



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Contract Management
Laws of Minnesota 2023 Accomplishment Plan

General Information

Date: 12/29/2022

Project Title: Contract Management

Funds Recommended: \$336,000

Legislative Citation: ML 2023, Ch. X, Article 2, Section 2, subd

Appropriation Language:

Manager Information

Manager's Name: Katherine Sherman-Hoehn

Title: OMBS Grants Manager

Organization: MN DNR

Address: 500 Lafayette Road

City: Saint Paul, MN 55155

Email: katherine.sherman-hoehn@state.mn.us

Office Number: 6512595533

Mobile Number:

Fax Number:

Website:

Location Information

County Location(s):

Eco regions in which work will take place:

- Metro / Urban

Activity types:

- Other : Contract Management

Priority resources addressed by activity:

Narrative

Abstract

Provide contract management and customer service to OHF pass-through appropriation recipients for approximately 245 open grants. Ensure funds are expended in compliance with appropriation law, state statute, grants policies, and approved accomplishment plans.

Design and Scope of Work

This appropriation will be used to continue and enhance contract management services to pass-through recipients of Outdoor Heritage Fund appropriations to the Commissioner of Natural Resources. The goal of contract management is to ensure that grantees are properly reimbursed and that organizations operate in compliance with OHF pass-through appropriation procedures, policies from the Department of Administration's Grants Management, OHF statute, and the recommendations of the Legislative Auditor. Contract management includes: grant agreements and amendments, training, technical assistance, reporting, fiscal monitoring, reimbursement request processing, and close-out of grants.

The DNR is currently the administrative agent for this program. The DNR's Office of Management and Budget (OMBS) Grants Unit is applying to continue to provide contract management services to pass-through grant recipients. The OMBS Grants Unit's goal is to provide pass-through recipients with the contract management, technical assistance, and grant monitoring they need to successfully complete their conservation work. The Grants Unit provides grantees with one consistent point of contact for their agreements and delivers timely, responsive, customer service.

Using this appropriation, the DNR Grants Unit will add an FTE to: adjust contract management capacity to meet increasing grant numbers, enhance coordination of our monitoring and compliance activities, and enable the unit to meet increasing requests for technical assistance from LSOHC/LCCMR staff and individual grantees. Increased costs are in line with an additional FTE and annual adjustments in salary costs. The Grants Unit last added a staff member in FY19. That staff member now has a full caseload. The new FTE will also provide subject matter expertise in monitoring, audits, and compliance to provide timely, coordinated service internally, to LSOHC staff, and to grantees.

Contract management services are billed using a professional services rate. In FY22, 4.53 FTE will be dedicated to contract management. The professional services hourly rate includes salary and fringe for grants management staff, supervisory time, travel costs, supplies, and allocated administrative costs including rent and printing as well as other related costs necessary to carry out the pass-through grant management program. Multiple staff with a variety of grants, financial or other responsibilities provide contract management services to OHF as well as the Environment and Natural Resources Trust Fund (ENRTF). The Grants Unit consults with Lands and Minerals and Fish and Wildlife staff as necessary on technical issues. Cost coding is used to record and differentiate time spent on ENRTF and OHF pass-through grant management. Services not received or provided will not be billed. The rate for FY22-23 is \$72.00/hr and is re-calculated at least biennially. If the rate changes, LSOHC staff will be informed immediately.

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?

N/A

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:

N/A

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

Which two other plans are addressed in this program?

Which LSOHC section priorities are addressed in this program?

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 request is for work related to Outdoor Heritage Fund appropriations. It would not be implemented but for the appropriation. No outside funding has been used for this purpose.

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

N/A

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

The Grants Unit is bringing more focus to BIPOC and diverse communities in our grant management work. The Minnesota DNR has adopted advancing diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) as a key priority in its 2020-22 strategic plan. The plan focuses on increasing the cultural competence of our staff, creating a workforce that is reflective of Minnesota, continuing to strengthen tribal consultation and building partnerships with diverse communities. The DNR has DEI strategies that benefit all OHF projects:

- Multilingual and culturally specific hunting and fishing education programs take place on public lands.
- All hiring is equal opportunity, affirmative action, and veteran-friendly. Contracting seeks out Targeted Group, Economically Disadvantaged and Veteran-Owned businesses. Subcontracting requirements for pass-through organizations also follow these guidelines.
- Public engagement seeks out BIPOC voices and involves diverse communities. Outreach and marketing of projects has this focus as well.

The Grants Unit participates in all trainings and have been leaders in developing the grants guidance, and members of our team helped launch the OGM's DEI community of practice. The Grants Unit only provides contract management activities to organizations who receive pass-through appropriations, so our scope for some activities is limited. In OHF contract management work, we concentrate on identifying and improving elements in our processes that may fall more heavily on or become barriers to participation by organizations from communities that have experienced disparities, and increasing our capacity for technical assistance. In FY21 we made several revisions to our reimbursement processes to:

- reduce the administrative burden on partners and provide flexibility in our process, while maintaining our high levels of risk mitigation
- focus on reaching out proactively to new organizations to set new projects up for success.

Our goal is to continue and increase these efforts, so that OHF contract management work is responsive to and supports the success of organizations and projects from BIPOC and diverse communities, as well as all pass-through organizations.

Activity Details

Requirements

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

Yes

Land Use

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

No

Timeline

Activity Name	Estimated Completion Date
Submit final report	August 2025
Submit first annual status report	August 2024
Contract management for Pass-through grant recipients	June 2025
Pass-through grant agreements prepared and provided to recipients	August 2023

Date of Final Report Submission: 11/01/2025

Availability of Appropriation: Subd. 7. Availability of Appropriation

(a) Money appropriated in this section may not be spent on activities unless they are directly related to and necessary for a specific appropriation and are specified in the accomplishment plan approved by the Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council. Money appropriated in this section must not be spent on indirect costs or other institutional overhead charges that are not directly related to and necessary for a specific appropriation. Money appropriated to acquire land in fee may be used to restore, enhance, and provide for public use of the land acquired with the appropriation. Public-use facilities must have a minimal impact on habitat in acquired lands.

(b) Money appropriated in this section is available as follows:

- (1) money appropriated for acquiring real property is available until June 30, 2027;
- (2) money appropriated for restoring and enhancing land acquired with an appropriation in this act is available for four years after the acquisition date with a maximum end date of June 30, 2031;
- (3) money appropriated for restoring or enhancing other land is available until June 30, 2028;
- (4) notwithstanding clauses (1) to (3), money appropriated for a project that receives at least 15 percent of its funding from federal funds is available until a date sufficient to match the availability of federal funding to a maximum of six years if the federal funding was confirmed and included in the original approved draft accomplishment plan; and
- (5) money appropriated for other projects is available until the end of the fiscal year in which it is appropriated.

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	-	-	-	-
Contracts	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-
Travel	-	-	-	-
Professional Services	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	-	-	-	-
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	-	-	-	-
Supplies/Materials	-	-	-	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	-	-	-	-

Amount of Request: -

Amount of Leverage: -

Leverage as a percent of the Request: -

DSS + Personnel: -

As a % of the total request: -

Easement Stewardship: -

As a % of the Easement Acquisition: -

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

N/A

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	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	-

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	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	-

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	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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	-	-	-	-
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	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

Outcomes

Programs in metropolitan urbanizing region:

- Other ~ *Pass-through grants are managed appropriately and grantee expenditures are reimbursed efficiently and correctly.*

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?

No

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

N/A



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Contract Management

Comparison Report

Program Title: ML 2023 - Contract Management

Organization: MN DNR

Manager: Katherine Sherman-Hoehn

Budget

Requested Amount: \$336,000

Appropriated Amount: \$336,000

Percentage: 100.0%

Item	Requested Proposal	Leverage Proposal	Appropriated AP	Leverage AP	Percent of Request	Percent of Leverage
Personnel	-	-	-	-	-	-
Contracts	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-	-	-
Travel	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional Services	\$336,000	-	-	-	0.0%	-
Direct Support Services	-	-	-	-	-	-
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supplies/Materials	-	-	-	-	-	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$336,000	-	-	-	0.0%	-

If the project received 70% of the requested funding

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

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

If the project received 50% of the requested funding

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

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

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	0	-	-
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	-	-	-
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	0	-	-
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	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-