

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

MEMO: **Agenda Item #10**

DATE: November 16, 2016

SUBJECT: Review and Progress FY 2018 Draft Accomplishment Plans

PRESENTER: Sandy Smith, LSOHC Project Analyst Manager

Suggested Motion:

Move to progress the plans and direct staff to proceed with the Outdoor Heritage Fund (OHF) bill draft based on draft accomplishment plans as discussed and directed today.

Suggested Procedure:

Members request clarifying language and direct specific questions in the plans to program managers.

Background:

The purpose of discussing the draft accomplishment plans is to “progress” (not approve). These plans contain accomplishments that managers report can be achieved with the recommendations from the September 29, 2016 council meeting. Most of the changes in the plans are reflected in the budget and outcome tables.

The accomplishments contained within the plans will be the basis for writing the OHF appropriations recommendation bill that the council will review at the December 14, 2016 meeting. Accomplishment plans will be considered by the council for final approval in June, 2017, after the bill is signed into law.

At a minimum, to enable bill preparation, the plans are progressed if they sufficiently describe: the recipient, the cooperators, the cooperators’ roles, the amount of the appropriation, the purpose of the appropriation and any specific direction or conditions the council feels should accompany the appropriation for the program.

Staff has reviewed the plans and the attached table reflects staff notes and questions posed to program managers. In some cases, clarification has already been included by the manager in the version of the accomplishment plan in members’ binders.

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2017 / FY 2018 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2016 Council Meeting

ID#	Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amt	Notes
PA 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition – Ph. IX	MN DNR	\$ 4,437,000	Removed work in the Northern Forest Region.
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Mgmt Area Program – Ph. IX	Pheasants Forever, Inc.	\$ 5,603,000	
PA 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project – Ph. VII	The Nature Conservancy	\$ 1,901,000	
PA 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition – Ph. VIII	The Nature Conservancy	\$ 2,683,000	
PA 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex – Ph. VII	The Trust for Public Land	\$ 1,436,000	Leverage reduction greater than the recommended amount.
PA 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection – Ph. III	MN DNR	\$ 2,481,000	
PA 07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water – Ph. VII	BWSR	\$ 5,333,000	See note in AP: restoration funds are included in outputs table, not in contracts budget.
PA 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley – Ph. III	MN Prairie Chicken Society/Pheasants Forever	\$ 1,908,000	
PRE 01	DNR Grasslands – Ph. IX	MN DNR	\$ 3,950,000	RIM easement pollinator plot restoration activity removed, contracts line cut disproportionately to other budget items to keep the roving crew working.
PRE 02	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation – Ph. V	Great River Greening	\$ 1,130,000	Currently budget \$20K per easement for stewardship enforcement, Anoka Conservation district doing much of the restoration work along with MCC contract.

ID#	Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amt	Notes
FA 01	Carnelian Creek Conservation Corridor	Minnesota Land Trust	\$ 2,458,000	<p>Past appropriation will be used to fund part of the funding shortage (see last page). Review easement prior to finalization? Would like clarification on hunting access on land? Project manager states that there is agreement among parties to do the whole deal, as referenced in the accomplishment plan, using all of MLT allotted MBR5, MBR6 and portion of MBR7 grants to make that happen. There is still a difference of approximately \$1.5M that will be made up by Washington County and the landowner.</p> <p>The \$10K in the contracts line is for a habitat management plan on the property.</p>
FA 02	Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project	MN Deer Hunters Association	\$ 2,400,000	Conservation Fund has a separate designated budget for their partnership in the program.
FA 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration – Ph. V	The Nature Conservancy	\$ 2,375,000	
FA 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future – Ph. V	MN DNR Forestry	\$ 2,291,000	Confirmed that DSS stayed the same as the proposal based on DNR formula.
FA 07	State Forest Acquisition - Richard J. Dorer Memorial Forest – Ph. IV	MN DNR Forestry	\$ 1,000,000	
FA 08	Critical Shoreland Habitat Protection Program – Ph. IV	Minnesota Land Trust	\$ 1,700,000	Contracts line is for habitat management plans.
FA 09	Bushmen Lake	The Conservation Fund	\$ 3,000,000	Mineral rights and ownership are addressed in the AP, acres did not change, dependent on leverage to acquire the total acres and accomplish the acquisition.
WA 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program – Ph. IX	Pheasants Forever, Inc.	\$ 5,500,000	
WA 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program – Ph. VI	Ducks Unlimited	\$ 5,750,000	
WA 03	RIM Wetlands – Ph. VIII	BWSR	\$ 10,398,000	See note in AP: restoration funds are included in outputs table, not in contracts budget.

ID#	Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amt	Notes
WA 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection – Ph. V	BWSR	\$ 750,000	
WRE 01	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement – Ph. IX	MN DNR	\$ 1,755,000	Only doing enhancement work, not restoration work with reduction in \$.
WRE 02	Living Shallow Lake Enhance & Wetland Rest. Initiative – Ph. V	Ducks Unlimited	\$ 4,716,000	Manager will need to move money from contracts to professional services for engineering work if needed.
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project – Ph. II	Mississippi Headwaters Board	\$ 2,396,000	Manager (MHB) budget is only 2.5% of the total recommended amount.
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes – Ph. III	Leech Lake Area Watershed Foundation	\$ 1,716,000	<p>Q: In the original proposal you did not breakout the budget between MLT and LLAWF. Our understanding at the time was the uncertainty of LLAWF getting certification for the easement process. Since the fee title parcel has dropped off the proposal, can you explain what the specific deliverables are going to be for LLAWF for the \$112,600? You mention donated easements, are those anticipated in the acreage estimates? What is in the contracts line item if it is not for R/E work?</p> <p>A: “LLAWF is the lead applicant and will be responsible for the overall grant administration and we oversee all partner coordination including monthly partner calls and the technical team.</p> <p>As you are aware, our program is a competitive application process that encourages donation and or bargain level compensation. We also raise acquisition funds and are prepared Besides overall grant administration - LLAWF will focus on Landowner recruitment that includes the development of lake ownership maps, lake presentations, targeted landowner outreach, direct mail appeals, follow-up with all interested landowners and inputting all application data. LLAWF also</p>

ID#	Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amt	Notes
				<p>provides a detailed analysis on each applicant, facilitates and provides detailed data and maps on each applicant for the Technical Team review. In Phase 1 we conducted 3 Rounds of outreach and review and we anticipate Phase 3 to be very similar. With additional staffing levels we anticipate being able to conduct more one of one landowner recruitment of our high ranked parcels and building more awareness and interest in Conservation Easements. We anticipate conducting 2 to 3 workshops that will outline the benefits from Conservation Easements. Additionally we anticipate using more electronic communication (Constant Contact), Facebook and other social media opportunities. We will also be working very closing with targeted lake associations and their existing communications including newsletters and Facebook pages.</p> <p>LLAWF will also invest a little more time and energy with selected (Finalist) landowners with a goal to reduce the number of landowners who decide to not move forward with a conservation easement. MLT has a lot on their plate and we see a clear need to keep the landowners engaged during the long CE process.</p> <p>To date LLAWF has been able to recruit a number of donated projects and we see this trend continuing. Our acre total includes both acquired and donated conservation easements.</p> <p>Regarding additional budget (Contract and Professional Service) line items include GIS mapping needs, development of lake maps and hiring a mail center to cover direct landowner mailings, general education and outreach efforts. Additionally, John Sumption will be</p>

ID#	Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amt	Notes
				<p>under contract to assist with landowner outreach, conduct landowner site visits and landowner application review.</p> <p>In reviewing our Phase 1 staffing levels - we will be requesting a revised accomplishment plan. We have had to tap into other sources of funds to support our implementation of Phase I. Our hope is that Phase 3 level funding could cover 100% of our implementation costs. I hope this helps clarify our body of work for Phase 3. Please let me know what additional info you might need.”</p>
HA 06	Goose Prairie Marsh WMA Enhancement	Wild Rice Watershed District	\$ 600,000	
HRE 01	MN Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration – Ph. IX	MN Trout Unlimited	\$ 2,403,000	Staff received assurance from the manager that the construction of Whitewater River will take place since we are funding the design and permitting in this recommendation.
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat – Ph. II	MN DNR	\$ 2,166,000	
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative – Ph. IV	MN DNR	\$ 3,392,000	<p>Q: What is the role of MLT in the AP as it was not in the original proposal? What would their deliverable be?</p> <p>A: “Role of MLT – The Minnesota Land Trust will act as the project manager and authorized representative of the MNDNR. They will oversee the design process for the Perch Lake Project. The design will be completed by the US Army Corps of Engineers. This will move the project toward being construction ready for funding by USEPA and OHF. The MLT will also assist MNDNR in the design process for the Grassy/Kingsbury Project, which will also be completed by USACE. Construction for the Grassy/Kingsbury Project is fully funded and is scheduled to begin in December of 2017.</p> <p>Deliverable of MLT – Produce bid ready designs for the Perch Lake Project as well as an EAW and work toward permits and necessary agreements for the project. Bid ready</p>

ID#	Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amt	Notes
				<p>design for Grassy/Kingsbury as well as an EAW, permits and all necessary agreements to begin construction in December of 2017.”</p> <p>Q: There is no person designated in the personnel table for MLT? Overall personnel went up 205% because of this?</p> <p>A: “The primary staff person responsible for producing the deliverable will be Daryl Peterson of the MLT. There will also be staff hours spent on administration. Personnel should be comparable to the direct appropriation to MLT in ML2014, which was 0.65 of an FTE for 2 years for \$196,000.”</p> <p>Q: Do you see any issues with OHF paying for the design and advancement of Perch Lake? Is there any reason why the construction of this would not move forward?</p> <p>A: “OHF will pay for 35% of the design completed by the USACE. This is the first time that the SLRRI has requested that OHF contribute to the completion of design work for projects they fund in the estuary. That is because MNDNR has developed a partnership directly with USACE instead of going through the partnership between USACE and MPCA. This strategy allows for much more control of our outcomes and deliverables. We anticipate that this partnership will be projected forward as we continue to complete projects. We anticipate that we would be approaching the OHC to secure construction funding for Perch Lake in ML2018. We already have an agreement with USEPA for their share of construction funds for this</p>

ID#	Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amt	Notes
				project. Construction is anticipated to begin in calendar 2019.”
HRE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Ph. III	Lake Superior Steelhead Association	\$ 1,758,000	Delayed submission of AP per request by LSOHC staff as they work with DNR Grants Management to define a fiscal agent to avoid potential conflict of interest.
HRE 05	Shell Rock River Wtshd Habitat Restoration Program – Ph. VI	Shell Rock River Watershed District	\$ 1,779,000	
HRE 06	Lake Wakanda Enhancement Project	Kandiyohi County	\$ 921,000	
HRE 07	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	Buffalo-Red River Watershed District	\$ 1,877,000	Fee acquisition activity removed. Manager confirmed that easement monitoring will be funded through levy taxes. Staff confirmed that the first reach of stream can be completed independent of the other reaches.
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program – Ph. IX	MN DNR	\$ 9,294,000	
O1	Contract Management 2017	MN DNR	\$ 150,000	
O2	Restoration Evaluations	MN DNR	\$ 150,000	
	LSOHC Administrative Budget 2018	LCC	\$ 571,000	
		Total:	\$ 104,128,000	