

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Laws of Minnesota 2016 Final Report

General Information

Date: 11/09/2020

Project Title: Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase IV

Funds Recommended: \$1,840,000

Legislative Citation: ML 2016, Ch. 172, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 3(e)

Appropriation Language: \$1,840,000 the second year is to the commissioner of natural resources to acquire forest, wetland, and shoreline habitat through working forest permanent conservation easements under the Minnesota forests for the future program pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, section 84.66. A conservation easement acquired with money appropriated under this paragraph must comply with Minnesota Statutes, section 97A.056, subdivision 13. The accomplishment plan must include an easement monitoring and enforcement plan. Of this amount, up to \$25,000 is to establish a monitoring and enforcement fund as approved in the accomplishment plan and subject to Minnesota Statutes, section 97A.056, subdivision 17. A list of permanent conservation easements must be provided as part of the final report.

Manager Information

Manager's Name: Richard F. Peterson Title: Forest Legacy Coordinator Organization: MN DNR Forestry

Address: 1810 - 30th St. NW City: Faribault, MN 55021

Email: richard.f.peterson@state.mn.us

Office Number: 507 333 2012 **Mobile Number:** 507 330 6291

Fax Number: Website:

Location Information

County Location(s): Crow Wing and Lake.

Eco regions in which work will take place:

Northern Forest

Activity types:

• Protect in Easement

Priority resources addressed by activity:

Forest

Narrative

Summary of Accomplishments

This Minnesota Forests for the Future project protected 3,293 acres of forest and forested wetlands with perpetual working forest conservation easements in Lake and Crow Wing Counties ensuring public benefits, management access and sustainable managed forests.

Process & Methods

Forest land ownership changes within recent years, primarily within the industrial forest ownerships, are occurring as the timber industry restructures and looks to obtain value from their land through real estate sales and recreational leases. These sales can result in forest fragmentation or even outright conversion of forest lands, impact public recreational access including recreational trail routes, affect forest management access by public agencies across the impacted lands, degrade wildlife habitat and decrease the use of sustainable forestry practices.

The current project has targeted two properties: 1) an industrial ownership located in northeastern Minnesota whose property adjoins and is commingled with thousands of acres of other public forests including those owned and managed by the state, Lake County and the Superior National Forest; and 2) a large privately owned publicly accessible property with lake shoreland and other riparian areas adjacent to already permanently conserved easement property located in an area of high forest conversion threat in Crow Wing County.

LSOHC appropriations target priority projects as determined by the scoring criteria developed in consultation with the Minnesota Forests for the Future Advisory Committee (stakeholder group). Projects may need to be scaled back or phased to accommodate the available funding. Each of the two projects included in this report were located within program priority areas as identified by a GIS model that integrates recreational, ecological and economic data.

These projects addressed forest fragmentation, habitat degradation, recreational and management access and sustainable forestry through perpetual conservation easements and fee acquisition that will protect the forest and wetland habitats in perpetuity, restrict forest parcelization and development, provide for public recreational access and public management access and promote sustainable forest management practices.

The Minnesota Forests for the Future and Federal Forest Legacy Programs have proven to be cost effective programs for protecting private forest land habitat in Minnesota, while also providing public recreational and agency management access and ensuring sustainable forestry. These programs have protected over 358,000 acres to date at an average cost of less than \$300/acre. Over \$24 million in non-state funds have been leveraged for these protection efforts over the past 10 years.

How did the program address habitats of significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, threatened or endangered species, and/or list targeted species?

The project area provides a wide diversity of habitats to many fish, game and non-game wildlife species found in northeastern Minnesota including moose, gray wolf, black bear, Canada lynx, white-tailed deer, ruffed grouse, spruce grouse, waterfowl, forest songbirds, and trout and other fish. With over 8,700 feet of shoreline on wild rice lakes, 2.2 miles of trout streams and over 1.3 miles of other streams and numerous wetlands the project area provides the critical shoreland habitats that are essential to many fish and wildlife populations. The project area

lies in the transition area between the conifer dominated boreal forests of the north and deciduous forest to the south that together with the array of streams, rivers, lakes and wetlands provides a rich mosaic of habitats that support these species. Over 80 species in greatest conservation need are known or predicted to occur in either the North Shore highlands and/or Toimi Uplands landscapes. Nearly half the project area is identified by the MCBS as high/moderate sites of biodiversity significance.

How did the program use science-based targeting that leveraged or expanded corridors and complexes, reduced fragmentation, or protected areas in the MN County Biological Survey.

Land proposed for protection has been identified through GIS modeling analysis that incorporated multiple criteria to identify the highest priority private forest lands for permanent conservation. The criteria focus on conserving lands that provide habitat and other environmental benefits, outdoor recreation opportunities including hunting & fishing, and which support sustainable forestry.

Explain Partners, Supporters, & Opposition

Exceptional challenges, expectations, failures, opportunities, or unique aspects of program

The Minnesota Forests for the Future and Federal Forest Legacy Programs have proven to be cost effective programs for protecting private forest land habitat in Minnesota, while also providing public recreational and agency management access and ensuring sustainable forestry. These programs have protected over 358,000 acres to date at an average cost of less than \$300/acre. Over \$24 million in non-state funds have been leveraged for these protection efforts over the past 10 years.

The DNR was able to obtain a bargain sale from one of the landowners which reduced the cost of acquiring the easement.

What other funds contributed to this program?

What is the plan to sustain and/or maintain this work after the Outdoor Heritage Funds are expended?

All lands protected through permanent conservation easements will be sustained through standards and practices for conservation easement stewardship that have been developed and implemented in the forest easement program over the past 15 years. Our easement stewardship program incorporates annual landowner meetings, annual on-site monitoring of all properties, records management, responding to landowner inquiries , tracking ownership changes and addressing and resolving easement violations. Funding for the easement stewardship is included in the current proposal. Stewardship funds will be transferred to the designated easement stewardship account and interest earned from the account will fund the annual stewardship and monitoring work for the easement. All easements will have baseline property reports, forest stewardship plans and easement monitoring plans prepared prior to closing of the project.

Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes

Year	Source of Funds	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
June 30, 2020	OHF	Ensure funding is	Develop Forest	Develop Baseline
		available in dedicated	Stewardship Plan	Property Report and
		stewardship account	prior to closing.	Easement Monitoring
		per OHF		Plan prior to closing.
		appropriation and		
		accomplishment plan.		
Annually, Perpetually	OHF - Easement	Monitor easements	Annual landowner	Review forest

Monitoring Account annually and enforce easement terms. meetings and on-site visits to easement annually and property. meetings and on-site visits to easement annually and and update For Stewardship I periodically.	review orest
--	-----------------

Budget

Totals

Item	Request	Spent	Antic.	Received	Leverage	Original	Final Total
D	¢10.000	¢10.000	Leverage	Leverage	Source	Total	¢10.000
Personnel	\$10,000	\$10,800	-	-	-	\$10,000	\$10,800
Contracts	\$20,000	\$32,900	-	-	-	\$20,000	\$32,900
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	i	1	1	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	ı	ı	1	1	-	-	-
Easement	\$1,739,000	\$1,773,000	-	-	-	\$1,739,000	\$1,773,000
Acquisition							
Easement	\$25,000	-	-	-	-	\$25,000	-
Stewardship							
Travel	\$2,300	\$400	-	-	-	\$2,300	\$400
Professional	\$40,000	\$21,900	-	-	-	\$40,000	\$21,900
Services							
Direct Support	\$3,000	-	-	-	-	\$3,000	-
Services							
DNR Land	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Acquisition Costs							
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Equipment/Tools							
Supplies/Materials	\$700	-	-	-	-	\$700	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$1,840,000	\$1,839,000	-	-	-	\$1,840,000	\$1,839,000

Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Funding Request	Antic. Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Prog Coord	70000.0	3.0	\$10,800		General Fund	\$10,800

Explain any budget challenges or successes:

DNR obtained a bargain sale from one of the landowners which reduced the cost of acquiring that easement.

Total Revenue: \$0

Revenue Spent: \$0

Revenue Balance: -

Of the money disclosed above, what are the appropriate uses of the money:

• D. This is not applicable because the recipient is a state agency or department.

Output Tables

Acres by Resource Type (Table 1)

Туре	Wetland (AP)	Wetland (Final)	Prairie (AP)	Prairie (Final)	Forest (AP)	Forest (Final)	Habitat (AP)	Habitat (Final)	Total Acres	Total Acres
									(AP)	(Final)
Restore	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fee with										
State										
PILT										
Liability										
Protect in	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fee w/o										
State										
PILT										
Liability										
Protect in	0	0	0	0	3,200	3,293	0	0	3,200	3,293
Easement					,	,			,	,
Enhance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	3,200	3,293	0	0	3,200	3,293

Total Requested Funding by Resource Type (Table 2)

Туре	Wetlan d (AP)	Wetlan d (Final)	Prairi e (AP)	Prairi e (Final)	Forest (AP)	Forest (Final)	Habita t (AP)	Habita t (Final)	Total Funding (AP)	Total Funding (Final)
Restore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
in Fee										
with										
State										
PILT										
Liability										
Protect	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
in Fee										
w/o										
State										
PILT										
Liability										
Protect	-	-	-	-	\$1,840,000	\$1,839,000	-	-	\$1,840,000	\$1,839,000
in										
Easemen										
t										
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	\$1,840,00	\$1,839,00	-	-	\$1,840,00	\$1,839,00
					0	0			0	0

Acres within each Ecological Section (Table 3)

Туре	Metro / Urban (AP)	Metro / Urban (Final)	Forest / Prairie (AP)	Forest / Prairie (Final)	SE Forest (AP)	SE Forest (Final)	Prairie (AP)	Prairie (Final)	N. Forest (AP)	N. Forest (Final)	Total (AP)	Total (Final)
Restore	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Fee w/o State PILT Liability												
Protect in	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,200	3,293	3,200	3,293
Easement												
Enhance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,200	3,293	3,200	3,293

Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section (Table 4)

Type	Metro / Urban (AP)	Metro / Urban (Final)	Fores t / Prairi e (AP)	Fores t / Prairi e (Final	SE Fores t (AP)	SE Fores t (Final	Prairi e (AP)	Prairi e (Final)	N. Forest (AP)	N. Forest (Final)	Total (AP)	Total (Final)
Restore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	ı	ı	ı
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Protect in Easeme nt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$1,840,00 0	\$1,839,00 0	\$1,840,00 0	\$1,839,00 0
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$1,840,00 0	\$1,839,00 0	\$1,840,00 0	\$1,839,00 0

Average Cost per Acre by Resource Type (Table 5)

Туре	Wetland (AP)	Wetland (Final)	Prairie (AP)	Prairie (Final)	Forest (AP)	Forest (Final)	Habitat (AP)	Habitat (Final)
Restore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee with								
State PILT								
Liability								
Protect in	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee w/o								
State PILT								
Liability								
Protect in	-	-	-	-	\$575	\$558	-	-
Easement								
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Average Cost per Acre by Ecological Section (Table 6)

Туре	Metro / Urban (AP)	Metro / Urban (Final)	Forest / Prairie (AP)	Forest / Prairie (Final)	SE Forest (AP)	SE Forest (Final)	Prairie (AP)	Prairie (Final)	N. Forest (AP)	N. Forest (Final)
Restore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee with										
State										

PILT										
Liability										
Protect in	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee w/o										
State										
PILT										
Liability										
Protect in	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$575	\$558
Easement										
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

Outcomes

Programs in the northern forest region:

• Forestlands are protected from development and fragmentation ~ Forestlands were protected from development and fragmentation; forestlands were permanently protected from conversion to non-forest uses by fee acquisition which will reduce potential development and fragmentation and consolidate public ownership in larger blocks that are sustainably managed by the Department of Natural Resources.

Parcels

Sign-up Criteria?

<u>Yes</u>

Protect Parcels

Name	County	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection
Clearwater	Crow Wing	04528205	76	\$758,000	No
Finland Phase 2	Lake	05907124	3,217	\$1,058,000	No

