

Land Acquisitions Revised Question responses.

Managers were asked via e-mail if the response provided in the proposal would change if the question was changed to “formally sought” regarding the local government approval question for the land acquisition programs. Below are the responses.

Project ID / Organization	Manager	Response
FA 03 / BWSR - ACUB	Helen McLennan	The WMA area was pre-approved acquisition by Crow Wing County several years ago so I think we're good.
HRE 07 / Buffalo-Red River Watershed District	Bruce Albright	Our answer to the revised question is still “Yes”. As watershed districts are technically political subdivisions of the state, at a public meeting there will be a vote of the Watershed Managers to acquire lands for the our South Branch project.
HA 07 / Dakota County	Lisa West	Yes, Dakota County Board approval is formally sought prior to all land or conservation easement acquisitions by the County. The County has excellent working relationships with the cities and townships within the County. Coordination takes place for each project with the respective jurisdiction. However, the County Board has historically not required jurisdictional approval, if a private landowner wishes to convey or sell land or a conservation easement to the County.
FA 07 / DNR (State Forest Acquisition)	Bob Milne	<p>It doesn't change the meaning at all but, given the opportunity to update it...</p> <p>It is our policy to notify county boards early of all proposed acquisitions and allow them time provide comments and concerns for us to consider. Generally, local government approval is not required for state forest acquisitions. However, specific to the RJ Dorer Memorial Hardwood forest, if the property includes more than 10 contiguous acres of class 1,2,3 tillable (slope less than 12%) county approval is required if the state is to retain it. This is addressed in Minnesota Statute 89.022.</p>
FA 05 / DNR Forests for the Future	Richard Peterson	No. It is our policy to notify county boards early of all proposed acquisitions and allow them time provide comments and concerns for us to consider. Generally, local government approval is

		not required for state forest acquisitions. However we have in our most recent acquisitions (Pinelands Ph 1. ML2014, Ch. 256, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 3(c) and Pinelands Ph 2. ML2015, First Sp. Session, Ch. 2, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 3(c)) sought and received formal county board approvals from the two counties in which we acquired land (Hubbard and Wadena Counties).
HA 04 / Leech Lake Area Watershed Foundation	Lindsey Ketchel	LLAWF always seeks county (informal) approval due to the fact that AMA's do not require a formal motion. It is my experience that County Boards are very aware that AMA's do not require a vote and to date they have been fine with providing an informal nod of approval. We do seek a formal motion from the Townships.
FA 02 / Laurentian Forest – St. Louis County Habitat Project – Phase II	Emilee Nelson	No, A county board resolution was passed in 2016 which discusses the acquisition of 7,000-8,000 acres to be protected in St. Louis County (see Laurentian Forest – St. Louis County Habitat Project proposal). The submission of the Phase II proposal was approved by the St. Louis County Lands and Minerals Department Director and the St. Louis County Administrator. Project sites selected through this proposal will be vetted with St. Louis County Lands and Minerals Department staff.
HA 06 / Metro Wildlife Management Areas	Emilee Nelson	No, The Conservation Fund will discuss projects with local government officials in conjunction with the acquisition process to determine if the conservation outcomes of the projects complement the goals of the community. The Conservation Fund does not seek pre-approval for land acquisitions but meets with local government officials to discuss the public benefits of the projects and the potential financial impacts.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Nerbonne, Brian A (DNR)** <brian.nerbonne@state.mn.us>

Date: Fri, Jul 28, 2017 at 12:15 PM

Subject: Response to your comment on the ML2018 DNR Aquatic Habitat proposal

To: "janehkingston@gmail.com" <janehkingston@gmail.com>

Cc: "Wilson, Grant (DNR)" <grant.wilson@state.mn.us>, "Strommen, Sarah (DNR)" <sarah.strommen@state.mn.us>

Council member Kingston,

I would like to provide some additional information in response to your comment regarding repeat parcels that also appear in other appropriations. There are a couple reasons why:

- For stream restorations and enhancements, DNR works off of a prioritized list of projects. We include more projects in an accomplishment plan than appropriated funding is expected to cover in case a project falls through, or if cost-savings or additional leverage are realized that allow us to do more projects than initially planned. As a result, projects often appear on multiple appropriations. As projects are completed off the prioritized list, they are removed from subsequent proposals.
- For AMA enhancement work there can be repeat parcels because vegetation management is an ongoing process. Control of invasive species is often a multi-year endeavor in order to be successful. In other cases, multiple issues require multiple steps to accomplish good habitat. For example, encroachment of woody species in a prairie may require cutting and treating stumps, which may need to be followed by a prescribed burn and potentially subsequent planting of native species.

Hopefully this provides some context for our parcel list between appropriations. I'd be happy to discuss this further via email or on the phone if you'd like.

Brian Nerbonne

Stream Habitat Supervisor | Fish and Wildlife

Minnesota Department of Natural Resources

500 Lafayette Rd.

St. Paul, MN 55155

Phone: [651-259-5205](tel:651-259-5205)

Email: brian.nerbonne@state.mn.us

mndnr.gov

Clean Water Critical Habitat Project Scoresheet

Score	Max Points	Criteria	Guidelines -												
	30	Feet of shoreline**	10 points for 400 feet -999 15 points for 1,000-2,000 20 points for 2,000-3,000 30 points for more than 3,000												
	30	Parcel Acres	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Shoreline</td> <td>Forested</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10 points for 3-5 acres</td> <td>10 points for 10-15 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15 points for 6-10</td> <td>15 points for 16-25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20 points for 11-15</td> <td>20 points for 26-40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25 points for 16-20</td> <td>25 points for 41-60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30 points for 21 or greater</td> <td>30 points for 61 or greater</td> </tr> </table>	Shoreline	Forested	10 points for 3-5 acres	10 points for 10-15 acres	15 points for 6-10	15 points for 16-25	20 points for 11-15	20 points for 26-40	25 points for 16-20	25 points for 41-60	30 points for 21 or greater	30 points for 61 or greater
Shoreline	Forested														
10 points for 3-5 acres	10 points for 10-15 acres														
15 points for 6-10	15 points for 16-25														
20 points for 11-15	20 points for 26-40														
25 points for 16-20	25 points for 41-60														
30 points for 21 or greater	30 points for 61 or greater														
	10	In Tullibee Lake Watershed	Yes or No												
	20	Designated Sensitive Shoreland	10 point for 200-499 feet 15 points for 500-1,000 20 points for 1,000-or greater												
	20	Development Potential of Proposed Easement	1-20 points based on the proportion of tract that is developable (10%= 2 pts)												
	20	% Developed	Scoring levels based on amount of impervious surface (buildings, roads, etc) on the parcel. No development=20, 25% impervious=0												
	10	Urgency	Property Protection opportunity is likely to be lost if we do not act quickly												
	10	Wetlands	Wetlands on parcel 2 points for Types 1 and 2 5 points for Types 3 and 6 8 points for Types 7 and 8 10 Points for Types 4 and 5												
	20	Adjoining public land or cons easement	20, No=0 Public land would include tribal land.												
	10	Forest or wildlife habitat management plan on property	Yes=10, No=0												
	10	Stream inlet or outlet, on or adjacent to property	Yes=10, No=0												
	10	Bonus Points —Critical fisheries habitat on property	Adjacent to documented or observed critical fisheries habitat Yes=10, No=0												
	10	Bonus Points --Critical Wildlife Habitat	Documented or observed rare or endangered species on property=10, Adjacent=10, No=0												
0	210	Totals													

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **microdepartment** <llawf@tds.net>

Date: Fri, Jul 28, 2017 at 2:07 PM

Subject: Follow-up on your LSOHC - Fisheries Habitat Phase 4

To: janehkingston@gmail.com

Hi Jane ~

I was reviewing the Council's scores I noticed you had a couple questions. I apologize for creating any confusing regarding our parcel list. Our parcels listed consist of three designations. First the list includes a TRED number to represent each lake we plan to work on (Tullibee Lakes). So this is a general indicator of where we plan to work. The second designation is for our 2 Fee Title acquisition. The third designation is for high profile conservation easements projects. Due to their potential cost - I thought it might be helpful to see these listed with more parcel details (ie the Hubbard Property). So the TRED numbers that appear every year are place holders. After the landowner recruitment and technical team selection process, I submit an accomplishment plan amendment that provides information on the selected conservation easement project.

Regarding our application review process - after the application deadline, staff reviews and grades each application based on the score sheet (see attached). Additionally we calculate a Rate of Return on Investment so we can better evaluate each parcels costs. We then hold a technical committee meeting that includes representatives from the 4 counties, MNDNR Fisheries staff, Soil and Water Districts, BWSR, MLT and LLAWF staff. It is during the technical meeting that we layer local knowledge, review maps and the scores to determine our landowner finalist. We also identify projects that are placed on a wait list. Some of our finalist drop out of the process for various reasons. Each year the technical team reviews the score sheet and application review process to identify way to improve on our current process.

Regarding the Leech Lake property. You are correct - it is expensive! I did want to point out that the parcel is on the market for \$1.2 Million - and just recently the seller indicated a willingness to take a significant reduction to assist with the sale and Leech Lake Association has offered resources to assist with the sale.

I hope this helps answer some of your questions and concerns. I plan to attend Mondays meeting and be available to answer other questions or concerns.

I appreciate that you take your review seriously - your questions demonstrate that and as an applicant it shows you really care - so thank you!

~ Lindsey

Lindsey