



## Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase VIII  
Laws of Minnesota 2022 Accomplishment Plan

---

### General Information

**Date:** 01/05/2022

**Project Title:** Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase VIII

**Funds Recommended:** \$1,434,000

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

**Appropriation Language:**

### Manager Information

**Manager's Name:** Bill Penning

**Title:** Conservation Programs Consultant

**Organization:** BWSR

**Address:** 394 S Lake Ave #403

**City:** Duluth, MN 5640558021

**Email:** bill.penning@state.mn.us

**Office Number:**

**Mobile Number:** 6512626403

**Fax Number:**

**Website:** BWSR.state.mn.us

### Location Information

**County Location(s):**

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

- Northern Forest
- Forest / Prairie Transition

**Activity types:**

- Protect in Easement

**Priority resources addressed by activity:**

- Forest

## Narrative

### **Abstract**

Phase 8 of the Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Program will utilize permanent conservation easements to protect 850 acres and 4 miles of wild rice shoreland habitat. Development trends pose a serious threat to wild rice habitat. Sites are selected through a ranking process that considers development risk, surrounding land use, habitat value, and other criteria. BWSR will utilize the RIM easement process in partnership with local soil and water conservation districts (SWCDs) within the Northern Forest and Forest Prairie Transition to accomplish protection. Previous phases of this project have protected 5,332 acres and exceeded goals by 22%.

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

Historically, wild rice occurred throughout Minnesota and extended into northern Iowa. Wild rice has since been extirpated from most of its southern range due to human impacts including changes to water quality and chemistry, sedimentation, drainage, flow alteration, boat traffic and competition from introduced aquatic invasive species. Today, the heart of the state's wild rice acreage falls within this project work area comprised of 14 counties -- Aitkin, Becker, Beltrami, Carlton, Cass, Clearwater, Crow Wing, Hubbard, Itasca, Otter Tail, St. Louis, Stearns, Todd, and Wadena.

Recent well-documented population and development trends pose a serious threat to remaining wild rice habitat. This population and development boom has reduced the availability of developable shoreline on recreational lakes, resulting in shallow lakes, rivers, and shallow bays containing wild rice being increasingly targeted for shoreline development. Many wild rice shoreland complexes are still intact with good water quality, but are subject to development pressure that, if allowed, will degrade the resource.

Voluntary, incentive-based conservation protection options for shoreland landowners are few. Unlike the prairie portion of the state where state funded easement options exist for conservation-minded landowners, private land protection options are limited for wild rice shoreland in the forest due to funding constraints. Further, many easement programs are targeted for restoration and not protection. In the northern forest, lower land values allow conservation dollars to stretch further while also leveraging existing public lands. Most wild rice lakes are public waters and offer some form of public access. This proposal will continue to fill a need for shoreland protection on key water bodies supporting wild rice in the Northern Forest and Forest Prairie Transition Sections.

Utilizing permanent conservation easements the Minnesota Board of Water & Soil Resources (BWSR) and fourteen local SWCDs will continue to offer permanent shoreland protection on shallow lakes, rivers and shallow bays producing wild rice. BWSR's Reinvest in Minnesota (RIM) Program will acquire 1,150 acres through permanent conservation easements.

Through local SWCD offices, BWSR will purchase RIM easements using rates set by the BWSR Board. Tracts will be selected based on the degree to which they help permanently protect the land around a given wild rice water body. RIM easements will be acquired through a sign-up process similar to BWSR's other easement programs.

SWCD generated landowner applications will be reviewed and parcels ranked by the project committee with guidance provided by the "Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Criteria Sheet" (attached).

## **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?**

Wild rice shoreland encompasses a complex of shallow lakes, rivers, and shallow bays of deeper lakes that support rice and provide some of the most important habitat for wetland-dependent wildlife species in Minnesota. Wild rice habitat is especially important to Minnesota's migrating and breeding waterfowl. More than 17 species of wildlife listed as Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) use wild rice areas as habitat for breeding, migration, and/or foraging.

Targeted SGCN are as follows: Common Loon, Trumpeter Swan, Bald Eagle, American Bittern, Least Bittern, Red-necked Grebe, Sora Rail, Virginia Rail, Yellow Rail, Black Tern, Rusty Blackbird, Sedge Wren, Lesser Scaup, Northern Pintail, and American Black Duck.

Wild rice is some of the most important habitat for wetland-dependent wildlife species in Minnesota as noted in the MNDNR's Natural Wild Rice in Minnesota report to the legislature (2008). Important game species supported by wild rice include the Ring-necked Duck, Mallard, Blue-winged Teal, Scaup, and Bufflehead.

## **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:**

To target sites, aerial photos of wild rice lakes are reviewed during a preliminary screening to find those that are the most intact, provide the most wild rice, with the most waterfowl use, and can be protected for the least cost. Lakes are sorted into Low, Medium and High categories. Once the lakes have been ranked the SWCD then contacts landowners on the high and some of the medium priority lakes.

Easement selection occurs with a goal of maximum wild rice habitat complex protection along all shoreland of a lake. Easement parcels are further targeted and prioritized by adjacency to current protected lands/public lands and a low level of current lake development. The following additional factors are considered to ensure site selection reflects current science-based measures for wild rice habitat protection: DNR wild rice lake designation, feet of shoreline protected, development potential of site, acquisition urgency, depth from shore, watershed considerations, easement size relative to the parcel, and an analysis of stakeholder support. Sites that contain a wild rice lake outlet are also prioritized for potential DNR management of water levels to ensure protection.

SWCD generated landowner applications will be reviewed and parcels ranked by the project committee with guidance provided by the "Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Criteria Sheet" attached to this proposal. Shoreland protection for wild rice lakes and rivers enjoys widespread support from tribal interests, SWCDs, and other habitat conservation partners.

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

- H2 Protect critical shoreland of streams and lakes
- H6 Protect and restore critical in-water habitat of lakes and streams

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

- Minnesota's Wildlife Action Plan 2015-2025
- Outdoor Heritage Fund: A 25 Year Framework

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

**Forest / Prairie Transition**

- Protect, enhance, and restore wild rice wetlands, shallow lakes, wetland/grassland complexes, aspen parklands, and shoreland that provide critical habitat for game and nongame wildlife

**Northern Forest**

- Protect shoreland and restore or enhance critical habitat on wild rice lakes, shallow lakes, cold water lakes, streams and rivers, and spawning areas

**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 maintenance, inspection and monitoring into perpetuity. The BWSR partners with local SWCDs to 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 stewardship costs have been 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 enforcement.

**Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes**

Year	Source of Funds	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
2026-Ongoing	Landowner Responsibility	Maintain compliance with easement terms	-	-
2026-Ongoing	Stewardship Account	Compliance Checks first 5 years then every 3rd year.	Corrective actions of any violations	Enforcement action by MN Attorney General Office

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

Wild rice is a culturally important resource for Native Americans in Minnesota. This proposal specifically works to protect wild rice resources.

## 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 landowner

**Who will be the easement holder?**

BWSR

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

12

### Land Use

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

No

**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 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 that has over 7,000 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 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 trails to be developed, 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 that has over 7,000 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?**

No

We are targeting lands that do not need restoration.

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

No

**Explain how, when, and source of the R/E work:**

We do not anticipate any restoration needs on these parcels.

**Timeline**

<b>Activity Name</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>
Final Report Submitted	November 1, 2025
RIM easements secured on 1150 acres	June 30, 2025

**Date of Final Report Submission: 10/31/2025**

**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	\$110,600	-	-	\$110,600
Contracts	\$28,000	-	-	\$28,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	\$1,183,700	-	-	\$1,183,700
Easement Stewardship	\$91,000	-	-	\$91,000
Travel	\$2,500	-	-	\$2,500
Professional Services	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	\$13,500	-	-	\$13,500
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$3,600	-	-	\$3,600
Supplies/Materials	\$1,100	-	-	\$1,100
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$1,434,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$1,434,000</b>

**Personnel**

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Funding Request	Antic. Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Easement staff	0.32	4.0	\$110,600	-	-	\$110,600

**Amount of Request:** \$1,434,000

**Amount of Leverage:** -

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

**DSS + Personnel:** \$124,100

**As a % of the total request:** 8.65%

**Easement Stewardship:** \$91,000

**As a % of the Easement Acquisition:** 7.69%

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

Expected number of acres and easements have been scaled back proportionately as have the budget lines.

**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 8 of an ongoing program. The funds from this appropriation will be used for staffing new projects.

## **Contracts**

### **What is included in the contracts line?**

Services performed by SWCDs that help us acquire easements.

## **Easement Stewardship**

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

We anticipate 12 easements at \$6,500/easement for Stewardship. This is based upon LTA standards that have been modified for BWSR monitoring and enforcement protocols.

## **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**

Only mileage, food and lodging are anticipated.

### **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?**

This is based upon an agency policy developed by BWSR Administrative staff and approved by the BWSR Executive Team.

## **Other Equipment/Tools**

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

Mostly signs, posts and hardware.

## **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	-	-	850	-	850
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	-	-	<b>850</b>	-	<b>850</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	-	-	\$1,434,000	-	\$1,434,000
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	-	-	<b>\$1,434,000</b>	-	<b>\$1,434,000</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	-	213	-	-	637	850
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	-	<b>213</b>	-	-	<b>637</b>	<b>850</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	-	\$358,500	-	-	\$1,075,500	\$1,434,000
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	-	<b>\$358,500</b>	-	-	<b>\$1,075,500</b>	<b>\$1,434,000</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	-	-	\$1,687	-
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	-	\$1,683	-	-	\$1,688
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-

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

4.0 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 ~ *Healthy populations of endangered, threatened, and special concern species as well as more common species. A summary of the total number of wetland acres and associated forest land secured under easement through this appropriation will be reported. We expect sustained populations of endangered, threatened, special concern and game species as these easements are secured. On-site inspections are performed every three years and compliance checks are performed in the other two years to ensure maintained outcomes.*

**Programs in the northern forest region:**

- Forestlands are protected from development and fragmentation ~ *Healthy populations of endangered, threatened, and special concern species as well as more common species. A summary of the total number of wetland acres and associated forest land secured under easement through this appropriation will be reported. We expect sustained populations of endangered, threatened, special concern and game species as these easements are secured. On-site inspections are performed every three years and compliance checks are performed in the other two years to ensure maintained outcomes.*

## 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:**

The Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Program utilizes a two tiered screening process to find the wild rice parcels with the highest quality habitat. First, DNR Wildlife staff rank wild rice lakes on a county by county basis. At this preliminary screening aerial photos are used to sort wild rice lakes to prioritize the lakes that are most intact, provide the most wild rice, with the most waterfowl use, and can be protected for the least cost. Lakes are sorted into Low, Medium and High categories. Lakes are dropped or added to the lake list as better information becomes available. Once the lakes have been ranked, the SWCD then contacts landowners on the high and some of the medium priority lakes.

Once the SWCD has an interested landowner, the parcel is presented to the project committee for comments and recommendations. The committee reviews proposals and sorts them for parcels that provide the greatest public benefit possible. Areas with high quality wild rice habitat, where a limited public investment can leverage a larger area of public land are sought after. The result is an increase in resiliency to the habitat base. The parcels that rank the highest tend to be adjacent to public lands, in a river corridor, or both.



## Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

### Comparison Report

**Program Title:** ML 2022 - Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase VIII

**Organization:** BWSR

**Manager:** Bill Penning

### Budget

**Requested Amount:** \$2,000,000

**Appropriated Amount:** \$1,434,000

**Percentage:** 71.7%

Item	Total Requested		Total Appropriated		Percentage of Request	
	Requested	Leverage	Appropriated	Leverage	Percent of Request	Percent of Leverage
Personnel	\$195,000	-	\$110,600	-	56.72%	-
Contracts	\$38,000	-	\$28,000	-	73.68%	-
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	\$1,615,000	-	\$1,183,700	-	73.29%	-
Easement Stewardship	\$123,500	-	\$91,000	-	73.68%	-
Travel	\$3,500	-	\$2,500	-	71.43%	-
Professional Services	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	\$18,500	-	\$13,500	-	72.97%	-
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$5,000	-	\$3,600	-	72.0%	-
Supplies/Materials	\$1,500	-	\$1,100	-	73.33%	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$2,000,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$1,434,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>71.7%</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 proportionately. Program management costs are the exception due to program management and oversight costs remaining constant regardless of the appropriation amount. However, this is a very small portion of the total 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 a necessary for each request based upon the appropriation amount and 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 proportionately. Program management costs are the exception due to program management and oversight costs remaining constant regardless of the appropriation amount. However, this is a very small portion of the total 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 a necessary for each request based upon the appropriation amount and 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	1,100	850	77.27%
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	\$2,000,000	\$1,434,000	71.7%
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	1,100	850	77.27%
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	\$2,000,000	\$1,434,000	71.7%
Enhance	-	-	-

## Phase 8 RIM Ranking Sheet

### Shallow Lake Shoreland Protection Easements: Wild Rice Lakes

#### Ranking Process

---

This score sheet has been used for phases two through seven, and will also be used for phase eight.

##### Max Score Criteria Guidelines:

30 # Feet of Shoreline 5 points for minimal shoreland on wild rice lake (<500ft)

10 points for at least 500 - 999 feet of shoreland on a wild rice lake

15 points for 1,000 - 2,000 feet of shoreland on a wild rice lake

20 points for 2,000 - 3,000 feet of shoreline on a wild rice lake

30 points for more than 3,000 feet of shoreland on a wild rice lake

15 % of Tract Developable 1-15 points base on the proportion of the tract that is developable (10%=1.5pts)

10 Wetland fringe width 1-10 points based on the distance between upland & the bank/water (0'=10pts, 300'=0pts, -1pt/30' wet)

20 Urgency Property opportunity is likely to be lost if we do not act quickly

20 Depth from shore 5 points for easments > 300 feet deep along wild rice lake shore

10 points for easments > 500 feet deep along wild rice lake shore

20 points for easments > 900 feet deep along wild rice lake shore

15 Adjoining Applications 15 points for land adjoining another application

15 Adjoining Public Land 15 points for land adjoining public land on the wild rice lake, or adjoining land permanently protected by other easement program

10 Habitat Value 1-10 points based on the habitat value of the property, uniqueness, and



lack of existing development and shoreline alterations

10 % of Parcel/Tract 1-10 points based on the proportion of the parcel enrolled (10% = 1 pt)

10 % of Lake Undeveloped 1-10 points based on the proportion of lake currently undeveloped (10% = 1 pt)

15 Lake Outlet 15 points for tracts containing land on the outlet of a wild rice lake & access granted for water level mngmt

15 Watershed 15 points for tracts with majority acres draining into the wild rice lake

15 Stakeholder Support Up to 15 points for level of landowner support for shoreland protection and wild rice management (e.g. lake mgt plan that prioritizes wild rice protection in lake)

---

200 TOTAL GROSS SCORE \*Other factors may raise or lower the priority of a parcel

100 Final Score (Total / 2)



# Identified Wild Rice Lakes

## Project Area

The map below portrays all identified wild rice lakes in the project area. Lakes are further prioritized on a scale of high to low in consultation with DNR staff. Marketing and easement acquisition is targeted on high and some medium priority lakes. A project committee reviews easement applications and selects those that provide the greatest public benefit.

