

Summary of Member Comments

Members not listed did not submit any comments

Project ID	Project Title	Jane Kingston	David Hartwell	Sen. Tom Saxhaug	Rep. Denny McNamara	Susan Olson	Ron Schara	Elizabeth Wilkens
PA 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase VIII		IDP is very high	\$9000/acre		**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.		Use of GMO seed and row crops reduces soil health and pollinator benefits.
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase VIII		Why not easements? What if no match not know until 7/1/16?	\$7,700/acre		**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.		Same as PA01 plus not following DNR policy regarding local government approval.
PA 03	Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Acquisition			\$8000/acre		**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.		Same as PA01 plus not following DNR policy regarding local government approval.
PA 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VII	No PILT for 1100ac/\$3.9M		\$3000/acre		**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.		Use of GMO seed and row crops reduces soil health and pollinator benefits.
PA 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VI			\$6500/acre		**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.		Should seek local government approval on land going to DNR as WMA.
PA 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection			\$6000/acre				
PA 07	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VI	Great leverage.	Buffers not required - but does the new law not do that? How to protect stewardship from raid? Like WA03	\$7500/acre		**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.		Why are food plots still allowed? CWF is not appropriate leverage. CREP language confuses the proposal.
PA 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley Phase II	No PILT for 517ac/\$1.8M	PILT and non PILT?	\$3540/acre		**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.		Same as PA01 plus not following DNR policy regarding local government approval.
PA 09	Lower Wild Rice River Corridor Habitat Restoration -- Phase II	#1 DNR Stream Restoration Priority List. No PILT for 716ac/\$2.5M		\$3500/acre		**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.		
PA 10	Grassland Conservation Partnership Phase II		How is value of easements determined?	\$3640/acre		**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.		Only 45 acres in natives. Clarify farming practices on restoration.
PRE 01	DNR Grassland - Phase 8		What is the difference between restore and enhance? - Evaluation of enhancement?	\$84/acre				Clarify farming practices, crops, GMO seed use, on private easements.
PRE 02	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase IV	Invasives Control dominant. No PILT for 10ac/\$120K		\$956/acre		The majority of these projects could have been submitted as individual projects through CPL		
FA 01	Young Forest Conservation Phase II		Staff cost is high. \$3000/acre for forest? Why would timber sales not be cheaper?	\$597/acre		Why does leverage % show as zero when the narrative mentions \$1 million in other funds?		
FA 02	Jack Pine Forest/Crow Wing River Watershed Habitat Acquisition	High personnel cost.	Staff cost seem high.	\$1894/acre				If goes to county or public entity other than DNR, need to define trails, structures, uses, etc. prior to sale.
FA 03	Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VI		No leverage. In the past there was a match.	\$2272/acre		**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.		
FA 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration, Phase IV	No PILT for 275ac/\$1.5M		\$2555/acre				Clarify restoration process and possible use of row crops, GMO seed, etc.
FA 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase IV			\$547/acre		**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.		
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VII	No PILT for 72ac/\$1.3M		\$1830/acre		**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.		Does not align with constitutional mandate.

Summary of Member Comments

Members not listed did not submit any comments

Project ID	Project Title	Jane Kingston	David Hartwell	Sen. Tom Saxhaug	Rep. Denny McNamara	Susan Olson	Ron Schara	Elizabeth Wilkens
FA 07	State Forest Acquisitions Phase III			\$3331/acre		**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.		Cost per acre high.
FA 08	Forest Habitat Protection Revolving Account			\$2633/acre		Not sure that this project would be allowed by the constitutional restrictions of LSOHC funding. **Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to		Good process; should inform county board.
FA 09	Protecting Forest Wildlife Habitat in the Wild Rice River Watershed	No PILT for 2034ac/\$2.1M		\$1075/acre	Should consider as a DNR WMA or AMA	Thank you for bringing this project back to the Council, it should never have been removed by the legislature for the last funding cycle. Good job addressing all of the points of contention raised by legislators during discussions of the bill. **Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.	Need to discuss this proposal about changes. Legislature already eliminated it???	
FRE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase 2	44% Supplies & Materials		\$1000/acre				
WA 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase VIII	No PILT for 2600ac/\$19.3M		\$7400/acre		**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.		Row crops and bare ground are not good for soil health or pollinators.
WA 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase V			\$7300/acre		**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.		Row crops and bare ground are not good for soil health or pollinators.
WA 03	RIM Wetlands: Phase 7		What is the difference between this and PA07?	\$5500/acre		**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.		CREP language confusing. For soil and pollinator health, bare ground should not be allowed. CWF not appropriate leverage.
WA 04	Wetland Habitat Protection Program – Phase 2			\$2100/acre		**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.		
WRE 01	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase VIII			\$473/acre				
WRE 02	Marsh Lake Phase II	Excellent leverage.		\$392/acre		Seems to be more of a Clean Water Funds project than LSOHC		
HA 01	MN DNR Aquatic Habitat Protection Phase 8			\$4000/acre		**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.		High cost per acre.
HA 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 7	Grey Cloud Slough “Phase 1” \$523K, not recommended in FY’15. No PILT for 250ac/\$1.5M.		\$3900/acre		Several of these projects should have been submitted as individual projects through CPL. Several should be submitted to Parks & Trails.		Grey Cloud Slough does not align with constitutional mandate.
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project	Parcel list doesn’t match map provided. No letter from Clearwater County. Is Forest Mgmt Plan by DNR State Standards or county? Technical Committee comprised of whom? Ranking protocol unclear. No PILT for 167ac/\$654K.	How many transactions? Is this an access or habitat proposal?	\$3000/acre		**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.		Easement costs same as acquisition.
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes: Phase II	Parcel cost estimates missing		\$2300/acre		Supporting a "powerful economic engine" is NOT THE GOAL of LSOHC funding. The goal is conservation and habitat. **Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is		All 38 lakes already 75% protected. Define trails and structures.
HA 05	Restoring Duluth's Cold Water Streams	Parks and Stormwater Management project. No cost estimates on R&E parcel lists. Clean Water Fund? Exorbitant \$/acre. No PILT for 19ac/\$877K.	What protections are in place for development under zoning? Would zoning setbacks, etc. be cheaper? Will water still be used for golf course?	\$49/acre		This is a Parks & Trails or perhaps Clean Water project, not a habitat and conservation project – see recent article in Duluth newspaper regarding this proposal.	Is this a park???? Go to parks fund. Doubt fishing value	Define trails and structures.

Summary of Member Comments

Members not listed did not submit any comments

Project ID	Project Title	Jane Kingston	David Hartwell	Sen. Tom Saxhaug	Rep. Denny McNamara	Susan Olson	Ron Schara	Elizabeth Wilkens
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement, Phase 8			\$19000/acre				
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat	Excessive \$/acre.		\$98000/acre				CWF not appropriate leverage.
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative Phase 3	Outstanding community & partner support & leverage.		\$13000/acre				
HRE 04	Sand Hill River Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement -- Phase II	#2 DNR Stream Restoration Priority List. Excellent leverage. Clean Water funds?		\$2000/acre				
HRE 05	Root River Restoration	Excessive \$/acre.	Does this address the root cause of the problem (nothing holding back the water on the uplands)?	\$96000/acre			Check track record???	Specify landowner agreement that will keep riverine system restoration in place into the future.
HRE 06	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program - Phase V	No PILT for 218ac/\$2.7 M		\$2500/acre			Clean water fund may be best way to go	Who will own acquired lands?
HRE 07	Restoring the Northern Gateway	Impaired waters. Clean Water funds? Supplies & materials high. OTG low. No cost breakdown or specific work plan/schedule. Exorbitant \$/acre.	Supplies budget seems high.	\$61000/acre			Sounds more like flood control than fish habitat???	Explain use of state bonding dollars.
HRE 08	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	Clean Water funds? No PILT for 37ac/\$298K.		\$6700/acre			Clean water fund may be best way to go	Describe restoration of perennial wetland and prairie plant communities.
CPL 1	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase 8: Statewide and Metro Habitat	Recommend Hearing	Personnel budget seems high.					YES – HEARING
O 1	Contract Management 2016	Recommend Hearing						YES – HEARING
O 2	Restoration Evaluation	Recommend Hearing	We should require evaluation of both enhance and restore.					YES – HEARING