



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Upper Mississippi Flyway Habitat Conservation Program
Laws of Minnesota 2026 Accomplishment Plan

General Information

Date: 10/16/2025

Project Title: Upper Mississippi Flyway Habitat Conservation Program

Funds Recommended: \$1,847,000

Legislative Citation:

Appropriation Language:

Manager Information

Manager's Name: Wayne Ostlie

Title: Director of Land Protection

Organization: Minnesota Land Trust

Address: 2356 University Ave W Suite 240

City: St. Paul, MN 55114

Email: wostlie@mnland.org

Office Number: 651-917-6292

Mobile Number: 651-894-3870

Fax Number:

Website: www.mnland.org

Location Information

County Location(s):

Eco regions in which work will take place:

Forest / Prairie Transition

Northern Forest

Metro / Urban

Activity types:

Protect in Easement

Priority resources addressed by activity:

Forest

Wetlands

Narrative**Abstract**

The Upper Mississippi Flyway Habitat Conservation Program is focused on the protection and restoration/enhancement of wetlands, stream corridors, and their associated uplands in central Minnesota to benefit migrating birds and iconic wetland-associated wildlife species. These habitats are at high risk for land conversion and fragmentation due to the expanding Twin Cities and St. Cloud metro areas. We will protect 295 acres using conservation easements for secretive marsh birds, bats, turtles, and other SGCN species. Conservation benefit will be maximized by targeting properties to strategically in-fill identified habitat cores and corridors.

Design and Scope of Work

The overall goal of this program is to expand the amount of permanently protected habitats that are within Important Bird Areas and/or prioritized within the Wildlife Action Network hotspots. These core and corridor areas would naturally include a diversity of forest, prairie, and savanna plant communities with numerous imbedded shallow lakes, hemi-marsh, and wetlands. Today, these lands are a mix of ownership with protected habitats interspersed with private lands developed for agriculture and now subject to increasing rural residential development.

Habitat for wetland/water associated birds and wildlife in central Minnesota, just north of the Twin Cities metro, is under significant threat of continuing fragmentation and loss from urban/suburban development and agriculture. These habitats are the kingpin that support birds using the Upper Mississippi flyway, one of the four major migratory corridors in the continental U.S. There are six Important Bird Areas (IBA) identified by the National Audubon Society found in this geography. These “core” areas, including Sherburne National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) and Crane Meadows NWR, retain what is left of the region’s traditional stopover sites essential for breeding, wintering, and/or migrating bird species. Additionally, the rivers in this geography serve as forested aerial highways facilitating movement for 60% of North American’s bird species. Moreover, many of these habitat cores and corridors overlap with Minnesota’s Wildlife Action Plan (WAN) hotspots for our state’s SGCN reptiles, amphibians, and other water associated wildlife such as Blanding’s turtle.

Healthy freshwater ecosystems are the lifeblood of our communities and are vital to the quality of life for birds and other species. This geography falls principally within the Mississippi River Headwaters Basin, the only major drainage basin with its entire watershed contained entirely within Minnesota’s borders. This program will have a collateral benefit to water quality as wetland protection and restoration contribute to floodwater retention, nutrient uptake, filtration of runoff, groundwater recharge, and carbon sequestration.

Minnesota Land Trust (MLT) will secure permanent conservation easements from willing landowners to protect 856 acres of quality wildlife habitat. The MLT will focus on properties around and within IBAs, WAN hotspots, or already restored by TNC. MLT employs a market-based approach to identifying and procuring easements, and program partners will encourage landowners to donate portions of their easement value, representing cost savings to the state.

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

Permanently protecting and restoring/enhancing the unique and threatened habitats in this geography is critical to maintaining native plant and wildlife biodiversity in Minnesota. Migratory birds rely on the habitat systems found here for food, shelter, and rest along the migration flyway of the Mississippi River and other river corridors. Upon their return to central Minnesota each spring, many of these bird species require wetland basins with open water areas and emergent aquatic vegetation to provide suitable nesting habitat to rear their broods. This program will provide critical habitat for thousands of migrating water birds and help ensure resilience to population decline from increased land use and climate change. Bird species benefiting include but are not limited to secretive marsh birds such as black-crowned night-heron, yellow rail, king rail, American woodcock, great blue heron, and Wilson's snipe, as well as waterfowl such as mallard, blue wing teal, wood duck, and trumpeter swan.

Reptiles, amphibians, and aquatic organisms such as fishes continue to face rates of population decline in Minnesota that exceed the rates of population decline of birds and mammals. Reptiles such as Blanding's turtle, which were once widespread in this geography but are now restricted statewide, will benefit from this work via protection within key remaining habitat cores. Fishes and mussels will benefit from stream and riparian protection due to the increase in high-quality critical habitats for all life stages and reduction of nonpoint source nutrient and sediment pollution.

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

Development pressure continues to increase in this geography and threaten critical aspects of existing ecosystems. Landowners in this geography have high and increasing interest in permanent conservation easements and habitat restoration/enhancement. In Mille Lacs County alone, MLT has identified, without doing any outreach, a list of nine high-quality properties totaling over 740 acres that have been proposed for conservation easements. Furthermore, TNC, USFWS, and other partners have been completing restoration in this geography for decades without many options for permanent protection. Many of the landowners that TNC and USFWS have worked with through 10-year restoration management agreements have expressed interest in permanently protecting their land if a conservation easement program was available. Without this program, there is a high risk that these restoration projects could be converted back to land uses that will adversely affect habitat and water quality benefits initially gained from those efforts.

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

This program is focused on protecting and restoring/enhancing priority wetland, riparian, and associated upland habitats as guided by the State Wildlife Action Plan. The program will work to build on initial conservation investments in the program area, expanding and buffering the footprint of existing protected areas (e.g., NWRs, existing conservation easements, WMAs, WPAs, and AMAs), facilitating the protection of habitat corridors, and reducing the potential for fragmentation of existing habitats while also restoring and enhancing habitat cores and corridors.

Once priority parcels are identified, MLT will work with private owners on protection strategies key to successful conservation in this region. MLT works closely with partners in the region to identify those habitat complexes where private land protection can make a significant contribution to existing conservation investments. Specific parcels available for acquisition of easements will be further reviewed relative to each other to identify priorities among the pool of applicants. This relative ranking is based on the amount of habitat on the parcel (size), the quality or condition of habitat, the parcel's context relative to other natural habitats and protected areas, and cost.

Field visits to further identify and assess condition of habitats prior to easement acquisition will further ensure maximum conservation benefits.

Which top 2 Conservation Plans referenced in MS97A.056, subd. 3a are most applicable to this project?

Minnesota's Wildlife Action Plan 2015-2025

Outdoor Heritage Fund: A 25 Year Framework

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.

Using TNC's Resilient Land Mapping and Resilient Rivers tools, we will target properties that provide the best opportunities for maintaining biodiversity in the face of climate change. These tools identify and prioritize areas for maximizing ecological resiliency and target climate-resilient sites for a resilient landscape. Protection of climate-resilient sites keeps sensitive species from disappearing by protecting complexes of large and connected habitat blocks, reducing fragmentation, and allowing for species movement as the climate changes. This proposal will prioritize conserving habitats that are connected to other habitats and sites with greater topographic variability to maximize habitat diversity.

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

Metro / Urban

Protect, enhance, and restore remnant native prairie, Big Woods forests, and oak savanna with an emphasis on areas with high biological diversity

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

Outcomes

Programs in forest-prairie transition region:

Protected, restored, and enhanced nesting and migratory habitat for waterfowl, upland birds, and species of greatest conservation need ~ *This program will permanently protect approximately 131 acres within the Forest-Prairie Transition. Measure: Acres protected.*

Programs in metropolitan urbanizing region:

Core areas protected with highly biologically diverse wetlands and plant communities, including native prairie, Big Woods, and oak savanna ~ *This program will permanently protect approximately 26 acres of strategic Metro Urban habitat. Measure: Acres protected.*

Programs in the northern forest region:

Increased availability and improved condition of riparian forests and other habitat corridors ~ *This program will permanently protect approximately 138 acres within the Northern Forest region. Measure: Acres protected.*

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.

Funding provided to MLT from the Outdoor Heritage Fund through this proposal will not supplant or substitute any previous funding from a non-Legacy fund used for the same purpose.

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

The land protected through conservation easements will be sustained through state-of-the-art standards and practices for conservation easement stewardship. MLT is a nationally accredited land trust with a very successful stewardship program that includes annual property monitoring, effective records management, addressing inquiries and interpretations, tracking changes in ownership, investigating potential violations, and defending the easement in cases of a true violation. Funding for these easement stewardship activities is included in the project budget. In addition, MLT will assist landowners in the development of comprehensive habitat management plans to help ensure that the land will be managed for its wildlife and water quality benefits.

Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes

Year	Source of Funds	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
2030 and in perpetuity	MLT Long-Term Stewardship and Enforcement Fund	Annual monitoring of easements in perpetuity.	Enforcement as necessary.	-

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

One of MLT's core values are commitments to diversity, equity, and inclusion. We work to demonstrate this commitment whenever possible across our work. For example, we look to find opportunities to protect and restore critical habitats associated within camps and nature centers that serve diverse constituencies, allowing access to nature in a welcoming and safe environment. MLT intends to continue to use diversity, equity, and inclusion as a lens in project, partner, and contractor selection. We will continue to listen and seek out potential, authentic partnerships that can advance our goals of conserving the best of Minnesota's remaining habitats and, at the same time, being more inclusive organizations.

Additionally, MLT will continue to use diversity, equity, and inclusion as a lens in project, partner, and contractor selection. We will listen and seek out potential, authentic partnerships that can advance our goals of conserving the best of Minnesota's remaining habitats while being a more inclusive organization, building relationships with and working collaboratively with diverse communities – Tribal Nations, rural farmers, multi-generational families.

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?

Minnesota Land Trust

Who will be the easement holder?

Minnesota Land Trust

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

Minnesota Land Trust expects to close between 2 and 6 conservation easements through this appropriation, depending on cost and amount of landowner donation.

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:

The purpose of the MLT's conservation easements is to protect existing high quality natural habitat and to preserve opportunities for future restoration. We restrict agricultural lands and use on the properties. In cases where there are agricultural lands associated with the larger property, we will either exclude the agricultural area from the conservation easement, or in some limited cases, we may include a small percentage of agricultural lands if it is not feasible to exclude those areas. In such cases, however, we will not use OHF funds to pay the landowners for that portion of the conservation easement. These lands will be available for traditional agriculture unless otherwise restricted by the easement.

As for food plots, although MLT prefers no food plots in our easements, we do recognize that these are important to some landowners; an outright restriction against them would greatly diminish our ability to protect quality habitat in some of our program areas. As such, we do allow a limited number of them over small areas when that's the case. Since January 1, 2020, MLT has completed 47 conservation easements containing food plots, representing 28.7% of the 162 conservation easements completed during this time. The total footprint of these food plots is 92 acres, a mere 0.47% of the total area protected. Our practice is to limit the area of food plots to no more than 3% of the total easement area of a property, with a preference for less than more. Exceptions to this practice will be very limited. Per our stated policy, MLT will prohibit the use of neonicotinoid-treated seed in the planting of food plots, prohibit the planting of invasive species, and require the landowner to submit seed tags to MLT's Stewardship Team on an annual basis after the planting of food plots.

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

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:

Most conservation easements are established on private lands, many of which have driveways, field roads, and trails located on them. Often, the conservation easement permits the continued usage of established trails and roads so long as their use does not significantly impact the conservation values of the property. Creation of new roads/trails or expansion of existing ones is typically not allowed and would require MLT approval.

Will the trails or roads remain and uses continue to be allowed after OHF acquisition?

Yes

How will maintenance and monitoring be accomplished?

Existing trails and roads are identified in the project baseline report and will be monitored annually as part of the MLT's stewardship and enforcement protocols. Maintenance of permitted roads/trails in accordance with the terms of the easement will be the responsibility of the landowner.

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?

No

Lands protected via easement will be assessed as to their need for R/E work by the Land Trust's Restoration Program. If R/E needs are identified, they will be built into future funding proposals.

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

No

Explain how, when, and source of the R/E work:

Lands protected via easement will be assessed as to their need for R/E work by the Land Trust's Restoration Program. If R/E needs are identified, they will be built into future funding proposals.

Timeline

Activity Name	Estimated Completion Date
Conservation easements completed	June 30, 2030

Date of Final Report Submission: 11/01/2030

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 for fee title acquisition of land 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, 2030;
- (2) money appropriated for restoring and enhancing land acquired with an appropriation in this section is available for four years after the acquisition date with a maximum end date of June 30, 2034;
- (3) money appropriated for restoring or enhancing other land is available until June 30, 2031;
- (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	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	\$200,000	-	-	\$200,000
Contracts	\$46,000	-	-	\$46,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	\$1,212,000	\$120,000	Landowner donation of easement value	\$1,332,000
Easement Stewardship	\$168,000	-	-	\$168,000
Travel	\$12,000	-	-	\$12,000
Professional Services	\$153,000	-	-	\$153,000
Direct Support Services	\$54,000	-	-	\$54,000
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$1,000	-	-	\$1,000
Supplies/Materials	\$1,000	-	-	\$1,000
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$1,847,000	\$120,000	-	\$1,967,000

Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
MLT Land Protection Staff	0.5	4.0	\$200,000	-	-	\$200,000

Amount of Request: \$1,847,000

Amount of Leverage: \$120,000

Leverage as a percent of the Request: 6.5%

DSS + Personnel: \$254,000

As a % of the total request: 13.75%

Easement Stewardship: \$168,000

As a % of the Easement Acquisition: 13.86%

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

The program was recommended for 26% of the proposed request. Outputs were reduced by 66% (34% of proposed). Personnel was reduced 43% (57% of proposed). Some costs are fixed. Personnel was reduced less to accommodate for potential donations above expectations and loss of projects midstream.

Detail leverage sources and confirmation of funds:

The Land Trust encourages landowners to fully or partially donate the value of conservation easements to the program; this leverage amount is a conservative estimate of value we expect to see donated by landowners.

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?**

Outputs would be reduced by 50-60 percent. Activities will be curtailed, but less than proportional, as some activities are fixed and necessary for program success.

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

Personnel and DSS will be scaled, but less than proportional. Some costs are fixed (e.g., landowner recruitment, grant management) and must occur regardless of grant amount. Projects may fail midstream after investment of time. Donation of easement value can inflate the number of projects pursued/completed.

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

No

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

Funds in the contract line are for the writing of habitat management plans for protected easement properties and for conducting landowner outreach within the program area via qualified vendors.

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

Appraisals

Other : Phase 1 Environmental Assessments, Minerals Reports, Mapping

Surveys

Title Insurance and Legal Fees

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

MLT expects to close 2-6 conservation easements under this appropriation. The average cost per easement to fund the Minnesota Land Trust's perpetual monitoring and enforcement obligations is \$28,000, although in extraordinary circumstances additional funding may be warranted. This figure is derived from MLT's detailed stewardship funding "cost analysis" which is consistent with Land Trust Accreditation standards. MLT shares periodic updates to this cost analysis with LSOHC staff.

Travel**Does the amount in the travel line include equipment/vehicle rental?**

Yes

Explain the amount in the travel line outside of traditional travel costs of mileage, food, and lodging

MLT staff occasionally rent vehicles for grant-related purposes, which can be a cost savings over use of personal vehicles on longer trips

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?

In a process that was approved by the DNR on March 17, 2017, Minnesota Land Trust determined our direct support services rate to include all of the allowable direct and necessary expenditures that are not captured in other line items in the budget, which is similar to the Land Trust's proposed federal indirect rate. We applied this DNR-approved rate only to personnel expenses to determine the total amount of direct support services requested through this grant

Other Equipment/Tools

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

GPS devices, field and safety gear, tools.

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	98	-	197	-	295
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
Total	98	-	197	-	295

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	\$615,600	-	\$1,231,400	-	\$1,847,000
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$615,600	-	\$1,231,400	-	\$1,847,000

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	26	131	-	-	138	295
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	26	131	-	-	138	295

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	\$162,500	\$821,900	-	-	\$862,600	\$1,847,000
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$162,500	\$821,900	-	-	\$862,600	\$1,847,000

Average Cost per Acre by Resource Type (Table 5)

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat
Restore	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	\$6,281	-	\$6,250	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-

Average Cost per Acre by Ecological Section (Table 6)

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest
Restore	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	\$6,250	\$6,274	-	-	\$6,250
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

0

Parcels

Parcel Information

Sign-up Criteria?

[Yes - Sign up criteria is attached](#)

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

The Land Trust uses a competitive, market-based approach through an RFP process to identify interested landowners and prioritize parcels for conservation easement acquisition. All proposals submitted by landowners are evaluated and ranked relative to their ecological significance based on three primary factors: 1) size of habitat on the parcel; 2) condition of habitat on the parcel; and 3) the context (both in terms of amount/quality of remaining habitat and protected areas) within which the parcel lies. We also ask the landowner to consider contributing all or a portion of fair market value to enable our funds to make a larger conservation impact (see attached sign-up criteria). We will undertake a variety of landowner outreach approaches to identify and encourage landowner participation in the program.



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Upper Mississippi Flyway Habitat Conservation Program

Comparison Report

Program Title: ML 2026 - Upper Mississippi Flyway Habitat Conservation Program

Organization: Minnesota Land Trust

Manager: Wayne Ostlie

Budget

Requested Amount: \$5,080,800

Appropriated Amount: \$1,847,000

Percentage: 36.35%

Item	Requested Proposal	Leverage Proposal	Appropriated AP	Leverage AP	Percent of Request	Percent of Leverage
Personnel	\$495,000	-	\$200,000	-	40.4%	-
Contracts	\$326,000	-	\$46,000	-	14.11%	-
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	\$3,500,000	\$350,000	\$1,212,000	\$120,000	34.63%	34.29%
Easement Stewardship	\$308,000	-	\$168,000	-	54.55%	-
Travel	\$24,200	-	\$12,000	-	49.59%	-
Professional Services	\$294,000	-	\$153,000	-	52.04%	-
Direct Support Services	\$124,600	\$47,400	\$54,000	-	43.34%	0.0%
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$5,000	-	\$1,000	-	20.0%	-
Supplies/Materials	\$4,000	-	\$1,000	-	25.0%	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$5,080,800	\$397,400	\$1,847,000	\$120,000	36.35%	30.2%

If the project received 70% of the requested funding

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

Outputs would be reduced by 50-60 percent. Activities will be curtailed, but less than proportional, as some activities are fixed and necessary for program success.

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

Personnel and DSS will be scaled, but less than proportional. Some costs are fixed (e.g., landowner recruitment, grant management) and must occur regardless of grant amount. Projects may fail midstream after investment of time. Donation of easement value can inflate the number of projects pursued/completed.

If the project received 50% of the requested funding

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

Outputs would be reduced by 70-80 percent. Activities will be curtailed, but less than proportional, as some activities are fixed and necessary for program success.

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

Personnel and DSS will be scaled, but less than proportional. Some costs are fixed (e.g., landowner recruitment, grant management) and must occur regardless of grant amount. Projects may fail midstream after investment of time. Donation of easement value can inflate the number of projects pursued/completed.

Output

Acres by Resource Type (Table 1)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	20	-	0.0%
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Easement	856	295	34.46%
Enhance	0	-	-

Total Requested Funding by Resource Type (Table 2)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	\$420,800	-	0.0%
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	\$4,660,000	\$1,847,000	39.64%
Enhance	-	-	-

Acres within each Ecological Section (Table 3)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	20	-	0.0%
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Easement	856	295	34.46%
Enhance	0	-	-

Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section (Table 4)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	\$420,800	-	0.0%
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	\$4,660,000	\$1,847,000	39.64%
Enhance	-	-	-