

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

MEMO: Agenda Item #9A
DATE: December 9, 2021
SUBJECT: ML 22 Accomplishment Plans for Re-Review
PRESENTER: Sandy Smith, LSOHC Staff

Suggested Motion:

Motion by Member XX to progress the DRAFT accomplishment plans and direct staff to proceed with drafting the ML 2022 Outdoor Heritage Fund (OHF) bill based on the plans as discussed and directed today.

Background:

At the November 3, 2021 Council meeting, the Council approved a motion to review at the December 9, 2021 meeting the budgetary reductions on 4 programs: PA04, HA02, HA09, and HA10. Managers are present to answer questions posed by Councilmembers.

MN Prairie Recovery Program, Phase 12 (PA04)

- The original AP was not changed from what was submitted.
- The program funding recommendation is 39% of original ask. Personnel is requested at 56% and DSS at 39%.
- **The Q relating to scaling of personnel and DSS was answered as follows:** “Reduced funding would result in decreased hiring of a full complement of short term seasonal crews. To ensure consistency in programmatic delivery full-time staff including project management and PR Biologists would be kept at approximately the same levels as in a full-funding model. DSS would remain at 7.5%.”
- Project Manager explanation is attached [here](#).
- *If the Council is ok with the 56% in personnel as per the explanation, then the AP is good to approve.*

Dakota County, Phase 8 (HA02)

- The original AP was not changed from what was submitted.
- The program funding recommendation was at 65% of original ask. Personnel was and is at \$0 (*fully funded as leverage*) and DSS at \$0.
- **The Q relating to scaling of personnel and DSS was answered as follows:** “The scaling may not proportionately reduce personnel and DDS expenses, because with a voluntary program, County staff can't anticipate what project applications will be received, and which ones will move forward to completion. It's possible that many smaller projects could take the place of fewer larger projects. Note that personnel and DDS expenses are fully funded as leverage.”
- **Issue:** Professional Services was proposed at \$0, AP shows Professional Services at \$41,000

- **Manager response:** “Funding in the Professional Services budget item (appraisal work) was initially included within the acquisition cost items for easements and fee title in the original AP – thinking it was just easier to have fewer budget items. In draft AP, Prof. Services was extracted into a separate budgetary line item. We typically budget an average of \$3,000 per anticipated appraisal.”
- *If the Council accepts the Professional Services being funded at \$41,000 as per the explanation, then the AP is good to approve.*

Additional explanation from Lisa West, Dakota County Project Manager:

The draft Dakota County AP did not include a funding request for Personnel costs. The revised, scaled-back AP also did not include a funding request for Personnel costs. All Personnel costs are provided at County expense as a part of its leverage for the grant. The final AP should note the Leverage Source for Personnel costs is Dakota County.

Acquisition costs in the draft AP included estimated professional services (e.g., appraisals). The revised AP subtracted these professional services costs from the Acquisition budget line item and shifted them into the Professional Services budget line item. The Acquisition Budget line-item dollar amount was reduced by the same dollar amount shifted into the Professional Services line item. Aside from proportionally scaling back all aspects of the County’s proposal budget, this was the only Budget line-item change.

Note that the County’s proposed leverage remains at the same percentage as was indicated in the draft AP, proportionately matching the reduction in the total grant allocation.

Washington County Habitat Partnership (HA10)

- The original AP was changed from what was submitted after Chair Hartwell’s inquiry.
- The program funding recommendation received 60% of original ask. Personnel is requested at 87% and DSS at 66%.
- **The Q relating to scaling of personnel and DSS was answered as follows:** “Personnel and DSS will be scaled, but moderately less than proportional. Some costs are fixed (landowner recruitment; parcel assessment; project management; county board navigation; grant management) and must occur regardless of grant amount. Projects can fail midstream after investment of time. Donation of easement value (high in this program) can inflate the number of projects pursued/completed.”
- **Manager Response:** attached [here](#).
- **Staff notes:** This is a 2 partner project with Washington County and MLT.

	MLT			Washington County		
	proposed	current	% of ask	proposed	current	% of ask
Personnel	228,000	150,000	66%	350,000	350,000	100%
DSS	62,000	41,000	66%	0	0	

- *If the Council accepts the explanation on Washington County’s requested budget, then the AP is good to approve.*

Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase 11 (HA09)

- The original AP was not changed from what was submitted.
- The program funding recommendation received 41% of original ask. Personnel is requested at 60% and DSS at 62%.
- **The Q relating to scaling of personnel and DSS was answered as follows:** “Program management costs (personnel and DSS expenses) will be reduced as well. However, not exactly proportionately as program development and oversight costs remain consistent regardless of appropriation amount.”
- **Manager Response:** “The primary reason why our current personnel and DSS costs are at 60% and 62% of our proposal when we were recommended at 41%, is that we made the decision as a partnership for Clean River Partners to remain at 100% of the proposed amount. This is because CRP's grant management, administration, and landowner outreach costs remain the same if the partnership is awarded \$5.6M or \$2.3M. Both TPL and GRG reduced their personnel and DSS costs as well, although not exactly proportionally as program development and oversight costs remain largely consistent regardless of the appropriation amount. This is how we approached the reallocation process as a partnership last year and we wanted to be consistent across appropriation years.”
- *If the Council accepts the explanation of the non-scaling as presented, then the AP is good to approve.*

Total	proposed	current	% of ask
Personnel	433,000	259,600	60%
DSS	162,800	101,400	62%

Clean River	proposed	current	% of ask
Personnel	123,200	123,200	100%
DSS	33,300	33,300	100%

GRG	proposed	current	% of ask
Personnel	169,800	72,400	43%
DSS	82,500	48,500	58%

TPL	proposed	current	% of ask
Personnel	140,000	64,000	46%
DSS	47,000	19,600	42%