



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Working Lands for Habitat

Laws of Minnesota 2023 Accomplishment Plan

General Information

Date: 12/29/2022

Project Title: Working Lands for Habitat

Funds Recommended: \$2,636,000

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

Appropriation Language:

Manager Information

Manager's Name: Bill Penning

Title: Conservation Programs Consultant

Organization: Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources

Address: 394 S Lake Ave #403

City: Duluth, MN 55803

Email: bill.penning@state.mn.us

Office Number:

Mobile Number: 651-262-6403

Fax Number:

Website: bwsr.state.mn.us

Location Information

County Location(s):

Eco regions in which work will take place:

- Prairie
- Southeast Forest
- Northern Forest
- Forest / Prairie Transition

Activity types:

- Protect in Easement

Priority resources addressed by activity:

- Forest
- Prairie
- Habitat
- Wetlands

Narrative

Abstract

Producer driven inquiries and significant land conversion pressure away from grazing lands has developed growing interest from SWCD's and conservation partners to develop a program that keeps cattle on the landscape while maintaining and improving wildlife habitat and protecting and improving water quality. RIM easements that allow long-term grazing coupled with approved grazing plans that take wildlife and water quality into consideration will be utilized to protect approximately 716 acres. Prioritization criteria are developed to give the highest return on conservation investment, water quality benefits, large block connectivity of grassland complexes and implementation of Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan priorities.

Design and Scope of Work

Loss of grasslands, particularly grass grazed by large ungulates is of significant concern to the natural resource management community. Although CRP provides significant tall grassland habitat (yet CRP has declined dramatically in MN since the 2000's) it is generally not hayed or grazed sufficiently to benefit shorter-grass species like bobolink, meadowlark, and longspurs. These species are all in decline. Likewise overgrazed pasture can negatively affect both wildlife and water quality. Properly managed grazing is essential to maintaining grassland health and diversity. The intent of this program is to protect, enhance and restore properly managed grasslands that provide not only improved grassland habitat and water quality but continuing long-term economic benefit for landowners. RIM easements that allow long-term grazing coupled with approved grazing plans that take wildlife and water quality into consideration will be utilized to protect approximately 716 acres. In addition to improving grassland quality there will be a focus on getting cattle out of sensitive water bodies by fencing and providing alternate water sources. This will reduce erosion, improve water quality and improve downstream fish habitat in rivers and lakes. Prioritization criteria are developed to give the highest return on conservation investment, water quality benefits, large block connectivity of grassland complexes and implementation of Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan priorities. A local technical advisory committee made up of BWSR, SWCD, agency and NGO partners will score, rank and identify priority parcels. This partnership will solicit applications from willing landowners and work collaboratively to share multiple-agency conservation program availability in what is intended to be a sustained long-term protection program. This program will encourage a working lands approach while prioritizing grassland multiple benefit protection values. Significant detail regarding the resource being protected will be identified in the management plans to include but not limited to a grazing management plan that protects the form and function of grassland ecological values, ground water and surface water hydrology management, adaptations for changing environmental conditions, promotion of soil health, and allowance for other compatible conservation practices over time. Our intent is to make this a statewide program, however if insufficient funding is secured we may scale back to targeted areas of the state. Although these areas have not been chosen yet we expect significant demand from northwest, central and southeast portions of the state Minnesota. In addition several SWCDs have expressed interest in developing grazing plan writing and implementation capacity which can be facilitated via this program. In 2020 BWSR received \$1M in Capitol Investment (Bonding) funds to implement a working lands program in three watersheds in north central Minnesota. This program is an outgrowth of that program and much of the work necessary to design and implement these programs has already been completed. Although limited both geographically and financially, there seems to be significant interest by

producers that are committed to environmentally sensitive grazing management so they can keep their family farms.

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. Species expected to benefit include: Greater prairie chicken, Sharp-tailed grouse, Eastern meadowlark, Western meadowlark, Upland sandpiper, 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, Powesheik skipper, Regal fritillary, and 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:

Pastures, both native and planted, are often part of large complexes of restored prairies, grasslands, and wetlands. These complexes will be the top priority for this project. The scoring and ranking process (see attached score sheet) evaluates a number of factors such as adjacency to permanently protected land, size, feet of shoreline, habitat score, resiliency, TMDLS, and other factors to ensure that the parcels that can maximize habitat values by building on existing complexes, being in high value wildlife areas, improving downstream water quality and aquatic habitat, are enrolled into the program. A local technical team composed of SWCD, BWSR, agency (such as NRCS grazing experts), NGO, and other experts as appropriate will vet each application and make funding recommendations to BWSR.

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, restore, and enhance habitat for waterfowl, upland birds, and species of greatest conservation need

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

Prairie

- Protect, enhance, or restore existing wetland/upland complexes, or convert agricultural lands to new wetland/upland habitat complexes

Southeast Forest

- Restore forest-based wildlife habitat that has experienced substantial decline in area in recent decades

Does this program include leveraged funding?

Yes

Explain the leverage:

One million dollars of Capital Investment funds are in-hand and have been allocated to develop a grazing program in central Minnesota. Additionally, we expect the program will utilize grazing plans written primarily by NRCS staff and EQIP funds will partially fund infrastructure such as fencing and alternative water sources that facilitate rotational grazing and keeping cattle from sensitive water bodies.

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.

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 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 and BWSR

Who will be the easement holder?

State of MN through BWSR

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

7

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:

For the most part lands enrolled will be currently grazed working lands. As such, field access roads and trails are likely to be present.

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 7,250 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. Grazing plans have maps that can be referred to that show all existing and approved infrastructure such as roads and fences.

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:

There could potentially be new field roads created if conservation grazing management needs change. For example a field road to access a watering facility that keeps cattle from sensitive water resources.

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 7,250 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. Grazing plans have maps that can be referred to that show all existing and approved infrastructure such as roads and fences.

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

Yes

Some parcels could potentially be replanted or managed to improve grasslands.

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

Yes

Timeline

Activity Name	Estimated Completion Date
Implementation of grazing plans	No later than June 30th, 2031
Enroll 620 acres into the RIM private land easement program	June 30th, 2028

Date of Final Report Submission: 11/01/2028

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	\$60,200	\$34,400	Capital Improvement	\$94,600
Contracts	\$14,000	\$8,000	Capital Improvement	\$22,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	\$2,482,700	\$944,400	Capital Improvement	\$3,427,100
Easement Stewardship	\$45,500	-	-	\$45,500
Travel	\$4,600	\$1,800	Capital Improvement	\$6,400
Professional Services	-	-	Capital Improvement	-
Direct Support Services	\$20,400	\$8,100	Capital Improvement	\$28,500
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$6,600	\$2,500	Capital Improvement	\$9,100
Supplies/Materials	\$2,000	\$800	Capital Improvement	\$2,800
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$2,636,000	\$1,000,000	-	\$3,636,000

Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Funding Request	Antic. Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Easemen Staff	0.1	6.0	\$60,200	\$34,400	Capital Improvement	\$94,600

Amount of Request: \$2,636,000

Amount of Leverage: \$1,000,000

Leverage as a percent of the Request: 37.94%

DSS + Personnel: \$80,600

As a % of the total request: 3.06%

Easement Stewardship: \$45,500

As a % of the Easement Acquisition: 1.83%

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

Acres have been scaled accordingly.

Describe and explain leverage source and confirmation of funds:

Matching funds are from 2019 Capital Improvement (Bonding) and are in hand.

Personnel

Has funding for these positions been requested in the past?

No

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?

7 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

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 annually 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	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	179	179	179	179	716
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
Total	179	179	179	179	716

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	\$659,000	\$659,000	\$659,000	\$659,000	\$2,636,000
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$659,000	\$659,000	\$659,000	\$659,000	\$2,636,000

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	-	179	179	179	179	716
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	179	179	179	179	716

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	-	\$659,000	\$659,000	\$659,000	\$659,000	\$2,636,000
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	\$659,000	\$659,000	\$659,000	\$659,000	\$2,636,000

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	\$3,681	\$3,681	\$3,681	\$3,681
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	-	\$3,681	\$3,681	\$3,681	\$3,681
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or 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 during the other two years to ensure maintained outcomes. An increase of grassland habitat availability within aspen parklands 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 complexes are restored.*

Programs in the northern forest region:

- Increased availability and improved condition of riparian forests and other habitat corridors ~ *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 grassland habitat and improved riparian habitat availability is expected to increase the carrying capacity of grassland-dependent and riparian wildlife as well as downstream aquatic resources. 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 protected and properly managed.*

Programs in prairie region:

- Key core parcels are protected for fish, game and other wildlife ~ *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. Protection of grazing lands that create wildlife corridors linking habitat blocks such as those identified in the Prairie Plan will be prioritized. 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 protected and properly managed.*

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 during the other two years to ensure maintained outcomes. An increase of grassland habitat and improved riparian habitat availability is expected to increase the carrying capacity of grassland-dependent and riparian wildlife as well as downstream aquatic resources. 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 protected and properly managed.*

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. Landowners with existing but not implemented grazing plans will be given priority.



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Working Lands for Habitat

Comparison Report

Program Title: ML 2023 - Working Lands for Habitat

Organization: Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources

Manager: Bill Penning

Budget

Requested Amount: \$6,000,000

Appropriated Amount: \$2,636,000

Percentage: 43.93%

Item	Requested Proposal	Leverage Proposal	Appropriated AP	Leverage AP	Percent of Request	Percent of Leverage
Personnel	\$172,200	\$34,400	\$60,200	\$34,400	34.96%	100.0%
Contracts	\$40,000	\$8,000	\$14,000	\$8,000	35.0%	100.0%
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	\$5,504,100	\$929,200	\$2,482,700	\$944,400	45.11%	101.64%
Easement Stewardship	\$130,000	-	\$45,500	-	35.0%	-
Travel	\$10,500	\$1,800	\$4,600	\$1,800	43.81%	100.0%
Professional Services	\$76,000	\$15,200	-	-	0.0%	0.0%
Direct Support Services	\$47,700	\$8,100	\$20,400	\$8,100	42.77%	100.0%
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$15,000	\$2,500	\$6,600	\$2,500	44.0%	100.0%
Supplies/Materials	\$4,500	\$800	\$2,000	\$800	44.44%	100.0%
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$6,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,636,000	\$1,000,000	43.93%	100.0%

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 (which are a small but important part of the overall ask), 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. DSS is proportionately reduced.

If the project received 50% 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 (which are a small but important part of the overall ask), 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. DSS is proportionately reduced.

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	1,580	716	45.32%
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	\$6,000,000	\$2,636,000	43.93%
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	1,580	716	45.32%
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	\$6,000,000	\$2,636,000	43.93%
Enhance	-	-	-



RIM WORKING LANDS ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS SCORING SHEET

Landowner Name:	County/SWCD Office:

Total Score **0**

1. APPROVED GRAZING PLAN *(maximum score 15)*

Score

- a. Approved and fully implemented grazing plan or recently expired EQIP contract (15 pts)
- b. Approved and partially implemented grazing plan or applied for EQIP and not funded (10 pts)
- c. Approved but not implemented grazing plan (5 pts)

2. SIZE OF OFFER *(maximum score 10)*

Score

- a. > 320 acres (10 pts)
- b. 150 – 320 acres (5 pts)

3. ADJACENT TO PERMANENTLY PROTECTED LAND *(maximum score 5)*

Score

- a. Yes (5 pts)
- b. No (0 pts)

4. LANDOWNER ENROLLED IN AG WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION PROGRAM
(maximum score 5)

Score

- a. Yes (5 pts)
- b. No (0 pts)

5. SHORELINE LINEAR FEET:

Total shoreline length of lakes, rivers, or public ditches in linear feet. Includes both sides of the watercourse/waterbody. One point per 660 ft.
(maximum score 10)

Score

6. CROPLAND CONVERSION:

Percent of offer converted from cropland to grassland/silvopasture in the last 5 years or will be converted upon easement completion
(maximum score 16)

Score

- a. 76–100% (16 pts)
- b. 51–75% (12 pts)
- c. 26–50% (8 pts)
- d. 0–25% (4 pts)

7. HABITAT SCORE (*maximum score 10*)

Score

- a. > 50% of offered area has high rank in Wildlife Action Network or within Important Bird Area (10 pts)
- b. > 50% of offered area has medium high rank in Wildlife Action Network (5 pts)

8. TNC MULTIPLE BENEFITS SCORE (*maximum score 15*)

Score

- 2nd Quartile
- 3rd Quartile
- 4th Quartile

9. TNC RESILIENT AND CONNECTED NETWORK SCORE (*maximum score 5*)

Score

- a. Climate Resilient Site Score (3 pts)
- b. Connectivity and Climate Flow Score (2 pts)

10. ALTERNATE WATERSOURCE: Another water source available other than natural watercourse/waterbody (*maximum score 5*)

Score

- a. Yes (5 pts)
- b. No (0 pts)

11. WELLHEAD PROTECTION: > 50% of offered area ranked Very High (VH) or High (H) Vulnerability within Drinking Water Supply Management Area Vulnerability (*maximum score 10*)

Score

- a. Yes (10 pts)
- b. No (0 pts)

12. TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD: Implementation of grazing plan will address water quality concerns for conventional pollutants identified in the TMDL. Must be within 1/4 mile of listed water or tributary. (*maximum score 5*)

Score

- a. Yes (5 pts)
- b. No (0 pts)

13. GRAZING SITE LISTED AS PRIORITY IN 1W1P/WATER PLAN (*maximum score 5*)

Score

- a. Yes (5 pts)
- b. No (0 pts)

APPLICATION FUNDING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I attest that this application has been reviewed by the program technical committee and selected for funding.

_____ BWSR Program Staff Signature

_____ Date