

# Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage CouncilDNR Grassland Enhancement - Phase 17ML 2026 Request for Funding

## General Information

**Date:** 06/26/2025

**Proposal Title:** DNR Grassland Enhancement - Phase 17

**Funds Requested:** $9,962,400

**Confirmed Leverage Funds:** -

**Is this proposal Scalable?:** Yes

### Manager Information

**Manager's Name:** Greg Hoch **Title:** Prairie Habitat Supervisor **Organization:** DNR **Address:** 500 Lafayette Rd  **City:** St Paul, MN 55155 **Email:** greg.hoch@state.mn.us **Office Number:** 651-259-5230 **Mobile Number:** 651-259-5230 **Fax Number:**   **Website:**

### Location Information

**County Location(s):** Jackson, Yellow Medicine, Murray, Houston, Anoka, Wabasha, Goodhue, Clay, Kittson, Polk, Cottonwood, Martin, Rice, Faribault, Le Sueur, Chippewa, Redwood, Meeker, Renville, Lincoln, Lyon, Big Stone, Swift, Lac qui Parle, Winona, Stearns, Wright, Fillmore, Olmsted, Todd, Benton, Cass, Roseau, Marshall, Otter Tail, Wilkin, Pope, Grant, Douglas, Norman and Becker.

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

Northern Forest

Forest / Prairie Transition

Prairie

Metro / Urban

Southeast Forest

**Activity types:**

Restore

Enhance

**Priority resources addressed by activity:**

Prairie

## Narrative

### Abstract

Grasslands continue to be the most threatened habitat in the state. This programmatic request will build on the DNR’s history of enhancing and restoring grasslands. The Prairie Plan and Wildlife Action Plan will guide our efforts to ensure we are operating in a strategic and targeted manner. This proposal will enhance and restore grasslands on over 22,000 acres that are permanently protected using prescribed fire, tree removal, high-diversity seedings, and similar science-based practices. Most lands enhanced with these funds are public and open to hunting.

### Design and Scope of Work

In many farmland counties less than five percent of the area is in public wildlife lands, often much less. While Minnesota does have acres enrolled in CRP as well as programs such as RIM and CREP, there is still very little grassland left in many counties of the state. Therefore, we need to make sure the remaining grasslands, especially those open to public recreation, are as diverse and productive as possible. These lands provide wildlife habitat as well as pollinator habitat and ecosystem services such as floodwater capture and groundwater recharge.

Wildlife and pollinator populations are a fraction of what they were even a couple decades ago. Water quality, especially nitrate contamination, is a human health and wildlife issue. Grasslands and embedded wetlands are also very good at sequestering and storing carbon, helping to mitigate the effects of climate change. These efforts can be an important part of the state's Climate Action Framework. Grassland and wetland restoration and enhancement, carefully guided by planning, is one of the best ways to address many of these issues.

This programmatic request seeks funding to enhance grassland habitat on permanently protected grasslands and prairies, most of which are open to public hunting. Without periodic management to simulate historic ecological disturbance patterns, grassland lose diversity and productivity. Invasive species may increase and woody vegetation will encroach into the grasslands, changing their very character and the species that inhabit the area. The activities listed in this proposal will use BMPs for grassland enhancement and diverse local ecotype seed mixes for restoration. These activities will include prescribed fire, installing grazing infrastructure, tree removal, seeding to increase plant diversity, and restoring cropland to grassland.

FAW staff include monitoring and contract management. Monitoring staff will work only on OHF funded restorations to plan restorations, monitor results, and determine what post-restoration management is most effective. They will then immediately communicate that information to DNR staff and partners to improve future restorations. This is the principle of quality control (business), continuous improvement (government), or adaptive management (wildlife). These staff will generate a number of research questions that will be passed on to academics. Monitoring tells us "what" our sites look like, while future research can tell us the "why". The PDs for these positions are attached and include the acronym "OHF" at least 18 times. Contract managers will work across all open OHF appropriations. It is much more efficient to code their time to one appropriation than several approriations. When occasionally working on non-OHF projects, they will code their time to alternative funding.

The SNA request will fund program coordinators who are responsible for overseeing appropriation budgets and reporting, as well as providing statewide and regional direction and guidance to field staff implementing OHF funded projects. Specialists and technicians are responsible for identifying, planning and implementing specific grassland enhancement projects via contracting and in-house operations. Laborers and seasonal staff provide additional on-the-ground capacity for specific enhancement projects as needed and where available

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

Grasslands and grassland wildlife continue to be the most threatened habitat and populations, both in Minnesota and across the Midwest.

According to the Wildlife Action Plan, Minnesota’s grasslands contain 4 state threatened species, 14 state endangered species, and 29 species of concern. The species on this list include 1 amphibian, 11 birds, 5 mammals, 16 moths and butterflies, 9 other invertebrates, and 5 reptiles. Waterfowl and game bird populations are still a fraction of what they were even 15-20 years ago. Grassland songbirds continue to decline from already low levels.

With few exceptions, grasslands for game species, nongame species, SGCN, and T&E species are similar. They all need habitat composed of a diversity of native grasses and forbs. Enhancements for one species will almost always benefit dozens of other species in the habitat. Many species of invertebrates and pollinators need a diversity and abundance of flowering plants. Many birds need grassland free of trees. All species need clean water. While the work proposed here will benefit game species, non-game species, SGCN, and T&E, it will also go beyond these objectives to provide numerous ecosystem services such as water filtration, floodwater retention and reduced flood damage, and create pollinator habitat to help sustain segments of the agricultural economy.

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

Without management, grassland habitat for many species of wildlife and pollinators will continue to degrade. The earlier we can address these issues, the more cost-effective the efforts are. For instance, removing a few scattered saplings early in a tree invasion is much less costly than waiting decades and removing a dense forest of large trees. The sooner we get areas restored to stands of diverse native grasses and wildflowers, the more carbon the soils will store in the long-term.

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

The projects in this proposal will be guided primarily by the Prairie Conservation Plan as well as individual wildlife species plans. First and foremost, these Plans outline focal areas (Core Areas and Habitat Complexes) where we can build on an existing base of conservation lands and improve the habitat there. The Prairie Plan identifies specific corridors and complexes that connect larger core areas. The latest science states that it isn’t the size of an individual habitat parcel that matters as much as the amount of habitat in the larger surrounding landscape. These Plans, and the work proposed here, build on these concepts of landscape level habitat planning. We will not restrict ourselves to these focal areas. There are critical habitats outside these areas. However, we will use these Plans to focus our efforts in areas where they can have the greatest wildlife benefits.

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

Minnesota Prairie Conservation Plan

Other : Pheasant Plan

### 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.

Prairie soils are famously dark, almost black. Prairie soils have a lot of carbon in them. When the prairie is broken, a lot of that carbon is lost. However, restoring grasslands using native grasses and wildflowers can significantly increase the amount of carbon taken out of the air and buried deep in the soil (Knops and Tilman 2000, Baer et al 2002, McLaughlin et al 2006, Fornara and Tilman 2008, Hernandez et al 2013, Ampleman et al 2014, Yang et al 2019). Matamala et al (2008) state that restoring prairie “has the potential to store relatively large amounts of SOC [Soil Organic Carbon]”. Research at the University of Minnesota found that using high diversity seed mixes sequesters more carbon than low diversity mixes. We've been doing this all along for pollinators and wildlife. What we were doing for pollinators is also be best practice for carbon capture.

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

**Forest / Prairie Transition**

Protect, enhance, and restore rare native remnant prairie

**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**

Restore and enhance habitat on existing protected properties, with preference to habitat for rare, endangered, or threatened species identified by the Minnesota County Biological Survey

**Prairie**

Restore or enhance habitat on public lands

**Southeast Forest**

Protect, enhance, and restore remnant goat prairies

### 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:

The work conducted under this proposal will be done on land under permanent conservation protection. However, by the very nature of habitat management, these enhancements will not be permanent. Grasslands rely on periodic ecological disturbances. To maintain the health and diversity of grasslands, they need burning, grazing, or other ecological disturbances, at least every 4 to 6 years.

With our restorations, we are leaving a lasting legacy. In recent years the use of 40-80 species seed mixes and local ecotype seed is dramatically improving the quality of our restorations for wildlife and pollinators. The diversity and structure of our newer restorations looks much better than restorations from even a few years ago.

## 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 ~ *Migratory game and non-game birds will be some of the primary beneficiaries of this work. We hope to continue to strengthen partnerships with the University of Minnesota to incorporate graduate students into research and monitoring work.*

### Programs in metropolitan urbanizing region:

Core areas protected with highly biologically diverse wetlands and plant communities, including native prairie, Big Woods, and oak savanna ~ *Monitoring will take place with the base level monitoring conducted by DNR staff and staff from other agencies/NGOs.*

### Programs in the northern forest region:

Healthy populations of endangered, threatened, and special concern species as well as more common species ~ *Monitoring will take place with the base level monitoring conducted by DNR staff and staff from other agencies/NGOs. This includes surveys such as pheasant, sharp-tailed grouse, and woodcock, which are all dependent on open areas.*

### Programs in prairie region:

Restored and enhanced upland habitats ~ *The multi-agency/NGO Grassland Monitoring Team (GMT) has developed standardized protocols for sampling grassland vegetation and a number of the sites on this request will be sampled over the 5 year period.*

### Programs in southeast forest region:

Healthier populations of endangered, threatened, and special concern species as well as more common species ~ *Monitoring will primarily be done through studies conducted by the DNR's Ecological and Water Resources Division of key indicator species such as timber rattlesnakes.*

### 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.

These funds are for additional ehance/restoration work beyond what the DNR is already conducting.

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

We select projects with these funds that strategically enhance priority habitats. We will continue management of these sites with agency staff. The OHF provides Minnesota’s conservation community with a large amount of non-Federal dollars as match that other Midwestern states don’t have. In recent years, the Minnesota prairie conservation partners have been coordinating to maximize our efforts with funding sources such as the North American Wetland Conservation Act (NAWCA) and the America the Beautiful Challenge Grants.

### Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Source of Funds** | **Step 1** | **Step 2** | **Step 3** |
| 2027 | Those listed above and OHF | Monitor subset of projects | Document results | Determine capacity for traditional funds to meet results |
| 2028 and beyond | Those listed above and OHF | Continue monitoring | adapt results to future projects | seek funding for continued monitoring |

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

The Minnesota DNR has adopted advancing diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) as a key priority in its strategic plan. The plan focuses on increasing the cultural competence of our staff, creating a workforce that is reflective of Minnesota, continuing to strengthen tribal consultation and building partnerships with diverse communities.

DNR’s OHF projects aim to serve all Minnesotans. At the same time, we are bringing more focus in all our work to BIPOC and diverse communities. OHF achieves high quality habitat that provides ecosystem services like clean water and carbon sequestration that support environmental justice. OHF also supports public access and recreational opportunities on these lands. Project scoring and implementation benefit BIPOC and diverse communities through recreational opportunities that are close-to-home, culturally responsive and accessible to Minnesotans with disabilities.

## Activity Details

### Requirements

**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

SNA

AMA

Permanently Protected Conservation Easements

State Forests

WPA

Refuge Lands

### 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:**There may be an instance of very limited rowcrop planting as part of a restoration process. But this would only be for a very short time before the site is planted to native grasses and forbs. Some of the crops may be GMO, but none of the crops should be treated with neonicotinoid seed coats per DNR guidelines and any farming will follow standard chemical use practices as outlined in DNR Operational Orders. Chemical usage on WMAs is reported and recorded by the Section of Wildlife.

**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

### 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** |
| 2024 | $1,427,000 | - | - | - |
| 2023 | $3,003,000 | $55,800 | $2,947,200 | 1.86% |
| 2022 | $3,088,000 | $135,500 | $2,952,500 | 4.39% |
| 2021 | $3,536,000 | $793,500 | $2,742,500 | 22.44% |
| Totals | $11,054,000 | $984,800 | $10,069,200 | 8.91% |

## Timeline

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity Name** | **Estimated Completion Date** |
| WMA Enhancement / Restoration - contract work | 6/30/2029 |
| SNA / NPB Enhancements / Restorations - contract work | 6/30/2029 |

## Budget

### Totals

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Funding Request** | **Total Leverage** | **Leverage Source** | **Total** |
| Personnel | $1,282,300 | - | - | $1,282,300 |
| Contracts | $7,988,000 | - | - | $7,988,000 |
| Fee Acquisition w/ PILT | - | - | - | - |
| Fee Acquisition w/o PILT | - | - | - | - |
| Easement Acquisition | - | - | - | - |
| Easement Stewardship | - | - | - | - |
| Travel | $217,000 | - | - | $217,000 |
| Professional Services | - | - | - | - |
| Direct Support Services | $225,800 | - | - | $225,800 |
| DNR Land Acquisition Costs | - | - | - | - |
| Capital Equipment | - | - | - | - |
| Other Equipment/Tools | $25,000 | - | - | $25,000 |
| Supplies/Materials | $224,300 | - | - | $224,300 |
| DNR IDP | - | - | - | - |
| **Grand Total** | **$9,962,400** | **-** | **-** | **$9,962,400** |

### Personnel

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Position** | **Annual FTE** | **Years Working** | **Funding Request** | **Total Leverage** | **Leverage Source** | **Total** |
| FAW Monitoring and Contract Admin | 3.0 | 2.0 | $844,800 | - | - | $844,800 |
| SNA Laborers and Seasonals | 2.23 | 2.0 | $437,500 | - | - | $437,500 |

**Amount of Request:** $9,962,400 **Amount of Leverage:** - **Leverage as a percent of the Request:** 0.0% **DSS + Personnel:** $1,508,100 **As a % of the total request:** 15.14% **Easement Stewardship:** - **As a % of the Easement Acquisition:** -

**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 composed of numerous projects. If we receive less than we request, we can scale back the number of projects and acres accordingly.

**Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?**Personnel work across OHF appropriations as described in the narrative. We would not be able to scale this part of our budget.

### 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 composed of numerous projects. If we receive less than we request, we can scale back the number of projects and acres accordingly.

**Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?**Personnel work across OHF appropriations as described in the narrative. We would not be able to scale this part of our budget.

### 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?**While we are funding FAW positions off this appropriation, they will work across existing open appropriations, but always on OHF funded projects. This creates efficiency for the DNR because they only code time to one appropriation. Coding time to each appropriation would be time-consuming and inefficient.

The SNA program funds coordinators who are responsible for overseeing OHF projects, budgets, and statewide coordination and guidance on OHF projects.

Neither set of staff are scalable as we are asking for the minumum required to complete the work on the staff budget line.

### Contracts

**What is included in the contracts line?**This line includes contracts for restoration and enhancement work that the DNR or Roving Crews don't have the specialized equipment or staff to conduct. Contracts increase our capacity to impact acres beyond what staff alone are capable of. They also stimulate local economies.

### 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**There could be some rental for specialized equipment on a specific project, but if so it would be a relatively small part of the travel budget.

**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?**We used the DNR's Direct and Necessary (D&N) calculator that was created for LSOHC/OHF and LCCMR/ENRTF proposals.

### Other Equipment/Tools

**Give examples of the types of Equipment and Tools that will be purchased?**This would be primarily fire equipment such as drip torches, backpack water pumps, etc.

## 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?**These funds will be matched with Pittman-Robertson, which is part of the DNR's annual funding cycle.

## Output Tables

### Acres by Resource Type (Table 1)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Wetland** | **Prairie** | **Forest** | **Habitat** | **Total Acres** |
| Restore | 0 | 306 | 0 | 0 | 306 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Protect in Easement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Enhance | 0 | 21,929 | 0 | 0 | 21,929 |
| **Total** | **0** | **22,235** | **0** | **0** | **22,235** |

### 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) | 9 | 297 | 658 | 21,271 |
| Non-DNR Lands (city, state, federal, etc.) | - | - | - | - |
| Easements | - | - | - | - |
| **Total** | **9** | **297** | **658** | **21,271** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Native Prairie (acres)** |
| Restore | 0 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | 0 |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | 0 |
| Protect in Easement | 0 |
| Enhance | 1,000 |
| **Total** | **1,000** |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Wetland** | **Prairie** | **Forest** | **Habitat** | **Total Funding** |
| Restore | - | $137,100 | - | - | $137,100 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | - | - | - | - |
| Enhance | - | $9,825,300 | - | - | $9,825,300 |
| **Total** | **-** | **$9,962,400** | **-** | **-** | **$9,962,400** |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Metro/Urban** | **Forest/Prairie** | **SE Forest** | **Prairie** | **N. Forest** | **Total Acres** |
| Restore | 0 | 0 | 5 | 301 | 0 | 306 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Protect in Easement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Enhance | 381 | 2,040 | 923 | 18,375 | 210 | 21,929 |
| **Total** | **381** | **2,040** | **928** | **18,676** | **210** | **22,235** |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Metro/Urban** | **Forest/Prairie** | **SE Forest** | **Prairie** | **N. Forest** | **Total Funding** |
| Restore | - | - | $2,200 | $134,900 | - | $137,100 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Enhance | $170,700 | $914,000 | $413,600 | $8,232,900 | $94,100 | $9,825,300 |
| **Total** | **$170,700** | **$914,000** | **$415,800** | **$8,367,800** | **$94,100** | **$9,962,400** |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Wetland** | **Prairie** | **Forest** | **Habitat** |
| Restore | - | $448 | - | - |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | - | - | - |
| Enhance | - | $448 | - | - |

### Average Cost per Acre by Ecological Section (Table 6)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Metro/Urban** | **Forest/Prairie** | **SE Forest** | **Prairie** | **N. Forest** |
| Restore | - | - | $440 | $448 | - |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | - | - | - | - |
| Enhance | $448 | $448 | $448 | $448 | $448 |

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

## Parcels

**Sign-up Criteria?**No

**Explain the process used to identify, prioritize, and select the parcels on your list:**Parcels are identified by Area Wildlife Managers and approved by Regional Managers. Priorities are set by the Plans identified earlier in this proposal.

### Restore / Enhance Parcels

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **County** | **TRDS** | **Acres** | **Est Cost** | **Existing Protection** | **Description** |
| Metro SNAs | Anoka | 03123226 | 80 | $52,000 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Metro SNAs | Anoka | 03123226 | 40 | $26,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Agassiz-Olson WMA | Becker | 13939208 | 450 | $67,500 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Clay County WMA | Becker | 13845222 | 300 | $90,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Burleene WMA | Benton | 12733209 | 300 | $105,000 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Glendorado WMA | Benton | 13132225 | 200 | $70,000 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| 25th Anniversary WMA | Big Stone | 11645221 | 1,151 | $120,000 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Bail Out WMA | Big Stone | 11643222 | 1,379 | $206,850 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Danvers WMA | Big Stone | 11743234 | 360 | $450,000 | Yes | Interseeding |
| Lac qui Parle WMA | Big Stone | 11841206 | 272 | $200,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Lac qui Parle WMA: Main Unit | Big Stone | 11943224 | 150 | $60,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Big Rice WMA: Access Unit | Cass | 14126225 | 10 | $32,800 | Yes | Interseeding |
| Acton WMA | Chippewa | 11639205 | 1,000 | $150,000 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Benderberg WMA: North Unit | Chippewa | 11840205 | 547 | $225,000 | Yes | Conservation Grazing |
| Cuka WMA | Chippewa | 11639205 | 100 | $500,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Lac qui Parle WMA | Chippewa | 11942236 | 32 | $50,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Lac qui Parle WMA | Chippewa | 11942234 | 5 | $15,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Lac qui Parle WMA: Main Unit | Chippewa | 11943203 | 190 | $100,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Lac qui Parle WMA: Main Unit | Chippewa | 11943224 | 100 | $100,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Northwest SNAs | Clay | 14245220 | 5 | $25,000 | Yes | Restoration |
| Bennett WMA | Cottonwood | 10129206 | 750 | $112,500 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Caron WMA | Cottonwood | 10332229 | 99 | $125,000 | Yes | Interseeding |
| Alberta WMA | Douglas | 12343203 | 45 | $225,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Anton Velishek Memorial WMA | Faribault | 10224211 | 790 | $50,000 | Yes | Conservation Grazing |
| Charlotte Hynes WMA | Faribault | 10327204 | 163 | $100,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Beaver Creek WMA | Fillmore | 10113228 | 46 | $69,000 | Yes | Interseeding |
| Beaver Creek WMA | Fillmore | 10113221 | 137 | $174,200 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Buck Family Memorial WMA | Fillmore | 10112204 | 500 | $190,000 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Rush Creek Woods WMA | Fillmore | 10212216 | 60 | $132,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Haverhill WMA | Goodhue | 10515204 | 74 | $101,500 | Yes | Restoration |
| Southeast SNAs | Goodhue | 11316225 | 5 | $25,000 | Yes | Restoration |
| Alberta WMA: North Unit | Grant | 12443233 | 100 | $40,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Southeast NPBs | Houston | 10304226 | 20 | $13,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Southeast NPBs | Houston | 10304226 | 20 | $13,000 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Southwest NPBs | Jackson | 10134227 | 5 | $25,000 | Yes | Restoration |
| Caribou WMA | Kittson | 16345233 | 40 | $60,000 | Yes | Interseeding |
| Northwest NPBs | Kittson | 16345202 | 250 | $87,100 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Northwest NPBs | Kittson | 16345202 | 150 | $100,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Haydenville WMA: Main Unit | Lac qui Parle | 11845233 | 116 | $98,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Haydenville WMA: Supplement Unit | Lac qui Parle | 11845221 | 4 | $25,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Bob Gehlen WMA | Le Sueur | 11026211 | 61 | $70,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Anderson Lake WMA | Lincoln | 11145206 | 500 | $75,000 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Archerville WMA | Lincoln | 11345206 | 184 | $100,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Chain-O-Sloughs WMA | Lincoln | 11140235 | 217 | $217,000 | Yes | Restoration |
| Discors WMA | Lincoln | 10944205 | 140 | $30,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Hopeful WMA | Lincoln | 10944212 | 590 | $90,660 | Yes | Conservation Grazing |
| Rost WMA | Lincoln | 11244232 | 58 | $30,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Brawner Lake WMA | Lyon | 11042217 | 138 | $50,000 | Yes | Conservation Grazing |
| Clifton WMA | Lyon | 11140206 | 729 | $160,000 | Yes | Conservation Grazing |
| Meadow Creek WMA | Lyon | 11141236 | 100 | $110,000 | Yes | Interseeding |
| Prairie Marshes WMA | Lyon | 11043201 | 452 | $155,000 | Yes | Conservation Grazing |
| Sioux Prairie WMA | Lyon | 11143207 | 500 | $75,000 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Red River of the North WMA | Marshall | 15750215 | 200 | $300,000 | Yes | Interseeding |
| Center Creek WMA | Martin | 10129206 | 229 | $114,500 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Kingston WMA | Meeker | 12129228 | 185 | $40,000 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Southwest NPBs | Murray | 10543205 | 250 | $87,100 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Southwest NPBs | Murray | 10543210 | 250 | $87,100 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Twin Valley WMA: North Unit | Norman | 14344230 | 120 | $118,000 | Yes | Interseeding |
| Whitewater WMA: Callahan Unit | Olmsted | 10610201 | 200 | $253,500 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Fergus Falls WMA | Otter Tail | 13343222 | 206 | $272,950 | Yes | Interseeding |
| Fergus Falls WMA | Otter Tail | 13343222 | 368 | $237,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Dugdale WMA | Polk | 14745209 | 600 | $150,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Northwest SNAs | Polk | 14844230 | 250 | $87,100 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Northwest SNAs | Polk | 14844230 | 22 | $87,100 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Cin WMA | Pope | 12336206 | 1,000 | $150,000 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Cin WMA | Pope | 12336206 | 1,000 | $125,000 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Lowry WMA: North East Unit | Pope | 12639223 | 25 | $40,000 | Yes | Interseeding |
| Cedar Rock WMA: North West Unit | Redwood | 11336204 | 108 | $160,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Cedar Rock WMA: South East Unit | Redwood | 11336210 | 156 | $234,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Klabunde WMA | Redwood | 11335230 | 33 | $45,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Whispering Ridge AMA | Redwood | 11436232 | 144 | $200,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Cold Springs WMA | Renville | 11336211 | 126 | $175,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Granite Prairie WMA | Renville | 11335218 | 53 | $106,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Whispering Ridge WMA | Renville | 11436229 | 12 | $36,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Boyd Sartell WMA: Main Unit | Rice | 11119225 | 650 | $84,480 | Yes | Conservation Grazing |
| Roseau River WMA | Roseau | 16343217 | 100 | $50,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Roseau River WMA | Roseau | 16343217 | 150 | $45,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Milton Kjeldahl WMA | Stearns | 12435226 | 198 | $40,000 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Norman T. Dahlman WMA | Stearns | 12335226 | 30 | $36,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| North Fork WMA | Stearns | 12232203 | 43 | $53,750 | Yes | Interseeding |
| Lac qui Parle WMA: Main Unit | Swift | 12043229 | 116 | $58,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Quistorff WMA | Todd | 12735221 | 100 | $35,000 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Mc Carthy Lake WMA | Wabasha | 10909218 | 31 | $156,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Southeast SNAs | Wabasha | 10909230 | 40 | $26,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Southeast SNAs | Wabasha | 10909230 | 80 | $60,000 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Akron WMA | Wilkin | 13445222 | 20 | $30,000 | Yes | Interseeding |
| Whitewater WMA: Main Branch Unit | Winona | 10810226 | 167 | $207,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Whitewater WMA: Main Branch Unit | Winona | 10810226 | 55 | $99,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Whitewater WMA: Main Branch Unit | Winona | 10810226 | 75 | $95,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Whitewater WMA: North Branch Unit | Winona | 10710208 | 100 | $227,000 | Yes | Interseeding |
| Whitewater WMA: South Branch Unit | Winona | 10710225 | 75 | $60,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Grass Lake WMA: Main Unit | Wright | 11828213 | 76 | $22,800 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Southwest SNAs | Yellow Medicine | 11438212 | 270 | $175,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
| Southwest SNAs | Yellow Medicine | 11438212 | 250 | $87,100 | Yes | Contract Rx Burn |
| Stoney Run WMA | Yellow Medicine | 11641230 | 130 | $93,000 | Yes | Woody Removal |
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