefore, we are recommending both ATV and snowmobile interpretation programs be offered at the OLC.

Users also indicated that they would like to see more programs with technology offered. Geocaching is an example of these types of programs that is currently offered in other Minnesota State Parks. Finally, all programs are recommended to support 20 [possibly 25] participants or less. This number is congruent to the desired carrying capacity of the facility.

Programming Operational Cost Recommendations

Operational costs for programming include program equipment fees, facility use fees, and instructor fees. Cost of equipment is based on 20 [possibly 25] participants. Details concerning equipment are described in a later section, titled Equipment Recommendations.

To have a snowmobile interpretation program, it is recommended that the users supply their own snowmobiles and gear. The instructor of the program should have a snowmobile which can be purchased for less than $5,000. Industry standards state that an interpreter for this program should be paid $100/day. It is recommended that the flat rate for an interpretive program will include a $100 program fee and a $75 facility rental fee.

For a cross-country ski program it is recommended that the OLC purchase all the equipment for an upfront cost of $8,000. An instructor will be hired to teach this program from an outside
source and will be paid $200 a day. The user groups will pay an $80 program fee, a $75 facility rental fee and a $7/person equipment rental fee.

Tettegouche State Park already owns and rents out snowshoes to visitors, so they will not need to buy or rent equipment to start a snowshoe program. The Outpost Learning Center will need to hire someone to teach snowshoeing and possibly do an interpretive hike for $100/day. The user will pay a $60 program fee, a $75 facility fee and a $4/person equipment rental fee.

It is recommended that the OLC outsource the renting of rock climbing equipment from an outfitter for a program at a cost approximately $200/program. The person who leads this program must be trained in the various rock climbing techniques, safety, and proper use of equipment. Due to the high level of specialized knowledge necessary, they will be paid $100/day. No equipment rental fee will be charged to individual groups. Groups will be charged $100 for a programming fee and $75 for a day-use rental of the facility. (Personal communication with Tim Bates, Dec 6th, 2010)

It is recommended that the participants of mountain biking programs at the OLC supply their own bikes and equipment. This will reduce the operational costs to the Outpost Learning Center. An instructor will be brought in and paid $75 a program. The user will pay a $50 program fee and a $75 facility rental fee.

All-Terrain Vehicle (ATV) interpretive rides will be similar to mountain biking in that user groups must supply their own equipment. The Outpost Learning Center will supply the interpreter with a vehicle which can be purchased for less than $5,000. An interpreter will lead this program and will be paid $100/day for their service. The user group will pay a $100 program fee and a $75 facility rental fee. (Personal communication with Tim Bates, Dec 6th, 2010)

Tettegouche State Park currently runs an “Archery in the Park” program. The cost for the Outpost Learning Center to purchase their own equipment is a onetime fee of $6,000. Hiring an instructor for this program costs $60/day. The user groups will pay a $50 program fee and a $75 facility rental fee.

Outsourcing the renting of sea kayaks would cost $20 per seat or $400 for a group of 20. Due to the expertise needed, an instructor would expect to be paid $200/day. User groups will pay a program fee of $100, and a $100 facility rental fee.

To initially start up a geocaching program it will cost the OLC $2,000 in equipment. This program will need an instructor who will be paid $50 a program. The user will pay a $50 program fee and a $75 facility rental fee. (Personal communication with Tim Bates, Dec 6th, 2010)
For a fly-fishing program the cost of purchasing the equipment will cost the OLC $1,900. The person who is hired to lead this program will be paid $75 a program due to the specialized skills involved in fly-fishing. This brings the total operational program cost to a one-time fee of $1,900 plus $75 for every program. The user will pay a $75 program fee, a $75 facility rental fee and a $7/person equipment rental fee.

Equipment for a spin-casting fishing program will cost a one-time fee of $1500 to the OLC. The instructor hired to lead the program will be paid $75 per program. The user will be charged a $75 for a program fee, a $50 facility rental fee, and a $7/person equipment rental fee.

For the Outdoor Photography program, users are asked to provide their own equipment such as cameras, lenses and other technology that they may require. This saves the OLC money on equipment rental/purchase. A person who is knowledgeable in outdoor photography will come in and lead the program. They will be paid $100 a program for their guidance in the areas of photography. The operational program cost to the park is only $100 per program. The user will pay a $50 program fee and a $75 facility rental fee. (Personal communication with Tim Bates, Dec 6th, 2010)

The nature education program will require the use of a lot of materials and so the start up operational cost will be $2000. There will be an interpreter to lead the educational programs and they will be paid $100 a program. This amount is based on the industry standard for naturalist/interpreters. The user groups will pay a $50 program fee and a $75 facility rental fee.

Outdoor cooking is a program that will run all year long is recommended for overnight-use of the facility. The operational program cost will be a one-time fee of $200 needed for equipment and $50 per program for the naturalist to lead the program. The user will pay a $50 program fee, a $100 facility rental fee and a $4/person equipment rental fee.

Camping is also a program that can be run year-round and is recommended for overnight-use. The operational program cost for the OLC will be a onetime fee of $1,250 for equipment. The user will pay a $75 program fee, a $100 facility rental and a $7/person equipment rental fee.

Backpacking is a program strongly supported by the survey. The operational program cost for the OLC will be a one-time cost of $1,000 for equipment. The user will pay a $75 program fee, a $100 facility rental fee, plus a $4/person equipment rental fee. (Personal communication with Tim Bates, Dec 6th, 2010)

Equipment Recommendations

The following three charts, Tables 2-4, provide an explanation for how the Outpost Learning Center will provide specialized equipment for the recommended programs offered at the OLC. It is broken into day, night and year-round programs to follow the format of above programming explanations. The equipment is then broken down into equipment source. The
options are Outsources, Purchase and Park Owns. Outsourced means that the Outpost Learning Center will allow outside outfitters to rent the facility for a small fee and provide equipment/programming for users of the center to create revenue for both the outfitter and the OLC. Purchase means that it is recommended that the OLC purchase the equipment from local outfitters for specific use by the center. Finally, Park Owns means that Tettegouche State Park currently owns the equipment.

The chart is then broken into Operational Equipment Cost, which is the total cost for the program, and Equipment Cost per Unit, which is the cost for a set of equipment per user.

Surveys supported on-site rental of equipment for programming. For a short-term plan, it is advised that the Outpost Learning Center contract rental with an outfitter to provide equipment for three to five years. If programs are successful then it is recommended that the OLC purchase equipment to then provide on-site rentals. Equipment such as kayaks, rock climbing gear and backpacks should be rented from a local outfitter initially. This will promote sustainable practices while helping build community ties and support for the Outpost Learning Center. Since camping was placed high on the list of programs that potential user groups wanted to see, it is advised that the OLC purchase camping gear such as stoves, tents, sleeping bags, pads from local outfitters.

Overall, we are recommending the Outpost Learning Center at Tettegouche State Park support a variety of programs year-round, which will help build positive relationships with the surrounding communities and businesses. For a long-term plan, it is recommended that the Outpost Learning Center purchase all necessary equipment for programming, in order to reduce rental costs for the user and earn some revenue for Tettegouche State Park.

Equipment for educational programs such as geocaching or nature education will not be purchased on a short or long-term plan. Rather, it is recommended that Tettegouche State Park purchase equipment in order to have supplies readily available to all users of the OLC at an affordable cost. (For specific equipment needs for each program, see Appendix to the HPER Report)
Equipment Operational Costs Recommendations

Winter Program Equipment Operational Cost

*Table 2*: Operational equipment cost and equipment cost per participant for the winter season.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Rental</th>
<th>Recommended Programs</th>
<th>Equipment Source</th>
<th>Operational Equipment Cost</th>
<th>Equipment Cost per Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day-Use</td>
<td>Snowmobile Interpretation</td>
<td>Users Provide</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross Country Skis</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Snowshoe</td>
<td>Park Owns</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Overnight-use   | Snowshoe                 | Park Owns        | NA                         | NA                            |
|                 | Cross Country Skis       | Purchase         | $8,000                     | $400                          |

Summer Program Equipment Operational Cost

*Table 3*: Operational equipment cost and equipment cost per participant for the summer season.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Rental</th>
<th>Recommended Programs</th>
<th>Equipment Source</th>
<th>Operational Equipment Cost</th>
<th>Equipment Cost per Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day-Use</td>
<td>Rock Climbing</td>
<td>Outsource</td>
<td>$200 (per program)</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain Biking</td>
<td>Users Provide</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archery</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATV Interpretation</td>
<td>Users Provide</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight-use</td>
<td>Sea Kayaking</td>
<td>Outsource</td>
<td>$400 (per program)</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Year-Round Program Equipment Operational Cost

Table 4: Operational equipment cost and equipment cost per participant for year-round programming.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Rental</th>
<th>Recommended Programs</th>
<th>Equipment Source</th>
<th>Operational Equipment Cost</th>
<th>Equipment Cost per Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day-Use</td>
<td>Geocaching</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fly-Fishing</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
<td>$95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor Photography</td>
<td>Users Provide</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature Education</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight-use</td>
<td>Outdoor Cooking</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Backpacking</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spin Fishing</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External Site Development Recommendations

External site development of the OLC should provide basic amenities such as drinking water, toilets, and electricity. This will support the five campsites recommended for development at the OLC. Additionally, a fire pit for outdoor food preparation and an eating area with picnic-table should be included in each campsite. This number of sites is appropriate given the building is designed to support groups of 20 people. In order to assist potential first time campers in having a comfortable experience, the five outdoor campsites available should be developed within walking distance of the proposed Outpost Learning Center. Due to the fact that the Outpost Learning Center is located adjacent to the busy U.S. Highway 61, we are also recommending native trees be planted to act as a noise and privacy barrier for the campsites.

We are also recommending trail development be included in the external development of the site. Trails should be developed linking the OLC to The Lake Superior Hiking Trail and the new Tettegouche Visitor Center. It is recommended in the long-range plan that a trail under the road to provide for snowmobile/ATVs to cross under U.S. Highway 61 safely be built. We also recommend the removal of the impervious parking-lot pavement. Removal of the pavement will leave much of the area bare, therefore performing site beautification including landscaping with native plantings would help return the area to its natural state. It is also recommended to
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replace a small section of the current pavement with a pervious surface to allow access for large groups.

To protect the sensitive areas around the existing wetlands, a boardwalk and maintained trail should be developed through the wetlands for beach access and to decrease impact on sensitive habitats. A viewing platform and signage should be developed to direct visitors away from sensitive cultural areas and provide interpretive direction. However to better understand and assess site development, Tettegouche State Park should consider the MN DNR’s biological assessment of the wetlands and cultural assessment of the site into account.

Facilities Development Recommendations

Currently, there are two buildings located at the proposed Outpost Learning Center site. The larger of the two structures is the garage or Equipment Storage Building No. 90226 which is currently owned and operated by the Minnesota Department of Transportation (Figure 11). This building was constructed in 1961. The building is roughly 44’8” X 80’8”, or 3520 square feet. There are two, ten-foot overhead garage doors, which allows a drive-through option. The building has two additional entrances and five windows, three feet wide. It is undetermined whether these entrances comply with ADA regulations.

Current Garage at MN DOT Site

Facilities also include one stool and sink for restroom use on the first floor and an additional storage area, 12’x18’, located on the second floor balcony. According to architectural drawings, the building was outfitted with a submersible pump, a fuel oil tank, a septic system and a well. Both the well and septic units will need to be replaced with further development of the building.

The second building located on site includes a salt storage shed located on the north section of the property. The structure is wooden and approximately 20’x40’. Due to structural and safety concerns, the storage shed will be torn down when MN DNR takes possession of the site.

Figure 11: Current MN DOT vehicle storage facility (A. Hummel, 2010).
As part of the feasibility study, two options were put forth by the MN DNR about the structures on the site. One was a partial-build option, which meant that the current garage that exists would be refurbished without any new structures being built. The second was the full-build option, which included possible refurbishing of the current garage as well as the building of a new structure on the site.

After looking at the data collected and goals for the Outpost Learning Center, it is recommended that Tettegouche State Park support the full-build option. The data collected supports the building of a brand new structure that would include overnight accommodations, as well as classroom and/or meeting space for up to 20 users. Building plans for this structure are identified in Figures 12-14.

It is proposed that the new building have a classroom that is large enough to comfortably support learning up to 20 [possibly 25] people, provide storage space for the class materials being used, and office space staff housed at the OLC, as well as the potential users and chaperones.

The building would be designed for user groups to be able to stay overnight, thus there needs to be sleeping facilities for the groups which should be a maximum of 20 people. Two large sleeping quarters with 15 beds each is recommended so that groups with a large majority of boys or girls could still have separated rooms by gender. There are also two smaller rooms so that adult chaperones and or instructors would have private sleeping spaces.

In order to meet the users’ natural human needs, there will be bathrooms with enough stalls and showers to support 30+ people comfortably as well. There will also be a multi-use area that can serve as a site for meetings, classes or dining facilities. The building will also provide a kitchenette to help refrigerate food and beverages, as well as provide a microwave and sink to allow visitors space for simple food preparation.

For accessibility there will be both stairs and an elevators providing users with physical disabilities have access to the Outpost Learning Center. All doors, hallways and bathrooms will be made in compliance with ADA standards.
Figure 12: First floor of proposed new building at the Outpost Learning Center (A. Hummel, 2010.)
Figure 13: Second floor of proposed new building at the Outpost Learning Center (A. Hummel, 2010).

Figure 14: Existing garage at the Outpost Learning Center (A. Hummel, 2010).
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The Outpost Learning Center will be built to incorporate green technologies and ideally will be LEED Certified. It will also be equipped with wireless Internet access so that groups can use laptops or other wireless devices should they need them.

In order to provide enough space for the projected activities, we are recommending garage space that will be developed from the existing building on site. It should be large enough to house ten kayaks, a trailer, archery equipment, snowshoes, skis, boots, poles, and additional programming equipment for 20 people.

It is recommended that the proposed Outpost Learning Center be built next to the current garage, for proximity to storage space, and reduce adding onto the footprint that already exists.

Staffing Recommendations

In order for the Outpost Learning Center to be functional, it must be properly staffed. After reviewing the mission and vision of Tettegouche State Park and the MN DNR, and taking into account the possible recreation activities taking place at the Outpost Learning Center, certain criteria need to be met when hiring staff.

It is recommended, based on user needs and programs offered at the Outpost Learning Center, that a minimum of one full-time employee work at the OLC. This person will be the Community Outreach and Program Coordinator. They will have the help of one-two seasonal staff, (recreational resource assistants) who will help manage equipment rental and maintenance and potentially lead some programs.

Following the Gateway Initiative set forth by the MN DNR, any staff working at the Outpost Learning Center must have experience and understanding with population dynamics of groups that will most often be using the Outpost Learning Center. These groups include youth and underrepresented racial, ethnic and low-income populations. The Community Outreach and Program Coordinator’s main focus will be to connect with the community leaders of the targeted user groups. This person should have strong interpersonal and community building skills which will help get these groups to the site.

Because of the unique number of recreational activities that can be offered directly from the Outpost Learning Center, any staff working at the site should have some background and experience with formal and non-formal recreation and education settings. Most of the programs requiring guides will be outsourced from different companies and outfitters in the surrounding local communities.
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An individual applying for the Outpost Learning Center’s Community Outreach and Program Coordinator position must have previous experience in outdoor recreation, natural resources, environmental education or a related field, developing outreach programs and community support. This individual must have a working knowledge of multiple outdoor recreational activities and be comfortable working with numerous age and racial groups.

Due to the wide range of qualifications and attributes associated with the Community Outreach and Program Coordinator position, we are recommending their base salary range from $49,569 - $53,265 (P. Leversedge, personal communication, September 21, 2010). This figure is reflective of salaries of current Natural Resource Park Specialists within the MN DNR agency. However, the operational cost to support this full-time staff member also includes a benefits package, increasing the operational cost by twenty percent. Therefore, we are recommending the management of Tettegouche State Park budget roughly $65,000 for the Community Outreach and Program Coordinator.

Furthermore, the two recommended seasonal staff housed at the Outpost Learning Center must have a background in leading and developing outdoor recreational activities. Additionally, they must have a working knowledge of a wide range of recreational equipment, consistent with programming needs described in above sections. Again, these staff members must have experience working with individuals ranging in ages, abilities, and racial and cultural backgrounds. It is our recommendation, based on current naturalist wages, that seasonal staff earn a wage ranging from $13-$23 hourly, or $6,240-$11,040 for a three month season (MN DNR, 2010b). Including workers benefits for seasonal staff increases the operational budget by ten percent. After calculations, the estimated operational budget for two seasonal staff members for the Outpost Learning Center is roughly $6,864 - $12,144.

Maintenance Recommendations

The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources will be responsible for site management and maintenance according to agency-specific standards. Maintenance costs for the site may be partially offset by user fees according to budgetary needs and availability of funds. Maintenance duties may potentially include: building upkeep, grounds upkeep, snow removal, and trails, boardwalk, and campground maintenance.