



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition Phase 2

Laws of Minnesota 2018 Final Report

General Information

Date: 03/26/2025

Project Title: Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition Phase 2

Funds Recommended: \$2,447,000

Legislative Citation: ML 2018, Ch. 208, Art. 1, Sec. 2, subd 2(i)

Appropriation Language: \$2,447,000 the second year is to the commissioner of natural resources for an agreement with Fox Lake Conservation League Inc., in cooperation with Ducks Unlimited and The Conservation Fund, to acquire lands in fee and restore and enhance strategic prairie grassland, wetland, and other wildlife habitat in Martin County for wildlife management under Minnesota Statutes, section 86A.05, subdivision 8. Of this amount, \$1,978,000 is to Fox Lake Conservation League Inc., \$400,000 is to Ducks Unlimited, and \$69,000 is to The Conservation Fund. A list of proposed acquisitions must be provided as part of the required accomplishment plan.

Manager Information

Manager's Name: Doug Hartke

Title: Grant Coordinator

Organization: Fox Lake Conservation League, Inc.

Address: PO Box 212

City: Sherburn, MN 56171

Email: dhartke@frontiernet.net

Office Number: 507-764-4060

Mobile Number: 507-236-1700

Fax Number: 507-764-4065

Website:

Location Information

County Location(s): Martin.

Eco regions in which work will take place:

Prairie

Activity types:

Protect in Fee

Priority resources addressed by activity:

Wetlands

Prairie

Narrative

Summary of Accomplishments

Two parcels were purchased and restored totaling 314 acres. Gleam WMA Tract 2 and 2A acquisition protected 2 acres of idle grasslands and opened up access to the existing, land locked 26 acre Gleam WMA. Restoration included 45 acres of wetlands and 185 acres of diverse native prairie.

Center Creek WMA Tract 15 protected 38 acres of riparian forest, 12 acres of native prairie, and we restored 74 acres back to diverse native prairie.

Process & Methods

Fox Lake Conservation League and The Conservation Fund worked together to identify these key parcels with willing sellers. TCF used their expertise to navigate the real estate processes while Fox Lake worked with MN DNR to submit and approve WAIF and IDP. FLCL held and monitored each parcel while Ducks Unlimited developed restoration plans and hired contractors to implement restoration dirt work, tree removal, and prairie seeding.

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?

These projects will protect and restore threatened habitats in Martin County. Native prairie was protected and high quality wetlands and prairie were restored and existing habitats expanded upon. Restoration provided the opportunity to expand populations of at-risk and threatened plant species that the Martin SWCD had propagated for introduction to permanently protected sites. Threatened species include, Eared gerardia (*Agalinis auriculata*); Sullivant's milkweed (*Asclepias sullivantii*); and Tuberous Indian plantain (*Cacalia tuberosa*). Other locally rare or Special Concern species include: Small white lady's slipper (*Cypripedium candidum*) and Rattlesnake master (*Eryngium yuccifolium*). We included local ecotype native plant materials in the establishment of a highly diverse prairie landscape, which provides habitat to support native pollinators, including several species of milkweed to support the federally threatened Monarch butterfly.

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.

Our Martin County Conservation Planning Group includes wildlife group representatives, local government, and state agencies. There is a wide range of knowledge and interest within the group. Historic Information, the MN County Biological Survey and local knowledge helped identify areas where habitat restoration were most beneficial for multiple reasons. Expanding habitat adjacent to existing high quality native habitat and habitat already protected by public ownership or perpetual conservation easements were targeted. Sites with threatened, endangered and species in decline are good targets to build upon, especially when expansions can link sites to help expand corridors, especially along water courses and lake chains.

Explain Partners, Supporters, & Opposition

Partners of this program, outside of FLCL, TCF, and DU are MN DNR, Martin SWCD, Martin County Pheasants Forever, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and several local agricultural producers who helped maintain the land and

prepare for restoration after acquisition. There was little opposition on these projects, except for one neighbor who was worried about how wetland restorations would impact their agricultural drainage, but FLCL worked diligently to earn their trust.

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

The main unforeseen challenge is the extensive coverage of private drainage agreements from the 1940’s, 50’s and 60’s which legally obligate landowners to fund drainage repairs and maintenance. These are problematic for DNR and either prevent acquisition or create an extra step to have all parties amend the agreement to exclude our parcels from financial obligations. We succeeded in navigating these obstacles, but they did delay our timelines for restoration some. These are unique to southern and western MN where extensive drainage has occurred in the prairie pothole region of the state.

What other dedicated funds may collaborate with or contribute to this program?

N/A

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

Maintaining and improving upon this work will be the responsibility of the MN DNR with support from project partners when appropriate. Local partners will continue to install additional local source native plant species to enhance habitat to support more species, including pollinators. Local partner monitoring will assist with identifying invasive species threats and provide assistance with eradication or control if necessary.

Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes

Year	Source of Funds	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
2025 & ongoing	DNR internal funding	DNR to maintain properties into the future	-	-

Budget

Grand Totals Across All Partnerships

Item	Requested	AP Amount	Spent	Leverage	Received Leverage	Leverage Source	Original Total	Final Total
Personnel	\$85,000	\$65,000	\$46,700	-	\$45,000	NAWCA	\$85,000	\$91,700
Contracts	\$200,000	\$251,000	\$210,700	-	\$25,000	NAWCA	\$200,000	\$235,700
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	\$1,947,000	\$1,861,000	\$1,860,900	-	-	-	\$1,947,000	\$1,860,900
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Travel	\$7,000	\$6,000	\$1,100	-	-	-	\$7,000	\$1,100
Professional Services	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	-	-	-	\$25,000	\$25,000
Direct Support Services	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$2,800	-	-	-	\$4,000	\$2,800
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	\$10,000	\$40,000	\$35,900	-	-	-	\$10,000	\$35,900
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	-	-	-	\$1,500	\$1,500
Supplies/Materials	\$122,500	\$148,500	\$115,900	-	-	-	\$122,500	\$115,900
DNR IDP	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$21,700	-	-	-	\$45,000	\$21,700
Grand Total	\$2,447,000	\$2,447,000	\$2,322,200	-	\$70,000	-	\$2,447,000	\$2,392,200

Partner: DU

Totals

Item	Requested	AP Amount	Spent	Leverage	Received Leverage	Leverage Source	Original Total	Final Total
Personnel	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$26,500	-	\$45,000	NAWCA	\$27,000	\$71,500
Contracts	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$161,200	-	\$25,000	NAWCA	\$200,000	\$186,200
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Travel	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$1,100	-	-	-	\$4,000	\$1,100
Professional Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	-	-	-	\$1,500	\$1,500
Supplies/Materials	\$122,500	\$122,500	\$89,900	-	-	-	\$122,500	\$89,900
DNR IDP	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$21,700	-	-	-	\$45,000	\$21,700
Grand Total	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$301,900	-	\$70,000	-	\$400,000	\$371,900

Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Amount Spent	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
DU Restoration Biologists and Engineers	0.25	3.0	\$26,500	\$45,000	NAWCA	\$71,500

Totals

Item	Requested	AP Amount	Spent	Leverage	Received Leverage	Leverage Source	Original Total	Final Total
Personnel	\$20,000	-	-	-	-	-	\$20,000	-
Contracts	-	\$51,000	\$49,500	-	-	-	-	\$49,500
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	\$1,947,000	\$1,861,000	\$1,860,900	-	-	-	\$1,947,000	\$1,860,900
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Travel	\$1,000	-	-	-	-	-	\$1,000	-
Professional Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	\$10,000	\$40,000	\$35,900	-	-	-	\$10,000	\$35,900
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supplies/Materials	-	\$26,000	\$26,000	-	-	-	-	\$26,000
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$1,978,000	\$1,978,000	\$1,972,300	-	-	-	\$1,978,000	\$1,972,300

Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Amount Spent	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Grant Administration	0.15	4.0	\$20,000	-	-	\$20,000

Partner: TCF

Totals

Item	Requested	AP Amount	Spent	Leverage	Received Leverage	Leverage Source	Original Total	Final Total
Personnel	\$38,000	\$38,000	\$20,200	-	-	-	\$38,000	\$20,200
Contracts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Travel	\$2,000	\$2,000	-	-	-	-	\$2,000	-
Professional Services	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	-	-	-	\$25,000	\$25,000
Direct Support Services	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$2,800	-	-	-	\$4,000	\$2,800
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supplies/Materials	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$69,000	\$69,000	\$48,000	-	-	-	\$69,000	\$48,000

Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Amount Spent	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
MN State Director	0.05	2.0	-	-	-	-
MN Acquisition Associate	0.15	2.0	\$20,200	-	-	\$20,200

Direct Support Services

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

TCF - Our real estate support staff keeps hourly time sheets to track direct time spent on projects by grant source. We have used those past metrics to estimate the costs for this grant.

DU - Minnesota DNR grants staff previously reviewed and approved DU accounting methodology for Direct Support Services, which are calculated and included in DU staff costs. DU Direct Support Services constitute approximately 10% of DU overall staff costs on average among DU conservation staff billing categories. DU breaks out and invoices for Direct Support Service expenses approved by DNR for reimbursement separately from Personnel expenses. In accordance with 2 CFR 200, DU uses the direct allocation method of allocating costs to programs and final cost objectives. This process of allocating costs is accomplished through the use of hourly rates. The direct cost of activities, including direct support expenses, is included in these hourly rates. The rates are comprised of costs for salaries, benefits, office space, general insurance, support staff, office supplies, and other various direct expenses incurred at the regional offices and conservation department at the home office. All costs are assigned to conservation projects (net of applicable personnel and other costs that are non-conservation related.) Hourly charges represent the amount that DU charges conservation projects per hour for each staff member working on the project. These costs represent expenses that directly support the labor cost necessary for the development of a specific water/wetlands conservation project.

Explain any budget challenges or successes:

One large challenge was the amount of inflation during the duration of this grant period. A delay in restoration until 2024 put some stress on 2018 restoration budgets, especially personnel. Additional moneys were sought for leverage via NAWCA which helped with contracts and personnel.

Total Revenue: \$68,705

Revenue Spent: \$68,545

Revenue Balance: \$160

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

A. This revenue, or a portion of it, was used according to the appropriation purposes approved in the AP Forest.

B. This revenue, or a portion of it, was used for other purposes as approved in the AP by the LSOHC.

Itemize out how the revenues were spent:

Seed costs of \$11,620, Drainage and flowage agreement \$19,300. Field Prep \$1,560. and real estate and drainage taxes of \$36,065

Output Tables

Acres by Resource Type (Table 1)

Type	Wetland (AP)	Wetland (Final)	Prairie (AP)	Prairie (Final)	Forest (AP)	Forest (Final)	Habitat (AP)	Habitat (Final)	Total Acres (AP)	Total Acres (Final)
Restore	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	45	35	269	326	0	0	0	0	314	361
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Easement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enhance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	45	35	269	326	0	0	0	0	314	361

How many of these Prairie acres are Native Prairie? (Table 1b)

Type	Native Prairie (AP)	Native Prairie (Final)
Restore	0	0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	12	12
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	0	0
Protect in Easement	0	0
Enhance	0	0
Total	12	12

Total Requested Funding by Resource Type (Table 2)

Type	Wetland (AP)	Wetland (Final)	Prairie (AP)	Prairie (Final)	Forest (AP)	Forest (Final)	Habitat (AP)	Habitat (Final)	Total Funding (AP)	Total Funding (Final)
Restore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	\$750,000	\$235,500	\$1,697,000	\$2,086,700	-	-	-	-	\$2,447,000	\$2,322,200
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$750,000	\$235,500	\$1,697,000	\$2,086,700	-	-	-	-	\$2,447,000	\$2,322,200

Acres within each Ecological Section (Table 3)

Type	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	314	361	0	0	314	361
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Easement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enhance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	314	361	0	0	314	361

Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section (Table 4)

Type	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$2,447,000	\$2,322,200	-	-	\$2,447,000	\$2,322,200
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$2,447,000	\$2,322,200	-	-	\$2,447,000	\$2,322,200

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

0

Explain the success/shortage of acre goals

We successfully acquired and restored two strategically identified parcels in our project area which expanded upon existing habitats and are great additions to wildlife areas in Martin County. We exceeded our 314 acre goal with a total acquisition of 361 acres.

Outcomes

Programs in prairie region:

Protected, restored, and enhanced habitat for migratory and unique Minnesota species ~ *We protected 361 acres through fee-title purchase and restored all cropland acres back to prairie grasslands and wetlands and enhanced the existing habitats on these parcels. Ducks Unlimited wildlife biologists and MN DNR staff worked together to evaluate habitat goals, restoration plans, and will continue to monitor and evaluate restoration success and need for maintenance in the future.*

Parcels

Sign-up Criteria?

No

Fee Parcels

Name	County	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection
Gleam WMA Tract 2 & 2A	Martin	10431216	232	\$1,900,000	No

Fee Parcels with Buildings

Name	County	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection	Buildings	Value of Buildings
Center Creek WMA Tract #15	Martin	10329223	129	\$600,000	No	4	\$3,500

Parcel Map



0 3 6 9 mi

- Protect in Easement
- ▲ Protect in Fee with PILT
- Protect in Fee W/O PILT
- ★ Restore
- ✕ Enhance
- ✚ Other