

ML 2016 / FY 2017 LSOHC Member Allocation - Chair's Proposal

Available to Allocate: **\$105,000,000**

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	Fund Request	Member Comments	# of Members Allocating	Average Member Allocation rounded down to nearest \$1K	Cumulative	Project Manager Comments RE: Average Member Allocation
O1	Contract Management 2016	MN DNR	\$ 150,000		n/a	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	
O2	Restoration Evaluations	MN DNR	\$ 100,000		n/a	\$ 100,000	\$ 250,000	
WRE 02	Marsh Lake - Phase II	DNR, Div. Fish & Wildlife	\$ 2,000,000		11	\$ 1,709,000	\$ 1,959,000	The request for Marsh Lake Phase II (WRE02) was \$2 million, as compared to the average member allocation of \$1,709,000. The \$2 million request, when combined with the amount of funding received in Marsh Lake Phase I a few years ago, provides the amount of non-federal match needed for the federally authorized amount to complete Marsh Lake. I contacted the project managers for this project and inquired if we could move ahead with a smaller amount. The comments were best summarized by, "...it would be difficult to cut anything else out of the project." Partial funding of Marsh Lake Phase II would leave us short of funding to complete the project.
WA 04	Wetland Habitat Protection Program - Phase II	Minnesota Land Trust	\$ 2,563,000	SO: Awesome concept on easements and reverse bidding.	11	\$ 1,777,000	\$ 3,736,000	
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement - Phase VIII	Minnesota Trout Unlimited	\$ 3,000,000		11	\$ 1,972,000	\$ 5,708,000	We will of course make do. Because we do not start projects unless we are sure we have funding to finish, we will very likely need to drop three major projects - Miller Creek in Duluth, the Clearwater River near Bemidji, and one of the three great projects in southeast MN. If we end up getting closer to 80% of our original ask, then we could keep the three southeast projects and do a modified project near Bemidji. I hope this helps. Thank you.
CPL 1	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase VIII: Statewide and Metro Habitat	DNR	\$ 11,488,000		11	\$ 7,387,000	\$ 13,095,000	Yes, the CPL program can definitely move forward with that amount. We just closed our first round of traditional (outstate) and metro applications for ML15 and I'm happy to report that we received nearly \$11 million worth of applications!
WA 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase V	Ducks Unlimited	\$ 14,700,000	SO: Any funding awarded should be contingent on no planting of corn, soybeans, or other row crops on land purchased or restored with these funds. DM: No "forest zone" acquisitions unless DNR sells the like value of land in county. DH: 3 issues with food plots that need discussion - GMO, use of contract labor that strip the food from 2/3 instead of DNR planting and allowing 100% to be available and the use of food plots generally.	11	\$ 5,545,000	\$ 18,640,000	DU can scale our work, and appreciate the initial allocation.
HRE 04	Sand Hill River Fish Passage Restoration & Habitat Enhancement - Phase II	Sand Hill River Watershed District	\$ 1,333,200	SO: Contingent on grantee obtaining its own prefunding to meet USACE requirements. JK: Needs CWC component.	10	\$ 903,000	\$ 19,543,000	We have a viable project with the amount indicated.
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase II	Leech Lake Area Watershed Foundation	\$ 2,948,200	SO: The claim that "sport fishing is a powerful economic engine ... important to ...quality of life and our regional economy" has absolutely nothing to do with the purpose of LSOHC funding.	10	\$ 1,463,000	\$ 21,006,000	In reviewing the spreadsheet - LLAWF could implement the grant. I would like folks to be aware the I purposefully did not inflate our application. Last year we were awarded a \$2.1 Million award (MLT and LLAWF) and when we drafted our grant we talked about inflating our request given the council approach of reduced awards. We chose to ask for what we needed - but I feel challenged by the current Council approach. I have heard from other applicants that they purposefully inflate their request - trying to game the approach.
N/A	Roseau Lake Rehabilitation	DNR & Roseau River Watershed District	\$ 6,000,000	DH: Just fund easement portion. JK: Needs CWC LCCMR components.	10	\$ 2,787,000	\$ 23,793,000	We have reviewed the allocation spreadsheet and understand that the preliminary allocation for the Roseau Lake Rehabilitation Project is \$2,787,000. If allocated and appropriated, funding to this level would accelerate development of this project and ensure that habitat rehabilitation is a strong component of this multipurpose project. If there are any additional questions about the project please contact me. We look forward to the outcomes of future council deliberations.
PRE 01	DNR Grassland - Phase VIII	DNR	\$ 9,107,100	SO: Any funding awarded should be contingent on no planting of corn, soybeans, or other row crops on land purchased or restored with these funds. DH: 3 issues with food plots that need discussion - GMO, use of contract labor that strip the food from 2/3 instead of DNR planting and allowing 100% to be available and the use of food plots generally.	10	\$ 4,072,000	\$ 27,865,000	
PA 07	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VI	BWSR	\$ 15,000,000	SO: Any funding awarded should be contingent on no planting of corn, soybeans, or other row crops on land purchased or restored with these funds. DM: Great match with Clean Water money. BI: Should qualify for clean water legacy funding as well. DH: 3 issues with food plots that need discussion - GMO, use of contract labor that strip the food from 2/3 instead of DNR planting and allowing 100% to be available and the use of food plots generally. EW: Legislative action.	10	\$ 6,409,000	\$ 34,274,000	
PA 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VII	The Nature Conservancy	\$ 7,000,000	SO: Any funding awarded should be contingent on no planting of corn, soybeans, or other row crops on land purchased or restored with these funds. DH: Fund for 2 years rather than 4. Only fund restoration portion of proposal.	10	\$ 2,731,000	\$ 37,005,000	
FA 01	Young Forest Conservation - Phase II	American Bird Conservancy	\$ 3,834,300		10	\$ 1,403,000	\$ 38,408,000	
FA 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase IV	The Nature Conservancy	\$ 9,517,700	SO: Awesome concept on easements and reverse bidding.	10	\$ 3,274,000	\$ 41,682,000	
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat	DNR	\$ 6,095,000	SO: Need to make sure that no double-funding of a Trout Unlimited project. The 2 groups duplicated one site in error. DM: No "forest zone" acquisitions unless DNR sells the like value of land in county. DH: No GMOs to be used in restoration prep.	10	\$ 2,035,000	\$ 43,717,000	
WA 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase VIII	Pheasants Forever, Inc.	\$ 19,309,100		10	\$ 5,800,000	\$ 49,517,000	
FA 02	Jack Pine Forest/Crow Wing River Watershed Habitat Acquisition	MN Deer Hunters Association	\$ 18,940,000	SO: Any funding awarded should be specifically contingent on NO motorized vehicle trails (existing or new) on any of the acquired or eased lands. DM: lots of potential problems that should get worked on first. DH: Sustainable forest management plans required. No motorized trails. Any future transfers of land to be subject to a conservation easement prohibiting subdivision, development or road/trail building. How to handle timber profits in the future must be addressed. JB: Start up and demonstrate success; come back after obtaining results. JK: State trail management standards preferred, minimize trails.	10	\$ 5,580,000	\$ 55,097,000	
FRE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River - Phase II	Audubon Minnesota	\$ 663,000	JB: Recommend a pilot project through the CPL or LCCMR.	9	\$ 453,000	\$ 55,550,000	
PA 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VI	Trust for Public Land	\$ 1,050,000		9	\$ 636,000	\$ 56,186,000	The average amount allocation for the Cannon River Watershed proposal would result in protection of smaller and/or fewer parcels; but it would be possible for us to scale our work.
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase III	DNR	\$ 5,242,000		9	\$ 2,681,000	\$ 58,867,000	Project elements of the St. Louis River Restoration Initiative described in this proposal are scheduled to be fully designed and ready for construction in January of 2017. Because our pre-construction work is now on a short timeline, the need to secure necessary funding to complete the projects becomes more important. Meeting the multi-partner goal of completing all of our Area of Concern project work by 2019 depends on the acquisition of necessary levels of funding support from both federal and state partners. Although the DNR would be able to begin the described work at the "average member allocation" level, the reduction in the amount of state support would reduce critical habitat restoration outcomes at the project site.
HA 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat - Phase VII	MN Valley Nat'l Wildlife Refuge Trust, Inc. (Metro Big Rivers)	\$ 6,076,900		9	\$ 2,825,000	\$ 61,692,000	
PRE 02	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase IV	Great River Greening	\$ 3,251,500		9	\$ 1,227,000	\$ 62,919,000	
WRE 01	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase VIII	DNR	\$ 5,515,000		9	\$ 2,183,000	\$ 65,102,000	
PA 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase VIII	DNR	\$ 9,118,000	SO: Any funding awarded should be contingent on no planting of corn, soybeans, or other row crops on land purchased or restored with these funds. DM: No SNA's and earmark \$2,188,000 for FA 09 as a DNR WMA. DH: 3 issues with food plots that need discussion - GMO, use of contract labor that strip the food from 2/3 instead of DNR planting and allowing 100% to be available and the use of food plots generally. EW: SNA priority.	9	\$ 3,272,000	\$ 68,374,000	
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project	Mississippi Headwaters Board	\$ 9,000,000	SO: Any funding awarded should be specifically contingent on NO motorized vehicle trails (existing or new) on any of the acquired or eased lands. DM: Lots of potential problems that should get worked on first. BI: Should qualify for clean water legacy funding as well. DH: No motorized or off road bike trails. JB: Start up and demonstrate success; come back after obtaining results.	9	\$ 3,209,000	\$ 71,583,000	Thank you providing the Mississippi Headwaters Board with the opportunity to present our project to you. We feel that protection of habitat on the Mississippi River is a benefit to our environment and Minnesotans. While the funding request is significant, we would need to scale down our protection efforts to accommodate this preliminary request. Thank you so much for your consideration of our project.
PA 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase II	MN Prairie Chicken Society/ Pheasants Forever, Inc.	\$ 7,885,100	SO: Any funding awarded should be contingent on no planting of corn, soybeans, or other row crops on land purchased or restored with these funds. DH: 3 issues with food plots that need discussion - GMO, use of contract labor that strip the food from 2/3 instead of DNR planting and allowing 100% to be available and the use of food plots generally	9	\$ 2,475,000	\$ 74,058,000	
WA 03	RIM Wetlands - Phase VII	BWSR	\$ 25,000,000	DM: great potential Federal match. DH: Come back when they know what the leverage will be. 3 issues with food plots that need discussion - GMO, use of contract labor that strip the food from 2/3 instead of DNR planting and allowing 100% to be available and the use of food plots generally. EW: Legislative action.	9	\$ 7,972,000	\$ 82,030,000	

HA 01	MNDNR Aquatic Habitat Protection - Phase VIII	DNR	\$ 6,444,700		9	\$ 1,631,000	\$ 83,661,000	We will certainly be able to scale our work to utilize the amount currently indicated by council members' allocations for the DNR Stream Habitat proposal. Our prioritized list will allow us to make use of the funds based on our pre-determined criteria.
PA 10	Grasslands Conservation Partnership	The Conservation Fund	\$ 6,848,500	SO: Any funding awarded should be contingent on no planting of corn, soybeans, or other row crops on land purchased or restored with these funds. DH: Criteria #3 should be adjacent to protected land. Reverse auction process required. 3 issues with food plots that need discussion - GMO, use of contract labor that strip the food from 2/3 instead of DNR planting and allowing 100% to be available and the use of food plots generally. EW: Pilot project. JK: Adjacent parcel priority.	9	\$ 1,609,000	\$ 85,270,000	
FA 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase IV	MN DNR Forestry	\$ 8,486,000		9	\$ 1,826,000	\$ 87,096,000	We do have a viable/scalable project with the amount listed. Additional dollars would be welcome and would enhance the project's habitat outcomes.
FA 09	Protecting Forest Wildlife Habitat in the Wild Rice River Watershed	White Earth Nation	\$ 2,188,000	SO: Thank you for bringing this one back. I hope it is fully funded and that the legislature doesn't remove it again. RS: Legislature in last session denied this proposal; will support if project is revised as instructed by Legislative member of the Council. JK: Perch Lake Parcel preferred.	8	\$ 1,035,000	\$ 88,131,000	
HRE 08	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	Buffalo-Red River Watershed District	\$ 4,963,000	DH: Funds only for fee or easements Haying and grazing only where the the plan improves the habitat. JK: Needs CWC component.	8	\$ 1,542,000	\$ 89,673,000	
PA 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection - Phase II	DNR	\$ 9,090,000		8	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 92,173,000	
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase VIII	Pheasants Forever, Inc.	\$ 19,272,000	SO: Any funding awarded should be contingent on no planting of corn, soybeans, or other row crops on land purchased or restored with these funds. DH: 3 issues with food plots that need discussion - GMO, use of contract labor that strip the food from 2/3 instead of DNR planting and allowing 100% to be available and the use of food plots generally.	8	\$ 5,295,000	\$ 97,468,000	
HRE 06	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program - Phase V	Shell Rock River Watershed District	\$ 3,788,800		7	\$ 1,155,000	\$ 98,623,000	We do have scalable projects and could make this work.
FA 03	Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VI	Morrison SWCD	\$ 3,000,000		7	\$ 872,000	\$ 99,495,000	
FA 07	State Forest Acquisition - Phase III	DNR - Forestry	\$ 4,648,000		7	\$ 1,227,000	\$ 100,722,000	Proposed Cutoff for Funding
HRE 07	Restoring the Northern Gateway	City of Champlin	\$ 3,000,000	DH: Come back with upstream habitat protection/restoration. Or go to CLP for small grants to do that work.	6	\$ 1,036,000		Thank you for providing the 2016 LSOHC Member Allocation Summary. The City of Champlin is requesting \$3M for the Mill Pond Deep Water Habitat and Fishery Restoration (Phase II of the Restoring the Northern Gateway). The Average Member Allocation is less than the amount that was requested. However, this project could be scaled back in scope and restored with a phased approach. What is most important is that this valuable resource be protected and restored. The City continues a great relationship with DNR Fisheries and the Mill Pond restoration has gained support from the Isaak Walton League, MN DNR Managers, along with resident/ author/Lake Expert Darby Nelson. The Mill Pond restoration is the most important environmental issue in the City. The project will improve water quality, restore the lake-habitat, buffers, and fishery and also provide an important regional benefit. Champlin and Elm Creek Watershed Commission are committed to restoring the Mill Pond habitat and fishery and will provide a \$1M local match for this project. Grant assistance is essential to restore the Mill Pond and given the Average Member Allocation of \$1.036 M, the City would need to scale back the scope and restore of the Mill Pond with a phased approach.
PA 03	Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Acquisition	Fox Lake Conservation League, Inc.	\$ 3,372,500	SO: Any funding awarded should be contingent on no planting of corn, soybeans, or other row crops on land purchased or restored with these funds. DH: 3 issues with food plots that need discussion - GMO, use of contract labor that strip the food from 2/3 instead of DNR planting and allowing 100% to be available and the use of food plots generally.	6	\$ 976,000		
HA 05	Restoring Duluth's Cold Water Streams	City of Duluth	\$ 1,077,500	SO: Recommend you request the funding for Buckingham from the CPL grant program. The other portion of the project truly appears to be a park project and isn't focused on the stream.	5	\$ 270,000		I do not believe that we have a viable/scalable project, as outlined in our application, with this amount of money - \$270,000. However, if we are able to use these funds for only one of the creek projects in our proposal, the \$270,000 would cover the costs for Buckingham Creek. If we would be able to do a scaled back version of our application that included both the Buckingham Creek project and a scaled back version of the Tischer Creek project (using these funds only to purchase the property and thus protect the Tischer Creek tributary), then we would need \$594,000.
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VII	Cass County	\$ 1,319,500	DH: Providing access to other public lands is not a rationale for these funds as they are to protect, restore or enhance habitat.	5	\$ 510,000		
FA 08	Forest Habitat Protection Revolving Account	DNR - Forestry	\$ 2,633,000		5	\$ 886,000		We do have a viable/scalable project with the amount listed.
PA 09	Lower Wild Rice River Corridor Habitat Restoration - Phase II	Wild Rice River Watershed District	\$ 4,150,000	DM: testifier mentioned 30 year easements-not sure LSOHC can fund them.	5	\$ 604,000		
HRE 05	Root River Restoration	Root River Restoration and Preservation	\$ 1,058,000	DH: Come back with a cooperative program involving the watershed district, DNR, TU and landowners EW: Seek CPL funding. JK: Apply for CPL grants.	1	\$ 18,000		HRE05 Root River Restoration is NOT scalable to \$18,000, and could not move forward with that amount. Engineering and Mobilization costs alone would exceed that. The lowest cost the project could be scaled to would be in the \$150,000-\$200,000 range. However, the project would have to be significantly reduced in length.
Total requested: \$ 291,226,600					Total: \$ 105,022,000			