

# Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage CouncilWetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase 11ML 2026 Request for Funding

## General Information

**Date:** 06/26/2025

**Proposal Title:** Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase 11

**Funds Requested:** $14,336,000

**Confirmed Leverage Funds:** $180,000

**Is this proposal Scalable?:** Yes

### Manager Information

**Manager's Name:** Wayne Ostlie **Title:** Director of Land Protection **Organization:** Minnesota Land Trust **Address:** 2356 University Avenue W Suite 240 **City:** St. Paul, MN 55114 **Email:** wostlie@mnland.org **Office Number:** 651-917-6292 **Mobile Number:** 651-894-3870 **Fax Number:**   **Website:** www.mnland.org

### Location Information

**County Location(s):** Becker, Otter Tail, Pipestone, Kandiyohi, Murray, Nobles, Brown, Martin, Freeborn, Redwood, Big Stone, Stevens, Pope, Swift, Douglas and Wadena.

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

Forest / Prairie Transition

Prairie

Northern Forest

**Activity types:**

Protect in Easement

Restore

Enhance

**Priority resources addressed by activity:**

Wetlands

Prairie

Forest

Habitat

## Narrative

### Abstract

Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase 11 advances conservation of high priority wetland complexes within Minnesota’s Prairie Pothole Region to the benefit of waterfowl and SGCN populations. Phase 11 will permanently protect 1,400 acres and restore/enhance 2,502 acres of priority habitat. Minnesota Land Trust will prioritize parcels with high-quality wildlife habitat proximal to other protected lands. Restoration and enhancement will be completed with the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on previously protected properties. This proposal includes leverage from the USFWS and donation of easement value from landowners.

### Design and Scope of Work

Wetlands and shallow lakes provide the essential backbone for the survival of waterfowl and other important wildlife species. In fact, more than 50% of Minnesota’s Species in Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) use wetlands during their life cycle. Most of the plans developed to protect Minnesota’s wildlife—including Minnesota’s Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy, the Statewide Conservation and Preservation Plan, and the Long Range Duck Recovery Plan—cite the protection and restoration of the state’s remaining wetlands as one of the top priorities to achieve the State’s conservation goals. Moreover, these plans cite the use of conservation easements on private lands as one of the primary strategies to protect important wetland and shallow lake habitat.

Minnesota Land Trust’s Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program extends along the vast glacial moraine system in western Minnesota that forms the eastern prairie pothole region. This prairie pothole country is the core of Minnesota’s “duck factory” and is central to one of North America’s most important flyways for migratory birds. Through Phase 10 of this program to date, the Land Trust has procured 45 conservation easements protecting 5,793 acres of habitat and 60 miles of shoreline. The Program has 6,567 acres of restoration/enhancement complete or underway.

Phase 11 will continue these accomplishments by restoring or enhancing 2,502 acres of important prairie and wetland habitats on permanently protected private lands within the Program area in partnership with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s (USFWS) Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program. The Land Trust will also work with FWS and landowners to develop additional shovel ready R/E projects. In addition, the Land Trust will protect 1,400 acres of new priority wetland and associated upland habitat through conservation easements. The Program will be closely coordinated with other public agencies, non-profit organizations and other stakeholders to ensure this Program meets multi-agency conservation goals.

The Land Trust will continue to implement a criteria-based ranking system and market-based approach for purchasing conservation easements. The Program will continue to target projects that help complete gaps in existing public ownership, are of the highest ecological value, and provide the greatest leverage to the state. The Land Trust will seek donated easements in these areas whenever possible, but will also purchase the full or partial value of easements to complete key complexes as necessary.

To focus our easement protection work, the Prairie Plan and other data sets/plans were used to shape our Wetlands Program plan and identify important wetland complexes in this landscape based on the nexus of high-quality habitat, existing protected areas and restorable agricultural lands. These complexes include a mosaic of wetland, prairie/grassland, and forest habitats, and agricultural land. Outcomes from this project include: 1) healthy wetland habitat complexes and associated populations of waterfowl, upland birds, and SGCN; 2) improved water quality; 3) increased participation of private landowners in habitat conservation projects; and 4) enhancement of prior public investments in wetland and upland habitat

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

Our Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program addresses LSOHC priorities by protecting and restoring/enhancing wetland and grassland complexes that provide critical habitat for Minnesota's wildlife, especially its migratory waterfowl and prairie-pothole associated species.

Minnesota's wetlands are essential to our wildlife health and diversity. This project directly benefits SGCN and other important game and non-game wildlife species by minimizing the potential threats to their habitat caused by detrimental agricultural practices, residential or commercial development or imprudent land management. The wetland habitat complexes that will be targeted through the ranking system will include a mosaic of wetlands, grasslands and woodlands. Priority projects will include high or outstanding habitat as identified in Minnesota Biological Survey data. Projects will also be located near other protected lands to help build larger habitat complexes comprised of both public and private lands. The vast majority of this landscape is in private ownership. For that reason, working with private owners on land protection strategies is key to successful conservation in this region. Finally, we will work closely with partners in the region to identify those habitat complexes where private land protection can make a significant contribution to existing conservation investments.

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

Wetlands and associated upland grasslands in Minnesota's Prairie Pothole region (and the species that live in these habitats) are under continuous threat of agricultural conversion and residential development. A short window of opportunity exists to permanently protect previously unavailable parcels as current land ownership is transitioning from one generation to the next. This proposal aims to capitalize on strong landowner interest we have secured in land protection and R/E arenas.

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

This program is focused on procuring easements and restoring prairie and wetland habitats on easement lands within priority complexes of wetlands and associated upland habitats, as guided by the State Wildlife Action Plan, Duck Plan and Prairie Plan. Specific parcels available for easement acquisition are evaluated relative to each other to identify priorities among the pool of applicants. This relative ranking is based on three primary ecological factors (1. amount of habitat on the parcel (size) and abundance of SGCN; 2. the quality or condition of habitat; and 3. the parcel's context relative to other natural habitats and protected areas) and cost. The program serves to build upon past conservation investments in the program area, expand the footprint of existing protected areas (WMAs, WPAs, etc.), facilitate the protection of habitat corridors and reduce the potential for fragmentation of existing habitats. In addition, our partnership with USFWS will enable the Land Trust to further reduce effects of fragmentation through restoration of prairie, wetlands and other habitats. Minnesota Biological Survey data is cornerstone to our assessment of potential conservation easement acquisitions; we also conduct field visits to further identify and assess condition of habitats prior to easement acquisition, because many private lands were not formally assessed through MBS.

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

Long Range Duck Recovery Plan

Minnesota's Wildlife Action Plan 2015-2025

### 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.

The Minnesota Land Trust’s Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program uses a two-prong approach to addressing habitat resilience to climate change: 1) we prioritize land protection and restoration projects that most support regional climate adaptation strategies such as improving migration corridors or habitat complexes, and 2) we include adaptive specifications in every project, such as using climate forward seed mixes and designing wetland features for future precipitation patterns.

Within our program, increasing the number and distribution of wetland-prairie complexes within the flyway improves the habitat selection opportunities for waterfowl and SGCN species, resulting in an increase in the regional resilience to climate change. Climate-forward seed mixes include enhanced proportions of plant species of the native plant communities that are expected to maintain or increase under future climate scenarios.

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

**Forest / Prairie Transition**

Protect, enhance, and restore wild rice wetlands, shallow lakes, wetland/grassland complexes, aspen parklands, and shoreland that provide critical habitat for game and nongame wildlife

**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

**Prairie**

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

### 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 Minnesota Land Trust and USFWS will focus their protection, restoration and enhancement work on key wetland, prairie and other habitats within Minnesota's Prairie Pothole area, guided by the Minnesota Prairie Plan, Duck Plan and State Wildlife Action Plan. High quality lands are protected through acquisition of perpetual conservation easements; native habitats are restored and enhanced on existing eased lands. We work in partnership with local, state and federal agency and non-profit conservation partners to ensure our activities are complementary to those undertaken by others working in the program area. By doing this, we are building complexes of high quality protected habitat, reducing fragmentation concerns and providing for connectivity between core habitat areas that will enable species to move freely.

In obtaining conservation easements (whether by donation or through purchase), we work with willing, conservation-minded landowners. Our landowner bid process will be targeted toward specific areas within our Wetlands program area identified through the plans listed above. Opportunities within the program area are identified and prioritized based on the potential to contribute to build a permanent conservation legacy that includes positive outcomes for wildlife and the public. Prairie and wetland habitats on lands protected through conservation easement by the Land Trust and USFWS are targeted for restoration and enhancement to elevate their inherent value for wildlife. Both the Land Trust and USFWS are deeply committed to maintaining these investments over time.

## Outcomes

### Programs in forest-prairie transition region:

Protected, restored, and enhanced nesting and migratory habitat for waterfowl, upland birds, and species of greatest conservation need ~ *This program will permanently protect 900 acres of wetland and upland habitat complexes and restore/enhance 778 acres of wetlands and prairies in the forest-prairie transition region. Measure: Acres protected; acres restored; acres enhanced.*

### Programs in the northern forest region:

Forestlands are protected from development and fragmentation ~ *This program will permanently protect 400 acres and enhance 269 acres of wetland and upland habitat complexes in the northern forest region. Measure: Acres protected.*

### Programs in prairie region:

Remnant native prairies and wetlands are perpetually protected and adequately buffered ~ *This program will permanently protect 100 acres and restore/enhance 1,455 acres of wetland and upland habitat complexes in the prairie region. Measure: Acres protected; acres restored; acres enhanced.*

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

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

Land protected through conservation easements will be sustained through state-of-the-art standards and practices for conservation easement stewardship. The Minnesota Land Trust is a nationally-accredited land trust with a very successful stewardship program that includes annual property monitoring, effective records management, addressing inquiries and interpretations, tracking changes in ownership, investigating potential violations and defending the easement in cases of a true violation. Funding for these easement stewardship activities is included in the project budget.

The USFWS and MLT (as easement holders on respective properties) will work with landowners on an ongoing basis to provide habitat restoration plans, resources, and technical expertise to undertake restoration, enhancement, and ongoing management of these properties. The partnership between USFWS and MLT also includes the landowners we work with. The landowners who participate in this partnership have a landowner agreement that states they must maintain the habitat restored. The level of dedication they have to their land makes what we do possible and propels our work far beyond each phase. We could not be successful without them.

### Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Source of Funds** | **Step 1** | **Step 2** | **Step 3** |
| 2030 and in perpetuity | MLT Long-Term Stewardship and Enforcement Fund | Annual monitoring of easements in perpetuity | Enforcement as necessary | - |
| Every 4-6 years | USFWS, Landowners, MLT | Prescribed fire, tree control, invasive species control | - | - |

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

One of MLT’s core values is a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. We work to demonstrate this commitment whenever possible across our work. For example, we look to find opportunities to protect and restore critical habitats associated within camps and nature centers that serve diverse constituencies, allowing access to nature in a welcoming and safe environment.

MLT will continue to use diversity, equity, and inclusion as a lens in project, partner, and contractor selection. We will continue to listen and seek out potential, authentic partnerships that can advance our goals of conserving the best of Minnesota’s remaining habitats and, at the same time, being a more inclusive organization. To that end, we intentionally build relationships and work collaboratively with diverse communities throughout the state, such as summer camps for youth, Tribal Nations, rural farmers, and multi-generational families.

## Activity Details

### Requirements

**Is the land you plan to acquire (easement) free of any other permanent protection?**Yes

**Will restoration and enhancement work follow best management practices including MS 84.973 Pollinator Habitat Program?**Yes

**Is the restoration and enhancement activity on permanently protected land per 97A.056, Subd 13(f), tribal lands, and/or public waters per MS 103G.005, Subd. 15 or on lands to be acquired in this program?**Yes

**Where does the activity take place?**

Permanently Protected Conservation Easements

### Land Use

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

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

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

**Will insecticides or fungicides (including neonicotinoid and fungicide treated seed) be used within any activities of this proposal either in the process of restoration or use as food plots?**No

**Will the eased land be open for public use?**No

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

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

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

**How will maintenance and monitoring be accomplished?**Existing trails and roads are identified in the project baseline report and will be monitored annually as part of the Land Trust's stewardship and enforcement protocols. Maintenance of permitted roads/trails in accordance with the terms of the easement will be the responsibility of the landowner.

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

**Will the 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:**Our priority for land protection is intact natural habitats. If some portion of a protected property requires restoration, the property will be evaluated and funding sought after developing the restoration plan and detailed cost estimates.

### 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 | $2,853,000 | - | - | - |
| 2024 | $2,128,000 | $68,100 | $2,059,900 | 3.2% |
| 2023 | $3,012,000 | $548,100 | $2,463,900 | 18.2% |
| 2022 | $3,330,000 | $851,100 | $2,478,900 | 25.56% |
| 2021 | $3,088,000 | $2,329,100 | $758,900 | 75.42% |
| 2020 | $2,683,000 | $2,548,100 | $134,900 | 94.97% |
| 2019 | $2,129,000 | $2,106,200 | $22,800 | 98.93% |
| 2018 | $1,786,000 | $1,782,200 | $3,800 | 99.79% |
| 2016 | $1,629,000 | $1,627,200 | $1,800 | 99.89% |
| 2013 | $1,980,000 | $1,966,200 | $13,800 | 99.3% |
| Totals | $24,618,000 | $13,826,300 | $10,791,700 | 56.16% |

## Timeline

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity Name** | **Estimated Completion Date** |
| Conservation easements completed or options secured | June 30, 2030 |
| Restoration and enhancement projects completed | June 30, 2031 |

## Budget

### Totals

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Funding Request** | **Total Leverage** | **Leverage Source** | **Total** |
| Personnel | $850,000 | $180,000 | USFWS In-Kind, Federal | $1,030,000 |
| Contracts | $7,310,000 | - | - | $7,310,000 |
| Fee Acquisition w/ PILT | - | - | - | - |
| Fee Acquisition w/o PILT | - | - | - | - |
| Easement Acquisition | $5,000,000 | $500,000 | Landowners | $5,500,000 |
| Easement Stewardship | $448,000 | - | - | $448,000 |
| Travel | $28,000 | - | - | $28,000 |
| Professional Services | $456,000 | - | - | $456,000 |
| Direct Support Services | $230,000 | - | - | $230,000 |
| DNR Land Acquisition Costs | - | - | - | - |
| Capital Equipment | - | - | - | - |
| Other Equipment/Tools | $3,000 | - | - | $3,000 |
| Supplies/Materials | $11,000 | - | - | $11,000 |
| DNR IDP | - | - | - | - |
| **Grand Total** | **$14,336,000** | **$680,000** | **-** | **$15,016,000** |

### Personnel

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Position** | **Annual FTE** | **Years Working** | **Funding Request** | **Total Leverage** | **Leverage Source** | **Total** |
| FWS Restoration Designer | 0.1 | 5.0 | - | $80,000 | USFWS In-Kind | $80,000 |
| MLT Land Protection Staff | 0.88 | 4.0 | $350,000 | - | - | $350,000 |
| MLT Restoration Staff | 1.0 | 5.0 | $500,000 | $100,000 | Federal | $600,000 |

**Amount of Request:** $14,336,000 **Amount of Leverage:** $680,000 **Leverage as a percent of the Request:** 4.74% **DSS + Personnel:** $1,080,000 **As a % of the total request:** 7.53% **Easement Stewardship:** $448,000 **As a % of the Easement Acquisition:** 8.96%

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Leverage (from above)** | **Amount Confirmed** | **% of Total Leverage** | **Amount Anticipated** | **% of Total Leverage** |
| $680,000 | $180,000 | 26.47% | $500,000 | 73.53% |

**Detail leverage sources and confirmation of funds:**USFWS: $80,000 in-kind contributions for R/E projects.
MLT: Anticipated: $500,000 from landowners through donated conservation easement value.
MLT: Federal funding for staff in hand - $100,000.

Also, programmatic leverage of $2,000,000 from USFWS Migratory Bird Conservation Fund committed (see attached commitment letter)

**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?**Acres and activities will be curtailed modestly (reduced 55-65%) from proportional reductions due to fixed costs and other factors. R/E project selection will be based on priorities; scaling may not be proportional.

**Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?**Personnel and DSS will be curtailed modestly greater than proportional (55-65%). Some costs are fixed (landowner recruitment; grant management) and must occur regardless of grant amount. Projects can fail midstream after investment of time. Donation of easement value (high in this program) can inflate the number of projects

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

**Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?**Acres and activities will be curtailed modestly (reduced ~75-80%) from proportional reductions due to fixed costs and other factors. R/E project selection will be based on priorities; scaling may not be proportional.

**Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?**Personnel and DSS will be curtailed modestly greater than proportional (75-85%). Some costs are fixed (landowner recruitment; grant management) and must occur regardless of grant amount. Projects can fail midstream after investment of time. Donation of easement value (high in this program) can inflate the number of projects.

### 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?**FTEs listed in the proposal are an estimate of the personnel time required to deliver the grant outputs included in this proposal. An array of staff may work on projects to complete legal review, sub-contracts, negotiating with landowners, drafting conservation easements, completing baseline reports and managing the grant. MLT's basis for billing is the individual Protection or Restoration project we work on, 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?**Restoration and enhancement accounts for $7,164,000 of the contracts line amount. Additional funds in the contract line are for the writing of habitat management plans via qualified vendors and conducting landowner outreach to facilitate communication of the protection program.

### Professional Services

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

Appraisals

Other : Mapping, Environmental Assessments; Mineral Reports; etc.

Surveys

Title Insurance and Legal Fees

### Easement Stewardship

**What is the number of easements anticipated, cost per easement for stewardship, and explain how that amount is calculated?**Minnesota Land Trust expects to close 10-15 conservation easements through this proposal. The average cost per easement to fund the MLT's perpetual monitoring and enforcement obligations is $28,000, although in extraordinary circumstances additional funding may be warranted. This figure is derived from MLT’s detailed stewardship funding “cost analysis" which is consistent with Land Trust Accreditation standards. MLT shares periodic updates to this cost analysis with LSOHC staff.

### Travel

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

**Explain the amount in the travel line outside of traditional travel costs of mileage, food, and lodging**Land Trust staff regularly rents vehicles for grant-related purposes, which is a significant cost savings over use of personal vehicles.

**I understand and agree that lodging, meals, and mileage must comply with the current MMB Commissioner Plan:**Yes

### Direct Support Services

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

### Other Equipment/Tools

**Give examples of the types of Equipment and Tools that will be purchased?**GPS devices, R/E tools, satellite communicator, safety gear.

## Federal Funds

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

**Are the funds confirmed?**Yes

Cash : $100,000

In Kind : $80,000

**Is Confirmation Document attached?**[Yes](https://lsohcprojectmgmt.leg.mn/media/lsohc/proposal/federal_funds_confirmation_document/28291a35-670.pdf)

## Output Tables

### Acres by Resource Type (Table 1)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Wetland** | **Prairie** | **Forest** | **Habitat** | **Total Acres** |
| Restore | 108 | 115 | 0 | 39 | 262 |
| 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 | 1,400 | 1,400 |
| Enhance | 70 | 2,170 | 0 | 0 | 2,240 |
| **Total** | **178** | **2,285** | **0** | **1,439** | **3,902** |

### 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 | - | 4 | 4 | - | 250 | 250 |
| **Total** | **-** | **4** | **4** | **-** | **250** | **250** |

### 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 | 4 | 258 | 250 | 1,990 |
| **Total** | **4** | **258** | **250** | **1,990** |

### 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 | 126 |
| **Total** | **126** |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Wetland** | **Prairie** | **Forest** | **Habitat** | **Total Funding** |
| Restore | $337,100 | $358,900 | - | $121,700 | $817,700 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | - | - | $6,527,000 | $6,527,000 |
| Enhance | $218,600 | $6,772,700 | - | - | $6,991,300 |
| **Total** | **$555,700** | **$7,131,600** | **-** | **$6,648,700** | **$14,336,000** |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Metro/Urban** | **Forest/Prairie** | **SE Forest** | **Prairie** | **N. Forest** | **Total Acres** |
| Restore | 0 | 30 | 0 | 232 | 0 | 262 |
| 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 | 900 | 0 | 100 | 400 | 1,400 |
| Enhance | 0 | 748 | 0 | 1,223 | 269 | 2,240 |
| **Total** | **0** | **1,678** | **0** | **1,555** | **669** | **3,902** |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Metro/Urban** | **Forest/Prairie** | **SE Forest** | **Prairie** | **N. Forest** | **Total Funding** |
| Restore | - | $93,600 | - | $724,100 | - | $817,700 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | $4,195,900 | - | $466,200 | $1,864,900 | $6,527,000 |
| Enhance | - | $2,334,600 | - | $3,817,100 | $839,600 | $6,991,300 |
| **Total** | **-** | **$6,624,100** | **-** | **$5,007,400** | **$2,704,500** | **$14,336,000** |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Wetland** | **Prairie** | **Forest** | **Habitat** |
| Restore | $3,121 | $3,120 | - | $3,120 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | - | - | $4,662 |
| Enhance | $3,122 | $3,121 | - | - |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Metro/Urban** | **Forest/Prairie** | **SE Forest** | **Prairie** | **N. Forest** |
| Restore | - | $3,120 | - | $3,121 | - |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | $4,662 | - | $4,662 | $4,662 |
| Enhance | - | $3,121 | - | $3,121 | $3,121 |

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

## Parcels

**Sign-up Criteria?**[Yes - Sign up criteria is attached](https://lsohcprojectmgmt.leg.mn/media/lsohc/proposal/signup_criteria/0553cd82-a34.pdf)

**Explain the process used to identify, prioritize, and select the parcels on your list:**The Land Trust uses a competitive, market-based approach through an RFP process to identify interested landowners and prioritize parcels for conservation easement acquisition. All proposals submitted by landowners are evaluated and ranked relative to their ecological significance based on three primary factors: 1) size of habitat on the parcel; 2) condition of habitat on the parcel; and 3) the context (both in terms of amount/quality of remaining habitat and protected areas) within which the parcel lies. We also ask the landowner to consider contributing all or a portion of fair market value to enable our funds to make a larger conservation impact (see attached sign-up criteria). We contract with local SWCD offices to provide outreach services as a way to connect effectively with local landowners.

Restoration and enhancement work will take place on private lands over which MLT and USFWS have secured permanent conservation easements to protect wetlands and associated upland habitat. The projects included in the parcel list were identified as priorities for restoration/enhancement by USFWS and MLT biologists.

### Restore / Enhance Parcels

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **County** | **TRDS** | **Acres** | **Est Cost** | **Existing Protection** | **Description** |
| HuLa | Becker | 13839210 | 40 | $120,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| Smit | Big Stone | 12245233 | 40 | $81,600 | Yes | Prairie |
| CRW | Brown | 10833203 | 135 | $168,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| KTJIn | Brown | 10834215 | 90 | $199,200 | Yes | Wetland |
| CKBe | Douglas | 12938220 | 40 | $240,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| CVic | Douglas | 12837225 | 37 | $111,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| DScr | Douglas | 12737221 | 9 | $120,000 | Yes | Habitat |
| EAnd | Douglas | 12839233 | 9 | $102,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| MOEP2 | Douglas | 13040213 | 20 | $120,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| PaMe | Freeborn | 10323236 | 22 | $48,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| GlaRG | Kandiyohi | 12134214 | 120 | $366,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| CuHop | Martin | 10233206 | 30 | $30,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| Joh1X | Murray | 10741210 | 50 | $84,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| Jvon | Murray | 10840228 | 70 | $84,000 | Yes | Wetland |
| Gkvi | Nobles | 10241225 | 10 | $66,000 | Yes | Wetland |
| BLei | Otter Tail | 13543224 | 50 | $240,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| BPau | Otter Tail | 13137220 | 110 | $360,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| BPri | Otter Tail | 13137207 | 30 | $90,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| BaCr | Otter Tail | 13238206 | 40 | $96,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| CSP2 | Otter Tail | 13644213 | 30 | $120,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| DRen | Otter Tail | 13743205 | 30 | $72,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| ErvFa1 | Otter Tail | 13736212 | 365 | $876,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| FrHea | Otter Tail | 13139215 | 25 | $72,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| GeMos | Otter Tail | 13138223 | 100 | $270,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| JohnLL | Otter Tail | 13141202 | 160 | $360,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| KyHve | Otter Tail | 13138202 | 18 | $90,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| LBar | Otter Tail | 13540222 | 30 | $180,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| LCLA | Otter Tail | 13641217 | 20 | $60,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| LLei | Otter Tail | 13442220 | 45 | $210,000 | Yes | Priarie |
| LTBa | Otter Tail | 13643204 | 40 | $150,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| RNP2 | Otter Tail | 13342213 | 30 | $300,000 | Yes | Habitat |
| RoCla | Otter Tail | 13241214 | 100 | $300,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| Pip | Pipestone | 10646201 | 4 | $24,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| Feig | Pope | 12439216 | 60 | $122,400 | Yes | Prairie |
| Kly28 | Pope | 12338228 | 70 | $142,800 | Yes | Prairie |
| Kly29 | Pope | 12338229 | 50 | $102,000 | Yes | Prairie |
| Hjoh | Redwood | 10936214 | 8 | $54,000 | Yes | Wetland |
| Pric | Stevens | 12642229 | 20 | $40,800 | Yes | Prairie |
| FlEd | Swift | 12042217 | 116 | $236,640 | Yes | Prairie |
| ErvFa2 | Wadena | 13735207 | 229 | $549,600 | Yes | Prairie |

## Parcel Map



