

# Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands - Phase IX ML 2026 Request for Funding

## General Information

**Date:** 06/26/2025

**Proposal Title:** Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands - Phase IX

**Funds Requested:** $7,168,900

**Confirmed Leverage Funds:** -

**Is this proposal Scalable?:** Yes

### Manager Information

**Manager's Name:** Sabin Adams **Title:** MN State Coordinator **Organization:** Pheasants Forever **Address:** 1783 Buerkle Circle  **City:** St. Paul, MN 55110 **Email:** sadams@pheasantsforever.org **Office Number:** 320-250-6317 **Mobile Number:** 3202506317 **Fax Number:**   **Website:** www.pheasantsforever.org

### Location Information

**County Location(s):** Lincoln, Kandiyohi, Big Stone, Meeker, Renville, Rock, Lyon, Yellow Medicine, Pope, Carver, Swift, Lac qui Parle, Chippewa, Stevens, Faribault, Murray, Nobles, Wright, Jackson, Mower, Douglas, Martin, Freeborn and Cottonwood.

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

Forest / Prairie Transition

Metro / Urban

Prairie

**Activity types:**

Enhance

Restore

**Priority resources addressed by activity:**

Prairie

Wetlands

## Narrative

### Abstract

In this phase of the Enhanced Public Lands - Grassland program, Pheasants Forever (PF) will enhance or restore 6,000 acres of upland and wetland habitat. The goal of this program is to improve habitat on existing WMAs, WPAs, SNAs, and National Wildlife Refuges (NWRs) that are open to public hunting. PF does this by working with agency partners to develop restoration and enhancement plans and hiring local, private contractors to complete work. Examples of habitat improvements include restoring wetlands, removing invasive trees, conducting conservation grazing, and seeding grasslands with high-diversity native seed mixes.

### Design and Scope of Work

Grassland-wetland ecosystems require regular disturbance to preserve their functionality and quality to positively impact fish, wildlife, and the public. Lack of disturbance on native and restored prairies has resulted in degraded habitats characterized by low plant diversity, presence of non-native or invasive species, and the spread of voluntary trees into open prairie. Wetlands embedded in these grasslands require restoration to achieve their fullest functionality, or have structures that need repair. The Minnesota Prairie Conservation Plan (MPCP) identifies restoration and enhancement as two strategies to combat these issues. In accordance with this plan, Pheasants Forever has created the Enhanced Public Lands - Grasslands program to restore and enhance grassland and wetland habitats on existing WMAs, WPAs, and NWRs (many of which were purchased in sub-optimal conditions) in the prairie, forest/prairie transition, and metro regions. Pheasants Forever will utilize a previously developed Request for Proposals (RFP) and process to evaluate projects submitted by agency partners. Restoration and enhancement activities include the following:  
1) Wetland restoration/enhancement: Tools used to accomplish this include removing drain tile, constructing/repairing earthen dams and/or water control structures, removing sediment and invasive narrow leaf cattail control. Wetlands targeted for enhancement are vital to providing food, cover, and the space required for breeding waterfowl while being essential to and landscape resiliency in the face of climate change.  
2) Upland Enhancement: We will use a site-specific combination of techniques (e.g. cultivation, tree removal, herbicide, and prescribed fire) to bring back productivity to these public lands. In close collaboration with the land managers, we will seed a diverse mix of native grasses and forbs that are well adapted to site conditions and are ideal for upland nesting bird production and success of pollinator species. Mowing will be used as needed to manage annual weed pressure to ensure establishment.   
3) Prescribed burning: This is the primary tool for managing grassland habitat as it is cost effective, increases vigor by removing built up litter, and sets back invasive woody species.  
4) Conservation Grazing: This is an important enhancement tool for sites that are difficult to conduct prescribed fires or need to target specific enhancement needs (e.g. cool season grass suppression, tree invasion, etc.). Permanent infrastructure with a lifespan of 30+ years will be installed to conduct conservation grazing plans written to benefit wildlife.   
5) Tree Removal: Research has shown that invasive trees are detrimental to prairie/grassland wildlife and thus will be removed with this proposal. These trees reduce nesting success by providing perches for aerial predators, dens for mammalian predators, and increases predator efficiency by creating habitat edges and fragmenting habitat. Predators are highly effective at predating both nests and nesting birds, especially in fragmented low quality habitat.  
  
Restoring or enhancing habitat to its highest function in these areas will not only greatly benefit fish and wildlife populations, but also reduce future management costs (by creating robust, better self-regulating ecosystems), and improve the enjoyment of the area by the public.

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

In line with the goals of the MPCP, this program directly addresses the loss of quality habitat on reconstructed and native prairies through restoration and enhancement best practices. By increasing the quality of existing remnant and reconstructed prairie habitat we benefit numerous species that are of special concern, threatened, or endangered. This proposal targets grassland species, including but not limited to, greater prairie chickens, ring-necked pheasants, monarch butterflies, honey bees and Dakota skippers.

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

Without frequent disturbance grasslands naturally degrade over time. This phenomenon is termed grassland succession. As grassland succession progresses, the cost to correct it increases . This program allows PF to consistently enhance public lands at maximum capacity for the benefit of wildlife and the public.

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

This proposal improves habitat within corridors and complexes which increases their usability by wildlife. For instance, large expanses of low-quality habitat provide little value to wildlife species who are not generalist, effectively reducing the size of the complex. Enhancing and restoring habitat within these complexes increases the usable area for a greater number of species. A characteristic of low-quality habitat is an increase in habitat edges, which is a type of habitat fragmentation. Rows of trees, and drastic changes in vegetative cover (e.g. visible transition from a stand of smooth brome to Kentucky bluegrass) create edges for predators to navigate and increases their efficiency when hunting. By removing trees and restoring grasslands to high-diversity mixes of grasses and forbs, we reduce the amount of habitat fragmentation within the greater complex.

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

Long Range Plan for the Ring-Necked Pheasant in MN

Minnesota Prairie Conservation 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.

Healthy ecosystems with diverse native plant communities and fully functional hydrologic systems are more resilient to the changing climate. They do a better job of warding off invasive species by filling all available niches, or "free spots," where invasive may create a foothold. Native vegetative communities also provide the best habitat for native wildlife. This is especially important for species with specific habitat requirements or species that are endemic to a particular region. Many of the sites restored or enhanced under this program are home to these sensitive species and help buffer the effect of climate change on wildlife populations. Restored or enhanced wetlands optimize groundwater recharge, nitrogen and carbon cycling, and constantly provide water for local game, fish, and wildlife species. By restoring, and enhancing targeted tracts we're creating habitats that are both resilient to climate change and require less maintenance due to their self-regulating nature.

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

**Forest / Prairie Transition**

Protect, enhance, and restore migratory habitat for waterfowl and related species, so as to increase migratory and breeding success

**Metro / Urban**

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

**Prairie**

Restore or enhance habitat on public lands

### 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:

Enhancements and restorations completed under this program significantly increase the quality of habitat for game birds and other wildlife on public lands in the prairie, forest/prairie transition, and metro regions. Many of the properties were purchased in sub-optimal condition with limited funds, preventing restoration efforts that would have resulted in fully functional ecosystems. This program sets these properties on a trajectory to provide high quality habitat for wildlife and improve enjoyment for all public land users.

## Outcomes

### Programs in forest-prairie transition region:

Increased waterfowl and upland bird migratory and breeding success ~ *Outcomes will be measured by resource professionals and evaluated by using the best science available to land managers.*

### Programs in metropolitan urbanizing region:

Other ~ *Outcomes will be measured by resource professionals and evaluated by using the best science available to land managers.*

### Programs in prairie region:

Improved condition of habitat on public lands ~ *Outcomes will be measured by resource professionals and evaluated by using the best science available to land managers.*

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

Clean Water Fund

### Per MS 97A.056, Subd. 24, Please explain whether the request is supplanting or is a substitution for any previous funding that was not from a legacy fund and was used for the same purpose.

This proposal supplements past investments and is focused on accelerating the protection and restoration of strategically selected parcels.

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

The enhancements completed under this phase will generally allow the unit to be managed more effectively by either the USFWS or MNDNR. Limited station/area funds, constant pressure from invasive species (i.e. grasses, forbs, and trees), water quality decline, aging grasslands, climate change and other factors increase the difficulty of maintaining these enhancements; therefore, we expect continued opportunity to supplement local agency efforts. While it's difficult for a third party like PF to provide an analysis of future costs on existing public land, according to the Long‐Range Budget Analysis of Land Management Needs, the cost of long-term management ranges from $11-16/acre annually. We expect the average need to be the same for the parcels enhanced or restored under this program.

### Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Source of Funds** | **Step 1** | **Step 2** | **Step 3** |
| Post Project Completion - WMA | MN DNR - Game and Fish Funds | Monitoring | Maintience | - |
| Post Project Completion - WPA | USFWS - Federal | Monitoring | Maintience | - |
| Post Project Completion - NWR | USFWS - Federal | Monitoring | Maintience | - |

### 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 goal of this program is to enhance and restore wildlife habitat on public lands open to all Minnesotans, regardless of cultural background or fiscal standing. WPAs, WMAs, and NRWs eligible for this program are free and open to access by all. This program spans all of the Prairie, Forest-Prairie, and Metro regions. Some acquisitions will be nearby areas with diverse or low-income communities. This program engages with everyone who wants to participate in public lands and the outdoors.

## 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

WPA

Refuge Lands

SNA

### 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

### 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 | $3,519,000 | - | - | - |
| 2024 | $1,902,000 | $526 | $1,901,474 | 0.03% |
| 2023 | $2,772,000 | $1,452,809 | $1,319,191 | 52.41% |
| Totals | $8,193,000 | $1,453,335 | $6,739,665 | 17.74% |

## Timeline

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity Name** | **Estimated Completion Date** |
| Distribute project Request for Proposals (RFP) to area land managers | 9/1/2026 |
| Review project RFP's with project selection committee | 11/30/2026 |
| Select projects for completion and hire contractors to complete habitat work | 1/31/2027 |
| Enhancement/restoration work begins | 5/31/2027 |
| Re-evaluate project status/budget and solicit additional projects as needed | 12/31/2027 |
| Complete all enhancement/restoration work | 9/1/2031 |

## Budget

### Totals

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Funding Request** | **Total Leverage** | **Leverage Source** | **Total** |
| Personnel | $325,000 | - | - | $325,000 |
| Contracts | $6,000,000 | $100,000 | PF/State/Federal | $6,100,000 |
| Fee Acquisition w/ PILT | - | - | - | - |
| Fee Acquisition w/o PILT | - | - | - | - |
| Easement Acquisition | - | - | - | - |
| Easement Stewardship | - | - | - | - |
| Travel | $30,000 | - | - | $30,000 |
| Professional Services | - | - | - | - |
| Direct Support Services | $173,900 | $25,000 | PF | $198,900 |
| DNR Land Acquisition Costs | - | - | - | - |
| Capital Equipment | - | - | - | - |
| Other Equipment/Tools | - | - | - | - |
| Supplies/Materials | $600,000 | - | - | $600,000 |
| DNR IDP | $40,000 | - | - | $40,000 |
| **Grand Total** | **$7,168,900** | **$125,000** | **-** | **$7,293,900** |

### Personnel

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Position** | **Annual FTE** | **Years Working** | **Funding Request** | **Total Leverage** | **Leverage Source** | **Total** |
| PF Field Staff | 0.87 | 5.0 | $292,500 | - | - | $292,500 |
| PF Grant Staff | 0.1 | 5.0 | $32,500 | - | - | $32,500 |

**Amount of Request:** $7,168,900 **Amount of Leverage:** $125,000 **Leverage as a percent of the Request:** 1.74% **DSS + Personnel:** $498,900 **As a % of the total request:** 6.96% **Easement Stewardship:** - **As a % of the Easement Acquisition:** -

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Leverage (from above)** | **Amount Confirmed** | **% of Total Leverage** | **Amount Anticipated** | **% of Total Leverage** |
| $125,000 | - | 0.0% | $125,000 | 100.0% |

**Detail leverage sources and confirmation of funds:**Leverage is expected from multiple sources including but not limited to federal sources, land value donations, contractor donations and PF. Not every source is 100% confirmed at this point. However, PF has an exemplary track record of delivery and over-achievement of match commitments that further stretch OHF funding.

**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's budget at 100% of the request is based on the average acres that are enhanced and restored per appropriation. If this project is reduced by 50% we would scale down all acres/activities and dollars amounts proportionately.

**Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?**Personnel and DSS will be scaled down proportionately.

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

**Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?**If this project is reduced by 70% we would scale down all acres/activities and dollars amounts proportionately.

**Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?**Personnel and DSS will be scaled down proportionately.

### 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?**In general PF staffing is existing and only partially funded by OHF and specifically this request. Billing to any appropriation would only be for time spent on direct and necessary costs incurred as outlined in an Accomplishment Plan.

### Contracts

**What is included in the contracts line?**We anticipate that all of the contract funding will be used for restoration and enhancement activities.

### Travel

**Does the amount in the travel line include equipment/vehicle rental?**No

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

**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?**PF utilizes the Total Modified Direct Cost method. This methodology is annually approved by the U.S. Department of Interior’s National Business Center as the basis for the organization’s Indirect Cost Rate Agreement. PF’s allowable direct support services cost is 15%. In this proposal, PF has discounted its rate to 2.5% of the sum of personnel, contracts, professional services, and travel. We are donating the difference-in-kind.

## 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?**7/1/2029

## Output Tables

### Acres by Resource Type (Table 1)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Wetland** | **Prairie** | **Forest** | **Habitat** | **Total Acres** |
| Restore | 600 | - | 0 | 0 | 600 |
| 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 | - | 5,400 | 0 | 0 | 5,400 |
| **Total** | **600** | **5,400** | **0** | **0** | **6,000** |

### 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) | - | 300 | - | 2,700 |
| Non-DNR Lands (city, state, federal, etc.) | - | 300 | - | 2,700 |
| Easements | - | - | - | - |
| **Total** | **-** | **600** | **-** | **5,400** |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Wetland** | **Prairie** | **Forest** | **Habitat** | **Total Funding** |
| Restore | $716,900 | - | - | - | $716,900 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | - | - | - | - |
| Enhance | - | $6,452,000 | - | - | $6,452,000 |
| **Total** | **$716,900** | **$6,452,000** | **-** | **-** | **$7,168,900** |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Metro/Urban** | **Forest/Prairie** | **SE Forest** | **Prairie** | **N. Forest** | **Total Acres** |
| Restore | 60 | 180 | 0 | 360 | 0 | 600 |
| 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 | 540 | 1,620 | 0 | 3,240 | 0 | 5,400 |
| **Total** | **600** | **1,800** | **0** | **3,600** | **0** | **6,000** |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Metro/Urban** | **Forest/Prairie** | **SE Forest** | **Prairie** | **N. Forest** | **Total Funding** |
| Restore | $71,700 | $215,100 | - | $430,100 | - | $716,900 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Enhance | $645,200 | $1,935,600 | - | $3,871,200 | - | $6,452,000 |
| **Total** | **$716,900** | **$2,150,700** | **-** | **$4,301,300** | **-** | **$7,168,900** |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Wetland** | **Prairie** | **Forest** | **Habitat** |
| Restore | $1,194 | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | - | - | - |
| Enhance | - | $1,194 | - | - |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Metro/Urban** | **Forest/Prairie** | **SE Forest** | **Prairie** | **N. Forest** |
| Restore | $1,195 | $1,195 | - | $1,194 | - |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | - | - | - | - |
| Enhance | $1,194 | $1,194 | - | $1,194 | - |

### 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:**Requests for proposals will be sent to MN public land managers and PF chapters within the prairie, prairie/forest transition, and metro regions. PF evaluates projects based on proximity to and size habitat complex, benefit to T/E and SGCN, and alignment with existing conservation plans. Projects will be accepted until all funds have been spent.

### Restore / Enhance Parcels

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **County** | **TRDS** | **Acres** | **Est Cost** | **Existing Protection** | **Description** |
| Big Stone WMA | Big Stone | 12246218 | 40 | $32,410 | Yes | Wetland, , |
| Karsky WPA | Big Stone | 12346207 | 68 | $17,550 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Kufrin WPA (Central) | Big Stone | 12245221 | 110 | $17,500 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Rapids Lake North NWR | Carver | 11523230 | 300 | $9,000 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Lundgren WPA | Chippewa | 11942209 | 221 | $12,300 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Clear Lake WPA | Cottonwood | 10538235 | 11 | $37,875 | Yes | Conservation Grazing |
| Swan Lake WPA | Cottonwood | 10636212 | 149 | $29,175 | Yes | Conservation Grazing |
| Sabolik WPA | Douglas | 12740225 | 16 | $60,000 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Thompson WPA | Douglas | 12740225 | 17 | $80,000 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Rice Lake WMA | Faribault | 10427231 | 95 | $55,000 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Goose Creek WPA | Freeborn | 10122213 | 195 | $117,500 | Yes | Diversity Seeding, , |
| Mansfield WMA | Freeborn | 10123205 | 76 | $80,000 | Yes | Diversity Seeding, , |
| Christiania WPA | Jackson | 10435209 | 40 | $52,500 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Mamre WMA | Kandiyohi | 12036227 | 95 | $1,999 | Yes | Wetland, , |
| Hastad WPA (North-W1/2W1/2) | Lac qui Parle | 11943205 | 230 | $29,900 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Lac Qui Parle WMA- Louisburg | Lac qui Parle | 12044222 | 77 | $47,000 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Taylor WPA | Lac qui Parle | 11646204 | 77 | $6,545 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Archerville WMA | Lincoln | 11345206 | 184 | $220,800 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Collinson WMA | Lincoln | 11045217 | 225 | $76,000 | Yes | Tree Removal, Prescribed Fire, |
| Gislason Unit (Northern Tallgrass Prairie NWR) | Lincoln | 11144202 | 111 | $88,200 | Yes | Conservation Grazing, Tree Removal, |
| Kragh Farms WPA | Lincoln | 11146228 | 202 | $60,000 | Yes | Wetland, , |
| MinnKota WMA | Lincoln | 11346206 | 80 | $30,487 | Yes | Fencing, , |
| Rook WPA | Lincoln | 11345227 | 162 | $45,000 | Yes | Conservation Grazing, Tree Removal, |
| Redwood River WPA | Lyon | 11240215 | 50 | $25,650 | Yes | Upland Restoration, Tree Removal, |
| Yellow Medicine WPA | Lyon | 11143208 | 155 | $47,000 | Yes | Conservation Grazing, Tree Removal, |
| Center Creek WMA | Martin | 10329220 | 11 | $27,000 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Clear Lake WPA | Meeker | 12130210 | 8 | $80,000 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Kingston WMA | Meeker | 12129228 | 230 | $100,000 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Tyrone Flats WPA | Meeker | 12131223 | 40 | $32,000 | Yes | Upland Restoration, Tree Removal, Seed Purchase |
| Schamber WPA | Mower | 10318217 | 30 | $85,000 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Big Slough WPA | Murray | 10641225 | 116 | $40,250 | Yes | Conservation Grazing |
| Pell Creek NWR | Murray | 10839212 | 73 | $25,000 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| John Erickson WMA | Nobles | 10140214 | 65 | $103,200 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Lake Bella WMA | Nobles | 10440215 | 31 | $19,200 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Lone Tree WMA | Nobles | 10135231 | 16 | $130,800 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Benson Lake WPA | Pope | 12339213 | 28 | $9,800 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Berg WPA | Pope | 12439235 | 29 | $10,150 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Cramlet NTGP | Pope | 12339234 | 6 | $1,020 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Froland WPA | Pope | 12439202 | 23 | $6,000 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Gust Prairie NTGP (South) | Pope | 12640232 | 42 | $7,725 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Heidebrink WPA | Pope | 12338224 | 370 | $750 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Hoffman (NTGP) | Pope | 12339235 | 136 | $6,650 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Lake Johanna WPA | Pope | 12336204 | 92 | $7,820 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| McIver WPA | Pope | 12639219 | 23 | $4,935 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Nelson Lake WPA | Pope | 12337203 | 77 | $9,900 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Ouren WPA | Pope | 12437232 | 25 | $3,300 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Rustad WPA | Pope | 12340224 | 69 | $35,249 | Yes | Conservation Grazing, Tree Removal, |
| Stenerson Lake WPA | Pope | 12438210 | 242 | $9,750 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Walden WPA | Pope | 12440217 | 59 | $3,540 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Cream City WPA | Renville | 11633214 | 22 | $172,000 | Yes | Upland Restoration, Tree Removal, Seed Purchase |
| Bartels NWR | Rock | 10446220 | 58 | $23,312 | Yes | Conservation Grazing |
| Touch the Sky Prairie NWR | Rock | 10345208 | 187 | $42,425 | Yes | Conservation Grazing |
| Touch the Sky Prairie NWR1 | Rock | 10345207 | 125 | $126,825 | Yes | Upland Restoration, Tree Removal, |
| Edwards WPA North | Stevens | 12441209 | 35 | $3,300 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Kill WPA | Stevens | 12643215 | 105 | $500 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Pepperton WPA (North) W1/2 | Stevens | 12543215 | 79 | $5,750 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Pomme de Terre River WPA | Stevens | 12641217 | 77 | $29,106 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Welfare WPA | Stevens | 12542213 | 55 | $11,000 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Big Slough WPA (East) | Swift | 12238210 | 74 | $4,440 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Big Slough WPA (West) | Swift | 12237203 | 7 | $420 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Fahl WPA | Swift | 12238206 | 103 | $2,400 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Lac Qui Parle WMA- Szabo | Swift | 12043220 | 300 | $60,250 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Loen WPA (NW) | Swift | 12238207 | 65 | $27,945 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Monson Lake WPA | Swift | 12137202 | 110 | $11,227 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Roderick WPA | Swift | 12137203 | 42 | $9,360 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Spring Lake WPA | Swift | 12243204 | 115 | $10,925 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Pelican Lake WPA | Wright | 12124230 | 55 | $103,500 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Temperance WPA | Wright | 11928209 | 58 | $56,250 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |
| Dakota WPA | Yellow Medicine | 11446204 | 35 | $65,000 | Yes | Tree Removal, Conservation Grazing, |
| Stony Run WMA | Yellow Medicine | 11641232 | 80 | $36,000 | Yes | Tree Removal, , |

## Parcel Map



