	Member Comments									
ID#	Program Title	Sen. D. Scott Dibble	Dudley Edmondson	Kristin Eggerling	David Hartwell	Mark Holsten	Ron Schara	Jamie Swenson		
PA01	MN Prairie Recovery Program, Phase 13	\$8.3223M, Protect in fee, Restore, Enhance, 750 prairie acres in fee, 25,000 acres enhanced, 250 acres restored, The Nature Conservancy	Phase 13. wondering if TNC envisions a point at which the restoration and protection of these prairie habitas could' would be considered complete. OR at least no longer requiring OHF		As this is a continuation of prior multi-year grants, I an a bit confused with the staffing comment in the section about the scaleable nature of the proposal. It states that project management and PR Biologists would be kept at the same level if the project does not receive full finding. But I am going to assume that project management and PR biologists are funded with some prior year grants so I get confused with how they are also then finded for multiple years under this (and previous) proposal. it feels like double dipping but I suspect I do not full y understand. A chart showing prior year appropriations with staff funding over multiple years and how this application would supliment this would be helpful. DSS seems unite bieh	no pilt obligations,	Buying Land			
PA02	Martin County DNR WMA, Phase 7	\$8.7301M, Protect in fee, Restore, Martin County, Fox Lake Conservation League		BIPOC?	2020 appropriation was not \$1.7B.		Poor Leverage			
PA03	RIM Grassland Reserve, Phase 5	\$5M, Protect in casement, 980 RIM acres, grassland, MN BWSR			The propsal mentions that unathrorized trails are a violation of an easement. I am wondering how my violations have been fround in the last 5 years (each year) and what the resolution was of the violations - restoration, financial penalty, taken to court, other? Will the parcels protected be those that are rolling out of CRP, anything in CRP or any parcel that fits the criteria?					
PA04	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley, Phase 9	\$10.0333M, Protect in Fee, Restore, 1,485 acres, Clay, Norman, Malnomen, Wilkin Counties MN Prairie Chicken Society & Pheasants Forever	These areas are open to public hunting. Does this include hunting of the "flagship species" Greater Prairie Chicken. Line 2 and 3 of your budget have the exact same description and numbers. could you please explain the difference?			comitted vs potential donations?				
PA05	Working Lands for Habitat	\$6M, Protect in easement, 1,580 RIM acres, MN BWSR			What will happin in the event of drought. Will the easment allow emergency grazing that is not what is envisioned in the proposal? What is the track record on grazing meeting the grazing plan? How is it monitoried? What are the enforcement actions on land allowing grazing in the past - number of violations noted and outcome? What would BWSR do if the demand for land to be grazed by eattle declines significantly due to the rise in factory grown meat in the next 25 years? How is the value of the easemnet calculated differently when grazing is allowed instead of no grazing?	apropraition?	\$6 Million to protect 1,580 acres?	Excellent project, long overdue, is this the best aligned agency and program? Do we need to re-create the wheel for grazeland in MN? NRCS vs BWSR? RIM vs ACEP? See NRCS ACEP or CSP program or SoDak's Second Century Habitat Fund Working Lands Habitat Program or as a model.		
PA06	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program, Phase 15	\$13.8805M, Protect in fee, Restore, 1,768 acres prairie grasslands & assoc. wetlands, WMA's, PF ngmt areas, Pheasants Forever			\$125K in easement stewardship as a match but no easemnet activity is anticipated in the program. Does not make sense. Explain the PF Forever HMA fund that will apparently receive some of the funds from this request? Not sure how i would work for PF to hold funds for "holding costs" on this project. Cost per acre is the same for all Ecological Sections. This does not make any sense.	need update on past funding balance, com/poten donation?	17 Land Purchases			
PRE01	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program, Phase 4	\$10.440M, Restore, Enhance, 4,000 acres proteced private grasslands and wetlands, Ducks Unlimited			What will happin in the event of drought. Will the easment allow emergency grazing that is not what is envisioned in the proposal? How does the value of these easements that allow grazing and haying differ in value than those that do not? PF staff costs - 33 EET over 3 years = \$300,000? As I caluculate this, it would mean paying someone \$300,000 per year which cannot be correct. DU's staff cost works out to just under \$200,000 for a FTE which also seems high.					
PRE02	DNR Grassland Enhancement, Phase 15	\$8.1879M, Restore, Enhance, 14,850 acres grasslands, MN DNR			How is this different than roving crews? DSS seems a bit high.	large multi year \$ carry over, workload capacity?				

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council ML 2023 / FY 2024 Request for Proposals										
Member Comments										
ID#	Program Title	Sen. D. Scott Dibble	Dudley Edmondson	Kristin Eggerling	David Hartwell	Mark Holsten	Ron Schara	Jamie Swenson		
PRE03	Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands, Phase 6	\$4.4383M, Restore, Enhance, 11,000 acres grassland (WMA's, WPA's, NWR's), Pheasants Forever			Salary for State coordinator03 x 3 years + .09 FTE for the 3 years - \$50,000 cost total for the proposal - Annual salary calculatoin is therefore \$556K. This cannot be correct.					
FA01	Hardwood Hills Habitat Conservation Program	\$4.203M, Protect in easement, 1,200 acres forest and wetlands in Avon Hills portion of Hardwood Hills, West Central MN, MN Land Trust			Written narative indicates \$600K or landowner match/leverage but the budget only shows \$500.	1st time proposal, simular to ACUB, would like to see some county involvement		Is private landowner "leverage" \$500k or \$600k? Both numbers are in the proposal.		
FA02	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program, Phase 11	\$5.5M, Protect in easement, 4,000 acres, Morrisor SWCD			I wonder why DOD wants local match on a program that is iniated by them to protect their base from being the nusience in the area and therefore subject to pressure to modify behavior on the base? It is also troublesome that there is no committed match.	has leverage \$ in past, need update on carry forward				
FA03	Protection/Enhancement of Public Land Forest Habitats Through Strategic Acquisition of Private Land Inholdings	\$2.785M, Ehance, Protect in fee, 1,760 acres protected, 500 acres enhanced w/in public forests, Ruffed Grouse Society & American Woodcock Society			Leverage indicates a \$1M waived amount (DSS) which is obviously an error. Was this meant to be \$10,000?	explain fed waived support leverage		More information needed to understand the listed \$1,061,391.5 leverage as "waived federal indirect" of direct support services.		
FRE01	DNR Forest Enhancement, Phase 3	\$3.8697M, Restore, Enhance, 712 acres restored, 15,359 acres enhanced in WMA's, AMA's, SNA's, State Forests, MN DNR			It would seem that this project is virtually 100% contract work so why even have SNA crews involved? The personnel side of this proposal confuses me.					
WA01	2023 Southeast Wetland Restoration, Land Acquisition, Phase 2	\$1.5105M, Protect in fee, 42 acres wetlands, 58 acres upland buffer, Mankato area	some board members may not be familiar with all the language used to describe wetland types. So describing wetlands in indictor species section as type 1-7 needs more explanation.		Seems like the personnel are already on the city staff, just assigned to other tasks and would be therefore a type of supplanting.	is this more than a park /stormwater management	Park?			
WA02	RIM Wetlands - Restoring the Most Productive Habitat in Minnesota	\$10M, Protect in easement, Restore, 1,260 acres RIM wetlands & adjacent grasslands			Does BWSR approve any new roads prior to them being established? Have new roads been established in the past and what are the consequences. Is BWSR willing to go to court to enforce the easement if there are violations? Examples please. Explain why program managment should not be scaleable. This would to me indicate a supplanting situation. Will easements only be done on expiring CRP. If not, how does that figure into criteria?	#8 need update on carryforward funds				
WA03	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection and Restoration Program, Phase 12	\$13.98M, Protect in fee, 1,600 acres drained wetlands & land adj. shallow lakes and adj. WMA's, SW MN prairie pothole region								
WA04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase 8	\$7.36M, Protect in easement, Restore, Enhance, 2,600 acres wetland, restore/enhance 1,844 acres wetlands/prairies								
WA05	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase 15	\$11.931M, Protect in fee, Restore, 1,545 Waterfowl Production Areas			Love the match	no pilt obligations, review leverage				
WRE01	Wetland Enhacement in the Big Woods	\$900K, Enhance, 99 acres, Scott and Rice Counties		CPL?	Curious how the language "water control structure would be designed by an engineering consultant with vast experience in natural resource bioengineering and installed by a qualified contractor who specialize in heavy civil and infrastructure construction" is exactly the same as appears in WRE04. Will the project be ut out widely for competive bidding or has the contracting team already been selected?	Ist time proposer at request of DNR, review time line				
WRE02	Living Shallow Lakes and Wetlands Enhancement and Restoration Initiative, Phase 9	\$13.7M, Restore, Enhance, 3,000 acres wetlands and adj. prairie grasslands, SW MN prairie pothole region (and MN, Miss, St. Croix rivers in Metro), Ducks Unlimited			I believe the amounts listed in the other OHF appropriations table are not correct - at least related to the Shallow Lakes funding for DU.					
WRE03	Voyaguers National Park Wetland Restoration Project, Phase 3	\$1.64M, Restore, >500 acres, Voyageurs National Park Kabetogama & Rainy Lake areas, Voyageurs National Park			While the goal of reducing navigational hazards and proprty damage are understandable, that is not the purpose of Legacy funding under the constutional dedication.	high administration costs				

	Member Comments								
ID#	Program Title	Sen. D. Scott Dibble	Dudley Edmondson	Kristin Eggerling	David Hartwell	Mark Holsten	Ron Schara	Jamie Swenson	
WRE04	Shallow Lake Enhancements in Grant County	\$2.631M, Enhance,1,300 acres of 7 shallow lakes & 2 wetlands, Grant County			Curious how the language "water control structure would be designed by an engineering consultant with vast experience in natural resource bioengineering and installed by a qualified contractor who specialize in heavy civil and infrastructure construction" is exactly the same as appears in WRE01. Will the project be put out videly for competive bidding or has the contracting team already been selected? The proposal indicated if funds are not received, the County will take other less expensive action to adress high water threatening roads. So why is the county not putting up match dollars that are equal to what it would spend on this option as part of this proposal instead of asking for the vast majority of funds (outside of in kind match) from LSOHC?				
WRE05	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase 15	\$12.428M, Enhance, Restore, 14,000 acres of shallow lakes, MN DNR			DSS seems high	significant carryforward and projected time completion, Carlos Avery - Bonding?			
WRE06	Nelson Slough/JD#19	\$6.192M, Enhance, 2,482 acre impoundment (Nelson Slough), Middle-Snake-Tamarac Rivers Watershed District (Is this a flood control project?)			Seems like more of a flood control project than a habitat one and as such, I would expect the majority of the funding should not come from funds dedicated to habitat. The fact this is not a scaleable project is concerning as well.	aggressive timeline			
HA01	Hennepin County Habitat Conservation Program, Phase 3	\$12.2766M, Enhance, Restore, Protect in easement, 740 acress easements, 1,342 acress habitat improvement, Hennepin County	supporting habitat protection near our urban centers give urbanites access to natural spaces with potential environmental education opportunities. Most of LSOHC funds tend to serve rural, lesser populated areas of the state and so we should take advantage of opportunities in urban spaces		Met Council is pushing development of land in many of their policies but then counties are having to pay to offset their plans. Something seems amiss.				
HA02	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation, Phase 8	\$8.9213M, Protect in easement, Restore, Enhance, 540 acres protected, 1,736 acres enhanced/restored, 2,200 feet shoreline, Anoka, Chisago, Sherburne, Crow Wing Counties, Great River Greening			DSS for NWTF seems very high. Very confusing as to what organization is doing what - and why.				
HA03	Accelerating Habitat Conservation in Southwest Minnesota, Phase 2	\$6.541M, Protect in easement, Restore, Enhance, 1,200 acres, SW MN 200 acres wetlands and assoc. prairies, MN Land Trust							
HA04	Bone Lake South Wetland Acquisition and Restoration	44.475M, Protect in fee, Enhance, Restore, 305 acres of wetland and upland, northern Washington County, Comfort Lake-Forest Lake Watershed District				unclear about long term ownership/management			
HA05	Buffalo-Red River Watershed District Stream Habitat Program, Phase 3	\$9.428M, Restore, Enhance, Protect in easement, 4.2 miles south branch Buffalo River, 5.1 miles Stony Creek, Upper Buffalo River, Whisky Creek and its southern tributary, Buffalo-Red River Watershed District			Why would new roads be established? Where would those funds come from? More information on the scaling question in terms of accomplishment seems needed.	leverage commitment is unclear, large 2018 carry forward balance			
HA06	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration, Phase 11	\$8.1817M, Protect in easement, Protect in fee, Restore, Enhance, 1,960 acres protect, 1,050 acres restore/enhance, SE MN Blufflands, The Nature Conservancy				#8 project timeline seems slow to complete			
HA07	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance, Phase 2	\$9.225M, Protect in easement, Protect in fee, 6 miles shoreland, 1,500 acres habitat, MN Land Trust				large 2017 carry forward - update			
HA08	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes, Phase 9	\$10.656M, Protect in easement, Protect in fee, 48 tullibee refuge lakes, 1.724 acres, 4.7 miles shoreline, Aitkin, Cass, Crow Wing, Hubbard Counties, Northern Waters Land Trust			DSS seems high				
HA09	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase 15	\$5.888M, Protect in fee, 700 acres for WMA's and SNA's MN DNR						Why no leverage compared to previous years?	
HA10	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements, Phase 3	\$1.360M, Protect in easement, 180 acres, 11 miles of trout streams, SE & NE MN, MN DNR						Where are project partners and leverage?	
HA11	Metro Big Rivers, Phase 13	\$20.3039M, Protect in easement, Protect in fee, Restore, Enhance 1,250 acres in fee, 516 acres in easement, 29 acres restored, 542 acres enhanced, Metro, MN Valley Trust (Metro Big Rivers)				HA11/HA12 apear to have same parcel acquisition? through TPL,			

	Member Comments									
ID#	Program Title	Sen. D. Scott Dibble	Dudley Edmondson	Kristin Eggerling	David Hartwell	Mark Holsten	Ron Schara	Jamie Swenson		
HA12	St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration, Phase 4	\$16.1533M, Project in Easement, Projtect in Fee, 1,570 acres St. Croix River watershed, Washington, Pine, Kanabec, Chisago Counties, Wild Rivers Conservancy				HA11/HA12 apear to have same parcel acquisition? through TPL,				
HA13	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program, Phase 7	\$4.6419M, Enhance, Protect in fee, Restore, 415 acres prairie upland, wetland, lake streambank, Shell Rock River Watershed District				owner/management of pilt obligated lands unclear				
HA14	Integrating Habitat and Clean Water, Phase 2	\$10M, Protect in easement, MN BWSR		Abstract is not clear.	Interested in knowing how to create critteria to score projects on a statewide basis given the wide diversity of habitat types and conservation challenges. The answer to the scaling questsion makes me think this is a supplanting since staff will be maintained regardless of funding level	#8				
HA15	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase 12	\$6.5191M, Project in fee, Restore, Enhance, 670 acres in fee, 607 acres restored, Cannon River watershed, Clean River Partners			CRP is managintg the project but only gets 3 years funding while GRG gets 5. How does this work?	how does this overlap with WRE01, adminstration overlap?				
HRE01	Southeast and Metro Trout Stream Habitat Enhancement	\$2.913M, Enhance, 9 creeks and numerous streams in Metro & SE MN, MN Trout Unlimited				large carry forward balance, need update				
HRE02	Lake Nokomis Shoreline Enhancements for Turtles and Pollinators, Phase 2	\$1.3M, Enhance, 8,500 fee shoreline, Lake Nokomis in Minneapolis, Minneapolis Parks & Recreation Board			Why no leverage provided by the Minneapolis Parks Foundation. It would seen the lack of support for this would indicate this is not a high priority project. Is there any cencus data on the number of spiney softshell turtles in Lake Nakomis or on the previously restored area?					
HRE03	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation Project, Phase 7	\$2.941M, Enhance, 3,000 feet stream habitat on Knife River, Lake Superior Steelhead Association ("There will be no direct appropriation request from OHF."???)			This seems like a lot of fiscal management for overseeing just contract work.	no fiscal agent!				
HRE04	Upper Sioux Community Habitat Restoration, Phase 1	\$1.1M, Enhance, Restore, 176 acres oak savanna, floodplain forest, forested blufflands, granite outcroppings, Yellow Medicine County, Upper Sioux Community			Price seems very high for the acreage	need more info on maintenance, compress parcel contract timelines?				
HRE05	Seidls Lake Park Habitat Restoration Project	\$637K, Restore, Seidls Lake Park wildlife habitat restoration, South St. Paul and Inver Grove Heights, City of South St. Paul			Seeding and then goats - why will the goats not eat the new plants? Signage? Don't tusty patch bees live in grasslands? Reserch plots? Very high cost per acre, especially since the clearing has already been done.	encourage to CPL Grants	Recommend CPL Here			
HRE06	Buckingham Creek Brook Trout Restoration Project	\$800K, Restore, 3,800 feet of Buckingham Creek, City of Duluth				golf course irrigation stream????				
HRE07	Rum River Corridor Fish and Wildlife Habitat Enhancement, Phase 2	\$5.3M, Enhance, 2,200 feet streambank, 1,200 feet in-stream fish habitat, 115 acres habitat, Rum River corridor from Mille Lacs to Mississippi River, Anoka Conservation District								
HRE08	Restoring and Enhancing Minnesota's Important Bird Areas in the St. Criox River Valley	\$1.6136M, Ehnance, Restore, 891 acres enhanced, 35 acres restored, St. Croix River Valley, Washington and Pine Counties, Audubon MN			As a member of the Audubon Political Fund Board (Audubon C4), I may have a conflict. It is not direct as the activities of Audubon are very different than the C4, but I would like council discussion and direction before participating in any discussion of this project.					
HRE09	DNR St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Phase 10	\$5.65M, Restore, 63 acres acquatic and wetland habitat, St. Louis River and estuary, MN DNR	Its great to see this collaboration between MLT, DNR and Fond du Lac Band. There should be more proposals that include this type of consideration/cooperation with tribal nations.		is this really the final phase of this project?	need a project carry forward update				
HRE10	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, Phase 6	\$13.2264M, Restore, Enhance, 6 fish passage projects in 8 rivers, 17 miles, 365 riparian and terrestrial habitat, MN DNR								

	Lessaru-Sains Outdoor Heritage Council ML 2025 / F 1 2024 Request for 1 Toposais									
	Member Comments									
ID#	Program Title	Sen. D. Scott Dibble	Dudley Edmondson	Kristin Eggerling	David Hartwell	Mark Holsten	Ron Schara	Jamie Swenson		
01	DNR Roving Crew, Phase 2	\$8.7329M, Restore, Enhance, 3 existing 8 person grassland/wetland roving crews, MN DNR			A refresher on what existing funds cover in terms of timing for roving crews and how this fits in would be helpful.					
02	Core Functions in the Partner-led OHF Land	\$674.3K, Protect in fee, single OHF appropriation to cover all DNR land acquisition costs and DNR IDP activities, MN DNR			Still seeing IDP in proposals. How will this work?		Need Discussion????			
03	Contract Management	\$336K, Contract Management, MN DNR			We need this		100			
04		\$200K, Restore, Restoration Evaluations, evaluation of a sampling of up to 25 restorations per year, MN DNR			Are we getting information that is actionable and useful from this? Has the work changed any activity from partners or pointed out glaring issues we should be considering?		100			
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase 15, Statewide and Metro Habitat	\$9.5M, Enhance, Projtect in fee, Restore, Protect in easement, grants up to \$500K, MN DNR			Explain the staffing levels - 2.5 FTE but is that then funded for 2 years each year?			Why is the requested amount so much less than the last few years? Is there not a greater need?		