

Why did you vote yes?
Age Group: 18-35

I believe it is important for our society to take responsibility for maintaining clean water and habitats where wildlife can thrive. God created the natural world and it is our job to take care of it. I am a non-hunter who likes our environment to be clean and pure.

A young woman bemoaned the loss of arts in the schools but was pleased by the growth of art communities and festivals around the state and felt it important to support arts throughout Minnesota.

Bike trails and parks were an additional concern for younger citizens and they hoped that non-metro parks trails would be funded fairly.

The 20 something I spoke with stated that she was concerned about the arts.

She voted yes because of the environment, mostly the clean water, parks and trails as opposed to the hunting and fishing. She thinks they lost a lot of money in the past and that we should have long-term investments in these programs.

I voted for it because it'd support the things that make our state unique. There's no other city that I know of that has anything like the Minneapolis chain of lakes with its parks, trails and concerts. The arts are so important. The museums and environment are important too.

Voted for it because we spend a lot of money on things that aren't worth it and this will get where it's needed.

I voted yes for the drinking water.

Environment is important.

Felt there was a need for the funding.

Cares about the outdoors and wants that to be better for all people in Minnesota. Is a dancer and hopes that expanded opportunities are available for work and viewing by all

people. Thinks this is a quality of life issue. Enjoys the theatre and arts that we now have and thinks that with expansion more young people will stay in Minnesota.

To see Minnesota lakes preserved and protected.

For clean water. I voted for it because I am proud of Minnesota. To keep our Outdoor and Cultural resources strong.

I voted yes because the environment is something that must be preserved for our generation and future generations.

Voted for the amendment because she feared that the Legislature would not be able to find the resources for conservation of protection of Minnesota water resources.

A 26 year old yes voter wanted high quality outdoor opportunities because leisure time travel was beyond his budget.

Voted yes because she has a science background and believes in preserving the environment.

Voted yes on the amendment because she has personally seen the degradation of Minnesota's lakes and believes it is due to lack of funding. Cited the example of milfoil in Lake Minnetonka where she spent time with her Grandparents as a child.

I care about the environment and a friend at work clued me in on it. I took his word for it. I don't know if the constitution is the best way to do it, but it will make it happen.

He voted yes because he was concerned about the environment.

Clean Water

Voted for the amendment because of the dedicated money for the arts.

He voted for the outdoors.

Sounded like a good idea.

Because I don't trust the state to provide the funding levels necessary to carry out the goals of the amendment.

I wanted there to be more funding for cleaning up our water.

I voted yes because I expected these funds to enhance what Minnesota already has! I know both the Minnesota State Arts Board and Regional Arts Councils have systems in place that address diversity issues and ensure opportunities and services to both young and old throughout the entire state. As well, funding is determined by public panels to avoid biased decisions regarding the allocation of funds. These access points are very important to the way I expected this money would be spent. I voted yes because this funding would allow these organizations to enhance the services they already provide throughout the entire state of Minnesota.

I voted yes for the amendment because I think that the minute increase in sales tax will have immeasurable benefits for the promotion of the arts and the protection of the environment in Minnesota. We have a long and distinguished heritage of artistic achievement, and I am proud that our state will now be giving additional funds to art and cultural programs. They feed the mind and soul in the same way a clean and accessible wilderness nourishes the body.

Generally very green and very pro-environment, really liked all of the items in the amendment and supports more funding for them. Did not care about the sales tax increase.

The Legislature and Governor have struggled to pass meaningful funding for these critical areas of our state and heritage, so I did it for them.

Cultural and Natural Assets are vital to our well being as a community. He believes that in general they are neglected in comparison to other issues.

Young voter is concerned about all the bad stuff getting into our drinking water sources like pharmaceuticals, industrial chemicals, agricultural pollution and sewage.

Young voter is worried that exurban development continuing as it is will wipe out our wetlands.

Young voter is worried about old, crumbling infrastructure is threatening our water quality.

Young voter is concerned about how few lakes have been tested and how many of those are polluted. He wants all our waters tested and cleaned up for drinking, swimming and fishing – for future generations and use.

Young voter wants to see more local lake cleanup.

I value arts and culture; I also think preserving the environment is important. It's very important to keep arts available and accessible to all. We need to make funding for the arts a priority.

I voted for the amendment because it provides direct funding for outdoor recreation.

I voted for the amendment because the money will be used for important natural resources that Minnesota needs to preserve and protect. We need money that is protected so that is cannot be used for other programs.

The new voter views climate change as a huge threat and voted yes to help protect and preserve Minnesota.

Because the money was much needed in these areas which had been neglected in our state. These are things that are important to me.

Opportunities for my kids.

I voted yes because I didn't think small non-profits and action groups can make as big of a difference on the environment as the government can if handled properly.

Why did you vote yes?
Age Group: 35-60

I am an outdoor enthusiast and I see my vote as a positive action for the outdoors. I do everything I can for wildlife.

A middle aged woman commented on the loss of the urban forest as more trees are cut down for development. She pointed out that more have also been lost because of Dutch elm and because people don't value them and don't want the inconvenience of raking and picking up from them. Tree loss contributes to global warming and to a huge loss of habitat for birds and other urban animals.

One middle aged respondent said he no longer brought home fish he caught because he feared they were contaminated.

The 45 year old I spoke with loves the outdoors activities that are an important part of her family's weekends in all seasons. She was excited about being able to improve opportunities for her children and their children to enjoy the outdoors.

She voted yes because she believes that our waters must be protected because pollution causes a risk to our health. Even though she doesn't eat fish, it is important for general public health.

I wasn't sure I would vote for it. I didn't like doing it through the constitution. But in the end I did vote for it because it seemed to protect the things that are always under funded.

I support the environment.

Circumvent Governor's "No New Taxes" pledge

There was a lack of funding.

Likes the outdoors...doesn't get too much of a chance to enjoy. Busy with kids, work and school. Thinks arts greatly enhance a quality of life experience for people. Helps them to be joined together and enriches their lives. Wants clean water and thinks water will continue to become more and more of a problem for Minnesota and beyond.

Minnesota's water and lakes seem like a pretty good investment.

To provide more funding for the arts. My dad was a high school band/orchestra instructor and I support the arts.

This was a complex vote. One part of me said it shouldn't be a constitutional amendment but another part said it wouldn't get done otherwise. There are things we need to do and even if it didn't pass, it was important to say yes, so people could then know how important it was.

I voted yes because I am an avid hunter, but I also enjoy the arts. We need to make the outdoors and the arts a higher priority in our state.

She voted for the measure reluctantly because she believes similar requests for other critical needs could be brought forward. However, she worried that without the amendment funding for the arts would be seriously jeopardized. She said that she could "see what was coming in the face of the nation's economic downturn" and believe that the amendment was the only way to assure adequate resources for the arts.

A 46 year old yes voter felt that things like this need a special fund in order to avoid being short changed or even forgotten, especially in hard times.

Voted yes because as she understood it (via questions asked before voting) the amendment would "override" legislature personnel changes and ensure funds are allocated to these causes regardless of who is in office.

Voted yes because he believes that the first thing to be cut when things become bad are arts and cultural entities otherwise funded by the state. By enacting a constitutional amendment he believes the money will be "off the table"

She voted yes because she supports the creation and maintenance of local bike trails.

Clean Water.

To preserve our wonderful Minnesota natural resources.

She voted strictly for the environment and walking trails.

Saw the commercials. It's for the environment.

I just love Minnesota's connection to the outdoors. I've never lived anywhere else and have fished and hunted since I was in elementary school. I am very worried about the degradation of our lakes. I voted yes because it just doesn't feel like enough is being done.

Because these programs won't get funded by the legislature unless we make them do it.

Ensure funding in perpetuity for those things that contribute to Minnesota quality of life-arts, healthy land and water, etc.

I voted yes because I believe in Minnesota. There is a special edition of Daedalus (Fall of 2000) that responds to the notion, Minnesota: A Difference America "If Minneapolis – St Paul sees itself as the major cultural city between Chicago and the great cities of the West Coast, and if this is more than just a testimonial to very great art museums – there are comparable ones, some would argue, in Houston and Dallas – the complex of cultural institutions, not lease of eminent private liberal arts colleges, so largely supported by private philanthropy, may in fact be unique." Minnesota is defined by its commitment to the arts, by its philanthropy, by its nature worship, probably occasioned by the awful winters that make a body appreciate the good weather all the more...I come from Wyoming, which is beautiful BUT it's a black hole for good radio or TV (I grew up with 2 country western radio stations and that was IT)...I love public radio, I am always struck by the stories that I encounter, like the series on the 9th inning. I love the complete coverage of Minnesota politics – the in-depth stories on towns impacted by the Governor's last-minute financial pullback or the reservation after the school-shooting or the school that will disappear because of vanishing enrollment. My life is significantly enriched by Minnesota Public Radio every single day. I'm better informed, I'm cheered, I'm sobered; it helps me expand the parameters of my community.

Clean Water. Persuaded by the ad with the scientist who said that of all our waters tested, 40% are polluted.

I didn't want to vote yes, I felt the State was dodging its responsibility to fund our natural resources, but I also felt these entities should be better funded, so I eventually voted yes.

Very important to me and my family and also my businesses, many of which are affiliated with arts and culture organizations.

Middle-aged duck hunter wants to see more wildlife corridors.

Middle-aged voter thinks it's simple – we have to have clean water.

Middle-aged voter wants more education about the events of dumping stuff into storm drains. Also, wants more education on the proper ways to use fertilizers at home.

“I voted for it because I want full enforcement of the Clean Water Act. I want to see the dead zone in the Gulf disappear in my lifetime.”

I believe the arts are important to the state of Minnesota. We need to ensure they have the funding they need. The amendment will support things that are important to our state – water, land, parks, art, cultural heritage.

I voted yes because conservation funding has been on a long and steady decline and the Legacy Amendment represented a direct way to reverse this negative trend and ensure there is long-term funding for the outdoor treasures that define who we are as Minnesotans.

I voted for the amendment because Minnesota's resources need more money than they have been getting. Existing activities need to be expanded widely across the state, and more work needs to be done to protect land and improve habitat, beyond what the DNR has been doing.

The mid 40-something voter is an avid boater, hunter, runner and cyclist who makes great use of the metro area park system. They voted yes to protect and maintain the parks, and because they felt an obligation to make an investment (just like their parents did before them).

I value the things that are included in the amendment. I enjoy spending time hiking, biking, visiting historic sites, learning more about history, etc. so it's worth a small investment now to have these things later on, for me and for my kids.

Arts are essential.

I voted yes because I thought the partnership between the Arts and the Environment in general would benefit from it and it appealed to me. We need to invest in those things that give the most reward and benefit to the majority. Leave a legacy where future generations will thank us for our vision in taking care of the environment and promoting the arts.

Why did you vote yes?
Age Group: Over 60

I voted yes because I believe it is important to protect and support the natural and cultural assets of Minnesota.

Emphasized their concern for quality of water and lakes. A fisherman cited the numerous lakes that had fish kill in the summer of 2007. Hoped that this trend could be reversed.

Two older respondents commented that the state had lost much of the pristine water resources that they had enjoyed as children.

The over 60 supporter was more concerned about clean lakes and drinking water. He worked as a geologist for the federal government and spent much of his career working on those issues.

He voted yes because he is a long-time volunteer for the Sierra Club and believes the legislature didn't give enough money to preserve and protect the outdoors.

Felt the environment needed it. Thought it was wonderful that it had multi-targeted efforts – not just environment, not just arts, many things. Choosing between them is a false choice – most of us aren't one-dimensional when we seek quality of life.

I want clean water.

We haven't done all we should to assure we have clean water in the future.

To have more money for the arts, cultural heritage, and historical preservation. Reduction to the Historical Society of \$8 million in one fell swoop by the Pawlenty Administration. Quality of life issue that should not be left to the whims of the budget cycle. Arts, cultural heritage, and historical preservation are often the first cut in a deficit.

Likes to fish and the outdoors and voted yes for these reasons. Not very interested in the arts and feels that they are for the rich people and not so much for the average person like himself. They have plenty of money already and have an easy time of fundraising. Feels

strongly about addition to current spending that more is done not filling holes. Measure success will be hard...just wants to have more fish stock in metro and around the state.

To see Minnesota's lakes restored to be safe and clean.

Seemed like a good idea, and sounded alright to increase and dedicate funding.

We need to save the planet; spend money on the environment and cleaning up.

I voted for the amendment because I think that we need to continue to support arts in Minnesota.

He compared the Outdoor Heritage Amendment to the change made to redirect MVST funds to transportation purposes. Without public approval of the amendment, he feared that the Legislature would not dedicate sufficient funds to the arts and conservation.

A 66 year old voted yes because this would require that a certain amount of money would be spend on something good instead of a bunch of goofy stuff.

Voted yes, enthusiastically, because he wants to see the environment protected and culture/art resources strengthened through appropriate state support. Believes the state has a responsibility to maintain quality parks, recreation facilities, natural environment, and cultural/arts experiences with appropriate public and private support.

Voted yes on the amendment because she believes Minnesota's history and cultural heritage has been ignored and "defamed" over time. She is also concerned how the landscape has changed in Western Minnesota during her lifetime.

He voted yes because he thinks there should be sustainable funding for arts and culture.

To maintain and improve the surface water quality in Minnesota.

She felt that she needed to put back into the environment and the future of our lakes and felt this was the only way to do it.

His interest in hunting and fishing was the reason for his vote.

That's a good question. I'm not really sure why. We love to walk the trails and bird watch. I want to keep doing that for the rest of my life. I have many grandchildren that should enjoy the same natural environment that I have enjoyed for so many years.

All of the areas funded by the amendment are desperately underfunded and likely to end up even worse off in a poor economy.

Just as it is a responsibility of all of us to see the stewardship of our lands and waters we need to also protect and nourish the cultural environment that generation before us have build. The creative nature of man is as much part of creation as any tree or stream. We must protect and nurture both. I voted yes because this amendment did both. The arts are essential to the spirit of the people. I believe that the arts need to be supported so they are available to all the people regardless of where they live in our state or because of the size of their incomes. State funding is important in order to maintain that equality for all the people. As an individual artist who has chosen to stay in my home state I am excited that the public would vote to affirm that the arts are an important part of the definition of being a Minnesotan. The overwhelming vote by the people was a validation of all the effort that has been worked for in the past and that there is the same commitment for the future. It makes me very proud. It pleases me to tell artists and other friends living in other parts of the country of what we did here. Sometimes people who have not been to Minnesota sell us short. This is a pretty big statement of what Minnesotan's value. It reminds me that I live in a very special state.

Legacy, grandchildren, preserve our state and our outdoors to greatest extent possible.

The environment and the arts are cornerstones of Minnesota heritage. They have been underfunded for too long.

Minnesota is blessed with an amazing natural resource base that adds so much to our quality of life. If we don't preserve and manage our resources they will not be around for future generations. I was privileged to work in and around the legislative process during my work life and saw funding for parks and natural areas fluctuate wildly during various budget cycles. This amendment provides the steady stream of dollars that are needed to preserve our natural resources.

Older fisherman concerned about mercury in the water. Can't believe that he has only a small number of lakes available to him where he can keep the fish to eat beyond a small limit.

Finally, dedicated funding for clean water. We want to see long-term strategic planning and action to ensure we have clean water forever.

Creativity and arts are a core need and core business resource in Minnesota. Because government has not been funding these areas – especially arts and culture – at the level they need. The amendment will guarantee increased funding which is needed. I was a teacher for many years and know how important it is for young people to have arts opportunities. Rather than cutting these programs we need to invest in more.

The legacy amendment marked the first opportunity in my long voting lifetime to directly influence how our tax dollars are spent.

I live in Marshall most of the year and near Brainerd in the summer months. I'm over 60 and have listened to public radio in both the Marshall and Brainerd locations for years. Both locations are too far from the Twin Cities area for us to take advantage of most cultural opportunities there, so we depend on MPR to bring cultural resources to us via radio. The speakers and authors who appear on MPR interviews and news programs give us insight into local, national, and world affairs and culture that we could never otherwise have access to. Kerry Miller's interviews, Talk of the Nation, Science Friday, As It Happen, the BBC at night, and of course the news programs are vital resources for an informed populace, along with MPR's coverage of Minnesota government affairs. I voted for the amendment because I thought the funding would help preserve Minnesota's outdoor resources, which have suffered in recent years. Deterioration of parks, wetlands, wildlife habitat has a profound effect on Minnesotans' ability to understand and interact with the environment. I also voted for the amendment because I thought the commitment reflected how much Minnesotans value both cultural and outdoor resources. Both are distinctive elements of the very nature of Minnesota, and both need reliable financial support. I hope that the availability of these funds will provide stable support for the arts that will enable art-related groups to weather difficult financial times. I hope that our outdoor resources will be both preserved and conserved as a result of this having this funding.

I voted for the amendment because I care about Minnesota's waters, and it is the only way to gain much-needed revenue since we have a Governor who will not raise taxes.

The 60+ voter is an avid equestrian who regularly rides in portions of the Big Woods. They want to protect the sensitive places and also are concerned about how climate change is affecting the woods.

The legislature didn't do what needed to be done, so then it was up to the people to decide. The subjects of the amendment were before the legislature for many years; there was support among the people for these purposes. The legislature chose to ask the people.

Provide access to next generation.

I voted yes because I don't trust the politicians to do the right thing in funding long term projects.

What are your expectations?
Age Group: 18-35

I expect all of the money to be used for the designated purposes.

None had very high expectations that these new dollars would address all of the problems in Minnesota's environment or provide enough support for arts or other cultural activities, but they all thought that they should be able to see changes start to take place soon.

She hoped that some of these resources could be used to help reestablish art and music programs that had been cut from our schools.

She honestly did not expect the amendment to pass, but was impressed and amazed and excited. She thinks the money may put special interest groups against each other, even those that worked together for the passage of the amendment.

The downturn in the economy has changed what I'd hoped for. Instead of making things better, how can we use this to make sure our arts scene doesn't change for the worse? People will be cutting back on spending money to support the arts and go to the plays. Can this be a preventative measure to keep art venues from closing and then when times are better help them grow and expand?

Expects more money for parks and trails.

Hope that the money actually goes to protect the environment.

Minnesota will clean up water and we will be known as having clean water like we used to have.

That the money would be spent efficiently and that long-term investments could be made in the areas receiving the funding.

To see accountability in how the money is spent.

I want to keep our state as a cultural center, I want clean water (less interest in land buying). I want parks and trails I can use.

I see ways for more art in low-income communities. Art will go into communities for people that might not otherwise have it so they can both create it and enjoy it.

I expect that we now will have the resources to devote to protect our natural resources.

Expects that the new resources will go for new purposes and will result in progress in these important areas.

He expects that quality outdoor experiences will be more available, especially closer to home (metro), without having to own a bunch of special equipment and vehicles.

She expects the money will be used to make sure the planet/state is preserved and isn't ruined by human caused environmental hazards.

Her expectation is that the water quality will significantly improve (with time) now that the adequate funding is there.

He's hoping that there is some long-term investments in clean water and efforts to educate the public about the need to preserve/protect the environment.

Hope that the money is evenly allocated among the many well run arts organizations.

Expecting better care of our game and fish resources.

He thinks it will be good for the future of our state.

Because I believe these 3 issues are fundamental to the character of Minnesota.

Polluted lakes and rivers in Minnesota will get cleaned up.

It is my understanding also that there is no system previously in place for the environmental portions, but I hope that funding will be allocated in a responsible way similar to the arts model that ensures positive and equal outcomes for all areas of the state.

I expect little in the first few years, but I am hopeful that this will be a wonderful legacy to my children. I hope that we will see benefits before my children are grown (this is, greater promotion/available access to art for children in public schools; music, theatre and dance in public spaces; public art installations; and additional funding for MPR, perhaps Minnesota's most important protector of the arts).

I worry the State will use this sales tax to fill the deficit. I hope the State will invest long-term in projects, initiatives, and educational programs that will both enrich Minnesotans and will encourage tourists. I would love to see serious redevelopment of the Mississippi River. It really needs to be a tourist destination.

Monies are distributed directly to programs that can produce results.

The money will actually be spent on the purposes that are listed in the amendment. Our state will see lasting value from this investment. I don't want the money to get lost in the state budget. I want to see tangible results, average citizens will be able to participate in more events, prices will be affordable, etc.

With the words parks and trails explicitly spelled out in the amendment I expect that all Minnesotans will be looking for visible signs that these places are improved and expanded.

I expect to see something new, not the same old thing. I hope that the money will be used as it was presented to the people of Minnesota, and that the citizen boards will use the funds to protect our lakes, rivers and streams.

To drastically improve these areas. To produce results. To have a lasting and significant impact on these areas in our state.

They can learn and experience the arts.

I expect to see help given to non-profit groups, arts and history theaters/museums/etc in order to help boost their respective areas of the economy. I also expect to see lakes and rivers cleaned up – keep mussels and other parasites from traveling from lake to lake. I hope to see city, county

and state pathways and trails kept neat and clean...and so I have good paths to rollerblade and run on in the summer.

What are your expectations?
Age Group: 35-60

I expect the government will use this money to assure that acres currently in the CRP program will continue to provide wildlife habitat. I expect this money to be used to keep farmers from plowing up habitat.

One middle aged woman suggested that if Minnesota cleaned up its water, the cost would be repaid through increased tourism.

She expects that our parks will be cleaner, there will be less general pollution, trails and bike lanes will be in better shape and more planting will take place to replace damage to parks that have been hit by storms. She also expects things will happen in a timelier manner because of this funding.

I would like it to be clear what it funded and the difference it makes. Not just get melded into the regular budget. Put it into things that are long-term investments.

Expects cleaner water.

Protect environment and arts programs that currently exist and promote future protections.

I expect to have a consistent flow of funds for environmental protection and improvement that will allow long term planning and implementation of comprehensive projects that maintain and improve Minnesota's natural environment.

Wants to feel that we are doing a good job with the money and thinks voters expect good things with the effort. Knows measurement will be hard.

That the money will be spent in the manner it was projected to the public.

That they will fund crazy, wacky, creative stuff that wouldn't normally get a chance.

I have a sense that it is a significant amount of money. It should undo the damage of the last 6 years and take care of things. If we are to be a leader than parks and the arts need to be protected and to grow.

I expect that the new money will help us preserve our outdoor resources and promote new arts organizations across the state.

She expects that the money will be used to protect the arts well into the future and considers “the arts” to be broadly defined to include science, medicine, as well as the performing arts.

He expected to finally see progress in water quality improvement.

She didn't understand at the time that there wasn't a strong plan in place in advance of the election for allocating the funds and her expectation now is that there will be “Monday morning quarterbacking” about how to allocate the funds. Her concern is that the plan that is now developed will not be well thought through and won't be in the best interest of all the items addressed by the amendment. She is also concerned the plan won't be administered in the intent the amendment proposed and that organizations receiving funds from the amendment will have previous allocations supplanted.

Voter number 2's expectations are that while the overall budget scenario is dire, the entities covered under the amendment will at least remain whole.

She wants to see more trails and more bike commuting options.

Increase access to our public hunting and fishing areas. Use the money to improve all habitats.

Expecting the DNR to do a better job controlling ATV's and clean water.

Money will be put to the correct use and help clean up the environment like what the lottery does.

My expectation is that we will begin to see projects and visible efforts to clean up our water bodies. It is my hope that the people making the decisions about the funding will ensure that they also ask outdoor enthusiasts like me to be part of the solution. Spend some of the funds on public awareness of the consequences of our everyday actions that hurt our wildlife and likes.

More public hunting areas that are better managed, clean up polluted lakes and rivers, and improvements to park and trails systems.

I fully expect 50% of the funds dedicated to the arts will be distributed directly to the Minnesota State Arts Board. Of the remaining 50%, I believe and understand that the Minnesota State Historical Society would benefit significantly.

I expect these tax dollars to be used in responsible ways. I don't think that every theatre needs to exist or that every artist needs to exhibit. I do think that this is populist in notion...so art that reaches a lot of people both metaphorically and really is important. For example, listeners to Minnesota Public Radio hear about art that is performed at the State Fair. I do think that the tax money should be used not for a narrow group of artists or musicians that are only appreciable to a small coterie of folks...it's the folks' money and it should be used for programming for the average Josephine.

I think the people who really wanted to see this happen will get funding for their long-term projects. I hope land acquisition is balanced with land use and current existing land to keep our metro region strong in all the areas addressed by the sales tax.

My understanding is that a fund would be established and monies will be available for various institutions and causes.

We will see increased funding for the arts and increased arts activities throughout the state as a result. I expect the money to go to the Arts Board and regional arts councils; they have the structure to make good decisions and a proven track record.

I expect that our elected officials will now have a clear gauge of how important our outdoor heritage is to Minnesotans and that they will respond by ensuring that we see tangible results for our decision to tax ourselves. I know I personally will be looking for extended park hours, enhanced visitor services and our trail system enhanced.

I expect that existing activities will continue to be funded as they have been, but will be reinforced by all the new money, and by many additional projects. I expect that forest land and wildlife will be improved, that vast acres of prairie will be restored, and that the waters will be cleaner. All this is necessary in order to preserve the ecology that we depend on and take comfort in, and enjoy.

I would expect that funding is spent wisely so that we have better parks and historic sites available for future generations.

More citizens can and will experience the arts.

What are your expectations?
Age Group: Over 60

I expect this money will stop the pollution of Minnesota's waters that is coming from our cities and farms.

He expects that the money will be used to invest across the state and protect habitat for birds and wildlife. He enjoys the outdoors and wants to see the money go to investments that we haven't seen in the past. He also has family members (and himself) who enjoy museums and the arts and knows that they haven't received the funding they need in the past.

Expects the environment will be helped.

The money collected will in practice be used to benefit our lakes, rivers, and streams.

Restoration of funding that was. Catch up. Embrace what arts, history and culture folks do. Encourage volunteerism. Building and rebuilding historical and arts programs to create a more civilized society.

Transparency in the process of how the money is allocated.

Hope to preserve the environment.

People should be held accountable. The public hasn't demanded accountability and that must change. The public must be informed. There should be some way of measuring, setting goals, making sure goals are met and even improved upon. Results oriented.

I hope that we can now have a steady stream of money to help our arts community flourish. We are so fortunate to have a vibrant arts community here in Minnesota. We need to make sure it doesn't flounder.

He expects that dedication of new resources will protect these funds from the vagaries of the Legislature.

He expects to pay more taxes.

His expectations are that the money will be equitably distributed on merit of an organization's needs and programming excellence, not in a political way but in a merit based way. He expects that the resources will not be redirected in ways that don't fulfill the stated purpose and goals of the amendment.

Her expectations are that someone will now safeguard all the contributions that prior generations have contributed to our heritage and preserve what is left of her childhood memories.

Like the others above, he's hoping for sustainability in these programs.

The Legislature will reduce its general fund commitments to the environment.

Money will be used to increase Minnesota's wildlife populations, especially pheasant, fish and deer numbers. Also, will allow the state to buy and preserve land for public use.

I am also a big patron to the arts and view the arts just as important a part of our Minnesota culture as outdoor activities and natural preservation.

I hope that parks, zoos and other public places like those get fixed up and updated. We should preserve natural areas and keep them open to the public. The water should continue to get cleaner, as well.

When I voted yes I expected that it would mean more money for the arts organizations in my local community and also more money for the larger arts organizations like the Walker, Institute of Art, and Guthrie. Many parts of the country do not have many art organizations so they have to build from little or nothing. In Minnesota we have built one of the broadest and best collections of art organizations in the country. What's more, they are all over the state. What I expect is that we will see to it that they all have new money to carry out their good work. I live in the small town of Randall, which is two hours north of the Twin Cities. I want to know that we have art opportunities within our own community, which we do although they need to grow to a bigger level. I also don't want a state where we have to wait to go to New York to see big time theater or see important works of art in a museum. I go to New York periodically but many of my neighbors never have that opportunity. That means we need arts organizations to thrive in our own areas and also in the Twin Cities. I expect both to be helped by this amendment. I became a successful artist because those resources were within my state. We need these

experiences available to everyone. I expect that the amendment will stabilize and increase funding for all these art organizations all over the state.

That Minnesota will regain its national position as a leader in environmental and cultural stewardship.

I expect and hope that a fair and open process will be developed that will look at the big natural resource picture so that the work of the various governmental and private organizations that are eligible to receive funds will be coordinated. I also expect that these organizations that were forced to compete with one another for limited funds will now become partners in the work of preserving our natural resources.

The money will provide stability for the Arts Board and existing high-quality organizations and programs. Increased funding will provide opportunities for new initiatives to reach people not readily served by existing organizations. The organizations I enjoy will have the funding they need.

I expect that politicians will no longer have to ponder whether Minnesotans care about our parks, trails, lakes, rivers and streams. Our vote to tax ourselves in the middle of a severe recession to pay for these things that make Minnesota great had to be a surprise to our elected representatives who have continually cut funding to our natural and cultural resources in good times and in bad.

I also voted for the amendment because I thought the commitment reflected how much Minnesotans value both cultural and outdoor resources. Both are distinctive elements of the very nature of Minnesota, and both need reliable financial support.

I would like to see the waters of the state improved, including a major effort to address invasives such as Eurasian water milfoil which is causing enormous damage to some of our lakes.

In addition to clean water, habitat, culture and history, etc. the passage of the amendment sent a message that these things are important. When the money is used for clean water, fishing, hunting, hiking, these healthy outdoor activities, as well as cultural activities will be enhanced. They will have a stable source of funding in addition to regular operating appropriations.

Develop next generation of arts advocates.

My expectations are that the money will be spent on long term projects with value, not on political pork.

What do you think will be different now that we have this money for the outdoors, arts, culture, water, parks, trails etc.?

Age Group: 18-35

I would see this effort as being successful when fish populations allow less restrictive limits for the sportsmen who fish on our lakes and we improve habitats to promote pheasant populations. I expect improved habitat and increases populations.

Most answers repeated the thoughts above, but a young woman hoped that frogs would be given a chance to be the 4 legged physical creatures that nature intended.

She hopes we can make good investments in projects that benefit all Minnesotans. The investments should be proportional and prioritize the most important projects.

Will have more parks to go to.

Would like to see expansion of parks and trails, especially by her home.

Hopefully these programs will be adequately funded for the future.

Not sure how she will know if we are successful.

I hope more Minnesotans will pay attention to the environment now that they voted for it. Minnesotans will be watching us and what will happen.

This person did not know what they thought would be different.

I use the trails and I want to see them maintained and expanded. I expect to see options for more funding for more things outdoors and cultural. I am skeptical of the Lessard Council and the direction it is going and don't support that.

I think that the money will help us enhance our parks and trails and permit more people to enjoy them.

She hopes that these dollars will leverage additional funds to accomplish additional projects over the long term.

The difference he anticipates is that he will spend more time outdoors and watch less television.

She hopes the money is put to good use, that it raises awareness that society cares about the environment and is interested in protecting it for future generations.

Firmly believes that the money cannot be touched if it is in the Constitution. Voter number 1 had no idea what supplanting was.

He's not sure if he will see any immediate effects because it could take some time to turn things around.

Increase accessibility for ALL people to arts activities.

The DNR will run their agency better.

It will make Minnesota a better place to live and protect our environment.

My expectation is that these funds are used for their designated purpose and not stolen and moved into the general fund.

If this funding is responsibly allocated, I know we can have a better, cleaner outdoors and that opportunities in the arts will expand for every Minnesotan in the state. I hope that this funding proves to be an "enhancement fund" and that legislators are sure to also fund these issues out of the general budget as the amendment reads.

I hope that we will see a difference in the fees for public access to state parks (lowered) and that trails and parks will be able to have full staffing and needed maintenance. I hope that MPR will not have to make programming cuts due to a lack of funding, particularly since their two music stations are the finest in the state, and their promotion of arts and culture (through news and arts programming) is the lifeblood of so many residents. I also hope to see more availability of grants and funding for performance and visual artists, particularly those who share their art publicly, or who are willing to involve children in their work.

There won't be any more excuses to not fund these things anymore.

Thinks it will be difficult to notice immediate results. Impact will be long term. That is acceptable as an outcome.

We will have cleaner lakes, better parks and trails. Everyone will have access to arts and cultural activities that will have a positive impact on their lives. More types of arts activities/programs will be available. Arts organizations (especially smaller and mid-sized ones) will have more flexibility, and more confidence to try new things.

I think it will be more difficult for politicians to cut spending on our natural resources because Minnesotans showed how much these things matter to us.

We will see a much needed improvement in areas that haven't received care and attention. In 25 years, when we look back, we will see protection of resources, conservation, economic development, sustaining resources.

More arts education and cultural opportunities.

I think that the good ideas that different groups and policy-makers have had will be able to have action taken on them so that we can make Minnesota a better place to live...rather than just keeping the ideas on a back-burner for "when there's money available"

What do you think will be different now that we have this money for the outdoors, arts, culture, water, parks, trails etc.?
Age Group: 35-60

I think we will avoid losing habitat and I expect to see steady improvement.

A man in his 50s suggested that he hoped to see a return to the “land of sky blue waters”

Better water to drink and cleaner lakes.

Less conflict and competition for limited resources.

I think that environmental agencies and projects will receive more funding than they would have without the amendment and that agencies will better plan and execute their work because of this large infusion of funds.

Minnesota lake quality will improve.

There will be a wider variety of arts because everyone is fighting for a small pot. Bigger pot, more variety.

You won't have to fight with the governor. We can reclaim things that have been neglected and be able to do the right thing rather than barely get anything done; do the right thing rather than letting go, letting go, letting go. We need to get back on track.

The new dedicated fund should give us the money we need to acquire public land for hunting and fishing for those who can't afford to own their own property.

She believes that funding resulting from the amendment will better secure “the arts” in a trying economic environment.

He sees a difference in the availability to fund more far reaching projects.

For the short term, she doesn't think much will be different because there isn't a clear cut plan in place yet.

He believes that what will be different is that the Legislature will have to seriously consider the constitutional dedication when making their decisions whereas in the past they only had to consider the overall budget.

She expects that there will be more off-road bike trails and hopefully more collaboration with organizations on trail sustainability.

More predictable revenues for habitat preservation and improvements.

She hopes the waters of the state will be cleaner, but doesn't expect a huge difference.

We will see more adequate state funding of environmental programs and money going into actual environmental protection and conservation projects instead of just more bureaucracy. Twenty years from now we will be able to list the improvements and projects that made this a successful effort.

Stable funding invites long-term strategies to be implemented to restore and sustain wetlands, waterways, land and the arts will remain a stable economic and cultural resources for all Minnesotans.

I would hope that the projects that I love, like the little paths that make the state parks navigable even to folks in wheelchairs, are kept up. Lots of talks about bats and eagles at the state parks. Funding for cool paintings and the kids to paint them on the sides of buildings. More public art. I would look to Portland OR for models...I've never been to a city with more and cooler public art...

I hope there will be some independence now by these agencies and not so much dependence on bonding and local taxes to pay for these important elements of our state.

Dollars are now available for new programs and services. Things that were previously not possible without the funding will now be possible and/or improved upon.

Dedicated funding to all four areas will create more stability; and will allow for more long-term planning. All Minnesotans will have the opportunity to participate in the arts. The increased funding will elevate the visibility and importance of arts in Minnesota.

I think that it will be more difficult for elected officials to exclude conservation, outdoor recreation and the environment from a list of state priorities that also rightfully includes health care and education.

I would hope that we are able to look back and say that we've done some good things with funding from the amendment. That we've left something better for our kids and their kids.

Youth and communities will have greater opportunities to experience the arts in sustainable ways.

What do you think will be different now that we have this money for the outdoors, arts, culture, water, parks, trails etc.?

Age Group: Over 60

These funds will assure that the parks and roadside rests of Minnesota will continue to be family friendly places. The funds will allow us to maintain clean water standards. Arts funding will guarantee that our schools will present children with the opportunity to participate in live theater productions without raising fees that would prevent participation by all students.

He didn't know exactly what would be different, but expected to see the legislature use the money to increase protection and opportunities for Minnesotans to enjoy the outdoors and museums.

Not sure what difference I expect. I hope you have many wonderful ideas to sort through and only fund the best.

Better habitat for hunting.

There will be targeted dollars that will allow us to improve the environment over time.

Stable funding. Elimination of hills and valleys in funding streams. More long range planning. Future generations will enjoy clean water and great outdoors.

People will feel safe eating fish from Minnesota lakes.

I expect things to be different because of the amendment, but I am not sure how at this point.

Minnesotans are really outdoor people. This will expand the love of the outdoors as useage of the outdoors expands.

The steady stream of funding will ensure that our existing and new arts organizations can count on a sustaining source of support as they plan for the future.

He expects dramatic improvements in water quality and continued support for the arts in all parts of the state because he believes that the arts bring important intangible meaning to our communities.

He suspects that nothing will change.

His hope is for greater accessibility by the public to high quality cultural and outdoor experience and that a broader segment of the public takes advantage of our state's educational and recreational opportunities.

She is not at all encouraged by what will be different but believe by being in the Constitution that money will be more difficult to move around to less "important political things".

He's hoping to see expansion and sustainability of art programs in areas outside the metro area.

More transparent funding streams.

Better hunting and fishing opportunities. More public access lands. Less pressure to sell state-owned lands.

It is my hope that now there is a fixed amount of funds that there will have to be progress on the environmental issues. My expectation is that there will finally be needed enforcement of environmental laws and that those causing the degradation of our waters will be held responsible.

This vote in a tough economy should point out to our leaders that the public expects these programs to be funded. This shouldn't be the only funding for all of these things, this should be the start of better funding for these programs being a higher state priority.

How could it not make a difference? Art is like every thing else in our society in that it requires money to make it happen. It frustrates me when I see others involved in bringing art experiences to Morrison and Todd counties being told how beneficial it is to our community but then being told there are no dollars for them. The arts seem to be always among the first to be cut when times are tough and the last ones to be funded when times are good. This amendment to the constitution says we are going to stop doing that by providing a steady source of funding for the arts. It will make a big difference right away and for many years to come.

We will start to bring back our youth into the fold of environment and the arts. We will see these elements in everyday life again.

Metropolitan parks will finally receive the state funding that was promised when the metropolitan system was first established and that implementing agencies will be able to count on a steady and appropriate funding stream from the state.

Older adults will have greater access to creative learning and creative expression opportunities. Rural areas will have greater access to these resources. There will be funding to try some new things, nurture some new programs and new art forms.

I think we will see our elected officials follow the lead of the people they represent and make sure that we can clearly see that the taxes we imposed on ourselves result in visible improvements to our parks, trails, lakes, rivers and streams.

A heightened awareness of the need for clean water, clean air and cultural attractions. More opportunities to enjoy parks, hiking, historical sites.

More youth will grow up with access and abilities associated with arts experiences

This will provide additional funding for important projects of public interest like historic and cultural legacy projects.