# Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

2027 Riparian Habitat Protection In the kettle and Snake River Watersheds
Laws of Minnesota 2027 Accomplishment Plan

## General Information

**Date:** 10/19/2026

**Project Title:** 2027 Riparian Habitat Protection In the kettle and Snake River Watersheds

**Funds Recommended:** $1,208,000

**Legislative Citation:**

**Appropriation Language:**

### Manager Information

**Manager's Name:** Paul Swanson
**Title:** District Manager
**Organization:** Pine County Soil and Water Conservation District
**Address:** 1610 Highway 23 North
**City:** Sandstone, MN 55072
**Email:** paul.swanson@pinecountymn.gov
**Office Number:** 320-216-4241
**Mobile Number:**
**Fax Number:**
**Website:** https://www.pineswcd.com/

### Partners Contact

**BWSR:** Dusty Van Thuyne - dusty.vanthuyne@state.mn.us - (651) 539-2573

**Pine SWCD:** Paul Swanson - paul.swanson@pinecountymn.gov - 320-216-4241

### Location Information

**County Location(s):**

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

Northern Forest

**Activity types:**

Protect in Easement

**Priority resources addressed by activity:**

Wetlands

Forest

# Narrative

## Abstract

We will utilize BWSR RIM conservation easements to protect approximately 300 acres of high-quality private forests, wetlands, and shoreline in the Northern Forest Ecological Section. Sites will be selected utilizing minor watershed/RAQ scoring and an integrative ranking process developed through a collaborative process. By using this methodology, not only will we be stacking public benefits but also maximizing conservation benefits per dollar (return on investment). Development trends pose a serious threat to Lake Sturgeon, four-toed and spotted salamanders, Gilt Darter, Northern Long-eared Bat, Blanding's Turtles, and over 128 unique, rare, endangered, and threaten species that live in these watersheds.

## Design and Scope of Work

Watersheds in northern Minnesota benefit from public lands since they are mostly forested. The primary risk to habitat and water quality is on private lands. Private forestlands are key because they are more likely to be developed resulting in habitat fragmentation, loss of connectivity, increased pollution and stormwater runoff, and siltation or sedimentation of water bodies. Conversion of private forestlands to more intense land uses place negative impacts on both wildlife habitat and water quality. Both the Kettle and Snake river watersheds have experienced an increase in development and land use conversion in recent years. Since most of the prime lakeshore in the counties is developed, present and future development of river shoreland is expected.

The DNR Hinckley Area Fisheries Office has been tagging and monitoring Lake Sturgeon in the Kettle, St. Croix, and Snake rivers since the early 1990's. Populations appear to be stable and small sturgeon are recruiting into the fishery. While Lake Sturgeon populations appear to be healthy in the Kettle and Snake Rivers, their future relies on clean water. Healthy forests, wetlands, and shorelines in watersheds are vital to the water quality downstream. Thus, protecting private riparian forestland is critical to fish and wildlife habitat.

In 2016, the MN DNR and BWSR, working with SWCDs and partners developed a protection framework based on research developed by MN DNR Fisheries. The MN DNR identified a strong correlation between water quality and habitat that sustains fish populations and maintaining 75 percent forest cover in the watershed. The process works as follows: 1) Prioritize minor watersheds that have less than 75% protected watersheds, 2) Target specific parcels using RAQ scores and 3) over time, measure progress toward 75% forestland protection goal on watershed basis. We periodically measure the percent of the watersheds with permanent forest protection to illustrate this transformation on graphic dial like a speedometer. As of early 2026, the Kettle Watershed is 57.06% protected, and the Snake Watershed is 48.84% protected.

To move the needle in Kettle and Snake watersheds, this program will utilize BWSR's Reinvest in Minnesota (RIM) conservation easements. To maximize conservation return on investment the SWCDs will select parcels with the greatest conservation value. To accomplish this, we will use the RAQ methodology scoring system (Riparian, Adjacent, Quality). Each private forested parcel is scored on a 0-10 scale based on the parcel proximity to water ("Riparian") or protected lands ("Adjacency") and various local defined features ("Quality"), such as wild rice, trout, and biodiversity. In short, the RAQ tool prioritizes parcels with benefits overlapping – habitat, biodiversity, cost, water quality, and resiliency to create and protect extensive habitat complexes. Therefore, using the minor

watershed/RAQ methodology we are stacking public benefits and maximizing the conservation benefits per dollar. We will protect approximately 300 acres of high-quality private forests, wetlands, and shoreline habitat important for Lake Sturgeon and another 128 Species in Greatest Conservation Need that are known to occur within these watersheds.

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

Most of the project area falls within the Mille Lacs Uplands Subsections. 128 Species in Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) are known or predicted to occur within the Mille Lacs Uplands, the third most of all subsections in Minnesota. According to the species problem analysis in the Tomorrow's Habitat for the Wild and Rare: An Action Plan for Minnesota Wildlife, habitat loss and degradation is the most significant challenge facing SGCN populations in this subsection. This project seeks to address this challenge by protecting the healthy riparian lands from the threat of development, habitat loss or degradation through the use of RIM conservation easements.

The project area has a mixed representation of extensive forest lands and riparian habitats that are home to many Species of Greatest Conservation Need including: Lake Sturgeon, Blanding's turtle, wood turtles, gray wolves, bald eagles, ospreys, sandhill cranes, trumpeter swans, and yellow rails. The St. Croix River Basin is also globally-recognized for its mussel diversity, over 40 known mussels occur within the St. Croix River Basin, including 5 federally endangered, and 20 state-listed species such as rare mussels like the winged mapleleaf, spike, and round pigtoe.

The Kettle and Snake Rivers are also home to populations of Lake Sturgeon (Acipenser fulvescens). These bony-plated, ancient-looking fish prefer moderately clear, large rivers and lakes, where they can migrate long distances to spawning areas and foraging for the invertebrates and small fish that make up their diet. Their large sizes and fighting qualities make them a favorite among catch and release anglers. Sturgeon are long-lived, slow growing, and can take many years to mature and be able to reproduce. They are vulnerable to degraded water quality and over exploitation, as well as to dams which block fish passage. Therefore, protecting high-quality private forests, wetlands, and shoreline is critical to maintain fish and wildlife habitat.

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

Because of its proximity to the Twin Cities and its vast network of roads, this area is under increasing pressure from human activities, including the expansion of residential development, some of it affecting river shoreline. While Lake Sturgeon populations appear to be healthy in the Kettle and Snake Rivers, their future relies on clean water. Healthy forests, wetlands, and shorelines in watersheds are vital to the water quality. If we do nothing this type of development along the rivers will continue. Increases in housing density and associated development on rural forest lands can be linked to numerous changes to private forest services across watersheds, including decreases in native wildlife; changes in forest health; and reduced water quality, forest carbon storage, timber production, and recreational benefits. Protecting healthy watersheds with conservation easements now is a cost-effective strategy to ensure that the ecosystem and economic services provided by healthy watersheds remain intact.

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

This project will utilize the Landscape Stewardship Plans minor watershed science-based targeting to expand important habitat corridors and complexes on private lands. The RAQ tool scores each private forested parcel on a 0-3 scale for each of common characteristics; "Riparian"--the parcels proximity to water, "Adjacency"--the parcels

location in relation to contiguous tracts of existing state, county, or federal land in preference to parcels scattered across the landscape, knowing that a forest community is healthier and more diverse with less fragmentation, and "Quality"-- is the locally determined value of the land (1-3 Points), which can include a number of criteria, such as biodiversity from the MN County Biological Survey, trout/cisco, wild rice, old growth forests, rare species, and groundwater recharge and sensitive areas.

The RAQ tool has been developed for the entire Kettle River Watershed and includes a series of RAQ maps for each major HUC-10 subwatershed. The RAQ tool will be a helpful tool to target areas where public investments will have the most benefit. This scoring was updated in 2022 with a new Landscape Stewardship Plan for the Kettle and Upper St. Croix watersheds. RAQ was developed for the Snake River Watershed with the first round of funding for this program. This data targets RIM easements to the parcel level and this allows us to hand select the best parcels for habitat value and prevent future fragmentation in the entire watershed. The following additional factors are considered to ensure site selection reflects current science-based measures for riparian habitat protection: feet of shoreline protected, development potential of site, depth from shore, watershed considerations, and easement size relative to the parcel. This played an integral part in outreach, interested and successful enrollment the first and second round of funding. This 2-step methodology is proven through Environmental Natural Resource Trust Fund and Clean Water Fund RIM easement programs. The BWSR RIM is one of the most efficient and effective easement programs in Minnesota.

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

Minnesota Forest Resource Council Landscape Plans

Outdoor Heritage Fund: A 25 Year Framework

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

**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 the northern forest region:

Forestlands are protected from development and fragmentation ~ *Forestlands are protected from development and fragmentation This project will measure the number acres of forestland and wetland habitat enrolled into RIM easements. We also will measure the number of miles of shoreline protected and the individual minor watershed percent protection goal.*

### 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 funding request is not supplanting existing funding or a substitution for any previous funding.

### 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-Ongoing | Landowner responsibility | Maintain compliance with easement terms. | - | - |
| 2027-Ongoing | Stewardship Account | Inspections every year for the first five years; then every third year. | Corrective actions to address violations. | Enforcement action taken by MN Attorney General's office. |

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

Lake sturgeon have long held importance in Native American cultures, including the bands of Ojibwe who call this area of Minnesota, home. Lake sturgeon are also a favored catch-and-release fish species in some circles of anglers. By protecting habitat that protects sturgeon populations, we are able to provide opportunities for many Minnesota communities to continue practice of their culture and recreational opportunities.

## 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 State of Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) will be the responsible party for monitoring and enforcing easements with assistance from the appropriate SWCD for monitoring.

**Who will be the easement holder?**
The State of Minnesota through the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR).

**What is the anticipated number of easements (range is fine) you plan to accomplish with this appropriation?**
5; the actual number will depend on the cost of 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?**
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.

RIM's statutory language requires restriction of building and agricultural activities on an easement. If RIM also required public access, the landowner would be retaining almost no private rights to the land and still paying property taxes. RIM easement land is still in private ownership and the landowner still pays property taxes and is still consistent with the statutory goals of the Outdoor Heritage Fund of protection and restoration of habitat. Minnesota Statute 97A.056 states ". . .the fund must be expended to restore, protect, and enhance wetlands, prairies, forests, and habitat for fish, game, and wildlife." and "The council shall make recommendations . . . that directly relate to the restoration, protection, and enhancement of wetlands, prairies, forests, and habitat for fish, game, and wildlife, and that prevent forest fragmentation, encourage forest consolidation, and expand restored native prairie."

Criteria in RIM program scoresheets used to evaluate and prioritize parcels funded include proximity of the easement land to lands that are in public ownership and/or open to public hunting. Parcels immediately adjacent to public land or that would connect or expand larger existing habitat areas receive additional points in the scoring and ranking process than a parcel that does not provide that benefit. Wildlife do not follow property lines; therefore protected private lands adjacent to and near public lands create complexes of public and private land that provide high quality habitat supporting wildlife, including recreationally hunted species, allowing them to thrive on and off public lands. Protected private lands also add visual and noise buffers that allow users of public land to better enjoy their experiences.

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

**Describe the types of trails or roads and the allowable uses:**
Though uncommon, new trails may be developed if they contribute to easement maintenance or benefit the easement site (fire breaks, berm maintenance, forest stewardship) and are noted on the conservation plan. Narrow mowed trails for personal use are allowed for landowner access on RIM easements. Unauthorized trails are a violation of the easement.

**How will maintenance and monitoring be accomplished?**
Under the terms of the easement, a conservation plan is developed with the landowner and maintained as part of each easement. Landowners are required to maintain compliance with the easement and the conservation plan. BWSR, in cooperation with SWCDs, implements a stewardship process to track, monitor quality and assure compliance with easement terms and the conservation plan.

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

Vegetative restoration will occur when necessary and these restoration costs are included in the Easement Acquisition line of the budget table.

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

## Timeline

| Activity Name | Estimated Completion Date |
|---|---|
| RIM easements secured on 300 acres | June 30, 2031 |
| Final Report Submitted | October 1, 2031 |

**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 | $96,700 | - | - | $96,700 |
| Contracts | $12,500 | - | - | $12,500 |
| Fee Acquisition w/ PILT | - | - | - | - |
| Fee Acquisition w/o PILT | - | - | - | - |
| Easement Acquisition | $1,021,800 | - | - | $1,021,800 |
| Easement Stewardship | $50,000 | - | - | $50,000 |
| Travel | $2,100 | - | - | $2,100 |
| Professional Services | - | - | - | - |
| Direct Support Services | $21,000 | - | - | $21,000 |
| DNR Land Acquisition Costs | - | - | - | - |
| Capital Equipment | - | - | - | - |
| Other Equipment/Tools | $3,000 | - | - | $3,000 |
| Supplies/Materials | $900 | - | - | $900 |
| DNR IDP | - | - | - | - |
| **Grand Total** | **$1,208,000** | **-** | **-** | **$1,208,000** |

## Partner: BWSR

### *Totals*

| Item | Funding Request | Leverage | Leverage Source | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Personnel | $81,600 | - | - | $81,600 |
| Contracts | $12,500 | - | - | $12,500 |
| Fee Acquisition w/ PILT | - | - | - | - |
| Fee Acquisition w/o PILT | - | - | - | - |
| Easement Acquisition | $1,021,800 | - | - | $1,021,800 |
| Easement Stewardship | $50,000 | - | - | $50,000 |
| Travel | $2,100 | - | - | $2,100 |
| Professional Services | - | - | - | - |
| Direct Support Services | $21,000 | - | - | $21,000 |
| DNR Land Acquisition Costs | - | - | - | - |
| Capital Equipment | - | - | - | - |
| Other Equipment/Tools | $3,000 | - | - | $3,000 |
| Supplies/Materials | $900 | - | - | $900 |
| DNR IDP | - | - | - | - |
| **Grand Total** | **$1,192,900** | **-** | **-** | **$1,192,900** |

### *Personnel*

| Position | Annual FTE | Years Working | Funding Request | Leverage | Leverage Source | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Program Management | 0.15 | 4.0 | $81,600 | - | - | $81,600 |

## Partner: Pine SWCD

***Totals***

| Item | Funding Request | Leverage | Leverage Source | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Personnel | $15,100 | - | - | $15,100 |
| Contracts | - | - | - | - |
| 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 | - | - | - | - |
| DNR IDP | - | - | - | - |
| **Grand Total** | **$15,100** | **-** | **-** | **$15,100** |

***Personnel***

| Position | Annual FTE | Years Working | Funding Request | Leverage | Leverage Source | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Program Administration | 0.03 | 4.0 | $15,100 | - | - | $15,100 |

**Amount of Request:** $1,208,000
**Amount of Leverage:** -
**Leverage as a percent of the Request:** 0.0%
**DSS + Personnel:** $117,700
**As a % of the total request:** 9.74%
**Easement Stewardship:** $50,000
**As a % of the Easement Acquisition:** 4.89%

**How will this program accommodate the reduced appropriation recommendation from the original proposed requested amount?**
A reduction in funding reduced outputs (acres/activities) almost 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 50% reduction in funding would reduce outputs proportionally.

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

A small portion of easement staff time specifically for appropriation and program management and reporting remains relatively consistent regardless of appropriation amount.

## Personnel

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

## Contracts

**What is included in the contracts line?**
The contracts line is used for payments to SWCD staff for easement acquisition and technical assistance, as appropriate. Estimated restoration costs are included in the easement acquisition line.

## Easement Stewardship

**What is the number of easements anticipated, cost per easement for stewardship, and explain how that amount is calculated?**
5 easements at $10,000 per easement. 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. 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.

## 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**
The travel line will only be used for traditional travel costs.

**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?**
Steel posts and signs to mark easement boundaries.

# 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 | 48 | - | 252 | - | 300 |
| Enhance | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Total** | **48** | **-** | **252** | **-** | **300** |

## 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 | $193,300 | - | $1,014,700 | - | $1,208,000 |
| Enhance | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Total** | **$193,300** | **-** | **$1,014,700** | **-** | **$1,208,000** |

## 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 | - | - | - | - | 300 | 300 |
| Enhance | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Total** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **300** | **300** |

## 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 | - | - | - | - | $1,208,000 | $1,208,000 |
| Enhance | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Total** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **$1,208,000** | **$1,208,000** |

## 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 | $4,027 | - | $4,026 | - |
| 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 | - | - | - | - | $4,026 |
| Enhance | - | - | - | - | - |

## Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

2.8 miles

# 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:**
The SWCDs will mail letters to eligible landowners utilizing RAQ scoring. Once the SWCD has an interested landowner the easement will be ranked using the integrative ranking process.The Kettle and Snake RIM Easement ranking sheet is attached as an example of the scoring sheet that will be used to rank RIM Easements. The SWCD then brings the parcel to the project technical committee for comments and recommendations. This committee reviews easement proposals and sorts through them for the parcels that provide the greatest public benefit possible. We always look for areas with high quality habitat, where a limited public investment can leverage a larger area of public benefit. The result is an increase in resiliency to the habitat base. The parcels that rank the highest tend to be adjacent to public lands, in a river corridor, or both.

# Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

2027 Riparian Habitat Protection In the kettle and Snake River Watersheds

Comparison Report

**Program Title:** ML 2027 - 2027 Riparian Habitat Protection In the kettle and Snake River Watersheds
**Organization:** Pine County Soil and Water Conservation District
**Manager:** Paul Swanson

## Budget

**Requested Amount:** $4,000,000
**Appropriated Amount:** $1,208,000
**Percentage:** 30.2%

| Item | Requested Proposal | Leverage Proposal | Appropriated AP | Leverage AP | Percent of Request | Percent of Leverage |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Personnel | $327,500 | - | $96,700 | - | 29.53% | - |
| Contracts | $42,500 | - | $12,500 | - | 29.41% | - |
| Fee Acquisition w/ PILT | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Fee Acquisition w/o PILT | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Easement Acquisition | $3,370,100 | - | $1,021,800 | - | 30.32% | - |
| Easement Stewardship | $170,000 | - | $50,000 | - | 29.41% | - |
| Travel | $6,900 | - | $2,100 | - | 30.43% | - |
| Professional Services | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Direct Support Services | $70,100 | - | $21,000 | - | 29.96% | - |
| DNR Land Acquisition Costs | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Capital Equipment | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Other Equipment/Tools | $9,900 | - | $3,000 | - | 30.3% | - |
| Supplies/Materials | $3,000 | - | $900 | - | 30.0% | - |
| DNR IDP | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Grand Total** | **$4,000,000** | **-** | **$1,208,000** | **-** | **30.2%** | **-** |

## If the project received 70% of the requested funding

**Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?**
A 50% reduction in funding would reduce outputs proportionally.

**Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?**
A small portion of easement staff time specifically for appropriation and program management and reporting remains relatively consistent regardless of appropriation amount.

## If the project received 50% of the requested funding

**Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?**
A 30% reduction in funding would reduce outputs proportionally.

**Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?**
A small portion of easement staff time specifically for appropriation and program management and reporting remains relatively consistent regardless of appropriation amount.

# 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 | 1,020 | 300 | 29.41% |
| 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 | $4,000,000 | $1,208,000 | 30.2% |
| 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 | 1,020 | 300 | 29.41% |
| 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 | $4,000,000 | $1,208,000 | 30.2% |
| Enhance | - | - | - |