



## Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Integrating Habitat and Clean Water Phase III  
Laws of Minnesota 2025 Accomplishment Plan

---

### General Information

**Date:** 10/31/2024

**Project Title:** Integrating Habitat and Clean Water Phase III

**Funds Recommended:** \$2,691,000

**Legislative Citation:** ML 2025, Ch. XXX, Art. 1, Sec. 2, subd.

**Appropriation Language:**

### Manager Information

**Manager's Name:** Kevin Roth

**Title:** Easement Programs Coordinator

**Organization:** Board of Water and Soil Resources

**Address:** 110 2nd St. S. Suite 307

**City:** Waite Park, MN 56387

**Email:** kevin.roth@state.mn.us

**Office Number:** 651-539-2521

**Mobile Number:**

**Fax Number:**

**Website:** <https://bwsr.state.mn.us/>

### Location Information

**County Location(s):**

**Eco regions in which work will take place:**

- Forest / Prairie Transition
- Northern Forest
- Southeast Forest
- Prairie
- Metro / Urban

**Activity types:**

- Protect in Easement
- Restore

**Priority resources addressed by activity:**

- Forest
- Prairie
- Habitat
- Wetlands

**Narrative****Abstract**

Funds for RIM conservation easements build on Clean Water Fund (CWF) investments for restoration and protection projects that “stack” habitat and clean water benefits. Projects will be identified in watershed plans developed through BWSR's One Watershed, One Plan program, in which local governments strategically set priorities for clean water and habitat, target implementation, and set measurable goals. BWSR currently distributes CWF dollars to partnerships with approved plans for water quality projects. BWSR aims to incentivize local partnerships to focus on more multi-benefit solutions in the highest priority areas that use the Legacy funds to their full potential.

**Design and Scope of Work**

This RIM easement program will build on success from previous phases of this project for land protection priorities identified in comprehensive watershed management plans (“watershed plans”) developed through BWSR's One Watershed, One Plan (1W1P) program. Outdoor Heritage Fund (OHF) dollars will be strategically paired with CWF dollars for implementation that stacks habitat and water quality benefits in priority areas as identified by the watershed-based partnerships of local and tribal governments.

Through the 1W1P program, partnerships of soil and water conservation districts, counties, and watershed districts identify priorities for watershed protection and restoration, set measurable goals, and commit to targeted implementation actions (municipal and tribal governments may also participate in local planning). State agencies (BWSR, DNR, MDA, MDH, MPCA, EQB) are advisors in the planning process and partners in implementation. Watershed plans are comprehensive: they address water quality, water quantity, groundwater, drinking water, habitat, recreation, and more.

Once BWSR approves a watershed plan, we grant dollars from the CWF for actions in the plan that address water quality concerns identified in the watershed plan. BWSR's vision is for this water quality funding to be stable and reliable for the life of the Legacy Fund. An important piece of this vision is to streamline the administrative burdens for local governments associated with applying for and reporting on grants while maintaining appropriate oversight of state funds. This allows local implementers to spend more time doing what they do best: implementation.

This BWSR RIM easement program marries CWF and OHF priorities together to maximize Legacy Fund benefits. The program allows the state to acquire permanent conservation easements in locations with the highest priorities for water quality and wildlife habitat benefits as determined by the local priorities developed in these watershed plans, and additional statewide priorities. This program also reduces the number of individual proposals submitted to the LSOHC by local governments. One example is Kandiyohi's Shakopee Creek Restoration project where the SWCD will seek funds for stream restoration on a local high priority stream. BWSR will hold easements on upland areas that ensure permanent water quality and wildlife habitat improvements while the district will seek other funds for construction. Another example are bluff protection and restoration easements in southeast Minnesota

where local partnerships have identified the highest priority areas to maximize wildlife habitat and water quality improvements.

Through this RIM program, BWSR offers a more comprehensive set of funding opportunities to priority sub-watersheds. OHF dollars allow partnerships to meet land protection goals to maintain and enhance terrestrial and aquatic habitats while simultaneously using CWF money to address water quality in the same sub-watersheds.

BWSR has established a scoring and ranking system to evaluate easement requests from partnerships with approved watershed plans. The scoring and ranking approach incorporates plan priorities, goals, and the amount of CWF dollars leveraged in the same sub-watershed.

Reinvest in Minnesota (RIM) program delivery will be supported by delivery through Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs) and administered by BWSR.

### **Explain how the plan addresses habitat protection, restoration, and/or enhancement for fish, game & wildlife, including threatened or endangered species conservation**

This proposal will benefit both aquatic and upland species through permanent protection and restoration of forested, grassland, wetland, and riparian areas coupled with best management practices paid for by the CWF that reduce erosion, sedimentation, and increased pollution loading associated with watershed disturbance. The targeted species in each individual watershed will vary.

In northern forests, key aquatic species include cold water species (cisco and lake trout) at risk from land conversion and climate change as well as cool-water species (walleye and northern pike) that face competition from warmer water species in northern Minnesota. Land protection in riparian areas will be targeted to the most sensitive shorelines, habitat for diving birds as well as shoreline-dependent species such as the common loon. Northern forests also support bald eagle, gray wolf, and a host of game species, migratory songbirds, endangered, threatened, and special concern species, including red-shouldered hawk, and over 55 Species in Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN), including northern goshawk, black-throated blue warbler, wood turtle, and four-toed salamander.

More than 150 SGCN use grasslands for breeding, migration, and/or foraging. Species that will be targeted include: greater prairie-chicken, eastern meadowlark, western meadowlark, grasshopper sparrow, chestnut collared longspur, bobolink, Wilson's phalarope, sedge wren, plains hog-nosed snake, American badger, prairie vole, plains pocket mouse, eastern spotted skunk, monarch butterfly, regal fritillary.

SGCN wetland species that will benefit include common five-lined skink, two-spotted skipper, northern pintail, American black duck, upland sandpiper, sedge wren, western grebe, and rusty patched bumble bee. In addition to the SGCN, the threatened or endangered species targeted in this proposal include the Blanding's turtle, Dakota skipper and poweshiek skipper.

In the forest/prairie transition or prairie areas, habitat fragmentation, land conversion, and climate change threaten migratory bird species, gray wolf, and long-eared bat. This project will work to increase populations of those species by increasing habitat quality and quantity in predetermined priority areas.

The bluff lands of Southeast Minnesota have more SGCN need than any other ecological subsection in Minnesota. This project will increase populations of those species by increasing habitat quality and quantity in predetermined priority areas.

## What are the elements of this plan that are critical from a timing perspective?

As of May 2024, nearly all of the 1W1P planning boundaries in Minnesota have an approved plan or are in plan development. The planning process encourages partnerships to examine the root cause of problems and commit to multi-benefit solutions. With CWF dollars already being spent in these areas, OHF funded easements can maximize project benefits for game, fish and wildlife species.

CRP contracts also continue to expire (with over 230,000 acres expiring in Minnesota federal fiscal years 2025 - 2027) and farming pressure leads to more habitat fragmentation. It is critical to retain as many acres of habitat in the most important locations. A combination of permanent protection with RIM and re-enrollment of CRP, when possible, will reduce this impact from habitat loss.

## Describe how the plan expands habitat corridors or complexes and/or addresses habitat fragmentation:

A central feature of the 1W1P program is the prioritize/target/measure approach.

Local partnerships set priorities with resource data and local values. Commonly used data include water quality trends, biological indicators, flooding issues, land disturbance and associated pollution loading, habitat quality including MN County Biological Survey, current land ownership status, stream stability, forest health, future risk of land conversion based on demographic, recreational value, and more. Partnerships use a public input process to gauge local values, which together with the data, inform priority issues (e.g. surface water quality protection or restoration, groundwater protection, riparian protection, stormwater management, habitat) and to identify the portions of the sub-watershed areas where priority issues are most pressing.

Priority ranking will take into account the local priorities for water quality and wildlife habitat in addition to statewide datasets that are also utilized for prioritization. Included is the proximity to other permanently habitats, proximity to land open to public hunting, SGCN, endangered and threatened species, planned vegetative diversity, protection of existing CRP, easement size and wildlife benefits scoring information.

Watershed partnerships set measurable goals to gauge their pace of progress. Two examples: 1) models show that a benchmark of less than 25% land disturbance is shown to correlate with high water quality. Partnerships can easily measure progress toward their forest protection goals with the land disturbance indicator. Once they have reached the goal for a sub-watershed, they can move on to the next. 2) Each watershed plan is required to have a quantifiable water storage goal, which can be met with wetland restoration and protection. Other indicators in watershed plans include water quality, miles of shoreline protection, index of biological integrity, and metrics for stream stability and connectivity. Partnerships will address these with CWF project dollars along with permanent protection.

BWSR has established a scoring and ranking system for this program that emphasizes habitat corridors, complexes and habitat fragmentation.

## Which top 2 Conservation Plans referenced in MS97A.056, subd. 3a are most applicable to this project?

- Minnesota's Wildlife Action Plan 2015-2025
- Other : Locally developed comprehensive watershed management plans developed through BWSR's One Watershed, One Plan program

**Explain how this plan will uniquely address habitat resilience to climate change and its anticipated effects on game, fish & wildlife species utilizing the protected or restored/enhanced habitat this proposal targets.**

Protection from land conversion will ensure habitats for game, fish and wildlife species remain on the landscape in perpetuity. High diversity native plant restorations and enhancements of existing habitats will result in resiliency to pressures from changes to the climate in Minnesota. The additional water quality benefits from CWF projects in the same sub-watersheds as OHF easements mean maximized benefits for game, fish and wildlife species and climate thanks to in-stream, riparian, wetland, and upland habitat protection, restoration, and enhancement.

**Which LSOHC section priorities are addressed in this program?**

**Forest / Prairie Transition**

- Protect, enhance, and restore wild rice wetlands, shallow lakes, wetland/grassland complexes, aspen parklands, and shoreland that provide critical habitat for game and nongame wildlife

**Metro / Urban**

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

**Northern Forest**

- Protect shoreland and restore or enhance critical habitat on wild rice lakes, shallow lakes, cold water lakes, streams and rivers, and spawning areas

**Prairie**

- Protect, enhance, or restore existing wetland/upland complexes, or convert agricultural lands to new wetland/upland habitat complexes

**Southeast Forest**

- Protect, enhance, and restore habitat for fish, game, and nongame wildlife in rivers, cold-water streams, and associated upland habitat

**Outcomes**

**Programs in forest-prairie transition region:**

- Wetland and upland complexes will consist of native prairies, restored prairies, quality grasslands, and restored shallow lakes and wetlands ~ *A summary of wetland acres and associated native grasslands acquired through this appropriation will be reported. On-site inspections are performed every three years and compliance checks are performed in the other two years to ensure outcomes are maintained. An increase of wetland and associated grassland habitat are expected to increase the carrying capacity of wetland and grassland dependent wildlife. This has a positive impact on both game and non-game species. We expect more abundant populations of endangered, threatened, special concern and game species as complexes are restored.*

**Programs in the northern forest region:**

- Forestlands are protected from development and fragmentation ~ *Healthy populations of endangered, threatened, and special concern species as well as more common species. A summary of the total number of*

forest land secured under easement through this appropriation will be reported. We expect sustained populations of endangered, threatened, special concern and game species as these easements are secured. On-site inspections are performed every three years and compliance checks are performed in the other two years to ensure maintained outcomes.

**Programs in prairie region:**

- Protected, restored, and enhanced shallow lakes and wetlands ~ A summary of wetland acres and associated native grasslands acquired through this appropriation will be reported. On-site inspections are performed every three years and compliance checks are performed in the other two years to ensure outcomes are maintained. An increase of wetland and associated grassland habitat are expected to increase the carrying capacity of wetland and grassland dependent wildlife. This has a positive impact on both game and non-game species. We expect more abundant populations of endangered, threatened, special concern and game species as complexes are restored.

**Programs in southeast forest region:**

- Stream to bluff habitat restoration and enhancement will keep water on the land to slow runoff and degradation of aquatic habitat ~ A summary of forest acres acquired through this appropriation will be reported. On-site inspections are performed every three years and compliance checks are performed in the other two years to ensure outcomes are maintained. An increase of wetland and associated grassland habitat are expected to increase the carrying capacity of wetland and grassland dependent wildlife. This has a positive impact on both game and non-game species. We expect more abundant populations of endangered, threatened, special concern and game species as complexes are restored.

**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.**

This funding request is not supplanting existing funding or a substitution for any previous funding.

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

BWSR is responsible for monitoring and enforcement of RIM easements. BWSR partners with local SWCDs to carry out oversight, monitoring and inspection of conservation easements. Easements are inspected every year for the first five years beginning the year after the easement is recorded. Thereafter, on-site inspections are performed every three years and compliance checks are performed in the other two years. SWCDs document findings and report to BWSR on each site inspection conducted. A non-compliance procedure is implemented when potential violations are identified.

Perpetual monitoring and enforcement costs have been calculated at \$10,000 per easement. This value is based on using local SWCD staff for monitoring and existing enforcement authorities. The amount listed for Easement Stewardship includes costs of SWCD regular monitoring, BWSR oversight and any enforcement necessary.

**Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes**

Year	Source of Funds	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
2025-ongoing	Landowner Responsibility or Limited Enhancement Funding	Maintain compliance with easements.	Manage habitats for diverse habitat benefits.	-
2025-ongoing	Stewardship Account	Inspections every year for the first five years;	Corrective actions of any violations.	Enforcement action taken by MN Attorney

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

Each watershed planning effort includes a public engagement component. BWSR is actively working to address diversity, equity, and inclusion as an agency; as part of those efforts, BWSR is encouraging direct involvement and engagement of Black, Indigenous, or People of Color (BIPOC) and diverse communities in local planning. For example, The local planning process will be used to identify potential RIM easement locations. BWSR will look for additional ways to ensure equitable use of funds to benefit BIPOC and diverse communities. Being a statewide program, rural communities and areas of the state with lower annual income thresholds will benefit from from this program in several ways, including financial benefits. RIM Easements not only offer financial benefits for landowners, but they also require outreach, monitoring and maintenance which help maintain and grow rural jobs and economies.

For our statewide programs, BWSR will pilot designating a percentage of the easement acquisition budget line for applicants who self-certify as emerging farmers or from underserved populations, which includes BIPOC. If funds remain at the end of a predetermined number of scoring/ranking periods and there are no additional applicants, the remaining funds would be added to the larger easement acquisition pool of funding.

BWSR recently updated the 1W1P Operating Procedures policy to require local partners to invite Minnesota Tribal Nations with reserved lands or rights in the planning boundary to participate in the planning process.

### 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?**

BWSR/SWCDs

**Who will be the easement holder?**

BWSR

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

8

**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?**



- Permanently Protected Conservation Easements

## 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:**

In certain circumstances, wildlife food plots are an allowable use on RIM easements as part of an approved Conservation Plan. Food plots on narrow riparian buffers, steep slopes or frequently flooded areas are not allowed. RIM policy limits food plots to 10% of the total easement area or 5 acres, whichever is smaller. There is no cost share for establishment of food plots and upon termination the landowners must re-establish vegetation as prescribed in the Conservation Plan at their expense. Food plots are infrequently used by landowners, to date less than 3% of RIM easements have food plots. RIM uses food plot seed restrictions highlighted in the LSOHC guidance restricting neonicotinoid, insecticides and fungicides.

**Will insecticides or fungicides (including neonicotinoid and fungicide treated seed) be used within any activities of this program either in the process of restoration or use as food plots?**

No

**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:**

Existing trails and roads are identified during the easement acquisition process and are often excluded from the easement area if they serve no purpose to easement maintenance, monitoring or enforcement. Some roads and trails, such as agricultural field accesses, are allowed to remain.

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

Yes

**How will maintenance and monitoring be accomplished?**

Under the terms of the RIM Easement, landowners are required to maintain compliance with the easement. Easements are monitored annually by SWCDs in cooperation with BWSR for the first five years and then every third year after easement acquisition to assure compliance with easement terms. A conservation plan is developed with the landowner and maintained as part of each easement. Basic easement compliance costs are borne by the landowner, periodic enhancements may be cost shared from a variety of sources.

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

Yes

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

Though uncommon, new trails could be developed if they contribute to easement maintenance or benefit the easement site (e.g. fire breaks, berm maintenance). Unauthorized trails are in violation of the easement.



**How will maintenance and monitoring be accomplished?**

The easements secured under this project will be managed as part of BWSR's RIM Reserve Program that has over 7,000 easements currently in place. Easements are monitored annually for each of the first five years and then every third year after that. BWSR, in cooperation with SWCDs, implement a stewardship process to track, monitor quality and assure compliance with easement terms.

Under the terms of the Reinvest In Minnesota (RIM) Easement Program, landowners are required to maintain compliance with the easement. A conservation plan is developed with the landowner and maintained as part of each easement. Basic easement compliance costs are borne by the landowner, periodic enhancements may be cost shared from a variety of sources.

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

Yes

Restorations or enhancements will be completed whenever feasible.

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

Yes

**Timeline**

<b>Activity Name</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>
Restorations complete	June 30, 2033
Easements recorded	June 30, 2029
Obtain applications from eligible landowners	June 30, 2026

**Date of Final Report Submission:** 11/01/2033

**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 for fee title acquisition of land 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, 2029;
- (2) money appropriated for restoring and enhancing land acquired with an appropriation in this section is available for four years after the acquisition date with a maximum end date of June 30, 2033;
- (3) money appropriated for restoring or enhancing other land is available until June 30, 2030;
- (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.*

### Totals

Item	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	\$94,000	-	-	\$94,000
Contracts	\$22,000	-	-	\$22,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	\$2,437,600	-	-	\$2,437,600
Easement Stewardship	\$80,000	-	-	\$80,000
Travel	\$4,700	-	-	\$4,700
Professional Services	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	\$44,000	-	-	\$44,000
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$6,700	-	-	\$6,700
Supplies/Materials	\$2,000	-	-	\$2,000
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$2,691,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$2,691,000</b>

### Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Engineering	0.01	4.0	\$7,400	-	-	\$7,400
Easements	0.16	6.0	\$86,600	-	-	\$86,600

**Amount of Request:** \$2,691,000

**Amount of Leverage:** -

**Leverage as a percent of the Request:** 0.0%

**DSS + Personnel:** \$138,000

**As a % of the total request:** 5.13%

**Easement Stewardship:** \$80,000

**As a % of the Easement Acquisition:** 3.28%

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

Reduced number of easements and acres enrolled.

**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?**

A 50% reduction in funding would reduce outputs proportionally. Program management costs are the

exception, due to program management & oversight remaining consistent regardless of appropriation amount. More funding means the ability to fund larger size easements which are more cost-effective than smaller easements.

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

BWSR calculates direct support services costs that are directly related to and necessary for each request based on the type of work being done.

### **Personnel**

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

Yes

### **Contracts**

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

The contract line amount will be used for payments to SWCD staff for easement implementation. Estimated restoration costs are included in the easements acquisition line.

### **Easement Stewardship**

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

Perpetual monitoring and enforcement costs have been calculated at \$10,000 per easement for 8 easements. This value is based on using local SWCD staff for monitoring and landowner relations and existing enforcement authorities. The amount listed for Easement Stewardship covers costs of the SWCD regular monitoring, BWSR oversight, and enforcement. We anticipate 8 or more easements with this request.

### **Travel**

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

No

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

The travel line only includes traditional travel costs of mileage, food and lodging.

**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?**

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.

### **Other Equipment/Tools**

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

Steel posts and signs to mark the easement boundaries.

**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	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	119	119	119	38	395
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>395</b>

### Total Requested Funding by Resource Type (Table 2)

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat	Total Funding
Restore	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	\$807,300	\$807,300	\$807,300	\$269,100	\$2,691,000
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$807,300</b>	<b>\$807,300</b>	<b>\$807,300</b>	<b>\$269,100</b>	<b>\$2,691,000</b>

### Acres within each Ecological Section (Table 3)

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest	Total Acres
Restore	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	20	135	70	90	80	395
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>395</b>

### Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section (Table 4)

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest	Total Funding
Restore	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	\$200,000	\$1,000,000	\$400,000	\$900,000	\$191,000	\$2,691,000
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>	<b>\$400,000</b>	<b>\$900,000</b>	<b>\$191,000</b>	<b>\$2,691,000</b>

### Average Cost per Acre by Resource Type (Table 5)

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat
Restore	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	\$6,784	\$6,784	\$6,784	\$7,081
Enhance	-	-	-	-

### Average Cost per Acre by Ecological Section (Table 6)

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest
Restore	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-

Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	\$10,000	\$7,407	\$5,714	\$10,000	\$2,387
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-

**Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles**

2025

## 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:**

Local partnerships set priorities by looking at multiple information sources and local values. Commonly used data include water quality trends, biological indicators (fish, plants, aquatic species), land disturbance and associated pollution loading, habitat quality including MN County Biological survey, current land ownership status, stream stability, forest health, future risk of land conversion, demographics, recreational value, and more. Targeting is selecting conservation projects, practices, or programs that address the priority issue and and specific placement on the landscape.

Partnerships set measurable goals to gauge their pace of progress. For example, they can easily measure progress toward their forest protection goals with the land disturbance indicator. Once they have reached the goal for a subwatershed, they can move on to the next. Another example is each watershed plan is required to have a quantifiable water storage goal, which can be met with wetland restoration and protection. Other indicators in watershed plans include water quality, miles of shoreline protection, index of biological integrity, and metrics for stream stability and connectivity. These will be addressed through CWF-supported projects along with permanent protection.

BWSR will established and will continue to adjust a scoring and ranking system to evaluate easement requests from partnerships with approved watershed plans. The scoring and ranking approach will incorporate plan priorities, the degree to which projects are paired with CWF dollars, and progress toward measurable goals set by local partnerships. Additional criteria will be set based on statewide datasets and priorities to maximize habitat benefits for game, fish and wildlife.





# Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

## Integrating Habitat and Clean Water Phase III

### Comparison Report

**Program Title:** ML 2025 - Integrating Habitat and Clean Water Phase III

**Organization:** Board of Water and Soil Resources

**Manager:** Kevin Roth

### Budget

**Requested Amount:** \$10,000,000

**Appropriated Amount:** \$2,691,000

**Percentage:** 26.91%

Item	Requested Proposal	Leverage Proposal	Appropriated AP	Leverage AP	Percent of Request	Percent of Leverage
Personnel	\$285,700	-	\$94,000	-	32.9%	-
Contracts	\$82,500	-	\$22,000	-	26.67%	-
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	\$9,123,800	-	\$2,437,600	-	26.72%	-
Easement Stewardship	\$300,000	-	\$80,000	-	26.67%	-
Travel	\$17,500	-	\$4,700	-	26.86%	-
Professional Services	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	\$158,000	-	\$44,000	-	27.85%	-
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$25,000	-	\$6,700	-	26.8%	-
Supplies/Materials	\$7,500	-	\$2,000	-	26.67%	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$10,000,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$2,691,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>26.91%</b>	<b>-</b>

### **If the project received 70% of the requested funding**

**Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?**

A 50% reduction in funding would reduce outputs proportionally. Program management costs are the exception, due to program management & oversight remaining consistent regardless of appropriation amount. More funding means the ability to fund larger size easements which are more cost-effective than smaller easements.

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

BWSR calculates direct support services costs that are directly related to and necessary for each request based on the type of work being done.

**If the project received 50% of the requested funding**

**Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?**

A 30% reduction in funding would reduce outputs proportionally. Program management costs are the exception, due to program management & oversight remaining consistent regardless of appropriation amount. More funding means the ability to fund larger size easements which are more cost-effective than smaller easements.

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

BWSR calculates direct support services costs that are directly related to and necessary for each request based on the type of work being done.

## Output

### Acres by Resource Type (Table 1)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	0	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Easement	1,500	395	26.33%
Enhance	0	-	-

### Total Requested Funding by Resource Type (Table 2)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	\$10,000,000	\$2,691,000	26.91%
Enhance	-	-	-

### Acres within each Ecological Section (Table 3)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	0	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Easement	1,500	395	26.33%
Enhance	0	-	-

### Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section (Table 4)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	\$10,000,000	\$2,691,000	26.91%
Enhance	-	-	-