Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Metro Forests for Minnesota Wildlife and Communities

Laws of Minnesota 2027 Accomplishment Plan

General Information

Date: 10/14/2026

Project Title: Metro Forests for Minnesota Wildlife and Communities

Funds Recommended: $1,294,000

Legislative Citation:

Appropriation Language:

Manager Information

Manager's Name: Rebecca Tucker
Title: Twin Cities Metro Program Manager
Organization: Great River Greening
Address: 251 Starkey Street Suite 2200
City: Saint Paul, MN 55107
Email: rtucker@greatrivergreening.org
Office Number: 651-272-3982
Mobile Number: 651-272-3982
Fax Number:
Website: https://www.greatrivergreening.org/

Location Information

County Location(s): Hennepin, Washington, Ramsey and Anoka.

Eco regions in which work will take place:

Metro / Urban

Activity types:

Restore

Priority resources addressed by activity:

Forest

Narrative

Abstract

Metro Forests for Minnesota Wildlife and Communities, led by Great River Greening, will work with three public landowners to restore 100 acres of permanently protected woodlands across three sites in Anoka, Hennepin, Ramsey, and Washington counties. These shovel-ready projects address the most urgent threat to metro forest health – low native plant diversity – and solve this problem through invasive species control and native tree and understory plant establishment. Forests will be restored to support Species of Greatest Conservation Need, pollinator forage, and wildlife habitat diversity with conservation outcomes publicly showcased for the more than three million Minnesotans in the region.

Design and Scope of Work

Forests in the Metropolitan Urbanizing Region serve as an increasingly rare refuge for both local and migratory wildlife. City expansion and rapidly changing rural land use has degraded the forested acres across the seven-county metropolitan area. These remaining forested acres have been impacted by lack of upfront initial restoration funding and required staff capacity, allowing invasive plant species to suppress native species diversity. However, public ownership has preserved the overall habitats from development, maintaining the structure for healthy environments given a targeted investment in vegetative restoration.

Great River Greening has partnered with three public landowners to prioritize 100 acres of forested uplands, oak woodlands, and floodplain forests on three sites in the Metropolitan Urbanizing Region. All are publicly accessible with shovel-ready restoration projects planned or potential cash (or in-kind) match. At every site, work includes invasive tree and shrub removal as well as native plant establishment, with species and methods tailored to each site's target habitat goals.

East River Flats and Mississippi River Bluffs, Minneapolis Parks and Recreation Board and Saint Paul: 28 and 22 acres, respectively, of connected habitat along four miles of the Mississippi River. Floodplain and savanna woodlands in Minneapolis lead to river bluffs in Saint Paul which require invasive removal for diverse native habitats and erosion control.

These three priority OHF sites strengthen the network of restored forest habitat spanning three counties, multiple watershed systems, and the most densely populated conservation landscape in Minnesota. Greening brings 30 years of metro forest restoration experience, established crew capacity, and active relationships with each of these partners to uniquely deliver this work at scale starting July 2027.

Bayport South WMA, MNDNR: 50 acres of oak woodland represents a WMA close to urban cities, rare in this region. Requires invasive species and preventative actions to ensure the longevity and natural regeneration of this forest within the larger WMA.
Locke Park, Fridley: Oak and mesic woodlands encompassing along Rice Creek. The Ramsey County Rice Creek West Regional Trail connects remnant oak pockets to the 31,000 residents. Requires invasive tree and shrub control to prevent further homogenization of habitat.

Marsh Lake Phase 2, Bloomington: Oak woodland and mixed forest on the Marsh Lake wetland complex along Nine Mile Creek. Extends current habitat restoration efforts (20 acres), connecting a two-mile-long upland corridor.

River Park, Brooklyn Park: Greenspace along the Mississippi River. Extends current city habitat restoration efforts by adding native trees to developing prairies and preparing woodland edges for diverse understory plantings.

Chatham Trails, Arden Hills: Floodplain forest connects city and county parks through a larger regional open space complex. Expands efforts by city volunteers on the initial invasive removal on partial sections to the full woodland.

Sunrise Confluence and Houle Parcels, Comfort Lake Forest Lake Watershed District: Upland and mesic forests along connected wetlands and the Sunrise River in Forest Lake. Connects adjacent restoration efforts by the Watershed District through concurrent efforts on these parcels.

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

Restoring forest habitat (structured canopy, native ground layer, snag retention) directly improves the breeding, foraging, and migratory stopover habitat these species depend on. Additionally, multiple sites impact riparian habitats, where forest restoration stabilizes banks, reduces sediment delivery, and supports aquatic habitats in the Mississippi, Nine Mile Creek and Rice Creek systems. Metro Forests for Minnesota Wildlife and Communities projects will improve habitats needed by wildlife Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN). Many of Minnesota's forest SGCNs are migratory. Wildlife habitat in the Metropolitan Urbanizing Region intersects with the primary mid-continent migratory corridor along and adjacent to the central Mississippi flyway.

Activities will include extensive invasive tree and shrub removal using standard practices as well as newer tested practices such as targeted, growing-season hand cutting which reduces the need for herbicide use in biologically sensitive areas. The subsequent wood waste from these deliberate activities can then be converted into biochar on-site to reduce carbon emissions, prevent soil scarring, and improve soil health. These actions prime the area for native plant reintroduction and establishment which will be achieved through planting and seeding of species that will be sustainable by the landowners and beneficial to the unique wildlife needs of each site. This mosaic of forested habitats and corridors within the urbanized portion of the state provides crucial resources for species navigating through and existing in a human developed landscape.

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

While protected, these public lands need robust initial forest restoration which these partners have identified as critical and time-sensitive opportunities to begin during this funding period.

Ecologically, invasive species do not pause between grant cycles. Every year without treatment advances understory canopy closure, increases the non-native seed bank, and raises the cost of restoration. Several sites have partners who have already begun limited volunteer and locally funded work, enough to confirm the need and demonstrate commitment, but not enough to reverse the decline at these sites alone. Delay makes restoration less realistic and more expensive in the future.

Practically, partners have confirmed match commitments, approved defined project scopes, and known staff ready to assist during this period. This alignment is the result of years of relationship-building and it does not hold indefinitely. Great River Greening has the project management capacity, crews, and the partner relationships to begin work July 2027.

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

Forest habitat in the Metro region exists almost entirely as fragments; publicly owned open space separated by development, roads, and infrastructure connected at the landscape level through corridors and habitat complexes.

The OHF's own 25-year framework confirms the scale of the challenge, stating at the time of writing, the Metropolitan Urbanizing Section contained only 12 percent permanently protected habitat, accounting for just 3 percent of the state's permanently protected acres, despite being home to more than half its public population. Invasive and non-native plant species accelerate the decline of these limited fragments from within by closing the canopy, eliminating the native ground layer, and reducing habitat function.

Great River Greening's sites address fragmentation at two scales. At the site scale, restoration converts degraded forest into functioning diverse ecosystem with a sustainable canopy, native ground layer, and the structural complexity that supports movement, foraging, and breeding habitat for wildlife. At the landscape scale, sites distributed across four counties reinforce existing protected land networks rather than creating isolated restoration patches. Community restoration work at these publicly accessible sites reaches Minnesota's densest concentration of residents, turning active restoration into visible entry points for a broader conservation ethic that sustains habitat corridors over time. With 30 years of experience and more than 8,000 members of the public engaged annually, Great River Greening brings proven capacity to connect diverse metro communities to the restoration work happening in their own backyards.

In addition to the woodland species listed previously that will directly benefit from this proposal, other wildlife that are crucial to the health of these larger habitats will gain temporary nesting or migratory refuges in these woodlands through the mosaic of habitat in the metro. These species include the federally endangered rusty patched bumble bee, Blanding's and wood turtles, and other wildlife common in the metro but dependent upon healthy woodland habitats for survival.

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

Minnesota's Wildlife Action Plan 2015-2025

Outdoor Heritage Fund: A 25 Year Framework

Which LSOHC section priorities are addressed in this program?

Metro / Urban

Protect from long-term or permanent endangerment from invasive species

Outcomes

Programs in metropolitan urbanizing region:

A forest land base that contributes to the habitat picture ~ *Restored and enhanced acreage will be reported for each of the sites. Habitat quality will be evaluated by reporting the diversification of native plant species (numbers and acres planted). Community engagement will be measured by counts of volunteer participation, attendance at outreach events, and tracked public communications throughout the grant. Together these metrics will document improved forest health across project sites, measurable restored habitat, and expanded community awareness of and investment in conservation in the Metropolitan Urbanizing Region.*

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 substituting any previous funding that was not from a legacy fund and was used for the same purpose.

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

All public partners are committed to maintaining the restoration of habitat improvements. Greening ecologists work throughout the course of the project with partner agency staff to create documentation of adaptive management techniques to ensure restoration success beyond the funding cycle. For each restoration project, site-specific resource management plans will be developed/adopted to guide effective long-term management. All land managers benefiting from R/E must commit to the long-term maintenance of these sites. A principal goal for each site is to elevate its ecological condition so that on-going management is financially feasible after a grant closes. For the sites and programs that use volunteers, community volunteer engagement promotes an increase in community stakeholders.

Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes

Year	Source of Funds	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Ongoing	Great River Greening, Local Partners, Private Landowners	Assessment and stewardship of restoration projects	Target maintenance actions, engage local partners and landowners	Take restorative action to correct any damaged or degraded habitat

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

Great River Greening believes Minnesota's high quality natural areas should be accessible to all Minnesotans. Historic and present-day inequities have created real barriers to green space, outdoor education, and conservation careers for communities of color, Indigenous peoples, and low- and moderate-income households. Addressing those disparities shapes where we work and how we design our projects. The seven-county metro is home to 31% Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) residents, the most diverse conservation landscape in Minnesota. Several of the sites in this proposal are in or directly adjacent to communities with high concentrations of BIPOC residents and low- to moderate-income households. Restoring habitat quality to publicly owned forests in these neighborhoods does not require residents to travel to access it. It improves the natural areas already in their communities. Great River Greening removes barriers to participation through volunteer events designed to welcome busy families.

Community volunteer events are open to the public to engage in the restoration process, where appropriate and beneficial to the restoration process, with outreach prioritized to adjacent neighborhoods. With over 30 years of community centered conservation in Minnesota, Great River Greening has built a diverse public stewardship program which last year engaged more than 8,000 community members, 40% of whom identified as BIPOC. Our strong volunteer base and active community partnerships mean that engagement does not end when the restoration crew leaves. Every acre restored through this proposal is on publicly owned land open to all. Communities that work alongside Great River Greening staff become invested in these places. The public that sees the impacts of the restoration efforts supported by these funds experience the benefits directly. That investment builds locally rooted stewardship capacity that no grant can fully fund but every grant should support.

Activity Details

Requirements

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

WMA

County/Municipal

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

Timeline

Activity Name	Estimated Completion Date
Provide landowners with project documentation, restoration results and proposed continued management activities for continued stewardship.	June 2032
Restore 100 acres of metro forest habitat.	June 2032
Release, award, and initiate habitat restoration contractors with external vendors.	June 2028
Record initial vegetative conditions, finalize timeline and plan and begin community outreach.	December 2027
Initiate cooperative agreements and initial designs of planned restoration projects.	December 2027

Date of Final Report Submission: 10/01/2032

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.

Totals

Item	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	$154,000	$30,000	Landowning Partners	$184,000
Contracts	$991,500	-	-	$991,500
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-
Travel	$3,000	-	-	$3,000
Professional Services	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	$67,000	$60,300	GRG	$127,300
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	$3,500	$5,000	GRG	$8,500
Supplies/Materials	$75,000	-	-	$75,000
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	**$1,294,000**	**$95,300**	**-**	**$1,389,300**

Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
GRG Staff	0.39	5.0	$154,000	$30,000	Landowning Partners	$184,000

Amount of Request: $1,294,000
Amount of Leverage: $95,300
Leverage as a percent of the Request: 7.36%
DSS + Personnel: $221,000
As a % of the total request: 17.08%
Easement Stewardship: -
As a % of the Easement Acquisition: -

How will this program accommodate the reduced appropriation recommendation from the original proposed requested amount?
The total program acres were reduced on scalable projects and reductions were made to the proposed scope of work on the original acres while still completing allowable outcomes that are maintainable by the landowning partner. Total number of project sites were reduced to match appropriation.

Detail leverage sources and confirmation of funds:
Great River Greening, landowning partners, and foundations are sources of leverage to assist with Personnel, Equipment/Tools, and DSS costs.

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?
If required, this program will reduce the number of acres it will complete on scalable projects or will reduce the proposed scope of work on the original acres while still completing allowable outcomes that are maintainable by the landowning partner.

Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?
Personnel and DSS expenses are scalable, but not proportionately, due to grant management, landowner and contractor coordination, implementation of the Great River Greening crew, and other fixed costs.

Personnel

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

Contracts

What is included in the contracts line?
Restoration contracts with service providers.

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
N/A

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?
As approved by the DNR in September 2023, GRG's DSS rate includes the allowable direct and necessary expenditures that are not captured in other line items in the budget. A portion not exceeding 50% of these costs are requested from the grant and the balance is contributed as leverage.

Other Equipment/Tools

Give examples of the types of Equipment and Tools that will be purchased?
Hand tools, saws, brush cutters, GPS devices, safety gear and other necessary equipment to complete restoration and enhancement activities.

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	-	-	100	-	100
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
Total	**-**	**-**	**100**	**-**	**100**

Total Requested Funding by Resource Type (Table 2)

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat	Total Funding
Restore	-	-	$1,294,000	-	$1,294,000
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
Total	**-**	**-**	**$1,294,000**	**-**	**$1,294,000**

Acres within each Ecological Section (Table 3)

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest	Total Acres
Restore	100	-	-	-	-	100
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	**100**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**100**

Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section (Table 4)

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest	Total Funding
Restore	$1,294,000	-	-	-	-	$1,294,000
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	**$1,294,000**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**$1,294,000**

Average Cost per Acre by Resource Type (Table 5)

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat
Restore	-	-	$12,940	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-

Average Cost per Acre by Ecological Section (Table 6)

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest
Restore	$12,940	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

0

Parcels

Parcel Information


Sign-up Criteria?
No

Explain the process used to identify, prioritize, and select the parcels on your list:
Great River Greening works with our public partners and other interested stakeholders to identify priority projects and areas. Criteria include ecological and habitat value and potential (biodiversity, size and location), congruence with existing plans and priority areas, adjacency and connectedness to other public and protected lands and complexes, willing and committed landowners and leveraged opportunities.

Restore / Enhance Parcels

Name	County	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection	Description
Locke Park	Anoka	03024211	0	$0	Yes	Upland and lowland forest along Rice Creek
East River Flats	Hennepin	02923231	28	$338,500	Yes	Restore 28 acres of mesic, floodplain, oak woodland and mesic forest along the Mississippi River
Marsh Lake Phase 2	Hennepin	02724217	0	$0	Yes	Oak woodland on the upland edge of the Marsh Lake wetland complex along Nine Mile Creek
River Park	Hennepin	11921224	0	$0	Yes	Woodland and savanna on the upland of the Mississippi River
Chatham Trails	Ramsey	03023228	0	$0	Yes	Floodplain forest in the Valentine Lake wetland complex
Mississippi River Bluffs	Ramsey	02823205	22	$457,000	Yes	Restore 22 acres of bluff forests along the Mississippi River
Bayport South WMA	Washington	02920222	50	$498,000	Yes	Restore 50 acres of oak woodland habitat within one mile of the St. Croix River
Houle Property	Washington	03221207	0	$0	Yes	Upland forest and tamarack woodland on a wetland complex
Sunrise Confluence	Washington	03221205	0	$0	Yes	Upland forest along the Sunrise River

Parcel Map


Kanabec
Pine
Mille Lacs
Isanti
Chisago
Sherburne
Anoka
Wright
Hennepin
Ramsey
Washington
Carver
Scott
Dakota
Le Sueur
Rice
Goodhue
Wabasha
0 3 6 9 mi
Protect in Easement
Protect in Fee with PILT
Protect in Fee W/O PILT
Restore
Enhance
Other

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Metro Forests for Minnesota Wildlife and Communities

Comparison Report

Program Title: ML 2027 - Metro Forests for Minnesota Wildlife and Communities
Organization: Great River Greening
Manager: Rebecca Tucker

Budget

Requested Amount: $2,968,000
Appropriated Amount: $1,294,000
Percentage: 43.6%

Item	Requested Proposal	Leverage Proposal	Appropriated AP	Leverage AP	Percent of Request	Percent of Leverage
Personnel	$369,200	$110,000	$154,000	$30,000	41.71%	27.27%
Contracts	$2,249,900	$10,000	$991,500	-	44.07%	0.0%
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-	-	-
Travel	$11,000	-	$3,000	-	27.27%	-
Professional Services	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	$145,100	$156,600	$67,000	$60,300	46.18%	38.51%
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	$11,000	$5,000	$3,500	$5,000	31.82%	100.0%
Supplies/Materials	$181,800	-	$75,000	-	41.25%	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	**$2,968,000**	**$281,600**	**$1,294,000**	**$95,300**	**43.6%**	**33.84%**

If the project received 70% of the requested funding

Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?
If required, this program will reduce the number of acres it will complete on scalable projects or will reduce the proposed scope of work on the original acres while still completing allowable outcomes that are maintainable by the landowning partner.

Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?
Personnel and DSS expenses are scalable, but not proportionately, due to grant management, landowner and contractor coordination, implementation of the Great River Greening crew, and other fixed costs.

If the project received 50% of the requested funding

Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?
If required, this program will reduce the number of acres it will complete on scalable projects and will reduce the proposed scope of work on the original acres while still completing allowable outcomes that are maintainable by the landowning partner.

Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?
Personnel and DSS expenses are scalable, but not proportionately, due to grant management, landowner and contractor coordination, implementation of the Great River Greening crew, and other fixed costs.

Output

Acres by Resource Type (Table 1)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	264	100	37.88%
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Easement	0	-	-
Enhance	0	-	-

Total Requested Funding by Resource Type (Table 2)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	$2,968,000	$1,294,000	43.6%
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-

Acres within each Ecological Section (Table 3)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	264	100	37.88%
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Easement	0	-	-
Enhance	0	-	-

Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section (Table 4)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	$2,968,000	$1,294,000	43.6%
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-