

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Laws of Minnesota 2018 Accomplishment Plan



Date: December 18, 2017

Program or Project Title: Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program Phase 10: Statewide and Metro Habitat

Funds Recommended: \$ 11,589,000

Manager's Name: Jessica Lee
Title: CPL Program Coordinator
Organization: MN DNR
Address: 500 Lafayette Road
Address 2: Box 20
City: St. Paul, MN 55155
Office Number: 651-259-5233
Email: jessica.lee@state.mn.us

Legislative Citation: ML 2018, Ch. X, Art. 1, Sec. 2, subd XX

Appropriation Language:

County Locations: Not Listed

Regions in which work will take place:

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

Activity types:

- Enhance
- Protect in Easement
- Protect in Fee
- Restore

Priority resources addressed by activity:

- Forest
- Habitat
- Prairie
- Wetlands

Abstract:

The Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program will be managed by the Department of Natural Resources to provide competitive matching grants of up to \$400,000 to local, regional, state, and national non-profit organizations and government entities. In its first 8 years of funding, the CPL program has provided 476 grants totaling \$45.5 million to 140 different grantee organizations, improving or protecting over 220,000 acres of habitat. Demand for CPL grants has continued to grow each year as new applicants hear about the program and successful grantees return.

Design and scope of work:

The CPL program fulfills MS 97a.056 Subd. 3a, directing LSOHC to establish a conservation partner's grant program

encouraging/supporting local conservation efforts. \$11,053,000 of the \$11,589,000 will be available for grants. Of this amount, up to \$2,567,000 will be used for projects in the 7-county metro area and in cities with a population of 50,000 people or greater. If funds remain from this \$2,567,000 after two grant rounds, they may be used for projects statewide. Statewide funds may be used in the metro area. This is a stand-alone program, but depends on support/technical advice from public land managers and habitat and acquisition specialists.

Grant activities include enhancement, restoration and protection of forests, wetlands, prairies, and habitat for fish, game, or wildlife in Minnesota. A 10% match from non-state sources is required for all grants, and may be in-kind or cash. Applicants will describe the project, location, activity, habitat, benefit, etc. For acquisition projects, applicants will describe the parcel selection process. CPL Staff will develop an RFP incorporating LSOHC priorities. Staff works with applicants to submit applications, oversees grant selection, prepares/executes grant documents, reviews expenditures, approves payments/reports, monitors work, and assists recipients with close-out. Staff complies with Office of Grants Management policies.

The CPL program has 3 annual grant cycles- Traditional, Metro, and Expedited Conservation Projects (ECP). The Traditional and Metro cycles will have one grant round beginning August 2018 and a second round if funds remain. Projects under \$25,000 will have a simplified application. The ECP grant cycle will be open continuously beginning August 2018, and applications will be awarded up to 5 times through May 2019, depending on available funds. DNR may choose to make additional awards, consistent with DNR and OHF policy and guidance, if additional funding becomes available.

CPL staff review applications for completeness. Technical Review Committees, comprised of habitat experts across the state and approved by the DNR Commissioner, review and score Traditional and Metro applications based on evaluation criteria (see attached). The DNR Directors of Fish and Wildlife, Eco Waters, and Forestry review the committee's recommendations and provide a final ranking to the Commissioner. Funding decisions are made by the Commissioner's office. ECP grants are reviewed by CPL staff and DNR habitat experts using established criteria. The Director of Fish and Wildlife makes final funding decisions for ECP.

Grantees are required to submit annual and final accomplishment reports. Grantees are paid on a reimbursement or "for services rendered" basis, meaning payment is made to the grantee after work has been performed. Proof that the vendor was paid must be submitted to staff before additional payments are made. Funds may be advanced for acquisitions to accommodate cash flow needs.

Administration costs of \$536,000 include salary/fringe, direct support services, travel, outreach, ongoing application system/database maintenance, and other professional services. 2.5 FTEs are needed to manage and effectively promote the program, monitor grants, and meet requirements.

How does the request address MN habitats that have: historical value to fish and wildlife, wildlife species of greatest conservation need, MN County Biological Survey data, and/or rare, threatened and endangered species inventories:

All CPL project requests include a Natural Heritage Database Review, which addresses wildlife species of greatest conservation need, the MN County Biological Survey data, and/or rare, threatened and endangered species inventories. These results are incorporated into the requests, along with mitigation measures if needed. Habitat value/species benefits is also one of the evaluation criterion used to score applications.

Describe the science based planning and evaluation model used:

The CPL program has a Technical Review Committee that reviews and scores projects based on evaluation criteria. One of the evaluation criterion addresses the overall project value, and includes the habitat quality and quantity of the site, whether or not it is part of a habitat corridor, and the use of currently accepted practices based on sound conservation science. A second evaluation criterion addresses the habitat benefits of the proposal, such as protecting areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey. A third evaluation criterion addresses public use and access, and the project's proximity to other protected lands.

Which sections of the Minnesota Statewide Conservation and Preservation Plan are applicable to this program:

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

Which other plans are addressed in this program:

- Minnesota DNR Strategic Conservation Agenda
- Plans addressed will vary depending on applications received and approved.

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, enhance, and restore remnant native prairie, Big Woods forests, and oak savanna with an emphasis on areas with high biological diversity

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, and restore remnant native prairie, Big Woods forests, and oak savanna

Southeast Forest:

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

Relationship to other funds:

- Not Listed

Describe the relationship of the funds:

Not Listed

How does this program include leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation:

This CPL proposal accelerates and/or supplements the wildlife and habitat management plans and activities of numerous nonprofit organizations and governments throughout the state of Minnesota. Partnerships and leverage are both encouraged, as reflected in the Evaluation Criteria. A minimum of 10% match is required, but more is often contributed. Many proposals include local match from multiple partner organizations. One of the evaluation criterion addresses the financial assessment of the project, which includes partner commitment and match as well as how the project supplements existing funding.

Per MS 97A.056, Subd. 24, Any state agency or organization requesting a direct appropriation from the OHF must inform the LSOHC at the time of the request for funding is made, 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 proposal is not supplanting or substituting previous non-legacy funding.

Describe the source and amount of non-OHF money spent for this work in the past:

Not Listed

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

Applicants are asked to describe or submit their long-term management plans when submitting a project proposal, and the Technical Review Committee considers these plans when scoring proposals and making funding recommendations. The sustainability of the project is also addressed through one of the evaluation criterion. Long-term maintenance commitment from the applicant is crucial to a successful proposal. The CPL program has a monitoring process to ensure that funds are being used to complete work as described in the grantee's work plans. The CPL natural resource specialist conducts site visits for projects that are over \$50,000, and smaller projects

as needed. When conducting site visits, CPL staff meets with the project manager and land manager to discuss and evaluate the work, and to address any issues that may have come up during the grant period.

Explain the things you will do in the future to maintain project outcomes:

Not Listed

Activity Details:

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

Will there be planting of corn or any crop on OHF land purchased or restored in this program - **No**

Will local government approval be sought prior to acquisition - **Yes**

Is the land you plan to acquire (fee title) free of any other permanent protection - **Yes**

Is this land currently open for hunting and fishing - **Yes**

The land may be open for hunting and fishing, depending on individual project applications.

Will the land be open for hunting and fishing after completion - **Yes**

All lands acquired with CPL funds will be open for hunting and fishing if required by law.

Who will eventually own the fee title land?

Depends on the acquisition projects funded.

Will the eased land be open for public use - **Yes**

Public use will depend on the conditions of the easement.

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

Who will manage the easement?

Depends on the easements acquired through CPL.

Who will be the easement holder?

Depends on the easements acquired through CPL.

Are there currently trails or roads on any of the acquisitions on the parcel list - **No**

Will new trails or roads be developed or improved as a result of the OHF acquisition - **No**

Will restoration and enhancement work follow best management practices including MS 84.973 Pollinator Habitat Program - **Yes**

Is the activity on permanently protected land per 97A.056, subd 13(f), tribal lands, and/or public waters per MS 103G.005, Subd. 15 - **Yes (WMA, WPA, SNA, AMA, Private Land, County/Municipal, Refuge Lands, Public Waters, State Wilderness Areas, State Recreation Areas, State Forests)**

Accomplishment Timeline:

Activity	Approximate Date Completed
Solicit applications: RFP posted online	August 2018
First round applications due (ECP applications accepted continuously)	September 2018
First round grantees announced	December 2018
First round grants encumbered, grantees begin work	January 2019
Solicit round 2 applications, if needed	January 2019
Round 2 applications due	March 2019
Round 2 grantees announced	May 2019
Round 2 grants encumbered, grantees start work	June 2019
Ongoing grant monitoring, per OGM policy	June 2020, 2021, 2022
Annual reports to the council	August 2019, 2020, 2021
Grantees complete grants and submit final reports	June 2022
Final report to council	August 2022

Date of Final Report Submission: 10/31/2022

Federal Funding:

Do you anticipate federal funds as a match for this program - **No**

Outcomes:

Programs in the northern forest region:

- Outcomes are dependent on proposals received and approved.

Programs in forest-prairie transition region:

- Outcomes are dependent on proposals received and approved.

Programs in metropolitan urbanizing region:

- Outcomes are dependent on proposals received and approved.

Programs in southeast forest region:

- Outcomes are dependent on proposals received and approved.

Programs in prairie region:

- Outcomes are dependent on proposals received and approved.

Budget Spreadsheet

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

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

Less grant money will be available for applicants and grantees.

Total Amount of Request: \$ 11589000

Budget and Cash Leverage

BudgetName	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	\$400,000	\$0		\$400,000
Contracts	\$11,053,000	\$623,500	local match	\$11,676,500
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	\$0	\$0		\$0
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	\$0	\$0		\$0
Easement Acquisition	\$0	\$0		\$0
Easement Stewardship	\$0	\$0		\$0
Travel	\$50,000	\$0		\$50,000
Professional Services	\$40,000	\$0		\$40,000
Direct Support Services	\$36,000	\$0		\$36,000
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	\$0	\$0		\$0
Capital Equipment	\$0	\$0		\$0
Other Equipment/Tools	\$0	\$0		\$0
Supplies/Materials	\$10,000	\$0		\$10,000
DNR IDP	\$0	\$0		\$0
Total	\$11,589,000	\$623,500		\$12,212,500

Personnel

Position	FTE	Over # of years	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Grants Specialist Coordinator	1.00	2.00	\$170,000	\$0		\$170,000
Grants Specialist	1.00	2.00	\$150,000	\$0		\$150,000
NR Specialist	0.50	2.00	\$80,000	\$0		\$80,000
Total	2.50	6.00	\$400,000	\$0		\$400,000

Amount of Request: \$11,589,000

Amount of Leverage: \$623,500

Leverage as a percent of the Request: 5.38%

DSS + Personnel: \$436,000

As a % of the total request: 3.76%

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

DNR's D&N Calculator

Does the amount in the contract line include R/E work?

The entire contract line is for grants to organizations for restoration, enhancement, and protection.

Describe and explain leverage source and confirmation of funds:

Leverage will be provided through local match of a minimum of 10%.

Output Tables

Table 1a. Acres by Resource Type

Type	Wetlands	Prairies	Forest	Habitats	Total
Restore	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Easement	0	0	0	0	0
Enhance	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0

Table 2. Total Funding by Resource Type

Type	Wetlands	Prairies	Forest	Habitats	Total
Restore	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Enhance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Table 3. Acres within each Ecological Section

Type	Metro Urban	ForestPrairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N Forest	Total
Restore	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Easement	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enhance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 4. Total Funding within each Ecological Section

Type	Metro Urban	ForestPrairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N Forest	Total
Restore	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Enhance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Table 5. Average Cost per Acre by Resource Type

Type	Wetlands	Prairies	Forest	Habitats
Restore	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Enhance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Table 6. Average Cost per Acre by Ecological Section

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	Northern Forest
Restore	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Enhance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

0

Parcel List

For restoration and enhancement programs ONLY: Managers may add, delete, and substitute projects on this parcel list based upon need, readiness, cost, opportunity, and/or urgency so long as the substitute parcel/project forwards the constitutional objectives of this program in the Project Scope table of this accomplishment plan. The final accomplishment plan report will include the final parcel list.

Section 1 - Restore / Enhance Parcel List

No parcels with an activity type restore or enhance.

Section 2 - Protect Parcel List

No parcels with an activity type protect.

Section 2a - Protect Parcel with Bldgs


No parcels with an activity type protect and has buildings.

Section 3 - Other Parcel Activity

No parcels with an other activity type.

Parcel Map

Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program Phase 10: Statewide and Metro Habitat



Data Generated From Parcel List

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Comparison Report

Program Title: 2018 - Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program Phase 10: Statewide and Metro Habitat

Organization: MN DNR

Manager: Jessica Lee

Budget

Requested Amount: \$12,036,000

Appropriated Amount: \$11,589,000

Percentage: 96.29%

Budget Item	Total Requested		Total Appropriated		Percentage of Request	
	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Leverage	Appropriated Amount	Anticipated Leverage	Percentage of Request	Percentage of Leverage
Personnel	\$400,000	\$0	\$400,000	\$0	100.00%	-
Contracts	\$11,500,000	\$1,150,000	\$11,053,000	\$623,500	96.11%	54.22%
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-	-
Easement Acquisition	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-	-
Easement Stewardship	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-	-
Travel	\$50,000	\$0	\$50,000	\$0	100.00%	-
Professional Services	\$40,000	\$0	\$40,000	\$0	100.00%	-
Direct Support Services	\$36,000	\$0	\$36,000	\$0	100.00%	-
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-	-
Capital Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-	-
Supplies/Materials	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000	\$0	100.00%	-
DNR IDP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-	-
Total	\$12,036,000	\$1,150,000	\$11,589,000	\$623,500	96.29%	54.22%

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

Less grant money will be available for applicants and grantees.

Output

Table 1a. Acres by Resource Type

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	0	0	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	0	-
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	0	0	-
Protect in Easement	0	0	-
Enhance	0	0	-

Table 2. Total Funding by Resource Type

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	0	0	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	0	-
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	0	0	-
Protect in Easement	0	0	-
Enhance	0	0	-

Table 3. Acres within each Ecological Section

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	0	0	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	0	-
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	0	0	-
Protect in Easement	0	0	-
Enhance	0	0	-

Table 4. Total Funding within each Ecological Section

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	0	0	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	0	-
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	0	0	-
Protect in Easement	0	0	-
Enhance	0	0	-

Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program

Evaluation Criteria Table

Applications are scored based on the 6 criteria listed below, using only the information provided within the application. Applicants should be sure their applications contain enough information for reviewers to consider all 6 criteria. Information may be provided on the Project Summary page of the application, or specifically requested on the Project Information page.

1	Overall Project Value	
	Critical habitat corridor; habitat quality/quantity	Amount, quality, and/or connectivity of habitat restored, protected and/or enhanced
	Consistent with current conservation science	Project use of currently accepted science and methods, increased efficiency and life expectancy of work completed
	Sustainability	Overall life expectancy of project
	Use of native plants	Use of local ecotype, native vegetation in form of seed, seedlings, root stock, etc.
2	Applicant Performance	
	Encouragement of local conservation culture	Applicant's past activities with local community in regards to conservation
	Collaboration and local support	Applicant's current interaction with other groups or agencies; current application support by multiple entities
	Capacity to successfully complete work	Applicant's history of receiving and successfully completing conservation work and grants
3	Project Benefits	
	Multiple benefits	Multiple or diverse species benefits; project directly improves intended species, indirect benefit to others
	Habitat benefits	Multiple or diverse habitat benefits; project directly improves intended habitat, indirect benefit to others
4	Public Benefits	
	Adjacent to protected lands	Project site(s) proximity to current protected land (public or private)
	Public access	Project site(s) availability for hunting, fishing, and other wildlife-based recreation
5	Financial Assessment	
	Full funding of project	All costs are identified and accounted for; all partners have submitted letters committing funds
	Supplements existing funding	Project would not be completed without CPL funding; CPL does not replace traditional sources of funding
	Budget and cost effectiveness	Project is succinct- no unnecessary costs or work has been added; costs are relative to location of project
6	Urgency	
	Urgency	Funding importance at this time: species or opportunity potentially lost