

Main Request for Funding Form

**Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council
Fiscal Year 2013**

Program or Project Title: Conservation Easements in the Avon Hills using MMAPLE

Funds Requested: \$ 1,354,000

Manager's Name: Thomas Kroll and John Taylor

Organization: Saint John's Arboretum (a unit of Saint John's Abbey and University)

Street Address: 104 New Science Center

City: Collegeville **State:** MN **Zip:** 56321-2000

Telephone: 320 363 3126

E-Mail: [@csbsju.](mailto:csbsju@csbsju.edu) [@csbsju.](mailto:csbsju@csbsju.edu)

Organization Web Site:

[://www.csbsju.edu/Arboretum/Education/Community/AvonHillsInitiative.](http://www.csbsju.edu/Arboretum/Education/Community/AvonHillsInitiative)

County Location: Stearns

Ecological Planning Regions:

Northern Forest Forest/Prairie Transition Southeast Forest

Prairie Metro/Urban

Activity Type:

Protect - Fee Protect - Easement Protect - Other

Restore Enhance

Priority Resources addressed by activity:

Wetlands Forests Prairie Habitat

Project Abstract

Landowners within the "Avon Hills" of Stearns County will submit sealed bids to grant easements. Easements will be prioritized based on their environmental benefits and cost using the MMAPLE method.

Project Narrative

Design and scope of work

The Location: The Avon Hills area is a 50,000 acre unique landscape covering most of Avon and Collegeville townships plus parts of St. Wendell, St. Joseph, Farming, and Wakefield townships, all located in Stearns county just 15 miles west of St. Cloud. The landscape is glacial moraine that rises out of the surrounding farmland. It lies within the Hardwood Hills Subsection (222Ma). Historically, big woods forests, oak savanna, and a few prairies dominated the landscape. It also includes one of the largest tamarack bogs in central-southern MN. Nearly 10,000 acres (20%) of the Avon Hills is mapped as a Site of Biodiversity Significance (SOBS) by the MN Department of Natural Resources (MN DNR). It is a priority area for The Nature Conservancy and it is also an Important Bird Area (IBA) for Audubon Minnesota. Stearns County has created a conservation overlay district for the area to help preserve the natural heritage.

The Problem: St. Cloud is the fourth-largest Minnesota population center with 65,000 residents in the city and another 125,000 in the St. Cloud metropolitan area. The need for green space and for preserving the remaining natural resources is clear. The Avon Hills area has had heavy development pressure due to its location just outside a large population center.

Interestingly, the landscape is still relatively undeveloped due to the cultural heritage of the pioneer farmers whose descendants still own much of the land. Due to a mixture of rolling hills, wetlands, and lakes, the majority of the area was never converted to cropland and remains natural. But the land prices are high (\$4,000+/acre) and with each passing generation it becomes more likely that the land will be sub-divided and converted to housing. Even if the housing were limited to one house per 40 acres, that change would dramatically affect the current habitat and ecological values of the land.

Within the Avon Hills, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service owns over 500 acres and the MN DNR has 3 Scientific and Natural Areas totaling about 1,000 acres, another indicator of the area's ecological significance. A 2008-2011 grant from LCCMR added 400 acres in permanent easements, mostly near or adjacent to other protected properties. 96% of the land within the Avon Hills is privately held and subject to development pressure.

The Solution: Conservation easements are a useful tool to add to Minnesota's conservation estate by preserving the open space and habitat in areas where land is very expensive and often simply not for sale. We propose to use a novel approach to acquire easements using a systematic evaluation that compares environmental benefits to easement cost. We named this ranking system the Minnesota Multi-faceted Approach for Prioritizing Land Easements (MMAPLE). We developed and used this system in 2011 for our LCCMR project with great success. This system works especially well in landscapes with a fair number of quality properties and where using easements to add more total acres to the conservation estate is more important than getting an easement on any specific, pre-selected tract.

The work of recruiting and prioritizing landowners will be accomplished by Saint John's using staff, contractors, and volunteers from the Avon Hills Initiative. The Avon Hills Initiative, a local citizens group, has a multi-year history of garnering support from the public and local institutions to promote and support conservation. The work of creating and holding the easements will be accomplished by the MN Land Trust using their standard procedures. Alternatively, Stearns

county and the MN DNR Forests for the Future program are also able to create and hold easements.

The MMAPLE Technique: The MMAPLE system was developed using ecological experts to define and rate the environmental qualities and benefits most sought from land within the Avon Hills (e.g. shoreline, land with identified Sites of Biodiversity Significance (SOBS), adjacency to other protected properties, etc.). All of the environmental rating factors are based on existing data that is easy to verify using maps and aerial photos.

For those properties which meet the minimum threshold of environmental benefits, MMAPLE uses a market-based approach, asking landowners to submit a sealed bid for the lowest price they will accept for a conservation easement. The opportunity to bid and the bidding deadline will be publically announced so anyone with qualified land may participate.

Prior to bidding, landowners will be able to visit with our organization to learn about easements and receive an environmental benefits score for their land to determine if their land is qualified. They will also receive a bidding form and will be able to see how different bids might affect their priority for receiving an easement. Our organization will not provide any advice on what a landowner should bid. We will explain that no payments will be made above the appraised value of an easement.

MMAPLE will prioritize easements by comparing the environmental benefits that are inherent to a specific parcel with the easement cost of the landowner's bid for that parcel. This method assures that high quality sites receive easements at the lowest cost and achieves the best value for the public funding.

Benefits of using a process like MMAPLE:

- MMAPLE creates a "Conservation Value Rating" for each parcel which is the ratio of environmental benefits on the parcel compared to the easement costs.
 - Using this ratio as the Conservation Value Rating allows a straight-forward comparison of multiple parcels.
- MMAPLE requires sealed bidding from the landowners offering parcels.
 - Reduces easement cost by letting landowners establish their lowest price (Note: limits are established so no bid can exceed the appraised value or some percent of the appraised value.).
 - Eliminates complaints that bureaucrats are setting the prices.
 - Eliminates gossip and hard feelings about how or why Landowner A got paid more than Landowner B.
 - Eliminates need for complex formulas to establish "fair" easement value (only the maximum needs to be established.).
 - Uses a fixed amount of funding most efficiently.
- MMAPLE uses natural resource experts to create the scoring system for rating the local natural resources.
 - Uses only existing data and aerial photo measurements for the resources.
 - Can be completed and easily explained in 30 minutes in the landowner's kitchen.
 - Scoring can be targeted to the funder's priorities.

Example:

Each of the following landowners has 100 acres within the target landscape. Land is worth \$4,000/acre in this landscape. Each parcel has different natural resource features and would provide different environmental benefits if enrolled in a conservation easement. Each of the properties meets the minimum threshold of natural resource benefits. Let's assume that \$160,000 has been allocated to this landscape for this round of bidding.

- Bob's land is ecologically very nice and has 10,000 environmental benefit points as scored. Equally importantly, Bob is willing to accept \$500/acre for an easement. His "Conservation Value Rating" is 10,000/500 or 20.
- Julie's land has 8,000 environmental benefit points as scored. Julie wants \$2,000/acre for an easement. Her "Conservation Value Rating" is 8000/2000 or 4.
- Jack's land has 5,000 environmental benefit points as scored and Jack wants \$1,000/acre for an easement. His "Conservation Value Rating" is 5000/1000 or 5.
- Rachel's land has the minimum 1,000 environmental benefit points as scored. Rachel is really interested in conservation and wants only \$100/acre for an easement. Her "Conservation Value Rating" is 1000/100 or 10.

Under the MMAPLE system, we begin funding with the highest Conservation Value Rating. (Conservation Value Rating = the ratio of Environmental Benefit Points / \$ per acre)

- First, we would fund Bob's land using \$50,000, (Conservation Value Rating = 20)
- Next, we would fund Rachel's land using \$10,000, (Conservation Value Rating = 10)
- Next, we would fund Jack's land using \$100,000, (Conservation Value Rating = 5)
- The funding would now be gone and we would not fund an easement for Julie's land. However she may choose to bid in future rounds if funding is again available and she may choose to lower her bid in a future round to increase her chance of being accepted.

More information, including an easement handout, landowner application, and the MMAPLE bidding worksheet are available on the Avon Hills Initiative web site:

[://www.csbsju.edu/Arboretum/Education/Community/AvonHillsInitiative/Events/Easements.](http://www.csbsju.edu/Arboretum/Education/Community/AvonHillsInitiative/Events/Easements)

Planning

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council FY13 Call for Funding Request Forest/Prairie Transition Section Vision, Page 5-7

The Council's future for the Forest/Prairie Transition Section envisions diverse and productive remnant tracts of native prairie, forests, grasslands, wetlands, lakes and rivers, and their associated fish and wildlife habitat.

Priority Action 1. Protect, enhance and restore wild rice wetlands, shallow lakes, wetland/grassland complexes, aspen parklands, and shoreland that provide critical habitat for game and non-game wildlife. Using conservation easements to preserve and protect the landscape and biodiversity of the Avon Hills would achieve this goal.

Priority Action 3. Protect, enhance and restore migratory habitat for waterfowl and related species, so as to increase migratory and breeding access. The Avon Hills is recognized as an Important Birding Area by Minnesota Audubon. Conservation easements in the Avon Hills, along with existing USFWS, SNA, and currently protected private lands will provide a corridor of habitat preserved for migratory waterfowl, upland birds, and other species of greatest conservation need.

Minnesota Statewide Conservation and Preservation Plan

Figure H2. MCBS sites of biodiversity. Page 39, note that the Avon Hills stand out as an island of high quality compared to the surrounding landscape for miles in any direction.

Figure H16. Vulnerable key habitat by township. Page 53, note that the Avon Hills are ranked on the highest end of vulnerability.

Figure H22. Proportion of township in protective ownership. Page 62, note that the Avon Hills are in the lowest class (0-10%) of land in protective ownership.

Habitat Recommendation H1: Protect priority land habitats

Focus protection on the critical lands the SCPP has identified by township

Figure H16. Page 66, note that Collegetown Township, the heart of the Avon Hills, has the highest overall ranking available in the state. The other townships in the Avon Hills are slightly lower ranked, but this proposal focuses on the best parts of those townships.

Habitat Recommendation H2: Protect critical shorelands of streams and lakes 2B. Protect private shorelands via economic incentives and other tools

Minnesota should greatly increase the use of economic incentives and other tools for private landowners to protect shorelines and other sensitive land along lakes, especially along shallow lakes and shallow bays of deep lakes, and streams and rivers throughout Minnesota...Protection of private shorelands should combine various tools, such as tax credits, conservation easements for shoreland protection and restoration.

Page 70, note that MMAPLE scoring process recognizes the environmental benefits for the shores of lakes, streams, and wetlands.)

Habitat Recommendation H6: Protect and restore critical in-water habitat of lakes and streams

6C. Protect deep-water lakes with exceptional water quality

Deep lakes with exceptional water quality will represent important sanctuaries for cold-water fish as the climate warms in Minnesota. However, future deterioration of water quality would greatly jeopardize the ability of these lakes to provide that refuge. These potential refuge lakes are being identified by the DNR and the UM. Many of these lakes are the "crown jewels" of Minnesota and deserve special status in addition to their value as refuges from climate change. Examples include...Big Watab Lake.

Page 83, note that Big Watab Lake is one of several deep water lakes surrounded by the Avon Hills. Interestingly, in the 2011 LCCMR round of MMAPLE bidding, 2 of the 3 landowners on Little Watab Lake, the last undeveloped lake in Stearns county, independently bid to get easements to protect all their shoreline and hundreds of acres around that lake. Unfortunately our LCCMR grant was too small to cover that project. But it could be done with this proposal!

Forestry Land Use Recommendations

8B. Prioritize forest lands for protection

Prioritization should be based on proximity to large blocks of already protected land (both public and private) to maximize the resiliency of the forests, and should include a specific focus on protecting working forests so that forest products can continue to support regional economies of Minnesota. Protection should focus on at-risk and high-priority lands (generally 100 acres or more) in both the Laurentian mixed forests and eastern broadleaf forests.

Page 130, note that MMAPLE achieves this goal by ranking potential easements higher based on parcel size and parcel adjacency to other protected lands. Also note that every easement in the Avon Hills will allow the option for working forests.

8C. Support and promote permanent protection of forest lands

Permanent protection of forestlands through fee title acquisition or conservation easements will need to be supported and promoted to landowners through financial incentives, education, and technical assistance. Page 130.

Land Use Recommendation 10: Support and expand sustainable practices on working forested lands

Description of recommended action. *The objective of this recommendation is to promote and implement sustainable forest practices in working forests in Minnesota.*

Page 131, note that every easement in the Avon Hills will allow the option for working forests.

10D. Provide incentives for sustainable forestry practices

Provide professional assistance to forest owners to assist in forest management in order to optimize forest resources and fulfill specific forest owner goals without jeopardizing sustainability and biodiversity.

Page 132, note that every easement in the Avon Hills will require the owner to obtain and use a Forest Stewardship Plan for their land, assuring achievement of this goal.

Minnesota Website

Avon Hills Important Bird Area

Conservation Issues:

Urbanization is the greatest threat to the area from St. Cloud sprawl and lakeside development.
[://iba.audubon.org/iba/viewSiteProfile.do?siteId=3217&navSite=](http://iba.audubon.org/iba/viewSiteProfile.do?siteId=3217&navSite=)

Note that conservation easements are the most cost effective measure to preserve significant areas of land in the Avon Hills where land prices are already high. MMAPLE will assure the best value for the funds expended.

Outdoor Heritage Fund - A 25-year framework:

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council December 15, 2010

A shortage of staffing and human capital is a limiting factor for organizations...

A particular skill set mentioned that is of importance to the OHF is real estate expertise in the area of conservation easements – both legal and process expertise.

Page 43, note that our experience from the recent LCCMR project shows that significantly less staff time is needed for the process of recruiting and prioritizing parcels using MMAPLE.

Relationship to Other Constitutional Funds

There is no relationship to other constitutional funds, though a pilot project using MMAPLE was completed in 2011 using Legislative-Citizen Commission on Minnesota Resources (LCCMR) funding.

Relationship to Current Organizational Budget

This funding will not substitute for any traditional funding that has done this type of work. Saint John's Abbey and University do not have any standing budget that focuses work on property

outside our own 2,800 acres. Saint John's staff forester has occasionally worked with adjacent landowners as a neighborly gesture. Saint John's did receive a 2008-2011 grant from LCCMR for \$337,000 to do this exact kind of work. That grant has expired, but great experience was gained.

Sustainability and Maintenance

The land protected through conservation easements will be sustained through the best standards and practices for conservation easement stewardship. The Minnesota Land Trust is a nationally-accredited land trust with a very successful stewardship program that includes annual property monitoring, effective records management, addressing inquiries and interpretations, tracking changes in ownership, investigating potential violations, and defending the easement in case of a true violation. Funding for these easement stewardship activities is included in the project budget. The option for other organizations to hold an easement under this grant exists, but is limited to either MN DNR or Stearns County. Both of these organizations currently hold and manage permanent conservation easements.

Outcomes

Inputs:

- \$1,000,000 from LSOHC for easements to be bid by landowners.
- \$300,000 estimated in-kind contributions from landowners who bid less than the appraised value of an easement.
- \$136,000 from LSOHC to pay easement holder for the costs for the long-term stewardship of the easements.
- \$39,000 from LSOHC to pay Saint John's for the costs of recruitment and prioritization of easements including contracted assistance and advertising (to be based on actual hours and costs necessary to complete the work).
- \$179,000 from LSOHC to pay easement holder for the costs of creating easements including professional services.

Activities/Outputs:

- Landowners use sealed bids to enroll easements which are prioritized using MMAPLE.
- Approximately 500 acres of new permanent conservation easements and assurance that they will be monitored through time (estimated acreage, actual bids will determine the final number of acres enrolled).

Outcomes – Short term & intermediate results:

Human related short term & intermediate results:

- Private landowners become more engaged in conservation, further encouraging more private participation.
- Reduces easement cost by letting landowners establish their lowest price (note that limits are established so no bid exceeds the appraised easement value or some percent of the appraised value).
- Eliminates complaints that bureaucrats are setting the prices.
- Eliminates gossip/ hard feelings about the program payments and why Landowner A got paid more than Landowner B.
- Eliminates need for staff time to establish and adjust complex formulas regarding the "fair" value of an easement (Only the maximum needs to be established).
- Reduces the need for staff time to negotiate prices with landowners.

- Focuses on properties that have high ecological value and allows a fixed level of funding to most efficiently acquire the best land for the price.

Land related short term & intermediate results:

Note that since all results will be based on bidders who are not known at this time, we can only estimate using the bidders that participated in the March 2011 round of LCCMR funding as a proxy. Eight bidders submitted bids totaling \$1,262,491 (Two were actually funded for easements at \$78,380 and \$19,500 using the \$100,000 we had available from LCCMR. All other bidders will have to rebid in a future round and compete with new bidders). The following are the totals from those eight bids and are an example of potential outcomes with LSOHC funding:

- 674 acres of habitat protected, 131 of which are DNR Sites of Biodiversity Significance.
- 21,024 feet of shoreline on public waters, including 6,635 feet on meandered lakes.
- 10,237 feet property boundary shared with existing public or other protected land.
- 17 building allotments to be extinguished.

Outcomes – Long term & end results:

- The Avon Hills landscape is further protected to assure continuation and health of the remaining ecological diversity, habitat, wildlife, water quality, and forests.
- Outdoor recreational opportunities and scenic vistas are preserved.
- Working forests will be well-cared for and used sustainably.
- Existing blocks of protected land are enlarged to achieve more resilient ecosystems.

Activity Type Detail

Fee Acquisition Projects

Will local government approval be sought prior to acquisition?

- Yes No, please explain not applicable

If no, please explain here:

Is the land you plan to acquire free of any other permanent protection?

- Yes No, please explain not applicable

If no, please explain here:

Easement Acquisition Projects

Will the eased land be open for public use?

- Yes No, please explain not applicable

If no, please explain here: While the idea of allowing public use will be encouraged throughout the process, it is not a requirement for participation. It is not expected that landowners of parcels less than

500 acres would likely grant blanket public access, though most probably allow access to relatives, friends, and people who ask permission.

Will the conservation easement be permanent?

Yes No, please explain not applicable

If no, please explain here:

Restoration and Enhancement Projects

Is the activity on permanently protected land and/or public waters?

Yes No, please explain not applicable

If no, please explain here:

Does the activity take place on an Aquatic Management Area (AMA), Scientific and Natural Area (SNA), Wildlife Management Area (WMA), or State Forests?

Yes, which ones No, please explain not applicable

If so, please indicate which ones:

Past Outdoor Heritage Fund Appropriations Received for this program

ML 2009	ML 2010	ML 2011
\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00

Accomplishment Timeline

Activity	Milestone	Date
Recruit and advertise round 1 of bidding	Newspaper articles / personal contacts	Sept-Dec 2012
Open bids and prioritize round 1 of bidding	Finalize commitment for \$500,000 in easements.	January 30, 2013
Complete easements from round 1	Complete approx. 250 acres of easements	June 30, 2013
Recruit and advertise round 2 of bidding	Newspaper articles / personal contacts	Feb- April 2013
Open bids and prioritize round 2 of bidding	Finalize commitment for \$500,000 in easements.	May 15, 2013

Complete easements from round 2	Complete approx. 250 acres of easements	Dec 30, 2013
---------------------------------	---	--------------

Attachments:

- A. Budget**
- B. Proposed Output Tables 1-5**
- C. Parcel List**

Attachment A. Budget Spreadsheet

Name of Proposal:	Conservation Easements in the Avon Hills using MMAPLE
Date:	8-Jul-11

[Link HERE to definitions of the budget items below.](#)

Total Amount of Request \$ 1,354,000 *From page 1 on the funding form.*

Personnel

Position breakdown here	FTE	Over # of years	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Cash		Total
				Leverage	Cash Leverage Source	
<i>SJ Manager of Programs</i>	0.2	2	\$ 14,000			\$ 14,000
<i>SJ Admin Assts</i>	0.15	3	\$ 11,000			\$ 11,000
<i>MLT Conservation Staff</i>	0.75	3	\$ 70,000			\$ 70,000
<i>MLT Legal Staff</i>	0.2	3	\$ 26,000			\$ 26,000
		3				\$ -
						\$ -
						\$ -
Total	1.3		\$ 121,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 121,000

Budget and Cash Leverage *(All your LSOHC Request Funds must be direct to and necessary for program outcomes.)*

Please describe how you intend to spend the requested funds.

Budget Item	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Cash		Total
		Leverage	Cash Leverage Source	
Personnel - <i>auto entered from above</i>	\$ 121,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 121,000
Contracts	\$ 8,000			\$ 8,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT <i>(breakout in table 7)</i>				\$ -
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT <i>(breakout in table 7)</i>				\$ -
Easement Acquisition	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 300,000	<i>landowners</i>	\$ 1,300,000
Easement Stewardship	\$ 136,000			\$ 136,000
Travel (in-state)	\$ 3,000			\$ 3,000
Professional Services	\$ 80,000			\$ 80,000
Direct Support Services	\$ 6,000			\$ 6,000
DNR Land Acquisition Costs <i>(\$3,500 per acquisition)</i>				\$ -
Other				\$ -
Capital Equipment <i>(auto entered from below)</i>	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -
Other Equipment/Tools				\$ -
Supplies/Materials				\$ -
	\$ 1,354,000	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ 1,654,000

Capital Equipment *(single items over \$10,000 - auto entered into table above)*

Item Name	LSOHC Request	Leverage
<i>Item 1 enter here</i>		
<i>Item 2 enter here</i>		
<i>Item 3 enter here</i>		
<i>Item 4 enter here</i>		
<i>Item 5 enter here</i>		
<i>Item 6 enter here</i>		
<i>Item 7 enter here</i>		
<i>Item 8 enter here</i>		
Total	-	-

Attachment B. Output Tables

Name of Proposal:	Conservation Easements in the Avon Hills using MMAPLE
Date:	8-Jul-11

Table 1 and Table 3 column totals should be the same AND Table 2 and Table 4 column totals should be the same

If your project has lakes or shoreline miles instead of land acres, convert miles to acres for Tables 1 and 3 using the following conversion:

Lakeshore = 6 acres per lakeshore mile / Stream & River Shore = 12 acres per linear mile, if both sides

Table 1. Acres by Resource Type

Describe the scope of the project in acres (use conversion above if needed)

	Wetlands	Prairies	Forest	Habitats	Total
Restore					0
Protect Fee					0
Protect Easement				500	500
Protect Other					0
Enhance					0
Total	0	0	0	500	

Total Acres (sum of Total column)
Total Acres (sum of Total row)

500
500 *These two cells should be the same figure.*

Table 2. Total Requested Funding by Resource Type

	Wetlands	Prairies	Forest	Habitats	Total
Restore					\$ -
Protect Fee					\$ -
Protect Easement				\$ 1,354,000	\$ 1,354,000
Protect Other					\$ -
Enhance					\$ -
Total	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,354,000	

Total Dollars (sum of Total column)
Total Dollars (sum of Total row)

\$ 1,354,000
\$ 1,354,000 *These two cells should be the same figure.*

Check to make sure this amount is the same as the Funding Request Amount on page 1 of Main Funding Form.

Table 3. Acres within each Ecological Section

	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	Northern Forest	Total
Restore						0
Protect Fee						0
Protect Easement		500				500
Protect Other						0
Enhance						0
Total	0	500	0	0	0	

Total Acres (sum of Total column)
Total Acres (sum of Total row)
Total Acres from Table 1.

500
500
500 *These three cells should be the same figure.*

Attachment B. Output Tables

Table 4. Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section

	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	Northern Forest	Total
Restore						\$ -
Protect Fee						\$ -
Protect Easement		\$ 1,354,000				\$ 1,354,000
Protect Other						\$ -
Enhance						\$ -
Total	\$ -	\$ 1,354,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	

Total Dollars (sum of Total column)

\$ 1,354,000

These two cells should be the same figure.

Total Dollars (sum of Total row)

\$ 1,354,000

Check to make sure these amounts are the same as the Funding Request Amount on page 1 of Main Funding Form.

Table 5. Target Lake/Stream/River Miles

miles of Lakes / Streams / Rivers Shoreline

Table 6. Acquisition by PILT Status (enter information in acres)

	Wetlands	Prairies	Forests	Habitats	Total
Acquired in Fee with State PILT Liability					0
Acquired in Fee w/o State PILT Liability					0
Permanent Easement PILT Liability				500	500
	0	0	0	500	

Table 7. Estimated Value of Land Acquisition by PILT Status (enter information in dollars)

	Wetlands	Prairies	Forests	Habitats	Total	
Acquired in Fee with State PILT Liability					\$ -	\$ -
Acquired in Fee w/o State PILT Liability					\$ -	\$ -
Permanent Easement PILT Liability		\$ 1,300,000			\$ 1,300,000	\$ 1,300,000
	\$ -	\$ 1,300,000	\$ -	\$ -		

FYI: should match total in budget table that is auto entered below

Attachment C. Parcel List

Name of Proposal: Conservation Easements in the Avon Hills using MMAPLE
Date: 8-Jul-11

All parcels below are for EXAMPLE ONLY as bidding will determine the final parcels. Those listed below bid on the March 2011 round of LCCMR funding and were not completed due to lack of funds.

Parcel Name	County	Township (25-258)	Range (01-51)	Direction most parcels are 2 with the exception of some areas of Cook County which is 1	Section (01 thru 36)	TRDS	# of acres	Budgetary Estimate (includes administrative, restoration or other related costs and do not include matching money contributed or earned by the transaction)	Description	Activity PF=Protect Fee PE=Protect Easement PO=Protect Other R=Restore E=Enhance	If Easement, what is the easement cost as a % of the fee acquisition?	Any existing protection? (yes/no)	Open to hunting and fishing? (yes/no)
Deerhunter 29	Stearns	124	30	2	26 & 27		129	\$387,000	6240 feet on public water	PE	63%	no	no
Farm boy	Stearns	124	30	2	22		200	\$501,150	4420 feet on public water	PE	53%	no	no
Rustic place	Stearns	124	30	2	13		103	\$63,036	2440 feet on public water	PE	13%	no	no
Lob Pine	Stearns	124	30	2	5		55	\$99,000	1924 feet on public water	PE	38%	no	no
Bobolink	Stearns	123	30	2	2		61	\$73,200		PE	27%	no	no
Whats the name	Stearns	124	30	2	27		40	\$37,600	Adjacent to USF&WS	PE	20%	no	no

Information provided will be used to map project locations. Incomplete or inaccurate information will result in that parcel or program not being mapped.