| ID#  | Program Title   | Rep. Jamie Becker-Finn   | David Hartwell   | Mark Holsten | Sen. Andrew Lang | Denny McNamara | Tom Saxhaug | Ron Schara | Jamie Swenson  |
|------|---|--|--|--------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|------------|--|
| PA01 | MN DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase XIII   | Phase 13, fee acquisition                                      | Given the current decline in agricultural land<br>prices, what method is used to determine value?<br>What is in the professional services line item?   |              | Hunting? No      |                |             |            | Q1: The Proposal's Need cites the counties with less than 2%<br>public ownership and the Prairie Plan. Support the<br>acquisitions where this is true - southern MN counties. This<br>does not include Chsago or Crow Wing according to the<br>state land ownership maps or Prairie Core Areas in the<br>Prairie Plan.<br>Q2: From the proposal, why have the total acres has been<br>lower in the last three yrs compared to previous, especially<br>when the appropriations have gone up?<br>Q3: Why no leverage compared to previous years?         |
| PA02 | Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program -<br>Phase XIII                   | Phase 13, Pheasants Forever, asking for almost \$14m           |  |              | Hunting Yes      |                |             |            |  |
|      | MN Prairie Recovery Program - Phase 11  | TNC, Phase 11  | Personnel line needs clarification. It appears<br>that staff (biologists and protection specialists)<br>have full time jobs - is that really necessary?<br>What keeps the biologists busy in the winter?<br>SSA finally makes sense :) |              | 18% DSS? Hunting |                |             |            | Q: Mentions the project is scalable with a proportional<br>reduction in on-the-ground accomplishments. Current fund<br>request is split for protection vs enhancement/restoration.<br>Historically funds have been split, but ML18 & ML19 show<br>more funds allocated to "Enhance" vs "Protect" - will more<br>funding go towards R&E like the last few years or go back to<br>the historical proportional split?   |
|      | Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge -<br>Phase XII                  | TNC, Phase 12  |  |              |                  |                |             |            |  |
| PA04 | Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and                                       | Phase 10, CAnnon River Watershed, TPL,<br>Great River Greening |  |              |                  |                |             |            |  |
| PA05 | Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection - Phase VIII                             | -  |  |              |                  |                |             |            | Q: Why doesn't the proposal include county locations?<br>Parcel list references map, nothing provided.   |
| PA06 | RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase IX                                       | Phase 9, BWSR  | No output in terms of acres for the restoration  |              |                  |                |             |            | Q: Previous funding had match/timing urgency. Does that<br>urgency still exist for RIM?<br>Explain in greater detail the changes in allocation within the<br>proposal from previous phases regarding funding riparian<br>buffers in support of the Buffer Law and instead expanding<br>into larger, non-buffer areas. Percent funding allocated to<br>Buffers vs Non-Buffer? Does the "Enhances MN Buffer Law"<br>expand funding for buffers on waters not required to have a<br>buffer in the Buffer Law (ie. Private Ditch), or non-buffer<br>areas? |
| PA07 | Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red<br>River Valley - Phase VII | Phase 7, Prairie Chicken Society, PF                           | is wind development a threat? Have there been<br>studies done that verify that? Contracts line<br>shows \$1135000 for restoration but outputs<br>show 30 acres and \$30K. Something is amiss.  |              |                  | 8              |             |            | Q: Has anyone, or is it possible, to analyzed data and<br>created a map for breeding prairie grouse similar to the<br>USFWS "thundermap" for mallards to identify habitat<br>needs?  |
| PA08 | Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation<br>Easement Program - Phase III         | Phase 3, DU and PF   | Is DU holding easements? If so, what is USFW<br>and what is DU holding. How determined? How<br>will price of DU easements be determined? No<br>stewardship dollars   |              |                  |                |             |            | Appreciate the public-private partnership innovation since<br>so much land in the prairie area is private. Great and<br>innovative way to preserve habitat and maintain outcomes<br>over time. A WIN-WIN<br>Q: Is the leverage a percent match or lump sum regardless<br>of funding amount?  |
| PA10 | Martin County WMA Acquisition Phase 5   | Phase 5, Fox Lake, Conservation Fund                           | no cost for restoration that is mentioned in<br>proposal. It seems to be imbedded in the<br>acquisition cost which us unfortunate as it<br>becomes invisible and there is no way to<br>understand the cost of each component.          |              | 3% DSS +         |                |             |            | Q: What is the percent of expired CRP contracts that don't re-<br>enroll that this proposal is looking to capture?   |
| PA10 | RIM Grassland Reserve - Phase III   | Phase 3, BWSR  |  |              |                  |                |             |            | Q: Previous funding had match/timing urgency. Does that urgency still exist for RIM?   |

| ID#    | Program Title                                 | Rep. Jamie Becker-Finn | David Hartwell | Mark Holsten | Sen. Andrew Lang | Denny McNamara | Tom Saxhaug | Ron Schara | Jamie Swenson  |
|--------|---|------------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|------------|--|
| PRE01a | DNR Grassland - Phase XIII - with Roving Crew |                        |                |              | 32% DSS?         |                |             |            | Q1: Previous funding from Game & Fish, Dedicated<br>Accounts (Duck Stamp, Pheasant Stamp, etc, and Heritage<br>Enhancement Acct. What percentage of this funding request<br>is supplanting?<br>Q2: Explain in greater detail how, "this request is part of a<br>larger effortmultiple partners worked together to submit a<br>State Acre For Wildlife Enhancement to FSA to boost CRP<br>acres in MN."<br>What percent of public grasslands are being grazed? Public-<br>private partnership opportunity? BLM Model? |
| PRE01b | DNR Grassland - Phase XIII                    |                        |                |              | 1                |                |             |            | Q1: Program, output table of acres and parcels are the same<br>with and without the roving crew. Difficult to understand<br>the program leftover as a stand-alone proposal if roving<br>crews are funded in a separate proposal. Why fund this<br>proposal if funding the O1 proposal?   |

| ID#   | Program Title   | Rep. Jamie Becker-Finn               | David Hartwell   | Mark Holsten             | Sen. Andrew Lang | Denny McNamara | Tom Saxhaug | Ron Schara  | Jamie Swenson   |
|-------|---|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|---|---|
|       | Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands - Phase V                                 | PF                                   | This seems to replicate the DNR roving crews<br>other than the conservation grazing. It is<br>basically a contract management proposal.<br>Perhaps just fund the conservation grazing part?  |                          | 19% DSS          |                |             |   |   |
| PREO2 | Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase 7                             | Great River Greening, NWTF, MLT, TNC | not sure what each partners specific role will be<br>and why they are necessary to get this work<br>done. Would like more info on exactly how the<br>rare plant rescue works and success rates. This<br>actually feels like separate proposals jammed<br>together for a reason I cannot understand.  |                          |                  |                |             |   | Great explanation of how this proposal is tied to other<br>funds.<br>Q: What portion of the proposal cover the ACD's Rare Plant<br>Rescue Program? If funded by LCCMR, what's the plan for<br>this proposal?  |
| PRE03 |   |                                      |  |                          |                  |                |             |   |   |
| FA01  | Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration Phase<br>9                   | TNC, blufflands                      | What makes TNC ownership appropriate?  | Who gets mineral rights? | Hunting? No      |                |             |   | Q: The proposal mentions federal funds as a match, but lists<br>this as "leverage" and doesn't include federal match<br>amounts in the table. Is this a typo or are there federal<br>funds as a leverage also?  |
| 1401  | Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase 8                                    | DNR                                  |  |                          |                  |                |             |   | Q: Previous funding came from the Wild Turkey Federation  |
| FA02  |   |                                      |  |                          |                  |                |             |   | and Minnesota Deer Hunters. Why no leverage from these<br>partners?<br>This proposal is very broad. Easier to see value and "move<br>the needle" if focused on specific outcomes, ie. permanent<br>working forest conservation easements on private lands.                |
| FAUZ  | Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Phase IX                                | Morrison County SWCD, easement only, | This seems more like a subsidy to the military   |                          |                  |                |             |   | Q: Similar to previous proposals, this proposal indicates   |
|       |   | not open to public                   | than a conservation project. They want habitat<br>funds to keep development from encroaching on<br>the camp rather than to protect habitat. And<br>they don't even promise any match.  |                          |                  |                |             |   | DOD leverage from the REPI program, but doesn't provide a leverage amount. Confirm this proposal also includes the DOD leverage similar to previous proposals.  |
| FA03  |   |                                      |  |                          |                  |                |             |   |   |
| FRE01 | DNR Forest Enhancement  | DNR                                  | How is climate change going to be addressed by<br>this proposal? Is this proposal not just another<br>roving crew under a different name? I have<br>wondered for some time how this clearing<br>enhances natural processes. What happened<br>before European settlement to these forests -<br>and were they unhealthy then? Staffing for fire<br>specialists when fire is not part of the proposal<br>and all the funds go to contractors? |                          |                  |                |             | can't see public value; return on<br>investment?? | Q: Previous funding from Game & Fish, Dedicated Accounts,<br>Heritage Enhancement. What percent of this proposal is<br>supplanting?   |
| TREUI | Floodplain Forest Enhancement-Mississippi River,<br>Phase 4                 | Audubon                              |  | Acquisition List?        |                  |                |             |   | Q1: Table shows 3,445 acres, but measure of<br>success/outcome is 1,000 acres. What is the measurement<br>of success for the other 2,445 acres?   |
|       |   |                                      |  |                          |                  |                |             |   | Q2: What is the assumed survival rate of tree plantings to achieve 4.5 ft height?   |
| FRE02 | Moose Habitat Collaborative, Phase IV - NE MN Forest<br>Habitat Enhancement | Ruffed Grouse Society                | Why is the Ruffed Grouse Society the lead in a moose habitat proposal?   |                          |                  |                |             |   | Q: Scientific approach to target areas: Proposal mentions<br>focus on the "moose range." With such a steep decline in<br>known moose population, is there data to focus on known<br>moose populations and target these specific areas for<br>habitat enhancements, or no? |
| FRE03 | Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program -                        | Pheasants Forever, Phase 13          |  |                          |                  |                |             |   |   |
| WA01  | Phase XIII  | -                                    |  |                          |                  |                |             |   |   |
| WA02  | Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration<br>Program - Phase X        | DU                                   |  |                          |                  |                |             |   | Q: Are we seeing an increase in urgency due to increased ag<br>drainage activity in the last decade?  |
|       | RIM Wetlands - Phase X  | BWSR                                 |  |                          |                  |                |             |   | Q: Previous funding had match/timing urgency. Does that<br>urgency still exist for RIM?   |
| WA03  | Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program -<br>Phase 6             |                                      | very low easement cost per acre  |                          |                  |                |             |   | Urgency still exist for RIM?<br>Q: With this proposal being an easement acquisition<br>program, are there working land components part of the<br>"comprehensive management plans" that are developed for<br>the easement areas?   |
| WA04  |   |                                      |  |                          |                  |                |             |   |   |
|       | Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase VII                                  | BWSR                                 | very low easement cost per acre  |                          |                  |                |             |   |   |

|                    | <b>Program Title</b>  |   |   |              |                  |                |             |                                       |   |
|--------------------|---|---|---|--------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|---|
|                    | 5   | Rep. Jamie Becker-Finn  | David Hartwell  | Mark Holsten | Sen. Andrew Lang | Denny McNamara | Tom Saxhaug | Ron Schara                            | Jamie Swenson   |
| Ph<br>WRE01a       | Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements<br>Phase 13 (with Roving Habitat Crew)       | Phase 13, statewide   | Professional services???  |              | hunting DSS ALL  |                |             |                                       | Q: how much is allocated to the ten wetland enhancement projects on 2,170 acres and how much on the other nine projects?  |
| Ac<br>Ph           | Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements<br>Phase 13 (without Roving Habitat Crew)    | Phase 13, statewide   | Professional services???  |              |                  |                |             |                                       |   |
|                    | Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland<br>Restoration Initiative - Phase VII                 | Phase 7, Ducks Unlimited  |   |              | leverage         |                |             |                                       |   |
| St.<br>Ph          | St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration<br>Phase 2                               | St Croix River Association, MN Land Trust,<br>Trust for Public Land. Carlos Avery,<br>Bayport WMAs. |   |              | hunting          |                |             |                                       |   |
| IAO1 Me            | Metro Big Rivers Phase 11   |   | why the large cost differential between fee with<br>PILT and without? Washing plants to remove<br>soil runs counter to what I know about<br>successful transplanting. Often it is the<br>microbes in the soil that a plant is dependent on<br>and removing the soil will significantly decrease<br>the success and vibrancy of the plant. |              | 373 acers        |                |             |                                       |   |
|                    |   | Watershed District, Wilkin SWCD   | What is the long term goal in terms of acres and<br>\$ for them? Same question for the restoration.<br>Project will not be done until 2029? Program<br>management personnel line is larger than the<br>easement processing which does not make<br>sense.  |              |                  |                |             | confusing plan/ parks and more parks? | Q: The DNR's HRE02 project includes the Otter Tail River<br>dam removal. How does this align with this project?   |
|                    | Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central<br>Minnesota Lakes - Phase VII          | Northern Waters Land Trust, MLT -<br>tullibee in deep cold water lakes in Cass                      | what is the professional services line for?   |              |                  |                |             |                                       |   |
| IA04               |   | County  | a smaller target area seems more reasonable   |              |                  |                |             |                                       |   |
| 1A05               | 5   |   | a smaller target area seems more reasonable   |              |                  |                |             |                                       |   |
| Pri<br>Sig<br>1A06 |   | ,Lakes of Outstanding Biological<br>Significance, NE part of state (Cass to Cook<br>to Carlton)     |   |              |                  |                |             | more leverage???                      | Q1: In discussing the state's lake priorities, the proposal<br>mentions "a major gap in protection exists" and that this<br>program "addresses the noted protection gap" can you<br>elaborate what plans/reports identify this gap?<br>Q2: Does this program replace the Critical Shorelands<br>Program? Is this a phased project? Elaborate on what is<br>considered success of this program.<br>Q3: 10% of 407 lakes is 40 lakes. No counties or parcel<br>information included with the proposal. Only a map of the<br>previous Critical Shorelands Program area footprint.<br>Elaborate on location information to determine overlap with<br>wild rice and cisco/tullibee programs. |
|                    | Riparian Habitat Protection in the Kettle and Snake<br>River Watersheds                         | Pine County SWCD, sturgeon  |   |              |                  |                |             |                                       |   |
|                    |   | stream, NE and SE rivers  | 11 miles of stream with 211 acres means a very small strip along the stream. Real protection of the stream would be deeper. This feels more like a fishing access than a habitat project.   |              |                  |                |             |                                       | Q: Where are project partners and leverage?   |
|                    | Targeted RIM Easement and Acquisition to the Parcel<br>Level Pine and Leech Watersheds Phase II | -   | Not excited with roads used for recreational<br>access  |              |                  |                |             | habitat or access??                   |   |
| Ur<br>Lai          |   | Audubon   |   |              | Good leverage    |                |             |                                       | Q1: There are three phases of the project over a 5-year<br>establishment period. Will there be future proposals or is<br>this the only proposal to LSOHC for the acquisition<br>component? Will the remainder be funded by CPL only?<br>Q2: Elaborate on how this is scalable.<br>Q3: What is all included in professional service line?  |
| HA10               | Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat  |   | Staffing seems very high to just manage contracts   |              |                  |                |             | this a park?                          |   |

| ID#    | <b>Program Title</b>  | Rep. Jamie Becker-Finn                 | David Hartwell  | Mark Holsten | Sen. Andrew Lang              | Denny McNamara | Tom Saxhaug             | Ron Schara                      | Jamie Swenson   |
|--------|---|--|---|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
|        | DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement -                                 | Phase 4, \$3.2m committed as leverage  |   |              | Good leverage                 |                | <u>_</u>                | design issues solved, settled?? | Q: How does this proposal and HA03 align?   |
| HRE02  | Phase 4   |  |   |              |                               |                |                         |                                 |   |
|        | St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase 8                                  | Phase 8,                               |   |              |                               |                |                         |                                 | Q: Does this proposal include Mud Lake E and W or both?<br>Supporting map shows Mud Lake East resto already   |
| HRE03  |   |  |   |              |                               |                |                         |                                 | underway?   |
| HRE04  | Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program - Phase                              | Phase 10, Freeborn County              | what are the professional services?   |              |                               |                |                         |                                 |   |
|        | Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation-Phase VIRestoration<br>Evaluations - ML 2020   | Phase 6, Lake & St Louis Counties      |   |              |                               |                |                         | more leverage???                |   |
| HRE05  | Southeast Wetland Restoration, Phase 2  | Phase 2, Mankato. Like that its near a | Very high restoration cost  |              | 42 Acres, Bad Source Leverage |                |                         |                                 | Q1: What percent of this project and personnel costs are  |
|        |   | population center                      |   |              |                               |                |                         |                                 | Supplanting from City's stormwater program?<br>Q2: Where are project partners to support urgency and<br>importance in region for this one city stormwater project?  |
| HRE06  | Cauly Diver Wetershed Unkitet Destation 9   | Phase 3, Douglas/Pope/Stearns/Todd,    |   |              | I hunting                     |                |                         | ia Ahia                         |   |
|        | Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection &<br>Restoration, Phase 3                 | MLT, Pheasants Forever, TNC            |   |              | + hunting                     |                |                         | is this                         |   |
| HRE07  |   |  |   |              |                               |                |                         |                                 |   |
|        | Klondike Clean Water Retention Project - Phase 1                                  | Phase 1, Kittson County                | More flood control than habitat. We are funding<br>removal of dams so it is confusing that we would<br>fund creation of them. |              |                               |                |                         |                                 |   |
| HRE08  |   |  |   |              |                               |                |                         |                                 |   |
| TINE08 | Targeted Culvert Replacement to Enhance Fish Passag                               | e First ask, Lake County, brook trout  | flood control? Why no match from owners of  |              |                               |                |                         |                                 |   |
| HRE09  |   |  | roads?  |              |                               |                |                         |                                 |   |
|        | Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program Phase 1<br>Statewide and Metro Habitat | 3:                                     | CPL coordinator - is there not funding for this in prior years covering the next two?   |              |                               |                | Need to be fully funded |                                 |   |
| CPL    |   |  |   |              |                               |                |                         |                                 |   |
|        | DNR Roving Crews  |  | please provide spreadsheet showing existing<br>roving crew funding and how this would fit with<br>that                        |              |                               |                | Need to be fully funded |                                 | One proposal for roving crew restoration work make sense,<br>whether the acres are prairie, wetland, or forest resto or<br>enhancement can be tracked on the reporting side. Also a<br>return of future/unspent funds from previous years, to be<br>recommended for reappropriation. Lets simplify this for<br>everyone.<br>Q1: in total, how many roving crew FTE have been funded<br>for FY 2022 and beyond from previous funding OHF? other<br>sources?<br>Q2: Clearly explain the pricing and resource difference<br>between the five proposals to clarify the math:<br>Roving Crew costs:<br>PRE01a is 6 FTE for 5 years for \$2,467,500 (ave<br>82,250/FTE/yr). 21.5k ac PE<br>WRE01a is 2 FTE for 5 years for \$701,000 (ave<br>\$70,100/FTE/yr). 24k acres total (ave \$132/ac)<br>Difference between PRE01a & b: \$4,005,100.<br>Difference between VRE01a & b: \$1,104,000.<br>Total: \$5,109,100<br>However;<br>OH-1 is 34 FTE for 2 years for \$5,549,000 (ave<br>\$81,603/FTE/yr). 9k ac WE, 4k ac PR+39,600ac PE, 3.5k ac<br>EF. 56 1k arres total (ave \$99/ac) |
|        | Contract Management 2021  | Fully fund                             |   |              |                               |                | Need to be fully funded |                                 | אר אין אין ארא ארא ארא ארא ארא ארא ארא ארא ארא אר   |
|        | Restoration Evaluations - ML 2021   | Fully fund                             |   |              |                               |                | Need to be fully funded |                                 |   |