Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project Phase 11

Laws of Minnesota 2027 Accomplishment Plan

General Information

Date: 10/12/2026

Project Title: Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project Phase 11

Funds Recommended: $1,855,000

Legislative Citation:

Appropriation Language:

Manager Information

Manager's Name: Tim Terrill
Title: Executive Director
Organization: Mississippi Headwaters Board
Address: 322 Laurel St., Suite 11
City: Brainerd, MN 56401
Email: timt@mississippiheadwaters.org
Office Number: 218-824-1189
Mobile Number: 218-838-8563
Fax Number:
Website: http://www.mississippiheadwaters.org

Partners Contact

BWSR: Darren Mayers - darren.mayers@state.mn.us - (218) 290-8384

MHB: Tim Terrill - timt@mississippiheadwaters.org - (218) 838-8563

Location Information

County Location(s):

Eco regions in which work will take place:

Forest / Prairie Transition

Northern Forest

Activity types:

Protect in Easement

Priority resources addressed by activity:

Habitat

Narrative

Abstract

The Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project (MHHCP) is a partnership of the Mississippi Headwaters Board, Trust for Public Land, and BWSR. Fee-title acquisitions and conservation easements on private lands adjacent to public land create/expand permanently protected aquatic and upland wildlife habitat complexes along the first 400 miles of the Mississippi River and major tributaries. This request is only for BWSR conservation easements and MHB program management. 450 acres of critical habitat will be placed in permanent conservation easements to benefit fish, wildlife, and migratory waterfowl and reduce forest fragmentation. Additionally, public recreation and drinking water quality is enhanced.

Design and Scope of Work

This phase of the Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project (MHHCP) will continue to provide aquatic and upland game habitat protection and food and shelter for migratory waterfowl along the first 400 miles of the Mississippi River (its headwaters) and tributaries. Work is focused on private land on or adjacent to the river or land on or near major tributaries within the 8 headwaters' counties of Clearwater, Beltrami, Cass, Hubbard, Itasca, Crow Wing, Aitkin, and Morrison. In addition to the 13,000 acres and 72 miles of shoreland already protected, this phase will permanently protect an additional 450 acres and 2+ miles of shoreland by creating and enlarging protected habitat complexes and corridors. Additionally, public recreational opportunities are enhanced for fishing, hunting, passive recreation and drinking water quality is ensured for millions downstream.

The 8-County headwaters are home to a variety of game fish and their adjacent lands are home to over 350+ species of animals and birds, including most of the endangered and threatened species in Minnesota. Development pressure along the river and its tributaries is increasing as people seek to live near water. Private land development can lead to fragmentation of forests that threaten wildlife and aquatic habitats. Public lands adjacent to developable private lands are in danger of losing habitat connectivity as private lands are increasingly developed resulting in destruction of wild rice beds, aquatic and upland habitat and fragmentation of forestlands, grasslands, and wetlands that dominate the Mississippi headwaters.

The MHHCP provides fish and wildlife habitat protection by targeting private lands adjacent to already protected public land for fee-title acquisition or conservation easements to create permanently protected habitat complexes. This proposal is only requesting funds for BWSR to complete conservation easements and for MHB project management; TPL has remaining funds available for fee-title acquisition and does not require additional funding at this time.

The MHHCP partners (MHB, BWSR, and TPL) realize there is critical conservation work to conduct yet future work needs to be strategic about where protection happens to ensure the highest rate of return on the OHF investment. A map was created to identify strategic areas for future protection using advanced GIS technology, recently updated land use information from the 8 headwaters' counties, and priorities from 1Watershed/1Plans from 6 major watersheds. The map will guide partners to priority areas for future land protection efforts and aid in

developing targeted landowner outreach.

As a partnership, The Mississippi Headwaters Board provides program administration and coordination. Trust for Public Land acquires fee-title to priority lands and conveys permanent ownership to a public entity (MN DNR or LGU). BWSR completes RIM conservation easements on private lands with local SWCD assistance. A Technical Team of project partners, 8 SWCDS and representatives from the DNR and The Nature Conservancy review and approve all projects using a ranked evaluation of habitat and biodiversity, urgency and opportunity for protection, size of the parcel, amount of shoreland and other critical habitat features. Strong local government involvement is unique to this program.

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

The Mississippi Headwaters is host to over 350 species of mammals, birds and fish, including most of Minnesota's endangered and threatened species. The MHHCP protects those species by creating permanently protected habitat complexes and corridors along the river and its major tributaries that provide upland wildlife with food, shelter, and protection from predators and clean water habitat for fish survival and spawning.

A strategic planning process recently began to identify priority aquatic and upland areas within the headwaters on which to prioritize future program activity. A qualitative analysis of the benefits of wildlife protection at a watershed scale was contracted to Peter C. Jacobsen, DNR Fisheries Scientist whose former fisheries research demonstrated that a minor watershed is considered permanently protected for water quality when a threshold of 75% land protection (public, private, and SFIA lands) is achieved. His recent research demonstrated the 75% threshold in a minor watershed also applies for upland wildlife protection. His report," Wildlife Habitat Benefits of Watershed Protection," demonstrated highly sensitive areas may need a higher threshold than 75% for adequate habitat protection.

Three wildlife assessment and prioritization data sets were used in the report: 1) Minnesota DNR Wildlife Action Network; 2) Minnesota DNR Watershed Health Assessment Framework Terrestrial Habitat Scores; and 3) The Nature Conservancy's Resilient and Connected Lands Network data. A map of wildlife land protection priorities within the 8-county headwaters was created by combining the three data sets with recent protected lands data provided by the 8 headwaters counties. The map pinpoints priority areas of high wildlife value on which to focus future landowner outreach to reach or exceed the 75% watershed protection value. (see the map on the project illustration). The priority areas correspond to a spreadsheet of landowner data in minor watersheds.

Parcels in priority areas are identified and assessed using a science-based tool (RAQ), where "R" is the riparian nature, "A" is adjacency to already protected land, and "Q" is the habitat quality established using various state and national databases. Outreach is then directed to landowners of high RAQ-value land.

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

Previously appropriated funds (ML24 and ML25) for conservation easements are spent or parcels have been approved by the Technical Committee for submission to BWSR and are in various processing stages. There are interested landowners waiting for availability of additional conservation easement funding, several with large parcels.

Because inland lakes are highly developed, there is increasing interest in developing along the river and its tributaries. There is urgency to protect high priority lands for fish and wildlife habitat protection because development pressures are threatening forest fragmentation and disturbance of shoreland and upland habitats.

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

The MHHCP focuses on creating and expanding permanently protected aquatic and upland wildlife habitat complexes/corridors by acquiring priority private land (via fee-title or easement acquisition) adjacent to already protected land (county, state, or federal land or land already under easement) to expand existing or create new habitat complexes. These large habitat corridors/complexes provide the essential elements of good upland habitat continuity for wildlife that includes food, a place to raise their young, cover from predators, and mobility for wildlife during various life stages and adaptation as needed to climate change. They also provide aquatic habitat (clean water) for fish survival and spawning and food and shelter for migratory waterfowl along the Mississippi Flyway. These complexes limit future development that could disrupt forest complexes and fragment fish and wildlife habitat.

Using the previously described map of priority habitat protection areas and the RAQ science-based parcel prioritization process, high priority private parcels are identified next to already protected lands (public or private in easement). Connecting these acquired parcels to already protected land enlarges or creates habitat protection complexes. Multiple habitat complexes along the river or its tributaries create safe corridors of protected land for wildlife to move around and/or protected and undeveloped shoreland for high quality fish habitat.

The Indian Jack WMA habitat complex featured on the project illustration is an example of the program's successful approach of using fee-title and easement acquisitions connected to already protected land to create a large habitat complex. Two fee-title acquisitions in Crow Wing County created the new 299-acre DNR Indian Jack WMA, which combined with two adjacent RIM conservation easements and other state and county land, created a habitat complex of 594+ contiguous acres, 2.5 miles of Indian Jack Lake shoreland, and 3 miles of Mississippi River shoreland, on which the DNR is adding a new public access. In addition to habitat protection for both wildlife and fisheries, this forested complex provides enhanced public recreation opportunities for fishing, hunting, bird watching and river access.

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

Mississippi River Headwaters Comprehensive Plan

Outdoor Heritage Fund: A 25 Year Framework

Which LSOHC section priorities are addressed in this program?

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

Outcomes

Programs in forest-prairie transition region:

Rivers and streams provide corridors of habitat including intact areas of forest cover in the east and large wetland/upland complexes in the west ~ *Conservation easements in this region have been funded in past appropriations. Those funded with an ML 27 appropriation will be placed on parcels on or near the main stem Mississippi River and/or along, near major Mississippi tributaries in the region, or in or around large habitat complexes. In the eastern portion of the region, parcels are mostly forested. Easement outcomes will be measured by the number of acres protected and shoreland feet and evaluated against set program criteria and goals. Easements will be evaluated into perpetuity through yearly monitoring by SWCDs in the 8 headwaters' counties.*

Programs in the northern forest region:

Increased availability and improved condition of riparian forests and other habitat corridors ~ *With permanent land protection via conservation easements forests will remain intact and less fragmented to maintain the forest integrity necessary for wildlife and fisheries habitat protection. Placement of projects will focus on private land that can connect with adjacent public or already protected private lands to create or expand habitat corridors. Outcomes will be measured by acres and shoreland miles protected and evaluated against program goals and criteria. Easements will be monitored annually into perpetuity by BWSR and the SWCD for the county in which the easement is located.*

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 request is not supplanting or a substitution for any previous Legacy funding used for the same purpose.

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

BWSR is responsible for monitoring and enforcement of RIM easements. BWSR partners with local SWCDs to carry out oversight, monitoring and inspection of conservation easements. Easements are inspected every year for the first five years beginning the year after the easement is recorded. Thereafter, on-site inspections are performed every three years and compliance checks are performed in the other two years. SWCDs document findings and report to BWSR on each site inspection conducted. A non-compliance procedure is implemented when potential violations are identified. Perpetual monitoring and enforcement costs are $10,000 per easement. This value is based on using SWCD staff for monitoring and preliminary enforcement. The amount includes costs of BWSR and local government unit staff time as well as costs for encouraging voluntary compliance, addressing potential violations and legal enforcement.

Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes

Year	Source of Funds	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
2027-2031	OHF	Work with project partners to determine fish and game habitat protection priorities; develop tools for prioritizing lands for acquisition (fee title or easement); provide outreach assistance to SWCDs: and develop/ maintain trusting relationships with local government for project support	The Mississippi Headwaters Board (MHB) provides project coordination among project partners and other supporting organizations, including responsibility for status reports, outreach assistance to SWCDs, developing prioritization tools for project selection, facilitation of regular meetings of the Project Technical Committee to review and approve participating landowner projects, and project representation to regional conservation collaborative efforts. MHB also promotes ongoing relationships and training as needed for the 8 Headwaters County Boards.	-
2027-2031	OHF	Work with project partners and landowners to determine interest in a fee-title acquisition and seek state or local government permanent land ownership.	The Trust for Public Land will acquire parcels for fee-title acquisition (with or without PILT) and transfer to the appropriate public entity.	Permanent public entity owners of acquired lands (state or local government) will follow the monitoring and land management policies of their organization.
2027-2031	OHF	Work with project partners and landowners to determine RIM conservation easement interest and develop long-term fish and game habitat protection priorities.	Work with BWSR and County SWCDs to conduct landowner outreach and acquire conservation easements	BWSR and SWCDs will perform ongoing onsite inspections and monitoring and enforce conditions of the recorded easement into perpetuity.

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

MHHCP partner organizations have programs funded through different sources that focus primarily on engaging Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) communities as well as diverse economic communities. A meeting of multiple conservation agencies and organizations was held with the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe (LLBO) to

discuss mutual conservation goals. LLBO is invited to participate in the MMHCP Technical Team that reviews and approves all projects in an effort to be more inclusive in the program's land protection work.

Generally, RIM priority areas are focused on rural communities across the state due to the nature of the program and payment rates. Review of the Environmental Justice map produced by the MPCA shows RIM easement programs overlap with many identified environmental justice areas across the state, particularly those areas that are identified by lower than state median incomes. Lower annual income areas of the state benefit from RIM in several ways, including financial benefits for landowners through easement payments. The individual program may also require seeding and wetland restoration work by local contractors. The work by SWCD staff also includes outreach, monitoring and maintenance which helps maintain and grow rural jobs and economies.

Conservation easements benefit all Minnesotans. They help to keep our air and water clean for fish habitat, provide upland habitat protection, help to ensure high-quality drinking water downstream of the headwaters, and help mitigate the impacts of climate change.

Activity Details

Requirements

If funded, this program will meet all applicable criteria set forth in MS 97A.056?
Yes

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

Who will manage the easement?
The Board of Water and Soil Resources will manage the easement with the assistance of the local SWCD for processing and perpetual monitoring.

Who will be the easement holder?
The MN Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR)

What is the anticipated number of easements (range is fine) you plan to accomplish with this appropriation?
6 easements, depending on size and cost.

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 program either in the process of restoration or use as food plots?
No

Will the eased land be open for public use?
Yes

Describe the expected public use:
RIM easements do not require that private land is open to the public; however, this question is also

evaluated on public benefit and RIM easements do provide a significant public benefit; often expand wildlife habitat near public lands; and do not limit the potential for the land to be open to the public through other programs. SWCD partners, who work with landowners on easement application, can enroll landowners into the DNR Walk-In Access (WIA) program upon easement application. The WIA program is available in 54 counties, all of which are eligible for RIM.

Will new trails or roads be developed or improved, beyond those used for maintenance and management, as a result of the proposed acquisition?

No

Will the acquired parcels be restored or enhanced within this appropriation?

No

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

No

Explain how and when the restoration/enhancement work will be completed and identify the source of funding:

No restoration or enhancement work will be done on conservation easements funded with this program.

Timeline

Activity Name	Estimated Completion Date
Under contract to BWSR, SWCDs do annual monitoring of acquired easements	Ongoing
SWCDs do landowner outreach according to established parcel priorities, works with landowner to submit easement application, assists BWSR with processing due diligence, and records the final easement. SWCD's are paid a set standard fee by BWSR for processing assistance.	2031
MHB provides project administration and coordination, assists with development of parcel prioritization tools and outreach, convenes the Technical Review Committee, and does project reporting	2031
BWSR approves and processes landowner applications that have been approved by the Project Technical Committee and is responsible for ongoing monitoring of completed easements.	2031; stewardship ongoing

Date of Final Report Submission: 10/01/2031

Availability of Appropriation: Subd. 7. Availability of Appropriation

(a) Money appropriated in this section may not be spent on activities unless they are directly related to and necessary for a specific appropriation and are specified in the accomplishment plan approved by the Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council. Money appropriated in this section must not be spent on indirect costs or other institutional overhead charges that are not directly related to and necessary for a specific appropriation. Money appropriated for fee title acquisition of land may be used to restore, enhance, and provide for public use of the land acquired with the appropriation. Public-use facilities must have a minimal impact on habitat in acquired lands.

(b) Money appropriated in this section is available as follows:

(1) money appropriated for acquiring real property is available until June 30, 2031;

(2) money appropriated for restoring and enhancing land acquired with an appropriation in this section is available for four years after the acquisition date with a maximum end date of June 30, 2035;

(3) money appropriated for restoring or enhancing other land is available until June 30, 2032;

(4) notwithstanding clauses (1) to (3), money appropriated for a project that receives at least 15 percent of its funding from federal funds is available until a date sufficient to match the availability of federal funding to a maximum of six years if the federal funding was confirmed and included in the original approved draft accomplishment plan; and

(5) money appropriated for other projects is available until the end of the fiscal year in which it is appropriated.

Budget

Budget reallocations up to 10% do not require an amendment to the Accomplishment Plan.

Grand Totals Across All Partnerships

Item	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	$143,800	-	-	$143,800
Contracts	$25,000	-	-	$25,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	$1,582,000	-	-	$1,582,000
Easement Stewardship	$60,000	-	-	$60,000
Travel	$3,200	-	-	$3,200
Professional Services	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	$31,100	-	-	$31,100
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	$4,500	-	-	$4,500
Supplies/Materials	$5,400	-	-	$5,400
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	**$1,855,000**	**-**	**-**	**$1,855,000**

Partner: BWSR

Totals

Item	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	$107,800	-	-	$107,800
Contracts	$15,000	-	-	$15,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	$1,582,000	-	-	$1,582,000
Easement Stewardship	$60,000	-	-	$60,000
Travel	$3,200	-	-	$3,200
Professional Services	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	$31,100	-	-	$31,100
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	$4,500	-	-	$4,500
Supplies/Materials	$1,400	-	-	$1,400
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	**$1,805,000**	**-**	**-**	**$1,805,000**

Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Easement Staff	0.2	4.0	$107,800	-	-	$107,800

Partner: MHB

Totals

Item	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	$36,000	-	-	$36,000
Contracts	$10,000	-	-	$10,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-
Travel	-	-	-	-
Professional Services	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	-	-	-	-
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	-	-	-	-
Supplies/Materials	$4,000	-	-	$4,000
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	**$50,000**	**-**	**-**	**$50,000**

Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Project Administrator	0.2	4.0	$36,000	-	-	$36,000

Amount of Request: $1,855,000
Amount of Leverage: -
Leverage as a percent of the Request: 0.0%
DSS + Personnel: $174,900
As a % of the total request: 9.43%
Easement Stewardship: $60,000
As a % of the Easement Acquisition: 3.79%

How will this program accommodate the reduced appropriation recommendation from the original proposed requested amount?
A reduction in funding would reduce outputs (acres/activities) proportionately.

Does this project have the ability to be scalable?
Yes

If the project received 50% of the requested funding

Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?
A reduction in funding would reduce outputs (acres/activities) proportionately.

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

Program management costs (personnel and DSS expenses) will be reduced; however not exactly proportionately as program administration, coordination, development and oversight costs remain consistent. A small portion of easement staff time specifically for appropriation and program management and reporting remains relatively consistent regardless of appropriation

Personnel

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

Contracts

What is included in the contracts line?
MHB will utilize the funding to contract with professionals that can perform research or develop tools to help administer the program more effectively. BWSR contract funds are for direct SWCD assistance.

Easement Stewardship

What is the number of easements anticipated, cost per easement for stewardship, and explain how that amount is calculated?
6 easements at $10,000 per easement for stewardship. The total stewardship amount will ultimately be dependent on the cost of easements and if the proposed easement number is reached. Perpetual monitoring and enforcement costs are $10,000 per easement. The value is based on using SWCD staff for monitoring and preliminary enforcement. The amount includes costs of BWSR and local government unit staff time as well as costs for encouraging voluntary compliance, addressing potential violations and legal enforcement.

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
none

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?
BWSR annually reviews and updates direct support services costs that are directly related to and necessary for each request based on the type of work being done and the program staff time involved.

Other Equipment/Tools

Give examples of the types of Equipment and Tools that will be purchased?
Signage for completed projects.

Federal Funds

Do you anticipate federal funds as a match for this program?
No

Output Tables

Acres by Resource Type (Table 1)

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat	Total Acres
Restore	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	450	450
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
Total	**-**	**-**	**-**	**450**	**450**

Total Requested Funding by Resource Type (Table 2)

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat	Total Funding
Restore	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	$1,855,000	$1,855,000
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
Total	**-**	**-**	**-**	**$1,855,000**	**$1,855,000**

Acres within each Ecological Section (Table 3)

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest	Total Acres
Restore	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	50	-	-	400	450
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	**-**	**50**	**-**	**-**	**400**	**450**

Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section (Table 4)

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest	Total Funding
Restore	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	$100,000	-	-	$1,755,000	$1,855,000
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	**-**	**$100,000**	**-**	**-**	**$1,755,000**	**$1,855,000**

Average Cost per Acre by Resource Type (Table 5)

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat
Restore	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	$4,122
Enhance	-	-	-	-

Average Cost per Acre by Ecological Section (Table 6)

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest
Restore	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	$2,000	-	-	$4,387
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

2+ miles of streambank

Parcels

Parcel Information

Sign-up Criteria?
Yes - Sign up criteria is attached

Explain the process used to identify, prioritize, and select the parcels on your list:
Because Trust for Public Land (TPL) is not requesting funds with this proposal, there are no fee-title parcels listed. This funding will provide for conservation easements held by BWSR. The parcels selected are submitted by the SWCDs in the 8 County headwaters and then vetted against program criteria by the Technical Committee for approval/disapproval to submit a BWSR application. The Technical Team ranking sheet is attached for a potential easement parcel evaluation When the easement is recorded it will be added to the Accomplishment Plan parcel list by BWSR.

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project Phase 11

Comparison Report

Program Title: ML 2027 - Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project Phase 11
Organization: Mississippi Headwaters Board
Manager: Tim Terrill

Budget

Requested Amount: $5,000,000
Appropriated Amount: $1,855,000
Percentage: 37.1%

Item	Requested Proposal	Leverage Proposal	Appropriated AP	Leverage AP	Percent of Request	Percent of Leverage
Personnel	$340,500	-	$143,800	-	42.23%	-
Contracts	$76,000	-	$25,000	-	32.89%	-
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	$4,288,500	-	$1,582,000	-	36.89%	-
Easement Stewardship	$180,000	-	$60,000	-	33.33%	-
Travel	$8,700	-	$3,200	-	36.78%	-
Professional Services	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	$86,200	-	$31,100	-	36.08%	-
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	$12,400	-	$4,500	-	36.29%	-
Supplies/Materials	$7,700	-	$5,400	-	70.13%	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	**$5,000,000**	**-**	**$1,855,000**	**-**	**37.1%**	**-**

If the project received 70% of the requested funding

Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?
A reduction in funding would reduce outputs (acres/activities) proportionately.

Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?
Program management costs (personnel and DSS expenses) will be reduced; however not exactly proportionately as program administration, coordination, development and oversight costs remain consistent. A small portion of easement staff time specifically for appropriation and program management and reporting remains relatively consistent regardless of appropriation

If the project received 50% of the requested funding

Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?
A reduction in funding would reduce outputs (acres/activities) proportionately.

Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?
Program management costs (personnel and DSS expenses) will be reduced; however not exactly proportionately as program administration, coordination, development and oversight costs remain consistent. A small portion of easement staff time specifically for appropriation and program management and reporting remains relatively consistent regardless of appropriation

Output

Acres by Resource Type (Table 1)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	0	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Easement	1,375	450	32.73%
Enhance	0	-	-

Total Requested Funding by Resource Type (Table 2)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	$5,000,000	$1,855,000	37.1%
Enhance	-	-	-

Acres within each Ecological Section (Table 3)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	0	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Easement	1,375	450	32.73%
Enhance	0	-	-

Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section (Table 4)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	$5,000,000	$1,855,000	37.1%
Enhance	-	-	-