



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Washington County Habitat Protection and Restoration Partnership
Laws of Minnesota 2022 Accomplishment Plan

General Information

Date: 06/24/2024

Project Title: Washington County Habitat Protection and Restoration Partnership

Funds Recommended: \$4,288,000

Legislative Citation: ML 2022, Ch. 77, Art. 1, Sec. 2, subd. 5(i)

Appropriation Language: \$4,288,000 the second year is to the commissioner of natural resources for agreements to acquire permanent conservation easements and to restore and enhance wildlife habitat on public lands and easements in Washington County as follows: \$968,000 is to Washington County and \$3,320,000 is to Minnesota Land Trust, of which up to \$288,000 to Minnesota Land Trust is to establish monitoring and enforcement funds as approved in the accomplishment plan and subject to Minnesota Statutes, section 97A.056, subdivision 17. A list of proposed permanent conservation easements, restorations, and enhancements must be provided as part of the required accomplishment plan.

Manager Information

Manager's Name: Serena Rath

Title: Senior Planner

Organization: Washington County

Address: Washington County Government Center 14949 62nd Street NE

City: Stillwater, MN 55082

Email: serena.raths@co.washington.mn.us

Office Number: (651) 430-6024

Mobile Number:

Fax Number:

Website:

Location Information

County Location(s): Washington.

Eco regions in which work will take place:

- Metro / Urban

Activity types:

- Enhance
- Protect in Easement
- Restore

Priority resources addressed by activity:

- Forest
- Habitat

Narrative

Abstract

Washington County possesses some of the best remaining wildlife habitat in the Metro Urbanizing Area. For a decade, Washington County and the Minnesota Land Trust have collaborated in protecting these resources, blending funding from the County's Land and Water Legacy Program (LWLP) and State's Outdoor Heritage Fund. In an effort to increase the pace of conservation ahead of increasing development pressure and meet heightened landowner demand, the Washington County Habitat Protection and Restoration Partnership seeks to build on these past successes, and protect 340 acres and enhance 180 acres within the LWLP's "Top Ten" priority conservation areas.

Design and Scope of Work

Washington County's prairies, savannas, forests, and wetlands, streams and rivers provide some of the best remaining wildlife habitat in the Metro Urbanizing Area. Located along the Mississippi and St. Croix rivers, Washington County serves as a significant migratory corridor for birds. These two rivers and their tributaries support a diverse assemblage of freshwater mussels and small stream fishes, and provide the cool, clear water required for trout. According to the Minnesota Wildlife Action Plan, as many as 149 SGCN are known or predicted to occur within Washington County; fifty species listed Endangered, Threatened or as a Species of Special Concern by the State of Minnesota or the U.S. government have been documented in the County. Three of the DNR's highest priority trout streams in the Twin Cities – Valley Creek, Old Mill Stream, and Brown's Creek – are located in Washington County.

Yet, these resources are under threat. Located between the Twin Cities and the St. Croix River, Washington County is especially vulnerable to habitat loss and degradation due to increasing development demands. These pressures will continue to grow, with a population increase of 25% projected by 2040. Only 7% of Washington County is currently protected.

Through a 2006 voter referendum, Washington County created its Land and Water Legacy Program (LWLP), approving \$20 million in funding to acquire and restore high priority lands for purposes of wetland, shoreline, and woodland conservation and water quality improvement. To date, the County has completed 33 LWLP land protection projects, many of these funded jointly by the Outdoor Heritage Fund through partnerships with the Minnesota Land Trust, Trust for Public Land, and others. The program continues to have broad support of its residents and local units of government.

This model of matching County Legacy and State Outdoor Heritage Fund dollars to protect priority lands has been wildly successful and has generated significant landowner interest in recent years. In the past two years, the County and its partners have completed eight land acquisition projects, with ten others in motion, including the program's largest acquisition and easement purchase of Wilder Forest. This increased demand has outstripped the availability of resources and strapped existing capacity, resulting in the need to pursue direct funding through the

Outdoor Heritage Fund, dedicated specifically to Washington County.

The Washington County Habitat Protection and Restoration Partnership is requesting funding to meet this growing conservation demand. The Partnership protects and restores critical wildlife habitats by focusing on Washington County's "Top Ten" priority conservation areas as identified by its LWLP. The Partnership harnesses each individual partner's strengths and expertise for success. Washington County will administer the program and orchestrate the restoration and enhancement on protected lands, working with Valley Branch Watershed District, Washington Conservation District, and others. The County and the Land Trust will work in close partnership to secure conservation easements on private lands. The Land Trust will engage local partners in conducting landowner outreach within priority conservation areas.

How does the plan address habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and list targeted species?

Washington County's "Top Ten" priority conservation areas contain the highest levels of biodiversity, unique plant communities, rare and imperiled plant and animal species, and proximity to ground and surface waters. Fifty-two Species in Greatest Conservation Need – including five federally listed endangered species – are known or expected to occur within the "Top Ten" areas. They also support an array of state-listed species: 18 endangered species, 24 threatened species, and 37 species of concern. SGCN include golden-winged warbler, prothonotary warbler, Blanding's turtle, fernleaf false foxglove, brown trout, and American brook lamprey. Every "Top Ten" area has Minnesota Biological Survey (MBS)-identified high quality native plant communities, high biological significance, special habitats, or other natural resources; all are located within Minnesota's Wildlife Action Network (WAN).

The proposal seeks to protect habitat within these key habitat complexes and enhance areas that will add and connect habitat corridors.

The Washington County LWLP "Top Ten" priority conservation areas are:

- German Lake: High quality lake protected by intact wetlands and uplands.
- Big Marine Lake North: Connects Forest Lake to the St. Croix River.
- Rice Lake Wetlands/Hardwood Swamps: Hardwood Creek corridor connecting wildlife management areas.
- Keystone Woods: Uplands surrounding high quality and unique wetland communities.
- Carnelian Creek Corridor: Intact habitat and large public and educational land.
- Silver-Twin Lakes Corridor: Trout stream corridor extending to the St. Croix River.
- Brown's Creek Central: Trout stream corridor supporting numerous plant and animal species.
- Valley Creek Corridor: Over 1,400 acres of existing protected land within a high-quality trout stream corridor.
- Mississippi Bend: High quality floodplain forests in a migratory bird flyway, near protected public lands.
- St. Croix Blufflands: Unfragmented forest on bluffs and ravines on a federally designated Wild and Scenic River.

Describe how the plan uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey:

Washington County's "Top Ten" priority conservation areas were identified using five data modules that analyzed geographic information and offered a weighted scoring of land based on the extent to which it contains ecological patches, connectivity between patches, uplands adjacent to important surface waters, high water infiltration potential, and restoration and enhancement potential. The data underpinning these analyses include the Minnesota Land Cover Classification System, DNR's Regionally Significant Ecological Areas, MBS, and surface water, soils, and

topographic datasets. Following the GIS analysis, boundaries of protected habitat complexes were overlaid on highly ranked land to identify the “Top Ten” areas.

Because this proposal seeks to implement the county’s conservation plan, which is based on up-to-date geographic and ecological data, the proposal will result in the protection of high-quality habitat adjacent to existing protected lands and the enhancement of that habitat – resulting in increasingly connected and larger corridors and complexes. Furthermore, each potential protection and enhancement project receives ground-truthing and further in-depth analysis upon selection and throughout the project, with an in-depth analysis of its location and relation to MBS-identified areas of native plant communities and biodiversity significance, the Wildlife Action Network, Regionally Significant Ecological Areas, and Natural Heritage Information, among other contextual and natural resource information.

Which two sections of the Minnesota Statewide Conservation and Preservation Plan are most applicable to this project?

- H1 Protect priority land habitats
- H5 Restore land, wetlands and wetland-associated watersheds

Which two other plans are addressed in this program?

- Minnesota's Wildlife Action Plan 2015-2025
- Other : Washington County Land and Water Legacy Plan

Which LSOHC section priorities are addressed in this program?

Metro / Urban

- Protect habitat corridors, with emphasis on the Minnesota, Mississippi, and St. Croix rivers (bluff to floodplain)

Outcomes

Programs in metropolitan urbanizing region:

- Core areas protected with highly biologically diverse wetlands and plant communities, including native prairie, Big Woods, and oak savanna ~ *This project will be measured by the acres of wildlife corridors protected and evaluated based on the observed use by wildlife populations and evidence of SGCN.*

Does this program include leveraged funding?

Yes

Explain the leverage:

Through its market-based RFP process, the Land Trust expects private landowners to donate at least \$245,000 in easement value toward the program, which is shown as leverage. In addition, Washington County, through its Land and Water Legacy Program, has committed \$720,000 toward the acquisition of permanent conservation easements as leverage to this grant. Together, these will provide 39% leverage to the funds requested for easement acquisition from the Outdoor Heritage Fund.

Per MS 97A.056, Subd. 24, Please explain whether the request is supplanting or is a substitution for any previous funding that was not from a legacy fund and was used for the same purpose.

Funding procured by Washington County and the Land Trust through the Outdoor Heritage Fund via this proposal will not supplant or substitute any previous funding from a non-Legacy fund used for the same purpose.

How will you sustain and/or maintain this work after the Outdoor Heritage Funds are expended?

The land protected through conservation easements will be sustained through state-of-the-art standards and practices for conservation easement stewardship. MLT and Washington County have worked together for over 20 years to co-hold conservation easements on private land. This program seeks to continue this partnership. MLT is a nationally accredited land trust with a very successful stewardship program and leads stewardship activities that include annual property monitoring, effective records management, addressing inquiries and interpretations, tracking changes in ownership, investigating potential violations, and defending the easement in case of a true violation. MLT and the County will assist landowners in the development of habitat management plans to help ensure that the land will be managed for its wildlife and water quality benefits. MLT and the County will work with landowners in the long-term to provide habitat enhancement funding, technical expertise, project plans, and other resources to maintain the conservation values of the protected properties.

Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes

Year	Source of Funds	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
2027	Washington County Land & Water Legacy Program	Begin monitoring R/E projects against performance standards	Make adaptive course corrections as needed to meet performance	-
2027	Washington County Land & Water Legacy Program	Accompaniment of monitoring conservation easements in perpetuity	Enforcement as necessary	-
2027	MLT Stewardship & Enforcement Fund	Annual monitoring of conservation easements in perpetuity	Enforcement as necessary	-

Provide an assessment of how your program celebrates cultural diversity or reaches diverse communities in Minnesota, including reaching low- and moderate-income households:

Washington County and the Minnesota Land Trust share a core public value of a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Both entities have engaged in processes to assess how we can better address these issues. To date, we have demonstrated this commitment when possible given our unique role in working with private landowners, including numerous projects to protect the camps and nature centers that serve a diversity of youth. Washington County and the Land Trust successfully protected land that are used for environmental education programming for diverse Twin Cities students, including those at the Belwin Conservancy, Sunfish Lake Park, and Dodge Nature Center’s Shepard Farm. In addition, our ongoing collaboration toward the protection of the Wilder Forest project will also serve these purposes.

This proposal continues this work by not only protecting and enhancing private land that offers the more universal public benefits of conserved lands such as wildlife habitat, clean air and water, and climate resiliency and mitigation, but can, over the long-term, add to the land base required to build strong relationships between BIPOC and diverse communities and Minnesota’s natural spaces. The Land Trust is exploring a new “Ambassador Lands Program” that would connect willing conservation landowners with diverse community groups that need access to

land for programming, such as youth mentored hunts, cultural or ceremonial use, conservation employment training, and more. We welcome more conversations with the LSOHC and conservation community about how these values can be better manifest in all our shared work going forward.

Activity Details

Requirements

If funded, this program will meet all applicable criteria set forth in MS 97A.056?

Yes

Is the land you plan to acquire (easement) free of any other permanent protection?

Yes

Who will manage the easement?

Easements will be managed by Minnesota Land Trust and Washington County per an MOU between the two organizations.

Who will be the easement holder?

Easements will be co-held by Washington County and Minnesota Land Trust.

What is the anticipated number of easements (range is fine) you plan to accomplish with this appropriation?

We anticipate closing on 6-10 conservation easements depending on size and cost.

Will restoration and enhancement work follow best management practices including MS 84.973 Pollinator Habitat Program?

Yes

Is the restoration and enhancement activity on permanently protected land per 97A.056, Subd 13(f), tribal lands, and/or public waters per MS 103G.005, Subd. 15 or on lands to be acquired in this program?

Yes

Where does the activity take place?

- County/Municipal
- WMA
- Permanently Protected Conservation Easements
- Public Waters

Land Use

Will there be planting of any crop on OHF land purchased or restored in this program, either by the proposer or the end owner of the property, outside of the initial restoration of the land?

Yes

Explain what will be planted and include the maximum percentage of any acquired parcel that would be planted into foodplots by the proposer or the end owner of the property:

Short-term use of agricultural crops is an accepted best practice in some instances for preparing a site for restoration. For example, short-term use of soybeans could be used for restorations in order to control weed seedbeds prior to prairie planting. In some cases this necessitates the use of GMO-treated products to facilitate herbicide use in order to control weeds present in the seedbank. However, neonicotinoids will not

be used.

The purpose of the conservation easements is to protect existing high quality natural habitat and to preserve opportunities for future restoration. As such, we restrict any agricultural lands and use on the properties. In cases where there are agricultural lands associated with the larger property, we will either carve the agricultural area out of the conservation easement, or in some limited cases, we may include a percentage of agricultural lands if it is not feasible to carve those areas out. In such cases, however, we will not use OHF funds to pay the landowners for that portion of the conservation easement.

Will the eased land be open for public use?

No

Are there currently trails or roads on any of the proposed acquisitions?

Yes

Describe the types of trails or roads and the allowable uses:

Most conservation easements are established on private lands, many of which have driveways, field roads and trails located on them. Often, these established trails and roads are permitted in the terms of the easement and can be maintained for personal use if their use does not significantly impact the conservation values of the property. Creation of new roads/trails or expansion of existing ones is typically not allowed.

Will the trails or roads remain and uses continue to be allowed after OHF acquisition?

Yes

How will maintenance and monitoring be accomplished?

Existing trails and roads are identified in the project baseline report and will be monitored annually as part of the stewardship and enforcement protocols. Maintenance of permitted roads/trails in line with the terms of the easement will be the responsibility of the landowner.

Will new trails or roads be developed or improved as a result of the OHF acquisition?

No

Will the acquired parcels be restored or enhanced within this appropriation?

No

Lands protected via easement will be assessed as to their need for R/E work by the Land Trust's Restoration Program and Washington County. If R/E needs are identified, they will be built into future funding proposals.

Will the land that you acquire (fee or easement) be restored or enhanced within this program's funding and availability?

No

Explain how, when, and source of the R/E work:

Lands protected via easement will be assessed as to their need for R/E work by the Land Trust's Restoration Program and Washington County. If R/E needs are identified, they will be built into future funding proposals.

Timeline

Activity Name	Estimated Completion Date
---------------	---------------------------

Washington County - Enhancement completed	June 30, 2026
MLT & Washington County - Conservation easements procured or options exercised	June 30, 2026

Date of Final Report Submission: 11/01/2026

Availability of Appropriation: Subd. 7. Availability of Appropriation

(a) Money appropriated in this section may not be spent on activities unless they are directly related to and necessary for a specific appropriation and are specified in the accomplishment plan approved by the Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council. Money appropriated in this section must not be spent on indirect costs or other institutional overhead charges that are not directly related to and necessary for a specific appropriation. Money appropriated to acquire land in fee may be used to restore, enhance, and provide for public use of the land acquired with the appropriation. Public-use facilities must have a minimal impact on habitat in acquired lands.

(b) Money appropriated in this section is available as follows:

(1) money appropriated for acquiring real property is available until June 30, 2026;

(2) money appropriated for restoring and enhancing land acquired with an appropriation in this act is available for four years after the acquisition date with a maximum end date of June 30, 2030;

(3) money appropriated for restoring or enhancing other land is available until June 30, 2027;

(4) notwithstanding clauses (1) to (3), money appropriated for a project that receives at least 15 percent of its funding from federal funds is available until a date sufficient to match the availability of federal funding to a maximum of six years if the federal funding was confirmed and included in the original approved draft accomplishment plan; and

(5) money appropriated for other projects is available until the end of the fiscal year in which it is appropriated.

Budget

Budget reallocations up to 10% do not require an amendment to the Accomplishment Plan.

Grand Totals Across All Partnerships

Item	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	\$520,000	-	-	\$520,000
Contracts	\$702,000	-	-	\$702,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	\$2,440,000	\$965,000	Landowners, Washington County	\$3,405,000
Easement Stewardship	\$264,000	-	-	\$264,000
Travel	\$10,000	-	-	\$10,000
Professional Services	\$291,000	-	-	\$291,000
Direct Support Services	\$46,000	-	-	\$46,000
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	\$10,000	-	-	\$10,000
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$3,000	-	-	\$3,000
Supplies/Materials	\$2,000	-	-	\$2,000
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$4,288,000	\$965,000	-	\$5,253,000

Partner: Minnesota Land Trust

Totals

Item	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	\$170,000	-	-	\$170,000
Contracts	\$84,000	-	-	\$84,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	\$2,440,000	\$245,000	Landowners	\$2,685,000
Easement Stewardship	\$264,000	-	-	\$264,000
Travel	\$10,000	-	-	\$10,000
Professional Services	\$291,000	-	-	\$291,000
Direct Support Services	\$46,000	-	-	\$46,000
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	\$10,000	-	-	\$10,000
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$3,000	-	-	\$3,000
Supplies/Materials	\$2,000	-	-	\$2,000
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$3,320,000	\$245,000	-	\$3,565,000

Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
MLT - Land Protection Staff	0.44	4.0	\$170,000	-	-	\$170,000

Partner: Washington County**Totals**

Item	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	\$350,000	-	-	\$350,000
Contracts	\$618,000	-	-	\$618,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	\$720,000	Washington County	\$720,000
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-
Travel	-	-	-	-
Professional Services	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	-	-	-	-
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	-	-	-	-
Supplies/Materials	-	-	-	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$968,000	\$720,000	-	\$1,688,000

Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Washington County - Staff	1.0	3.0	\$350,000	-	-	\$350,000

Amount of Request: \$4,288,000

Amount of Leverage: \$965,000

Leverage as a percent of the Request: 22.5%

DSS + Personnel: \$566,000

As a % of the total request: 13.2%

Easement Stewardship: \$264,000

As a % of the Easement Acquisition: 10.82%

How will this program accommodate the reduced appropriation recommendation from the original proposed requested amount?

The program has been scaled proportional to awarded funding, for the most part. Some costs are fixed (Washington County must hire a person to carry out the successful completion of the grant); MLT's personnel were reduced proportionately. Acres protected and restored have been scaled relative to revised budgets.

Describe and explain leverage source and confirmation of funds:

The Land Trust encourages landowners to donate easement value to the program; this amount (\$245,000) is a conservative estimate we expect to see from landowners. Washington County is committing \$720,000 through its Land and Water Legacy Program toward conservation easements; these funds are subject to County Board approval.

Does this project have the ability to be scalable?

Yes

If the project received 50% of the requested funding**Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?**

Acre scaling will be approximately proportional. R/E project selection will be based on priorities; scaling may not be proportional. Activities will be curtailed, but less than proportional, as some activities are fixed and necessary for program success.

Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?

Personnel and DSS will be scaled, but moderately less than proportional. Some costs are fixed (landowner recruitment; 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.

Personnel**Has funding for these positions been requested in the past?**

No

Contracts**What is included in the contracts line?**

Restoration and enhancement accounts \$618,000 of the contracts line amount. Additional funds in the contract line are for the writing of habitat management plans via qualified vendors and for landowner outreach purposes to facilitate communication of the protection program.

Easement Stewardship**What is the number of easements anticipated, cost per easement for stewardship, and explain how that amount is calculated?**

This budget is based on closing up to 10 conservation easements. The average cost per easement to fund the Minnesota Land Trust's perpetual monitoring and enforcement obligations is \$24,000, although in extraordinary circumstances additional funds may be warranted. This figure is derived from MLT's detailed stewardship funding "cost analysis" which is consistent with Land Trust Accreditation standards. MLT shares periodic updates to this cost analysis with LSOHC staff.

Travel**Does the amount in the travel line include equipment/vehicle rental?**

Yes

Explain the amount in the travel line outside of traditional travel costs of mileage, food, and lodging

Land Trust staff regularly rents vehicles for grant-related purposes, which is a significant cost savings over use of personal vehicles.

I understand and agree that lodging, meals, and mileage must comply with the current MMB Commissioner Plan:

Yes

Direct Support Services

How did you determine which portions of the Direct Support Services of your shared support services is direct to this program?

MLT - In a process that was approved by the DNR on March 17, 2017, Minnesota Land Trust determined our direct support services rate to include all of the allowable direct and necessary expenditures that are not captured in other line items in the budget, which is similar to the Land Trust's proposed federal indirect rate. We applied this DNR-approved rate only to personnel expenses to determine the total amount of direct support services requested through this grant.

Other Equipment/Tools

Give examples of the types of Equipment and Tools that will be purchased?

GPS devices, safety equipment.

Federal Funds

Do you anticipate federal funds as a match for this program?

No

Output Tables**Acres by Resource Type (Table 1)**

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat	Total Acres
Restore	-	-	-	30	30
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	340	340
Enhance	-	-	-	150	150
Total	-	-	-	520	520

Total Requested Funding by Resource Type (Table 2)

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat	Total Funding
Restore	-	-	-	\$106,000	\$106,000
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	\$3,670,000	\$3,670,000
Enhance	-	-	-	\$512,000	\$512,000
Total	-	-	-	\$4,288,000	\$4,288,000

Acres within each Ecological Section (Table 3)

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest	Total Acres
Restore	30	-	-	-	-	30
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	340	-	-	-	-	340
Enhance	150	-	-	-	-	150
Total	520	-	-	-	-	520

Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section (Table 4)

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest	Total Funding
Restore	\$106,000	-	-	-	-	\$106,000
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	\$3,670,000	-	-	-	-	\$3,670,000
Enhance	\$512,000	-	-	-	-	\$512,000
Total	\$4,288,000	-	-	-	-	\$4,288,000

Average Cost per Acre by Resource Type (Table 5)

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat
Restore	-	-	-	\$3,533
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	\$10,794
Enhance	-	-	-	\$3,413

Average Cost per Acre by Ecological Section (Table 6)

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest
Restore	\$3,533	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-

Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	\$10,794	-	-	-	-
Enhance	\$3,413	-	-	-	-

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

Parcels

Parcel Information

Sign-up Criteria?

[Yes - Sign up criteria is attached](#)

Explain the process used to identify, prioritize, and select the parcels on your list:

Minnesota Land Trust uses a competitive, market-based approach through an RFP process to identify interested landowners and prioritize parcels for conservation easement acquisition. All proposals submitted by landowners are evaluated and ranked relative to their ecological significance based on three primary factors: 1) size of habitat on the parcel; 2) condition of habitat on the parcel; and 3) the context (both in terms of amount/quality of remaining habitat and protected areas) within which the parcel lies. We also ask the landowner to consider contributing all or a portion of fair market value to enable our funds to make a larger conservation impact (see attached sign-up criteria).

Restore / Enhance Parcels

Name	County	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection	Description
Dale Woods	Washington	02821W30	64	\$213,000	Yes	City park conservation easement area restoration and enhancement
La Lake	Washington	02821W12	29	\$103,000	Yes	City park conservation easement area restoration and enhancement
Doerr	Washington	02821W34	30	\$236,000	Yes	City park conservation easement area restoration and enhancement
Aiple River	Washington	03020221	16	\$53,000	Yes	Exotic species control and forest enhancement
Bayport River	Washington	02920211	11	\$37,000	Yes	Exotic species control and forest enhancement
Long Lake	Washington	03120209	38	\$127,000	Yes	Exotic species control and forest enhancement
Oakdale Priory	Washington	02921218	5	\$17,000	Yes	Exotic species control and forest enhancement
Palmer	Washington	03020219	16	\$53,000	Yes	Exotic species control and forest enhancement

Easement Parcels

Name	County	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection
St. Croix River 3 (Arnold)	Washington	03219207	74	\$675,000	No
St. Croix River - MLT	Washington	02820226	40	\$937,000	No
MLT - St. Croix River 2	Washington	02720222	73	\$600,000	No

Easement Parcels with Buildings

Name	County	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection	Buildings	Value of Buildings
Keystone Woods 1 (Thompson)	Washington	03121212	20	\$245,000	No	2	\$73,000

Parcel Map

