

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Staff Notes
PA01	MN DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase XII	MN DNR	\$ 2,375,000	Priority Resource Habitat Removed Removed work in Chippewa County
PA02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XII	Pheasants Forever, Inc.	\$ 3,841,000	Leverage anticipated reduced - not proportionate Capital Equipment 4 items down to 1 item Restoration work reduced – not proportionate
PA03	MN Prairie Recovery Program - Phase X	The Nature Conservancy	\$ 2,891,000	<p>Q1: Can you explain the \$10,000 increase for the UTV track system in capital equipment that was originally listed at \$25,000 and is now listed at \$35,000?</p> <p>A1: The original proposal sought to purchase both a UTV with a spray tank for fire and a second UTV outfitted with tracks. Given the reduction in funding we'll combine those features into a single unit, albeit at a higher cost for the individual piece of equipment – not an ideal scenario but a workable compromise.</p> <p>Q2: Can you also explain why the program reduced the restore activity so much disproportionate to the rest of the activity?</p> <p>A2: As to the restoration acres – the priority of the Prairie Recovery Program is to protect and enhance native prairie primarily in Prairie Plan core/corridor areas. There are always some restoration opportunities and full funding would have allowed us to pursue more of those. However, again given the substantial reduction in funding awarded versus proposed we would like to</p>

<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount</b>	<b>Staff Notes</b>
				use the now very limited dollars mostly on our core priorities, but leaving enough in the AP to conduct critical restorations, often in conjunction with other enhancement activities.
PA04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase XI	The Nature Conservancy	\$ 2,142,000	
PA05	Lower Wild Rice River Corridor Habitat Restoration - Request III	Wild Rice Watershed District	\$ 2,168,000	
PA06	Martin County MN DNR WMA Acquisition - Phase IV	Fox Lake Conservation League, Inc.	\$ 2,750,000	
PA07	RIM Grassland Reserve - Phase II	BWSR	\$ 2,987,000	DSS stayed at 100% of proposal, Personnel 85% of proposal, approp recommendation is 49% of proposal – program management costs stay the same due to program development and oversight remaining the same regardless of the approp amount
PA08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase VI	Prairie Chicken Society / Pheasants Forever, Inc.	\$ 1,990,000	
PA09	Heron Lake Area Conservation Partnership	Heron Lake Watershed District	\$ 4,157,000	Added work in Nobles County Easement work reduced – not proportionate Budget not proportionately reduced – Conservation Tech position critical to success of the partnership was retain at full request Q: Can you explain the reason to reduce the easement activity disproportionate to the fee title activity?

<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount</b>	<b>Staff Notes</b>
				<p>A: In the original proposal, the narrative requested funding for a Conservation Technician for five years, but the budget only reflected three years. MLT agreed to reduce their share of easement funding in order to provide a full three years of funding for the Conservation Technician.</p> <p>The other part is that we moved funding from easement to fee so that there would be sufficient funding in PF and DU for each of them to do one fee acquisition.</p>
PA10	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase IX	Trust for Public Land	\$ <b>1,304,000</b>	Enhancement work reduced – not proportionate Leverage stayed high
PA11	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase II	Ducks Unlimited	\$ <b>3,683,000</b>	
PRE01	MN DNR Grassland - Phase XII	MN DNR	\$ <b>4,385,000</b>	
PRE02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands - Phase IV	Pheasants Forever, Inc.	\$ <b>2,625,000</b>	
FA01	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase VIII	Morrison SWCD	\$ <b>2,259,000</b>	Acres anticipated reduced – not proportionate
FA02	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase IIX	The Nature Conservancy	\$ <b>3,120,000</b>	Enhancement activity reduced – not proportionate

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Staff Notes
FA03	Northern Forest Habitat Conservation	Minnesota Land Trust	\$ 2,970,000	<p>Budget reductions not proportionate – administrative costs stayed the same – Fee acquisition reduced</p> <p>Q: Can you explain why the staffing and professional services remained so high in proportion to the recommended amount for pre-identified set of parcels? Fewer transactions?</p> <p>A: Although the overall amount has been reduced from the original proposal, in this case there is not a direct proportional decrease in the amount needed for personnel and professional services. This is because the number of transactions to be completed remains the same as the original proposal. This proposal is for one acquisition of multiple parcels from the industrial forest owner and a subsequent transfer to St. Louis County. As we stated in the proposal, personnel and professional service costs to adequately complete real estate due diligence are related to the transaction steps and don't vary dramatically with the number of parcels or acres. Therefore, while there will be some modest cost savings due to reducing the number of parcels or acres included in the transaction, the overall requirements to complete that transaction such as mapping, title work, appraisals, legal review, staffing, etc. are all still needed for this project and their costs do not drop proportionally with fewer acres. That being said, once the project partners have identified the priority parcels to be selected based on the recommended amount of funding, we will re-evaluate to see if there are any cost savings to these</p>

<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount</b>	<b>Staff Notes</b>
				categories based on the location or configuration of these parcels.
FRE01	MN DNR Forest Habitat Enhancement	MN DNR	\$ <b>2,033,000</b>	Added potential work in 9 additional counties
FRE02	Southeast Forest Habitat Enhancement - Phase II	MN DNR	\$ <b>1,132,000</b>	Enhancement Acres greater than the proportionate reduction
FRE03	Young Forest Conservation - Phase III	American Bird Conservancy	\$ <b>1,202,000</b>	Leverage did not change from proposal Enhancement Acres, greater than the proportionate reduction
WA01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XII	Pheasants Forever, Inc.	\$ <b>4,233,000</b>	
WA02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program - Phase IX	Ducks Unlimited	\$ <b>4,341,000</b>	Removed work in Nobles County Added potential work in 5 additional counties
WA03	Wetland Habitat and Protection Program - Phase V	Minnesota Land Trust	\$ <b>2,345,000</b>	Restoration/Enhancement activity greater than the proportionate reduction – personnel/DSS remained high due to retention of that activity Leverage anticipated reduced - not proportionate
WRE01	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase XII	MN DNR	\$ <b>1,920,000</b>	Removed work in 5 counties – project list reduced to 4 high priority projects – Enhancement activity reduced – not proportionate  Capital equipment reduced by 50% Roving Crew only funded for 3 yrs instead of 5 yrs
HA01	Protecting Coldwater Fisheries on Minnesota's North Shore	Minnesota Land Trust	\$ <b>2,075,000</b>	Leverage anticipated reduced - not proportionate

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Staff Notes
				<p>Q: Can you explain why the leverage was disproportionately reduced compared to the recommendation amount?</p> <p>A: The proposed leverage in the accomplishment plan (20%) is consistent with past appropriations via our Critical Shoreland program. With reduction in funding relative to that proposed, the ability to leverage funds via landowner donation of easement value will fall to a small handful of projects. Therefore, we are more conservative in the accomplishment plan than what was originally proposed (30%). That said, MLT has a track record of exceeding our stated leverage goals - at times substantially - through this program, and it is likely that will happen again.</p>
HA02	Metro Big Rivers - Phase X	MN Valley Trust	\$ 5,866,000	Enhancement acres greater than the proportionate reduction
HA03	Resilient Habitat for Heritage Brook Trout	MN Trout Unlimited	\$ 2,608,000	Restoration and Enhancement acres greater than the proportionate reduction.
HA04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase VI	Northern Waters Land Trust	\$ 3,248,000	Fee title acres greater than the proportionate reduction
HA05	Accelerating Habitat Conservation in Southwest Minnesota	Minnesota Land Trust	\$ 2,266,000	Leverage anticipated reduced - not proportionate
HA06	Targeted RIM Easement Program to the Individual Parcel: Pine	Crow Wing SWCD	\$ 2,083,000	Q: Can you explain why the DSS remained high in proportion to the personnel? Does the DSS include

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Staff Notes
	and Leech Watersheds Phase I			<p>personnel contract oversight and management work or is that in the personnel line?</p> <p>A: BWSR provided the costs that is required for them to perform the work. Crow Wing SWCD and BWSR calculates and periodically reviews and updates direct support services costs that are directly related to and necessary for each request based on the type of work being done.</p> <p>For the Crow Wing SWCD and BWSR personnel line does include contract management and oversight work.</p>
HA07	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase IV	Mississippi Headwaters Board	\$ 3,375,000	
HA08	Hennepin County Habitat Conservation Program - Phase II	Hennepin County	\$ 3,396,000	<p>Leverage anticipated higher than the proportionate reduction</p> <p>Budget disproportionate reductions</p>
HRE01	Minnesota MN Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement - Phase XII	MN Trout Unlimited	\$ 1,434,000	<p>Leverage anticipated higher than the proportionate reduction</p>
HRE02	MN DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement - Phase III	MN DNR	\$ 4,386,000	<p>Leverage anticipated increased 600%</p> <p>Reduction in restoration, enhancement stayed the same</p> <p>Q1: Can you explain the decision to keep the enhancement projects and make reductions in the restoration activity?</p> <p>A1: We work off a prioritized list and this year the enhancement projects were ranked higher than a couple</p>

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Staff Notes
				<p>of restoration projects. The enhancement projects we are proposing to complete with this year's allocation are both fish passage projects. While these projects will reconnect many acres of lakes and stream upstream of the structures, we have been instructed to only include the footprint of these projects when calculating outputs. Therefore, these projects only total two acres of enhancement. Each of these projects also have elements of restoration but we decided to keep the projects as enhancements.</p> <p>Q2: Also, is the leverage increase a typo? 600% increase?</p> <p>A2: Yes, the leverage is accurate. We recently received confirmation that a Sustain Our Great Lakes grant has been awarded for the Hockamin Creek project for \$390,000. We did not include this leverage in our original proposal since the funding had not been confirmed yet when we submitted the proposal. Good news!</p>
HRE03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase VII	MN DNR	\$ <b>2,625,000</b>	<p>Same amount of acres and linear stream mile completed with reduced funding</p> <p>Q1: Can you explain the disproportionate budget reductions, i.e. personnel, P/S and Equipment/Tools remained so high compared to contract work?</p> <p>A1: The salary and other equipment (largely funding office space) budgets were not reduced, due to the amount of staff capacity required to usher all four</p>



Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Staff Notes
				<p>parcels identified in the Accomplishment Plan through the design and planning process. DNR employs a stakeholder-driven design approach which is time-intensive. Completing all permits, access agreements, environmental/cultural reviews, and contracting documents also require many staff hours.</p> <p>Q2: Is the design and engineering being paid for with OHF and then being completed with other funds?</p> <p>A2: The Professional Services budget was reduced a small amount as it largely funds the DNR's Professional Engineer's involvement in design review and contract development, also crucial in getting all of the identified parcels through design and planning. The construction contracts budget has been significantly reduced to prioritize getting all parcels "ready to construct." Additional state and federal funding will be pursued to fund future construction contracts.</p>
HRE04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase V	Zeitgiest and Lake Superior Steelhead Association	\$ 782,000	<p>Acres remained the same</p> <p>Leverage anticipated higher than the proportionate reduction</p>
HRE05	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase IX	Shell Rock River Watershed District	\$ 1,802,000	<p>Enhancement activity remained higher than proportionate reduction</p> <p>Leverage remained high</p>
HRE06	Phase 1: Rum River Wildlife and Fish Habitat Enhancement using	Anoka Conservation District	\$ 822,000	<p>Acres remained the same</p> <p>Personnel doubled</p>

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount	Staff Notes
	Bioengineered Bank Stabilization			<p>Q: Can you explain the over doubling in personnel costs from the proposal to the accomplishment plan?</p> <p>A: Instead of relying on consulting engineers, we are now going to do most of the survey and design work in-house, and work with a neighbor SWCD with an in-house engineer for project sign off. This results in a shift of funds from Professional Services to Personnel.</p> <p>Also, when updating the proposal to accommodate the reduced budget we came to realize that we had lumped construction management under Contracts instead of Professional Services. Since we also intend to oversee construction management in-house, we needed to shift some funds from Contracts to Personnel.</p> <p>The current proposal delivers proportional project benefits both in acres and number of sites relative to the reduced budget.</p>
HRE07	Roseau River Habitat Restoration	Roseau River Watershed District	\$ 3,207,000	
HRE08	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase II	Sauk River Watershed District	\$ 4,045,000	
HRE09	Southeast Wetland Restoration	City of Mankato	\$ 1,541,000	No acre change with reduced funding
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program	MN DNR	\$ 10,726,000	

<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>LSOHC Recommended Funding Amount</b>	<b>Staff Notes</b>
	Phase 12: Statewide and Metro Habitat			