Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council
25 Year Framework of Funding
Facilitation Questions for September 15 meeting

Topic: Is there a difference between a 10-year *plan* and a 23-year *framework*?

Background: The working group has been focused on a framework of funding for the next 23-years. A *framework of funding* differs from a *plan*, or a *strategic plan*, in that a framework provides more clarity on what can be accomplished with the anticipated funds, while a plan lays out a vision, goals and objectives for the use of the funds. We have clearly delineated roles between this working group and the council – the working group is focusing on developing the analysis for framework -- with planning the responsibility of the council. The council has articulated it goals in its Statewide Priority Criteria and in its Ecological Section Vision and Priorities developed on the basis of input gained last summer, published most recently in the council's Call for Funding Requests for 2012 Appropriations.

We note, however, that the Council's statutory language uses the word *plan* for the first ten years of funding:

M.S. 97A.056, Subd. (3)
(i) The council shall develop and submit to the Legislative Coordinating Commission **plans** for the first ten years of funding, and a **framework** for 25 years of funding, consistent with statutory and constitutional requirements. The council may use existing plans from other legislative, state, and federal sources, as applicable.

Focus questions:

Do you feel that the council's Statewide Priority Criteria and Ecological Section Vision and Priorities are what you want to submit to the Legislative Coordinating Commission as your ten-year plan for the first ten years of funding?

If not, would you like to schedule time for the council to develop a ten-year plan? What would like that process to look like – how and when would you like that to happen?

Topic: Discussion about next steps for Results Management Framework

Background: The working group is using a results management framework for each of the ecological sections, using the council's approved vision and priorities for each section as a guideline. An example from the Metropolitan-Urbanizing section is provided in your meeting materials. Frameworks such as this help articulate clear outcome-based goals, and help relate public investments, daily activities, and outputs to identified outcomes. They also aid in spotting gaps between activities/outputs and associated outcomes.

In developing these frameworks for the sections, the working group has spotted a few areas where there are gaps. Specifically:

- There are areas where the council has articulated activities and outputs, but has not specified the outcomes expected or anticipated as an immediate consequence of that activity.
- There are areas where ultimate outcomes are articulated, but the pathway to achieve that outcome is not clear. Furthermore, some of the outcomes can only be accomplished in partnership with other state, federal and private efforts.

The working group has filled in some of these gaps with some assumptions and suggestions, but we are not certain if we are going beyond our scope in doing so.

Focus question:

Would you like the working group to continue developing the results management framework, with an eye toward filling in observed gaps with suggested interim goals and measures? Or would you rather develop these at the council level?

RESULTS MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK/ – LSOHC Section: Metropolitan-Urbanizing Area DRAFT

Inputs (What We Invest)	**Activities / Outputs** (What We Do)	**Outcomes (what success looks like)**	
		Initial and Continuing Results	Legacy

Investment for Acquisition (and by PWFAq)
$$
$ for Fee acquisition (per acre but also associated fees. E.g., legal fees)
$ for Conservation easements
PILT on those acquisitions (for public)
$ for easement stewardship
 	
Human Capital
# employees 	
Personnel expenses devoted to acquisition (FTE) (including reimbursements such as travel)
$ for other professional services (appraisals, surveys etc)
Investment for R/E
$$
$ spent on restoration/enhancement contracted services
$ spent on capital equipment
$ spent on equipment/tools
$ spent on materials (e.g., seeds, water control structures)
Human Capital
# employees 	
$ spent on restoration/enhancement personnel (including reimbursements)
$ for other professional services
	(#/acres of acquisitions, # /acres easements # projects/acres by habitat)
	
	ACROSS HABITATS
	➢ **Protect, restore and enhance habitat for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, Minnesota County Biological Survey data, and rare, threatened and endangered species** *(Acres and # habitats for SGCN and ETS species, # MCBS sites)*
	➢ **Protect uplands adjacent to game lakes** *(Acres, shoreline miles protected, # projects adjacent to priority game lakes)*
	➢ **Protect habitat corridors, with emphasis on the Minnesota, Mississippi and St. Croix rivers (bluff to floodplain.)** *(Acres, shoreline miles protected …particularly within priority corridors)*
	➢ **Restore or enhance habitat on state-owned WMAs, AMAs, SNAs, and state forests** (also protect Buffers for public lands) *(Acres and distribution)*
	➢ **Target unique Minnesota landscapes that have historical value to fish and wildlife** [for protection and restoration/enhancement projects] e.g., Anoka sandplain, River corridors and C.A. WMA *(Extent and distribution)*
	➢ Enhance and restore areas from adverse impacts of invasive species (e.g., terrestrial plants, insects and diseases). *(Extent and distribution, % of mapped acres restored)*
	➢ Encourage increased wildlife habitat on private lands *(# projects with matching private land work)*
		What do we expect to see?
		
		ACROSS HABITATS
		❖ **A network of natural lands…habitats will connect, making corridors for wildlife and species in greatest need of conservation** *(Corridors connecting protected areas, evidence of SGCN and other wildlife using corridors, acres of "green infrastructure" corridors protected)*
		❖ **Core areas protected with highly biologically diverse wetlands and plant communities including native prairies.** *(Diverse, quality native plant communities, average size of core complexes…e.g.,* 4-9 square mile complexes*)*
		❖ Improved condition of habitat on public lands *(evidence of successful R/E projects)*
		❖ ?? Invasive species management *(acres of habitat restored, # species requiring mitigation)*
		❖ Increased participation of private landowners in habitat projects *(acres habitat P/R/E in private land adjacent/near projects)*
			What's the legacy? Natural resource conservation...
			
			ACROSS HABITATS
			❖ **Quality wildlife and fisheries habitat** *(Extent and distribution of **restored and perpetually protected wetland, prairie, and forest complexes**…including remnant native prairies and oak savanna; population levels of indicator species)*
			- **Key forest game species** include white-tailed deer, ruffed grouse, wild turkey and waterfowl species.
			- **SGCN:** Forested habitats - over 50 SGCN including the Acadian flycatcher and red-shouldered hawk
			❖ **Invasive species permanently eradicated where possible.** *(Acreage of mapped invasive species, % of public lands where "problem")*
			❖ **Minnesotans have public access to outdoor environments for recreation opportunities** *(# access points, % population with access within distance)*

	PRAIRIE/WETLAND ➢ **Protect, enhance and restore remnant native prairie and oak savanna with an emphasis on areas with high biological diversity.** *(Acres and distribution, % of 2010 remaining prairie and oak savanna protected, % protected sites that are MCBS sites)* **FOREST/WETLAND** ➢ **Protect, restore and enhance forests contributing to quality fisheries** - reforestation of once forested areas (e.g., in riparian areas to improve water quality and fish and wildlife habitat). *(Extent and distribution, shoreline miles, # of priority watershed with projects)* ➢ **Protect, enhance and restore remnant Big Woods forests with an emphasis on areas with high biological diversity.** - Reforest once forested areas. *(Extent and distribution, % of acres that are MCBS sites, acres reforested)* **AQUATIC** ➢ **Enhance and restore coldwater fisheries systems.** *(shoreline miles, # projects on designated trout streams, # projects in priority lakes)* ➢ **Protect, enhance and restore riparian and littoral habitats on lakes to benefit game and non-game fish species.** - e.g., prairie acquisitions buffer wetlands *(Extent and distribution, shoreline miles protected in watershed)*	**PRAIRIE/WETLAND** ❖ Remnant native prairies and oak savannas are perpetually protected and restored *(percent of remnant prairies/savannas protected, %adequately buffered/connected, # native community types protected/ represented, evidence of successful R/E/ projects)* **FOREST/WETLAND** ❖ **A forest land base that contributes to the habitat picture** *(High quality forests, including oak savanna and Big Woods complexes are restored/protected, evidence of use by species dependent on these habitats, particularly SGCN, evidence of successful watershed approaches…e.g., reduced erosion)* **AQUATIC** ❖ **Game lakes are significant contributors of waterfowl, due to efforts to protect uplands adjacent to game lakes** *(# Impaired lakes, evidence of lake use/success….nesting success, etc.)* ❖ **Protected habitats will hold wetlands and shallow lakes open to public recreation and hunting.** *(# access points, user satisfaction)* ❖ High quality aquatic habitat ***(streams, rivers and lakes protected by vegetative buffers along riparian areas,*** *aquatic indicators…mussels, fish populations, increased water quality and water on a site)*	**PRAIRIE/WETLAND** ❖ Healthy, diverse native prairies and oak savannas provide multiple, enduring conservation benefits *(key wildlife species populations, evidence of habitat and water quality)* **FOREST/WETLAND** ❖ Healthy, diverse Big Woods forests are connected via **habitat corridors** and provide multiple, enduring conservation benefits *(key wildlife species populations, evidence of habitat and water quality)* **AQUATIC** ❖ **High quality fisheries, particularly cold water, within an hour's drive of the majority of the state's population.** *(Population levels, angler success and satisifaction)*

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council
25 Year Framework of Funding Process Update
September 15, 2010

Background and Context

A working group of conservation professionals has been developing a draft funding framework for the council's consideration. As a reminder from our previous updates, this framework is exploring three alternative habitat scenarios that were originally suggested by Council chair Kilgore:

- A baseline scenario, or historic trajectory of funding, which describes outcomes that could have been expected if the OHF was not available to fund conservation work,
- An estimated trajectory of funding, based on the decisions made in the council's first two years of appropriations, and
- A maximized scenario, that describes different levels of outcomes that would be achievable if the maximum funding needed were dedicated to one particular habitat. This is not a likely scenario, but it would illustrate the upper bound of the habitat work that could be accomplished.

In addition to these three scenarios, the council has also requested that the working group identify any research needs for the LCCMR's consideration, to recommend future metrics for evaluation, and to note significant organizational or capacity issues.

Progress Update

The working group has been meeting every two weeks, with participation by LSOHC staff and facilitation by Management Analysis & Development. Two meetings have been held since our last update on August 16.

Within the **historical trajectory of funding scenario**, the group is using GIS analysis to describe and identify conservation lands throughout the state. GIS Analyst Aaron Spence of the Board of Water and Soil Resources has completed most of the data analysis to assemble GIS data layers in two general categories – publicly protected conservation lands that provide wildlife habitat, and privately owned lands that are in a state of providing quality wildlife habitat. He is now assembling maps and tables that present the conservation estate by acreage within each LSOHC planning zone, as well as acreage by ownership and landscape type (prairie, wetland, forest). The aquatic habitat portion of this analysis has been the most challenging piece, and the DNR is assisting Aaron with addressing it.

Other information for the baseline scenario has been collected by working group members via a questionnaire that they distributed to 15 public and non-profit organizations that, we believed, expend a minimum of $1 million per year to protect, restore and enhance habitat. They asked numerous questions that will be helpful for the baseline description, including their recent expenditures, their primary activities and the outcomes from those activities, the extent of their grant programs, and their goals and opportunities for the future. We have received eight of those questionnaires back to this date, and we have enough data in hand that we began preliminary analysis last week. We are expecting another two responses in the next week.

As noted during our prior update, we realized once the information requests had already been distributed that we had adopted an assumption around the term "protect" that was perceived as limiting by some of our respondents. We are asking follow up questions to obtain additional qualitative data about additional actions that conservation partners conduct that they perceive as falling under their own definitions of protection, restoration and enhancement.

For the **two-year trajectory of funding**, Peter Butler of our staff has been working with the appropriations and accomplishment plan data from your first two years of funding, provided by Heather Koop on the council staff. As noted during our prior update, the two-year trajectory will performed on a statewide basis, rather than performing individual trajectories for each of the LSOHC sections.

The estimates for the **maximized scenario** will follow the same economic assumptions used for the two-year trajectory. You asked that we note if any of the maximized scenarios would be limited or capped by legal, process, organizational or political constraints. To get a better sense of these constraints, we asked conservation partners on the Information Request (mentioned above) to rate the significance of various constraints that have affected them in the previous ten years and that might affect their organization's ability to protect, restore or enhance habitat over the next 10 to 25 years. The basic estimates for a first draft of the maximized scenario and the constraints analysis were discussed last week, and the working group will continue to discuss this at their next meeting.

With regard to **recommended metrics for future evaluation**, Leslie McInenly of the Minnesota Forest Resources Council and Andy Holdsworth of the DNR developed first drafts of a results management framework for each of the LSOHC sections, based upon the section-specific vision and priorities adopted by the council at their prior meetings. This type of framework helps define success and theories of change, and helps clarify the expected relationships between investments, actions taken, and results achieved. The section-specific frameworks were the primary topic at the working group's August 19 meeting, and suggested revisions to the framework are planned for this month.

Project Management Update

We are currently on time and on budget. The development of the baseline scenario has taken more effort and time than we originally estimated, due to the need to develop the Information Request form and to allow time for organizations to complete it. However, the two-year trajectory of funding and the maximized scenario are not as complicated as we thought they would be originally.

J:\Lessard Council\25 year planning\Plan Outline.doc

25 Year Framework and 10 Year Objectives for the Outdoor Heritage Fund

I. Summary
- A. Plan Organization
  1.
  2.
- B. Plan Process
  1.
  2.
- C. Plan Findings
  1.
  2.

II. Introduction
- A. Land History
  1. Forestry
  2. Settlement
  3. Agriculture
     - a, Drainage
       - (I) Historic
       - (II) Modern
     - b. Tillage
       - (I) Historic
       - (II) Modern

III. Legislative Background
- A. The ballot initiative
- B. The statutes
  1.
  2.
- C. The first two years of recommendations
  1.
  2.

IV. The Conservation Estate

V. Framework Development
- A. Plan Review
- B. Supporting Efforts
- C. Regional Input
- D. Regional Targets
- E. Council Ideation
- F. Scenario Development
  1. Baseline
  2. OHF Historical
  3. MaxVest
  4. Advisors Scenario

VI. Statewide
- A. Vision
  1. Quality Habitat
  2. Healthy Populations of Fish, Game and Other Wildlife
  3. Functioning Forest Landscapes
  4. Protected Native Prairie Reserves
  5. Functioning Prairie Pothole Region
  6. Quality Fisheries
  7. Large Scale Upland Ecosystems
- B. Priorities
- C. Framework