Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Martin County WMA Acquisition Phase 11

Laws of Minnesota 2027 Accomplishment Plan

General Information

Date: 10/13/2026

Project Title: Martin County WMA Acquisition Phase 11

Funds Recommended: $2,616,000

Legislative Citation:

Appropriation Language:

Manager Information

Manager's Name: Doug Hartke
Title: Grant Coordinator
Organization: Fox Lake Conservation League, Inc.
Address: PO Box 212
City: Sherburn, MN 56171
Email: doughartke@gmail.com
Office Number:
Mobile Number: 507-236-1700
Fax Number:
Website: Foxlakeconservation.com

Partners Contact

Ducks Unlimited: Jake Chronister - jchronister@ducks.org - (507) 706-1904

Fox Lake Conservation League: Doug Hartke - doughartke@gmail.com - 507-236-1700

The Conservation Fund: Stacy Salvevold - ssalvevold@conservationfund.org - (651) 243-4149

Location Information

County Location(s): Watonwan and Martin.

Eco regions in which work will take place:

Prairie

Activity types:

Protect in Fee

Priority resources addressed by activity:

Prairie

Wetlands

Narrative

Abstract

This program will continue our conservation partnership into Phase 11 to protect and restore diverse prairie and wetland habitat in areas that adjoin existing DNR WMA. Parcels are identified with representatives of local government, Windom area MN DNR, Ducks Unlimited (DU), The Conservation Fund (TCF), the Fox Lake Conservation League, Inc (FLCL), and other local partners. Wetland restoration and additional grasslands are needed to make our WMA habitats resilient and productive. We will optimize this process by utilizing real estate expertise of TCF, wetland restoration know-how of DU, and the local conservation efforts of FLCL.

Design and Scope of Work

This proposal will restore 200 acres of prairie wetlands and grasslands in Martin and Watonwan Counties. Our partnership brings together the expertise of three organizations with a strong history working in the area. The Conservation Fund (TCF) will negotiate the acquisition and lead the real estate process for properties targeted in this proposal. Fox Lake Conservation League will hold and monitor the properties during the restoration work, which will be completed by Ducks Unlimited. The completely restored lands will then be conveyed to the MN DNR for perpetual protection and management. All projects are done in partnership with neighboring landowners and without disruption to existing drainage of their lands.

Shallow lake and wetland restorations are top priority actions in all major conservation plans for Minnesota. Our work addresses the habitat goals identified in the North American Waterfowl Management Plan, Minnesota's Prairie Conservation Plan, and Minnesota's Duck Recovery Plan which calls for the active management of 1,800 shallow lakes and restoring 64,000 wetlands to Minnesota's landscape. This work is time-sensitive because complex shallow lake and wetland restoration projects take several years to design and implement. Additionally, grasslands surrounding these wetlands are critical to the prairie ecosystem but difficult to acquire in the agricultural landscape of Martin County. This proposal will best prepare the partnership to act when landowners are willing to sell their lands to conservation.

Priority land acquisition areas have been identified with considerations for proximity to existing protected lands (DNR Wildlife Management Areas), threatened and endangered species' key habitats, and important watersheds. Acquired lands will be restored using best management practices to accurately represent and manage for pre-settlement conditions. The extensive agricultural and drainage history of Southwest Minnesota has resulted in the loss of 90% of our prairie wetlands and 99% of the native prairie on the landscape. What remains of the lakes and wetlands are only those which were too deep to drain and have now become nutrient rich, invaded by exotic species, and are overall unproductive to wetland-dependent species. These factors have caused a significant decline in Minnesota's once diverse waterfowl population, and as a result, in Minnesota's rich waterfowling traditions.

Through this funding, TCF, FLCL, and DU will acquire and restore much needed habitats to the landscape where wetland-wildlife, prairie species, and people will flourish. Further, these sites will improve water quality, soil conservation, and water storage in the region.

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

This program protects and restores threatened habitats in Martin County. Native prairie and high-quality wetlands will be protected, buffered, and expanded upon. Restoration sites will provide the opportunity to expand populations of at-risk and threatened plant species that Martin SWCD has propagated and introduced into permanent protected sites. The FLCL is continuing work initiated by Martin County SWCD, by selecting locally rare, at-risk species for propagation and use on these and future habitat restoration projects to protect the local native seed source. While hundreds of Sullivant's milkweed (Asclepia sullivantii) and Tuberous Indian Plantain (Cacalia tuberosa) have been introduced into WMAs and other protected land, Small white lady's slipper (Cypripedium candidum) and Rattlesnake master (Eryngium yuccifolium) will continue to be propagated using local source plant material for use in this project. Parcels selected for this proposal expand habitat protection for the threatened Blanding's Turtle (Emydoidea blandigii) Perch Creek population that has been studied by the MN DNR and featured in the "MN Volunteer". In 2025, this partnership protected 307 acres at Perch Creek and Manyaska WMA's. This proposal is largely targeting parcels adjacent to those recent additions.

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

We continue to have great success with our previous funding by protecting over 2,500 acres to existing WMA's since phase 1 of this program. It can be a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity when we find a willing seller that owns some of our highest priority native habitat and marginal agricultural lands in proximity to WMAs and other protected natural habitats. If we don't act immediately, these lands may never become available in the future or may be converted to other uses, with degradation or complete elimination of natural features and high-value resources that currently exist. Additionally, wind easements are quickly sweeping across Southwest Minnesota and directly compete with our interests and ability to protect affected lands. This proposal will financially prepare us to act quickly when parcels in our focus area become available.

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

Our "Martin County Conservation Alliance" has grown into a planning group that includes wildlife group representatives, NGO's, local government, and state agencies. There is a wide range of expertise and experience within the group. We utilized Historic information, the MN County Biological Survey, GIS spatial data, and local knowledge to identify areas where habitat restoration will be most beneficial. Expanding habitat complexes by protecting and restoring lands adjacent to existing high-quality native habitat and habitat already protected through public ownership or permanent conservation easements is our key focus. Parcels which will link or expand sites with threatened or endangered species and species-in-decline further narrowed our focus area. We additionally highlighted opportunities to protect and enhance habitat buffers along water courses and lake chains. On our parcel list, we have the following tracts that have areas of biodiversity significance as identified by the MN County Biological Survey:

Caron WMA: moderate level of biodiversity significance and has a Priority Shallow Lake as identified by DNR Wildlife. Caron WMA is also part of a Pheasant Habitat Complex.
Perch Creek WMA: High level of biodiversity significance.

Additionally, some of the targeted parcels occur in landscapes that are estimated to support 10-25 breeding ducks per square mile as per USFWS. Breeding pair accessibility will only increase with increased wetland restoration in these areas. One highlight of this program's work is increasing Perch Creek WMA complex to over the threshold of 40% grasslands and 20% wetlands. This is the scientifically recognized threshold at which waterfowl populations

can have an overall net gain in production. This habitat goal has been recognized in the MN Duck Recovery Plan, MN Prairie Conservation Plan, MN Working Lands Initiative, Prairie Pothole Joint Venture, and others.

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

Long Range Duck Recovery Plan

Minnesota's Wildlife Management Area Acquisition - The Next 50 Years

Which LSOHC section priorities are addressed in this program?

Prairie

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

Outcomes

Programs in prairie region:

Key core parcels are protected for fish, game and other wildlife ~ *By adding these important parcels to the Martin County WMA complexes we are restoring valuable wetlands and grasslands to the WMAs of Southern Minnesota. These added diverse prairies will provide much needed habitat for many wildlife species. This program will also add valuable acres for public hunting, fishing and other outdoor activities with all of the fish, game, and rare species that will be found on this new public land.*

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

This proposal does not supplant or substitute previous funding for the same purpose.

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

Initial restoration efforts focus on long term, low maintenance solutions to water control structures and native prairie plantings. Maintaining habitat and infrastructure after our restoration and donation to DNR is complete will be the responsibility of the MN DNR. However, local groups within the "Martin County Conservation Alliance" will be there to assist the DNR with future private dollars and partner ECP CPL grants, if and when available. Local partners will continue to install additional local source native plant species to enhance habitat to support more species, including pollinators. Local partner monitoring will assist in identifying invasive species threats and aid with eradication or control when necessary.

Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes

Year	Source of Funds	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Ongoing	Local	Monitor and add local species	Monitor for invasive species	Treat and plant as needed
Ongoing	MN DNR Budget	Monitoring	Maintenance	Management

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

13.2% of Martin County is below the poverty line, according to the 2023 Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates. Restoration of wetlands and grasslands will create high-quality habitat to support healthy wildlife populations in

the area for all people to enjoy with low-barrier recreation opportunities. These actions will help improve air quality, water quality, support pollinator populations, and help fight climate change and the disproportionate effects it has on BIPOC and low-income communities. These newly restored lands will be open to the public and will provide numerous opportunities for all people to enjoy through hunting, wildlife viewing, kayaking, canoeing, and various other forms of outdoor recreation and education. This proposal includes a shallow lake restoration just outside of Fairmont, which will provide recreation as well as improve drinking water supply and decrease flooding of this community.

Activity Details

Requirements

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

Will county board or other local government approval be formally sought prior to acquisition, per 97A.056 subd 13(j)?**
No

Describe any measures to inform local governments of land acquisition under their jurisdiction:
Local governments will be informed at least 30 days prior to any sale using OHF funds in writing via email and/or paper copy.

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

Land Use

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

Explain what will be planted and include the maximum percentage of any acquired parcel that would be planted into foodplots by the proposer or the end owner of the property:
Food Plots could be utilized by the MN DNR as part of their WMA management plans. Short-term farming may be necessary in the timetable to best restore the uplands to native habitats.

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

Is this land currently open for hunting and fishing?
No

Will the land be open for hunting and fishing after completion?
Yes

Describe any variation from the State of Minnesota regulations:
All of these lands will be part the DNR WMA system.

Who will eventually own the fee title land?

State of MN

Land acquired in fee will be designated as a:

WMA

What is the anticipated number of closed acquisitions (range is fine) you plan to accomplish with this appropriation?
1-3

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?
Yes

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
Follow-up/Maintenance/Weed Control	2028 and Beyond
Plan Restoration	Winter 2027 - Winter 2031
Complete Restoration	2027-2032
Transfer to MN DNR	2027 - 2030
Acquire Parcel (s)	Summer 2027 - Summer 2030
Begin Parcel qualification and review	Summer and Fall 2027

Date of Final Report Submission: 06/30/2032

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.

Grand Totals Across All Partnerships

Item	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	$108,000	$20,000	-, DU, NAWCA	$128,000
Contracts	$242,000	$50,000	-, DU, NAWCA	$292,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	$1,920,800	-	-	$1,920,800
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-
Travel	$26,400	$2,000	DU, NAWCA	$28,400
Professional Services	$47,400	-	-	$47,400
Direct Support Services	$10,400	-	-	$10,400
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	$60,000	-	-	$60,000
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	$5,000	-	-	$5,000
Supplies/Materials	$161,000	-	-	$161,000
DNR IDP	$35,000	-	-	$35,000
Grand Total	**$2,616,000**	**$72,000**	**-**	**$2,688,000**

Partner: Ducks Unlimited

Totals

Item	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	$80,000	$20,000	DU, NAWCA	$100,000
Contracts	$242,000	$50,000	DU, NAWCA	$292,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-
Travel	$25,000	$2,000	DU, NAWCA	$27,000
Professional Services	$17,400	-	-	$17,400
Direct Support Services	$6,400	-	-	$6,400
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	$5,000	-	-	$5,000
Supplies/Materials	$161,000	-	-	$161,000
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	**$536,800**	**$72,000**	**-**	**$608,800**

Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
DU Conservation Staff - Biologists and Engineers	0.33	3.0	$80,000	$20,000	DU, NAWCA	$100,000

Partner: Fox Lake Conservation League

Totals

Item	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	-	-	-	-
Contracts	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	$1,920,800	-	-	$1,920,800
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-
Travel	-	-	-	-
Professional Services	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	-	-	-	-
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	$60,000	-	-	$60,000
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	-	-	-	-
Supplies/Materials	-	-	-	-
DNR IDP	$35,000	-	-	$35,000
Grand Total	**$2,015,800**	**-**	**-**	**$2,015,800**

Partner: The Conservation Fund

Totals

Item	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	$28,000	-	-	$28,000
Contracts	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-
Travel	$1,400	-	-	$1,400
Professional Services	$30,000	-	-	$30,000
Direct Support Services	$4,000	-	-	$4,000
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	-	-	-	-
Supplies/Materials	-	-	-	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	**$63,400**	**-**	**-**	**$63,400**

Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
MN TCF staff	0.1	4.0	$28,000	-	-	$28,000

Amount of Request: $2,616,000
Amount of Leverage: $72,000
Leverage as a percent of the Request: 2.75%
DSS + Personnel: $118,400
As a % of the total request: 4.53%
Easement Stewardship: -
As a % of the Easement Acquisition: -

How will this program accommodate the reduced appropriation recommendation from the original proposed requested amount?
the number of acres and budgets will be reduced proportionately

Detail leverage sources and confirmation of funds:
DU will work diligently to leverage OHF grant funds with additional sources, but OHF acquisition expense is typically needed first.

FLCL will provide leverage through volunteer hours and travel costs at their own expense, which is estimated in the table above.

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?
The number of acres would be reduced proportionately.

Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?
Personnel and DSS are budgeted by number of projects in this program. A baseline amount of time and effort are needed for every project, regardless of size. Therefore, personnel and DSS will not be adjusted at the same proportions as acres, contracts, and other categories.

Personnel

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

Contracts

What is included in the contracts line?
Contracts are for private contractor charges to restore/enhance wetlands (earthmoving) and grasslands (native seeding) on lands acquired. Wetland restoration in Martin County is very expensive and requires engineering due to intensive landscape drainage via complex networks of private/public tile/ditches that affect private neighbors and public roads.

Professional Services

What is included in the Professional Services line?

Appraisals

Other : Soil investigations, county tile petition fees, Phase I environmental review

Surveys

Title Insurance and Legal Fees

Fee Acquisition

What is the anticipated number of fee title acquisition transactions?

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
DU - travel costs consist of in-state mileage and lodging for land manager, biologists, and engineering field staff. DU generally does not spend OHF grant funds on food.
TCF - Mileage or car rental with fuel and lodging are charged for project specific travel. TCF does not spend OHF grant funds on food.

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?
FLCL- we will not charge DSS.
TCF: Direct Support Services has been reviewed and approved by Minnesota DNR grants staff, and is determined using our Federally-approved and audited rate as the basis for calculating Direct Support Services as a percentage of the budgeted personnel costs.
DU: Minnesota DNR grants staff previously reviewed and approved DU accounting methodology for Direct Support Services, which are calculated and included in DU staff costs. DU Direct Support Services constitute approximately 8% of DU overall staff costs on average among DU conservation staff billing categories.

Other Equipment/Tools

Give examples of the types of Equipment and Tools that will be purchased?
GPS survey equipment for performing engineering wetland restoration survey work and engineering surveys of shallow lake and wetland projects, including survey equipment lease charges instead of actual outright equipment purchases to avoid buying equipment that becomes obsolete due to upgrades and advancements. Other examples include hand tools and other field equipment as needs arise.

Federal Funds

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

Are the funds confirmed?
No

What is the approximate date you anticipate receiving confirmation of the federal funds?
Beginning in 2027 via future NAWCA grants leveraged to help restore lands acquired via OHF. This first requires expenditures of state OHF grant funds on land acquisitions to leverage federal NAWCA grant funds to restore lands acquired.

Output Tables

Acres by Resource Type (Table 1)

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat	Total Acres
Restore	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	40	160	-	-	200
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
Total	**40**	**160**	**-**	**-**	**200**

Total Requested Funding by Resource Type (Table 2)

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat	Total Funding
Restore	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	$523,200	$2,092,800	-	-	$2,616,000
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
Total	**$523,200**	**$2,092,800**	**-**	**-**	**$2,616,000**

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	-	-	-	200	-	200
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	**-**	**-**	**-**	**200**	**-**	**200**

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	-	-	-	$2,616,000	-	$2,616,000
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	**-**	**-**	**-**	**$2,616,000**	**-**	**$2,616,000**

Average Cost per Acre by Resource Type (Table 5)

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat
Restore	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	$13,080	$13,080	-	-
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	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	$13,080	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

Parcels

Parcel Information

Sign-up Criteria?
No

Explain the process used to identify, prioritize, and select the parcels on your list:
We utilized historic information, the MN County Biologic Survey, GIS spatial data, and local knowledge to identify areas where habitat restoration will be most beneficial. Expanding habitat complexes by protecting and restoring lands adjacent to existing high-quality native habitat and habitat already protected through public ownership or permanent conservation easements is our key focus. Parcels which will link or expand sites with threatened or endangered species and species-in-decline further narrowed our focus area. We additionally highlighted opportunities to protect and enhance habitat buffers along water courses and lake chains.

Fee Parcels

Name	County	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection
Caron WMA Parcel 14	Martin	10333224	80	$900,000	No
Manyaska WMA	Martin	10232222	30	$400,000	No
Manyaska WMA	Martin	10232222	50	$680,000	No
Manyaska WMA	Martin	10232222	35	$450,000	No
Manyaska WMA	Martin	10232222	20	$325,000	No
Rooney Run WMA	Martin	10332228	80	$1,350,000	No
Perch Creek WMA	Watonwan	10530219	320	$3,370,200	No
Perch Creek WMA	Watonwan	10530231	80	$880,000	No
Perch Creek WMA Parcel 17A	Watonwan	10530230	140	$1,217,800	No

Parcel Map


Redwood
Brown
Nicollet
Le Su
Cottonwood
Watonwan
Blue Earth
Jackson
Martin
Faribault
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

Martin County WMA Acquisition Phase 11

Comparison Report

Program Title: ML 2027 - Martin County WMA Acquisition Phase 11
Organization: Fox Lake Conservation League, Inc.
Manager: Doug Hartke

Budget

Requested Amount: $12,972,000
Appropriated Amount: $2,616,000
Percentage: 20.17%

Item	Requested Proposal	Leverage Proposal	Appropriated AP	Leverage AP	Percent of Request	Percent of Leverage
Personnel	$512,000	$90,000	$108,000	$20,000	21.09%	22.22%
Contracts	$1,210,000	$400,000	$242,000	$50,000	20.0%	12.5%
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	$9,573,000	-	$1,920,800	-	20.06%	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-	-	-
Travel	$132,000	$12,000	$26,400	$2,000	20.0%	16.67%
Professional Services	$234,000	-	$47,400	-	20.26%	-
Direct Support Services	$47,700	-	$10,400	-	21.8%	-
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	$287,200	-	$60,000	-	20.89%	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	$25,000	-	$5,000	-	20.0%	-
Supplies/Materials	$805,000	-	$161,000	-	20.0%	-
DNR IDP	$146,100	-	$35,000	-	23.96%	-
Grand Total	**$12,972,000**	**$502,000**	**$2,616,000**	**$72,000**	**20.17%**	**14.34%**

If the project received 70% of the requested funding

Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?
The number of acres would be reduced proportionately.

Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?
Personnel and DSS are budgeted by number of projects in this program. A baseline amount of time and effort are needed for every project, regardless of size. Therefore, personnel and DSS will not be adjusted at the same proportions as acres, contracts, and other categories.

If the project received 50% of the requested funding

Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?
The number of acres would be reduced proportionately and we would target priority projects with funding available.

Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?
Personnel and DSS are budgeted by number of projects in this program. A baseline amount of time and effort are needed for every project, regardless of size. Therefore, personnel and DSS will not be adjusted at the same proportions as acres, contracts, and other categories.

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	835	200	23.95%
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	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	$12,972,000	$2,616,000	20.17%
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	0	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	835	200	23.95%
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	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	$12,972,000	$2,616,000	20.17%
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-