



## Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Martin County WMA Acquisition Phase 8  
Laws of Minnesota 2024 Accomplishment Plan

---

### General Information

**Date:** 01/25/2024

**Project Title:** Martin County WMA Acquisition Phase 8

**Funds Recommended:** \$2,589,000

**Legislative Citation:** ML 2024, Ch. X, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd.

**Appropriation Language:**

### Manager Information

**Manager's Name:** Doug Hartke

**Title:** Grant Coordinator

**Organization:** Fox Lake Conservation League, Inc.

**Address:** PO Box 212

**City:** Sherburn, MN 56171

**Email:** doughartke@gmail.com

**Office Number:**

**Mobile Number:** 507-236-1700

**Fax Number:**

**Website:** Foxlakeconservation.com

### Location Information

**County Location(s):** Martin.

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

- Prairie

**Activity types:**

- Protect in Fee
- Restore

**Priority resources addressed by activity:**

- Prairie
- Wetlands
- Habitat

## Narrative

### Abstract

This program will continue our conservation partnership into Phase 8 and will continue to protect and restore diverse prairie and wetland habitat in areas that adjoin existing DNR WMA. Parcels are identified with representatives of local government, Windom Area MN DNR, Ducks Unlimited (DU), The Conservation Fund (TCF), the Fox Lake Conservation League, Inc (FLCL), and other local partners. Wetland restoration and additional grasslands are needed to make our WMA habitats resilient. We will use the real estate expertise of TCF, wetland and grassland restoration expertise of DU, and the local conservation efforts of FLCL.

### Design and Scope of Work

This proposal will restore 210 acres of shallow lakes, wetlands, and prairie grasslands in Martin County. Our partnership brings together the expertise of three organizations with a strong history working in the area. The Conservation Fund (TCF) will negotiate the acquisition and lead the real estate process for properties targeted in this proposal. Fox Lake Conservation League will hold and monitor the properties during the restoration work, which will be completed by Ducks Unlimited biologists and engineers. The completely restored lands will then be conveyed to the MN DNR for perpetual protection and management. All projects are done with neighboring landowners included in the conversation and without disruption to existing drainage of their lands.

Shallow lake and wetland restoration are top priority actions in all major conservation plans for Minnesota. Our work addresses the habitat goals identified in the North American Waterfowl Management Plan, Minnesota's Prairie Conservation Plan, and Minnesota's Duck Recovery Plan which calls for the active management of 1,800 shallow lakes and restoring 64,000 wetlands to Minnesota's landscape. This work is time-sensitive because complex shallow lake enhancement projects take several years to design and implement, and because wetland restorations are critically needed for breeding waterfowl.

Priority land acquisition areas have been identified with considerations for proximity to existing protected lands (DNR Wildlife Management Areas), threatened and endangered species' key habitats, and important watersheds. Acquired lands will be restored using best management practices to accurately represent and manage for pre-settlement conditions. The extensive agricultural and drainage history of Southwest Minnesota has resulted in the loss of 90% of our prairie wetlands and 99% of the native prairie on the landscape. What remains of the lakes and wetlands are only those which were too deep to drain and have now become nutrient rich, invaded by exotic species, and overall unproductive to wetland-dependent species. These factors have caused a significant decline in Minnesota's once diverse waterfowl population, and as a result, in Minnesota's rich waterfowling traditions.

Through this funding, TCF, FLCL, and DU will restore much needed habitats to the landscape where wetland wildlife, prairie species, and people will flourish. Further, these sites will improve water quality, soil conservation, and water storage in the region.

## **Explain how the plan addresses habitat protection, restoration, and/or enhancement for fish, game & wildlife, including threatened or endangered species conservation**

This project will protect threatened habitats in Martin County. Native prairie and high quality wetlands will be protected, buffered and expanded upon. Restoration sites will provide the opportunity to expand populations of at-risk and threatened plant species that Martin SWCD has propagated and introduced into permanent protected sites. The FLCL is continuing work initiated by Martin County SWCD, by selecting locally rare, at-risk species for propagation and use on these and future habitat restoration projects to protect the local native seed source. While hundreds of Sullivant's milkweed (*Asclepia sullivantii*) and Tuberous Indian Plantain (*Cacalia tuberosa*) have been introduced into WMAs and other protected land, Small white lady's slipper (*Cypripedium candidum*) and Rattlesnake master (*Eryngium yuccifolium*) will continue to be propagated using local source plant material for use in this project. Parcels selected for this proposal expand habitat protection for the threatened Blanding's Turtle (*Emydoidea blandingii*) Perch Creek population that has been studied by the MN DNR and featured in the "MN Volunteer".

## **What are the elements of this plan that are critical from a timing perspective?**

We continue to have great success with our previous funding by protecting over 800-acres in 2019 and 2020, and our partnership acted quickly in 2021 and 2022 to add four separate additions to existing WMAs totaling over 410 acres. It can be a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity when we find a willing seller that owns some of our highest priority native habitat and marginal agricultural lands in proximity to WMAs and other protected natural habitats. If we don't act immediately, these lands may never become available in the future and may be converted to other uses, with degradation or complete elimination of natural features and high-value resources that currently exist.

## **Describe how the plan expands habitat corridors or complexes and/or addresses habitat fragmentation:**

Our "Martin County Conservation Alliance" has grown into a planning group that includes wildlife group representatives, NGO's, local government, and state agencies. There is a wide range of knowledge and interest within the group. Historic information, the MN County Biologic Survey, GIS spatial data, and local knowledge help identify areas where habitat restoration will likely be most beneficial. Expanding habitat adjacent to existing high quality native habitat and habitat already protected by public ownership or perpetual conservation easements are targeted. Sites with threatened, endangered and species-in-decline are good targets to build upon, especially when these expansions can link sites to help extend corridors, expand blocks, and protect and enhance habitat buffers along water courses and lake chains. On our parcel list, we have the following tracts that have areas of biodiversity significance as identified by the MN County Biological Survey:

Perch Creek WMA: high level of biodiversity significance. Perch Creek is also part of a DNR Pheasant Habitat Complex.

Caron WMA: moderate level of biodiversity significance and also has a Priority Shallow Lake as identified by DNR Wildlife. Caron WMA is also part of a Pheasant Habitat Complex.

Gruven WMA: moderate biodiversity significance.

Center Creek WMA: outstanding level of biodiversity significance.

Additionally, some of the targeted parcels occur in landscapes that are estimated to support 10-25 breeding ducks per square mile as per USFWS. Breeding pair accessibility will only increase with increased wetland restoration in these areas.

## Which Conservation Plans referenced in MS97A.056, subd. 3a are most applicable to this project?

- Long Range Duck Recovery Plan
- Minnesota's Wildlife Management Area Acquisition - The Next 50 Years

## Explain how this plan will uniquely address habitat resilience to climate change and its anticipated effects on game, fish & wildlife species utilizing the protected or restored/enhanced habitat this proposal targets.

Climate trends are warmer and wetter than 100 years ago. On average, temperatures have risen 3 degrees F and precipitation has increased 3.4 inches annually with more large rain events. Restored wetlands and surrounding uplands uniquely store and clean precipitation and replenish groundwater resources. Considering the intense agricultural drainage of Martin County, water storage on the landscape is greatly needed to handle climate change. Deep rooted native plant species provide increased soil infiltration and perennial land cover, reducing runoff and erosion into our waterways. Properly restored wetlands will serve as a sponge during this period of change, storing and cleaning water, which can be released downstream when the time is right. By installing water control structures on wetlands, land managers will be well positioned to mitigate adverse effects from climate change, including fighting invasive fish, restoring historic water regimes, and promoting shallow wetland ecosystems.

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

### Prairie

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

## Outcomes

### Programs in prairie region:

- Key core parcels are protected for fish, game and other wildlife ~ *By adding these important parcels to the Martin County WMA complexes we are restoring valuable grasslands to the WMAs of Southern Minnesota. These added diverse upland prairies will provide much needed habitat for many wildlife species. This program will also add valuable acres for public hunting, fishing and other outdoor activities with all of the fish, game, and rare species that will be found on this new public land.*

## 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 proposal does not supplant or substitute previous funding for the same purpose.

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

Maintaining habitat after our restoration and donation to DNR is complete will be the responsibility of the MN DNR with support from project partner ECP CPL grants if and when available to continue to assist the MN DNR. Also, local groups within the "Martin County Conservation Alliance" will be there to assist the MN DNR with future dollars. Local partners will continue to install additional local source native plant species to enhance habitat to support more species, including pollinators. Local partner monitoring will assist in identifying invasive species threats and provide assistance with eradication or control when necessary.

## Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes

Year	Source of Funds	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Ongoing	Local	Monitor and add local species	Monitor for invasive species	Treat and plant as needed
Ongoing	MN DNR Budget	Monitoring	Maintenance	Management

### Provide an assessment of how your program celebrates cultural diversity or reaches diverse communities in Minnesota, including reaching low- and moderate-income households:

Restoration of wetlands and grasslands will create high-quality habitat to support healthy wildlife populations in the area for all people to enjoy. These actions will help improve air quality, water quality, support pollinator populations and help fight climate change and the disproportionate effects it has on BIPOC communities. These newly restored lands will be open to the public and will provide numerous opportunities for BIPOC communities to enjoy through hunting, wildlife viewing, kayaking, canoeing, and various other forms of outdoor recreation and education.

## Activity Details

### Requirements

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

Yes

**Will county board or other local government approval be formally sought\*\* prior to acquisition, per 97A.056 subd 13(j)?**

Yes

**Is the land you plan to acquire (fee title) 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 or on lands to be acquired in this program?**

Yes

**Where does the activity take place?**

- WMA

### Land Use

**Will there be planting of any crop on OHF land purchased or restored in this program, either by the proposer or the end owner of the property, outside of the initial restoration of the land?**

Yes

**Explain what will be planted and include the maximum percentage of any acquired parcel that would be planted into foodplots by the proposer or the end owner of the property:**

Food Plots could be utilized by the MN DNR as part of their WMA management plans. Short-term farming may be necessary in the timetable to correctly restore the uplands to native habitats.

**Will insecticides or fungicides (including neonicotinoid and fungicide treated seed) be used within any activities of this program either in the process of restoration or use as food plots?**

No

**Is this land currently open for hunting and fishing?**

No

**Will the land be open for hunting and fishing after completion?**

Yes

**Describe any variation from the State of Minnesota regulations:**

All of these lands will be part the DNR WMA system.

**Who will eventually own the fee title land?**

- State of MN

**Land acquired in fee will be designated as a:**

- WMA

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

2-3

**Are there currently trails or roads on any of the proposed acquisitions?**

No

**Will new trails or roads be developed or improved as a result of the OHF acquisition?**

No

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

Yes

**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
Follow-up/Maintenance/Weed Control	2026 and Beyond
Transfer to MN DNR	2025 and 2026
Plan Restoration	Winter 2023 and Winter 2024
Complete Restoration	2025-2027
Acquire Parcel (s)	Fall 2023 - Fall 2025
Begin Parcel qualification and review	Summer and Fall 2023

**Date of Final Report Submission: 10/31/2028**

**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, 2028;
- (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, 2032;
- (3) money appropriated for restoring or enhancing other land is available until June 30, 2029;
- (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.*

**Grand Totals Across All Partnerships**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Funding Request</b>	<b>Leverage</b>	<b>Leverage Source</b>	<b>Total</b>
Personnel	\$106,000	\$18,400	DU Private and federal USFWS NAWCA	\$124,400
Contracts	\$540,000	\$80,000	DU, Private, and Federal USFWS NAWCA	\$620,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	\$1,880,400	-	-	\$1,880,400
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-
Travel	\$8,000	\$4,600	-, DU, Private, and Federal USFWS NAWCA	\$12,600
Professional Services	\$32,000	-	-	\$32,000
Direct Support Services	\$10,600	-	-	\$10,600
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$6,000	-	-	\$6,000
Supplies/Materials	\$6,000	-	-	\$6,000
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$2,589,000</b>	<b>\$103,000</b>	-	<b>\$2,692,000</b>



**Partner: Ducks Unlimited****Totals**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Funding Request</b>	<b>Leverage</b>	<b>Leverage Source</b>	<b>Total</b>
Personnel	\$80,000	\$18,400	DU Private and federal USFWS NAWCA	\$98,400
Contracts	\$500,000	\$80,000	DU, Private, and Federal USFWS NAWCA	\$580,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-
Travel	\$7,500	\$4,600	DU, Private, and Federal USFWS NAWCA	\$12,100
Professional Services	\$7,000	-	-	\$7,000
Direct Support Services	\$7,000	-	-	\$7,000
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$6,000	-	-	\$6,000
Supplies/Materials	\$6,000	-	-	\$6,000
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$613,500</b>	<b>\$103,000</b>	-	<b>\$716,500</b>

**Personnel**

<b>Position</b>	<b>Annual FTE</b>	<b>Years Working</b>	<b>Funding Request</b>	<b>Leverage</b>	<b>Leverage Source</b>	<b>Total</b>
Ducks Unlimited Conservation Staff - Biologists and Engineers	0.8	3.0	\$80,000	\$18,400	DU Private and federal USFWS NAWCA	\$98,400

**Partner: The Conservation Fund****Totals**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Funding Request</b>	<b>Leverage</b>	<b>Leverage Source</b>	<b>Total</b>
Personnel	\$26,000	-	-	\$26,000
Contracts	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-
Travel	\$500	-	-	\$500
Professional Services	\$25,000	-	-	\$25,000
Direct Support Services	\$3,600	-	-	\$3,600
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	-	-	-	-
Supplies/Materials	-	-	-	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$55,100</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$55,100</b>

**Personnel**

<b>Position</b>	<b>Annual FTE</b>	<b>Years Working</b>	<b>Funding Request</b>	<b>Leverage</b>	<b>Leverage Source</b>	<b>Total</b>
MN TCF staff	0.05	4.0	\$26,000	-	-	\$26,000

**Partner: Fox Lake Conservation League****Totals**

Item	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	-	-	-	-
Contracts	\$40,000	-	-	\$40,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	\$1,880,400	-	-	\$1,880,400
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	-	-	-	-
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$1,920,400</b>	-	-	<b>\$1,920,400</b>

**Amount of Request:** \$2,589,000**Amount of Leverage:** \$103,000**Leverage as a percent of the Request:** 3.98%**DSS + Personnel:** \$116,600**As a % of the total request:** 4.5%**Easement Stewardship:** -**As a % of the Easement Acquisition:** -**How will this program accommodate the reduced appropriation recommendation from the original proposed requested amount?**

We will only be able to complete approximately 3 parcels from the original plan. We will scrutinize each parcel closely to prioritize which are best for our goals.

**Detail leverage sources and confirmation of funds:**

NAWCA Grants will be leveraged.

**Does this project have the ability to be scalable?**

Yes

**If the project received 50% of the requested funding****Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?**

The number of projects and acres would be reduced proportionately. Sometimes multiple parcels can be grouped for professional services, such as appraisals, surveys, and an economy of scale can be achieved for project savings.

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

Personnel would be reduced, nearly proportionally. Personnel and DSS are budgeted by number of projects in this program, which would be fewer with less funding.

## Personnel

**Has funding for these positions been requested in the past?**

Yes

## Contracts

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

Contracts are for private contractor charges to restore/enhance wetlands (earthmoving) and grasslands (Native Seeding) on lands acquired. Wetland restoration in Martin County is very expensive and requires engineering due to intensive landscape drainage via complex networks of private/public tile/ditches that effect private neighbors and public lands.

## Professional Services

**What is included in the Professional Services line?**

- Appraisals
- Surveys
- Title Insurance and Legal Fees

## Fee Acquisition

**What is the anticipated number of fee title acquisition transactions?**

2 or 3

## 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**

TCF: Instate Mileage

DU: Travel costs consist of in state mileage and lodging for land manager, biologists, and engineering field staff, DU generally does not spend OHF grant funds on food.

FLCL: no 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?**

TCF:DSS has been reviewed and approved by MN DNR Grant staff, and is determined using our federally approved and audited rate as the basis for calculating DSS as a percentage of the budgeted personnel costs.

DU:MN DNR grants staff previously review and approved DU accounting methodology for DSS, which are calculated and include in DU Staff Costs. DU DSS constitute approximately 10% of DU overall staff costs on average among DU conservation staff building categories.

FLCL: No DSS

## **Other Equipment/Tools**

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

GPS Survey equipment for performing engineering wetland restoration survey work and engineering surveys of shallow lake and large wetland enhancement projects, including survey equipment lease charges instead of actual outright purchases to avoid buying equipment that becomes absolute due to upgrades and advancements. Other Examples include hand tools and other field equipment as needs arise.

## **Federal Funds**

### **Do you anticipate federal funds as a match for this program?**

Yes

#### **Are the funds confirmed?**

No

#### **What is the approximate date you anticipate receiving confirmation of the federal funds?**

Beginning in 2024 via future NAWCA grants leveraged to help restore lands acquired via OHF. This first requires expenditures of state OHF grant funds on land acquisitions to leverage federal NAWCA grant funds to restore lands acquired.

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	20	190	-	0	210
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>210</b>

**How many of these Prairie acres are Native Prairie? (Table 1b)**

Type	Native Prairie (acres)
Restore	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	210
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-
Protect in Easement	-
Enhance	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>

**Total Requested Funding by Resource Type (Table 2)**

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat	Total Funding
Restore	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	\$400,000	\$2,239,000	-	-	\$2,639,000
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$400,000</b>	<b>\$2,239,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$2,639,000</b>

**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	-	-	-	210	-	210
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>210</b>

**Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section (Table 4)**

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest	Total Funding
Restore	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	\$2,639,000	-	\$2,639,000
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$2,639,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$2,639,000</b>

**Average Cost per Acre by Resource Type (Table 5)**

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat
Restore	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	\$20,000	\$11,784	-	-
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	-	-	-	\$12,566	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-

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

## 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:

Fox Lake Conservation is a leader in public lands acquisitions in Martin County and is continually working with the MN DNR to best qualify parcels that need to be acquired to improve the state WMA holdings in Martin County.

### Fee Parcels

Name	County	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection
Caron WMA Parcel 13B	Martin	10333226	209	\$1,700,000	No
East Fork WMA Parcel 1A	Martin	10332208	120	\$950,000	No
Center Creek WMA Parcel 13	Martin	10329229	107	\$975,000	No
Caron WMA Parcel 16	Martin	10332225	160	\$1,750,000	No
Rooney Run WMA	Martin	10332228	80	\$1,100,000	No
Caron WMA Parcel 14	Martin	10332224	77	\$900,000	No
East Fork WMA Parcel 2A	Martin	10332208	110	\$700,000	No
Caron WMA Parcel 15	Martin	10333225	50	\$475,000	No

### Fee Parcels with Buildings

Name	County	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection	Buildings	Value of Buildings
East Fork WMA Parcel 1B	Martin	10332208	10	\$80,000	No	3	\$0



# Parcel Map



- Protect in Easement
- ▲ Protect in Fee with PILT
- Protect in Fee W/O PILT
- ★ Restore
- ✕ Enhance
- ⊕ Other





# Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

## Martin County WMA Acquisiton Phase 8

### Comparison Report

**Program Title:** ML 2024 - Martin County WMA Acquisiton Phase 8

**Organization:** Fox Lake Conservation League, Inc.

**Manager:** Doug Hartke

### Budget

**Requested Amount:** \$11,466,900

**Appropriated Amount:** \$2,589,000

**Percentage:** 22.58%

Item	Requested Proposal	Leverage Proposal	Appropriated AP	Leverage AP	Percent of Request	Percent of Leverage
Personnel	\$416,500	\$80,000	\$106,000	\$18,400	25.45%	23.0%
Contracts	\$2,000,000	\$350,000	\$540,000	\$80,000	27.0%	22.86%
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	\$8,630,000	-	\$1,880,400	-	21.79%	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-	-	-
Travel	\$33,500	\$20,000	\$8,000	\$4,600	23.88%	23.0%
Professional Services	\$116,000	-	\$32,000	-	27.59%	-
Direct Support Services	\$40,900	-	\$10,600	-	25.92%	-
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	\$180,000	-	-	-	0.0%	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$25,000	-	\$6,000	-	24.0%	-
Supplies/Materials	\$25,000	-	\$6,000	-	24.0%	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$11,466,900</b>	<b>\$450,000</b>	<b>\$2,589,000</b>	<b>\$103,000</b>	<b>22.58%</b>	<b>22.89%</b>

### **If the project received 70% of the requested funding**

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

The number of projects and acres would be reduced proportionately. Sometimes multiple parcels can be grouped for professional services, such as appraisals, surveys, and an economy of scale can be achieved for project savings.

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

Personnel would be reduced, nearly proportionally. Personnel and DSS are budgeted by number of projects in this program, which would be fewer with less funding.

## **If the project received 50% of the requested funding**

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

The number of projects and acres would be reduced proportionately. Sometimes multiple parcels can be grouped for professional services, such as appraisals, surveys, and an economy of scale can be achieved for project savings.

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

Personnel would be reduced, nearly proportionally. Personnel and DSS are budgeted by number of projects in this program, which would be fewer with less funding.

## Output

### Acres by Resource Type (Table 1)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	0	0	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	923	210	22.75%
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	\$11,466,900	\$2,639,000	23.01%
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	0	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	923	210	22.75%
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	\$11,466,900	\$2,639,000	23.01%
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-