



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

ML 2022 Request for Funding

General Information

Date: 06/07/2021

Proposal Title: RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase X

Funds Requested: \$10,000,000

Manager Information

Manager's Name: Dusty Van Thuyne

Title: CREP Coordinator

Organization: BWSR

Address: 520 Lafayette Road North

City: St. Paul, MN 55155

Email: dusty.vanthuyne@state.mn.us

Office Number:

Mobile Number: 651-508-0000

Fax Number:

Website: www.bwsr.state.mn.us

Location Information

County Location(s):

Eco regions in which work will take place:

- Forest / Prairie Transition
- Southeast Forest
- Prairie
- Metro / Urban

Activity types:

- Protect in Easement
- Restore

Priority resources addressed by activity:

- Prairie

Narrative

Abstract

This continuation of the Reinvest in Minnesota (RIM) Reserve buffers program will protect and restore riparian areas, permanently protecting approximately 1,365 acres on 39 easements. This program will continue utilizing a science-based ranking and selection process and be implemented locally, working with Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) staff in targeted areas in the state. Historically, buffer funding was used to expand basic water quality buffers into larger buffers. The focus of the funding has been modified in recent phases to include larger areas (floodplain scale) rather than the narrower areas traditionally thought of as riparian buffers.

Design and Scope of Work

Riparian corridors containing healthy buffer and floodplain areas contribute to clean water and, when done correctly, provide critical wildlife habitat and travel corridors. The MN Buffer Law requires a modest buffer area on roughly 50% of these riparian areas but does not follow technical design criteria, accommodate flooding issues, and allows continued disturbance of these areas not favorable to wildlife. By extending the smaller required buffer area, we can create significantly better wildlife habitat while achieving multiple benefits. This partnership program between Outdoor Heritage Fund, Clean Water Fund, and potentially Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), would establish permanent riparian areas that provide both critical water quality improvements and improved habitat.

Criteria used to evaluate and prioritize parcels funded under this program include One Watershed One Plans or other comprehensive water plans, proximity to other permanently protected habitat, DNR Pheasant Action Plan, MN Prairie Plan, proximity to lands open to public hunting, overall size, and type of water resource being buffered. A competitive RIM Riparian application process for landowners will be used. Recent CREP enrollment for CP-21 (buffers) has fallen short of program goals due to practice limitations. The goal for this new phase will be funding from both LSOHC and Clean Water Funding as well as USDA when possible under existing or new CRP enrollment. Wider riparian areas provide long-term water quality treatment and increased habitat. Buffers that are established in proximity to other grasslands also function at a higher level within the landscape for grassland nesting birds and other wildlife.

Reinvest in Minnesota (RIM) Buffers program delivery will be supported by delivery through Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs) and administered by BWSR.

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

Buffers are commonly viewed as simply a water quality practice, but buffers have positive impacts on wildlife due to their unique habitat. This is especially true for expanded width buffers enrolled through this program. Not only are grasslands protected or restored, detrimental impacts to stream-reliant biota is reduced. Many species of amphibians, such as the Northern Cricket Frog (endangered) rely on aquatic habitat during the breeding season and then spend most of their lives in upland habitat. In southeastern MN, reptiles such as the Blanding's Turtle (threatened) rely on meandering streams, rivers, and adjacent lands.

The Sedge Wren, a Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) most commonly associated with grassland habitat, is encountered in buffer areas. Bird use is influenced by buffer width with greater widths experiencing greater abundance and diversity of birds and grassland species. However, bird use is negatively associated by the amount of edge exposure. In an effort to limit edge exposure, sites that may serve as corridors or expand current complexes receive higher weight using this program's scoring and ranking process.

Diverse vegetation, access to a water resource, and protection from pesticides are important to Minnesota's native pollinator species. BWSR's native vegetation guidelines and pollinator initiative have outlined the RIM Program's commitment to protecting native pollinators. Complexes and corridors targeted through RIM Buffers provide areas that are safe from pesticides and are natural passageways for pollinators. Targeted pollinator species include the Monarch Butterfly and solitary bee species including Leafcutter Bees, Mason Bees, and Yellow-faced Bees.

SGCN in the RIM Buffers area include the Five-lined Skink, Two-spotted Skipper, Northern Pintail, American Black Duck, Grasshopper Sparrow, Upland Sandpiper, Sedge Wren, Dickcissel, and Western Grebe. In addition to the SGCN, the threatened or endangered species targeted in this proposal include the Dakota Skipper, Poweshiek Skipperling, and Rusty Patched Bumble Bee.

What is the degree of timing/opportunistic urgency and why it is necessary to spend public money for this work as soon as possible?

CRP contracts continue to expire (with over 230,000 acres expiring in Minnesota over the next three years) and farming pressure leads to more habitat fragmentation and agricultural fields within the floodplain. It is critical to retain as many acres of habitat in the most important locations. A combination of permanent protection with RIM and re-enrollment of CRP, when possible, will reduce this impact from habitat loss.

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

Through a combination of targeted outreach, eligibility screening, and a scoring and ranking process, each site is considered on its benefits to the surrounding landscape, as well as the site-specific features.

During the application process, a review of adjacent permanent habitat and easement size is conducted to evaluate a site's importance as a corridor or extension to an existing habitat complex. Other examples of the science-based targeting used include drainage to shallow lakes, buffering along lakeshore, planned vegetative diversity, and proximity to land open to public hunting.

As we implement this phase, we will utilize similar science-based considerations that have been historically used by the RIM Buffers Program.

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
- H7 Keep water on the landscape

Which two other plans are addressed in this proposal?

- Long Range Plan for the Ring-Necked Pheasant in MN
- Outdoor Heritage Fund: A 25 Year Framework

Describe how your program will advance the indicators identified in the plans selected:

Permanent habitat protection is vital to the future of waterfowl, grassland birds and other wildlife dependent on native and restored prairies. A strategy of the Long Range Plan for the Ring-Necked Pheasant in MN is to increase enrollment of perennial grassland in the CRP and RIM programs. Through the extensive leverage of Clean Water Funds and potentially federal funds, RIM Buffers will permanently protect and restore riparian buffers, advancing

the goal of a healthy and plentiful supply of habitat for fish, game, and wildlife, especially for waterfowl and upland birds.

Which LSOHC section priorities are addressed in this proposal?

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

Metro / Urban

- Protect habitat corridors, with emphasis on the Minnesota, Mississippi, and St. Croix rivers (bluff to floodplain)

Prairie

- Protect expiring CRP lands

Southeast Forest

- Protect, enhance, and restore habitat for fish, game, and nongame wildlife in rivers, cold-water streams, and associated upland habitat

Describe how your program will produce and demonstrate a significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or outcomes for fish, game, and wildlife as indicated in the LSOHC priorities:

Protection and restoration of riparian buffers provides habitat for both game and nongame wildlife, which is a priority in the Southeast Forest Section. This program targets and restores existing corridors and complexes, as well as those areas where complexes exist but the addition of a buffer provides a needed connection. This reflects the Forest/Prairie Transition Section legacy outcome of diverse and productive grasslands and wetlands that are connected by corridors, providing multiple benefits in the face of climate change and other major stressors. The focus on corridors in the Metro Section is no different, as sites are analyzed for their function as habitat linkages.

What other fund may contribute to this proposal?

- Clean Water Fund

Does this proposal 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.

Non-OHF Appropriations

Year	Source	Amount
2009-2019	Clean Water Fund	60,900,000
2008, 2011, 2012, and 2014	Bonding	17,640,206

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

BWSR is responsible for monitoring and enforcement of RIM easements. BWSR partners with local SWCDs to carry out oversight, monitoring and inspection of conservation easements. Easements are inspected every year for the first five years beginning 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 document findings and report to BWSR on each site inspection conducted. A non-compliance procedure is implemented when potential violations or problems are identified.

Perpetual monitoring and enforcement costs are \$6,500 per easement. This value is based on using local SWCD staff for monitoring and existing enforcement authorities. The amount listed for Easement Stewardship includes costs of 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	Inspections every year for the first five years; then every third year.	Corrective actions of any violations.	Enforcement action taken by MN Attorney General office.
2022-Ongoing	Landowner Responsibility	Maintain compliance with easements.	-	-

Identify indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support:

DNR staff, in consultation with a variety of experts in NGOs and other agencies, have compiled a select group of indicator species and associated quantities to be used by any applicant to answer the question above.

Pheasant

By looking at the ratios of CRP acres in Minnesota to pheasant harvest, we can estimate that every three acres of grassland habitat has the potential to produce one harvested pheasant rooster.

Bobolink and Grasshopper Sparrow

The breeding territory size of bobolinks and grasshopper sparrows is 1.7 and 2.1 acres, respectively, in high quality habitat in Wisconsin. If all of the habitat was occupied, 100 acres of habitat could potentially hold approximately 60 and 48 pairs of bobolinks and grasshopper sparrows, respectively.

Monarch Butterfly

Research from the University of Minnesota has shown that it takes approximately 30 milkweed plants to result in one monarch butterfly contributing to the overwintering Mexican population. Grasslands can have between 100-250 milkweed stems per acre. An acre of restored or enhanced grassland could potentially contribute 3 to 8 monarchs to the population.

Mallards

Both the Prairie Pothole Joint Venture and the Upper Mississippi/Great Lakes Joint Venture (UMGL JV) – use the mallard as a focal species. The biological model used in the UMGL JV to estimate habitat needs to support mallard population growth uses a simple but accepted rate of 1 mallard pair per hectare (1 mallard pair per 2.47 acres) of wetland habitat (noting that upland habitat for nesting is also obviously needed).

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

For our statewide programs, BWSR will pilot designating a percentage of the easement acquisition budget line for applicants who self-certify as emerging farmers or from underserved populations, including Black, Indigenous, or People of Color (BIPOC). If funds remain at the end of a predetermined number of scoring/ranking periods and there are no additional applicants, the remaining funds would be added to the larger easement acquisition pool of funding.

Activity Details

Requirements

If funded, this proposal 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

Will restoration and enhancement work follow best management practices including MS 84.973 Pollinator Habitat Program?

Yes

Is the restoration and enhancement activity on permanently protected land per 97A.056, Subd 13(f), tribal lands, and/or public waters per MS 103G.005, Subd. 15?

Yes

Where does the activity take place?

- Permanently Protected Conservation Easements

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, wildlife food plots are an allowable use on RIM easements as part of an approved conservation plan. Food plots on narrow buffers, steep slopes, and wet areas are not allowed. RIM policy limits food plots to 10% of the total easement area or five acres, whichever is less. There is no cost-share for establishment of food plots and upon termination, the landowner must re-establish vegetation as prescribed in the conservation plan at their expense. Food plots are infrequently used by landowners, to date less than 3% 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?

Under the terms of the RIM easement, landowners are required to maintain compliance with the easement. Easements are monitored annually by SWCDs in cooperation with BWSR for the first five years and then every third year after easement acquisition to assure compliance with easement terms.

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, new trails could be developed if they contribute to easement maintenance or benefit the easement site (e.g., fire breaks, berm maintenance). Unauthorized trails 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 BWSR RIM Reserve Program that has over 7,000 easements currently in place. Easements are monitored annually for the for each of the first five years and then every third year after that. BWSR, in cooperation with SWCDs, implement a process to track, monitor quality, and assure compliance with easement terms.

Under the terms of the RIM Reserve 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 land that you acquire (fee or easement) be restored or enhanced within this proposal's funding and availability?

Yes

Other OHF Appropriation Awards

Have you received OHF dollars in the past through LSOHC?

Yes

Approp Year	Approp Amount Received	Amount Spent to Date	Leverage Reported in AP	Leverage Realized to Date	Acres Affected in AP	Acres Affected to Date	Complete/Final Report Approved?
2018	\$5,000,000	\$103,800	\$25,967,200	-	1,900	12	No
2017	\$5,333,000	\$569,100	\$27,666,900	-	2,053	108	No
2016	\$6,708,000	\$5,705,100	\$33,553,400	-	2,655	1,298	No
2015	\$4,544,000	\$2,999,000	\$22,720,000	-	1,793	722	No
2014	\$2,200,000	\$2,110,800	\$2,200,000	\$2,101,100	375	303	Yes
2013	\$3,520,000	\$3,431,600	\$3,520,000	\$3,413,500	700	533	Yes

2012	\$2,090,000	\$2,088,400	\$2,254,200	\$4,858,900	400	375	Yes
2011	\$2,249,000	\$2,249,000	\$2,000,000	\$4,950,800	1,156	1,595	Yes

Timeline

Activity Name	Estimated Completion Date
Activity 1 - obtain applications from eligible landowners	June 30, 2024
Activity 2 - easements recorded	June 30, 2026
Activity 3 - restorations completed, and final report submitted	June 30, 2030

Budget

Totals

Item	Funding Request	Antic. Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	\$351,800	-	-	\$351,800
Contracts	\$83,900	-	-	\$83,900
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	\$9,182,500	-	-	\$9,182,500
Easement Stewardship	\$253,500	-	-	\$253,500
Travel	\$17,500	-	-	\$17,500
Professional Services	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	\$78,300	-	-	\$78,300
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$25,000	-	-	\$25,000
Supplies/Materials	\$7,500	-	-	\$7,500
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$10,000,000	-	-	\$10,000,000

Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Funding Request	Antic. Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Easements	0.52	6.0	293800	-	-	\$293,800
Eco Engineering	0.14	3.0	58000	-	-	\$58,000

Amount of Request: \$10,000,000

Amount of Leverage: -

Leverage as a percent of the Request: 0.0%

DSS + Personnel: \$430,100

As a % of the total request: 4.3%

Easement Stewardship: \$253,500

As a % of the Easement Acquisition: 2.76%

Does this proposal have the ability to be scalable?

Yes

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.

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 10 of an ongoing program. These funds will pay for staff time spent on new easements associated with this Phase.

Contracts

What is included in the contracts line?

The contracts line amount will be used for payments to SWCD staff for easement implementation. Estimated restoration costs are included in the easements acquisition line.

Easement Stewardship

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

39 easements at \$6,500 per easement. Perpetual monitoring and enforcement 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 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?

Steel posts and signs to mark the easement boundaries.

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	0	-	0	0	0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Easement	0	1,365	0	0	1,365
Enhance	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	1,365	0	0	1,365

Total Requested Funding by Resource Type (Table 2)

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat	Total Funding
Restore	-	\$614,300	-	-	\$614,300
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	\$9,385,700	-	-	\$9,385,700
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	\$10,000,000	-	-	\$10,000,000

Acres within each Ecological Section (Table 3)

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest	Total Acres
Restore	-	-	-	-	0	0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Easement	136	136	273	820	0	1,365
Enhance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	136	136	273	820	0	1,365

Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section (Table 4)

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest	Total Funding
Restore	\$61,400	\$61,400	\$122,900	\$368,600	-	\$614,300
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	\$935,600	\$935,600	\$1,877,100	\$5,637,400	-	\$9,385,700
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$997,000	\$997,000	\$2,000,000	\$6,006,000	-	\$10,000,000

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	-	\$6,875	-	-
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	\$6,879	\$6,879	\$6,875	\$6,874	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

3 miles

Outcomes

Programs in forest-prairie transition region:

- Protected, restored, and enhanced aspen parklands and riparian areas ~ *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 in the other two years to ensure maintained outcomes. An increase of native grassland habitat is expected to increase the carrying capacity of grassland-dependent wildlife. 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 areas are restored.*

Programs in metropolitan urbanizing region:

- A network of natural land and riparian habitats will connect corridors for wildlife and species in 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 in the other two years to ensure maintained outcomes. An increase of native grassland habitat is expected to increase the carrying capacity of grassland-dependent wildlife. 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 areas are restored.*

Programs in prairie region:

- Expiring CRP lands are permanently protected ~ *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 in the other two years to ensure maintained outcomes. An increase of native grassland habitat is expected to increase the carrying capacity of grassland-dependent wildlife. 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 areas are restored.*

Programs in southeast forest region:

- Rivers, streams, and surrounding vegetation provide corridors of habitat ~ *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 in the other two years to ensure maintained outcomes. An increase of native grassland habitat is expected to increase the carrying capacity of grassland-dependent wildlife. 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 areas are restored.*

Parcels

Sign-up Criteria?

[Yes](#)

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

Through a combination of eligibility screening followed by a scoring and ranking process, the RIM Buffers program evaluates each application on the potential to restore ecological functions and values; optimizing wildlife habitat benefits and providing other benefits including water quality. Each site is evaluated on its benefits to the surrounding landscape and any site-specific features that are important for permanent protection of habitat.

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 as an extension of an existing habitat complex.

BWSR will continue to utilize similar science-based considerations as have been historically used by the RIM Buffers Program.

May 27, 2021

RIM Buffers Phase X

Phase X Request

Corridors for wildlife are critical to linking larger habitat complexes while maintaining agricultural landscapes. RIM Buffers Phase 10 targets parcels where landowners are experiencing flooding, erosion, and sedimentation resulting in marginal agricultural production.

- Permanent protection and restoration of 1,365 acres
- Permanently protects, restores, and manages resources while private ownership continues
- \$10 million request
- Leverages Clean Water Fund dollars



Funding History and Accomplishments



Phases I – IV \$10,059,000

- Over 2,800 acres protected through OHF funding
- Over 4,000 acres total protected acres of riparian habitat (all sources of funding)

Phases V – VIII \$21,585,000

- Using Clean Water Fund and federal leverage in combination with OHF funding, an estimated 16,800 acres of environmentally sensitive lands will be protected

Outcomes – Benefits to Minnesotans

- Restores and permanently protects wildlife habitat that supports healthy populations
- Improves hunting and fishing by building permanent wildlife complexes
- Creates and sustains Minnesota jobs

Enhances MN Buffer Law Through Expanded Riparian Protection

- Covers the waters not required to have a buffer
- Uses technical criteria to design and install a water quality buffer above the 50 ft requirement
- Provides an opportunity to protect expiring CRP



No buffer



OHF expanded protection

For More Information:

Dusty Van Thuyne

CREP Coordinator

(651) 508-0000

Dusty.VanThuyne@state.mn.us

Sharon Doucette

Conservation Easement Section Manager

(651) 358-4127

Sharon.Doucette@state.mn.us

RIM FILTER STRIP - CP21 ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS SCORING SHEET



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

Choose only ONE answer per question below

CP21 Total Score

1. LOCATION — At least a portion of the CP21 offer is adjacent to a: *(maximum score 20)*

Score

- a. Public water included on the Buffer protection map — 20 pts
- b. Public drainage system included on the Buffer protection map — 7 pts
- c. Priority water identified in a State approved local water plan — 7 pts
- d. None of the above — 0 pts

2. LINEAR CORRIDOR CONNECTIVITY *(maximum score 15)*

Score

- a. Permanently protected land (fee title or easement) or another Minnesota Water Quality and Habitat CREP eligible offer or approved contract is on both ends of the land to be devoted to CP21 — 15 pts
- b. Permanently protected land (fee title or easement) or another Minnesota Water Quality and Habitat CREP eligible offer or approved contract is only on one end of the land to be devoted to CP21 — 7 pts
- c. Permanently protected land (fee title or easement) or another Minnesota Water Quality and Habitat CREP eligible offer or approved contract on the same watercourse/water body is within one mile of either end of the land to be devoted to CP21 — 4 pts
- d. Permanently protected land (fee title or easement) or another Minnesota Water Quality and Habitat CREP eligible offer or approved contract on the same watercourse/water body is greater than one mile from either end of the land to be devoted to CP21 — 2 pts

3. LENGTH — total length of the CP21 offer in linear feet as measured as close to the watercourse as possible, each side is counted and added together (if both sides of a watercourse are a part of the offer) *(maximum score 30)*

Score

- a. > 20,000 ft — 30 pts
- b. > 5,000 and ≤ 20,000 ft — 20 pts
- c. > 2,500 and ≤ 5,000 ft — 12 pts
- d. > 1,000 and ≤ 2,500 ft — 8 pts
- e. ≤ 1,000 ft — 4 pts

RIM FILTER STRIP - CP21 ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS SCORING SHEET

4. Sediment and Sediment Associated Materials Potential (derived from MN NRCS Filter Strip Standard 393, Table 1). Select the score that represents the specific filter strip situation of the CP21 offer as utilized when filter strip width was determined. *(maximum score 17)*

Score

RUSLE2 Soil Loss tons/acre/yr	Upland Watershed Area to Filter Strip Area Ratio			
	60:1	40:1	20:1	10:1
≤ 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
2.1–4	<input type="checkbox"/> 13	<input type="checkbox"/> 13	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
4.1–6	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> 13	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 7
6.1–8	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> 17	<input type="checkbox"/> 17	<input type="checkbox"/> 10

OR

Soluble Materials Potential (sediment and sediment associated materials potential already included in the chart below) (derived from MN NRCS Filter Strip Standard 393, Table 1). Select the score that represents the specific filter strip situation of the CP21 offer as utilized when filter strip width was determined. *(maximum score 35)*

% Slope of Contributing Area	Upland Watershed Area to Filter Strip Area Ratio			
	60:1	40:1	20:1	10:1
1.1–3	<input type="checkbox"/> 22	<input type="checkbox"/> 20	<input type="checkbox"/> 17	<input type="checkbox"/> 14
3.1–5	<input type="checkbox"/> 29	<input type="checkbox"/> 25	<input type="checkbox"/> 22	<input type="checkbox"/> 20
5.1–12	<input type="checkbox"/> 35	<input type="checkbox"/> 30	<input type="checkbox"/> 29	<input type="checkbox"/> 24