



## Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

RIM Grasslands Reserve Phase IV  
Laws of Minnesota 2022 Accomplishment Plan

---

### General Information

**Date:** 01/05/2022

**Project Title:** RIM Grasslands Reserve Phase IV

**Funds Recommended:** \$4,424,000

**Legislative Citation:** ML 2022, Ch. XX, Art. 1, Sec. 2, subd.

**Appropriation Language:**

### Manager Information

**Manager's Name:** John Voz

**Title:** RIM Easement & Working Lands Specialist

**Organization:** MNBWSR

**Address:** 1723 North Tower Road

**City:** Detroit Lakes, MN 56501

**Email:** john.voz@state.mn.us

**Office Number:** 218-846-8426

**Mobile Number:** 218-849-1603

**Fax Number:**

**Website:** <http://www.bwsr.state.mn.us/index.html>

### Location Information

**County Location(s):**

**Eco regions in which work will take place:**

- Forest / Prairie Transition
- Prairie

**Activity types:**

- Protect in Easement

**Priority resources addressed by activity:**

- Prairie

## Narrative

### **Abstract**

Using the Reinvest in Minnesota (RIM) program, this project addresses the potential loss of grassland habitats from conversion to cropland and accelerates grassland protection efforts not covered by other programs. Working in coordination with 11 established Prairie Conservation Plan Local Technical Teams (LTTs), and local SWCDs this proposal will enroll 880 RIM acres (approximately 11 easements), focusing on Minnesota Prairie Plan identified landscapes. This proposal focus is on protecting non-crop moderate to high quality remnant prairies and associated buffer that can be improved through habitat management.

### **Design and Scope of Work**

In 2021 and 2022 an additional 144,000 acres of the USDA Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) will expire. Minnesota was once a land of 18 million acres of prairie. Today less than two percent remains. The few acres of native remnant prairie that remain were once thought of as too rocky or wet for row crops, but not anymore. If the current trajectory of grassland and prairie loss continues it will be devastating to grassland wildlife populations, including pollinator species.

This proposal, working in partnership with Prairie Conservation Plan Local Technical Teams (LTTs) and local SWCD's focuses on protecting current grasslands and buffering native prairie that are within wildlife habitat complexes not covered by other conservation programs. There are programs for native prairie such as MNDNR Native Prairie Bank, Federal Native Tallgrass Prairie (NTP) and programs for cropland, but there are no programs for moderate quality prairies that have the potential for higher quality through protection and management. As Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs) and LTTs review these areas for possible enrollment, they may find additional tracts that are native prairie. With this project, some native prairie may be included to square up parcels. In cases where larger tracts are identified, they will contact the DNR's Biological Survey and Native Prairie Bank staff for a more formal botanical survey of the site.

The loss of native prairie and grassland habitat is arguably the greatest conservation challenge facing northwest, western and southern Minnesota. This proposal aims to protect 880 acres of prairie and grassland habitat by coordinating and accelerating the enrollment in Reinvest in Minnesota (RIM) through private land easements. This level of acceleration is needed to address today's rapid loss of grassland habitat and meet the goals set forth in the Minnesota Prairie Conservation Plan.

A portion of this funding request will be used to contract with the Conservation Corp of Minnesota (CMMI) to encourage young adults from diverse backgrounds to become engaged in conservation, involved in community, and prepare for future employment.

### **How does the plan address habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and list targeted species?**

Minnesota grasslands provide important habitat for a wide range of Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN). Consistent with guidance in The Minnesota Wildlife Action Plan and Minnesota Prairie Conservation Plan, strategic site selection will be conducted as well as efforts to minimize landscape stressors and plan for plant diversity and long-term resiliency of project sites. More than 150 SGCN use grasslands for breeding, migration, and/or foraging.

Target Species include: Greater prairie chicken, Eastern meadowlark, Western meadowlark, Grasshopper sparrow, Northern pintail, Northern black duck, Burrowing owl, Chestnut collared longspur, Bobolink, Wilson's phalarope, Sedge wren, Plains hog-nosed snake, American badger, Prairie vole, Plains pocket mouse, Eastern spotted skunk, Dakota skipper, Monarch butterfly, Powe sheik skipper, Regal fritillary, Rusty patched bumble bee.

### **Describe how the plan uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey:**

Native prairies are often part of large complexes of restored prairies, grasslands, and wetlands. These complexes will be the top priority for this project using the MN Prairie Plan framework. A preference will be given to protecting expiring CRP with enrollment of adjacent remnant prairie as identified in the MN County Biological Survey. This focus on expiring CRP will fill a niche that cannot otherwise be filled by the Native Prairie Bank program. LTTs will help guide restoration strategies such as prescribed burning, conservation grazing and woody tree removal to be used to restore the conditions of moderate quality prairies. In addition, the LTTs will identify remnant prairie sites that are not listed on the MN County Biological Survey and update the survey accordingly. By utilizing the LTTs, parcels will be targeted for protection and resulting acres will be tracked and reportable.

Recent genetic diversity research was conducted on Greater Prairie Chickens by the MNDNR to understand how birds move through the landscape using a new approach called landscape genetics. It found that prairie chickens in the northern part of the sampled area, near Glacial Ridge National Wildlife Refuge, are not very connected to prairie chickens in Clay, Otter Tail, and Wilkin counties to the south. Connecting these areas with high quality habitat would allow more genetic mixing, potentially reduce stress and mortality and eliminate the need for birds to travel long distances to find suitable habitat. This "follow the chicken" approach has worked remarkably well in identifying, targeting and protecting areas that have positive impacts on a wide range of species of greatest conservation need.

### **Which two sections of the Minnesota Statewide Conservation and Preservation Plan are most applicable to this project?**

- H1 Protect priority land habitats
- H5 Restore land, wetlands and wetland-associated watersheds

### **Which two other plans are addressed in this program?**

- Minnesota Prairie Conservation Plan
- Minnesota's Wildlife Action Plan 2015-2025

### **Which LSOHC section priorities are addressed in this program?**

#### **Forest / Prairie Transition**

- Protect, enhance, and restore rare native remnant prairie

#### **Prairie**

- Protect, enhance, and restore remnant native prairie, Big Woods forests, and oak savanna

### **Does this program include leveraged funding?**

No

**Per MS 97A.056, Subd. 24, Please explain whether the request is supplanting or is a substitution for any previous funding that was not from a legacy fund and was used for the same purpose.**

This funding request is not supplanting existing funding or a substitution for any previous funding.

**How will you sustain and/or maintain this work after the Outdoor Heritage Funds are expended?**

Once a RIM easement is acquired, BWSR is responsible for monitoring and enforcement into perpetuity. BWSR partners with local SWCDs carry-out oversight, monitoring and inspection of its conservation easements. Easements are inspected for the first five consecutive years beginning in the year after the easement is recorded. Thereafter, on-site inspections are performed every three years and compliance checks are performed in the other two years. SWCDs report to BWSR on each site inspection conducted and document findings. A non-compliance procedure is implemented when potential violations or problems are identified.

Perpetual monitoring and enforcement costs are calculated at \$6,500 per easement. This value is based on using local SWCD staff for monitoring and landowner relations and existing enforcement authorities. The amount listed for Easement Stewardship covers costs of the SWCD regular monitoring, BWSR oversight, and any enforcement necessary.

**Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes**

Year	Source of Funds	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
2022-Ongoing	Stewardship Account	Inspection every year for the fist 5 years; then every 3rd year	Corrective actions on any violations	Easement action taken by MN General Office
2022-Ongoing	Landowners Responsibility	Maintain compliance with easement terms	-	-

**How will the program directly involve, engage, and benefit BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, People of Color) and diverse communities:**

A portion of this funding request will be used to contract with the Conservation Corp of Minnesota (CMMI) to encourage young adults from diverse backgrounds to become engaged in conservation , involved in community, and prepare for future employment. See attached CCMI letter of support.

**Activity Details**

**Requirements**

**If funded, this program will meet all applicable criteria set forth in MS 97A.056?**

Yes

**Is the land you plan to acquire (easement) free of any other permanent protection?**

Yes

**Who will manage the easement?**

The easements secured under this project will be managed as part of the MN Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) RIM Reserve Program in cooperation with local County Soil & Water Conservation Districts (SWCD's).

**Who will be the easement holder?**

The state of Minnesota through the MN Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) RIM Reserve Program.

**What is the anticipated number of easements (range is fine) you plan to accomplish with this appropriation?**

This proposal will enroll 880 RIM acres (approximately 11 easements), focusing on Minnesota Prairie Plan identified landscapes.

## Land Use

### Will there be planting of any crop on OHF land purchased or restored in this program?

Yes

#### Explain what will be planted:

In certain circumstances food plots for wildlife are an allowable use on RIM easements and must be part of an approved Conservation Plan. Under this proposal no food plots would be allowed on remnant prairies which have never been cultivated (only areas that buffer remnant prairies). Food plots on narrow buffers, steep slopes and wet areas are not allowed but may be offered on any potential surrounding grass buffer on prior cultivated lands. RIM policy limits food plots to 10% of the total easement area or 5 acres whichever is smaller. There is no cost share for establishment of food plots and upon termination and/or abandonment the landowners must reestablish the vegetation as prescribed in the Conservation Plan at their own expense. Food plots are a rarely selected option by landowners, to date only 2.2% of RIM easements have food plots.

### Will the eased land be open for public use?

No

### Are there currently trails or roads on any of the proposed acquisitions?

Yes

#### Describe the types of trails or roads and the allowable uses:

Existing trails and roads are identified during the easement acquisition process and are often excluded from the easement area if they serve no purpose to easement maintenance, monitoring or enforcement. Some roads and trails, such as agricultural field accesses, are allowed to remain.

### Will the trails or roads remain and uses continue to be allowed after OHF acquisition?

Yes

#### How will maintenance and monitoring be accomplished?

The easements secured under this project will be managed as part of the MN Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) RIM Reserve Program which has over 7,000 individual easements currently in place. Easements are monitored annually for each of the first five years and then every third year after that. BWSR, in cooperation with Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCD), implement a stewardship process to track, monitor quality and assure compliance with easement terms. Under the terms of the Reinvest In Minnesota (RIM) Easement Program, landowners are required to maintain compliance with the easement. A conservation plan is developed with the landowner and maintained as part of each easement. Basic easement compliance costs are borne by the landowner, periodic enhancements may be cost shared from a variety of sources.

### Will new trails or roads be developed or improved as a result of the OHF acquisition?

Yes

#### Describe the types of trails or roads and the allowable uses:

Though uncommon, there could be a potential for new minimal use trails, if they contribute to easement maintenance or benefit the easement site (e.g. firebreaks, berm maintenance, etc). Unauthorized trails identified during the monitoring process are in violation of the easement.

**How will maintenance and monitoring be accomplished?**

The easements secured under this project will be managed as part of the MN Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) RIM Reserve Program which has over 7,000 individual easements currently in place. Easements are monitored annually for each of the first 5 years and then every 3rd year after that. BWSR, in cooperation with Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCD), implement a stewardship process to track, monitor quality and assure compliance with easement terms. Under the terms of the Reinvest In Minnesota (RIM) Easement Program, landowners are required to maintain compliance with the easement. A conservation plan is developed with the landowner and maintained as part of each easement. Basic easement compliance costs are borne by the landowner, periodic enhancements may be cost shared from a variety of sources.

**Will the acquired parcels be restored or enhanced within this appropriation?**

Yes

The RIM Grassland Reserve program evaluates each application on its potential to restore upland/wetland functions and values to optimize wildlife habitat and provide other benefits, including water quality. Each site is evaluated on its benefits to the surrounding landscape, ability to build upon existing corridors and complexes, and site-specific features that highlight the benefits of selection for permanent protection and habitat and associated environmental benefits.

**Will the land that you acquire (fee or easement) be restored or enhanced within this program's funding and availability?**

Yes

**Timeline**

<b>Activity Name</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>
Final Report Submitted	November 1st, 2028
Enroll 880 acres into the RIM private land easement program	June 30th, 2027

**Date of Final Report Submission: 11/01/2028**

**Budget**

Budget reallocations up to 10% do not require an amendment to the Accomplishment Plan.

**Totals**

Item	Funding Request	Antic. Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	\$92,400	-	-	\$92,400
Contracts	\$22,600	-	-	\$22,600
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	\$4,181,000	-	-	\$4,181,000
Easement Stewardship	\$73,300	-	-	\$73,300
Travel	\$7,700	-	-	\$7,700
Professional Services	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	\$32,600	-	-	\$32,600
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$11,100	-	-	\$11,100
Supplies/Materials	\$3,300	-	-	\$3,300
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$4,424,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$4,424,000</b>

**Personnel**

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Funding Request	Antic. Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Program Mgmt	0.14	6.0	\$92,400	-	-	\$92,400

**Amount of Request:** \$4,424,000

**Amount of Leverage:** -

**Leverage as a percent of the Request:** 0.0%

**DSS + Personnel:** \$125,000

**As a % of the total request:** 2.83%

**Easement Stewardship:** \$73,300

**As a % of the Easement Acquisition:** 1.75%

**How will this program accommodate the reduced appropriation recommendation from the original proposed requested amount?**

Reduction in funding will reduce outputs proportionally. Program management costs are the exception, due to program management & oversight remaining consistent regardless of appropriation amount.

**Personnel**

**Has funding for these positions been requested in the past?**

Yes

**Please explain the overlap of past and future staffing and position levels previously received and how that is coordinated over multiple years?**

This is Phase IV of an ongoing program and these funds will pay for staff time spent on new easements associated with this phase.

## Contracts

### What is included in the contracts line?

The contract line includes costs covered under the SWCD MJPA, \$2000 for staff time per easement acquisition.

## Easement Stewardship

### What is the number of easements anticipated, cost per easement for stewardship, and explain how that amount is calculated?

This proposal will enroll 780 RIM acres (approximately 10 easements), focusing on Minnesota Prairie Plan identified landscapes. Perpetual monitoring and enforcement costs are calculated at \$6,500 per easement. This value is based on using local SWCD staff for monitoring and landowner relations and existing enforcement authorities. The amount listed for Easement Stewardship covers costs of the SWCD regular monitoring, BWSR oversight, and any enforcement necessary.

## Travel

### Does the amount in the travel line include equipment/vehicle rental?

No

### Explain the amount in the travel line outside of traditional travel costs of mileage, food, and lodging

The travel line will only be used for traditional travel costs.

### I understand and agree that lodging, meals, and mileage must comply with the current MMB Commissioner Plan:

Yes

## Direct Support Services

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

BWSR calculates and periodically reviews and updates direct support services costs that are directly related to and necessary for each request based on the type of work being done.

## Other Equipment/Tools

### Give examples of the types of Equipment and Tools that will be purchased?

None anticipated at this time but we keep a small amount in this budget line for contingencies.

## Federal Funds

### Do you anticipate federal funds as a match for this program?

No



Output Tables**Acres by Resource Type (Table 1)**

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat	Total Acres
Restore	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	880	-	-	880
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	-	<b>880</b>	-	-	<b>880</b>

**Total Requested Funding by Resource Type (Table 2)**

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat	Total Funding
Restore	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	\$4,424,000	-	-	\$4,424,000
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	-	<b>\$4,424,000</b>	-	-	<b>\$4,424,000</b>

**Acres within each Ecological Section (Table 3)**

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest	Total Acres
Restore	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	100	-	780	-	880
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	-	<b>100</b>	-	<b>780</b>	-	<b>880</b>

**Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section (Table 4)**

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest	Total Funding
Restore	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	\$490,000	-	\$3,934,000	-	\$4,424,000
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	-	<b>\$490,000</b>	-	<b>\$3,934,000</b>	-	<b>\$4,424,000</b>

**Average Cost per Acre by Resource Type (Table 5)**

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat
Restore	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	\$5,027	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-

**Average Cost per Acre by Ecological Section (Table 6)**

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest
Restore	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-

Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	\$4,900	-	\$5,043	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-

### Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

## Outcomes

### Programs in forest-prairie transition region:

- Protected, restored, and enhanced nesting and migratory habitat for waterfowl, upland birds, and species of greatest conservation need ~ *A summary of the total acres acquired through this appropriation will be reported. On-site inspections are performed every three years and compliance checks are performed during the other two years to ensure maintained outcomes. An increase of native grassland habitat availability within a certain region is expected to increase the carrying capacity of grassland-dependent wildlife within that region. This would have a positive impact on both game and non game species. We expect more abundant populations of endangered, threatened, special concern and game species as these complexes are restored.*

### Programs in prairie region:

- Protected, restored, and enhanced habitat for migratory and unique Minnesota species ~ *A summary of the total acres acquired through this appropriation will be reported. On-site inspections are performed every three years and compliance checks are performed during the other two years to ensure maintained outcomes. An increase of native grassland habitat availability within a certain region is expected to increase the carrying capacity of grassland-dependent wildlife within that region. This would have a positive impact on both game and non-game species. We expect more abundant populations of endangered, threatened, special concern and game species as these complexes are restored.*

## Parcels

*For restoration and enhancement programs ONLY: Managers may add, delete, and substitute projects on this parcel list based upon need, readiness, cost, opportunity, and/or urgency so long as the substitute parcel/project forwards the constitutional objectives of this program in the Project Scope table of this accomplishment plan. The final accomplishment plan report will include the final parcel list.*

### Parcel Information

#### Sign-up Criteria?

[Yes](#)

#### **Explain the process used to identify, prioritize, and select the parcels on your list:**

Through a combination of eligibility screening and a scoring and ranking process, each application will be assessed on its potential to restore functions and values (optimize wildlife habitat benefits) and to provide other landscape benefits. Each site is considered on its benefits to the surrounding landscape, as well as the site-specific features which highlight the benefits of selection for permanent protection. During the application process, a review of adjacent permanent habitat and easement size is conducted to indicate a site's usefulness as a corridor or extension to an existing habitat complex.



# Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

## Comparison Report

**Program Title:** ML 2022 - RIM Grasslands Reserve Phase IV

**Organization:** MNBWSR

**Manager:** John Voz

### Budget

**Requested Amount:** \$9,000,000

**Appropriated Amount:** \$4,424,000

**Percentage:** 49.16%

Item	Total Requested		Total Appropriated		Percentage of Request	
	Requested	Leverage	Appropriated	Leverage	Percent of Request	Percent of Leverage
Personnel	\$184,400	-	\$92,400	-	50.11%	-
Contracts	\$45,000	-	\$22,600	-	50.22%	-
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	\$8,513,200	-	\$4,181,000	-	49.11%	-
Easement Stewardship	\$146,300	-	\$73,300	-	50.1%	-
Travel	\$15,800	-	\$7,700	-	48.73%	-
Professional Services	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	\$66,000	-	\$32,600	-	49.39%	-
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$22,500	-	\$11,100	-	49.33%	-
Supplies/Materials	\$6,800	-	\$3,300	-	48.53%	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$9,000,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$4,424,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>49.16%</b>	<b>-</b>

### If the project received 70% of the requested funding

**Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?**

A 30% reduction in funding would reduce outputs proportionally. Program management costs are the exception, due to program management & oversight remaining consistent regardless of appropriation amount.

**Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?**

BWSR calculates direct support services costs that are directly related to and necessary for each request based on the type of work being done.

**If the project received 50% of the requested funding**

**Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?**

A 50% reduction in funding would reduce outputs proportionally. Program management costs are the exception, due to program management & oversight remaining consistent regardless of appropriation amount.

**Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?**

BWSR calculates direct support services costs that are directly related to and necessary for each request based on the type of work being done.

## Output

### Acres by Resource Type (Table 1)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	0	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Easement	1,800	880	48.89%
Enhance	0	-	-

### Total Requested Funding by Resource Type (Table 2)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	\$9,000,000	\$4,424,000	49.16%
Enhance	-	-	-

### Acres within each Ecological Section (Table 3)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	0	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Easement	1,800	880	48.89%
Enhance	0	-	-

### Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section (Table 4)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	\$9,000,000	\$4,424,000	49.16%
Enhance	-	-	-

## RIM Grassland Reserve Phase IV scoresheet

Landowner/Project Name:	County (Field Office):	Prepared By:	Date:
-------------------------	------------------------	--------------	-------

**Offer should follow the 2018 Minnesota Prairie Plan Strategic Guide - Outcome 2: Prairie Landscape or Restoration Strategy 1, 2 & 3 and associated action items.**

	Factors	Possible Points	Score
<b>1</b>	<p><b>Prairie Plan Priority Areas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Prairie Core</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Prairie Corridor</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Prairie Ag Matrix</li> </ul>	<p>25 pts</p> <p>20 pts</p> <p>0 pts</p>	0
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Risk of Conversion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> High-(&lt; 5yrs. CRP)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Medium(&gt;5yrs. CRP)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Low-(Isolated, Regulated)</li> </ul>	<p>20 pts</p> <p>10 pts</p> <p>0 pts</p>	0
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Proximity to core, corridor and existing protected grassland complex &gt; 160 ac.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Immediately adjacent to a protected habitat within core or corridor</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Within 1/2 mile</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Within 1 mile</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> &gt; 1 mile</li> </ul>	<p>15 pts</p> <p>10 pts</p> <p>5 pts</p> <p>0 pts</p>	0
<b>4</b>	<p><b>Site Characteristics-check all that apply</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Wetland present or restoration potential</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Riparian to lake or stream</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> T &amp; E Species within 1/2 mi.</li> </ul>	<p>5 pts</p> <p>5 pts</p> <p>5 pts</p>	0
<b>5</b>	<p><b>Vegetative Diversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> &gt; 20 Native species exist or planted</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 5 - 20 Native species</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> &lt; 5 Native species</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Restoration Needed-reseeding, site dominated by invasive species or subject to woody encroachment</li> </ul>	<p>10 pts</p> <p>5 pts</p> <p>0 pts</p> <p>(10) pts</p>	0
	<p><b>Combined Easement Size</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Regional Significance or &gt; 80 ac.</li> </ul>	<p>15 pts</p>	

<b>6</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	41 - 80 ac.	10 pts	0
	<input type="checkbox"/>	10 - 40 ac.	5 pts	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	< 10 ac.	0 pts	
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>0</b>



## RIM FLOODPLAIN WETLANDS - CP23 ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS SCORING SHEET



Landowner Name:	County/SWCD Office:
-----------------	---------------------

Application Total Score

**A. RESTORATION BENEFITS** *(maximum score capped at 50)*

Score

Wetland Condition →	Effectively Drained	Partially Drained	Farmed Only
<b>Restorable Depressional Wetlands (Basins)</b>	<b>No. of Basins</b>	<b>Check one (if applicable)</b>	<b>Check one (if applicable)</b>
	1	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
	2	<input type="checkbox"/> 15	<input type="checkbox"/> 10
	3	<input type="checkbox"/> 20	<input type="checkbox"/> 14
	4	<input type="checkbox"/> 25	<input type="checkbox"/> 17
	5	<input type="checkbox"/> 30	<input type="checkbox"/> 21
	6	<input type="checkbox"/> 35	<input type="checkbox"/> 24
≥ 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 40	<input type="checkbox"/> 28	

Size of Largest Basin (acres)	Check one (if applicable)
< 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 0
6-10	<input type="checkbox"/> 7
11-20	<input type="checkbox"/> 15
21-30	<input type="checkbox"/> 20
31-40	<input type="checkbox"/> 25
> 40	<input type="checkbox"/> 30

Total Upland : Wetland Ratio	Check one (if applicable)
< 1:1	<input type="checkbox"/> 0
≥ 1:1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
≥ 2:1	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
≥ 3:1	<input type="checkbox"/> 10

OR

Wetland Condition →	Effectively Drained	Partially Drained	Farmed Only
<b>Restorable Non-Depressional Wetlands</b>	<b>Wetland Acres</b>	<b>Check one (if applicable)</b>	<b>Check one (if applicable)</b>
	< 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
	10 - 40	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
	41 - 80	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
	81 - 120	<input type="checkbox"/> 16	<input type="checkbox"/> 11
≥ 121	<input type="checkbox"/> 20	<input type="checkbox"/> 14	

Total Upland : Wetland Ratio	Check one (if applicable)
< 1:1	<input type="checkbox"/> 0
≥ 1:1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
≥ 2:1	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
≥ 3:1	<input type="checkbox"/> 10

**B. ECOLOGICAL/HABITAT BENEFITS** *(maximum score 20)*

Score

Size (total CP23 acres)	(Check one)
≤ 40	<input type="checkbox"/> 0
41 - 80	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
81 - 120	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
121 - 160	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
> 160	<input type="checkbox"/> 10

AND

LINEAR CORRIDOR CONNECTIVITY - Permanently protected land (fee title or easement) or another Minnesota Water Quality and Habitat CREP eligible offer or approved contract is on: <i>(check one)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> 10 Both ends of offer
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Only one end of offer
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 The same watercourse and ≤ one mile from either end of offer
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 The same watercourse and > one mile from either end of offer

## RIM FLOODPLAIN WETLANDS - CP23 ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS SCORING SHEET - *Continued*

**C. ADDITIONAL WILDLIFE BENEFITS** *(maximum score 20)*

Score

<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 15	<input type="checkbox"/> 20
----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------

*Determine score from Additional Wildlife Benefits GIS layer located on the local USDA NRCS office server and check appropriate score box*

**D. ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS** *(maximum score 10)*

Score

*(Check all that Apply)*

1. The majority of the area within the CP23 offered area is within a Prairie Plan Core or Corridor Area.	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
2. The CP23 offered area is beneficial to, and within 1 mile of breeding/population of Federal or State listed Endangered or Threatened species as identified by DNR Natural Heritage Database (State Special Concern species shall not be considered). Federal species to be considered include Endangered, Threatened, and Candidate species, including designated critical habitat (e.g. Topeka shiner).	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
3. The CP23 offered area project will result in addressing water quality concerns for conventional pollutants (examples: sediment, phosphorus, hydrology, bacteria, nitrogen) as identified in a TMDL report or implementation plan or a Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategy (WRAPS).	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
4. The predominant soils (more than 50%) within the CP23 offered area are Highly Erodible Land (HEL) or Partially Highly Erodible Land (PHEL).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
5. The majority of the contributing watershed(s) to the CP23 offered area is in agricultural use.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1

**Note:** *If points are taken for considerations 1 and 2, additional documentation must be provided. Refer to Site Evaluation Form - Instruction documents for further information.*

#NAME?

## RIM WETLANDS PROGRAM - CP23a ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS SCORING SHEET



Landowner Name:	County/SWCD Office:
-----------------	---------------------

Application Total Score

**A. RESTORATION BENEFITS** *(maximum score capped at 50)*

Score

Wetland Condition →	Effectively Drained	Partially Drained	Farmed Only	
<b>Restorable Depressional Wetlands (Basins)</b>	<b>No. of Basins</b>	<b>Check one (if applicable)</b>	<b>Check one (if applicable)</b>	<b>Check one (if applicable)</b>
	1	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
	2	<input type="checkbox"/> 15	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
	3	<input type="checkbox"/> 20	<input type="checkbox"/> 14	<input type="checkbox"/> 7
	4	<input type="checkbox"/> 25	<input type="checkbox"/> 17	<input type="checkbox"/> 9
	5	<input type="checkbox"/> 30	<input type="checkbox"/> 21	<input type="checkbox"/> 11
	6	<input type="checkbox"/> 35	<input type="checkbox"/> 24	<input type="checkbox"/> 13
≥ 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 40	<input type="checkbox"/> 28	<input type="checkbox"/> 15	

Size of Largest Basin (acres)	Check one (if applicable)
< 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 0
6-10	<input type="checkbox"/> 7
11-20	<input type="checkbox"/> 15
21-30	<input type="checkbox"/> 20
31-40	<input type="checkbox"/> 25
> 40	<input type="checkbox"/> 30

Total Upland : Wetland Ratio	Check one (if applicable)
< 1:1	<input type="checkbox"/> 0
≥ 1:1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
≥ 2:1	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
≥ 3:1	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
≥ 4:1	<input type="checkbox"/> 10

OR

Wetland Condition →	Effectively Drained	Partially Drained	Farmed Only	
<b>Restorable Non-Depressional Wetlands</b>	<b>Wetland Acres</b>	<b>Check one (if applicable)</b>	<b>Check one (if applicable)</b>	<b>Check one (if applicable)</b>
	< 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
	10 - 40	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
	41 - 80	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
	81 - 120	<input type="checkbox"/> 16	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
≥ 121	<input type="checkbox"/> 20	<input type="checkbox"/> 14	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	

AND

Total Upland : Wetland Ratio	Check one (if applicable)
< 1:1	<input type="checkbox"/> 0
≥ 1:1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
≥ 2:1	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
≥ 3:1	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
≥ 4:1	<input type="checkbox"/> 10

**B. ECOLOGICAL/HABITAT BENEFITS** *(maximum score 20)*

Score

Size (Total CP23a acres) <i>(Check one)</i>	Check one
≤ 40	<input type="checkbox"/> 0
41 - 80	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
81 - 120	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
121 - 160	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
> 160	<input type="checkbox"/> 10

AND

Acres of Permanent Habitat within 1.5 miles of the CP23a offered area <i>(Check one)</i>	Check one
≤ 200	<input type="checkbox"/> 0
200 - 500	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
501 - 1000	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
1001 - 3000	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
over 3000	<input type="checkbox"/> 10

## RIM WETLANDS PROGRAM - CP23a

### ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS SCORING SHEET - *Continued*

**C. ADDITIONAL WILDLIFE BENEFITS** *(maximum score 20)*

Score

<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 15	<input type="checkbox"/> 20
----------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------

*Determine score from Additional Wildlife Benefits GIS layer located on the local USDA NRCS office server and check appropriate score box*

**D. ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS** *(maximum score 10)*

Score

*(Check all that Apply)*

1. The majority of the area within the CP23a offered area is within a Prairie Plan Core or Corridor Area.	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
2. The CP23a offered area is beneficial to, and within 1 mile of breeding/population of Federal or State listed Endangered or Threatened species as identified by DNR Natural Heritage Database (State Special Concern species shall not be considered). Federal species to be considered include Endangered, Threatened, and Candidate species, including designated critical habitat (e.g. Topeka shiner).	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
3. The CP23a offered area buffers and/or the majority of runoff from it drains to and is within 1/2 mile of a DNR Public Waters or designated aquatic management areas.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
4. The CP23a offered area project will result in addressing water quality concerns for conventional pollutants (examples: sediment, phosphorus, hydrology, bacteria, nitrogen) as identified in a TMDL report or implementation plan or a Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategy (WRAPS).	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
5. The predominant soils (more than 50%) within the CP23a offered area are Highly Erodible Land (HEL) or Partially Highly Erodible Land (PHEL).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
6. The majority of the contributing watershed(s) to the CP23a offered area is in agricultural use.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1

**Note:** *If points are taken for considerations 1 thru 3, additional documentation must be provided. Refer to Site Evaluation Form - Instruction documents for further information.*

#NAME?



resources restored. lives changed.

May 27, 2021

John Voz, RIM Easement & Working Lands Specialist  
Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR)  
USFW Detroit Lakes Wetland Management District  
1732 North Tower Road  
Detroit Lakes, MN 56501

Dear John,

On behalf of Conservation Corps Minnesota & Iowa (CCMI), I am writing to confirm our interest in and support for the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources' (BWSR) proposal LSHOC to build new partner and project opportunities for CCMI to work with the RIM Easement program to conduct habitat conservation and maintenance activities on select remnant prairie and grassland areas throughout Minnesota.

With a longstanding proven partnership serving areas across Minnesota, this proposal builds on our organizations' mutual interests in providing high-quality and equitable training experiences for young people from diverse urban and rural backgrounds who have a passion for hands-on, service learning and environmental stewardship.

BWSR envisions working with the CCMI to build project opportunities that will help us tackle mutual objectives: attract and train the next generation natural resource professionals; and to recruit and retain more of these young professionals to be from previously underrepresented populations and BIPOC communities to prepare them for careers in the natural resource sector.

This program opportunity is a keen fit with CCMI's vision which is a world where everyone has equitable access to nature, is equipped to succeed in career and life, and is empowered to make a difference in conserving natural resources.

We are excited to learn more about this potential opportunity in the future and look forward to working with BWSR and LSHOC as further developments evolve. CCMI and our program team is ready and available to assist in further design and thinking about how best to ensure success with these objectives.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Mark Murphy".

Mark Murphy  
Executive Director

[conservationcorps.org](http://conservationcorps.org)

60 Plato Blvd E Ste 210, Saint Paul MN 55107 | 651.209.9900 fax 651.209.9901