Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Final Accomplishment Plan Report

Date: August 31, 2011

Program Title: Accelerated Prairie Grassland Restoration and Management (P13)

Manager's Name: Bill Penning

Title: Farmland Wildlife Program Leader

Organization: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources

Address: 500 Lafayette Road

City: St. Paul State: Minnesota

Zip: 55155

Telephone: 651-259-5230

Email: bill.penning@state.mn.us

Fax: 651-297-4961

Funds Recommended: \$1,700,000

Legislative Citation and Appropriation Language: ML 2009, Ch. 172, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 2(a)

Outcomes

The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources Accelerated Prairie Grassland Restoration and Management Program had a successful first round of funding from the Legacy Funds. The program worked through the growing pains and obstacles in getting a new program up and operational and was successful in enhancing nearly 5,800 acres of prairie and grasslands in eight of the ecological subsections of Minnesota. A contractor base has been established for this type of work statewide that needs to be evaluated and expanded on for future appropriations.

Maintenance

These restorations and enhancements will occur on public lands (primarily Wildlife Management Areas) which are owned in fee title by the state. Long-term maintenance will be incorporated into DNR's regular planning and maintenance schedule. The new LSOHC funded WMA Roving Crews will also be utilized in maintaining these projects through prescribed burning and other maintenance activities. It should be noted, however, that current levels of normal DNR funding for these activities are insufficient to manage the entire WMA system. Therefore, additional management funds will likely be requested from LSOHC in the future.

Sustainability

These restorations and enhancements will be sustained by incorporating them into DNR's regular planning and maintenance schedule. The new LSOHC funded WMA Roving Crews will also be utilized in sustaining these projects through prescribed burning and other maintenance activities. It should be noted, however, that current levels of normal DNR funding for these activities are insufficient to manage the entire WMA system. Therefore, additional management funds to sustain these projects will likely be requested from LSOHC in the future.

Program Summary Information

The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources Accelerated Prairie Grassland Restoration and Management Program completed enhancement projects on a total of 5,785 acres on WMA's located throughout the various prairie habitats within Minnesota under this appropriation. Despite a slow start, two bad winters and one spring we accomplished 79% of our total acreage goal and spent 80% of the appropriation. These projects primarily consisted of woody vegetation management and conversion of crop and brome fields to prairie.

The somewhat controversial Roadsides component of this program was never initiated and the \$250,000 designated originally for this project was redistributed via an amended accomplishment plan to complete secondary projects that had been proposed and approved but were not funded.

The Wildlife Contract Specialist position was hired in August, 2010. This position was originally proposed as a ½ time (.5 FTE) position over the two years of the appropriation. Due to the late start of this position during the 2 year appropriation funding cycle this position became a full time position for one year. The Contract Specialist provided 1,896 hours of contract and project management services to the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources Section of Wildlife for both the ML 2009, Ch. 172, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 2(a) and ML 2010, Ch.361, Art.1, Sec. 2, Subd. 2(a). appropriations.

Initial site development (IDP) on newly acquired WMA's was originally targeted to restore/enhance about 1,500 acres at a cost of approximately \$300,000. We were initially operating under the understanding that we would have 4 years to complete the necessary development projects verses the 2 years to complete the other enhancement and restoration projects. Late in the grant cycle it was determined that these funds would expire on June 30, 2011 and were only available for the first 2 years of this appropriation. Most of the projects planned for completion using these funds needed more than 2 years for implementation. This change resulted in only 199 acres of habitat work for initial site development being completed. However, numerous other necessary IDP components were completed. These activities are reported in the "IDP parcel list" tab of the parcel list spreadsheet. The Accomplishment plan was amended to reallocate \$150,000 from IDP to habitat project work and where feasible these funds were used to complete secondary enhancement projects before the funding expired.

Weather was a key factor in the number of projects and acres that were completed under this appropriation. Back-to-back severe winters' of 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 limited equipment access to sites. Much of the woody vegetation removal was planned and contracted out to be completed during the winter months when the ground was frozen to minimize the impact to the existing prairie. Unable

to complete this work during the winter led to numerous contract cancellations, extensions, and rebids. The wet spring of 2011 also greatly impacted the number of acres completed. Many conversions were planned for the spring of 2011 with the site prep work having been completed the previous year and the seed purchased or acquired through local harvest. These sites remained too wet to plant prior to the appropriation expiring so the sites will be planted in the fall of 2011 using alternative funding or DNR staff including the DNR WMA Roving Crews.

Where appropriate, Conservation Corps Minnesota was contacted about crew availability and interest in these enhancement projects. Projects that required heavy equipment or large trees to be removed were beyond the capabilities of the Conservation Corps crews. On several projects a combination of contracted services from the private sector and Conservation Crews worked together for successful project completion. Work accomplished by the Conservation Corps tended to be at a higher cost than what was estimated or budgeted for a specific project resulting in fewer acres or fewer projects being completed with the available funds. Many enhancement projects are well suited to the labor intensive hand work that can be provided by the Conservation Corps crews. The goal would be to continue this mutually beneficial relationship well into the future.

Additional Notes:

- 1) The data that we were requested to track changed multiple times (along with formatting and precision requirements) during this initial grant phase. Unfortunately we were not able to track everything requested under these dynamic conditions and some information has therefore been aggregated. For example, tracking individual habitat projects was more challenging than we anticipated. Traditionally habitat expenditures are tracked by DNR Work Area rather than a small project by small project basis. Therefore, we were only able to provided aggregated expenditure information in Work Areas that had multiple projects. This is reflected in the final parcel list.
- 2) The ongoing controversies (at the time) regarding definitions of enhance vs restore led us to eventually treat all projects as enhancement projects. Thus we ultimately had no restoration projects although under some definitions much of what we did could have been termed restoration. We made no attempt to differentiate through project tracking.
- 3) The timeline from the passage of the Legacy Amendment to awarding the first round of grants was extremely compressed and virtually impossible to meet. I'd like to recognize that the Council did an amazing job under these difficult circumstances. Furthermore, Council staff has been extremely responsive, helpful and flexible. They have been essential in helping us navigate through uncharted waters and have done and continue to do an outstanding job.
- 4) Unpredictable weather and the fluidity of individual projects linked to a two year time frame prevented DNR from completing all of the projects and expending all available funding. We are glad to see that the Council has recognized these factors and extended timelines and provided additional flexibility in future years.

5) At the start of this project DNR recognized that there were not enough private vendors currently in the business to meet the new demands for this type of work. Therefore early contracts had minimal requirements in terms of demonstrated previous performance, performance bonds, etc. This was done on purpose to allow small and new start up contractors the ability to get into the business. For the most part these incentives failed. Nearly 50% of the original contracts were never started and had to be rebid. Weather certainly played a role but simple lack of contractor performance with no enforcement "stick" to compel compliance explains many of these failures. Since that time additional control and compliance requirements have been added to new contracts to help ensure project completion. There are two unfortunate consequences of these actions: 1) New/small vendors are less competitive, and 2) costs increase. Creating an expanded pool of qualified vendors is still an important goal and one that DNR strongly supports. However, a different approach will be required to achieve that goal.

Table B-2. Other Outcome Table

The IDP Parcel List tab lists other outcomes by newly acquired unit. Please refer to that table for additional outcomes.

Attachments (on spreadsheet workbook – 4 separate tabs):

Analysis Tables 1-7

Budget Table 8

Parcel List

IDP Parcel List

Program Name: Accelerated Prairie Grassland Restoration and Management (P13)

Date: 9/1/2011

Legal Citation: ML 2009, Ch. 172, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd X(x) / ML2010, Ch. 361, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. X(x)

Table 1 and Table 3 column totals should be the same AND Table 2 and Table 4 column totals should be the same

If your project has lakes or shoreline miles instead of land acres, convert miles to acres for Tables 1 and 3 using the following conversion:

Lakeshore = 6 acres per lakeshore mile / Stream & River Shore = 12 acres per linear mile, if both sides

Table 1. Acres by Resource Type

Table 1 & 2 ask for Initial and Final information. INITIAL information means the data in the FIRST accomplishment plan approved by the Council, NOT approved versions thereafter.

Restore Protect Fee Protect Easement Enhance Total

	Wetlands		Prairies		Forest		Habitats		Total	
_	Initial	Final	Initial	Final	Initial	Final	Initial	Final	Initial	Final
	0	0	2000	0	0	0	0	0	2000	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	5350	5785	0	0	0	0	5350	5785
	0	0	7350	5785	0	0	0	0	7350	5785

Table 2. Total Requested Funding by Resource Type

Restore Protect Fee Protect Easement Enhance Total

	Wetland	ls		Pra	iries		Fore	est		Hab	itats		Tota	al	
		Initial	Final		Initial	Final		Initial	Final		Initial	Final		Initial	Final
	\$	-	\$ -	\$	462,000	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	\$	462,000	\$ -
	\$	-	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -
t	\$	-	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -
	\$	-	\$ -	\$	1,238,000	\$ 1,357,982	\$	-	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	\$	1,238,000	\$ 1,357,982
		0	0		1700000	1357982		0	0		0	0	\$	1,700,000	\$ 1,357,982

Note: Due to the controversial nature of restore vs enhance we treateed all projects as enhancement projects even though there were acre and dollar values contained within the initial proposal.

Tables below only ask for final amounts and achievements.

Table 3. Final Acres achieved within each Ecological Section

Restore
Protect
Enhance
Total

Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N Forest	Total
					0
					0
93	707	965	3864	156	5785
93	707	965	3864	156	

Total Acres (sum of Total column)
Total Acres (sum of Total row)
Total Acres from Table 1.

5785 These three cells 5785 should be the same figure.

Table 4. Final Amount spent within each Ecological Section

Restore Protect Enhance Total

Metro	/Urban	Fore	st/Prairie	SE F	orest	Prair	ie	N Fo	rest	Tot	al
										\$	-
										\$	-
\$	25,242	\$	157,081	\$	214,607	\$	923,180	\$	37,872	\$	1,357,982
\$	25,242	\$	157,081	\$	214,607	\$	923,180	\$	37,872		

Total Dollars (sum of Total column)

Total Dollars (sum of Total row)

\$ 1,357,982 These two cells \$ 1,357,982 should be the same figure.

Check to make sure these amounts are the same

as the Funding Request Amount on page 1 of Main Funding Form.

Table 5. Target Lake/Stream/River Miles

miles of Lakes / Streams / Rivers Shoreline

Table 6. Acquisition by PILT Status (enter information in acres)

Acquired in Fee with State PILT Liability

Acquired in Fee without State PILT Liability

Permanent Easement NO State PILT Liability

NO State PILT Liability

Wetlands Prairies Forests Habitats Total

Table 7. Estimated Value of Acquisition by PILT Status (enter information in dollars)

		Wetlands	Prairies	Forests	Habitats	Total
Acquired in Fee State PILT Liability	with					\$ -
Acquired in Fee without State PILT Liability						\$ -
Permanent Easement State PILT Liability	NO					\$ -

Program Name:	Accelerated Prairie Grassland Restoration and Management (P13)
Date:	9/1/2011
Legal Citation:	ML 2009, Ch. 172, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd X(x) / ML2010, Ch. 361, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. X(x)

Link HERE to definitions of the budget items below.

Total Amount of Request \$ 1,700,000 From page 1 on the funding form.

Personnel

		Over # of				
	FTE	years	Initial OHF Request	Actual OHF Expended	Actual Cash Leverage	Cash Leverage Source
Position breakdown here						
Contract Specialist	0.5	2	60,000	\$ 48,611		
Total	0.5			\$ 48,611	\$ -	\$ -

Budget and Cash Leverage (All your LSOHC Request Funds must be direct to and necessary for program outcomes.)

Please describe how you intend to spend the requested funds.

Budget Item
Personnel - auto entered from above
Contracts
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT (breakout in table 7)
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT (breakout in table 7)
Easement Acquisition
Easement Stewardship

Easement Stewardship
Travel (in-state)
Professional Services
Direct Support Services
DNR Land Acquisition Costs
Other

Supplies/Materials

Capital Equipment (auto entered from below)
Other Equipment/Tools

1	nitial OHF Request	Α	ctual OHF Expended	Actual Cash Leverage	Cash Leverage Source
		\$	48,611	\$ -	\$ -
	1,619,000	\$	1,299,701		
	6,000	\$	9,670		
		\$	1,357,982	\$ -	\$ -

Capital Equipment (single items over \$10,000 - auto entered into table above)

Item Name	Initial OHF Request	Actual OHF Request	Leverage	Disposition Plan
Total	0	-	-	

Program Title: Accelerated Prairie Grassland Restoration and Management (P13)

Date: 9/1/2011

Legal Citation: ML 2009, Ch. 172, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 2(a)

Parcel Name	County	Twp	Rng	Direction	Sec	TRDS	# of acres	Cost to OHF	Primary habitat type: wetland, prairie, forest, aquatic	Activity: R=Restore PF=Protect Fee PE=Protect Easement E=Enhance (Note: these figures should be the same as those in Attachment B)		Open to hunting and fishing? (yes/no)	Identify state or federal disposition: WPA, WMA, AMA, SNA, State Forest
Thorson Prairie	Polk	148	45	2	5	1484525	103		prairie	E	PT	Υ	WMA
Tympanuchus	Polk	149	45	2		14945228	13		prairie	E	PT	Υ	WMA
Maple Meadows	Polk	148	44	2	15	14844215	10		prairie	E	PT	Υ	WMA
Belgium	Polk	152	46	2	16	15246216	8		prairie	E	PT	Υ	WMA
Chicog	Polk	148	45	2	28	14845228	16		prairie	E	PT	Υ	WMA
Enerson	Polk	149	40	2	19	14940219	46		prairie	E	PT	Υ	WMA
Maple Meadows	Polk	148	44	2	15	14844215	36		prairie	E	PT	Υ	WMA
Maple Meadows	Polk	148	44	2	15	14844215	8		prairie	E	PT	Υ	WMA
Mentor Prairie	Polk	149	43	2	9	1494329	8		prairie	E	PT	Υ	WMA
Mentor Prairie	Polk	149	43	2	9	1494329	11		prairie	E	PT	Υ	WMA
Mentor Prairie	Polk	149	43	2	9	1494329	42		prairie	E	PT	Υ	WMA
Onstad	Polk	148	45	2	36	14845236	17		prairie	E	PT	Υ	WMA
Stipa	Polk	150	45	2	11	15045211	14.5		prairie	E	PT	Υ	WMA
Erskine	Polk	149	42	2	27	14942227	21		prairie	E	PT	Υ	WMA
Pembina	Polk	152	46	2	12	15246212	60		prairie	E	PT	Υ	WMA
Bee Lake WMA	Polk	148	42	2	8	14842208	1.5		prairie	E	PT	Υ	WMA
Burnham WMA	Polk	148	45	2	24	14845224	12	\$73,479.99	prairie	E	PT	Υ	WMA
Chippewa Pond	Grant	127	41	2	24	12741224	13		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
John A. Scharf WMA	Stevens	123	44	2	4	1234424	1.7		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Nora	Pope	126	40	2	34	12640234	28		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Old Gravel Pit WMA	Stevens	123	44	2	33	12344233	39		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Red Rock	Douglas	128	40	2	20	12840220	2		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Red Rock	Douglas	128	40	2	20	12840220	2		prairie	E	P	Υ	WMA
Urness East	Douglas	128	40	2	10	12840210	3		prairie	E	P	Υ	WMA
White Bear Lake	Pope	125	39	2	4	1253924	52		prairie	E	P	Υ	WMA
White Bear Lake	Pope	125	39	2	4	1253924	32		prairie	E	P	Υ	WMA
Benson East WMA	Stevens	125	41	2	36	12541236	23		prairie	E	P	Υ	WMA
Beson West WMA	Stevens	125	41	2	36	12541236	6		prairie	E	P	Υ	WMA
Chippewa Pond	Grant	127	41	2	24	12741224	40		prairie	E	P	Υ	WMA
Klason WMA	Stevens	125	41	2	18	12541218	19		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Muddy Creek WMA	Stevens	124	42	2	7	1244227	14.2		prairie	E	P	Υ	WMA
New Prairie	Pope	125	40	2	12	12540212	12		prairie	E	P	Υ	WMA
New Prairie	Pope	125	40	2	12	12540212	6		prairie	E	P	Υ	WMA
Urness SE	Douglas	128	40	2	10	12840210	28		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Freeman WMA	Stevens	123	42	2		12342220	60		prairie	E	Р		WMA
Nora WMA	Pope	126	40	2		12640234	43		prairie	E	P		WMA
Sedan WMA	Pope	125	37	2	36		25		prairie	E	Р		WMA
White Bear WMA	Pope	125	39	2	4	1253924	81		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Everglade Marshes WMA	Stevens	126N	44	2		126N44236	1.3		prairie	Е	Р		WMA
Metz	Traverse	125N	49	2	25	125N49225	10	\$123,036.14	prairie	E	P	Υ	WMA

Pembina	Pennington	152N	45	2	6 152N4526	120	\$45,807.44	prairie	E	PT	Υ	WMA
Burgen Lake WMA	Wadena	137	33	21/	4 and 13733205	139		prairie	E	PT	Ιγ	WMA
Menahga WMA	Wadena	137	34		6 and 13734207	21	\$82,267.55	prairie	E	PT	Y	WMA
IVICII dilga VVIVIA	Wadena	137	54	210	0 dild 13734207	21	302,207.33	pranic	L L		1'	WIVIA
Robina WMA	Hennepin	118	24	2	17 11824217	10	\$4,911.67	prairio	E	MU	Υ	WMA
Nobilia WWW	Пеннерш	110	24	2	17 11024217	10	54,911.07	pranie	L	IVIO	1'	WIVIA
Ann Lake WMA	Kanabec	40	25	2	36 4025236	48		prairie	E	NF	Tv	WMA
Dalbo WMA	Isanti	37	25	2	9 372529	83		prairie	E	MU	v	WMA
Kroschel WMA	Kanabec	42	22	2	33 4222233	108	\$76,670.59	prairie	E	NF	v	WMA
KIOSCHEI WIVIA	Kariabee	72	22		33 4222233	100	\$10,010.33	pranic	<u></u>	IVI	1'	WIVIA
Beaver Creek WMA	Fillmore	101	13	2	21 10113221	424		prairie	F	SEF	Ιν	WMA
High Forest WMA	Olmsted	105	15	2	15 10515215	26		prairie	E	SEF	v	WMA
Mound Prairie WMA	Houston	104	5	2	27 1045227	12		prairie	E	SEF	v	WMA
Murtaugh WMA	Goodhue	112	15	2	36 11215236	40		prairie	E	SEF	Y	WMA
Nelson Fen WMA	Olmsted	105	15	2	16 10515216	40		prairie	F	SEF	Y	WMA
Nosek	Fillmore	101	13	2	24 10113224	50		prairie	E	SEF	Y	WMA
Suess WMA	Olmsted	105	15	2	22 10515222	9		prairie	E	SEF	Y	WMA
Upper Iowa River WMA	Fillmore	101	13	2	31 10113231	82		prairie	E	SEF	Υ	WMA
Gordy Yeager WMA	Olmsted	107	13	2	32 10713232	4		prairie	E	SEF	Υ	WMA
Buck WMA	Goodhue	110	15	2	22 11015222	6		prairie	E	SEF	Υ	WMA
Tiedemann WMA	Goodhue	110	15	2	27 11015227	5		prairie	E	SEF	Υ	WMA
John Peter Hoffman												
WMA	Goodhue	112	15	2	7 1121527	42		prairie	E	SEF	Υ	WMA
Roscoe WMA	Goodhue	109	16	2	33 10916233	25	\$146,590.56	prairie	Е	SEF	Υ	WMA
-												
Whitewater WMA	Winona	108	10	2	23 10810223	54		prairie	E	SEF	Υ	WMA
Coop with ECO -												
Whitewater WMA -												
Lupine/Historic Valley	Winona	108	10	2	14 10810214	71		prairie	E	SEF	Υ	WMA
Whitewater WMA	Winona	108	10	2	16 10810216	75	\$57,483.70	prairie	E	SEF	Υ	WMA
D 11011	l			-	24 445 44224	40			T ₌	T ₌	1	T
Reserve WMA	Yellow Medicin	115	44	2	31 11544231	18		prairie	E	P	Y	WMA
Timm's Lake WMA	Yellow Medicin	113	39	2	34 11339234	0.6		prairie	E E	P	Y	WMA
Timm's Lake WMA	Yellow Medicin	113 113	39	2	34 11339234 34 11339234	0.9		prairie	E	P	Y	WMA
Timm's Lake WMA Timm's Lake WMA	Yellow Medicin Yellow Medicin	113	39 39	2	34 11339234	4.1 3.2		prairie	E	P D	Y V	WMA WMA
	1	113	39	2	34 11339234	7.2		prairie	F	P	Y Y	WMA
Timm's Lake WMA	Yellow Medicin	114		2	31 11446231	3		prairie	E	P D	V	WMA
Tatley WMA Tatley WMA	Yellow Medicin Yellow Medicin	114	46 46	2	31 11446231	10		prairie prairie	E	p	v	WMA
Tatley WMA	Yellow Medicin	114	46	2	31 11446231	10		prairie	E	P	v v	WMA
Tatley WMA	Yellow Medicin	114	46	2	31 11446231	20		prairie	E	P	v	WMA
Tatley WMA	Yellow Medicin	114	46	2	31 11446231	25		prairie	E	P	Y Y	WMA
Tatley WMA	Yellow Medicin	114	46	2	31 11446231	23		prairie	E	P	Y Y	WMA
Benjamin Thovson Memori	Yellow Medicin	114	44	2	6 1144426	43		prairie	E	P	y ·	WMA
Richard J. Dorer WMA	Lincoln	113	46	2	25 11346225	57.1	\$35,377.94	prairie	E	P	Y	WMA
<u>- </u>		·							•	•		<u>,</u>
Willow Creek WMA	Martin	104	31	2	6 1043126	11		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Armbrust WMA	Martin	104	30	2	30 10430230	50		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Ewy WMA	Watonwan	106	33	2	1 1063321	67		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Valleau WMA	Jackson	104	38	2	25 10438225	85	\$61,494.30	prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Γ	I	1		_ I		1			Γ_	T_	T	T
Ringo	Kandiyohi	121	34	2	31 12134231	38		prairie	E	۲	Y	WMA
Sween WMA	Chippewa	116	39	2	5 1163925	68		prairie	E	P	Υ	WMA
Cold Springs	Renville	113	36	2	11 11336211	117		prairie	E	P	Υ	WMA

Mulligan Slough	Brown	108	33	2		0833236	252.5		prairie	E	P	Υ	WMA
Wood Lake	Brown	108	33	2	29 1	0833229	107.5		prairie	E	P	Υ	WMA
Rosenau-Lambrecht	Brown	110	31	2	15 1	1031215	11		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Daub's Lake	Redwood	111	37	2	4 1	113724	18		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Faxvog	Redwood	112	38	2	20 1	1238220	25		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Hanska	Brown	108	31	2	30 1	0831230	10		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Bashaw	Brown	108	34	2	16 1	0834216	40		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Lamberton	Redwood	109	36	2		0936218	80	\$138,982.59	prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
				•	•		•		•-			•	•
Prairie Heritage	McLeod	116	29	2	32 1	1629232	51.3		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Baker's Lake	McLeod	114	29	2		1429217	27.2		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Deutsch	McLeod	114	29	2		142927	71.8		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Evans Slough	Blue Earth	106	29	2		0629234	82		prairie	E	P	Υ	WMA
	_,00 201011	200		-	3-1		02		, ac	-			
George & Elizabeth Lange	Blue Earth	105	27	2	11 1	0527211	3.5		prairie	E	Р	Y	WMA
Maple River - Traynor	_,00 201011	200		-			5.5		,	-			
Tract	Blue Earth	106	27	2	23 1	0627223	31		prairie	F	P	l _Y	WMA
Mark & Ursel Smith	McLeod	116	29	2		1629230	23.9		prairie	F	D	v	WMA
Penn	McLeod	114	29	2		1429228	6		prairie	E	D	v	WMA
Rice Lake	Faribault	104	27	2		0427231	84		prairie	F	D	V	WMA
Courtland East (Swan	i aribault	104	21	۷	31 1	U+4/431	04		Prairie	-	1	<u>'</u>	VV (VI/A
Lake)	Nicollet	110	29	2	16 1	1029216	39.3		prairie	F	D	v	WMA
North Star (Swan Lake)	Nicollet	109	28	2		0928228	32.8		prairie	F	D	v	WMA
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	McLeod	109	28	2		1429221	20		'	E	P	Y	WMA
Spiering	McLeod	114	29	2		152924	70		prairie prairie	E	P D	Y	WMA
Sumter Wiwi Pay (Swap Lake)							22.7			E	P	Y	
Wiwi Bay (Swan Lake) Ras-Lynn	Nicollet	110 116	28 30	2		1028213 1630233	254	\$116,632.63	prairie	E F	P	Y	WMA WMA
Nas-Lyllli	McLeod	110	30	2	33 1	1030233	234	\$110,032.03	prairie	E	r	ī	VVIVIA
Dud Janson W/MA	Dadas	100	4-1	-1	25 4	0617335	20			l _r	P	l _v	Isanaa
Bud Jensen WMA	Dodge	106	17	2		0617225	29		prairie	lt In	P	Y	WMA
Wasioja WMA	Dodge	107	17	2		0717217	3		prairie	E	P	Υ	WMA
Lyle-austin WMA	Mower	101	18	2		011822	42		prairie	E	P	Y	WMA
Lena Larson WMA	Mower	101	17	2	16 1	0117216	25		prairie	E	P	Υ	WMA
n willin burrer							4.0					l	l
Ramsey Mill Pond WMA	Mower	103	18	2		0318214	100		prairie	É	Р	Υ	WMA
Rose WMA	Mower	101	17	2		0117211	27		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Naylor WMA	Dodge	107	18	2	13 1	0718213	61		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
					1								
Pheasants Forever WMA	Dodge	107	17	2		0717225	25		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Senn-Rich	Waseca	106	22	2	8 1	062228	13		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
													1
Ramsey Mill Pond WMA	Mower	103	18	2	14 1	0318214	37	\$159,979.11	prairie	E	P	Υ	WMA
Lac qui Parle WMA	Swift	120	44	2	25 1	2044225	298		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Camp Kerk WMA	Swift	122	37	2	19 1	2237219	338		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
Hornstein WMA	Big Stone	124	49	2	36 1	2449236	25		prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
David B. Vesall WMA	Lac Qui Parle	118	46	2	23 1	1846223	50	\$75,592.27	prairie	E	Р	Υ	WMA
				· ·					•			•	•
Nelson WMA	Murray	108	43	2	2 1	084322	30		prairie	E	Р	γ	WMA
Talcot Lake WMA	Cottonwood	105	38	2		0538219	14	\$11,416.12	prairie	F	P	γ	WMA
Taicot Lake WIVIV	Cottonwood	103	50	-	15 1	0550215	17	γ11, 1 10.12	prunic	_	l'	•	******

Total Acres Enhanced = 5,582.8 acres
Cost of contracts, seed, chemical, etc. = \$1,209,722.60