Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Agenda Item Memo

DATE: June 4, 2013

SUBJECT: ML 2012, Ch. 264, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 3c Northeast Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse

Habitat Partnership;

ML 2013, Ch. 147, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 3c Northeast Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse

Habitat Partnership

Background:

Pheasants Forever requests an amendment to the accomplishment plans for:

 ML 2012, Ch. 264, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 3c Northeast Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership and

• ML 2013, Ch. 147, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 3c Northeast Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership.

The amendment accommodates unforeseen a higher than planned appraisal. The top priority acquisition abuts Gun Lake WMA on three sides. It has been identified as critical habitat for one of the top 13 leks in east central Minnesota. The land to be acquired is needed for the lek's welfare. This 760 acre parcel is appraised at \$2,210,000. The purchase price is based on an appraisal conducted to state standards as defined by DNR.

If the Council agrees to the amendment allowing the Gun Lake AMA acquisition, outputs across both appropriations decrease from a total of 1,984 acres to 760 acres. Also, completing the acquisition will require nearly the entirety of both years' appropriation. Pheasants Forever and the Minnesota Sharptailed Grouse Society recommend the amendments allowing the acquisition and reducing the program outputs because of the quality of the lek served and the critical location of the land relative to the existing WMA.

Suggested Motion:

'I move to approve the accomplishment plan amendment reducing the total outputs of the Northeast Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership Accomplishment Plans for Minnesota Laws of 2012 and 2013 from 1984 acres to 760 acres for the reasons presented.'

Suggested Procedure:

Place the above motion before the Council for approval. Discuss the program with the program manager. Amend the above motion if discussions with the program manager indicate an amendment is necessary. Vote on the amendment.

Agenda Item # 11

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Laws of Minnesota 2012 Accomplishment Plan

Date: May 11, 2012 Amendment Request - May 30, 2013

Program Title: Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership

Manager's Name: Ward Julien Title: Board Member, Treasurer

Organization: Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Society

Telephone: 763-754-8361

Email: jpavelko@pheasantsforever.org

Fax: 651-773-5500

Manager's Name: Ron Leathers

Title: Director of Public Finance, Fiscal Agent

Organization: Pheasants Forever, Inc.

Telephone: 651-209-4919

Email: rleathers@pheasantsforever.org

Fax: 651-773-5500

Funds Recommended: \$1,340,000

Legislative Citation: ML 2012, Ch. 264, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 3 (c): Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-Tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership - Phase III - \$1,340,000 in the second year is to the commissioner of natural resources for an agreement with Pheasants Forever in cooperation with the Minnesota Sharp-Tailed Grouse Society to acquire and enhance lands for wildlife management area purposes under Minnesota Statutes, section 86A.05, subdivision 8. A list of proposed land acquisitions must be provided as part of the required accomplishment plan.

Abstract:

This sharp-tailed grouse habitat partnership will protect, restore and enhance up to $\frac{1,015}{476}$ acres, primarily brushland, in northeastern Minnesota for addition to the WMA system, providing multiple environmental benefits.

Program Narrative

Design and Scope of Work

Until the 1880s, most of Minnesota was inhabited by sharp-tailed grouse where suitable open and brushland habitat, such as prairies, savannas, sedge meadows and open bogs, occurred. This indigenous grouse was once one of Minnesota's most abundant game birds, with over 100,000 harvested annually in the 1940's. Loss, degradation and fragmentation of open and brushland habitat within Minnesota due to natural succession and conversion to other land uses (cropland and tree plantations) has lead to a long term decline in this unique grouse's population (estimated harvest of 14,000 in 2008), causing its listing as a species in greatest conservation need. Today its remaining range in northern Minnesota, which is less than one-third of its historic range, is in jeopardy of additional fragmentation and degradation.

In east central Minnesota, preliminary research results have shown that genetic diversity of the sharp-tailed grouse population may be declining due to increasing isolation of subpopulations. In nearby Wisconsin, genetic diversity (allelic diversity and heterozygosity) has declined so greatly that Wisconsin DNR has begun translocating sharp-tailed grouse to create a genetic infusion to increase the likelihood that populations will persist. Increasing the amount of protected brushland habitat in northeastern Minnesota will be critical to the sustainability of the local sharp-tailed grouse population and gene exchange between Minnesota and Wisconsin populations.

habitat that will be affected and how actions will directly restore, enhance, and/or protect them:

Specific habitats to be affected will include up to 1,015 476 acres of open, brushland, and forest habitat (including 495 20 acres of wetland and 165 acres forest). Acquisition of the habitats and their transfer to MDNR for management under the state WMA will protect them. Natural habitats will include wet meadow, sedge meadow, shrub wetland, bog, grassland, and aspen and northern hardwoods forest. They will be enhanced with prescribed burning, mowing, shearing, timber harvest, and possibly grazing, biomass harvest and occasional haying to maintain open and brushland landscape. Other land includes hay, pasture and crop land that will be restored to open and brushland habitat through establishment of native vegetation, prescribed burning and natural succession.

Multiple benefits:

Multiple benefits of the above protection, enhancement and restoration actions will include increased plant and animal diversity, carbon sequestration, water retention and filtration, opportunities for biomass harvest, access to public lands for recreation, increases eco-tourism opportunities, economic benefits, and secure habitat for sharp-tailed grouse and other open and brushland species in greatest conservation need.

Wildlife species that will benefit:

In addition to sharp-tailed grouse, several other species that use or depend upon open and brushland habitats are also in decline, listed as species in greatest conservation need, and will benefit from this project, including bobolinks, loggerhead shrikes, short-eared owls, yellow rails, eastern meadowlarks, American bittern, northern harrier, golden-winged warblers, Henslow's sparrow, Le Conte's sparrow,

Nelson's sharp-tailed sparrow, and American woodcock. Six of these species are state listed as endangered, threatened or special concern.

Game species that will benefit include white-tailed deer, waterfowl (mallards, blue-winged teal, Canada geese, and more species during migration), wild turkey, American woodcock, common snipe, ruffed grouse, cottontail rabbit, snowshoe hare, fox, raccoon, and bobcat. Many nongame species such as the Eastern bluebird, American kestrel, brown thrasher, gray catbird, common yellowthroat, sora rail, sedge wren, and spring peeper will benefit, as well as the sandhill crane which is expanding its range.

Urgency and opportunity:

If not acquired while the opportunities exist (i.e., willing sellers and funding opportunities), the chance to protect these priority tracts permanently from land practices incompatible as open and brushland wildlife habitat, and from fragmentation, parcelization and development may be lost.

How priorities were set / Parcel selection and scoring process:

For consideration of protection and enhancement efforts by the partnership, open and brushland tracts must be located within an ECS landtype association identified as a priority open landscape through DNR's SFRMP landscape planning process. Further criteria to prioritize which tracts are most critical include a ranking system based upon county location, distance to active sharp-tailed grouse lek, tract size, and distance to protected brushland.

of stakeholder opposition and involvement:

No stakeholder opposition to proposed acquisitions has been encountered. Proposals to protect land and manage them as public conservation lands are locally-driven by conservation groups, hunters, conservation agency staff, and willing sellers due to the multiple benefits such land protection and management can provide. Local government has been or will be contacted and their support sought.

Planning

Relationship to the Minnesota Conservation and Preservation Plan and other Published Resource Management Plans:

- Minnesota Statewide Conservation and Preservation Plan, 2008 This partnership will address and advance the Habitat Recommendations of 1. Protect priority land habitats (p. 63), 3.
 Improve connectivity and access to outdoor recreation (p. 74), 5. Restore land, wetlands, and wetland-associated watershed (p. 80), and 7. Keep water on the landscape (p.84).
- MDNR, Tomorrow's Habitat for the Wild and Rare, 2006 Lists sharp-tailed grouse and other open and brushland wildlife species that are species in greatest conservation need (App. B) and key habitats which occur in brushland ecosystems (wetland-nonforest, shrub/woodland-upland, forest-lowland conifer) of the Tamarack Lowland and Mille Lacs Upland ECS Subsections (profiles on pages 184 and 154, respectively) where the proposed open and brushland tracts to acquire are located. The goal of stabilizing and increasing populations of species in greatest conservation need will be addressed.

- MDNR, A Strategic Conservation Agenda, 2009-2013
 - Trend: Changes in Outdoor Recreation Participation
 Strategic Direction: Connecting People to Minnesota's Great Outdoors (p.13, Long term Desired Outcomes regarding Minnesotan's outdoor recreation needs and increasing participation and opportunities in nature-based outdoor recreation.) Additional access to public conservation lands will help meet these needs.
- o <u>Trend: Changes Related to Energy and Climate</u>
 Strategic Direction: Conservation-based Energy Sources (p. 19, Key Measure on DNR-administered lands) Biomass harvesting has great potential to serve as a management tool in open and brushland habitats.
 - Trend: Landscape Changes from Growth and Development
 Strategic Direction: Integrated Public and Private Land Management (p. 29, Key Measure of number of acres protected in WMAs) This project will add WMAs to the system.
- Minnesota's Wildlife Management Area Acquisition (2002) The Next 50 Years Habitat is the Key This partnership will help meet goals of additional WMA acres in Ecological Sections 5 (p.10, Northern Lakes) and 8 & 9 (p. 15, Superior Uplands) in which sharp-tailed grouse are noted as a focus species.

-based strategic planning and evaluation:

This proposal is based on science-based strategic planning and evaluation, similar to the US Fish and Wildlife Service's Strategic Habitat Conservation model. This model uses biological planning, conservation design, delivery, monitoring and research, and adjustments in strategies as needed to maintain an adaptive approach.

In 2002, DNR Division of Wildlife completed "An Assessment of Open Landscapes for Management of Brushland Wildlife Habitat in Northern and Central Minnesota" to provide information on open landscape wildlife locations, pre-settlement vegetation, land use and cover and landownership/administration to resource managers for identification and prioritization of large, open landscapes. The assessment has been used in DNR's landscape planning effort, Subsection Forest Resource Management Planning, and priority open landscapes (ECS landtype associations) have been identified. All of the open and brushland parcels proposed for acquisition lie within or at the edge of these priority open landscapes.

Sharp-tailed grouse leks (dancing grounds) are the essential hubs of subpopulations. Nesting and brooding rearing occur in suitable habitat within approximately a two-mile radius of leks. Six parcels proposed for protection either have active leks located on them (Olson), less than 0.5 mile away (Thompson, Thompson, Bork), one mile away (Rezac) or less than two miles away (Slade). One parcel (Linder) is slightly over 2 miles from an active lek however sharp-tailed grouse have been observed on it.

A study in 1999 revealed 13 sharp-tailed grouse leks in northeastern Minnesota that had the greatest potential (based on longevity and number of birds using the leks) to be maintained as large active leks and serve as core populations. 87% of these leks were located on private land and vulnerable to land use

changes. In Aitkin County, two parcels proposed for protection each have one of these leks 0.1 to 0.5 mile away (Thompson, Thompson).

All of the tracts will be critical to providing suitable patches of nesting and brood rearing habitat for subpopulations of sharp-tailed grouse in northeastern Minnesota. Research by Stanley Temple in Wisconsin suggests that suitable habitat patches of 4000 ha (roughly 10,000 acres, 15½ sq. miles, or a 2.2 mile radius circle) are needed for a sharp-tailed grouse population to survive. Opportunities to protect and connect suitable patches of this size are dwindling due to development, parcelization and other landscape change pressures.

A nearly completed, sharp-tailed grouse habitat model will help further refine open landscape management and acquisition decisions made within the priority open landscapes.

A pilot study in Aitkin County was conducted in spring/summer 2009 as part of a planned long term study that will examine habitat selection, nest success and survival of sharp-tailed grouse. This long term study will occur in 2012 and 2013 in east central Minnesota. Data will provide additional information to improve and keep brushland management adaptive.

Annual spring surveys of sharp-tailed grouse leks allow for monitoring of local populations and the effect that habitat protection and enhancement and other land management activities have on them.

section priorities addressed:

As noted in the LSOHC's Northern Forest Section Vision, "Of special concern is the condition of brushlands within forestlands. These lands, along with early successional forest habitat are crucial for game species and non-game species and need restoration and enhancement work so as to ensure ample availability of this habitat type." Also, "These and other key habitats are envisioned to protect endangered, threatened and species of special concern." The priority action - "Restore forest-based wildlife habitat that has experienced substantial decline in aerial extent in recent decades" – is specifically addressed. Additionally, nearly all of the Statewide Priority Criteria are addressed.

Relationship to Other Constitutional Funds

The partnership will coordinate with other conservation organizations receiving Constitutional Funding to ensure projects are compatible and complementary; do not have duplicated efforts and together address the Council's statewide and section priorities.

Of the Environment and Natural Resources Trust Fund, Clean Water Fund, Parks and Trail Fund, and Outdoor Heritage Fund, this project is best suited to apply for funds from the latter because it is a habitat-based project. This project will have multiple natural resource, economic and social benefits, but its greatest benefit is in the habitat it will provide for a unique, native game bird that is also a species in greatest conservation need, the entire suite of plants and wildlife that also inhabit the same brushland communities, and the outdoor enthusiasts who enjoy and utilize them.

Relationship to Current Organizational Budget

MSGS and PF do not have a specific, existing budget for protection of critical brushland parcels within the sharp-tailed grouse range of Minnesota, other than a FY11 OH grant and potential FY12 OH grant.

Availability of acquisition funds has been limited and often directed toward other areas of the state, such as for grassland and wetland protection in the western and southern portions of Minnesota.

Sustainability and Maintenance

After the period of grant funding has ended, the proposed parcels will become part of the state WMA system, being sustained and managed by local DNR Wildlife Area staff involved in the partnership. Maintenance will be funded through the DNR budget and funds provided by partners. Partner funds will come from conservation organization's general membership and grants, such as OH and Heritage Enhancement grants.

Stewardship plans for these tracts entail maintenance as integral portions of priority open landscapes. After initial protection and enhancement is completed, the primary habitat management technique will be prescribed burning. It will be used as needed, roughly once every three to seven years, to maintain their open structure and stimulate native vegetation. Brushland prescribed burn costs average approximately \$30/acre, depending upon burn unit size and equipment and personnel needed. Other habitat management techniques may be involve prescribed grazing or haying through cooperative agreements (no cost) or mechanical treatment of woody vegetation such as mowing (\$130/acre), shearing (\$80/acre), timber harvest (no cost), or biomass harvest (\$100/acre).

Outcomes

Short-term and Intermediate Outcomes

- Protection of 1,015 476 acres of brushland habitat around three existing sharp-tailed grouse leks, providing secure nesting and brood rearing habitat.
- Improved access to public lands (1,015 476 additional acres of previously private lands protected and opened permanently for public access)

Long Term and End Results

This proposal is working towards a long term outcome of creating stable and/or increasing wildlife populations of game and non-game species while increasing opportunities for wildlife dependent recreation through an increase in permanently protected publicly owned Wildlife Management Areas.

Accomplishment Timeline

| Activity | Milestone | Date completed |
|-----------------------|--|----------------|
| Funding available | Order appraisals | July 2012 |
| Protection completed | All tracts acquired and transferred to | July 2013 |
| | MDNR for WMA system | |
| Enhancement underway | Initial site development completed | September 2013 |
| Enhancement underway | Firebreaks cleared, winter mechanical | March 2014 |
| | brushland treatments completed | |
| Enhancement underway | Prescribed burns completed, native | June 2014 |
| Restoration completed | vegetation seeded | |
| Enhancement underway | Summer mechanical brushland treatments | September 2014 |
| | completed | |
| Enhancement underway | Additional firebreaks cleared | March 2015 |

| Enhancement completed | Additional prescribed burns completed | June 2015 |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|

Attachments (on spreadsheet workbook – 3 separate tabs):

- A. Budget
- B. Proposed Outcome Tables
- C. Parcel List

No Map is needed for the accomplishment plan

Attachment A. Budget Spreadsheet

| Name of | Proposal: |
|---------|-----------|
| Date: | |

| Northeaster | n Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership |
|----------------------|---|
| 5/11/2012 | <u>5/30/2013</u> |
| | |

Link HERE to definitions of the budget items below.

Total Amount of Request \$ 1,340,000 From page 1 on the funding form.

Personnel

| | | Over # of | | Anticipated Cash | | |
|-----------------------------|------|-----------|---------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| | FTE | years | LSOHC Request | Leverage | Cash Leverage Source | Total |
| Position breakdown here | | | | | | |
| PF Director of Conservation | 0.05 | 3 | \$ 12,000 | | | \$ 12,000 |
| PF Regional Representative | 0.08 | 3 | \$ 8,000 | | | \$ 8,000 |
| | | | | | | \$ - |
| | | | | | | \$ - |
| | | | | | | \$ - |
| | | | | | | \$ - |
| | | | | | | \$ - |
| Total | 0.13 | | \$ 20,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 20,000 |

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
Personnel - auto entered from above
Contracts
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT (breakout in table 7)
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT (breakout in table 7)
Easement Acquisition
Easement Stewardship

Travel (in-state)
Professional Services
Direct Support Services

DNR Land Acquisition Costs (\$3,500 per acquisition) **Other**

Capital Equipment (auto entered from below)
Other Equipment/Tools
Supplies/Materials

| LSOHC Request | Anticipated Cash Leverage | | Total |
|-----------------|------------------------------|------|-----------------|
| \$ 20,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 20,000 |
| \$ 54,000 | | | \$ 54,000 |
| \$ 1,167,000 | | | \$ 1,167,000 |
| | | | \$ - |
| \$ 30,000 | | | \$ 30,000 |
| | | | \$ - |
| \$ 10,500 | | | \$ 10,500 |
| | | | \$ 58,500 |
| \$ - | \$ - | | \$ - |
| | | | \$ - |
| \$ 58,500 | | | \$ 58,500 |
| \$ 1,340,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,340,000 |

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

| Item Name | LSOHC Request | Leverage |
|-----------|---------------|----------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Total | - | - |

Attachment B. Output Tables

Name of Proposal:

Date:

Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership 5/11/2012 <u>5/30/2013</u>

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 | | | | 1015 <u>476</u> | <u>476</u> |
| Protect Easement | | | | | 0 |
| Protect Other | | | | | 0 |
| Enhance | | | | | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

476 These two cells o should be the same figure.

Table 2. Total Requested Funding by Resource Type

| | Wetlands | | Prairies | | Forest | | Habi | tats | Total | |
|-------------------------|----------|---|----------|---|--------|---|------|-----------|-------|-----------|
| Restore | | | | | | | | | \$ | - |
| Protect Fee | | | | | | | \$ | 1,340,000 | \$ | 1,340,000 |
| Protect Easement | | | | | | | | | \$ | - |
| Protect Other | | | | | | | | | \$ | - |
| Enhance | | | | | | | | | \$ | - |
| Total | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 1,340,000 | | |

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

1,340,000 These two cells

1,340,000 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 | | | | | 1015 <u>476</u> | 476 |
| Protect Easement | | | | | | 0 |
| Protect Other | | | | | | 0 |
| Enhance | | | | | | 0 |
| Total | (|) 0 | 0 | 0 | C | |

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

476 These three cells o should be the same 476 figure.

Table 4. Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section

| | Metro/Urban | Forest/Prairie | SE Forest | Prairie | Northe | rn Forest | Total | |
|-------------------------|---|----------------------------------|-----------|---------|--------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|
| Restore | | | | | | | \$ | - |
| Protect Fee | | | | | \$ | 1,340,000 | \$ | 1,340,000 |
| Protect Easement | | | | | | | \$ | - |
| Protect Other | | | | | | | \$ | - |
| Enhance | | | | | | | \$ | - |
| Total | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ | 1,340,000 | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | Total Dollars (sum of Total column) | | | | | 1,340,000 | | |
| | | Total Dollars (sum of Total row) | | | | | should be figure. | the same |
| | Check to make sure these amounts are the same | | | | | | | |

Table 5. Target Lake/Stream/River Miles

0 # miles of Lakes / Streams / Rivers Shoreline

as the Funding Request Amount on page 1 of Main Funding Form.

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

Acquired in Fee with State PILT Liability

Acquired in Fee w/o State PILT Liability

Permanent Easement NO State

PILT Liability

| • | , | 0.007 | | | |
|---|----------|----------|---------|----------|-------|
| | Wetlands | Prairies | Forests | Habitats | Total |
| Ī | | | | | |
| L | | | | 1015 | 1015 |
| I | | | | | |
| L | | | | | 0 |
| ľ | | | | | |
| L | | | | | 0 |
| Ī | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1015 | |

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

match total in budget table that is auto

Acquired in Fee with State PILT Liability

Acquired in Fee w/o State PILT Liability

Permanent Easement NO State

PILT Liability

| Wetlands | l | Prairies | Fo | rests | Habitats | Total | | entered below | |
|----------|----|----------|----|-------|-----------------|-------|-----------|---------------|-----------|
| | | | | | \$ 1,167,000 | \$ | 1,167,000 | \$ | 1,167,000 |
| | | | | | | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| | | | | | | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ 1,167,000 | | | | |

Attachment C. Parcel List

| Name | οf | Pro | posal | ŀ |
|------|----|-----|-------|---|
| | | | | |

Date:

Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership

24 Oct 11 30-May-13

| 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? | protection? (yes/no) | Open to hunting and fishing? (yes/no) |
|--|---------|----------------------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|--------------|----------------------|--|-------------|--|--|-------------------------|--|
| Pomroy Pastures WMA (new) | Kanabec | 41 | 22 | 1 | 1. 4. 11. 131 | 2211,4,11,13 | 960 | 1,540,000 | | PF, R, E | | No | Yes |
| Alm Land | | | | _ | , ,, | , ,==,== | | _,, | | , , | | | |
| Gun Lake WMA (addition) Thompson land | Aitkin | 48 | 25 | 2 | 5 | 482525 € | 297.7 760 | \$ 695,000 \$2,210,000 | | PF, R, E | | No | Yes |
| Grayling Marsh WMA (addition) Thompson land | Aitkin | 48 | 22 | 2 | 6,7 | 482226,7 | 394 | \$512,200 | | PF, E | | No | Yes |
| Aitkin WMA (addition) Rezac land | Aitkin | 47 | 26 | 2 | 9 | 472629 | 158.5 | \$206,050 | | PF, E | | No | Yes |
| Bork WMA (new) Bork land | Pine | 41 | 19 | 2 | 13,24 | 4119213,24 | 505 | \$656,500 | | PF, R, E | | No | Yes |
| Cross Lake WMA (new) Olson land | Carlton | 49 | 20 | 2 | 21,28 | 4920221,28 | 280 | \$364,000 | | PF, R, E | | No | Yes |
| Rutledge WMA (addition) Slade land | Pine | 44 | 19 | 2 | 21,22 | 4419221,22 | 480 | \$624,000 | | PF, E | | No | Yes |
| Peace Ford WMA (new) Linder land | Kanabec | 41,42 | 23 | 2 | 3,35 | 41,4223,35 | 806 | \$1,047,800 | | PF, R, E | | No | Yes |

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Laws of Minnesota 2013 Accomplishment Plan

Date: October 18, 2012

Program or Project Title: Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat

Partnerhip, Phase IV

Funds Recommended: \$1,180,000

Manager's Name: Joe Pavelko Title: Director of Conservation

Organization: Pheasants Forever, Inc. **Street Address:** 7975 Acorn Circle

City: Victoria, MN 55386 **Telephone:** 612-532-3800

E-Mail: jpavelko@pheasantsforever.org

Organization Web Site: www.pheasantsforever.org

Legislative Citation: (to be completed when signed by Governor)

County Locations: Aitkin, Aitkin, Carlton, and Kanabec.

Ecological Planning Regions:

Northern Forest

Activity Type:

- Restore
- Enhance
- Protect in Fee

Priority Resources Addressed by Activity:

Habitat

Abstract: 410

This sharp-tailed grouse habitat partnership will protect, restore and enhance up to 969 acres, primarily brushland, in northeastern Minnesota for addition to the WMA system, sustaining species in greatest conservation need, increasing public recreational opportunity and providing multiple environmental benefits.

Activity Detail

Design and Scope of Work:

Problem and Scope: Until the 1880s, most of Minnesota was inhabited by sharptailed grouse where suitable open and brushland habitat, such as prairies, savannas, sedge meadows and open bogs, occurred. This indigenous grouse was once one of Minnesota's most abundant game birds, with over 100,000 harvested annually in the 1940's. Loss, degradation and fragmentation of open and brushland habitat within Minnesota due to natural succession and conversion to other land uses (cropland and tree plantations) has lead to a long term decline in this unique grouse's population (estimated harvest of 10,000 in 2009), causing its listing as a species in greatest conservation need. Today its remaining range in northern Minnesota, which is less than one-third of its historic range, is in jeopardy of additional fragmentation and degradation. In east central Minnesota, preliminary research results have shown that genetic diversity of the sharp-tailed grouse population may be declining due to increasing isolation of subpopulations. In nearby Wisconsin, genetic diversity (allelic diversity and heterozygosity) has declined so greatly that Wisconsin DNR has translocated sharp-tailed grouse to create a genetic infusion to increase the likelihood that populations will persist. Increasing the amount of protected brushland habitat in northeastern Minnesota will be critical to the sustainability of the local sharp-tailed grouse population and gene exchange between Minnesota and Wisconsin populations. 410

Specific habitat that will be affected and how actions will directly restore, enhance, and/or protect them: Specific habitats to be affected will include up to 969 acres of openland, brushland, and forest habitat. Acquisition of the habitats and their transfer to MDNR for management under the state WMA will protect them. Natural habitats will include wet meadow, sedge meadow, shrub wetland, bog, grassland, and aspen and northern hardwoods forest. They will be enhanced with prescribed burning, mowing, shearing, timber harvest, and possibly grazing, biomass harvest and occasional haying to maintain open and brushland landscape. Other land includes hay, pasture and crop land that will be restored to open and brushland habitat through establishment of native vegetation, prescribed burning and natural succession.

Multiple benefits: Multiple benefits of the above protection, enhancement and restoration actions will include increased plant and animal diversity, carbon sequestration, water retention and filtration, opportunities for biomass harvest, access to public lands for recreation, increases eco-tourism opportunities, economic benefits, and secure habitat for sharp-tailed grouse and other open and brushland species in greatest conservation need.

Urgency and opportunity: If not acquired while the opportunities exist (i.e., willing sellers and funding opportunities), the chance to protect these priority tracts permanently from land practices incompatible as open and brushland wildlife habitat, and from fragmentation, parcelization and development may be lost. Incompatible land uses, such as building sites, tree plantings, and uncontrolled natural succession, on a tract not only negatively impacts the tract directly, but also surrounding habitat by fragmenting the open character of the land and impacting area-sensitive wildlife species, such as sharp-tailed grouse that are adapted to large open vistas.

How priorities were set / Parcel selection and scoring process: For consideration of protection and enhancement efforts by the partnership, open and brushland tracts must be located within or at the edge of an ECS landtype association identified as a priority open landscape through DNR's SFRMP landscape planning process. Further criteria to prioritize which tracts are most critical include a ranking system based upon county location, distance to active sharp-tailed grouse lek, tract size, and distance to protected brushland. A nearly-completed sharp-tailed grouse habitat use model (attached) will soon be ready for targeting brushland habitat for protection, restoration and enhancement efforts.

Science-based strategic planning and evaluation: This proposal is based on science-based strategic planning and evaluation. Biological planning, conservation design, delivery, monitoring and research, and adjustments in strategies as needed are used to maintain an adaptive approach. Sharp-tailed grouse leks (dancing grounds) are the essential hubs of subpopulations. Nesting and brooding rearing occur in suitable habitat within approximately a two-mile radius of leks. All but one of the parcels proposed for protection have active leks either located on them or within 3/4 mile away. All tracts will be critical to sustaining nesting and brood rearing habitat for subpopulations of sharp-tailed grouse. Research by Stanley Temple in Wisconsin suggests that suitable habitat patches of 4000 ha (roughly 10,000 acres, 15½ sq. miles, or a 2.2 mile radius circle) are needed for a sharptailed grouse population to survive. Opportunities to protect and connect suitable patches of this size are dwindling due to development, parcelization and other landscape change pressures. A pilot study in Aitkin County was conducted in spring/summer 2009 as part of a planned long term study to examine habitat selection, nest success and survival of sharp-tailed grouse. Data from this study and the long term study to begin spring 2013 will provide addition information to improve and keep management adaptive. Annual spring surveys of sharp-tailed grouse leks allow for monitoring of local populations and the effect that habitat protection and enhancement and other land management activities have on the local populations.

Planning

MN State-wide Conservation Plan Priorities:

- H1 Protect priority land habitats
- H3 Improve connectivity and access to recreation
- H5 Restore land, wetlands and wetland-associated watersheds
- H7 Keep water on the landscape
- LU8 Protect large blocks of forest land

Plans Addressed:

- A Vision for Wildlife and Its Use -- Goals and Outcomes 2006-2012
- Minnesota DNR Nongame Wildlife Plans
- Minnesota DNR Strategic Conservation Agenda
- Minnesota's Wildlife Management Area Acquisition The Next 50 Years
- Outdoor Heritage Fund: A 25 Year Framework

- Partners in Flight Conservation Plans for States and Physiographic Regions
- State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan
- Tomorrow's Habitat for the Wild and Rare
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Strategic Habitat Conservation Model

LSOHC Statewide Priorities:

- Are ongoing, successful, transparent and accountable programs addressing actions and targets of one or more of the ecological sections
- Produce multiple enduring conservation benefits
- Are able to leverage effort and/or other funds to supplement any OHF appropriation
- Allow public access. This comes into play when all other things about the request are approximately equal
- Address conservation opportunities that will be lost if not immediately acted on
- Use a science-based strategic planning and evaluation model to guide protection, restoration and enhancement, similar to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service's Strategic Habitat Conservation model
- Address wildlife species of greatest conservation need, Minnesota County Biological Survey data, and rare, threatened and endangered species inventories in land and water decisions, as well as permanent solutions to aquatic invasive species
- Provide Minnesotans with greater public access to outdoor environments with hunting, fishing and other outdoor recreation opportunities
- Ensures activities for "protecting, restoring and enhancing" are coordinated among agencies, non profits and others while doing this important work
- Target unique Minnesota landscapes that have historical value to fish and wildlife

LSOHC Northern Forest Section Priorities:

- Protect forestland though acquisition or easement to prevent parcelization and fragmentation and to provide the ability to access and manage landlocked public properties
- Restore forest-based wildlife habitat that has experienced substantial decline in area in recent decades

Relationship to Other Constitutional Funds:

No Relationships Listed

Accelerates or Supplements Current Efforts:

This partnership greatly accelerates and supplements protection, restoration and enhancement of brushland habitat. Prior to the availability of Outdoor Heritage grants, very little brushland habitat could be protected and opportunities were lost. Limited funds within DNR for acquisition were typically directed to western and southern Minnesota for protection of wetland and grassland habitat.

Sustainability and Maintenance:

The acquired parcels will become part of the state WMA system, being sustained and managed by local DNR Wildlife Area staff involved in the partnership. Maintenance will be funded through the DNR budget, grants and funds provided by partners. Partner funds will be derived from conservation organization's general membership and grants, such as Outdoor Heritage and Conservation Partnership Legacy grants. Stewardship plans for these tracts entail maintenance as integral portions of priority open landscapes. After initial protection and enhancement is completed, the primary habitat management technique will be prescribed burning. It will be used as needed, roughly once every three to seven years, to maintain their open structure and stimulate native vegetation.

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

Current DNR language requires acquisition partners to notify local government of acquisition. However, where local government approval is already required, or if DNR guidance was to change, we will adhere to all requirements and seek approval.

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

Is this land open for hunting and fishing? - Yes

No Variation from State of Minnesota regulations.

Is the activity on permanently protected land and/or public waters per MS 103G.005, Subd. 15? - Yes (WMA)

Accomplishment Timeline

| Activity | Approximate Date Completed |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Funding available - Order appraisals | July 2013 |
| Protection completed - All tracts acquired and transferred to MDNR for addition to the WMA system | March 2014 |
| Enhancement begins- Initial site development completed | Sept. 2014 |
| Enhancement continues - Firebreaks cleared, winter mechanical brushland treatments completed | March 2015 |
| Enhancement continues & Restoration completed - Prescribed burns completed & Native veg. is established. | June 2015 |
| Enhancement continues - Summer mechanical brushland treatments completed | Sept. 2015 |
| Enhancement underway - Additional firebreak cleared | March 2016 |
| Enhancement completed - Additional prescribed burns completed | June 2016 |

Outcomes

Programs in the northern forest region:

- Forestlands are protected from development and fragmentation
- Healthy populations of endangered, threatened, and special concern species as well as more common species
- Increased availability and improved condition of riparian forests and other habitat corridors
- Landlocked public properties have increased access for land managers
- Brushlands (of special concern in the Council's vision).

Budget Spreadsheet

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

Total Amount of Request: \$1,180,000

Budget and Cash Leverage

| Budget Name | LSOHC Request | Anticipated Cash Leverage | Cash Leverage Source | Total |
|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Personnel | \$12,000 | \$0 | | \$12,000 |
| Contracts | \$39,000 | \$0 | | \$39,000 |
| Fee Acquisition w/ PILT | \$1,055,000 | 138,000 \$14,000 | Private Source | \$1,069,000 |
| Fee Acquisition w/o PILT | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 |
| Easement Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 |
| Easement Stewardship | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 |
| Travel (in-state) | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 |
| Professional Services | \$25,000 | \$0 | | \$25,000 |
| Direct Support Services | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 |
| DNR Land Acquisition Costs | \$15,000 | \$0 | | \$15,000 |
| Capital Equipment | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 |
| Other Equipment/Tools | . \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 |
| Supplies/Materials | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 |
| DNR IDP | \$34,000 | \$0 | | \$34,000 |
| Total | \$1,180,000 | _\$14,000 | | \$1,194,00 0 |

\$138,000

\$ 1,318,000

Personnel

| Position | FTE | Over # of years | LSOHC Request | Anticipated Cash Leverage | Cash Leverage Source | Total |
|-----------------------------|------|-----------------|------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| PF Director of Conservation | 0.02 | 3.00 | \$9,000 | \$0 | | \$9,000 |
| PF National Grants Staff | 0.02 | 3.00 | \$3,000 | \$0 | | \$3,000 |
| Total | 0.04 | 6.00 | \$12,000 | \$0 | | - \$12,000 |

Output Tables

Table 1. Acres by Resource Type

| Туре | Wetlands | Prairies | Forest | Habitats | Total |
|---|----------|-----------------|--------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Restore | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | 0 | 0 | 0 | - 969 410 | - 969 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 969 | -96 9 |

40 410

Table 2. Total Requested Funding by Resource Type

| Туре | Wetlands | Prairies | Forest | Habitats | Total |
|---|----------|-----------------|--------|-------------|-------------|
| Restore | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,180,000 | \$1,180,000 |
| 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 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,180,000 | \$1,180,000 |

Table 3. Acres within each Ecological Section

| Туре | Metro/Urban | Forest/Prairie | SE Forest | Prairie | Northern Forest | Total |
|---|-------------|----------------|--------------|---------|--------------------|-------|
| Restore | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | _969 <i>410</i> | 969 |
| 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 | 0 | 969 | 969 |

410 410

Table 4. Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section

| Туре | Metro/Urban | Forest/Prairie | SE Forest | Prairie | Northern Forest | Total |
|--|-------------|----------------|--------------|---------|--------------------|-------------|
| Restore | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,180,000 | \$1,180,000 |
| 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 | \$0 | \$1,180,000 | \$1,180,000 |

Table 5. Target Lake/Stream/River Miles

0 miles

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

Aitkin

| Name | TRDS | Acres | Est Cost | Existing Protection? | Hunting? | Fishing? |
|----------------------------------|----------|-------|-----------|----------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Herlache (Willowsippi WMA) | 05025215 | 40 | \$45,000 | | Full | Not Applicable |
| Lawrence (Willowsippi WMA) | 050252 | 160 | \$180,000 | No | Full | Not Applicable |

Aitkin

| Name | TRDS | Acres | Est Cost | Existing Protection? | Hunting? | Fishing? |
|------------------------------|----------|-------|----------|----------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Parchuc (Grayling WMA) | 04823213 | 40 | \$44,000 | No | Full | Not Applicable |

| Gun Lak | L | | | | | |
|----------|-----------|-----|-------------|----|------|-----|
| WMA | 048720206 | 760 | \$2,210,000 | NO | full | Not |
| 71000.77 | | | | | - | |

Carlton

| Name | TRDS | Acres | Est Cost | Existing Protection? | Hunting? | Fishing? |
|-------------------------------------|----------|-------|----------|----------------------|----------|--|
| Baars (new Cross Lake WMA) | 04920221 | 40 | \$44,000 | No | Full | Not Applicable |
| Bennett (new Cross Lake WMA) | 04920228 | 40 | \$52,000 | No | Full | Not Applicable |
| Casey (new Cross Lake WMA) | | 40 | \$58,000 | No | Full | Not Applicable |
| Eder (new Cross Lake WMA) | 04920220 | 40 | \$54,000 | No | Full | Not Applicable |
| French (new Cross Lake WMA) | | 40 | \$52,000 | No | Full | Not Applicable |
| Graf (new Cross Lake WMA) | 04920211 | 80 | \$85,000 | No | Full | Not Applicable |
| Klimek (Wrenshall WMA) | 04716207 | 20 | \$42,000 | No | Full | Not currently. It will be after it becomes a WMA, however no fishing opportunity is available. |
| Richards (new Cross Lake WMA) | 11 | 37 | \$54,000 | No | Full | Not Applicable |
| Senese (new Cross Lake WMA) | | 20 | \$25,000 | No | Full | Not Applicable |
| T. Olson (new Cross Lake WMA) | | 40 | \$53,000 | No | Full | Not Applicable |

Kanabec

| Name | TRDS | Acres | Est Cost | Existing Protection? | Hunting? | Fishing? |
|---|----------|-------|-------------|----------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Linder (new Peace Ford WMA) | 04223235 | 14 | \$1,200,000 | | 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.