

# Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage CouncilFisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - ML2026ML 2026 Request for Funding

## General Information

**Date:** 06/26/2025

**Proposal Title:** Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - ML2026

**Funds Requested:** $8,567,700

**Confirmed Leverage Funds:** -

**Is this proposal Scalable?:** Yes

### Manager Information

**Manager's Name:** Annie Knight **Title:** Executive Director **Organization:** Northern Waters Land Trust **Address:** 800 Minnesota Ave W PO Box 124 **City:** Walker, MN 56484 **Email:** AnnieK@nwlt-mn.org **Office Number:** 218-547-4510 **Mobile Number:**   **Fax Number:**   **Website:** www.northernwaterslandtrust.org

### Location Information

**County Location(s):** Aitkin, Crow Wing, Cass and Hubbard.

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

Northern Forest

**Activity types:**

Protect in Fee

**Priority resources addressed by activity:**

Forest

Habitat

## Narrative

### Abstract

The Northern Waters Land Trust (NWLT) will permanently protect 933 acres of critical fish habitat within 48 coldwater lakes and their minor watersheds by acquiring lands in fee for permanent protection. These efforts prioritize the 23 highest-priority coldwater lakes. Through this Fisheries Habitat Protection program, NWLT is working to protect 75% of each targeted watershed—a measure that provides a high probability of maintaining clean water and healthy, resilient lake ecosystems.

### Design and Scope of Work

Sustaining a strong angling heritage in North Central Minnesota (along with the local economy it drives) revolves around protecting fisheries habitat. Resurging shoreland development pressures and climate change are direct threats to the ecology of MN's lakes. Fisheries research shows that the greatest loss of coldwater habitat has occurred in lakes with substantial land-use changes within their catchments (Jacobson et. al, 2010). Healthy watersheds with intact forests are fundamental to sustaining good fish habitat over the long term; achieving a 75% lake watershed protection goal ensures a resilient and healthy lake ecosystem.

Our protection efforts are focused on coldwater lake watersheds that are distinct in their environmental conditions, water quality, and ability to sustain cold-water fish species such as tullibee, lake trout, and lake whitefish. Cold-adapted fish species require cold, well-oxygenated waters, a condition most common in lakes with deep water and healthy watersheds. MN DNR Fisheries researchers studied tullibee populations and designated 68 lakes in MN as "refuge lakes" for coldwater fish species that need protection. We are prioritizing 23 of these lakes and their minor watersheds of the 48 within our service area. Many are MN's premier recreational lakes.

In prioritizing these 23 lakes, the Clean Water Critical Habitat Technical Committee considered: (1) ecological value of the lake, (2) percent of the minor watershed currently protected, (3) number of parcels in the watershed greater than 20 acres in size, (4) partner organizations available for advising on outreach efforts, and (5) investment by other agencies to protect lands within the watershed.

The Technical Committee has also developed a scoring framework to evaluate specific parcels within these priority watersheds (Attachment A). This framework considers 4 factors: Program Requirements (at least 20 acres, within our service area, on a refuge lake), Ecological Factors (size, quality/condition of the resource, landscape context), Threat/Urgency (development or disturbance in the minor watershed and risk classification from water plans), and Cost (cost of project and donative value). These factors are scored on a scale of 0-210, with the highest score indicating the greatest need for conservation action. These scored parcels are made available in a user-friendly format on the online Clean Water Critical Habitat map.

Through this grant, we will protect 933 strategically important acres of land through fee title acquisitions. Program partners will include County Soil & Water Conservation Districts, MN DNR, and County land departments. This team will conduct outreach to potential landowners and help evaluate the projects to ensure we are prioritizing those projects with the greatest conservation outcomes. In addition, to ensure the best conservation return on the state's investment, landowner willingness to donate a portion of the acquisition value will be a key component of the parcel's evaluation.

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

Tullibee (aka cisco) and lake whitefish are preferred forage fish for walleye, northern pike, muskellunge and lake trout. These species require cold, well oxygenated waters - a condition most common in lakes with deep water and healthy watersheds. Coldwater fish populations are the "canaries in the coal mine" for three significant threats to Minnesota's sport fisheries: shoreland development, watershed health and climate warming. Deep, cold water lakes with high quality, well-oxygenated waters and natural, undisturbed land cover along the shorelines and within their watersheds will have the best chance to sustain coldwater fish populations in the face of these threats and will serve as a "refuge" for coldwater fish species if annual temperatures continue to increase.

Minnesota DNR Fisheries Research scientists studied coldwater lakes and designated 68 lakes in Minnesota as primary "refuge lakes" for coldwater fish that need protection. 48 of these lakes and their minor watersheds are located in Crow Wing, Aitkin, Cass and Hubbard counties. These lakes are premier recreational and sport fishery lakes. Fisheries research has shown that healthy watersheds with intact forest are fundamental to good fish habitat. MN DNR Fisheries Habitat Plan states near shore fish habitat affected by shoreland disturbance can impact fisheries. Maintaining good water quality is critical to sustaining coldwater fish as determined by the water’s oxygen level and nutrient content. Lakeshore development decreases a lake’s ability to function as a healthy ecosystem for sport fish and their forage, due to increased runoff, but also through physical alternation by lakeshore owners.

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

Now is a critical time to protect Minnesota’s coldwater fisheries lakes. These rare and ecologically sensitive systems are under increasing threat from climate change, which is warming deepwater habitats and reducing oxygen levels essential for coldwater fish species such as trout and tullibee. At the same time, shoreline development and land-use pressures continue to degrade water quality and fragment critical forested buffers. Protecting these lakes now—through strategic land acquisition —offers a cost-effective, long-term solution to preserving water quality, sustaining recreational fisheries, and maintaining biodiversity. With public awareness growing and science-based conservation tools in place, this is a unique window of opportunity to secure irreplaceable aquatic habitats before further degradation occurs. Grant support will enable us to act quickly and collaboratively to protect these high-priority lakes for current and future generations.

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

Timothy Cross and Peter Jacobson in their white paper, "Landscape factors influencing lake phosphorus concentrations across Minnesota," determined coldwater fish communities are especially vulnerable to eutrophication from increased phosphorus concentrations. Decreases in hypolimnetic oxygen concentrations have direct negative effects on fish such as tullibee and whitefish that physiologically require oxygenated cold water to survive, grow and reproduce. Protection is viewed as the most cost-effective strategy when applied to watersheds where human activities have not already significantly elevated phosphorus levels.

Peter Jacobson and Mike Duval, in "Protecting Watershed of Minnesota Lakes with Private Forest Conservation Easements: A Suggested Strategy", stated that protecting the forests in these watersheds from development is critical for maintaining water quality in these lakes. While large areas of land in forested portions are under public ownership, a considerable amount is also owned by private individuals in some of our most critical lake watersheds. These parcels are increasingly being "split up" and sold. Modelling by MN DNR Fisheries research unit suggests that total phosphorus concentrations remain near natural background levels when less than 25% of a lake’s watershed is disturbed. Coldwater "refuge" lakes have watersheds with less than 25% disturbed land uses and are good candidates for protection. Very deep lakes with exceptional water quality to support coldwater fish populations like tullibee were considered priorities by the report.

Minnesota DNR Fisheries researchers studied tullibee lakes and designated 68 lakes in Minnesota as the primary “refuge lakes” for tullibee. Tullibee refuge lakes exhibited major differences compared to non-refuge lakes in their transparency, depth, temperature, and oxygenation. We continue to focus our protection efforts of the highest quality (Teir 1) coldwater lakes that will require modest to moderate levels of land protection to achieve 75% protection levels. Protecting the habitats of coldwater"refuge" lakes along the shoreline and surrounding forest lands is essential to a sustained sport fishery.

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

Long Range Plan for Fisheries Management

Other : Regional One Watershed One Plans

### Explain how this proposal 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.

Coldwater lakes will be more resilient to threats of eutrophication and climate change if 75% of the land area within the watershed is permanently protected from development and agricultural conversion. In addition to directly protecting coldwater fish species, land protection actions through this grant help preserve a vital carbon sink through the forests, peatlands and other habitats protected. This will reduce the concentration of greenhouse gases and mitigate the effects of climate change on water resources and fish habitats.

The Minnesota Climate Action Framework’s Initiative 2.1 is to “manage forests, grasslands, and wetlands for increased carbon sequestration and storage”. Preserving forested watersheds directly mitigates the impacts of climate change in northern Minnesota, making forest and aquatic habitat more resilient. Additionally, The Nature Conservancy climate resilience data is a key element in the ranking criteria for land protection within this grant.

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

**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

### Describe how this project/program will produce and demonstrate a significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or outcomes for fish, game, and wildlife, and if not permanent outcomes, why it is important to undertake at this time:

Priority private shoreline habitat and forested parcels totaling 933 acres will be permanently protected from development and fragmentation through fee title acquisitions. Riparian forest lands under fee will maintain healthy habitat complexes for upland and aquatic species; forest cover will enhance water quality habitat for coldwater lakes. Greater public access for wildlife and outdoors-related recreation will be attained through fee title acquisition, with properties being open to public for hunting and fishing.

## Outcomes

### Programs in the northern forest region:

Forestlands are protected from development and fragmentation ~ *Shoreline habitat and forested parcels totaling 933 acres will be permanently protected from development and fragmentation through fee title acquisitions. These riparian and upland forest parcels will be monitored to ensure they maintain high-quality habitat for fish, wildlife, and aquatic species, as well as support water quality in coldwater lakes. Acquired lands will also be evaluated for their contribution to public access and recreational opportunities. Properties conveyed to government agencies will be managed according to established land management plans, ensuring long-term conservation goals are met and maintained.*

### What other dedicated funds may collaborate with or contribute to this proposal?

N/A

### 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 procured by NWLT through this Outdoor Heritage Fund 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?

NWLT is an accredited conservation organization that does not depend on Outdoor Heritage Funds to sustain or maintain our work. The majority of financial support for both NWLT must be raised on an annual basis. The work in this proposal allows NWLT to enhance and accelerate ongoing conservation efforts in North Central Minnesota. These grant funds will not substitute for or supplant other funding sources.

The fee-title acquisitions will be owned and managed by a governmental agency.

### Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Source of Funds** | **Step 1** | **Step 2** | **Step 3** |
| 2031 and in perpetuity | Managing governmental agency | Ongoing management in line with developed management plans | - | - |

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

NWLT deeply values inclusiveness, collaboration, teamwork and diversity in all of our programs, projects, and community work. We believe that enduring conservation success depends on the active involvement of people and partners whose lives and cultures are linked to the natural systems we seek to conserve. Currently, NWLT is directly including the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe in these protection efforts by engaging in regular discussions, acknowledging which lands have cultural and ecological significance, and engaging in partnership on conservation projects where possible. NWLT is focused on building relationships based on trust, listening, and mutual respect.

Going forward, we intend to build on this engagement by using diversity, equity, and inclusion as a lens in project, partner, and contractor selection. In each of our program areas, we intend 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 a more inclusive organization.

## Activity Details

### Requirements

**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

### 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?**No

**Will insecticides or fungicides (including neonicotinoid and fungicide treated seed) be used within any activities of this proposal 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 fee title acquisitions will be open to hunting and fishing.

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

State of MN

County

Local Unit of Government

Tribal

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

WMA

AMA

State Forest

County Forest

SNA

Tribal

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

**Describe the types of trails or roads and the allowable uses:**Forest access roads and trails have been developed on some of the proposed acquisitions. Depending on the management plan of the receiving agency, these roads and trails may be maintained to provide ongoing access for forestry, fisheries and wildlife management activities and public use on the properties.

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

**How will maintenance and monitoring be accomplished?**Maintenance of access roads and trails will be the responsibility of the receiving agency.

**Will new trails or roads be developed or improved as a result of the OHF acquisition?**No

**Will the land that you acquire (fee or easement) be restored or enhanced within this proposal's funding and availability?**No

**Explain how, when, and source of the R/E work:**NWLT does not anticipate that R/E funds through this grant will be needed for fee title acquisitions.

### Other OHF Appropriation Awards

**Have you received OHF dollars through LSOHC in the past?**Yes

**Are any of these past appropriations still OPEN?**Yes

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Approp Year** | **Funding Amount Received** | **Amount Spent to Date** | **Funding Remaining** | **% Spent to Date** |
| 2025 | $1,292,000 | - | - | - |
| 2024 | $2,252,000 | $192,000 | $2,060,000 | 8.53% |
| 2023 | $1,777,000 | $1,727,300 | $49,700 | 97.2% |
| 2022 | $1,853,000 | $1,790,900 | $62,100 | 96.65% |
| 2021 | $975,000 | $879,800 | $95,200 | 90.24% |
| 2020 | $883,000 | $845,900 | $37,100 | 95.8% |
| 2019 | $841,000 | $653,300 | $187,700 | 77.68% |
| 2018 | $1,005,000 | $961,000 | $44,000 | 95.62% |
| 2017 | $113,000 | $108,700 | $4,300 | 96.19% |
| 2016 | $480,000 | $322,800 | $157,200 | 67.25% |
| 2014 | $1,150,300 | $955,600 | $194,700 | 83.07% |
| Totals | $12,621,300 | $8,437,300 | $4,184,000 | 66.85% |

## Timeline

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity Name** | **Estimated Completion Date** |
| Landowner outreach for fee acquisition program. | Ongoing through June 2030 |
| Protection of 933 acres via fee acquisition; conveyance to a governmental agency. | June 2030 |

## Budget

### Totals

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Funding Request** | **Total Leverage** | **Leverage Source** | **Total** |
| Personnel | $238,000 | - | - | $238,000 |
| Contracts | $75,000 | - | - | $75,000 |
| Fee Acquisition w/ PILT | $7,000,000 | $700,000 | Landowners, Lake Associations | $7,700,000 |
| Fee Acquisition w/o PILT | - | - | - | - |
| Easement Acquisition | - | - | - | - |
| Easement Stewardship | - | - | - | - |
| Travel | $15,200 | - | - | $15,200 |
| Professional Services | $824,000 | - | - | $824,000 |
| Direct Support Services | $80,000 | - | - | $80,000 |
| DNR Land Acquisition Costs | $168,000 | - | - | $168,000 |
| Capital Equipment | - | - | - | - |
| Other Equipment/Tools | - | - | - | - |
| Supplies/Materials | $4,000 | - | - | $4,000 |
| DNR IDP | $163,500 | - | - | $163,500 |
| **Grand Total** | **$8,567,700** | **$700,000** | **-** | **$9,267,700** |

### Personnel

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Position** | **Annual FTE** | **Years Working** | **Funding Request** | **Total Leverage** | **Leverage Source** | **Total** |
| NWLT Staff | 0.75 | 4.0 | $238,000 | - | - | $238,000 |

**Amount of Request:** $8,567,700 **Amount of Leverage:** $700,000 **Leverage as a percent of the Request:** 8.17% **DSS + Personnel:** $318,000 **As a % of the total request:** 3.71% **Easement Stewardship:** - **As a % of the Easement Acquisition:** -

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Leverage (from above)** | **Amount Confirmed** | **% of Total Leverage** | **Amount Anticipated** | **% of Total Leverage** |
| $700,000 | - | 0.0% | $700,000 | 100.0% |

**Detail leverage sources and confirmation of funds:**NWLT: Works with landowners and corresponding lake associations to donate funds. We anticipate $700,000 of leverage; not confirmed. Any expenses not covered by this grant will be funded through general operating income.

**Does this proposal 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?**This proposal is true to budget and protection goals and would be most effective if funded fully. If 50% funding was received, outputs would be reduced by approximately 50-65%.

**Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?**Personnel and DSS will be reduced, but less than proportional. Some costs are fixed (landowner recruitment; grant management) and must occur regardless of grant amount. Projects can fail midstream after investment of time.

### If the project received 30% of the requested funding

**Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?**This proposal is true to budget and protection goals and would be most effective if funded fully. If 30% funding was received, outputs would be reduced by 70-80%.

**Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?**Personnel and DSS will be reduced, but less than proportional. Some costs are fixed (landowner recruitment; grant management) and must occur regardless of grant amount. Projects can fail midstream after investment of time.

### Personnel

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

**Please explain the overlap of past and future staffing and position levels previously received and how that is coordinated over multiple years?**NWLT estimates the personnel costs for fee title acquisition, outreach and grant administration activities to accomplish the specific outcomes for each grant. NWLT staff bill time to individual protection projects, ensuring allocation to the appropriate grant award. And by using a timesheet-based approach we use only those personnel funds actually expended to achieve the goals of the grant.

### Contracts

**What is included in the contracts line?**NWLT - Contracts for acquisition services; outreach services to connect with prospective landowners.

### Professional Services

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

Appraisals

Other : Environmental Assessments, Project Mapping.

Surveys

Title Insurance and Legal Fees

### Fee Acquisition

**What is the anticipated number of fee title acquisition transactions?**NWLT expects to complete 14 fee title acquisitions through this proposal.

### 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**NWLT's travel budget does not include equipment/vehicle rental.

**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 annually reviewed and approved by MNDNR Grants (most recently in April of 2024), NWLT determined their direct support services rate to include all allowable direct and necessary expenditures not captured in other line items in the budget. NWLT also provides MNDNR Grants with a copy of their financial audit as an additional validation as part of the request for DSS rate approval.

## 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | 0 | 0 | 0 | 933 | 933 |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Protect in Easement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Enhance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **933** | **933** |

### Restoration/Enhancement Acres of OHF Acquired Lands (Table 1a.1)

|  | **RESTORE** |  | **Total** | **ENHANCE** |  | **Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Lands acquired in this proposal** | **Lands acquired with previous OHF approprations (<5yrs old)** |  | **Lands acquired in this proposal** | **Lands acquired with previous OHF approprations (<5yrs old)** |  |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Total** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** |

### Restoration/Enhancement Acres Breakdown of Existing Protected Lands (Table 1a.2)

|  | **RESTORE** |  | **ENHANCE** |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Lands acquired with OHF** | **Lands NOT acquired with OHF** | **Lands acquired with OHF** | **Lands NOT acquired with OHF** |
| DNR Lands (WMA, State Forests, etc) | - | - | - | - |
| Non-DNR Lands (city, state, federal, etc.) | - | - | - | - |
| Easements | - | - | - | - |
| **Total** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Wetland** | **Prairie** | **Forest** | **Habitat** | **Total Funding** |
| Restore | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | $8,567,700 | $8,567,700 |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | - | - | - | - |
| Enhance | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Total** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **$8,567,700** | **$8,567,700** |

### Acres within each Ecological Section (Table 3)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Metro/Urban** | **Forest/Prairie** | **SE Forest** | **Prairie** | **N. Forest** | **Total Acres** |
| Restore | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 933 | 933 |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Protect in Easement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Enhance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **933** | **933** |

### 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 | - | - | - | - | $8,567,700 | $8,567,700 |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Enhance | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Total** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **$8,567,700** | **$8,567,700** |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Wetland** | **Prairie** | **Forest** | **Habitat** |
| Restore | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | $9,182 |
| 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 | - | - | - | - | $9,182 |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | - | - | - | - |
| Enhance | - | - | - | - | - |

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

1.5

## Parcels

**Sign-up Criteria?**[Yes - Sign up criteria is attached](https://lsohcprojectmgmt.leg.mn/media/lsohc/proposal/signup_criteria/71111905-f9f.pdf)

**Explain the process used to identify, prioritize, and select the parcels on your list:**Northern Waters Land Trust (NWLT) uses a combination of objective criteria and professional judgment to identify, prioritize, and select parcels for protection. A criteria-based scoring system provides a standardized framework to compare projects using consistent data, allowing proposals to be evaluated relative to each other and to a baseline. Local knowledge, program goals, timing, funding availability, organizational capacity, and other qualitative considerations also inform final selections.

NWLT solicits project proposals through a Request for Proposal (RFP) process, targeting landowners with properties on high-priority lakes. Each proposal is reviewed and scored by NWLT’s Clean Water Technical Advisory Committee, which includes conservation professionals from the DNR, counties, SWCDs, and regional NGOs. This committee brings deep, place-based knowledge to the selection process and ensures alignment with local and regional conservation priorities.

The scoring framework evaluates three main categories:

1- Ecological Integrity – Measures the current condition of the site, including parcel size, habitat quality, and surrounding landscape context.

2- Threat/Urgency – Assesses the potential risk of development or degradation if the property is not protected.

3- Cost/Value – Considers the overall conservation value relative to cost, including any donative value offered by the landowner.

By combining these factors, NWLT identifies parcels with the greatest potential for long-term ecological viability and public benefit. This process ensures that limited resources are directed toward the highest-impact conservation opportunities.

### Protect Parcels

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **County** | **TRDS** | **Acres** | **Est Cost** | **Existing Protection** |
| Cedar Lake | Aitkin | 04727231 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Long Lake | Aitkin | 04625210 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Round Lake | Aitkin | 04923225 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Bass Lake | Cass | 14026227 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Cass Lake | Cass | 14531219 | 1,000 | $3,000,000 | No |
| Cooper | Cass | 14028211 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Deep Portage | Cass | 13929207 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Girl Lake | Cass | 14128220 | 40 | $200,000 | No |
| Girl Lake | Cass | 14128233 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Long Lake | Cass | 14231233 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Long Lake | Cass | 14128223 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Thunder Lake | Cass | 14026209 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Washburn Lake | Cass | 13926209 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Whitefish Lake | Cass | 14031222 | 40 | $150,000 | No |
| Big Trout | Crow Wing | 13728223 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Big Trout | Crow Wing | 13728223 | 78 | $267,500 | No |
| Borden Lake | Crow Wing | 04428215 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Crooked Lake | Crow Wing | 04528216 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Kenny Lake | Crow Wing | 04428202 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Lower Hay Lake | Crow Wing | 13729225 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Ossawinamakee Lake | Crow Wing | 13628204 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Pelican Lake | Crow Wing | 13628227 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Roosevelt Lake | Crow Wing | 13826208 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Star Lake | Crow Wing | 13728225 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Whitefish Lake | Crow Wing | 13728207 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Big Sand Lake | Hubbard | 14134228 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Eleventh Crow Wing Lake | Hubbard | 14132215 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Kabekona Lake | Hubbard | 14332230 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Ninth Crow Wing Lake | Hubbard | 14032206 | 0 | $0 | No |
| Spearhead Lake | Hubbard | 14534223 | 0 | $0 | No |

### Protect Parcels with Buildings

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **County** | **TRDS** | **Acres** | **Est Cost** | **Existing Protection** | **Buildings** | **Value of Buildings** |
| Cedar Lake | Aitkin | 04627207 | 5 | $346,100 | No | 4 | $127,600 |
| Upper Bottle Lake | Hubbard | 14134201 | 81 | $842,000 | No | 5 | $83,320 |

## Parcel Map



