

Summary of Member Comments and Questions

ID#	Program Title	Suzanne Baird	Rep. John Burkel	Kristin Eggerling	David Hartwell	Sen. Fong Hawj	Matt Kucharski	Sen. Andrew Lang	Darrel Palmer	Tom Saxhaug	Ron Schara	Ted Suss	Rep. Samantha Vang
PA01	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XIX		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 5/10. WMA acquisition provides public hunting/fishing benefits but expands public ownership and PILT exposure; rank lower than restoration/easement projects.		How do you define what is the goal of restoration in terms of fully functioning wetlands? What does "permanently protected by PF" mean?		Strong program, good leverage, money being spent		Phase XiX?? Land Acq for public use, good past performance, small amount of unused funds, good matching funds @ 14.48%. What is ultimate goal?			1)To what degree will existing field tile be blocked or modified to bypass acquired property? 2)To what degree will historic wetlands be restored naturally or by sgnificant eathmoving work? 3) Will provision be made to permit non motorized trails in the future if other funding can be found to purchase right of way from private owner and reimburse OHF for easement rights? How is PILT or not on which acres determined?	
PA02	Acquisition and restoration of terrace wetland complex with potential fen characteristic	What NGO will own and manage?? Excessive amount of funding going toward staffing compared to actual project work. Over 50% -	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 8/10. Strong wetland restoration value and habitat benefit; fiscal score moderated by acquisition/permanent protection components and need to confirm long-term tax treatment.		"potential calcareous" fen. Is it is or is it not? I am concerned that the proposal is based on the "potential calcareous fen" and "appears to retain meaningful restoration potential." I need to know what we would e investing in to be comfortable recommending funding. Who holds the conservation restrictions and what are they? What is the plan for wetland hydrology and water retention and aquatic habitat complexity once he beavers abandon the site and the dam disappears? I am a bit confused as to the plan for habitat protection/restoration on one hand and agriculture (apparently not just conservation grazing) - please explain how these funds are just focused on habitat and not agriculture. I would find it hard to support the use of Neonics for an period of time on the property. Who specifically will own acquired property (beyond NGO)?		High personnel costs. Why 53%? Questions about juristiction/continuity of access. What does "potential" mean here? Good leverage.	53% DSS, Crops, not open to public, does not seem to fit the scope of LSOHC	Does this project fit withiin the type of projects funded in past by OHF? Large personnel cost as %. Land not open to public? Ground Penetrating radar \$13,000 plus Winter ATV w tracks \$50K??			References to potenital fen is fen still there? Can a Fen once destroyed be restored? Land price seems extremely high for landlocked existing wetlands.	
PA03	DNR Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection-Phase IX	Previous OHF Appropriations - Yes, but no information on any pas appropriations still open - question is left blank.	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 8.5/10. Native prairie bank protection keeps land largely private/taxable, but limited public access and protection-heavy emphasis reduce the score.		Use of Neonics for a transition period is a grave concern.		Contuation of solid program - who is accountable for easment maintenance?	easement, not open to public	not open to public use, 0% leverage, funds requested in past but no timeline or history of funds spent? Is there a Goal?			If the land under consideration is already Native Prarie, why is cropped land being discussed. Is this restoration of cropped land back into prairie? If yes, then this does not appear to be protection of existing remnant prairie. If it is conversion back to prairie isnt any land that was once prairie suitable for consideration for this program? At some point the ownersip will pass to a next generation or sold. What if next landownner(s) is totally unwilling to perform any maintenance work such as woody vegetation removal?	
PA04	DNR WMA & SNA Acquisition, Phase XIV		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 5/10. Strong habitat and access outcomes, but fee acquisition expands public ownership and should rank below restoration-focused or tax-base-friendly proposals.				Acquisitions. Decision to designate SNA vs. WMA?		open to public use, land acq to add to public lands, good history of project completion and spending, leverage TBD 10% (history is 33%), Is there a Goal??			1)To what degree will existing field tile systems be blocked or modified to bypass acquired property? 2)To what degree will historic wetlands be restored naturally or by future eathmoving work? 3) will provision be made to allow regional or state trails to cross the property in the most minimally intrusive way, including possible payment for the acreage used by the trail? How is PILT or not Pilt on which acres determined?	

Summary of Member Comments and Questions

ID#	Program Title	Suzanne Baird	Rep. John Burkel	Kristin Eggerling	David Hartwell	Sen. Foung Hawj	Matt Kucharski	Sen. Andrew Lang	Darrel Palmer	Tom Saxhaug	Ron Schara	Ted Suss	Rep. Samantha Vang
PA05	Great Prairie Lakes and Wetlands Restoration Initiative		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 9/10. Strong prairie/wetland restoration and habitat outcomes with less concern than acquisition-heavy proposals; good fit if implementation dollars are directed to habitat.				Like the program but quesitons about where Iowa comes in. Second-highest cost per acre in category.		Abstract and SOW did not identify specific project (# of acres), open to public use, land acq to add to public lands, IA Conservation group focused on helping in MN, 8% leverage, \$15k/acres			If this is marginal farmland as stated, price seems high. Will provision be made to allow regional or state trails to cross the property in the most minimally intrusive way, including possible payment from another source for the acreage used by the trail?	
PA06	Lower Sioux Prairie and Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Project		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 2/10. Significant concern that tribal ownership may not guarantee local property tax replacement; uncertain public access and property tax shift risk require low priority under fiscal model.		Not sure if we should be considering funding fencing. I am not certain what all the language about the open for hunting really means = please explain.		On paper looks good. Need to understand how ownership works. Third-highest CPA in category.	ukn land size?identified plots?what is the category after restoration? WMA? Public access	Project overall seems good but I am concerned about 1.) long term ownership of land funded by OHF \$\$ 2.) concerns over restoration but letting buffalo graze along with public safety, and 3.) future tribal regulations on public use/hunting access. If land is to be acquired by OHF then land use needs to be set by Mn DNR regulations. MPCA Funds????		Will land be open to hunting for both non-tribal and tribal members?	I really like the objectives of this application, but 12' will fences necessary for bison cut off access and other animal movement? Price of \$15,000 per acre seems high for very marginal farm land, I believe there is a wetland complex or shallow lake on property and using the \$15,000 starting figure might create an artifical expectation. Is LSOHF the right source of \$ to pay for fencing? Fences and sorting pens strike me as being very like buildings that we don't buy.	
PA07	Martin County WMA Acquisition Phase 11		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 4.5/10. WMA acquisition may create public hunting access but remains acquisition-heavy and should rank substantially lower than restoration/enhancement projects.				We're on Phase 11 - how many phases? Coordination with other OHF applications? Highest CPA of all HA applications.		Good history of projects, \$15,500/acre, low leverage %, WMA owned, open to public use, Is there a Goal?		Lots of unspent funds	Narrative says parcel ID will begin fall of 2027, yet specific parcels are listed? Which is it? Is the land to be acquired currently farmed prime land or marginal land that worth less? This is becoming a huge complex, will provision be made to allow regional or state non motorized trails to cross the property in the most minimally intrusive way, possibly payment for the acreage used by the trail from another source?	
PA08	Minnesota Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (MN CREP)	Previous OHF Appropriations - Yes, but no information on any pas appropriations still open - question is left blank.	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. CREP/RIM model is strongly tax-base friendly, keeps land private/taxable, and delivers restoration through voluntary easements; public access is indirect.		Explain how extensive wetland restoration is under this proposal. What is the cost of permanent protection as a percentage of land value under this proposal. Is there a difference in the value paid for prime agricultural property vs marginal cropland under this proposal? No open appropriations are listed after the yes answer.		Easements - necessary but not accessible.		Easements, 1020 acres, \$9803/acre of leased land!, 4.47% leverage, summary info says leased land will be open to hunting but in full reading does not say open to public use??			17 parcels 1024 acres suggests parcels are IDd but no list, why? \$10,000,000 request, \$9,000 per acre cost. Tables 5 and 6 only show \$9,803 per acre times 1024 acres. where did the \$8,000,000 federal money go?	
PA09	Minnesota River Watershed Habitat Conservation Program Phase 2		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 8/10. Solid watershed habitat benefits and easement-based protection, but public access is limited and outcomes depend on parcel selection.		Since both MLT and GRG do restoration work (and it is all contracted out), explain why this proposal includes both organization vs just MLT doing both the acquisition and restoration.		Phase 2 - would be good to understand long tail. MN River needs help for sure.		\$1.8 mill Acq, \$3.5 mill leases, \$4.4 mill restoration, no public use on leased land.Should focus on restoration - all on public lands - before acquiring more? 4.4% leverage			explain how \$28,000 per parcel for ongoing maintenance is managed. Is that set aside or estimated future cost? is staffing the application stacked on top of staff from prior appropriations, if so, what is current OHF paid staffing for both MLT and GRG	

Summary of Member Comments and Questions

ID#	Program Title	Suzanne Baird	Rep. John Burkel	Kristin Eggerling	David Hartwell	Sen. Foung Hawj	Matt Kucharski	Sen. Andrew Lang	Darrel Palmer	Tom Saxhaug	Ron Schara	Ted Suss	Rep. Samantha Vang
PA10	MN Prairie Recovery Program	Personnel costs are a little high.	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 8.5/10. Strong prairie recovery and restoration benefits; score moderated where protection/acquisition components or public access limitations exist.		The enhancement cost per acres is close to double that of the roving crew budget. Why is this a good deal for us to fund?		Lots of outstanding dollars. How likely is the 300/300/300 acre split? Personnel costs higher on paper due to use of on-staff vs. contractors (OK)		Phase 16, 10% leverage, large unspent funds from 2023 and 2025, Is there a Goal?			If scaling is necessary, prioritize acquisition and easements, I would like a better understanding of what is being done to support claim that 10,000 acres have been enhanced, % fire, % tree removal, etc. Do all of the species cited such as Rusty Patch Bumble Bee already populate these parcels or will restoration improve habitat for potential species expansion? How good is the inventory of existing remnant, never tilled, prairie in these counties? What is reason there is nothing in Redwood and Renville Counties surrounded by other counties as they are two of the most intensively farmed counties in the state?	
PA11	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase XIII		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 9/10. Strong grassland/wetland habitat benefits and prairie chicken focus; favorable where work avoids fee acquisition and leverages local/private partnerships.		What happens if a parcel is not appropriate to transfer to a WMA or WPA? Proposal states prairie chicken habitat should be 320 acres or more but criteria does not list size of complex at all - Why?		How likely is the 600/600 acre split? Good spending of funds so far, How many phases?		Phase 13, Purchase, open to public use, 9% matching funds, \$8800/acre purchase. Is there a Goal?		Lots of unspent funds	There is a reference to 320 acre minimum needed size, three acquisitions are smaller, do they connect to existing WMA? Staff seems high, how many PF staff are now on OHF funding? Does restoration go beyond removal of invasives and planting desirable natives? Any reshaping of the earth? How much existing never farmed Prairie remnant is being acquired.	
PA12	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase XIII		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. RIM buffer easements protect habitat while keeping land privately owned and on tax rolls; limited direct public access is the primary drawback.		Food plots - now up to 10% (higher than other proposals that are 1-3%) or "will not exceed a maximum acreage depending on the size of the easement." What does this mean? Cost per acre seems high but there is no indication of cost of restoration in proposal.		Easements necessary -- buffers an efficient/effective use of them. Past money being used.		Phase 13, \$14k/acre for an Easement????, Not open to public, has public benefit based on potential protection of habitat but not open to public use. no matching funds? What is Goal?			Are the 6 properties ID'd or is that an expected number? Much reference to floodplains, price seems high for floodplain land. Is the \$10,000 per easement for maintenance of OHS funds placed into a special account? please explain. Will provision be made to permit non motorized trails in the future with other funding to purchase right of way from private owner and reimburse OHF for easement rights?	
PA13	Western Minnesota Prairie and Wetland Protection Program		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 7/10. Important prairie/wetland protection, but permanent protection/acquisition elements and uncertain public access reduce priority.				New program? Evaluate against existing programs - overlap? Heavy on easements		Phase 12, What is Goal?, 6% leverage, 1400 acres of easements + 120 acres of Acq, Leased land (bulk of \$\$) not open to public, large \$\$ unspent dating back to ML2022, \$15k/acre Acq cost, \$5k/acre easements, What is Goal?			How is the fair market value of an easement determined? Is stewardship budget amount placed in a separate dedicated fund? Does the \$200,000 budget amount for each 40 acre fee acquisition parcel include contract and professional services amounts or is that the estimated purchase price? Will provision be made to permit non motorized trails in the future if other funding can be found to purchase right of way from private owner and reimburse OHF for easement rights?	
PRE01	Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands - Phase X		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. Excellent enhancement of existing public grasslands with no new acquisition or tax-base loss; strong alignment with restoration-first philosophy.		What standard will wetlands be restored to? What control methods are used for cattail? If this work is done on state land, why is PF a better provider than the roving crews?		A little more clarity on where work is being done? Public or easements? Fair amount of money remaining from last year.		Phase 10, 5% leverage, restore/enhance Public lands, good spending history, land being restored is open to public use			does drain tile removal mean actual removal of an entire tileline or simply breaking the line and plugging a few feet with non permeable material? While many WMAs need restoration and tree removal, priority ought be on acquiring land at this time, See PA 01. Public access already exists	

Summary of Member Comments and Questions

ID#	Program Title	Suzanne Baird	Rep. John Burkel	Kristin Eggerling	David Hartwell	Sen. Fong Hawj	Matt Kucharski	Sen. Andrew Lang	Darrel Palmer	Tom Saxhaug	Ron Schara	Ted Suss	Rep. Samantha Vang
PRE02	Restoring Minnesota's Prairie Pothole Ecosystem - Phase 1		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 9.5/10. Strong prairie pothole restoration benefits; phase/start-up considerations and leverage determine final priority.				New program. Cost per acre quite a bit higher than PRE01. Why? Public access question?		Phase 1 or Phase ???, restore and acquire easements, Work seems the same as prior Phase 11??, New Goal. 30% leverage! w USFWS (Is this duck stamp funds that the Feds are going to use to buy the easements anyway????, federal easements and not open to public use,			Is the \$2,000,000 available without this appropriation? Since work will be completed on already acquired property, what is a reasonable time frame from appropriation to completion? I assume Upland prairie restoration costs far less than wetland restoration. Does each wetland need a complete makeover including silt removal for example, or can wetlands be restored by breaking and blocking tile lines, installing ditch plugs, and letting the water accumulate? I prefer we prioritize acquisition over restoration at this time, Public Access already exists.	
FA01	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program Phase 14		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 8/10. ACUB/easement model protects working lands and limits development while generally reducing tax-base concerns; public access is limited.		Food plots - now up to 10% (higher than other proposals that are 1-3%) or "will not exceed a maximum acreage depending on the size of the easement." What does this mean? Where is the partnership with the National Guard. - no leverage funds at all.		Would like to hear more about monitoring of RIM lands after enhancement. Spend on existing funds? Second highest CPA in category.		Phase 14, Easements for the Camp Ripley, Public use not allowed on RIM Easements, \$4200/acre of lease, 7% leverage, Goal Completion %?			20 easements protecting 1400 acres is an average of 70 acres per. There is little probability of parcels this size being converted to farm land. Can owners log timber under the easements? What is the county zoning in this area, how many houses per what size acreage? Does zoning provide protection? Can an owner retain non easement ownership of one acre to build a house and place the remainder of the property under easement? If so, is there any real benefit to the easement on the remaining property?	
FA02	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project Phase 11		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 6/10. Strong forest corridor value, but acquisition/permanent protection and limited guaranteed hunting/fishing access moderate the ranking.				Big project, lots of phases. Long tail? REALLY open for public use?	fy21 spending? Add info needed	Phase 11, last time it was a HA Project?, \$3600/acre of leased land, RIM Easement is not open to public access, slow spending history, no leverage, Goal?			Maps do not specify where excly esements are being sought. referencing the 75% protected goal, how close are any of these sub watersheds and how much closer will this apropriation get a waterehd to that goal. Can an owner retain non easement ownership of one acre to builld a house and place the remainder of the property under easement? If so, is there any real benefit to the easement on the remaining property? Is logging permitted on the easement property?	
FA03	MN Forests of the Future Phase XI South East Blufflands to Northern Forests Protection		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 7/10. Forest protection value is real, but public access limitations and protection/acquisition emphasis reduce priority under this rubric.				Dollars from previous allocation spent? Says public access but really?		Phase 11, 3326 acres leased land @\$2405/acre, under 1% leverage, Goal ??			Does working forest equal logging permitted? If yes shoud some parcels be set aside to permit eventual old growth forest to come into existance? Will entire pacels be acquired or placed under easement or will small areas be excluded to permit the owner to build a house in the woods? Will provision be made to permit non motorized trails in the future if other funding can be found to purchase right of way from private owner and reimburse OHF for easement rights?	

Summary of Member Comments and Questions

ID#	Program Title	Suzanne Baird	Rep. John Burkel	Kristin Eggerling	David Hartwell	Sen. Foung Hawj	Matt Kucharski	Sen. Andrew Lang	Darrel Palmer	Tom Saxhaug	Ron Schara	Ted Suss	Rep. Samantha Vang
FA04	Pine and Leech Watershed Phase IV Forest Habitat Protection		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 6/10. Watershed forest protection has habitat value, but fee acquisition/permanent protection and local tax concerns keep it below restoration-focused proposals.				Decent spend of existing funds, Watershed emphasis in forest habitat. Not loving the answers to public use access question in the FA section. Highest CPA in category.		Phase 4, 840 acres @ \$5107/acre, RIM Easement is not open to public access but has public benefit based on potential protection of habittat .no matching funds?			Does a forest stewardship plan allow any logging? Will easements be for entire parcels only or allow an opt out for a house in the woods (Wilderness homestead)? Can these parcels be developed into wilderness homesteads with county zoning providing pretection? confirm that all private land under easement will actually be open to public use?	
FRE01	DNR Statewide Forest Enhancement-Phase 7	Travel costs seem high - This includes vehicle rental but no explanation of for what.	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. Strong forest enhancement on existing public/protected lands; no new acquisition and direct habitat work make this a high-priority investment.		Lots of prior year funds available		Lots of acres, smaller percentage spent but tied to public lands.		Phase 7, Restoration work on public lands!, No leverage, \$286/acre, slow spending history??		Unspent funds need explaining	How often does a section of forest need to be enhanced or restored?	
FRE02	Enhancing Black Ash Forests for Resilience and Habitat	Personnel costs are a little high.	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. Black ash resilience/enhancement is a strong restoration investment; private/non-state support deserves some leverage forgiveness and no new tax-base impact.				This is interesting. Would like to see the science behind this but very promising program.		Phase 1, acreage not stated in Abstract or SOW, 12% leverage, \$2347/acre to plant trees?		Can this project move the needle??	per acre cost seems high, what % of the black ash forest statewide that is being lost does this address?	
FRE03	Metro Forests for Minnesota Wildlife and Communities	Personnel costs are a little high.	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 9.5/10. Good metro forest restoration and community benefit, though cost and public access/scale considerations keep it below statewide enhancement projects.		NO real answer on scaling that lets us understand.		Metro program - we don't have many. Good application. Something funky on CPA? \$11K? Others seem lower.	all 264 acres are city state fed? Proposal says easements, but not reflected in the chart	Restore 264 acres at \$11,242/acre??, metro public lands, 9.4% leverage - Go to Metro CPL funds		Is forest land open to the public??	Cost seems extravegant, land is already publicly owned so no new acres protected.	
FRE04	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project	Personnel costs are very high. These costs get higher with each year	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 9.5/10. Strong forest recovery and public hunting/fishing benefit where lands are accessible; enhancement/restoration focus is positive.				Good use of existing dollars - lots of acres.		Phase 4, Restoration of 14,000 acres @ \$705/acre, public lands, 17% leverage, 10% labor cost			Impressive list of sites. Isn't post burn recovery part of nature taking its course? Which parcels are actualy on tribal land?	
WA01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XIX		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 5/10. WPA acquisition creates permanent habitat and public access but remains acquisition-heavy with local tax-base concerns.				good program, public benefit, high leverage		Phase 19, PF/Fed Acquistion, Open to public use, 1440 acres @ \$12887/acre, 30% leverage, Goal??			how secure is the federal money? is it in a reserve for this type of acquisition? How much of this is prime farmland verses marginal?	
WA02	RIM Wetlands - Restoring the most productive habitat in Minnesota		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. RIM wetland restoration keeps land private/taxable while restoring highly productive habitat; limited public access is the main drawback.		Food plots - now up to 10% (higher than other proposals that are 1-3%) or "will not exceed a maximum acreage depending on the size of the easement." What does this mean? Cost per acre seems high but there is no indication of cost of restoration in proposal.		Work is on easements - near corridors/public. CPA highest in category - easements? Higher than acquisition in WA03?		Phase 16, 0% leverage, RIM Easement is not open to public access, 495 acres of Easements @ \$15,151/acre, good spending history, Goal?			Acreage is very specific, did I miss the location list? Land in CRP is typically lower quality yet price is high, seems to reflect prime farmland.	
WA03	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 9.5/10. Strong shallow lake/wetland restoration with broad public wildlife and waterfowl benefits and limited tax-base impact.				Projects tied to wetlands and watershed. Solid spend of existing dollars.		Phase 16, DU acq & restore 1222 acres @\$13908/acre, open to public use, 10% leverage, Goal?			restoring drained and farmed wetlands is a plus/ Are NAWCA Funds secure from cancelation? All for acquisition?	

Summary of Member Comments and Questions

ID#	Program Title	Suzanne Baird	Rep. John Burkel	Kristin Eggerling	David Hartwell	Sen. Foung Hawj	Matt Kucharski	Sen. Andrew Lang	Darrel Palmer	Tom Saxhaug	Ron Schara	Ted Suss	Rep. Samantha Vang
WRE01	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program	Very high percentage of personnel costs!!!! This seems to increase each year.	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 9/10. USFWS easements protect habitat while generally avoiding fee acquisition; public access is limited/variable.				Good partnership, some leverage, big ask, modest spend to date, easements.		Phase 7, restore & enhance Fed Easement lands, 4300 acres @ \$3372/acre, No Public Use, 12% leverage, large amount of 2023 funding unspent, Goal?? P3/23 Timing - confusing comment about critical timing for landowners wanting to enroll this land in other programs?? Is this not already permanently protected with a Fed Easement??		missing questin about open to public	Narrative says land is already protected. If this land is already hayed or pastured and will continue, what will the money be used to accompolish? Are all new easement acres purchased with USF&W money	
WRE02	DNR Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements Phase 19	Personnel cost are a little high.	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. High-value shallow lake and wetland enhancement on existing public/protected lands with strong public wildlife benefits.		Staff request - 10 people for 2 years who will work on projects that this request funds AND OTHERS and will not be scaled. This feels a lot like last years proposal for just staff. Will only support this if staff is scaled and work to be done by the staff is on projects funded with this proposal.		Ask quite a bit higher than past allocations? Good use of allocated funds. Shallow lakes a priority for sure. Good public benefit.		Phase 19, Goal???, restore and enhance 12,865 acres of public lands @ \$1834/acre, No leverage. \$3.4 mil for WCS structure work, reduced funding not proportional to staff adds/reductions		Unspent funds a problem??	All restoratin on already owned land. Support critical projects such as replacing FAILED WCS. Not supporting reshaping the land by moving earth except to create berms for more wetlands.	
WRE03	DNR Statewide control and reduction of invasive Phragmites Phase I		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. Invasive Phragmites control is direct habitat protection/restoration with no acquisition or tax-base impact.		Explain what removal entails.		Need to learn more on this - small ask but cost per acre really high for enhancement. Per acre cost second-highest in category. Both way above average.	leverage? Need additional information	Phase 1, 23% leverage, need to stop the spread before it cannot be contained - can they get CPL funds right now to use in Metro area		Leverage dollars confusing. \$50,000 versus \$250,000 ???	67 acres? handout says every known stand of phragmites will be controlled but the map suggests that 67 acres would barely touch the surface.	
WRE04	Living Shallow Lakes and Wetlands Enhancement & Restoration Initiative	high personel costs	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. Strong shallow lake/wetland restoration and public wildlife benefit with no meaningful local tax-base concern.				Need to reconcile this with WRE02 -- lower dollars spent - how do these two proposals compare?		Phase 13, Goal? Enhance/restore 2500 acres of public and private lands @\$5310/acre, bulk of projects are on USFWS easements, 13% leverage, asking for \$12 mill (but is a reduced ask??) but only plan to spend \$5 mill annually - hmm, large amount of unspent funds , 19% of funds Personnel cost		Consider amount of unspent funds; what is difference between WA03 and WRE04?	No additional lands protected. Already public or protected lands. If these landa are being returned to nature, why so much expense building WCS and other landscape changes? significant funds for personell.	
WRE05	Mud River Enhancement Phase II		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. Top-tier enhancement/restoration of existing habitat with strong fiscal fit, public benefit, and no acquisition concerns.	Not scalable	What will happen in flood events greater than the 10 year flood. Will that harm the work being done and the refuge? If full funding is not granted, what happens?		Coming back for phase II? Doesn't look like Phase I money has been tapped??	what does the diversion structure look like?	Phase 2, River Flow redesign/meander with flood control structures plus 372 acres of restoration on public lands, 20% leverage,		One and done	Problem caused by drainage, yet see no plan component that addresses changing farming practices to reduce runoff and preserve project benefits,	
WRE06	Otter and Campbell Lakes Habitat Enhancement and Restoration Phase 1	Would like more information on the project will address ongoing sedimentation once you have removed the sediment from the lake.	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 9.5/10. Solid lake habitat restoration/enhancement with public benefit; score moderated by cost, scale, and leverage.		If this work is done, will it not just be a temporary fix as the upstream sediment will continue to fill the lakes? Why should the effort not be directed to fixing the cause of the problem before this work?		New program. Would like to understand more on scalability and surrounding impact. Acre cost really high - check?		Phase 1, lakes restoration in Hutchison area, 10% leverage,			no new public land. Are upstream lands managed in a way to prevent residementation?	

Summary of Member Comments and Questions

ID#	Program Title	Suzanne Baird	Rep. John Burkel	Kristin Eggerling	David Hartwell	Sen. Fong Hawj	Matt Kucharski	Sen. Andrew Lang	Darrel Palmer	Tom Saxhaug	Ron Schara	Ted Suss	Rep. Samantha Vang
HA01	2027 Riparian Habitat Protection In the kettle and Snake River Watersheds		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 8/10. Easement-focused riparian protection keeps land largely taxable but limited restoration and uncertain public access reduce score.				Lots remaining from existing fund? River watershed		Phase 3?, Conservation Easements to protect watersheds on Kettle and Snake River, 1020 acres at \$3922/acre, No leverage, RIM Easement is not open to public access but has public benefit based on potential protection of habitat, Goal 75% of watershed attached land?? what is total amount of acreage in watershed that you are trying to get easements on?,			How many parcels would actually be developed in a way that results in construction if not placed under easement? Would part a parcel still see construction of a "house in the woods" on non RIM acres?	
HA02	2027 St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Phase 8		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 4/10. Primarily fee acquisition with local tax-base concerns; ranks lowest among HA proposals despite habitat/public access value.				Like the work being done on WMAs. Good spend of existing.		Phase 8, Acq 950 acres @ \$11,544/acre plus Restore 100 acres @ \$2000/acre, Open to public use, 1% leverage			Are all of the parcels eligible for development. Are any of these parcels protected by Bluff setbacks?	
HA03	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - 16		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 6.5/10. Good restoration/enhancement and public access, but 600 acres of fee acquisition and low leverage limit priority.		Do not understand the \$300K remaining for CRP to do program coordination, administration and outreach on prior appropriations that are for the most part, already spent.		Similar to HA 02 and like it for same reasons, different area.		Phase 16, Acq 600 acres @ \$11942/acre plus Restore 471 acres @ \$10558/acre???? Why so high for restoration costs ,Open to public use, 3% leverage, Goal?? Does this include the Kaplan Woods area??			Conflict	
HA04	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration Phase IX		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 9.5/10. Restoration dominates, no fee acquisition, strong county match; public access on easements is limited.		Spending restoration dollars on "soon to be protected" land does not fit our criteria. Eased land is not open to public use as the question indicates - it might. Answer should be changed.		Phase 9 - good spend of previous, metro area. Mostly "Restore" - why in HA?		Phase 9, Restore 1361 acres on easements @ \$2693/acre plus 176 acres of new easements @ \$7259/acre, some easements may allow public use?? 36% leverage, history of unspent funds 2018-2022, How much have they had to return - past audit issues?? - Vote no until past \$\$ are spent??		Amount of unspent dollars is a big problem	County is covering personel costs. If full funding is not received, I prefer funding acquisition.	
HA05	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - ML2027		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 4.5/10. Strong fisheries science and public access, but entirely fee acquisition with no restoration/enhancement and modest leverage.		50% of funds remain from FY 23 FY24 and virtually all of FY25 (and FY 26). Are additional funds double/triple what has been funded in the last 4 years really necessary at this time?		coldwater watersheds, 45% of open funds spent (ok)		Phase 13, Goal??, Acq 875 acres of shoreline, \$9686/acre, open to public use, 8% leverage			Since this is a growing complex in Lake Country, Will provision be made to allow regional or state trails to cross the property in the most minimally intrusive way, including possible payment from another source for the acreage used by the trail?	
HA06	Metro Big Rivers Phase 17	If the restoration and enhancement is being contracted out why such a high amount for supplies/equipment/tools???	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 5.5/10. Strong corridor and public access benefits with meaningful enhancement, but very acquisition-heavy and expensive.		FMR using \$ to improve public access (does not seem like a habitat project). MLT's personnel is as much as contracts for restoration. Please explain. MVT is showing \$350K of DSS as a match but no personnel?		BIG ask, lots of opportunity but also need to scale. CPA highest in category (because metro??) Acquisition so maybe OK.		Phase 17, Acq 1100 acres @ \$15011/acre plus restore/enhance 864 acres @ 4696/acre, Open to public use, 6% leverage, Goal ??			Acquisition is high priority when lands become available. Restoration costs seem high and should take backseat to purchase or easement of additional property. For any parcel in the Minnesota River basin, provision should be made for continued extension of the Minnesota Valley State Trail or connecting regional trails across or along the acquired parcels, Especially Blakely Bluffs.	
HA07	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance - Phase 6	Question - Who will eventually own - Federal is listed but no Federa; designation is listed - explain who the Federal ownership will be.	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 5/10. Excellent lake science and county approval, but fee acquisition-only, no restoration, anticipated leverage, and slow spending.		Not sure I understand the difference between this and HA05 other than geography - why 2 proposals? Seems like a lost of unspent funds "moving through acquisition process" (but not committed?)		Decent leverage, modest spend of existing. Acquisition.		Phase 6, Acq 750 acres/.5 miles of shoreline @ \$9773/acre, Open to Public Use, 8% leverage, low personnel cost%		Unspent funds need explaining	Most funds for acquisition to protect lakeshore and near laek watersheds. Buy anything it when it is available!	

Summary of Member Comments and Questions

ID#	Program Title	Suzanne Baird	Rep. John Burkel	Kristin Eggerling	David Hartwell	Sen. Fong Hawj	Matt Kucharski	Sen. Andrew Lang	Darrel Palmer	Tom Saxhaug	Ron Schara	Ted Suss	Rep. Samantha Vang
HA08	RIM Priority Habitat		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 9.5/10. RIM easements keep land private/taxable while incorporating restoration and stewardship; no fee acquisition.		Part time person doing less than 2 easements a year seems high.		Seems high on CPA for easements? \$13k/acre?	open to public? Says yes on proposals, but has a explanations of sorts	Phase 5????, Easements 385 acres @ \$12,987/acre???, RIM Easement is not open to public access but has public benefit based on potential protection of habitat, good spending history, No leverage			How many of the 178,000+ CRP acresreferenced in the narrative do you expect to be re-enrolled by owners? Little of this looks like prime farmland based on maps and pictures, yet cost is close to prime land price. If property remains in private ownership, how is the \$10,000 per eazsement spent for stewardship.	
HA09	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration Phase 15		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 8.5/10. Strong restoration/enhancement and easement-heavy protection; public access only on fee acquisitions and county approval concerns.				Lower leverage, higher percentage of easement but decent track record.		Phase 15, SE Blufflands, Acq 650 acres @ \$12023/acre, Easements 1970 acres @ \$4358 /acre and Restore 2750 acres @ \$1097 /acre, Acq land open to Public Use, 5% Leverage, Goal??,		Unspent funds need explaining further???	Personell over 10% . Support acquisition and esaements. Most of funds for last 4 years are unspent. This suggests timing is not that crucial. How is the value of easement established? is there the same appraisal process to determine sale value before negotiation on easement value commences?	
HA10	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Phase X		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. Wild rice shoreland protection uses voluntary easements with no fee acquisition; no restoration and no leverage reduce score.				Easements, but wild rice=water quality.		Phase 10, RIM Easements @ \$4166/acre, no leverage, Goal?			Are the 12 parcels ID'd or is that an estimate of the number these funds will acquire? Are entire parcels placed under easement or just shoreline? How subject are these parcels to development?	
HRE01	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Enhancement and Restoration - Phase 11	Very high personnel costs	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. Strong enhancement on existing protected lands with no acquisition; concerns are recent spending pace and personnel/DSS share.		ACD - 2 full time people for 5 years to oversee \$1.7M in contracts seems excessive. GRG personnel also seem high.		Personnel costs?		Phase 11, Enhance 1221 acres @ \$4506/acre in the Anoka Sand Plains, 7.5 % leverage, Shouldn't the Parks stuff be funded by Parks and Trails \$\$?????, Has a lot of unspent funds given that this is all just restoration and not Acq which requires extra time?? Spend down the funds they have and then come back.			No additional public land therfore no additional public access. Significant unspent funds that are not waiting for property acquisiitons.	
HRE02	Beaver Creek Habitat Restoration		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. Focused trout stream restoration on existing public land; no tax impact, strong measurable outcomes, but high cost per acre and low leverage.	Not scalable			Not a huge budget ask but a lot of ancillary benefit. Wish there was more leverage.		Phase 1, Enhance trout stream and evaluate 2 methods of restoration, 1.7% leverage, Public waters, \$161,546/acre			Already public access. No additional public land . Unusual reason for restoration, to set up a research project. Does this restoration truly improve the habitat or just make it look nicer?	
HRE03	Daylighting Phalen Creek - Phase 2		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. No acquisition and strong urban habitat/public access value, but significant planning/design costs and unspent prior appropriation reduce priority.		What is the need for a volunteer coordinator?		Phase 1 predates me - would be good to learn more about progress. Metro. Will point out CPA is huge, but kind of hard to compare.	10 m total for .25 miles?	Phase 2, 5 year habitat restoration project, Restore 9 acres @ \$753,489/acre???????, 14.8% leverage, Is this all considered Public Waters??, funding in 2022 + an extension largely unspent \$\$??, Is this more of a Clean Waters project?? Seems like a poor place for habitat	What happened to the last 4 years?		In the metro area. high % of leverage is confirmed. No additional public land or public access. Quality of habitat to be improved.	
HRE04	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Phase 10	The abstract mentions 2 feasiblity studies but the design and scope of work does not go into any detail. Should OHF be funding studies??? Aslo funding a lot of staff positions.	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. Statewide aquatic connectivity and restoration with no acquisition; top-tier habitat value, moderated by large open balances.				Big ask. Where's leverage coming from? Like the buffer/water quality aspect of this - long tail?		Phase 10, River and stream connectivity projects w 6 fish passageways, 872 acres @ \$18725/acre, 9.3% Leverage, Projects on Public lands/waters, lagre amount of unpsent funds due to nature of projects, Goal??			Support those projects that restore fish passage. Significant unspent funds perhaps could fund the burn and invasive removal portion of the request. Not certain of how habitat is improved as a result of the Necktie channel project.	

Summary of Member Comments and Questions

ID#	Program Title	Suzanne Baird	Rep. John Burkel	Kristin Eggerling	David Hartwell	Sen. Fong Hawj	Matt Kucharski	Sen. Andrew Lang	Darrel Palmer	Tom Saxhaug	Ron Schara	Ted Suss	Rep. Samantha Vang
HRE05	DNR Fish Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Phase 1	high personel costs	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. Good fish habitat and no acquisition, but score reduced for two new OHF-funded positions, 20%+ personnel/DSS, and weak leverage.				New? I see lots of "phases" in the future on this one. Precedents?		Phase 1, Lake Habitat Restoration starting point, Install 6 rock arch rapids at lake outlets + other restorations on lakes, Hard to evaluate cost based on \$/acre due to type of project, 1.4% leverage , low long term maintenance on rock archs, Public lands			Two FTE for five years? high support for lake connectivity projects. high scores are for connectivity projects. no new public access	any big differences between HRE04 and 05?
HRE06	DNR Irish Creek Watershed Enhancement, Phase 1	high personel costs	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. Strong trout/moose habitat benefits on existing public lands, but no confirmed leverage and 21.7% personnel/DSS reduce fiscal score.		Seems quite administratively heavy for what will be mostly contracted work. Is some of this work really just roadwork that the county should be doing?		Another Phase I in same category from DNR. Looks worthwhile - are we sunseting any others?		Phase 1 , Trout and moose habitat projects, Rock arch culverts to allow fish passage, Restoration at \$12,999/acre for combined stream and moose habitat projects, no Leverage? Says they expect Cook County and Federal Funding but no stated level , low long term maintence costs, Open to public use			high personel costs. What exactly is done to improve moose forage habitat?	
HRE07	DNR Roving Crew 4		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. Committee Judgment Override: although personnel/DSS is very high, roving crews are essential to manage existing public lands and protect prior investments.		Explain the need for funds one year I advance of need.		We obviously need this - looks like funded every other year - hard to understand how much is needed/how much has been spent. Should this be treated like Contract Management going forward?		Roving crews are necessary to maintaiin habitat		Lots of unspent funds	This is where I feel invasive removal projects ought to be funded. Pick the Highest priority of need for this work across all projects and areas.	
HRE08	Enhancing Agate Bay's Coastal Wetland Habitat along the Lake Superior Shore in Lake County, Minnesota	Question boardwalk and trail construction with OHF??	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. Long-term coastal wetland concept has merit, but this request is almost entirely engineering/design with no construction and limited confirmed leverage.	Is it the expectation that LSOHC funding would pay for trails and boardwalks ?	Funds should not be used to improve public access - not habitat work. Pictures show boardwalks. Very high cost per acre for enhancement - apparently just for engineering		Smallish ask but would like to understand more about the habitat benefit of this specific project. Sounds like it needs to happen but is it really an OHF thing? Reminds me a little of Delano Crow River project.		Phase 1, engineering cost to design restoration of Agate Bay shoreline - City park??, 33% leverage, public lands, Is this a Clean Waters Project? Small \$\$ Project	CPL?	Rather confusing project; need to hear more.	This does not seem to fit our programming purpose.	
HRE09	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation Project-PH VIII		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. Proven Knife River rehabilitation with durable stream restoration, strong trout benefits, reasonable cost, and no acquisition; monitor Phase VII status.	Not scalable	Raise the groundwater table? 15 years of work, how has that effected the trout populations specifically? Need for almost .5FTE for 4 years to oversee contracts seems excessive.		how much shoreline benefits? What happens with the next 10-year flood?		Phase 8, Knife River trout stream restoration, Team expects this to be their FINAL request for funding due to completing all resotration needed on Knife River - Congrats!!, last funding request was ML2024, 7% leverage, Restore at \$8870/acre. Open to Public			will this project ever be completed? a few thousand feet on miles of river. the river is already public.	

Summary of Member Comments and Questions

ID#	Program Title	Suzanne Baird	Rep. John Burkel	Kristin Eggerling	David Hartwell	Sen. Foung Hawj	Matt Kucharski	Sen. Andrew Lang	Darrel Palmer	Tom Saxhaug	Ron Schara	Ted Suss	Rep. Samantha Vang
HRE10	Little Cannon River Stream Habitat Restoration - Construction Phase		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. High-quality construction-phase stream restoration with permanent public angling access; cost per acre and modest leverage keep it behind top projects.		Need better understanding of timeline. When would construction actually start?		Gave 500k last year (for evaluation? Engineering?) hasn't been spent. Should we move ahead or wait?		Phase?? 2??, Restore trout stream in SE MN, Restore @ \$35371/acre , 4% leverage, Open to public		Will stream be open to public fishing?	conflict	
HRE11	Minnesota Marine Art Museum LSCOHC Proposal	????	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. Meaningful habitat and strong leverage, but broader museum campus/public amenity scope is better suited to multiple Legacy funds; no permanent protection yet.		This should be disqualified as the land is not permanently protected - just and "intent" to do so. The cost per acres is also excessively high, especially since the request is intended to fix what the applicant did in the past that destroyed habitat.		Understand the need and appreciate leverage but restores 500 feet of the Mississippi. Best use of funds? Someone should fund this. OHF?	interesting construction project, limited habitat impact, outside the scope of LSOHC, should look at other avenues	Phase 1, restore 4 acres (or is it 7 acres??)and 460 ft of shoreline on Mississippi River in Winona @ \$613,100/acre (who did the development which altered the shoreline in 2006????? How did the permit get approved?) Applicant wants it restored - and then put it into permanent protection - isn't that backwards???, Leverage at 38%		Need more discussion?	Conflict with one of the partners	
HRE12	Minnesota Statewide Trout Habitat Enhancement & Protection - Construction	Is \$4.5M enough to do 12 projects??	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. Statewide trout construction on existing protected/public access lands; low personnel overhead and guaranteed public angling access; leverage is anticipated and prior appropriations warrant review.		Permit and engineering status? When would construction start?		9 miles of stream is significant - gave them \$750 last year (startout?) Ready for next part or wait?		Phase? 2?, Restore trout streams statewide - construction phase @ \$37136/acre , Open to Public, Leverage @15% but possible other funds available,			Significant unspent funds from several yers. No new public access. This looks like an excellent long term plan covering numerous streams over multiple future funding cycles.	
HRE13	Protection and Resiliency in the Rainy River Headwaters		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. Permanent fish passage and watershed connectivity through right-sized culverts; strong leverage and no tax impact; public access benefit is indirect.				Addressing culverts seems to be efficient use of dollars for high impact.		Phase ??, replace 16 undersized culverts on Trout streams (will they be bottomless arched culverts?) at \$187500 each, 42% Leverage Public waters,			Is this not a road improvement project that will benefit habitat rather than a habitat project?	
HRE14	Restoring priority habitats for Hennepin County's sensitive wildlife	Very high personnel costs	Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. Strong protected-land restoration, biological monitoring, and corridor value; concerns are high personnel/DSS, unidentified acreage, and current spending pace.				Good leverage, metro area - not a lot of metro.	Vague on the parcel discription,	Phase 4, Habitat restoration on 956 acres in Hennepin County @ \$6999/acre, 24% leverage - USE CPL METRO FUNDS			while no additional public land or public access is included, there are few opportunities to expand public land in the metro area. Projects in the metro area are somewhat limited to restoration and enhancement. Nearby population density results in high level of public use and benefit.	
HRE15	Swift Coulee Channel Restoration/ Enhancement - Phase 2		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. Top-tier watershed-scale restoration with perpetual RIM easements, strong confirmed leverage, measurable sediment/phosphorus reductions, and broad local benefits.				good leverage, 6 miles of habitat, spend of existing?		Proposal says Phase 2?? Isn't this phase 3?, Channel/stream restoration @\$17765/acre - on easements?, This application would complete the 10 mile long project, Leverage @ 36%			This looks like a drainage system improvement or repair project that should be paid for with assessment to the benefitting property. Construction of a two-stage ditch is supposed to reduce sediment transfer. Good drainage design should minimize sediment transfer and be paid for within the drainage project costs. Narrative states this project will enable farming BMPs, they can be implemented now. I see no enforceable commitment to use BMPs on adjacent ag land. Support funding only for RIM purchase portion of the project which appears to have been done with ML24 funds. .	

Summary of Member Comments and Questions

ID#	Program Title	Suzanne Baird	Rep. John Burkel	Kristin Egerling	David Hartwell	Sen. Foung Hawj	Matt Kucharski	Sen. Andrew Lang	Darrel Palmer	Tom Saxhaug	Ron Schara	Ted Suss	Rep. Samantha Vang
HRE16	Tamarac River Enhancement Project - Phase 1		Net Local Tax Impact Score: 10/10. Committee Judgment Override: high cost and phased implementation are concerns, but this district project corrects a state-created ditch impact and creates a permanent prairie river corridor.				Ditch remediation (worthwhile). Some leverage. How many phases expected?	interesting project, public vs. the easement portions? Need more info on the surrounding habitat	Phase 1, Convert an 8 mile ditch into a 9.6 meander stream - restore at @ \$54317/acre on easement lands,(100% of Engineering + 4 of the 8 miles restored), 15.7% Leverage			This ditch exists for the benefit of the adjacent drained farmland. Collapsing side wall repairs should be handled as maintenance or seperable repairs. restoring meander ought be part of designing a Drainage improvement project that does not negatively affect downbstream.	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program ML27/FY28		Competitive Grant Program – Support, Not Ranked. CPL funds smaller local habitat projects that do not fit the large-grant space; evaluate separately for accountability, transparency, and statewide/local partnership value.		Budget for staff is exactly the same as prior year - Looks like the same people funded for 2 years. Feels like a doubling up.		11m last year. Hoping this is statewide this year.				No scoring needed; council discussion	Excellent program. Does Legislative limit to metro area reduce need for funds?	
O1	2027 Contract Management		Administrative Program – Support, Not Ranked. Contract management is necessary for compliance, reimbursements, monitoring, and close-out of Outdoor Heritage pass-through grants.			fully fund	Necessary				No scoring needed; council discussion	necessary	
O2	2027 Restoration Evaluations - ML 2027		Administrative Program – Support, Not Ranked. Restoration evaluation is an accountability function that improves future habitat work; high personnel share is appropriate to evaluation mission.			fully fund	Necessary				No scoring needed; council discussion	necessary	
O3	DNR Core Functions in Partner-led OHF Acquisitions		Administrative Program – Support, Not Ranked. DNR core functions support partner-led acquisitions and public access readiness; not comparable to competitive habitat projects.			fully fund	Necessary				no scoring needed; council discussion	necessary	