

# Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

## Laws of Minnesota 2018 Accomplishment Plan



**Date:** October 16, 2017

**Program or Project Title:** Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase IV

**Funds Recommended:** \$ 1,162,000

**Manager's Name:** Eran Sandquist

**Title:** State Coordinator - MN

**Organization:** MN Prairie Chicken Society / Pheasants Forever, Inc.

**Address:** 410 Lincoln Ave S

**Address 2:** Box 91

**City:** South Haven , MN 55382

**Office Number:** 320-236-7755

**Mobile Number:** 763-242-1273

**Email:** esandquist@pheasantsforever.org

**Website:** www.pheasantsforever.org

**Legislative Citation:** ML 2018, Ch. X, Art. 1, Sec. 2, subd XX

**Appropriation Language:**

**County Locations:** Clay, Mahnomen, Norman, and Wilkin.

**Regions in which work will take place:**

- Forest / Prairie Transition
- Prairie

**Activity types:**

- Protect in Fee

**Priority resources addressed by activity:**

- Prairie

### Abstract:

The Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership IV permanently protects 303 acres of greater prairie chicken habitat in the Southern Red River Valley of Minnesota. This partnership protects and restores strategic habitat that builds onto or creates corridors between existing protected lands. Acquired lands will be transferred to the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MN DNR) to be included as a Wildlife Management Area (WMA) or to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) as a WPA. This proposal aims to build quality grassland habitat blocks that sustain and grow greater prairie chicken populations in Minnesota.

### Design and scope of work:

The Problem: In Minnesota, greater prairie chickens are largely restricted to the beach ridges of the Glacial Lake Agassiz region. Greater prairie chickens require large blocks of grasslands, with a minimum of 320 acres at any one site. The makeup of these grassland complexes should include numerous successional states of habitat to sustain a local population. Greater prairie chickens are a "flagship" species in the sense that if we have greater prairie chickens on the landscape, then we have also included the habitat needs of many additional grassland-dependent wildlife species with less exacting habitat requirements. Greater prairie chicken habitat has declined dramatically in recent years due to 1) loss of Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) acres and 2) conversion of grasslands; (including remnant native prairie), to row crop production.

**An Approach to the Problem:** This partnership protects native and restored prairies, sedge meadows, and other types of grasslands and associated wetlands to promote the growth and stability of greater prairie chicken populations. The priority is protecting remnant prairies within core and corridor areas of the Minnesota Prairie Conservation Plan. All projects acquired under this proposal will be restored and/or enhanced to be productive grassland habitat as part of the grant activity. Once acquired, the subject tracts will be fully restored and/or enhanced. Our proposed tracts were identified as high priority greater prairie chicken habitat with willing sellers who have an interest in preserving wildlife values of those acres. Tracts are also on the list based on a strategic approach that ranks each tract based on six criteria including: 1) distance to the nearest prairie chicken lek; 2) location in or outside of a core area from the Minnesota Prairie Conservation Plan (MPCP); 3) distance to the nearest public hunting land (WPA or WMA); 4) tract size; 5) current grassland type (native prairie, restored prairie, brome, or row crop; and 6) wetland density and predicted waterfowl breeding pairs (wetlands can provide important habitat for prairie chickens over their annual life cycle).

**Benefits:** By protecting, restoring and enhancing grasslands and wetlands in the right areas, this partnership delivers on many of the goals of the MPCP. In fact, one ecosystem measure of the MPCP success is to have stable or increasing greater prairie chicken populations in Minnesota. The MPCP is ideally suited for greater prairie chicken management with core areas containing large contiguous blocks of grassland and smaller grassland patches scattered across the landscape called corridors that allow birds to maintain populations outside the core areas as well as move across the landscape. In addition to grassland conservation, most tracts have extensive wetlands. Restoring and maintaining these wetlands will have several benefits including water storage, sequestering and storing carbon, water quality, diversity of flora and fauna, and reducing erosion. Providing secure habitat for greater prairie chickens also provides habitat for a host of other grassland species that have less exacting habitat requirement with respect to acreage.

### **How does the request address MN habitats that have: historical value to fish and wildlife, wildlife species of greatest conservation need, MN County Biological Survey data, and/or rare, threatened and endangered species inventories:**

There are a number of game, non-game, and Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) that benefit from this partnership's results. Pheasants Forever uses GIS layers and works with DNR staff to identify rare, threatened and endangered species that occur on or near a project. The State of North America's Birds 2016 report (<http://www.stateofthebirds.org/2016/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/SoNAB-ENGLISH-web.pdf>) shows how many of our continent's grassland birds are in steep declines, and species dependent on grasslands are also threatened. SGCN for this region include eight mammals, 54 birds, three reptiles, and ten insects. Of those, all eight mammals and ten insects, as well as 38 of the bird species could potentially benefit from these activities. Many of the proposed tracts contain native prairie communities as mapped by the Minnesota Biological Survey. Depending on the quality, these native tracts likely have a number of T&E prairie dependent species identified on them. This proposal aims to increase greater prairie chicken numbers in Minnesota by adding to and connecting the system of grassland habitats across the landscape. In this way, we are addressing greater prairie chicken populations, while also building more habitat for rare, threatened and endangered species. We work in close coordination with partners and land managers on the restoration and enhancement of all acquired tracts. When SGCN are located on or near project tracts, restoration/enhancement activities add habitat value for these species as feasible.

### **Describe the science based planning and evaluation model used:**

This proposal is fully integrated into the MPCP as described in the "design and scope of work" section. Most of the tracts listed are within core areas, have remnant native prairie on them, and are adjacent to existing WMAs/WPAs, allowing us to build upon past conservation efforts. Most tracts are within less than a half mile of known greater prairie chicken habitat. The latest geospatial layers will be used to help identify and evaluate projects such as the MN County Biological Survey, core and corridors in the MNPCP, high priority areas within the MN Wildlife Action Plan, etc. to make the best science-based decisions as possible. Close coordination with local resource managers will ensure that this partnership is delivering the best results for the investment.

A recent study by MN DNR researcher, Dr. Charlotte Roy, and collaborators Dr. Andrew Gregory (Bowling Green State University) and Eric Nelson (MN DNR), informs us about landscape connectivity gaps for greater prairie chickens. Using landscape genetic techniques, Dr. Roy and her colleagues learned that greater prairie chickens in the northern part of the sampled area, near Glacial Ridge National Wildlife Refuge, are not very connected to greater prairie chickens in Clay, Otter Tail, and Wilkin counties to the south. Their findings suggest that providing quality grassland habitat in Norman and Polk counties should be a priority to improve connectivity in the planned corridor. The genetic data obtained also indicates that birds in Norman County are moving less than other areas, which could put them at risk for inbreeding in the future, particularly if habitat needs are not addressed. To begin addressing this conservation need, the researchers recommend increasing grassland quantity and improving grassland quality near areas from which greater prairie chickens can expand, to begin making connections between core areas in the planned corridor.

### **Which sections of the Minnesota Statewide Conservation and Preservation Plan are applicable to this program:**

- H1 Protect priority land habitats

- H3 Improve connectivity and access to recreation

### Which other plans are addressed in this program:

- Grassland Conservation Plan for Prairie Grouse
- Minnesota Prairie Conservation Plan

### Which LSOHC section priorities are addressed in this program:

#### Forest / Prairie Transition:

- Protect, enhance, and restore wild rice wetlands, shallow lakes, wetland/grassland complexes, aspen parklands, and shoreland that provide critical habitat for game and nongame wildlife

#### Prairie:

- Protect, enhance, or restore existing wetland/upland complexes, or convert agricultural lands to new wetland/upland habitat complexes

### Relationship to other funds:

- Not Listed

#### Describe the relationship of the funds:

Not Listed

### How does this program include leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation:

Available funding continues to be a limiting factor for protection programs. With CRP authority declining in the current farm bill, Minnesota is experiencing significant CRP acres (largely grassland practices) expiring out of the program. Conservation efforts must be accelerated to sustain or grow grassland habitat for wildlife. Before the passage of the Legacy Amendment, PF would acquire approximately 1,000 acres/year to become WMAs or WPAs in this area. This grant significantly accelerates our ability to acquire priority parcels and more than triples our historic annual accomplishments. This proposal accelerates the protection and restoration of valuable grassland habitat that benefit greater prairie chickens and other wildlife while providing additional public access to hunt, bird, trap or otherwise recreate in Minnesota's great outdoors.

### Per MS 97A.056, Subd. 24, Any state agency or organization requesting a direct appropriation from the OHF must inform the LSOHC at the time of the request for funding is made, whether the request is supplanting or is a substitution for any previous funding that was not from a legacy fund and was used for the same purpose:

This proposal accelerates protection efforts in the state and does not supplant any previous funding.

### Describe the source and amount of non-OHF money spent for this work in the past:

Appropriation Year	Source	Amount
Annual		None

### How will you sustain and/or maintain this work after the Outdoor Heritage Funds are expended:

All lands will be enrolled into the WMA or WPA system and will be managed in perpetuity by the MN DNR or USFWS, respectively. All acquisitions will be restored and/or enhanced to as high quality as practicable, with the knowledge that quality and comprehensive restorations utilizing native species result in lower management costs. In addition, local PF chapter members and volunteers maintain significant interest in seeing the habitat and productivity of acquired parcels are high. MPCs, PF, DNR and USFWS will develop an ecological restoration and management plan for each parcel. Grant and partner dollars will be used for the initial site development and restoration/enhancement work.

## Explain the things you will do in the future to maintain project outcomes:

Year	Source of Funds	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Post Transfer - WMA	DNR - Game and Fish Funds	Standard long-term maintenance; fire, invasives control, etc		
Post Transfer - WPA	USFWS - Federal	Standard long-term maintenance; fire, invasives control, etc		

### Activity Details:

If funded, this program will meet all applicable criteria set forth in MS 97A.056 - **Yes**

Will there be planting of corn or any crop on OHF land purchased or restored in this program - **Yes**

Explain

The primary purposes of WMAs are to develop and manage for the production of wildlife and for compatible outdoor recreation. To fulfill those goals, the DNR may use limited farming, specifically to enhance or benefit the management of state lands for wildlife. This proposal may include initial development plans or restoration plans to utilize farming to prepare previously farmed sites for native plant seeding. This is a standard practice across the Midwest to prepare the seedbed for native seed planting. In these restorations, PF's policy is to use non neonicotinoid treated seed and no herbicides other than glyphosate. On a small percentage of WMAs (less than 2.5%), DNR uses farming to provide a winter food source for a variety of wildlife species in agriculture-dominated landscapes largely devoid of winter food sources. There are no immediate plans to use farming for winter food on any of the parcels in this proposal.

Are any of the crop types planted GMO treated - **Yes**

Will local government approval be sought prior to acquisition - **No**

At minimum, we will notify local government in writing of the intent to acquire and donate lands to the state and follow up with questions prior to the acquisition. In cases where there is interest, we will also indicate our willingness to attend or ask to attend county or township meetings to communicate our interest in the projects and seek support.

Is the land you plan to acquire (fee title) free of any other permanent protection - **No**

Because we are working within priority habitat areas, it is possible that parcels could have perpetual easements on a portion of them. If a parcel has a perpetual easement and is deemed a high priority by the partners, we will follow guidance established by the Outdoor Heritage Fund to proceed, or use non-state funding to acquire the protected portion of the property.

Is this land currently open for hunting and fishing - **No**

Will the land be open for hunting and fishing after completion - **Yes**

No variation from State of MN regulations for WMA acquisitions.

All WPA acquisitions will be open to the public taking of fish and game during the open season according to the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act, United States Code, title 16, section 668dd, et seq.

Who will eventually own the fee title land?

The State of Minnesota

Are there currently trails or roads on any of the acquisitions on the parcel list - **No**

Will new trails or roads be developed or improved as a result of the OHF acquisition - **No**

## Accomplishment Timeline:

Activity	Approximate Date Completed
Identify priority acquisitions	07/01/2018
Contract appraisals ordered	09/01/2018
Purchase agreements	02/01/2019
Re-evaluate tract priority	02/14/2019
Contract appraisals ordered	04/01/2019
Purchase agreements	09/01/2019
Close on tracts	01/01/2021
Restorations completed	06/30/2023

**Date of Final Report Submission:** 11/1/2023

## Federal Funding:

Do you anticipate federal funds as a match for this program - **Yes**

Are the funds confirmed - **No**

What is the approximate date you anticipate receiving confirmation of the federal funds - **07/01/2018**

## Outcomes:

### Programs in forest-prairie transition region:

- Protected, restored, and enhanced nesting and migratory habitat for waterfowl, upland birds, and species of greatest conservation need *Number of acres of uplands protected and restored.*

### Programs in prairie region:

- Key core parcels are protected for fish, game and other wildlife *Most parcels are within core areas as defined by the MPCP. Most parcels abut existing WMAs or WPAs which will create larger blocks of contiguous habitat. Most tracts have some remaining native prairie on them meeting a second goal of the MPCP of protecting remaining native prairie. Number of acres protected within core areas and corridors of the MPCP.*

# Budget Spreadsheet

Budget reallocations up to 10% do not require an amendment to the Accomplishment Plan

**How will this program accommodate the reduced appropriation recommendation from the original proposed requested amount**

We have reduced accomplishments/costs proportionately across the overall program to accommodate the reduced appropriation. As a result of the reduction, we will be able to protect fewer acres. As in past appropriations, we will focus on the most strategic, highest priority tracts.

**Total Amount of Request: \$ 1162000**

## Budget and Cash Leverage

BudgetName	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	\$8,600	\$0		\$8,600
Contracts	\$197,100	\$0		\$197,100
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	\$910,000	\$12,100	Federal, Private, PF, MPCS	\$922,100
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	\$0	\$0		\$0
Easement Acquisition	\$0	\$0		\$0
Easement Stewardship	\$0	\$0		\$0
Travel	\$600	\$0		\$600
Professional Services	\$21,800	\$0		\$21,800
Direct Support Services	\$3,400	\$0		\$3,400
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	\$9,500	\$0		\$9,500
Capital Equipment	\$0	\$0		\$0
Other Equipment/Tools	\$0	\$0		\$0
Supplies/Materials	\$0	\$0		\$0
DNR IDP	\$11,000	\$0		\$11,000
Total	\$1,162,000	\$12,100		\$1,174,100

## Personnel

Position	FTE	Over # of years	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
PF State Coordinator - MN	0.01	3.00	\$1,800	\$0		\$1,800
PF Field Staff	0.02	3.00	\$3,400	\$0		\$3,400
PF Grant Staff	0.02	3.00	\$3,400	\$0		\$3,400
Total	0.05	9.00	\$8,600	\$0		\$8,600

Amount of Request: \$1,162,000

Amount of Leverage: \$12,100

Leverage as a percent of the Request: 1.04%

DSS + Personnel: \$12,000

As a % of the total request: 1.03%

**How did you determine which portions of the Direct Support Services of your shared support services is direct to this program:**

PF utilizes the Total Modified Direct Cost method. This methodology is annually approved by the U.S. Department of Interior's National Business Center as the basis for the organization's Indirect Cost Rate agreement. PF's allowable direct support services cost is 4.12%. In this proposal, PF has discounted its rate to 1.5% of the sum of personnel, contracts, professional services, and travel. We are donating the difference-in-kind.

**Does the amount in the contract line include R/E work?**

We anticipate that all of the contract funding will be used for restoration, enhancement and initial development of the protected acres. This could include but is not limited to wetland/grassland restoration, tree removal, prescribed fire, building removal, parking lots, signage, and other development activities.

**Describe and explain leverage source and confirmation of funds:**

Leverage is expected from multiple sources, including but not limited to federal sources, land value donations, contractor donations, MPCS and PF. Not every source is 100% confirmed at this point. However, PF has an exemplary track record of delivery and over-achievement of match commitments that further stretch OHF funding.

## Output Tables

**Table 1a. Acres by Resource Type**

Type	Wetlands	Prairies	Forest	Habitats	Total
Restore	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	303	0	0	303
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Easement	0	0	0	0	0
Enhance	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	303	0	0	303

**Table 1b. How many of these Prairie acres are Native Prairie?**

Type	Native Prairie
Restore	0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	0
Protect in Easement	0
Enhance	0
Total	0

**Table 2. Total Funding by Resource Type**

Type	Wetlands	Prairies	Forest	Habitats	Total
Restore	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	\$0	\$1,162,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,162,000
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Enhance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$0	\$1,162,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,162,000

**Table 3. Acres within each Ecological Section**

Type	Metro Urban	ForestPrairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N Forest	Total
Restore	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	0	0	303	0	303
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Easement	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enhance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	303	0	303

**Table 4. Total Funding within each Ecological Section**

Type	Metro Urban	ForestPrairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N Forest	Total
Restore	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,162,000	\$0	\$1,162,000
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Enhance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,162,000	\$0	\$1,162,000



Table 5. Average Cost per Acre by Resource Type

Type	Wetlands	Prairies	Forest	Habitats
Restore	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	\$0	\$3835	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Enhance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Table 6. Average Cost per Acre by Ecological Section

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	Northern Forest
Restore	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3835	\$0
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Enhance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

0

## Parcel List

For restoration and enhancement programs ONLY: Managers may add, delete, and substitute projects on this parcel list based upon need, readiness, cost, opportunity, and/or urgency so long as the substitute parcel/project forwards the constitutional objectives of this program in the Project Scope table of this accomplishment plan. The final accomplishment plan report will include the final parcel list.

### Section 1 - Restore / Enhance Parcel List

No parcels with an activity type restore or enhance.

### Section 2 - Protect Parcel List

#### Clay

Name	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection?	Hunting?	Fishing?
Clay County WMA addition	13845222	160	\$512,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Gruhl WMA	14045229	160	\$458,334	No	Full	Not Applicable
Hatchet Lake WPA addition	14145229	615	\$1,968,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Hoykens WPA addition	14044230	160	\$544,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Hoykens WPA addition	14045225	282	\$958,800	No	Full	Not Applicable

#### Mahnomen

Name	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection?	Hunting?	Fishing?
Coburn WMA addition	14342231	160	\$416,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Jason Barker WPA addition	14542224	116	\$371,200	No	Full	Not Applicable
Jason Barker WPA addition	14542225	230	\$598,000	Yes	Full	Not Applicable
Santwire WMA addition	14341205	280	\$728,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Skoog WPA addition	14342212	80	\$120,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Vanose WMA addition	14641225	309	\$575,000	No	Full	Not Applicable

#### Norman

Name	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection?	Hunting?	Fishing?
Agassiz Olson WMA addition	14645233	120	\$240,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Dalby WMA addition	14345210	160	\$320,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Dalby WMA addition	14345211	200	\$400,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Faith WMA addition	14443225	80	\$120,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Faith WMA addition	14443226	200	\$400,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Frenchmans Bluff WPA addition	14343207	60	\$150,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Neal WMA addition	14344218	320	\$960,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Neal WMA addition	14344219	20	\$80,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Rockwell WMA addition	14445234	160	\$512,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Slininger WPA addition	14345210	320	\$1,024,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Twin Valley WMA addition, Tract 6	14344228	400	\$940,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Vagsness WMA addition, Tract 5	14344202	40	\$40,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Vagsness WMA addition, Tract 8	14344202	60	\$100,000	No	Full	Not Applicable

## Wilkin

Name	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection?	Hunting?	Fishing?
Rothsay WMA addition	13545205	150	\$495,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Rothsay WMA addition	13545207	160	\$512,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Rothsay WMA addition	13545217	480	\$1,536,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Rothsay WMA addition	13545221	40	\$128,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Rothsay WMA addition	13546210	320	\$960,000	No	Full	Not Applicable
Rothsay WMA addition	13546214	320	\$1,024,000	No	Full	Not Applicable

### Section 2a - Protect Parcel with Bldgs


No parcels with an activity type protect and has buildings.

### Section 3 - Other Parcel Activity

No parcels with an other activity type.

## Parcel Map

### Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase IV



Data Generated From Parcel List

# Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

## Comparison Report

**Program Title:** 2018 - Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase IV

**Organization:** MN Prairie Chicken Society / Pheasants Forever, Inc.

**Manager:** Eran Sandquist

## Budget

Requested Amount: \$9,576,700

Appropriated Amount: \$1,162,000

Percentage: 12.13%

Budget Item	Total Requested		Total Appropriated		Percentage of Request	
	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Leverage	Appropriated Amount	Anticipated Leverage	Percentage of Request	Percentage of Leverage
Personnel	\$71,000	\$0	\$8,600	\$0	12.11%	-
Contracts	\$1,625,000	\$0	\$197,100	\$0	12.13%	-
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	\$4,500,000	\$50,000	\$910,000	\$12,100	20.22%	24.20%
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	\$3,000,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	0.00%	0.00%
Easement Acquisition	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-	-
Easement Stewardship	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-	-
Travel	\$5,000	\$0	\$600	\$0	12.00%	-
Professional Services	\$179,400	\$0	\$21,800	\$0	12.15%	-
Direct Support Services	\$28,300	\$0	\$3,400	\$0	12.01%	-
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	\$78,000	\$0	\$9,500	\$0	12.18%	-
Capital Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-	-
Supplies/Materials	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-	-
DNR IDP	\$90,000	\$0	\$11,000	\$0	12.22%	-
Total	\$9,576,700	\$100,000	\$1,162,000	\$12,100	12.13%	12.10%

## How will this program accommodate the reduced appropriation recommendation from the original proposed requested amount?

We have reduced accomplishments/costs proportionately across the overall program to accommodate the reduced appropriation. As a result of the reduction, we will be able to protect fewer acres. As in past appropriations, we will focus on the most strategic, highest priority tracts.

## Output

**Table 1a. Acres by Resource Type**

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	0	0	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	1,500	303	20.20%
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	1,000	0	0.00%
Protect in Easement	0	0	-
Enhance	0	0	-

**Table 2. Total Funding by Resource Type**

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	0	0	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	5,746,000	1,162,000	20.22%
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	3,830,700	0	0.00%
Protect in Easement	0	0	-
Enhance	0	0	-

**Table 3. Acres within each Ecological Section**

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	0	0	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	1,500	303	20.20%
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	1,000	0	0.00%
Protect in Easement	0	0	-
Enhance	0	0	-

**Table 4. Total Funding within each Ecological Section**

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	0	0	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	5,746,000	1,162,000	20.22%
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	3,830,700	0	0.00%
Protect in Easement	0	0	-
Enhance	0	0	-