

Conservation Partners Legacy Grants - Online Applications

[Jamie Gangaware](#)[Admin](#)[List Applications](#)[Summary Spreadsheet](#)[Log Out](#)[Project Summary](#)[Project Info](#)[Site Info](#)[Budget Info](#)[Review & Approval](#)[Additional Info](#)[Application Submission](#)

Project Summary

Project Name and Contact

Project Name:	Calcareous Fen Habitat Protection	Project Manager:	Judy Schulte
Organization Name:	Redwood SWCD	Title:	District Technician
Organization Type:	Government	Phone:	507-637-2427
Mailing Address 1:	1241 E Bridge Street Ste C	Email:	judy.schulte@racgroup.net
Mailing Address 2:			
City:	Redwood Falls		
State:	MN		
Zip Code:	56283		

Project Location Summary

Primary County:	Redwood	Secondary Land Ownerships:	
Nearest City:			
Project Site Name:	Calcareous Fen Habitat Protection Site		
Primary Land Ownership:	Private		

Project Activity Summary

Primary Activity:	Acquisition	Primary Habitat Type:	Wetland
Additional Activities:		Additional Habitats:	Prairie and Fish, Game or Wildlife Habitat
Total Project Sites:	3		
Total Project Acres:	126		

Project Funding Summary

Total Grant Amount	\$242,658
Requested:	
Total Match Amount	\$42,822
Pledged:	
Additional Funding:	
Total Project Cost:	\$285,480
Estimated Project Completion Date:	2012-07-16

Summary

The 126 acres to be permanently protected through this grant contain a remnant calcareous fen, one of the rarest types of wetland in the United States. Located northwest of Redwood Falls in the Minnesota River Valley, this excellent wetland site includes five species of state-listed rare plants and important wildlife habitat. According to the Minnesota DNR Fact sheet on Calcareous Fens, "Calcareous fens are rare and distinctive wetlands characterized by a substrate of non-acidic peat and are dependent on a constant supply of cold, oxygen-poor groundwater rich in calcium and magnesium bicarbonates". With only two calcareous fens still in existence in Redwood County, it is essential to permanently protect and maintain the remaining habitat. Through a combined effort of three local landowners, the Redwood Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) and the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) we are submitting a grant for a perpetual Re-invest in Minnesota (RIM) easement.

Problem Statement

Habitat degradation and loss have been identified as the primary threat facing this project site. According to the State's Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP) the Wetland Conservation Act regulates the alteration of wetlands through a variety of methods; however the common strategy of developing replacement wetlands often lacks the diversity and complexity of natural wetlands. Therefore, the only way to keep the integrity of the habitat provided and the rare species that reside is to permanently protect this site. Identified because of past management problems with landowners, placing an easement on the property would allow the Redwood SWCD and other land managers to be proactive creating a conservation plan of action with the landowners and conducting annual site inspections. The majority of this site is remnant native prairie grasses, forbs and aquatic vegetation never disturbed by agriculture. In addition to the calcareous fen, the site is also interspersed with Granite Rock Outcrop which was formed 3.5 billion years ago and later exposed by the forces of the Glacial River Warren. The unique diversity of this site provides excellent habitat for grassland dependant species such as pheasants and grassland songbirds, in addition to brood rearing habitat for eastern wild turkeys. The wet features make it important for amphibians including tiger salamanders, toads and frogs. Rare vegetative species found on site include: Small White Lady's Slipper (*Cypripedium candidum*): Minnesota special concerns, Twig-rush (*Cladium mariscoides*): Minnesota special concerns, Hairy fimbriatylis (*Fimbristylis puberula*): Federally endangered, Whorled Nut-rush (*Scleria verticillata*): Federally threatened, and Marsh Arrowgrass (*Triglochin palustris*): tracked by Minnesota DNR. According to the Minnesota DNR species profile, Hairy fimbriatylis, a perennial member of the sedge family, has only identified in one other county in Minnesota.

Project Objectives

According to the U.S. Geological Service, Calcareous fen communities in general have a disproportionate number of rare, threatened, and endangered plant species compared to other plant communities in the Great Lakes Region. The expected results of this project are to conserve and manage the diversity of habitat and species that already exist on site for future generations. Proper management of calcareous fen systems along with minimizing genetic contamination will provide a source of resiliency from a variety of threats today and in the future. Giving this habitat the tools it needs to be sustainable. A sustainable habitat such as this has the potential to be home to many different wildlife species. According to Jeff Zajac, Area Wildlife Manager, calcareous fens sites such as this one offer excellent habitat for potential species such as

There is a 13.1 acre agricultural field within the easement area immediately adjacent to the Minnesota River just north of the fen site. This field was placed into the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) in 1998, seeded down into 5 native warm season grasses and acts as a buffer to the Minnesota River. According to the CRP eligibility document for a CP-21 filterstrip practice, buffers such as this one remove nutrients, sediment, organic matter, pesticides, and other pollutants from surface runoff and subsurface flow by deposition, absorption, plant uptake, denitrification, and other processes, and thereby reduce pollution and protect surface water and subsurface water quality while enhancing the ecosystems of the water body. Through the use of the RUSLE II and the BWSR Filterstrip Erosion Calculator, it is calculated that this 13.1 acre CRP field saves 4.3 tons of sediment, 12.28 tons of soil and 7.86 pounds of phosphorus every year from polluting the Minnesota River improving Minnesota aquatic populations.

Methods

There are several action items that need to take place in order to accomplish the goals of this grant. Managed at the state level, RIM has been around since 1986 providing a track record of landowner assurances and is a very secure long term vehicle for conservation easements such as this one. The landowners are familiar with RIM and have previously enrolled wetland and floodplain areas. If approved, the Redwood SWCD has chosen to work with BWSR, utilizing their RIM program. Therefore, following acceptance of the grant we would immediately start working with BWSR and the landowners to start processing easement paperwork. A baseline document report outlining important conservation values protected by the easement and relative conditions of the property along with a conservation plan of action will be developed by Redwood SWCD. Once all the necessary documents are completed and the easement is recorded at the courthouse we would

then allocate the funds to the landowners and BWSR. After the easement is recorded it is maintained in the Redwood SWCD office and administered through BWSR. The Redwood SWCD will be responsible for landowner relationships and completing annual site reviews (easement monitoring) for the first five years and conduct spot checks every three years after that to ensure that conservation plan of action objectives are being met. Redwood SWCD will work with the landowners, update other land managers on the site and look to them for technical assistance on future projects and objectives. Redwood SWCD will respond to landowner requests for approvals of any significant reserved or permitted rights.

Project Timeline

Time Frame	Goal
12/15/2010	Start processing easement paperwork
06/01/2011	Conservation Plan of Action developed
12/15/2011	Final Easement should be recorded at Redwood County Courthouse
01/30/2011	Final payments received by landowners
07/15/2012	Annual site visits begin

For all lands acquired in fee title or permanent conservation easement, provide a description of the selection process used to identify parcels to be acquired.

Since 90% of the land in Redwood County is used for agriculture and <1% of the counties natural wetlands still exist, selection was based on the rare species and habitat found on site along with urgency felt among land managers to protect against habitat loss and degradation. The Redwood SWCD selection process also requires that the site meet not only wildlife benefits but the water quality goals of our local water management plan.

Conservation Partners Legacy Grants - Online Applications


Jamie Gangaware

Admin

[List Applications](#)


[Summary Spreadsheet](#)


[Log Out](#)


 Project Summary


 Project Info

 Site Info

 Budget Info

 Review & Approval

 Additional Info

 Application Submission

Project Information

Answer each of the following questions in 1000 characters or less; descriptions/definitions are available in the [Criteria and Scoring Table](#).

1. Describe the local support for this project.

Local support for the permanent protection of the Calcareous Fen includes the support of three landowners and the Redwood SWCD.

2. Describe the degree of collaboration for this project.

There has been and will continue to be a lot of collaboration on this project between the three different landowners, Redwood SWCD, BWSR, Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) and both the DNR Wildlife and Waters division. With technical guidance from all of the previously mentioned organization we hope to maximize the maintenance of the site for its full wildlife habitat and water quality benefits.

3. Describe any urgency associated with this project.

This project is urgent due to the rarity of the calcareous fen and the species that thrive on the site. Not to mention the ongoing threat of habitat degradation and loss. Regardless of laws that are in place to protect wetlands, once damage is done, a unique site like this is virtually impossible to restore fully. Therefore even with laws in place, being proactive is the only way to maximize habitat and minimize destruction of these rare features.

4. Discuss if there are multiple benefits resulting from your project, identifying those species, habitats, etc.

The main project benefit is preservation of a unique habitat and the plant and wildlife species that thrive within it. However, other benefits include improved water quality, expanded corridor habitat and minimization of genetic contamination. The many acres of remnant prairie and wetland species found on site have the potential to house many of the state listed Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) with five rare species already identified on site by the Natural Heritage Database .

5. Discuss the habitat benefits resulting from your project.

Due to the significant diversity currently present the main goal will be to preserve and manage habitat and species diversity long term. The calcareous fen, identified by the DNR's Native Plant Community Code OPp93b, with interspersed granite rock outcroppings and other wetland areas create a diverse habitat full of relic native species. These interspersed wetland areas are identified by the National Wetland Inventory as Palustrine Scrub-Shrub (PSS1B) and Palustrine Forested (PFO1B) wetlands.

6. Describe how your project is consistent with sound conservation science.

Prior to even John Muir's times, there has always been a balance between preservation and conservation. In a county that is 90% agriculture with <1% of the natural wetlands still in existence, even with best management practices, preservation of pristine sites remains essential to maintaining that healthy balance and staying consistent with sound conservation science.

7. Indicate if your project is adjacent to protected lands, describing those lands (ownership, public access, etc.)

Within a 1/2 mile of this project site are several RIM easements totaling 150 acres. With the addition of the project site, an exceptional 276 acre wildlife corridor would be created.

8. Discuss if there is full funding secured for this project and the sources of funding.

Since this project costs \$285,480 it was necessary to provide a 15% local match totaling \$42,822. The local match is being provided through \$5,024 of in-kind

contributions of personnel by the Redwood SWCD office and \$37,798 being deducted from the cash value of the land therefore being provided by the landowners, securing full funding for the project.

9. Discuss if CPL Grant funds will supplement or supplant existing funding. Discuss how these CPL funds will impact your organization's current budget.

This grant is only the 2nd opportunity that the Redwood SWCD has been given to permanently protect the rare and endangered species of Redwood County. The funding that would be received through this grant would supplement existing funds because we currently do not have any funds that can be used to protect existing wildlife sites like these. The grant will not impact our budget at all because all the funds received will go to the landowner and to BWSR for the easement administration and paperwork. All the work completed for this grant by the Redwood SWCD has been donated as an in-kind service.

10. Describe public access at project site for hunting and fishing, identifying all open seasons.

The land will remain private with public access at the discretion of the landowners. Like many landowners, a level of access is currently granted annually for hunting, fishing, gathering mushrooms, etc. to neighbors and local community.

11. Describe the sustainability of your project.

Since relatively little disturbance has occurred to the site, the wetland system remains relatively resilient and self sustaining, however, baseline habitats will be identified in a plan of operation and subject to periodic management outlined in a jointly developed plan. Field verified spot checks will be completed every year for the first five years and every three years after that, enabling the Redwood SWCD to work with the landowners to keep the site in compliance with RIM program standards.

12. Discuss use of native vegetation (if applicable).

There is no need for large scale re-installation of native vegetation at this time. The long term goal would be to protect the existing site and prevent habitat loss from land disturbance activities as well as system changes from invasive species. Acting as a riparian buffer to the river, the 13.1 acres of CRP are seeded to 5 native warm season grasses. These locations will be maintained as prairie requiring periodic maintenance from woody and invasive species encroachment.

13. Discuss your budget and why it is cost effective.

This grant budget is exceptionally cost effective because the landowners are covering the 15% match needed and the Redwood SWCD is donating its administrative and technical resources. After the local match and BWSR fees are deducted, the landowners will receive an average of \$1,729 per acre to place land into a RIM easement. This is 15% less than what other landowners in Redwood County are receiving to place land into similar RIM programs such as the Riparian Buffer Program.

14. Describe your organization's ability to successfully complete this work, including experience in the area of interest and ability to successfully implement the proposed project. Include descriptions of your most recent grant experience and if the expected outcomes were achieved.

Over the past 5 years, the Redwood SWCD has handled over 1 million dollars in grant funding with the bare minimum kept for district resources. The district has acquired and maintains 450 perpetual RIM easements that convert cropland into desirable native species to decrease erosion, restore wetlands and improve water quality. In 2010, the Redwood SWCD acquired 64 RIM easements with the Riparian Buffer Program, exceeding expected outcomes and making it the top performer in the state.

15. Discuss how your project supports landscape level plans. Use additional sources for information if needed or available.

Numerous plans and initiatives target the Minnesota River and associated habitat. For example, according to SWAP before settlement the predominant vegetation in this area was tall grass prairie and wetlands. It also states that the major concerns today are impacts on water quality from intensive agricultural activities, drainage of wetlands, and continued loss of native upland habitat. SWAP also states that prairie remnants are rare. This plan targets aspects of each landscape level plan.

16. Discuss how your project supports species plans. Use additional sources for information if needed or available.

According to the Minnesota River Prairie subsection of SWAP 21-50 SGCN have been validated in Swedes Forest Township where the project site is located. SWAP states that 90% of the SGCN in this subsection have problems due to habitat degradation and 87% of the SGCN have problems with habitat loss. Not to mention the plan also states that prairie and wetland are the key habitats for these species. Therefore, preserving the habitat provided by this project in return supports DNR's species plans.

17. Discuss how your project conforms to the Statewide Conservation and Preservation Plan.

The Statewide Conservation and Preservation Plan's 1st Habitat Recommendation is to protect priority land habitats, the 2nd Recommendation is to protect critical shorelands of streams and lakes and the 5th Recommendation is to restore land, wetlands, and wetland-associated watersheds. This project meets these recommendations by preserving a key habitat area, insuring the protection of the Minnesota River through a vegetative CRP buffer and protecting one of the states rarest types of wetland.

18. Discuss how your project conforms to the State Wildlife Action Plan (if applicable).

According to SWAP fens typically provide optimal habitat for additional wildlife such as sedge wrens, yellow rails and Nelson's sharp-tailed sparrows. SWAP also lists several management options to support SGCN in nonforested wetlands. They include preventing loss or degradation of all types of nonforested wetlands, focusing on protecting wetlands larger than 25 acres and wetland complexes, and managing for invasive exotic plants, all of which will be accomplished with this project.

Conservation Partners Legacy Grants - Online Applications


Jamie Gangaware

Admin

[List Applications](#)


[Summary Spreadsheet](#)

[Log Out](#)


 Project Summary


 Project Info

 **Site Info**

 Budget Info

 Review & Approval

 Additional Info

 Application Submission

Site Information

*you may group your project sites together as long as land ownership, activity and habitat information is the same for the land manager

Land Manager

Name:	Tabor Hoek	Phone:	507-537-7260
Organization:	BWSR	Email:	tabor.hoek@state.mn.us
Title:	Private Lands Coordinator		

Site Information



Land Ownership:	Private	Acres:	35
Site Name(s):	William Anderson site	Click here to View Site Map	
Activity:	Acquisition		
Habitat:	Wetland		

Site Information

Land Ownership:	Private	Acres:	27
Site Name(s):	Larry Donner Site	Click here to View Site Map	
Activity:	Acquisition		
Habitat:	Wetland		

Site Information

Land Ownership:	Private	Acres:	64
Site Name(s):	Jeanne Savage Site	Click here to View Site Map	
Activity:	Acquisition		
Habitat:	Wetland		



CPL FY11-101
Calcareous Fen Habitat Protection
Redwood SWCD
Redwood County
LSOHC Prairie Planning Section



Conservation Partners Legacy Grants - Online Applications


Jamie Gangaware


Admin

[List Applications](#)

[Summary Spreadsheet](#)

[Log Out](#)


 Project Summary


 Project Info

 Site Info

 Budget Info

 Review & Approval

 Additional Info

 Application Submission

Budget Information

Organization's Fiscal Contact Information

Name:	Marilyn Bernhardson	Street Address 1:	1241 E Bridge Street
Title:	District Administrator		Ste C
Email:	marilyn.bernhardson@racgroup.net	Street Address 2:	
Phone:	507-637-2427	City:	Redwood Falls
		State:	MN
		Zip Code:	56283

Budget Subtotals

Budget Item	Grant	Match	Total		
Personnel	\$15,597	\$5,024	\$20,621		
Contracts					
Fee Acquisition with PILT					
Fee Acquisition without PILT					
Easement Acquisition	\$217,162	\$37,798	\$254,960		
Easement Stewardship	\$3,899		\$3,899	In-kind Total	Cash Total
Travel (in-state)				\$5,024	\$37,798
Professional Services	\$6,000		\$6,000		
DNR Land Acquisition Cost					
Equipment/Tools/Supplies					
Additional Budget Items					
Total:	\$242,658	\$42,822	\$285,480		

Details

Personnel

Name	Title / work to be completed	Amount	Grant/Match	In-kind/Cash
BWSR	Easement Processing	\$15,597	Grant	
Redwood SWCD	Grant Admin/Computer Use	\$1,680	Match	In-kind
Redwood SWCD	Grant Admin Oversight	\$1,650	Match	In-kind
Redwood SWCD	Grant Tech Assistance	\$1,694	Match	In-kind
Totals	Grant: \$15,597 Match: \$5,024	Total: \$20,621		

Easement Acquisition

Parcel Name	Parcel Purchase Price	Amount	Grant/Match	In-kind/Cash
William Anderson site	68321	\$57,068	Grant	
Larry Donner Site	50902	\$42,518	Grant	
Jeanne Savage site	140761	\$117,576	Grant	
William Anderson site	68321	\$9,933	Match	Cash
Larry Donner Site	50902	\$7,400	Match	Cash
Jeanne Savage site	140761	\$20,465	Match	Cash
Totals	Grant: \$217,162 Match: \$37,798	Total: \$254,960		

Easement Stewardship

Activity	Description	Amount	Grant/Match	In-kind/Cash
BWSR	Easement Stewardship	\$3,899	Grant	
Totals	Grant: \$3,899 Match: \$0	Total: \$3,899		

Professional Services

Professional Name	Description of Services	Amount	Grant/Match	In-kind/Cash
BWSR	Easement Processing	\$6,000	Grant	
Totals	Grant: \$6,000 Match: \$0	Total: \$6,000		

Conservation Partners Legacy Grants - Online Applications

Jamie Gangaware

Admin

[List Applications](#)

[Summary Spreadsheet](#)

[Log Out](#)



Project Summary



Project Info



Site Info



Budget Info



Review & Approval



Additional Info



Application Submission

Project Review and Approval

A Project Review and Approval Form must be completed by each Land Manager named within the Site Info tab and Land Managers only need to complete one form for all sites they manage. Submitting this form fulfills the following requirements:

- Provides the results of the Natural Heritage Database Review,
- Allows for technical review of the project by the Land Manager, and
- Verifies that the public agency approves the work to be done (or acquisition) on land they manage.

You, as the applicant, are responsible for meeting with the Land Manager and receiving a completed Project Review and Approval Form. This form must contain an original signature from the Land Manager and you must upload it below as a PDF.

Each project will require at least one Project Review and Approval form. You may attach up to 4 forms on this page, but if you need more room you may attach up to three more on the "Additional Info" tab. If your project is working under 3 Land Managers, you must receive and submit a form from each manager.

No late Project Review and Approval Forms will be accepted. Applications lacking any necessary approval forms will be deemed incomplete and not considered for funding.

Answer the following questions, then attach the form(s)

Yes **Natural Heritage elements were found within my project site(s):**

Name the site(s) and their associated Land Managers:

The project site is the Calcareous Fen Habitat Protection Site located in Swedes Forest Township Section 22 & 27 owned by William Anderson, Larry Donner and Jeanne Savage. The main Land Manager is Tabor Hoek, BWSR Private Lands Coordinator, with other Land Managers Jeff Zajac, Area Wildlife Manager and Lucas Youngsma, Area Hydrologist assisting.

Name the elements found:

Small White Lady's Slipper (*Cypripedium candidum*): Minnesota special concerns Twig-rush (*Cladium mariscoides*): Minnesota special concerns Hairy fimbriatylis (*Fimbristylis puberula*): Federally endangered Whorled Nut-rush (*Scleria verticillata*): Federally threatened Marsh Arrowgrass (*Triglochin palustris*): tracked by Minnesota DNR

Discuss any interaction or impact to these elements and the recommended mitigation / avoidance measures you will take within your project to protect these elements:

No impact to these natural heritage elements will occur. This project will place a perpetual easement on the property to secure the protection of these elements. No construction or work will be done. Due to Calcareous Fens being protected by several state and federal agencies, we also included a project review and approval form from area hydrologist, Lucas Youngsma.

Project Review and Approval Forms

[Uploaded Form 1](#)

[Uploaded Form 2](#)

[Uploaded Form 3](#)

CPL Project Review and Approval Form

REVIEWER INFORMATION:

Land manager/ easement holder name:	Tabor Hoek
Agency:	BWSR
Title:	Private Lands Coordinator
Phone:	507-537-7260
Email:	tabor.hoek@state.mn.us

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Project Name:	Redwood County Calcareous Fen Habitat Protection
Contact Person:	Judy Schulte
Organization:	Redwood SWCD
Email:	judy.schulte@racgroup.net


Please check the appropriate boxes:

- ☐ I have read the application and discussed this proposed project with the above listed Organization Contact Person.
- ☒ For work on easements, the private landowner has been contacted and has given support and approval for this project.

I have performed a Natural Heritage Database review and found:

- ☐ this project to have no features within one mile.
- ☒ this project to have features within one mile, but project is not likely to adversely affect those features. I have listed the features below and recommended the following minimization strategy:

Review completed by Jeff Zajac, DNR Area Wildlife Manager:



- ☐ this project is likely to adversely affect Natural Heritage features. I feel that this project is important and should be forwarded to DNR Ecological Resources staff for further review.

☐ I do not have access to the Natural Features database and will forward this completed form to DNR by Friday, August 27th 2010 to CPL Staff at LSCPLGrants.DNR@state.mn.us to complete the Natural Heritage Review.

I have discussed what role my office will be expected to have in this project and find that the project, as described will require:

- ☐ minimal or no involvement from my office for completion.
- ☒ a commitment of involvement by staff that is reasonable and can be accomplished with current staffing levels and workload.
- ☐ an amount of staff involvement that cannot be committed during the project time period with current staffing levels. Unless additional staffing can be committed from other offices, Divisions or appropriate partners, I feel this project cannot be completed within the project timeline to our desired standards.

- ☒ I have discussed permits and applications that the applicant may be responsible for using the Working on DNR Lands and Working on Public Lands, or Working on Private Lands documents.

CPL Project Review and Approval Form

For Acquisitions Only:

- ☐ This project is for an acquisition to be transferred to a public agency by applicant:
- ☐ I have discussed any required Initial Development (facilities, habitat, etc.) work that is required before the transfer with the applicant.
- ☐ I have discussed all applicable costs of those developments and what party is responsible for those costs.

Complete the following cost tables (required work to bring to agency standards).

Habitat Development	# Acres	Cost/ Acre	Total	Funding Source	Applicant is responsible for:
Prairie Grassland					Choose
Forest/ Woody Cover					Choose
Wetland					Choose
Totals					

Facility Development	Cost	Funding Source	Applicant is responsible for:
Boundary Survey			Choose
Posting/ Fencing			Choose
Wood Routed Sign			Choose
Access Roads and Trails			Choose
User Facilities, Access, Parking Lots			Choose
Well Sealing/ Site Clean-up			Choose
Total			

Upon final review of this project:


- ☒ I find this project to be consistent with sound conservation science. This work will benefit area fish, game and wildlife by restoring, enhancing or protecting forests, wetlands, prairies and habitat and is consistent with the management or stewardship plan for this land. (APPROVAL)
- ☐ I find that this project does not follow the management or stewardship plan for this land and does not fit within the long range goals for this land at this time on the local level. (DECLINE)
- ☐ I find that this project should be sent up to a higher level within the agency for further review and decision. I have forwarded the Project Planning Form and this Review and Approval Form for further review to:

Name: Tabor Hoek, BWSR

Phone: 507-537-7260

☒ By checking this box and signing my name below I certify that I have met with the above applicant and discussed the proposed project and have provided feedback to the applicant. I understand I must provide this document as a PDF with my original signature on it to the applicant to submit a complete application.

Name:



Date:

9-10-10

Comments:

CPL Project Review and Approval Form

REVIEWER INFORMATION:

Land manager/ easement holder name: Jeff Zajac
Agency: MN DNR
Title: Area Wildlife Manager
Phone: 507-637-4076
Email: jeffrey.zajac@dnr.state.mn.us

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Project Name: Calcareous Fen Habitat Protection
Contact Person: Judy Schulte
Organization: Redwood SWCD
Email: judy.schulte@racgroup.net

Please check the appropriate boxes:

- ☒ I have read the application and discussed this proposed project with the above listed Organization Contact Person.
☒ For work on easements, the private landowner has been contacted and has given support and approval for this project.

I have performed a Natural Heritage Database review and found:

- ☐ this project to have no features within one mile.
☒ this project to have features within one mile, but project is not likely to adversely affect those features. I have listed the features below and recommended the following minimization strategy:

--

- ☐ this project is likely to adversely affect Natural Heritage features. I feel that this project is important and should be forwarded to DNR Ecological Resources staff for further review.

☐ I do not have access to the Natural Features database and will forward this completed form to DNR by Friday, August 27th 2010 to [CPL Staff at LSCPLGrants.DNR@state.mn.us](mailto:LSCPLGrants.DNR@state.mn.us) to complete the Natural Heritage Review.

I have discussed what role my office will be expected to have in this project and find that the project, as described will require:

- ☐ minimal or no involvement from my office for completion.
☒ a commitment of involvement by staff that is reasonable and can be accomplished with current staffing levels and workload.
☐ an amount of staff involvement that cannot be committed during the project time period with current staffing levels. Unless additional staffing can be committed from other offices, Divisions or appropriate partners, I feel this project cannot be completed within the project timeline to our desired standards.

☒ I have discussed permits and applications that the applicant may be responsible for using the Working on DNR Lands and Working on Public Lands, or Working on Private Lands documents.

CPL Project Review and Approval Form

For Acquisitions Only:

- ☐ This project is for an acquisition to be transferred to a public agency by applicant:
- ☐ I have discussed any required Initial Development (facilities, habitat, etc.) work that is required before the transfer with the applicant.
- ☐ I have discussed all applicable costs of those developments and what party is responsible for those costs.

Complete the following cost tables (required work to bring to agency standards).

Habitat Development	# Acres	Cost/ Acre	Total	Funding Source	Applicant is responsible for:
Prairie Grassland					Choose
Forest/ Woody Cover					Choose
Wetland					Choose
Totals					

Facility Development	Cost	Funding Source	Applicant is responsible for:
Boundary Survey			Choose
Posting/ Fencing			Choose
Wood Routed Sign			Choose
Access Roads and Trails			Choose
User Facilities, Access, Parking Lots			Choose
Well Sealing/ Site Clean-up			Choose
Total			

Upon final review of this project:

- ☒ I find this project to be consistent with sound conservation science. This work will benefit area fish, game and wildlife by restoring, enhancing or protecting forests, wetlands, prairies and habitat and is consistent with the management or stewardship plan for this land. (APPROVAL)
- ☐ I find that this project does not follow the management or stewardship plan for this land and does not fit within the long range goals for this land at this time on the local level. (DECLINE)
- ☐ I find that this project should be sent up to a higher level within the agency for further review and decision. I have forwarded the Project Planning Form and this Review and Approval Form for further review to:

Name: <u><i>[Signature]</i></u>	Phone: <u> </u>
---------------------------------	------------------------------------

☒ By checking this box and signing my name below I certify that I have met with the above applicant and discussed the proposed project and have provided feedback to the applicant. I understand I must provide this document as a PDF with my original signature on it to the applicant to submit a complete application.

Name: *[Signature]*

Date: 9-16-10

Comments:

Excellent Project!

CPL Project Review and Approval Form

REVIEWER INFORMATION:

Land manager/ easement holder name: Lucas Youngsma
Agency: Department of Natural Resources
Title: Area Hydrologist
Phone: 507-537-7258
Email: lucas.youngsma@state.mn.us

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Project Name: Redwood County Calcareous
Fen Habitat Protection
Contact Person: Judy Schulte
Organization: Redwood SWCD
Email: judy.schulte@racgroup.net

Please check the appropriate boxes:

- ☒ I have read the application and discussed this proposed project with the above listed Organization Contact Person.
☒ For work on easements, the private landowner has been contacted and has given support and approval for this project.

I have performed a Natural Heritage Database review and found:

- ☐ this project to have no features within one mile.
☒ this project to have features within one mile, but project is not likely to adversely affect those features. I have listed the features below and recommended the following minimization strategy:

The site to be protected by the easement is itself listed in the database, in addition to the plants that survive only in this environment. No minimization strategy is necessary since the project is itself a minimization strategy to prevent degradation of rare features and plants, and the wildlife that live there.

- ☐ this project is likely to adversely affect Natural Heritage features. I feel that this project is important and should be forwarded to DNR Ecological Resources staff for further review.

☐ I do not have access to the Natural Features database and will forward this completed form to DNR by Friday, August 27th 2010 to CPL Staff at LSCPLGrants.DNR@state.mn.us to complete the Natural Heritage Review.

I have discussed what role my office will be expected to have in this project and find that the project, as described will require:

- ☐ minimal or no involvement from my office for completion.
☒ a commitment of involvement by staff that is reasonable and can be accomplished with current staffing levels and workload.
☐ an amount of staff involvement that cannot be committed during the project time period with current staffing levels. Unless additional staffing can be committed from other offices, Divisions or appropriate partners, I feel this project cannot be completed within the project timeline to our desired standards.

- ☒ I have discussed permits and applications that the applicant may be responsible for using the Working on DNR Lands and Working on Public Lands, or Working on Private Lands documents.

CPL Project Review and Approval Form

For Acquisitions Only:

- ☐ This project is for an acquisition to be transferred to a public agency by applicant:
- ☐ I have discussed any required Initial Development (facilities, habitat, etc.) work that is required before the transfer with the applicant.
- ☐ I have discussed all applicable costs of those developments and what party is responsible for those costs.

Complete the following cost tables (required work to bring to agency standards).

Habitat Development	# Acres	Cost/ Acre	Total	Funding Source	Applicant is responsible for:
Prairie Grassland					Choose
Forest/ Woody Cover					Choose
Wetland					Choose
Totals					

Facility Development	Cost	Funding Source	Applicant is responsible for:
Boundary Survey			Choose
Posting/ Fencing			Choose
Wood Routed Sign			Choose
Access Roads and Trails			Choose
User Facilities, Access, Parking Lots			Choose
Well Sealing/ Site Clean-up			Choose
Total			

Upon final review of this project:

- ☒ I find this project to be consistent with sound conservation science. This work will benefit area fish, game and wildlife by restoring, enhancing or protecting forests, wetlands, prairies and habitat and is consistent with the management or stewardship plan for this land. (APPROVAL)
- ☐ I find that this project does not follow the management or stewardship plan for this land and does not fit within the long range goals for this land at this time on the local level. (DECLINE)
- ☐ I find that this project should be sent up to a higher level within the agency for further review and decision. I have forwarded the Project Planning Form and this Review and Approval Form for further review to:

Name: Phone:

☐ By checking this box and signing my name below I certify that I have met with the above applicant and discussed the proposed project and have provided feedback to the applicant. I understand I must provide this document as a PDF with my original signature on it to the applicant to submit a complete application.

Name: Joey

Date: 9/14/2010

Comments: This is a tremendous proposal. The cumulative benefit for permanently protecting such a valuable and rare resource will likely be seen for generations into the future, and probably only truly understood at that time. Perpetual easement protection of the most sensitive wetlands in the Minnesota River Valley will ensure these sites will not succumb to incremental degradation, which is typically beyond the scope of regulatory protection. I support the Redwood SWCD in this effort.

Conservation Partners Legacy Grants - Online Applications


Jamie Gangaware

Admin

[List Applications](#)


[Summary Spreadsheet](#)

[Log Out](#)

 Project Summary


 Project Info

 Site Info

 Budget Info

 Review & Approval

 **Additional Info**

 Application Submission

Additional Information

List any additional details about your project here. Include your organization's history or charter to receive private contributions for local conservation or habitat projects. This is not required.

According to Lucas Youngsma, Area Hydrologist, by placing this project into a permanent RIM easement, the calcareous fen and landowner's involved will receive the guidance and management needed to insure the site diversity stays intact. His office will be contacted with any future projects in order to insure no adverse affects occur. The Redwood SWCD established in January of 1953, after state legislature passed the Minnesota Soil Conservation District Law, is governed by 5 locally elected supervisors. The Redwood SWCD has a long history of conservation excellence and prides itself on the conservation stewardship instilled in landowners of Redwood County for the past 57 years.

Supplemental Documents

If you / your project does not need to upload any of these documents, you may leave these upload boxes empty.

Upload additional information here, limited to Partner Commitment Letters, Letters of Support, Easement information, etc. You may email easement information only if it exceeds size limit while trying to submit the application; all other supporting documentation must be uploaded. Reference CPL Application # and name when emailing (provided upon application submission) or your email will be returned. Send emails to

LSCPLGrants.DNR@state.mn.us

[Uploaded Document 1](#)

[Uploaded Document 2](#)

[Uploaded Document 3](#)

**Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program
Staff Questions
FY 11 Applications**

Redwood SWCD, Calcareous Fen Habitat Protection.

Please find the attached budget sheet from your application for reference and an Excel version of the budget page to make edits.

1. Please break up the Easement Stewardship entry on budget to Easement Acquisition costs (BWSR's charge) and the cost of the Easement Stewardship, placing each into their proper budget categories. Stewardship is a requirement of this program and must be specifically accounted for.

See Attached Budget Worksheet

2. Describe BWSR's easement cost and what is included.
 - a. BWSR personnel costs for easement processing include:
 - i. Processing easement application to insure accuracy of all information
 - ii. Confirm ownership
 - iii. Draft and develop legal description of sites
 - iv. Develop and process agreements
 - v. Review title insurance
 - vi. Develop and process final easement document
 - b. BWSR contract costs with Redwood SWCD includes:
 - i. Completing Easement application
 - ii. Providing legal documents/deeds found at local level
 - iii. Work with landowners to get signatures on agreement and easement
 - iv. Collect abstracts and take to the attorney office for updating
 - v. Provide all information needed from landowners in order for BWSR to process easement
 - c. BWSR Easement Stewardship cost includes:
 - i. Annual spot checks every year for the first five years and every three years after that
 - ii. Technical assistance for future enhancement projects
 - iii. All other future updates

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

"Helping bring YOU clean water"



Redwood SWCD

1241 E Bridge St.—Suite C
Redwood Falls, MN 56283
Phone: 507-637-2427 EXT 3
Fax: 507-637-6002
redwoodswcd.org

Supervisors September 16, 2010

Chair
Mike Hewitt
District V
(507) 859-2406

Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program
Partner Commitment Letter:

Vice Chair
Donald Steffen
District II
(507) 648-3485

Secretary
Thomas Morley
District I
(507) 641-3742

Treasurer
Joseph Plaetz
District IV
(507) 747-2803

PR & I
Ralph Heiling
District III
(507) 249-3568

I, Jeanne Savage, along with the rest of the landowners on this tract, will be taking part in the Redwood County Calcareous Fen Habitat Project. This project is being applied for by the Redwood Soil & Water Conservation District. I am a private landowner who will be contributing to the project during its implementation on our property in Swedes Forest Township section 22 and 27. Our donation will be made through a reduction in cash value to our property and will cover ⁴⁸% of the \$42,822.05 needed for the 15% local match. This contribution will not utilize any other state funds nor will it utilize any fund-raising events.

Sincerely,

Staff
Marilyn
Bernhardson
District
Administrator

Jeanne Savage
Private Landowner
Swedes Forest Sec. 22 & 27

Karl Clouse
Office Assistant

Judy Schulte
District
Technician

Karen Wilhelmi
Education
Coordinator

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

"Helping bring YOU clean water"



Redwood SWCD

1241 E Bridge St.—Suite C
Redwood Falls, MN 56283
Phone: 507-637-2427 EXT 3
Fax: 507-637-6002
redwoodswcd.org

Supervisors

Chair
Mike Hewitt
District V
(507) 859-2406

Vice Chair
Donald Steffen
District II
(507) 648-3485

Secretary
Thomas Morley
District I
(507) 641-3742

Treasurer
Joseph Plaetz
District IV
(507) 747-2803

PR & I
Ralph Heiling
District III
(507) 249-3568

Staff

Marilyn
Bernhardson
District
Administrator

Kari Clouse
Office Assistant

Judy Schulte
District
Technician

Karen Wilhelmi
Education
Coordinator

September 14, 2010

Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program Partner Commitment Letter:

I, Larry Donner, will be taking part in the Redwood County Calcareous Fen Habitat Project. This project is being applied for by the Redwood Soil & Water Conservation District. I am a private landowner who will be contributing to the project during its implementation on my property in Swedes Forest Township section 27. My donation will be made through a reduction in cash value to my property and will cover 17% of the \$42,822 dollars needed for the 15% match. This contribution will not utilize any other state funds nor will it utilize any fund-raising events.

Sincerely,

Larry Donner
Private Landowner
Swedes Forest Sec. 27

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

"Helping bring YOU clean water"



Redwood SWCD

1241 E Bridge St.—Suite C
Redwood Falls, MN 56283
Phone: 507-637-2427 EXT 3
Fax: 507-637-6002
redwoodswcd.org

Supervisors

Chair
Mike Hewitt
District V
(507) 859-2406

Vice Chair
Donald Steffen
District II
(507) 648-3485

Secretary
Thomas Morley
District I
(507) 641-3742

Treasurer
Joseph Plaetz
District IV
(507) 747-2803

PR & I
Ralph Helling
District III
(507) 249-3568

Staff

Marilyn
Bernhardson
District
Administrator

Kari Clouse
Office Assistant

Judy Schulte
District
Technician

Karen Wilhelmi
Education
Coordinator

September 14, 2010

Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program Partner Commitment Letter:

I, William Anderson, will be taking part in the Redwood County Calcareous Fen Habitat Project. This project is being applied for by the Redwood Soil & Water Conservation District. I am a private landowner who will be contributing to the project during its implementation on my property in Swedes Forest Township section 27. My donation will be made through a reduction in cash value to my property and will cover ~~23~~²⁵% of the \$ 42,822 dollars needed for the 15% match. This contribution will not utilize any other state funds nor will it utilize any fund-raising events.

Sincerely,

William Anderson
Private Landowner
Swedes Forest Sec. 27

Conservation Partners Legacy Grants - Online Applications


Jamie Gangaware

Admin

[List Applications](#)


[Summary Spreadsheet](#)

[Log Out](#)


 Project Summary

 Project Info

 Site Info

 Budget Info

 Review & Approval

 Additional Info

 Application Submission

Final Application Submission

This completes your CPL Grant Application. Please take the time to revisit the previous sections and make sure you have entered everything completely and correctly. Once you hit the submit button below, you will not be able to return to this application to make changes.

I certify that I have read the Conservation Partners Legacy Grants Program Request for Proposal, Program Manual and other program documents, and have discussed this project with the appropriate public land manager, or private landowner and easement holder.

I certify I am authorized to apply for and manage these grant and match funds, and the project work by the organization or agency listed below. I certify this organization to have the financial capability to compete this project and that it will comply with all applicable laws and regulations.

I certify that all of the information contained in the application is correct as of the time of the submission. If anything should change, I will contact CPL Grant Staff immediately to make corrections.

I certify that if funded I will give consideration to and make timely written contact to Minnesota Conservation Corps or its successor for consideration of possible use of their services to contract for restoration and enhancement services. I will provide CPL staff a copy of that written contact within 10 days after the execution of my grant, should I be awarded.

I certify that I am aware at least one Project Review and Approval form is required for every application and I must submit all completed forms by uploading them into this application. I have attached one form as necessary for each different Land Manager within my project.

I am aware that by typing my name in the box below, I am applying my signature to this online document.

Signature:

Judy Schulte

Organization / Agency:

Redwood SWCD

Title:

District Technician

Date:

2010-09-16

FY2011 Technical Review Comments and Scoring, Regional and Divisional Directors Comments

Page 24 of 25

SCORE

13)Use of Native Plant Materials	14)Budget and Cost Effectiveness	15)Capacity to Successfully Complete Work	16)Supports Existing Landscape Level Plans	17)Supports Species Plans	18)Conforms to Statewide Conservation and Preservation Plan	19)Conforms to State Wildlife Action Plan
7.00	7.00	8.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00
8.00	8.00	10.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	8.00
9.00	9.00	9.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	8.00
8.00	7.00	7.00	8.00	8.00	7.00	8.00
7.00	8.00	9.00	6.00	8.00	8.00	6.00
7.80	7.80	8.60	8.00	8.40	8.20	7.40