

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

MEMO: Agenda Item #8

DATE: November 16, 2017

SUBJECT: Review and Progress FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plans

PRESENTER: LSOHC Staff

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 28, 2017 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 12, 2017 meeting. Accomplishment plans will be considered by the council for final approval in June, 2018, 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 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
PA 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase X	MN DNR	\$ 2,786,000	removed Forest/Prairie Transition region; removed Habitat Resource
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase X	Pheasants Forever, Inc.	\$ 5,740,000	
PA 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VIII	The Nature Conservancy	\$ 2,001,000	removed Fee w/PILT acquisition;
PA 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase IX	The Nature Conservancy	\$ 1,893,000	DSS and personnel increased from 9.41% (proposal) to 13.05% (draft AP)
PA 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VIII	The Trust for Public Land	\$ 1,345,000	
PA 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection - Phase VII	MN DNR	\$ 1,490,000	<p>Q: The easement stewardship budget line (22% of the ask) was not proportionately reduced, since the easement acquisition (main activity of the program) was reduced to 16% (below the 18% cut) - can you explain this?</p> <p>A: Easement stewardship is generally written into law, stating “up to this amount” can be enrolled. If I underestimate, I cannot ask for an amendment to move more dollars into stewardship but I could ask to transfer stewardship funds elsewhere. If preferred, I can cut at the 16 or 18%, it simply may limit the # of sites we can acquire. For example, if we are able to acquire more sites in low dollar/acre areas or we get more value donated allowing us to acquire more, we could run out of stewardship funds making acquisition of additional sites difficult.</p>

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
				<p>As for acquisition, the acres were cut to 19% and the dollars per acre to 17%, as I am projecting a slight decrease in cost per acre as crop prices go down.</p> <p>Q: The DSS budget lines (29.8% of the ask) were not proportionately reduced, we thought the DSS was a formulary calculation based on personnel which was reduced to 19% why did the DSS stay so high? Just want to make sure this wasn't an entry error.</p> <p>A: As for DSS, these are determined using DNRs Direct & Necessary Costs Calculator. Some of the components the calculator uses, such as number of allotments (regions work is completed in), are fixed and not scalable.</p>
PA 07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VIII	BWSR	\$ 5,000,000	
PA 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase IV	MN Prairie Chicken Society / Pheasants Forever, Inc.	\$ 1,162,000	
PA 09	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition - Phase II	Fox Lake Conservation League, Inc.	\$ 2,447,000	
PA 10	Protect and Restore MN IBAs within the Tallgrass Aspen Parklands - Phase II	Audubon Minnesota	\$ 829,000	<p>Added Forest/Prairie Transition region; removed restoration activity; added forest and Habitat priorities; DSS increased from 9.64% (proposal) to 22.47% (draft AP); MLT "encourages" landowners to manage properties (See MLT Attachment)</p>

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
PA 11	Grassland Conservation Partnership - Phase III	The Conservation Fund	\$ 1,468,000	<p>DSS went from 3.41% (proposal) to 10.92% (draft AP).</p> <p>Q: You state (page 7) that 100,000 in the contract line is for R/E, what is the other 21,000 for?</p> <p>A: We typically build a budget around a set number of projects. In this case, that was 3. The stewardship amount reflects the actual costs for doing 3 projects at \$24k for each. Normally, we budget an additional 1-3 stewardship contributions above and beyond what we expect to close in order to accommodate high levels of donation if they occur. And since that number is locked in by the appropriation language, we are cautious in not under-estimating need. We do not expect that need to occur here.</p> <p>Q: Who, how and to what extent is the R/E work being done?</p> <p>A: In addition to R/E work via contracts, we budgeted for 3 grassland management plans for a total of \$21k. That explanation is now in the updated AP.</p> <p>Q: Contracts are 252% of the ask, but easement acquisition (the main activity of the program) is 17.3%, but the easement stewardship is 60% of the ask – can you explain this.</p>

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
				<p>A: In reviewing past projects and opportunities before us, we see opportunities to further advance our goals with inclusion of a modest amount of restoration funding which is the reason for the increase in the R/E line. Landowners often have desires to improve the condition of their land as wildlife habitat and this will enable them to do so. This often includes activities such as woody vegetation removal and interseeding to improve vegetative diversity. If R/E work is desired by landowners, these activities will be managed by the MN Land Trust. This explanation is now included in the AP as well.</p>
<p>PA 12</p>	<p>Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase I</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>\$ 2,960,000</p>	

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
PRE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement - Phase X	MN DNR	\$ 4,007,000	<p>errors in parcel list, includes federal lands (DNR comment) I think I have the parcels correct now. This goes back to the issue Ricky and I were having with the save function last week. That problem seems to have cleared up as my final report parcel entry has been working fine the last couple days.</p> <p>Q: Gores Pool WMA in Dakota and Raguet WMA in Carver are on the list. Aren't those in the floodplain of the MN and Miss. Rivers. Is there grassland work happening on those? A: Even though these units are outside the prairie/farmland area, our Area Wildlife Managers have identified grassland acres on the WMAs that were a priority for management.</p> <p>Q: Federal lands were removed from the project list, but the abstract still includes federal lands. As a result, federal lands should be removed from the abstract if that is the intent.</p> <p>A: We don't plan to work on any specific WPA/NWR with this appropriation, but would like to be able to if the opportunity arises. For instance, doing a block burn of adjacent WMA/WPA with a FWS fire crew. But I put in two placeholder federal tracts, Hamden Slough NWR and Hoykens WPA, in the parcel list.</p> <p>4. In the original proposal and in this accomplishment plan, there was \$400,000 and \$380,000 for a FAW – Contract Administrator (1 FTE over 4 years) respectively. The original proposal stated there would be 27,300 WMA habitat R/E completed for a total of \$8,518,900. This is an average of 5,460 acres annually over 5 years. The accomplishment plan has now been updated that a total</p>

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
				<p>of \$1,876,500 will be spent on R/E to complete 7,400 acres. This is an average of 1,480 acres annually over 5 years. If this full time Contract Administrator position could complete 27,300 acres at full time over 4 years, is it logical or not to perceive that the salary and time need to now be cut by 73% to allow for the reduction in work requirements? The AP info at hand doesn't appear to support that paying for a full time position over 4 years with a 73% workload reduction makes sense.</p> <p>A: I had to do significant amounts of reshuffling of the budget. We felt we needed to keep the contract manager to keep projects flowing efficiently. However, we did have to eliminate the second roving crew for R4 and the FWS Rx fire section. Those were obviously big acres that we had to delete. In other words, because we eliminated some programs and shuffled some of the others, it isn't a simple X percent reduction in every line of the budget.</p>
PRE 02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands - Phase III	Pheasants Forever, Inc.	\$ 2,160,000	

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
FA 03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase VII	Morrison SWCD	\$ 1,229,000	<p>Q: With no money in contracts – can you explain how R/E work is happening on the Fee title lands?</p> <p>A: No OHF funds are being requested for R/E on the Fee title lands. We have added an additional description to the “Design and scope of work” field to detail this information.</p>
FA 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase VI	The Nature Conservancy	\$ 2,142,000	<p>MLT "encourages" landowners to manage properties (See MLT Attachment), reduction in leverage, DSS went from 9.67% (proposal) to 14.61% (draft AP)</p> <p>Q: The leverage was not proportionately reduced, can you explain this?</p> <p>A: The reduced amount of leverage is from donative value from conservation easements. Because there will be a far fewer conservation easements completed due to the lower appropriation, there is a smaller landowner pool. Because there are few participating landowners there is lower certainty on a few landowners contributing more donative value.</p>
FA 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase - VI	MN DNR	\$ 1,473,000	dropped restore, increased fee acres, decreased easement acres
FA 07	State Forest Acquisition, Richard J. Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase V	MN DNR	\$ 1,255,000	removed restore, leverage stayed at 100%
FA 08	Critical Shoreland Habitat Program - Phase V	Minnesota Land Trust	\$ 1,094,000	removed restore, main activity funded was reduced below proportionate recommendation - reductions were not proportional, \$30,000 in contracts for habitat

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
				management plans but landowners are only "encouraged" to manage land (See MLT Attachment). DSS increased from 4.86% (proposal) to 9.41% (draft AP)
FRE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative - Phase III	MN Deer Hunters Association	\$ 1,938,000	
WA 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase X	Pheasants Forever, Inc.	\$ 5,061,000	
WA 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program - Phase VII	Ducks Unlimited	\$ 4,770,000	
WA 03	RIM Wetlands - Phase IX	BWSR	\$ 10,000,000	
WA 04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase III	Minnesota Land Trust	\$ 1,786,000	high personnel with few acres, main activity was reduced below the proportionate recommendation, leverage dropped, (See MLT Attachment)
WRE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase X	MN DNR	\$ 2,759,000	<p>Removed component #4 small wetland initiative, removed additional roving crew, personnel numbers not consistent with personnel reduction, data loggers mentioned in design and scope but not included in capital equipment. Is replacement/renovation of wetland infrastructure enhancement?</p> <p>Q: Why did the other equipment and tools INCREASE from the proposal?</p> <p>A: The Other Equipment/Tools budget line did increase from \$33,000 in the proposal to \$36,000 in the accomplishment plan. The original proposal also requested Capital Equipment funding for a MarshTracker, a large amphibious work vehicle that is extremely</p>

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
				<p>valuable for roving habitat crews. We eliminated that item due to the funding cut. We increased the Other Equipment/Tools budget line by \$3,000 (0.1% of the total budget) to make sure that we had enough funding to purchase identified equipment and supplies; the costs used in the proposal were based on two-year old estimates.</p> <p>Q: Why did Professional Services stayed at 74% of the request rather than being reduced?</p> <p>A: The original proposal requested funding for approximately 30 individual projects, along with funding for staff and capital equipment. Most of the individual projects require survey and engineering work, i.e. Professional Services, though depending on the type of project being constructed, they can be a relatively small portion of the cost. We are going to move ahead with a majority of the individual projects, but due to the reduction in funding, have decided to postpone a few of the high cost ones. These postponements resulted in a fairly significant reduction in our overall contracts expenses, but a relatively small reduction in our professional services costs</p>

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
WRE 02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	Ducks Unlimited	\$ 3,740,000	<p>DSS increased from 18% (proposal) to 20.32% (draft AP) , 6 FTEs, acre outputs were not proportionally reduced</p> <p>Q: DSS increased from the proposal ask of \$12,000 to \$70,000?</p> <p>A: This increase is to address a typo in my proposal. Our DSS accounts for approximately 10% of our Personnel costs, which was noted in our proposal. However, in the proposal budget, I inadvertently requested \$12,000 instead of \$120,000 to accompany the \$1.2 million requested for Personnel, so I adjusted in the AP by listing 10% of the \$700,000 now budgeted for Personnel</p> <p>Q: Equipment and Tools increased from the proposal ask of \$40,000 to \$95,000?</p> <p>A: This increase is due to our engineering department recent change in plans to begin leasing GPS survey equipment in 2019 rather than purchasing new equipment (Capital Equipment). Equipment will be leased for each job and charged as an Equip/Tools charge for each project. Additionally, we recently determined that UTVs can be purchased for slightly under \$10,000, so we will strive to purchase one as an Equip/Tools item instead of Capital Equip, assuming no big price jumps in 2019. Thus, I increased our budget for Equip/Tools to accommodate both variables.</p> <p>Q: It appears that OHF is buying capital equipment for the USFWS, is this the case? If so, can you explain how this will work? A: DU proposed to purchase and transfer a permanent portable diesel pump for enhancing large wetlands and shallow lakes on federal property in partnership with DU and DNR to meet the goals of</p>

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
				<p>Minnesota's Long-range Duck Recovery Plan, etc. As we did for DNR via our ML2012 OHF appropriation for this program, DU proposed to purchase a portable pump, trailer, and fuel tank for USFWS to use to temporarily lower water levels to enhance large wetlands and small shallow lakes on federal WPAs and NWRs where installing permanent water control structures or pumps is not feasible or does not make good management or fiscal sense due to the infrequent nature of temporary drawdowns required. As we did with Minnesota DNR, we plan to purchase and transfer this Capital Equipment to USFWS. Mechanically, I am not sure yet how to make this happen (in terms of paperwork, etc), but if this is problematic to do with state funds, please let me know and we'll have to change plans (possibly by reallocating these funds to Equipment/Tools, Contracts, or Professional Services to pay a private company to provide/conduct consulted pumping on a fee for service basis, project by project, instead).</p>
HA 02	Metro Big Rivers - Phase VIII	MN Valley Trust	\$ 2,630,000	<p>Q: You state that 67% of the contract for MLT is for R/E, what is the other amount used for? A: The remaining is for habitat management/restoration plans and for contractual landowner outreach via SWCD offices. This is our standard approach in the Metro.</p> <p>Q: Is the 67% (\$91,120) in the contract line being used to R/E the easement parcels as well as the 35 unique acres outside of the easements being purchased? A: I am not sure I fully understand your question, but restoration/enhancement is most likely to occur on</p>

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
				<p>existing easement lands. We reserve the right to allocate some \$\$ for new easements, however. The parcels in our R/E parcel list are existing easement lands.</p> <p>Q: Why was the easement stewardship funds not proportionately reduced to the budget for easement purchases?</p> <p>A: This is standard practice for us. Since we do an RFP process, we don't know which projects will come before us. Although we develop our budget based on a set number of easements, we often retain an elevated stewardship budget (typically 1-3 projects) should we receive higher than expected number of donations. Since the state requires that these funds be specifically identified in the appropriation language, we build this in on the front end. We will be drawing \$24K per easement for stewardship purposes. If we don't use all stewardship funds, the excess is reallocated to other line items in the budget. We do this for all of our easement grants.</p>
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase III	Mississippi Headwaters Board	\$ 2,998,000	
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase III	Leech Lake Area Watershed Foundation	\$ 2,801,000	DSS increased from 4.97% (proposal) to 8.39% (draft AP); high personnel, travel, and DSS costs; leverage not proportionately reduced
HA 05	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	MN DNR	\$ 642,000	DSS is not proportional
HA 06	Metro Wildlife Management Areas	The Conservation Fund	\$ 1,174,000	In proposal indicated local government approval would be sought, Draft AP states approval will NOT be sought; high travel and DSS costs; leverage stayed the same.

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
HA 07	Dakota County Habitat ProtectionRestoration - Phase VI	Dakota County	\$ 2,288,000	<p>Major activity changes (reduced restoration, increased acquisition)</p> <p>Q: On top of pg 6 (Activity Detail Tab questions), you state that “soft service trails may be established, in part to assist in natural resource management. What is the other part for?</p> <p>A: The approved conservation easement language allows the landowner to create new soft surface trails for property access and low impact recreation as previously noted on the page. Any new trail has to be reviewed and approved by the County in advance and cannot contradict the Natural Resource Management Plan.</p> <p>Q: Supplies budget line INCREASED from the proposal, can you explain this?</p> <p>A:We are combining the supplies/materials original budget amount with an adjusted Contracts amount, since we contract and receive invoices for supplies and materials. This will be reflected in our revised AP.</p> <p>Q:Who will own the fee title land and how will it be managed?</p> <p>A:Fee title ownership will depend on which projects are completed. In all cases, public entities (i.e., Dakota County, DNR or the city within which the property is located) will own the fee title and will be responsible for ongoing management. (LSOHC Staff Note: Land ownership and future land use/mgmt. must be detailed in draft accomplishment plan.)</p> <p>Q: Why did the acres for fee land increase from 91</p> <p style="text-align: center;">We have revisited our acres and budgeted amounts and reflected those in our parcel</p>

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
				<p>list. The revised figures and acreages are based on revised anticipated project information.</p>
<p>HA 08</p>	<p>Hennepin County Habitat Conservation Program - Phase I</p>	<p>Hennepin County</p>	<p>\$ 1,514,000</p>	<p>High easement stewardship and DSS, (See MLT Attachment) Q: The budget line item for easement stewardship went up from the request of \$36,000 to \$192,000, is this correct or a typo? If correct, please explain. A: The current budget is based on the completion of an estimated 9 easement projects, with a \$24,000 (\$216,000 total) stewardship cost for each. In the proposal budget, Hennepin County planned to contribute most of the stewardship funds from local sources as leverage to the LSOHC funds. In the revised budget, we shift most of our leverage contribution to other budget areas (personnel and professional services), while maintaining a similar amount of leverage across the grant as a whole. We decided on this shift in order to ensure that as much LSOHC award money as possible is directed toward on-the-ground conservation accomplishments. Q: The budget line item for DSS was not proportionately reduced, can you explain this? A: As stated in the proposal, DSS is based on 27% of personnel costs for Minnesota Land Trust. Personnel</p>

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
				costs were reduced to the level we thought was essential to deliver upon the proposed accomplishment plan. This reduction was not directly proportional to the overall reduction because we anticipate extra effort to perform outreach and marketing activities during the early years of this program expansion.
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration - Phase X	Minnesota Trout Unlimited	\$ 2,291,000	no reduction in travel and DSS,

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase V	MN DNR	\$ 2,013,000	<p>DSS and personnel increased from 6.8% (proposal) to 15.8% (draft AP).</p> <p>–(DNR Response) The St. Louis Restoration Initiative partnership (MNDNR/MLT) developed a strategy to incorporate into the AP that most efficient applied the reduced amount of funding to the highest priority project, while continue to advance other critical projects identified in the proposal.</p> <p>Q: Will this project be able to move forward if the match does not come through?</p> <p>A: It is highly probable that the match provided by the USEPA through the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI) for the highest priority project (Perch Lake) will be allocated in federal fiscal year 2018. The continuing resolution for the federal budget is allowing USEPA to advance a budget for GLRI and this project is on their priority list for funding. However, if funding were not come from USEPA, the Outdoor Heritage Fund would have to cover all costs associated with construction of the Perch Lake Project. It is important to note that the SLRRI has a track record of securing greater than 50% of project costs from the GLRI and that after the completion of five successful projects, and the ongoing state support, the work that this team is completing is considered very desirable to support by the federal partners.</p> <p>Q: Can you explain why the main activity (contracts for R/E work) was reduced below the recommendation proportionately?</p> <p>A: The need to drop the contracts line for Perch Lake is directly related to the substantially reduced allocation for</p>

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
				<p>the six projects identified in the proposal. Although Perch Lake is the highest priority project, there is an ongoing need to advance the other five projects. If the allocation had been in the range of 35 – 40%, I suspect that the contracts line would have been maintained at that level, while also being able to apply necessary attention to advance the other projects.</p> <p>Q: Is MLT not charging any staff time to manage \$1.35 million in R/E contracts?</p> <p>A: The MLT was allocated \$226,000 in the ML2017 to complete the primary task of administering and advancing the priority project (Perch Lake) through design and construction. It is not anticipated that the MLT will require any additional funding to complete this task. The proposed allocation for Perch Lake from ML2018 will be applied entirely to construction.</p> <p>Q: Can you justify \$300,000 in personnel to R/E 36 acres?</p> <p>A: Funding for construction from ML2018 will be applied to Perch Lake. However, the other projects identified in the proposal are all in some stage of active advancement by multi-agency project teams, which are led by MNDNR or MLT. These are personnel-intensive tasks including design, engineering, Environmental Assessment Worksheets, and a number of permits necessary to advance the projects to construction. The SLRRI is compelled to continue to lead those processes. To do that, the SLRRI only claimed a small proportion of the total project acreages. Although only 31 acres are being claimed in the AP for the five projects other than Perch Lake, when completed, those five projects will deliver 161</p>

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
				<p>acres of restoration.</p> <p>Q: What is the difference between DNR and MLT as far as R/E work goes?</p> <p>A: The SLRRI is an active partnership between the MNDNR and the MLT. Because the MNDNR has limitations in staff capacity, the MLT completes all tasks associated with advancing a project from design through construction. The MNDNR and the MLT work together to determine which projects are most appropriate for them to complete and MNDNR then works with them to develop work plans and agreements to facilitate that work. The most recent project completed by the MLT is Chambers Grove, which was completed through direct allocation of funding from the OHF and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.</p>

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
HRE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	Lake Superior Steelhead Association	\$ 927,000	personnel not proportional
HRE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VII	Shell Rock River Watershed District	\$ 1,421,000	personnel not reduced w/greatly reduced acres
HRE 06	Lake George Dam and Rum River Erosion	Anoka County Parks	\$ 539,000	personnel leverage removed (LSOHC Staff note: Program Manager and DNR will be adding a fish passage component to the dam. Revision of accomplishment plan forthcoming.
HRE 07	Buffalo River Watershed Stream Habitat Program - Phase I	Buffalo-Red River Watershed District	\$ 1,195,000	increase in leverage
HRE 08	Two Rivers Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement	City of Hallock	\$ 1,700,000	
HRE 09	Six Mile Creek-Halsted Bay Habitat Restoration - Phase I	Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	\$ 567,000	increase in leverage, maintained acres

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
HRE 11	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	MN DNR	\$ 2,834,000	<p>DSS and personnel increased from 16.88% (proposal) to 35.17% (draft AP), leverage removed, substantial acre reduction, main activity not proportionally reduced</p> <p>Q: Is your program really funding 5 FTE's? If so, can you give a brief explanation as to what the staff does for the program as the professional services was not reduced proportionately and the main activity of the program (R/E) in the contract line was reduced BELOW the proportionate amount?</p> <p>A: We did include funding for several positions. Our original proposal included 8 FTE, which was reduced to 5 FTE in our accomplishment plan. The total number of years was also reduced for AMA positions from 5 to 3 years. Because the proposal includes two different programs there is a greater need for position support, as well as specifics to the programs involved. I spent a considerable portion of my testimony before the council explaining the need for our Aquatic Management Area (AMA) specialists and technician positions in order to complete that work. Because they are working on projects across multiple appropriations that all include AMA enhancement, it is important to keep their capacity at a minimum level in order to accomplish what we have planned. These positions are unique in both their expertise with vegetation management that differs from other Fisheries staff, and because the enhancement work we are doing is a significant acceleration of work that would be done if we relied only on existing non-OHF positions. Similarly, our stream restoration coordinator and interns are responsible for planning and</p>

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
				<p>implementing the large and complex stream projects that are included in this and other OHF appropriations that include stream habitat. Their work includes surveying the sites, coordinating with partners, creating conceptual designs, applying for permits, overseeing construction, and administering contracts. These projects typically take several years to complete because they are so complex, and would be very difficult to complete without these LSOH-funded positions. The relative reduction in professional services vs. contracts from our proposal to the accomplishment plan reflects which stream habitat projects were kept in the accomplishment plan vs. those included in our original proposal. Our proposal included 12 potential stream projects. The costliest projects on that list were to be done via contracts with partners, but were not included in the accomplishment plan given the amount of recommended funds. Instead, 2 of the 3 highest priority projects we could accomplish from our list were ones where DNR would handle the engineering design because they lack an available partner to handle that task. As a result, the reduction from our proposal to our accomplishment plan for contracting was greater than for professional services.</p>
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase X: Statewide and Metro Habitat	MN DNR	\$ 6,771,000	
O1	Contract Management 2018	MN DNR	\$ 210,000	

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Notes
O2	Restoration Evaluations	MN DNR	\$ 150,000	

ADDITIONAL NOTES –

Wayne –

This is a general question related to several of MLT AP's.

In several of the AP's it states that, "The Land Trust encourages landowners to manager their properties in line with the easement..." What does the MLT easements specifically state about maintaining habitat? Does the OHF pay for management habitat plans for easements that are optional to follow? Let me know if your clarification needs updating in your AP's and I will open those back up for you.

We will include your answers on a sheet to Councilmembers as a way to pre-address questions they might have. Let me know if you want to make any changes to your AP. If you do, the deadline to re-submit them would be Thursday this week as the binder are going to the printer on Friday.

Sandy:

Thanks for the inquiry. I touched base with Kris Larson to gain his perspective as this topic has been one that has been discussed prior to my arrival with both LCCMR and LSOHC, and subsequent to that as well. I hope this helps.

The Minnesota Land Trust has a long history of working with landowners to identify their management objectives on the property before signing a conservation easement to ensure that they are in keeping with the goals of the easement and easement's funding sources. In the past, the State of Minnesota has required that a management plan accompany each conservation easement to set the sidebars on what management would be compatible with the easement's terms. We have carried this requirement forward into our practice today of requiring a management plan for each new conservation easement we secure. The Outdoor Heritage Fund has paid for habitat management plans written for each easement completed with resources from the Fund.

Outdoor Heritage Fund ML 2018 / FY 2019 Draft Accomplishment Plan Notes

Presented at Nov. 16, 2017 Council Meeting

The easement establishes the general rules on what the landowners *can't* do, such as clear-cutting forests, plowing up the prairie or disturbing the shoreline. However, most activities that are *proactive* in nature such as frequency of burning a prairie, invasive species control, thinning trees to maintain an oak savanna or selective cutting in a forest for ecological purposes are deferred to a habitat management plan. The easement states that if proactive management occurs, it must be done in accordance with a habitat management plan which is agreed to at closing. If the landowner determines that due to certain circumstances the management regime or activities need to change, they can't move forward on these new activities until a new plan is approved by the Land Trust.

If a landowner chooses not to or cannot manage the property at all due to financial or practical reasons and would prefer to just let nature take its course, the Land Trust's reaction depends upon each property and the easement's conservation goals. In many instances, maintaining good wildlife habitat doesn't require proactive management to continue to meet our habitat goals. In other circumstances, inputs may be needed to maintain a particular habitat type (e.g., prairie). In these cases, the Land Trust works with landowner to find the expertise and resources to meet these management objectives outlined in the plan.

In either case, if the habitat management sidebars established by the easement are violated, the Land Trust takes swift legal enforcement action to minimize further degradation and establish an appropriate remedy.

Wayne Ostlie

Director of Land Protection, Minnesota Land Trust