

**Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council ML 2024 / FY 2025 Request for Proposals**

**Member Comments**

ID#	Program Title	Rep. John Burkel	Dudley Edmondson	David Hartwell	Mark Holsten	Rep. Leon Lillie	Ashley Peters	Ron Schara
PA01	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase XIV	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 4.05%		Staffing seems high	concerned about high past year fund balance - skip a year?			
PA02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XVI	Protect? Leverage as a percent of the Request: 20.08%		Please define "small percentage" in the food plot section - specific to acquisitions in this proposal Is leverage going to be scaled if less than full funding is received?	HMA - Is this new to this program? No ID parcels for HMA		Please include # of acres in abstract, or at least scope of work	
PA03	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase X	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 8.39%		Since these acquisitions are part of complexes, why the need to have food plots since there will be plenty of other habitat surrounding it that is available for wildlife?	No mention of HMA - Why not in this program?		Please include total # of acres in abstract. Urgency for this one is very compelling.	
PA04	Martin County WMA Acquisition - Phase 8	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 3.92%					\$ from 2018 not spent down; \$2.7 mil higher than last year's request w/out significant explanation.	
PRE01	DNR Grassland Enhancement - Phase 16	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 0.0%		Why does this project not participate in the roving crews?	Very large fund balance - need update at hearings			
PRE02	Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands - Phase VII	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 5.82%		Why is it better for PF to do this work on Public Lands rather than the agency that owns them? Especially since the work is being done by private contractors. Much of this work seems to be roving crew type work - why are they not involved?	PF appears to be able to move faster then PRE01			
FA01	Minnesota Heritage Forest - Transition to Public Ownership Program	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 19.27%		What assurance will be provided that counties will treat acquired lands as habit related holdings vs recreation or economic holdings? What future requests of LSOHC are likely on TCF land they acquired from Potlatch?	Uncertain about NWLT roll - why not directly with countys?		NOT scalable. County letters included	
FA02	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase 12	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 25.3%		What would the cost be to acquire all 350 interested landowners property? With 350 interested landowners, why is the perimeter of the project so large. It would make more sense to focus on infill projects rather than those in "outlining" areas What are the limitations on the ACUB funding? Should we try and define trails since BWSR does not feel we have given them a definition that they can manage to? Leverage touted is 3 to 1 but proposal only indicates 1 to 4?				
FA03	2024 Riparian Habitat Protection in the Kettle and Snake River Watersheds	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 0.0%			DNR - remote access/shorefishing partnership opportunities?	Cost Concern		
FRE01	DNR Forest Enhancement and Restoration - Phase 4	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 0.0%		Is this work subsidizing forest timber interests as much as creating wildlife habitat. If not, why? Past appropriations are not spent quickly and are open when this is all contract work. How could they quickly spend \$6M when they cannot spend \$1-2M?	Implementation doesn't start until '28			UNSURE OF STATUS OF THIS APPLICATION BASED ON LAST REVIEW AND SUSPENSION???
FRE02	Young Forest Conservation - Phase IV	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 14.95%			Feels like the program has been strung out over the 4 years?		Well-written	
FRE03	Floodplain and Upland Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase 5	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 7.77%		Why is funding being asked for a Policy Director? Slight reduction in personnel if project is not fully funded does not seem right			Please include acres in abstract. Climate explanation could've been better.	
WA01	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase IX	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 0.0%					Cultural significance of wild rice and threats could be better articulated in proposal.	
WA02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program - Phase XIII	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 13.6%		2.5% of WMA's have food plots. What is the percentage of land that would be acquired with this proposal that would have food plots on them (acres of food plots vs total acreage)?				
WA03	RIM Wetlands - Restoring the Most Productive Habitat in Minnesota	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 0.0%		Proposal indicates restoration but budget does not have any funds for this.				
WA04	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XVI	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 34.57%		Table showing prior appropriations has a total of \$9.2 M remaining but the total does not equal the figures in the table. Is leverage locked in or will it be scaled if the request is not fully funded?				
WRE01	DNR Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements - Phase 16	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 0.0%			Large fund balance - out year projects		Need explanation/update on spend-down of past funds.	
WRE02	Nelson Slough - East Park WMA	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 45.2%		More of a flood control project than a habitat one. If more flood waters can be stored, will that not decrease grassland habitat for ground nesting birds? How would a new structure that prevents downstream flooding reduce the "bounce" in large rainfall/melting events? What is being done upstream to hold water on the land vs allowing it to create flooding type conditions?				
WRE03	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase 9	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 33.41%					Would like update on spend down of funds from past allocations.	
WRE04	Living Shallow Lakes and Wetlands Enhancement & Restoration Initiative - Phase X	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 9.06%		Funds remaining (\$11.6M) is not the total of the numbers shown available in prior years (\$5.2M)				
WRE05	Lake Alice - Fergus Falls	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 0.0%	These are the exact types of proposals LSOHC should encourage. They provide crucial habitat in urban spaces that are often forgotten by conservation organizations. More importantly they give something back in urban/ city spaces where most of Minnesota taxpayers live.	What is being done to address the problem (reduce phosphorus) rather than treat it (trap and remove it)? Explain how a sediment trap removed phosphorus since it can be dissolved in the water. Why is the community not putting any funding into this project since it is creating the problem?				IS THIS A PARK???
HA01	St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase 5	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 9.73%		What restrictions will be placed on land transferred to LGUs?				
HA02	Pine and Leech Watershed Phase III Targeted RIM Easement Permeant Land Protection	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 0.0%		No match but then indicates a federal match that is confirmed?		High personnel		5

**Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council ML 2024 / FY 2025 Request for Proposals**

**Member Comments**

ID#	Program Title	Rep. John Burkel	Dudley Edmondson	David Hartwell	Mark Holsten	Rep. Leon Lillie	Ashley Peters	Ron Schara
HA03	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance - Phase 3	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 7.99%		Roads and trails on fee property?				
HA04	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase XIII	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 2.08%			Large fund balance - out year projects	Not sure about the in town part of this project		
HA05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase 13	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 3.61%		'what does "generally there would be no net gain of trails" mean? Scaling - if 1/2 or 1/3 of the funding was proposed, it is hard to imagine that the program development, coordination and oversight costs would be the same as in a \$6.4M proposal.	Recreation component to project?			
HA06	Trout Stream Restoration in the Root River Watershed	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 1.35%		Interesting but this model seems suspect to me. They do not want to disclose there staffing costs rather just bill per foot of work - on a for profit basis. But they then also want DSS. Not sure who would hold the easement short term. No money for long term monitoring and enforcement of easements. Management strategy long term is to "educate landowners" but that is faulty as owners change and this will not work in the long term.	New Funding Process - has this model been tested anywhere?		Need more details on evaluation and and how outcomes will be maintained over time.	
HA07	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase 8	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 1.02%		How is it that in the past they have exceeded goals by 250%. More easements and less fee acquisition, more donated value, changing land values, initial goals that were not realistic, something else? Not specific to this proposal but in general, how many LSOHC funded easements have had violation? Specifically, how have they been resolved - restoration agreements, legal prosecution, court decisions, penalties, unresolved, etc? Generally, no net gain of trails. Can you actually commit to something rather than being as unspecific as that?	claim all previous funding is/will be committed			
HA08	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase X	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 7.99%		Why are funds remaining from 2014 and 2016 appropriations but mostly used up from 2017, 2018 and 2019 appropriations?	need updated fund balance update		Update on 2014 and 2016 allocations?	
HA09	Shakopee Creek: Headwaters Restored, Species and Land Protected	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 3.13%		No leverage but proposal indicates partnership with Clean Water Funds?	Is this a priority area or opportunity to fix poor land use practice			
HA10	Red River Basin Riparian Habitat Program - Phase I	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 16.35%		Scaling - would leverage also be scaled and if so, how?	new area - I need more detail for each basin - degrees of benefit	Does this leverage Clean Water Funds?		
HA11	Resilient Habitat for Heritage Brook Trout - Phase 2	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 6.96%						
HA12	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase 12	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 3.17%			update previous funding levels at hearing		17% dss	
HA13	Lower Wild Rice River Corridor Habitat Restoration - Phase IV	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 16.25%		How are food plots consistent with the desire to remove agricultural practices and restore natural ecosystems in the river and floodplain?	contradiction between unspent funding and project timeline for this funding			
HA14	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase XVI	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 0.0%		2.5% of WMA's have food plots. What is the percentage of land that would be acquired with this proposal that would have food plots on them (acres of food plots vs total acreage)? Why open appropriations from 2009 on including \$778K from 2011?				
HA15	Accelerating Habitat Conservation in Southwest Minnesota - Phase 3	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 7.36%						
HA16	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection & Restoration, Phase 5	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 14.18%		With \$7.6M spent over 4 appropriations, the request for \$16.6< seems quite high. 2.5% of WMA's have food plots. What is the percentage of land that would be acquired with this proposal that would have food plots on them (acres of food plots vs total acreage)? What is GRG bringing to this partnership that cannot be provided by others? They are only requesting 2% of the total request.				
HA17	Metro Big Rivers - Phase 14	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 10.61%		Is there a plan/commitment to maintain the restorations done by GRR by the various landowners involved? Enhance cost per acre seems high. Please explain. There appear to be appropriations open from 2010 including \$2.3M from 2012, \$900K from 2013 and \$1.4M from 2014. Why?		Seems to have many high personnel		
HRE01	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase 9	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 3.23%		The proposal mentions monitoring biochar efforts. Would funds from this proposal be used for that is if not, where would they come from?				
HRE02	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement - Phase 7	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 24.53%		If less than full funding, what happens with the match? Two full time stream biologists seems like a lot for these projects	explain Volume of previous year funding			
HRE03	Minnesota Statewide Trout Habitat Enhancement	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 10.85%			explain Volume of previous year funding			
HRE04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase VII	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 19.83%		Where do Clean Water funds go? A half time person to manage one contract seems excessive.				
HRE05	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative – Phase 11	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 0.0%		No leverage?	explain Volume of previous year funding		20% dss	
HRE06	Restoring Connectivity, Floodplain, and River Habitat in the Upper Clearwater River for Trout and Creek Heel Splitter Mussels	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 81.79%		Preserve OHV trail? How is that important for wildlife habitat? Are you asking for funds from LSOHC for this? Who is responsible for the infrastructure and are they contributing to this project? This request is asking for funds to reduce infrastructure risk - not focused on habitat. The matched funds will expire if not matched by 12/21/23 - even if we recommend this, the legislature will not act for close to 6 months after the deadline outlined in the proposal.				

**Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council ML 2024 / FY 2025 Request for Proposals**

**Member Comments**

ID#	Program Title	Rep. John Burkel	Dudley Edmondson	David Hartwell	Mark Holsten	Rep. Leon Lillie	Ashley Peters	Ron Schara
HRE07	Roseau Lake Rehabilitation: Phase II	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 33.33%		is all the land that would be covered in water currently owned by public entities? This seems like as much a flood control project as a wildlife one. Where is the flood control funding that would match the LSOHC funds instead of expecting 2/3rds of the funding to come from funds dedicated to wildlife?	update unspent funds			
HRE08	Highbanks Ravine Bat Hibernaculum	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 174.0%		Where is some significant funding from the city and adjacent landowners as this project directly benefits adjacent landowners (with threatened buildings) and is caused by city development. White nose syndrome in the bats on site? Only 2 bats use the current facility? Math in attachment does not add up - \$6.3M - \$2.89M (FEMA) - \$825K (LCCMR) = \$2.586 but says \$2.3M which is the request of LSOHC				
HRE09	Owámniyomni Native Landscape & River Restoration (St. Anthony Falls)	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 227.5%		This is far more a cultural proposal than a habitat one. Not a bad project but I don't see it as appropriate for funds constitutional dedicated to habitat.	This looks like a 5 acer city river park with a paved trail though the middle		Curious to know more about maintaining work over time.	
HRE10	Silver Lake Dam Fish Passage Modification	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 83.33%		Do not understanding the "cutoff wall control structure and how it will not impede passage A lot of non habitat reasons for this project. What is the total cost estimate of fixing the entire system? Rationale is that the city wants to avoid maintenance cost of existing structure - more than habitat need				
HRE11	Little Devil Track River Restoration	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 19.29%		With healthy populations of brook trout above and below the site, I don't see huge benefit in connecting them with this project. Seems a bit more like a road project than a habitat one				
O1	Contract Management	Core functions / Statutory compliance ???						120
O2	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2024	Core functions / Statutory compliance ???		Why is a proposer on the evaluation team. Seems like a major conflict of interest. Please provide specific examples of lessons learned that have influenced specific projects.				120
O3	DNR Core Functions in Partner-led OHF Land Acquisitions	Core functions / Statutory compliance ???		How is this proposal saleable if requested funds are not all recommended?			Ashley COI with RGS & AWS included here?	120
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program Ph. 16 Statewide and Metro Habitat	Leverage as a percent of the Request: 9.5%		\$3M for groups not receiving funding before - is that realistic and what is the goal of this? Do not understand the OHF appropriation Awards table that indicates things like -174K remaining or funds remaining from 2010 on. 3 people working for 3 years seems like overkill since this is an annual appropriation with annual staffing. And all 3 people earning the same amount?				120