## Request for Funding Form Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Fiscal Year 2011

Program or Project Title: # 29 Restoring and Enhancing Wildlife Habitat on Key Public Lands Across the Anoka Sand Plain through Collaborative Partnerships

Date: November 1, 2009

Manager's Name: Wayne Ostlie

Title: Director of Conservation Programs Mailing Address: Great River Greening Telephone: 651-665-9500 x19 Fax: 651-651-9409 E-Mail: wostlie@greatrivergreening.org Web Site: www.greatrivergreening.org

	Council Funding Request	Out-Year Projections of Needs		
Funds Requested (\$000s)	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014
Outdoor Heritage Fund	\$1,425,563	0	0	0

## A. Summary

The Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Partnership works to 1) elevate and capitalize on resources available for protection, restoration, and enhancement of natural resources in the ASP, 2) share and disseminate management and restoration expertise to public and private landowners, 3) tackle emerging research issues and use findings to guide management actions across public and private lands and waters, and 4) build strong connections to local communities through education, outreach and opportunities for volunteerism.

Our program will harness the expertise, resources, and connections of a broad partnership of committed conservation stakeholders to significantly elevate restoration and enhancement of oak savannas (Minnesota most critically imperiled habitat), woodlands and forests on public lands across the Anoka Sand Plain (ASP). Through funding from the Outdoor Heritage Fund, we will restore and enhance over 3900 acres of prairie and forest habitat across 17 priority sites, including state WMAs (8), state SNAs (5), USFWS National Wildlife Refuges (1), county parks (2), and a ecological science reserve operated by the University of Minnesota (1).

## **B.** Background Information

## 1. What is the problem or opportunity being addressed?

The ASP ecological region is home to some of Minnesota's crowning conservation achievements over the past century:

- Carlos Avery Wildlife Management Area (Anoka & Chisago counties 25,000 acres) is the largest WMA in the Twin Cities Metro Area and is composed of wetlands and oak woodland and savanna.
- Sherburne National Wildlife Refuge (Sherburne County 30,700 acres) was in 1965 to protect and restore the habitats associated with the St. Francis River Valley for migratory birds and other wildlife, the focus of the Refuge is on the restoration of oak savanna, wetland and Big Woods habitat.
- Crane Meadows National Wildlife Refuge (Morrison County 13,500 acres only 2,000 acquired) was established in 1992 to preserve a large, natural wetland complex. The refuge is located in central Minnesota and serves as an important stop for many species of migrating birds and harbors one of the largest nesting populations of greater sandhill cranes in Minnesota. Habitats include native tallgrass prairie, oak savanna, and wetlands with stands of wild rice.
- Rum River Wild & Scenic River (Mille Lacs, Sherburne, Isanti and Anoka counties) was added to Minnesota's Wild & Scenic Rivers Program in 1978.
- Sand Dunes State Forest/Uncas Dunes SNA (Sherburne County). The Sand Dunes State Forest consists of oak savanna forest and prairie and 2,700 acres of pine plantation of rolling terrain and few hills. The 745 acres of Uncas Dunes contains a relict dunefield associated with Glacial Lake Grantsburg.
- Cedar Creek Ecosystem Science Reserve (Anoka & Isanti counties 5,400 acres) is a Registered Natural Landmark, recognized as 'possessing exceptional value in illustrating our nation's natural heritage'. Superb examples of oak savanna, tamarack-black spruce forest and white cedar swamp occur throughout the Reserve.

Despite these storied successes, the future of wildlife in the ASP is far from assured. Much remains to be accomplished in order to ensure the long-term success of wildlife in this ecological region of the state:

- Oak savanna habitat that once characterized the ASP has been reduced to less than 1% of its historic extent (<12 square miles across the region), making it the single most imperiled ecological system in Minnesota. The demise of oak savanna in the ASP mirrors regional trends and is classified as a globally rare ecosystem.
- Prairie habitat in this subsection has declined from 10% coverage historically to less than .05% coverage today.
- Habitat loss and degradation has had profound impacts on the wildlife of the ASP; some 97 Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) in the state of Minnesota are known or predicted to occur within the ASP (*Tomorrow's Habitat for the Wild and Rare*, pp. 70-71). These include 15 bird species, 9 of which have exhibited persistent rangewide declines over the past 40 years (USFWS Breeding Bird Survey 2008) lark sparrow (-1.65% decline per year), eastern towhee (-1.61%), loggerhead shrike (-3.68%), red-headed woodpecker (-2.66%), field sparrow (-2.78%), eastern meadowlark (-2.86%), brown thrasher (-1.13%), whip-poor-will (-2.19%) and grasshopper sparrow (-3.55%).
- To date, there have existed inadequate resources to pursue protection of what is remaining in private hands, and to adequately manage/restore what occurs in public/NGO conservation ownership. *Tomorrow's Habitat for the Wild and Rare*: Minnesota's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy, identifies maintenance,

enhancement and protection of oak savannas as its first priority for this ecological subsection.

• The ASP is among the fastest growing areas in the state. Urban sprawl, coupled with invasive exotic species and woody encroachment, are placing immense pressure on remaining natural resources and threatening existing protected areas.

While there has been a tremendous loss of native habitat in the ASP, there is a lot of existing public land that needs significant restoration and enhancement work. Public land managers over the past decades have made good investments of time and resources, but all are facing serious funding shortages. None of our partners have reached their restoration and enhancement goals despite the range of efforts over many years. As the **Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Partnership** (ASP Habitat Partnership), we acknowledge this habitat work has to be an ongoing effort, one that is far more integrated and collaborative than what has been done in the past.

This Partnership aims, through a coordinated approach, to 1) elevate and capitalize on resources available for protection, restoration, and enhancement of natural resources in the ASP, 2) share and disseminate management and restoration expertise to public and private landowners, 3) tackle emerging research issues and use findings to guide management actions across public and private lands and waters, and 4) build strong connections to local communities through education, outreach and opportunities for volunteerism.

This Partnership, at present, includes the following stakeholders:

Anoka County Parks Audubon Minnesota Benton SWCD BWSR Chisago SWCD Friends of the Rum River Great River Greening Isanti County Parks Minnesota DNR Minnesota Forest Resources Council Morrison SWCD Mid-Minnesota Mississippi River RC&D National Wild Turkey Federation Onanegozie RC&D Stearns SWCD The Nature Conservancy US Fish & Wildlife Service University of Minnesota Wright SWCD

This grant will help advance the effort even more significantly. We will collaborate on projects, share resources and expertise, broaden the existing funding base for this work, and outreach to public/private partners and the local community – all supported foundationally by a world class ecological research center.

Funding through the Outdoor Heritage Fund (OHF) will be used to leverage further funding and in-kind support on all sites where we work. We will increase involvement by the public through the combining and integrating of the volunteer programs led by Great River Greening, SWCDs, municipalities and school districts, National Wild Turkey Federation, The Nature Conservancy, USFWS, MFRC, Isanti County Parks and others. These groups have wide recognition for volunteer development, yet to date there has not been a connecting and sharing of these programs to the degree needed. This project will embark on that next generation of collaboration.

In addition, this project will create new jobs. Our partners will bring in MCC crews as an integral part of the restoration/enhancement work being performed. We will grow a better landscape L-SOHC Request for Funding Form

through work completed by local businesses and contractors. Our partners are committed to connecting with local vendors to help implement these projects.

This grant is essential to showing the general public and landowners adjacent to the sites included in this proposal that we are actively pursuing and committed to this critical work. And we will work hard to get them to join in too – not only adjacent landowners, but students and teachers, hunters, bird watchers, and more. We will get them all involved so that we can ultimately work more effectively on private lands too.

Our proposal focuses on restoration and enhancement activities on 17 priority sites occurring on public lands in the ASP, a mix of sites that include state WMAs (8), state SNAs (5), USFWS National Wildlife Refuge (1), county parks (2), and the University of Minnesota (1). Leverage for this work on public land will occur through the ASP Habitat Partnership and the East Central Regional Committee of the Minnesota Forest Resources Council.

The concept behind the ASP Habitat Partnership - integrated public and private land management – is a strategic direction of the Minnesota DNR (as stated in A Strategic Conservation Agenda 2009-2013). The ability of the DNR to administer state forests, parks, wildlife management areas, aquatic management areas, and scientific and natural areas is strongly influenced by the management of surrounding lands and waters. Through engagement in partnerships like the ASP Habitat Partnership, the DNR is pursuing integrated management for extensive interspersed public and private lands in order to build its capacity to work across ownership boundaries.

Through this proposal, the ASP Habitat Partnership is requesting \$1,425,563 as an initial foundational request to make major strides in the restoration and enhancement of priority wildlife habitat across state and county lands in the program area. Backed by a slate of seasoned resource professionals (wildlife managers, ecologists, restoration experts, scientists) within an array of established conservation agencies and organizations, the Partnership is poised to begin making immediate impacts across 3904 acres of habitat.

## 2. What action will be taken?

Beginning in 2010 and occurring over the next 3 years, restoration and enhancement activities will take place on the following state and county managed lands, producing a combined outcome of 3658 acres of restored oak savanna, oak woodland and other important natural habitats, and enhancement of 246 acres of prairie and forest wildlife habitat:

#### **State Scientific and Natural Areas**

- A. Uncas Dunes SNA (Sherburne County) Uncas Dunes contains a relict dunefield and includes oak savanna, oak forest, and wetland habitats. The rare Uncas skipper gives this site its name; this is one of only two sites in the state where this species has been found. <u>Actions:</u> Restoration of 70 acres of oak savanna habitat through removal of invasive trees/shrubs and regenerating pine, planting of old fields and disturbed areas with native seed collected onsite (followed by post-seeding management over two years), and prescribed fire.
- B. Rice Lake SNA (Sherburne County) Glacial meltwaters deposited their outwash sands across this large plain, providing the basis for an open, grassy landscape dotted with bur and pin oak--a classic savanna. Rice Lake Savanna SNA contains examples of L-SOHC Request for Funding Form

oak savanna and oak woodland communities. <u>Actions:</u> Restoration of 80 acres of oak savanna habitat through removal of invasive trees/shrubs, planting of old fields and disturbed areas with native seed collected onsite, and prescribed fire.

- C. Mississippi River Islands SNA (Sherburne County) This SNA includes five islands formed of outwash and alluvium deposited by the Mississippi River, rising as high as 30 feet above river level. Flooding, erosion, and sedimentation have resulted in various stages of succession, creating a mosaic of wet floodplain forest, drier floodplain forest, and sandbar plant communities. <u>Actions:</u> Restoration of 5 acres of hardwood forest through invasive species removal.
- D. Clear Lake SNA (Sherburne County) Clear Lake SNA has the distinction of being the first land parcel acquired under the State Wild and Scenic Rivers Program. It contains a mosaic of oak forest, floodplain forest, and old field sumac thicket, along with a small population of the very rare Hill's thistle. <u>Actions:</u> A first phase of oak savanna restoration on 50 acres through woody invasive species control and prescribed fire (to be followed upon by seeding and restoration management in a future proposal).
- E. Harry W. Cater Homestead SNA (Sherburne County) This SNA covers a sandy river terrace deposited by glacial meltwaters and is dominated by dry, upland oak savanna, mesic and wet-mesic prairie openings in aspen groves, floodplain forest along the Elk River, wet meadow and marsh on peat. <u>Actions:</u> Restoration of 15 acres of oak savanna habitat through removal of invasive trees/shrubs and use of prescribed fire.

#### State Wildlife Management Areas

- F. Lamprey Pass WMA (Anoka and Washington counties) Lamprey Pass is the largest WMA outside of Carlos Avery in the North Metro area. Originally owned by Uri Lamprey, it was managed as a hunt club from 1881 until the 1970s. The acquisition of Lamprey pass marked the first time money was used from the Nongame Wildlife Tax Check-off revenue. The unit is identified as a DNR Regionally Significant Ecological Area. <u>Actions:</u> Restoration of 16 acres of old field to oak woodland through direct seeding and follow-up management.
- G. Carlos Avery WMA (Anoka and Chisago counties) This 25,000-acre WMA is the largest in the Twin Cities Metro Area and is one of the iconic WMAs in the state of Minnesota. The site is composed principally of wetlands and oak woodland and savanna. <u>Actions:</u> Enhancement of 22 acres of grassland through removal of invasive trees and shrubs, followed by prescribed fire.
- H. Sand Prairie WMA (Sherburne County) This 700-acre WMA is situated in the glacial flood plain of the Mississippi River, with mesic to wet remnant prairie, dry prairie, and aspen occurring at the site. In addition to its status as a WMA, Sand Prairie is the first WMA also designated as an Environmental Education Area, providing a strong connection to local school and college students. <u>Actions:</u> Restoration of 159 acres of partially restored oak savanna through the planting of oak trees. The site has one of the most diverse prairie species assemblages in a Minnesota restored prairie.
- I. Becklin Homestead WMA & County Park (Isanti County) This WMA is located along the Rum River and consists of partially restored oak savanna and other habitats. The WMA is also jointly managed as an Isanti County Park and is dedicated to hunting L-SOHC Request for Funding Form

use by Physically Challenged hunters only. <u>Actions:</u> Restoration of 25 acres of oak savanna through direct seeding and planting of trees.

- J. Sartell WMA (Benton County) This 368-acre WMA is featured by Little Rock Creek (which flows through the site), along with significant oak savanna, oak woodland and prairie in various stages of restoration. <u>Actions:</u> Restoration of 91 acres of oak savanna/woodland habitat, and enhancement of 21 acres of grassland and woodland through exotic and native woody species control.
- K. Rice Area Sportsman Club WMA (Morrison County) This WMA (580 acres) consists of extensive oak savanna/woodland along its east border, merging with restored native grass fields and wetlands. <u>Actions:</u> Restoration of 163 acres of deciduous woodland, dry oak woodland and dry oak savanna; enhancement of 29 acres of grassland.
- L. Michaelson Farm WMA (Benton County) This 276-acre WMA occurs on the Mississippi River floodplain forest, lowland grass and brush, and oak woodland on higher grounds. Management of the unit focuses on maintaining and improving habitat for a diversity of native plants and wildlife. <u>Actions</u>: Enhancement of 120 acres of oak woodland, woodland and grassland through control of exotic and native woody invasive plants.
- M. McDougall WMA (Morrison County) This 228-acre WMA occurs along the Mississippi River and is characterized by floodplain forest, oak woodland and deciduous woodland, with some crop field. The WMA borders a preserve of The Nature Conservancy along its south edge. <u>Actions:</u> Enhancement of 54 acres of oak woodland, deciduous woodland and grassland through control of exotic and native woody invasive species.

## National Wildlife Refuge

N. Sherburne National Wildlife Refuge (Sherburne County) – This 30,700-acre refuge was in 1965 to protect and restore the habitats associated with the St. Francis River Valley for migratory birds and other wildlife, the focus of the Refuge is on the restoration of oak savanna, wetland and Big Woods habitat. <u>Actions:</u> Restoration of 1000 acres through prescribed fire and oak seeding of prairie habitats.

## County Parks

- O. Anderson County Park (Isanti County) The 174-acre park lies within the Typo Chain of Lakes watershed, and consists of open fields (in the process of prairie and oak savanna restoration), woods, and wetlands adjacent to both Horseshoe and Horse Leg Lakes. <u>Actions</u>: Restoration of 20 acres of oak savanna through direct seeding of acorns and planting of oak trees into restored understory of tallgrass prairie.
- P. Springvale County Park (Isanti County) This 211-acre park is situated on Johnny's Lake and lies on eskers and wetlands left by the last glaciers. The park includes rolling prairies, oak savanna, northern hardwood forest and wetlands. <u>Actions:</u> Restoration of 20 acres of oak savanna through direct seeding of acorns and

<u>Actions:</u> Restoration of 20 acres of oak savanna through direct seeding of acorns and planting of oak trees into restored ground layer of tallgrass prairie.

## University of Minnesota

**Q. Cedar Creek Ecosystem Science Reserve (Anoka & Isanti counties)** – Cedar Creek Ecosystem Science Reserve is a large ecological research site in central Minnesota with natural habitats that represent the entire state. Cedar Creek Ecosystem Science Reserve is within the meeting point of the three largest ecosystems of North America. Here the western prairies, the northern evergreen forests, and the leafy forests of the east all converge in a remarkable combination of plants and animals over a nine-square-mile area. The Minnesota County Biological Survey ranks Cedar Creek a site of Outstanding Biodiversity Significance, its highest rating, and the Nature Conservancy has named Cedar Creek an Ecologically Significant Area. <u>Actions:</u> Restoration of 1000 acres of oak savanna and 800 acres of oak woodland habitat through prescribed fire and invasive exotic species control.

## 3. Who will take action and when?

All proposed sites will begin restoration and enhancement work in 2010, with work progressing at a majority of sites over the following 3 years (into 2013). Specific actions and those taking action will vary by site, but will include each respective agency/organization responsible for management of the site. In most instances, conservation partners (including Great River Greening, National Wild Turkey Federation, MCC and others) will play significant roles. Volunteers from local communities will also be engaged at a number of project sites. It should be noted that activities at some sites will be contracted out to for-profit companies as the need exists.

## State Wildlife Management Areas

- A. Lamprey Pass WMA (Anoka and Washington counties) DNR Wildlife will lead and implement all phases of this enhancement project. The project will commence in FY2011 and continue into FY2012.
- **B.** Carlos Avery WMA (Anoka and Chisago counties) The restoration project will be led by Great River Greening in collaboration with the DNR Wildlife. Great River Greening will oversee removal of red cedar and other woody invasive trees by a contractor; DNR Wildlife will follow with a prescribed burn. Enhancement will begin in FY2011 and continue through FY2013.
- **C.** Sand Prairie WMA (Sherburne County) This restoration project will be led by DNR Wildlife in collaboration with Great River Greening. Volunteers will be used in the planting of trees as a way to connect the local community to this important site. The project will begin in FY2011 and conclude in FY2012.
- **D.** Becklin Homestead WMA & County Park (Isanti County) Isanti County Parks and DNR Wildlife will collaborate on this restoration project. The project will begin in FY2012 and conclude in FY2013.
- *E. Sartell WMA (Benton County)* Oversight of this project will be provided by Great River Greening in collaboration with the DNR Wildlife. Aside from project oversight, much of the proposed work will be subcontracted through MCC and/or private vendor. The project will begin in FY2011 and will conclude in FY2013.
- *F. Rice Area Sportsman Club WMA (Morrison County)* Oversight of this project will be provided by Great River Greening in collaboration with the DNR Wildlife. Aside from project oversight, much of the proposed work will be subcontracted through MCC and/or private vendor. The project will begin in FY2011 and will conclude in FY2013.

- *G. Michaelson Farm WMA (Benton County)* Oversight of this project will be provided by Great River Greening in collaboration with the DNR Wildlife. Aside from project oversight, much of the proposed work will be subcontracted through MCC and/or private vendor. The project will begin in FY2011 and will conclude in FY2013.
- H. McDougall WMA (Morrison County) Oversight of this project will be provided by Great River Greening in collaboration with the DNR Wildlife. Aside from project oversight, much of the proposed work will be subcontracted through MCC and/or private vendor. The project will begin in FY2011 and will conclude in FY2013.

## **State Scientific and Natural Areas**

- I. Uncas Dunes SNA (Sherburne County) The restoration project will be led by Great River Greening in collaboration with the DNR SNA Program and DNR Forestry. Portions of the work (harvesting of pine plantation, etc.) will be subcontracted to a private consultant specializing in that area of work. Portions of the project will be performed by volunteers as a way to connect the local community to this important land. Restoration will begin in FY 2011 and continue through 2013.
- J. Rice Lake SNA (Sherburne County) The restoration project will be led by Great River Greening in collaboration with the DNR SNA Program. Portions of the work may be subcontracted to a private contractor. Portions of the project will be performed by volunteers as a way to connect the local community to this important land. Restoration will begin in FY2011 and continue into 2013.
- K. Mississippi River Islands SNA (Sherburne County) The restoration project will be led by Great River Greening in collaboration with the DNR SNA Program. Restoration will begin in FY2011 and conclude with mop-up work in FY2012.
- L. Clear Lake SNA (Sherburne County) The restoration project will be led by Great River Greening in collaboration with the DNR SNA Program. Portions of the work may be subcontracted to MCC or a private contractor. Portions of the project will be performed by volunteers as a way to connect the local community to this important land. Restoration will begin in FY2011 and continue through FY2013.
- M. Harry W. Cater Homestead SNA (Sherburne County) The restoration project will be led by Great River Greening in collaboration with the DNR SNA Program. Portions of the work may be subcontracted to MCC or a private contactor. Portions of the project will be performed by volunteers as a way to connect the local community to this important land. Restoration will begin in 2010 and continue into 2013.

## National Wildlife Refuge

N. Sherburne National Wildlife Refuge (Sherburne County) – The USFWS will hire a forester to complement existing staff engaged in the large-scale oak savanna restoration efforts underway at Sherburne NWR. The forester will flag trees for thinning in line with savanna restoration plans.

## **County Parks**

- **O.** Anderson County Park (Isanti County) Isanti County Parks will implement all phases of this restoration project with assistance from volunteers. Restoration will commence in FY2012 and conclude in FY2013
- P. Springvale County Park (Isanti County) Isanti County Parks will implement all phases of this restoration project with assistance from volunteers. Restoration will commence in FY2012 and continue into FY2013.

## University of Minnesota

Q. Cedar Creek Ecosystem Science Reserve (Anoka & Isanti counties) – CCESR staff will perform most activities related to this restoration, but components (prescribed fire, invasive species control, etc.) may include staff from Great River Greening, MCC and/or the DNR. Restoration will commence in FY2011 and continue through FY2013.

## 4. How will you coordinate this program with the other Constitutional Funding?

Coordination of this program with other Constitutional funding will occur largely through the ASP Habitat Partnership. The Partnership includes the majority of conservation organizations and agencies working in the region; two of these (MN DNR and BWSR) administer significant portions of these funds. Also, many of the county Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs) in the project area, through which the Clean Water Funds will be distributed, are also partners.

Since the desired goal of the Partnership is focused both on terrestrial and aquatic habitats, it is imperative that a good working knowledge of a diverse suite of funding sources is achieved among its partners, and the we collectively find effective ways to strategically tap them to their most effective and efficient uses. To this end, the Partnership is establishing a necessary communication protocol to ensure that coordination among partners is well orchestrated.

## 5. What specific habitat changes will occur if this item is funded? Be specific about and list multiple benefits if they exist.

We expect to see major improvements to oak savanna, oak woodland and associated habitats through restoration and enhancement actions as identified under question #2 above. These actions will result in:

- elimination of invasive plants (trees, shrubs and forbs) over 2254 acres of oak savanna, oak woodland, and deciduous forest habitats
- seeding/planting of 1269 acres of oak savanna habitat
- seeding of 16 acres of oak woodland habitat
- prescribed fire over 2140 acres of oak savanna habitat

Beyond these direct impacts, restoration and enhancement activities will greatly impact a large suite of species using these habitats by reducing negative impacts from edge effects. These actions will provide for needed habitat improvements to the benefit of many of the 97 Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCNs) as well as numerous other game and non-game species with populations occurring in the ASP.

Beyond the direct benefits to species using these habitats, these actions will result in:

- A. Significantly improved recreational assets and richer experiences for hunters, bird watchers, hikers, and for education and other activities.
- B. Enhancement of an existing and irreplaceable investment. The state of Minnesota and local units of government have used millions of dollars of taxpayer money to acquire these important tracts of land, yet the resources for their appropriate management have not been available to the level required to sustain them. Many of these include the best examples of the most imperiled habitats in the state, and cannot be replaced.

- C. Major opportunities for building strong connections to local communities through volunteerism as a means of enhancing public awareness, appreciation and a constituency for these important lands.
- D. Restoration actions focused on Cedar Creek Ecosystem Science Reserve serves to not only improve upon the current condition of high quality habitats at the site, but continues to position it as the State's premier ecosystem research facility whose science serves to both underpin oak savanna restoration efforts, but the science behind conservation at the global scale.
- E. Water quality improvements will be realized in watersheds where restoration activities take place.
- F. Jobs. We will grow a better landscape through work completed by local businesses and contractors. Our partners are committed to connecting with MCC crews and local vendors to help implement these projects.

## 6. When do you expect to see these habitat changes?

In areas where native habitats exist, but actions are necessary to restore ecological function through prescribed fire and treatment of invasive species, we expect to see immediate changes to habitat beginning the first year of effort (2010), with continual improvement occurring over the following 3 years and beyond. We expect to see significant positive responses to these habitat improvements by game and non-game species alike within the 5-10 year timeframe.

In areas where reconstruction of habitat is necessary (generally seeding into old fields), changes will slower to realize. Hardwood seeding will take decades to produce mature forest conditions, although impacts on wildlife will begin occurring within the first decade. In oak savanna settings, the ground layer will take shape and support grassland species in approximately 3 years. However, oak trees are notoriously slow growing and the full savanna structure may not develop for at least 2-3 decades.

## 7. Will your Outdoor Heritage Fund dollar request complete the planned accomplishments?



Proposed restoration and enhancement actions will, in large part, complete the planned accomplishments for sites or portions of sites featured in this proposal. In some instances (e.g., Clear Lake SNA), however, actions likely may be required beyond the duration of this funding cycle. Depending on need, the completion of restoration activities may be proposed as a second phase through a following funding proposal to LS-OHC.

It should also be noted that this OHF proposal touches on but a few of the priority conservation areas located in the ASP. Many other protection, restoration and enhancement priorities exist across the ASP, and those needs will be targeted in funding proposals over the coming years. In some instances, restoration and enhancement activities in different portions of a site featured in this proposal also will be featured.

Meeting these needs will require a strong, coordinated approach of the ASP Habitat Partnership, that will serve to build in efficiencies by sharing resources and expertise between organizations/agencies, and jointly fundraise to elevate the funding base through the OHF and an array of other funding sources to address major resource and capacity constraints.

## 8. How will you pay for the maintenance of the accomplishments?

All partners participating in this proposal have committed to the long-term maintenance of these habitat improvements once they are made. Often, the expense of restoration/enhancement on the front end is a major hurdle that first must be overcome. The cost of ongoing management to maintain these improvements is relatively low and can be accommodated in the existing program funds of participating agencies/organizations.

Also, a principle goal of the ASP Habitat Partnership is to elevate and broaden the resource base for use in protecting, restoring and enhancing wildlife habitat throughout the program area. We are committed to raising funds/resources through an array of channels that will ensure any deficits in funding for the long-term maintenance of these improvements are covered.

## 9. How does this action <u>directly</u> restore, enhance, or protect prairies, wetlands, forests or habitat for fish, game, and wildlife?

Each specific proposed action is a necessary element in the restoration or enhancement of targeted habitats at each site. These actions include prescribed fire, woody encroachment removal, invasive species control, and establishment of native plants/habitats through seeding/planting. These restoration and enhancement activities will restore ecological function to these habitats and provide optimal habitat for game (e.g., turkey, deer, pheasant and waterfowl) and non-game species alike. Improved habitat will subsequently lead to healthier populations of these species.

# *10.* If you are restoring or enhancing property, is the activity on permanently protected land?



All proposed activities within this proposal will be conducted on public lands formally protected in fee title by the State of Minnesota or other government entities. The proposal encompasses 8 state Wildlife Management Areas, 5 state Scientific and Natural Areas, 2 County Parks, and 1 site maintained by the University of Minnesota.

## 11. How will you ensure transparency and provide information about your work and use of Outdoor Heritage Fund dollars.

Great River Greening, the grant manager for these funds, has financial tracking systems in place to ensure transparency in how OHF dollars are allocated and used, and for documenting

matching funds and in-kind contributions allocated to associated projects by respective partners over the duration of the project. These financial "books" are open and available for review. Great River Greening and each partner through which funding will flow have solid fiscal records.

Greening has a long history of managing grants of this scale. At one time, the organization was the largest recipient of LCCMR funds among nonprofits. It has successfully administered several LCCMR grants over the last decade.

The Partnership and its associated partners will publish results/outcomes of this program annually on their respective web sites. Furthermore, the Partnership is committed to establishing its own web presence and will deliver this information through that web site once it becomes live.

Finally, the Partnership and its associates will actively publicize its collective works and achievements through the web, media outlets and directly to local communities through myriad public presentations, volunteer events, educational venues and other means.

### 12. Why will this strategy work?

The strength of the proposal lies with the ASP Habitat Partnership and the diverse skill sets, expertise and resources of its committed partners. Each partner has a long-term demonstrable track record of achievement in conserving the natural resources of the ASP. Collectively, this expertise is deeper and the resources and skill sets each brings to the table can be used more efficiently, effectively, and with greater impact than each acting alone.

Across the Partnership there exists a broad cross-section of expertise, skill sets, and missions that reach to all corners of the conservation arena:

- Deep expertise in areas of protection, restoration and enhancement
- Strong science both pure and applied
- Public and private partners
- Outreach to private landowners
- Sophisticated educational programs woven throughout partner curricula
- Strong volunteer programs
- Solid grant-writing and fundraising capabilities

As a Partnership, we acknowledge this habitat work has to be an ongoing effort, one that is far more integrated and collaborative than what has been done in the past. We will collaborate on projects, share resources and expertise, broaden the existing funding base for this work, and outreach to public/private partners and the local community in efficient and effective ways – all supported foundationally by a world class ecological research center. The ASP Habitat Partnership has already produced over 2000 hours of in kind time to form as a coalition and develop these projects. This same kind of energy will be the foundation to our new broad collaborative approach to managing public sites throughout the ASP. By supporting this proposal, the LSOHC will gain far more than the basic investment of wildlife habitat improvements on public lands; it will produce major lasting commitments on the part of local conservation managers to ensure the on-going collaborative nature of this Partnership.

Funding through the Outdoor Heritage Fund (OHF) will be used to leverage further funding and in-kind support on all sites where we work. The Partnership will increase involvement by the

public through the combining and integrating of the volunteer programs led by Great River Greening, SWCDs, municipalities and school districts, National Wild Turkey Federation, The Nature Conservancy, USFWS, MFRC, Isanti County Parks and others. These groups have wide recognition for volunteer development, yet to date there has not been a connecting and sharing of these programs to the degree needed. This project will embark on that next generation of collaboration.

All restoration and enhancement actions will be rooted in sound science and adaptive management. Already a hallmark of its partners, the Partnership is committed to using the most effective practices and restoration/management techniques and monitoring/evaluate results for the benefit of the broader conservation community. In collaboration with the University of Minnesota's Cedar Creek Ecosystem Science Reserve, we can ensure that our proposed actions are rooted in the best science.

Finally, through the ASP Habitat Partnership, this funding will spearhead the future investment for wildlife habitat on private lands through a systematic and ongoing public awareness process created and implemented by the Partnership.

## 13. Who might make decisions that assist or work against achieving the expected impact program?

This proposal focuses squarely on the restoration and enhancement components of the conservation equation. As such, many of the potential obstacles commonly encountered during acquisition efforts are not an issue here. Rather, there is broad support for enhancing the management and restoration of existing public lands among neighbors, hunters and the outdoor recreation enthusiasts, and local communities.

The principle constraint affecting habitat management and restoration resources on existing public lands is availability of resources. State legislature in large part determines funding levels to state management agencies; DNR management determines in large part the priorities for expenditure of these limited resources. The solution to this obstacle is to both focus on the need for enhanced restoration and management actions (i.e., elevate its awareness) in the eyes of legislature and wildlife management agencies and to effectively grow those resources through other channels to maintain the public investment in these important lands. The ASP Habitat Partnership will work avidly to achieve both outcomes by: 1) building strong public awareness, participation, and support for restoration and management of our public wildlife lands, 2) creating a voice for public land managers through the Partnership and the public for restoration and management of our public wildlife lands, and 3) raising and efficiently using resources to elevate the management and restoration of our public wildlife lands.

As the Partnership moves into the protection arena next year and other challenges will arise, a slate of strategies will be developed to position those proposals for success. Each of those strategies above (among others) will be core to that effort.

## 14. If this is acquisition of land, has the local government formally approved the acquisition? NA

YES NO

15. If this is fee simple acquisition of land, is the land free of any other permanent protection such as a conservation easement? NA

\_\_\_\_YES

\_\_\_\_NO

16. If this is an easement acquisition, will the eased land be open for public use? NA

NO

\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_ If Yes what kind of use?

17. If easement acquisition, will the easement be a permanent conservation easement as described in MS 2009, Chapter 84C.01, specifically protecting the natural resource values of real property forever? NA

\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_NO

*18.* If you are proposing funding for a new or ongoing program how long into the future do you expect this program to operate?

\_\_\_\_\_100\_\_\_\_ Years

This is all subjective. The need for this Partnership is immense and it will continue to operate as long as the need and value of the Partnership persists. At present, we do not see a short-term horizon for this Partnership.

- 19. Which planning sections will you work in? Check all that apply in the list below.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Northern Forest
  - \_\_\_\_X\_ Forest/Prairie Transition
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Southeast Forest

\_\_\_\_\_ Prairie

- \_\_\_\_X\_ Metropolitan Urbanizing Area
- 20. Does the request address an urgent conservation opportunity that will be lost if not immediately funded?

\_\_\_\_X\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_\_NO If yes, please explain. L-SOHC Request for Funding Form

Oak savanna systems are the single most imperiled habitat type in Minnesota. Although the ASP still maintains the best examples in the state of these habitats, remaining examples are severely threatened due to inadequate management, neglect, and conversion to other uses. The proximity of the ASP to the Twin Cities metro area places an additional level of urgency for action. Opportunities to undertake effective management (prescribed fire, etc.) and to broaden their current extent through restoration are increasingly limiting due to the rapidly expanding urban population.

Years of insufficient funding for restoration and management activities at local, state, and federal levels have often degraded habitats occurring on public lands, sometimes to the point of loss. With this degradation has come a corresponding decline in their value for wildlife and an increase in the resources required to bring these habitats back to their optimal state. These costs rise every year that management is delayed. The impact of this habitat degradation is a root cause in the decline of the majority of the 97 species occurring in the ASP now considered among Minnesota's Species of Greatest Conservation Need.

The ASP Habitat Partnership recognizes that a multi-pronged conservation approach of protection (fee simple and easement), restoration/enhancement of public and private lands, and education/outreach is required to significantly advance and build support for conservation of these imperiled habitats. In this proposal, we focus on the restoration and enhancement of public lands; as our Partnership matures, we will be adding a protection element to our proposals.

## 21. Does the request restore and/or enhance habitat on existing state-owned Wildlife or Aquatic Management Areas or Scientific and Natural Areas?

### \_\_\_\_X\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_\_NO If Yes, list the names of the AMAs, WMAs and/or SNAs and the acres to be restored and/or enhanced.

In total, 1064 acres will be restored and enhanced across 8 WMAs and 5 SNAs:

- Lamprey Pass WMA 16 acres
- Carlos Avery WMA 22 acres
- Becklin Homestead WMA 25 acres
- Sand Prairie WMA 159 acres
- Sartell WMA 112 acres
- McDougal WMA 54 acres
- Michaelson Farm WMA 120 acres
- Rice Area Sportsman Club WMA 192 acres
- Mississippi Islands SNA 149 acres
- Uncas Dunes SNA 70 acres
- Rice Lake SNA 80 acres
- Harry W. Cater Homestead SNA 15 acres
- Clear Lake SNA 50 acres

## 22. Is this request based on assessment through a science based strategic planning and evaluation model similar to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service's Strategic Habitat Conservation model?

## \_\_\_\_X\_\_\_YES If yes explain the model briefly.

The ASP Habitat Partnership is well versed in these science-based strategic planning processes, with these being core to the Minnesota DNR, US Fish and Wildlife Service, The Nature Conservancy and Great River Greening, among others.

NO

1. Biological Planning and Conservation Design – The Partnership has used existing prioritysetting efforts and data sets to identify focal conservation targets and corresponding priorities for conservation efforts. Our focus on habitats identified by the Minnesota County Biological Survey, Regional Ecologically-Significant Areas (RESA, as identified by the MN DNR, Central Region), and habitat corridors (as identified by the MN DNR RESA and Green Corridors) serves to define our conservation priorities. Additional information about prioritization and weightings can be found in Section C of this proposal.

2. Strategy Development and Conservation Delivery – To move conservation efforts forward in an effective and strategic way, the ASP Habitat Partnership will develop a broad and effective suite of conservation strategies that address protection, restoration and enhancement needs. At present, strategies are focused purely on the restoration and enhancement portions of the conservation equation, and are based on a full understanding of focal targets and threats to those targets as identified in through the planning and design phases.

3. Research, Evaluation and Monitoring – Evaluation of assumptions and assessment of the effectiveness of strategies to abate threats to focal conservation targets are at the heart of adaptive management. The Partnership is committed to understanding the effectiveness of its restoration and enhancement approaches by tapping the best restoration science available, sharing lessons and experiences throughout the Partnership (and broadly with others), and evaluating the success of these efforts through on-going monitoring. Our relationship with the University of Minnesota's Cedar Creek Ecosystem Sciences Reserve provides a unique opportunity to tap into and inform world-class research related to oak savanna systems.

## 23. Explain the scientific foundation for your project, and the benefits it will produce.

Restoration and enhancement techniques used during the course of the program are based on the best science and will be tailored to the specific conditions of each site. The Partnership includes organizations/agencies with an array of seasoned professionals that collectively have over two centuries of expertise in the restoration and enhancement arena, with well developed connections to a rich array of additional expertise in the field. The ASP Habitat Partnership provides a forum for information sharing, vetting of proposed restoration/enhancement strategies, and implementing an effective, coordinated monitoring program to inform adaptive management and advance restoration science. Land managers are committed to monitor the results of these efforts over time.

Cedar Creek Ecosystem Science Reserve is a cornerstone of our restoration and enhancement efforts. The site is important both ecologically and as a long-term ecological research site,

where research can tackle critical conservation issues of the ASP. The Partnership, which includes CCESR, will both benefit from the research occurring on CCESR (effects of prescribed fire, climate change, biomass energy) but also inform research that occurs at the site.

Cedar Creek ESR has been practicing prescribed burning since the 1960s, making it one of the longest ongoing scientific fire experiments in the world. Researchers at Cedar Creek study the effects of fire at individual, community, and ecosystem levels with the goal of maintaining the prairies and developing effective restoration methods for its oak savanna. The controlled settings available to researchers at CCESR are indispensable and not found elsewhere in the region, and it is therefore critical that this site receive the appropriate levels of restoration and management funding to maintain its integrity, both for its inherent wildlife and as a research site of importance.

## 24. How do you set priorities? (Be sure to list the criteria you use and the weight you give each one.)

The Partnership uses existing priority-setting efforts that, in line with its goals, serve to highlight areas of greatest need for conservation action.

We have used MCBS Sites of Biodiversity Significance, Regionally Ecological Significant Areas, and Habitat Corridors (all developed by the MN DNR) to define priorities at the regional scale. Inherent within this priority-setting process are the following assumptions:

- Presence of MCBS quality ecological system(s) and/or concentration of SGCN/T&E species (weighted heavily) – indicators of the long-term viability of species/systems (habitat condition, size and landscape context) and conservation efficiency. Weighting = High;
- Size of habitat block or managed area one indicator of long-term viability. Weighting = High;
- Occurrence within DNR mapped habitat corridors an indicator of potential for restoring/conserving important habitat connectivity between protected areas. Weighting = Moderate;
- Public lands or private lands with long-term easements or other long-term commitments a
  predictor of conservation success and security of investment. Weighting = Moderate;
- Multiple conservation benefits to both game and non-game species and other natural resources – an indicator of conservation efficiency. Weighting = Moderate;
- Immediacy of need/action as determined by Minnesota County Biological Survey and other sources – an indicator of conservation urgency. Weighting = High.;
- Ability to effectively manage lands over the long term through established groups an indicator of conservation capability of potential partner. Weighting = Moderate.

# C. Relationship to the *Minnesota Conservation and Preservation Plan* and Other Published Resource Management Plans

The actions highlighted by this proposal are prominently featured in the Minnesota Conservation and Preservation Plan and an array of other published resource management plan, as detailed below:

## Minnesota Conservation and Preservation Plan

Oak savanna habitat is specifically detailed as a protection priority (as is prairie) in the Minnesota Conservation and Preservation Plan (Habitat Recommendation 1). Habitat Recommendation 5 identifies restoration of land, water and wetland-associated watersheds as priorities for restoration. Since oak savanna was identified as a statewide protection priority, it naturally follows that it is a restoration priority as well, as is prairie. Habitat recommendation 9 identifies overall research on land and aquatic habitat as a priority need, emphasizing our relationship to Cedar Creek ESR as a critical element to that end.

#### Minnesota Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy

Oak savanna systems within the ASP were identified as a statewide conservation priority in *Tomorrow's Habitat for the Wild and Rare:* Minnesota's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (An Action Plan for Minnesota Wildlife). Some 30 SGCN species are associated with oak savanna habitat in the ASP. The Action Plan identifies maintenance, enhancement and protection of oak savannas as the state's highest priority for the ASP ecological subsection.

#### Minnesota Forest Resources Council

The Minnesota Forest Resources Council (MFRC), a state agency responsible for implementing the Minnesota Sustainable Forest Resources Act (SFRA) of 1995, serves as the chief advisors to the Governor and Legislature on sustainable forestry matters. In 2005, the MFRC approved the East Central Forest Resource Management Plan as developed by its East Central regional landscape committee. The plan envisions healthy and sustained forests across the region in an ecologically appropriate manner, and provides a framework of goal and strategies for four ECS subsections including the ASP. The Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Partnership project is supported by the East Central Committee as one of its pilot projects to promote sustainable forestry in the region.

#### Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Priority actions identified by the LS-OHC for the Metropolitan Urbanizing Section to the 2010 Legislative session included prairie and oak savanna protection, enhancement and restoration as priorities, with emphasis on areas of high biological diversity. Emphasis was also placed on habitat corridors as priorities for protection.

In the Forest/Prairie Transition Section, recommendations included wetland/grassland complexes as critical habitat for game and non-game wildlife, along with protection, enhancement and restoration or rare native remnant prairies.

All of these are priorities for the ASP Habitat Partnership.

#### Minnesota DNR Strategic Conservation Agenda

Restoration and enhancement of imperiled resources through conservation partnerships is captured as explicit goals of the Minnesota DNR in its Strategic Conservation Agenda (2009-2013):

#### Goals:

- A. Minnesota's natural lands and habitats will be conserved and enhanced
  - a. Remaining natural ecosystems are conserved Healthy habitats are connected by natural corridors. Native prairies are protected, and grasslands and riparian forest are restored. We are responsible stewards of DNR-administered lands and good neighbors to adjacent landowners. Uncommon and rare habitats are protected.
  - b. Degraded habitats are restored Grasslands and forests have been restored.

- c. Natural resources thrive in the context of human influences. Urban and developing areas support a diversity of plant and animal communities and offer diverse recreational opportunities Local decisions are supported by public-private partnerships, with DNR providing technical assistance and coordination.
- B. Minnesota's fish and wildlife populations will be healthy and provide great recreation opportunities
  - a. Fish and wildlife populations and the habitats that support them are healthy Habitat types in jeopardy, such as prairies, wetlands, and shallow lakes, are restored. Endangered and threatened species are protected.
  - b. Conservation partnerships and stewardship ethics are strong Public- and privatesector partners work together to support Minnesota's resources and promote conservation.

Budget Item	Fiscal Year 11	Fiscal Year 12	Fiscal Year 13
Personnel	\$165,000	\$165,000	\$104,928
Contracts	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$82,170
Equipment/Tools/Supplies	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$12,287
Fee Acquisition	0	0	0
Easement Acquisition	0	0	0
Easement Stewardship	0	0	0
Professional Services	0	0	0
Travel	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$1,125
Project Admin & Reporting	\$11,780	\$11,780	\$11,780
TOTAL	\$612,780	\$612,780	\$200,003

## D. Budget

**E. Personnel Details** In the space below list the names, titles and anticipated program funds to be paid (in whole or in part) by this recommendation. If you will need to fill a position just list the title and amount.

Title	Name	Amount.
	Nume	Amount

Great River Greening

Project Manager - Ecologist Crew Manager Crew Technician (2 positions) Dir. Conservation Prog Volunteer Coordinator Director of Finance Budget Management	Various Michael Varian Wayne Ostlie Mark Turbak Greg Wenz Deborah Gagner	\$82,838 \$34,403 \$41,403 \$18,347 \$ 1,903 \$13,089 \$ 6,545
Cedar Creek Ecosystem Science Technicians (24 positions) Field Restoration Specialist USFWS Forester	<u>Reserve</u>	\$95,000 \$60,000 \$105.000

**F. All Leverage** In the table below list the sources and amounts of leverage you anticipate by fiscal year you anticipate receiving it. Include state and non-state leverage.

Source of Non- State Leverage	Fiscal Year 11	Fiscal Year 12	Fiscal Year 13
Great River Greening	\$75,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
NWTF	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$ 5,000
USFWS	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$125,000
Isanti County	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 8,000
Cedar Creek ESR	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,000
Source of State Leverage			
MN DNR	\$ 18,000	\$18,000	\$18,000
Cedar Creek ESR	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000
TOTAL	<b>4050 000</b>	<b>\$050.000</b>	<b>4</b> 475.000
TOTAL	\$252,000	\$252,000	\$175,000

### G. Outcomes:

Table 1 Accomplish- ments	Wetlands	Prairies	Forests	Habitats for Fish, Game and Wildlife
Restore	0 acres	2628 acres	1030 acres	0 acres
Protect	0 acres	0 acres	0 acres	0 acres
Enhance	0 acres	117 acres	129 acres	0 acres
Table 2 Sections Impacted and Impact Quantifier	Wetlands	Prairies	Forests	Habitats for Fish, Game and Wildlife
Restore	0 acres	Metro Urbanizing Section (2419 acres); Prairie/Forest Transition (209 acres)	Metro Urbanizing Section (985 acres); Prairie/Forest Transition (45 acres)	0 acres
Protect	0 acres	0 acres Metro Urbanizing Section (22 acres);	0 acres	0 acres
Enhance	0 acres	Prairie/Forest Transition (95 acres)	Prairie/Forest Transition (129 acres)	0 acres
Table 3 Recommend Fund Allocation	Wetlands	Prairies	Forests	Habitats for Fish, Game and Wildlife
Restore	0	\$1,016,385	\$ 146,921	0
Protect	0	0	0	0
Enhance	0	\$ 115,887	\$ 108,254	0
Table 4 Leverage \$	Wetlands	Prairies	Forests	Habitats for Fish, Game and Wildlife
Restore	0	\$583,000	\$ 33,000	0
Protect	0	0	0	0
Enhance	0	\$ 41,000	\$ 22,000	0
Table 5 Acquisition Data	Wetlands	Prairies	Forests	Habitats for Fish, Game and Wildlife
Acquired in				

## L-SOHC Request for Funding Form

0

0

0

PILT Liability 0

Acquired in Fee without State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0
Permanent Easement	0	0	0	0

**H.** Accomplishment Time Table Using the headings below, include a clear statement of how much of what is being accomplished and when. Attach a map showing where accomplishments are anticipated. Accomplishments should clearly restore, enhance or protect forests, wetlands, prairies and habitat for fish, game and wildlife.

Milestone	Date	Measure
Restoration/enhancement actions fully completed	2010	3 sites (197 acres)
Restoration/enhancement actions fully completed	2011	3 sites (323 acres)
Restoration/enhancement actions fully completed	2012	11 sites (3384 acres)

### I. Relationship to Your Current Budget

#### **Great River Greening**

Operating budget = \$195,000 for general, administration, office, fees. Program budget = \$784,500 for restoration and other program activities

#### **Isanti County Parks**

Operating Costs = \$95,000 for general, administration Program Costs = \$112,000 for capital, management, maintenance

#### University of Minnesota, Cedar Creek Ecosystem Science Reserve

Comprehensive Operations & research/Education Program = \$1,000,000 Operations budget (only) = \$400,000 for admin, building & grounds, general overhead Research/Education budget (only) = \$600,000 for plot upkeep, data collection, programs

#### Minnesota DNR - Lidell

Operating Budget (Local Office) = \$40,000-\$750,000 annually (not including acquisition). Our local budget for habitat work is quite variable.

Operating Budget = \$300,000-\$400,000 annually for salaries and operating budget for our office (which is involved in the habitat work directly)

#### MN DNR – Lueth

Operating budget = \$32,000

#### MN DNR (SNA Program)

General fund = \$536,000 (annual statewide allotment) Invasive Management Fund = \$100,000 (annual statewide allotment) Heritage Enhancement Fund = \$136,800 (annual statewide allotment)

Also:

Federal Funds = \$400,000 (allocated statewide over 3 years) LCCMR funds = \$2,994,000 (allocated statewide over 3 years) Bonding = \$5,484,000 (allocated statewide over 3 years)

## USFWS

Operating budget = \$2,000,000 annually for all associated activities

## J. How Will the Habitat Improvements Be Sustained?

Management plans or briefs (if not already in place) will be developed for each site to guide and ensure effective long-term management. Land managers associated with sites included in this proposal have committed to the long-term maintenance of these habitat improvements in line with prescribed actions. Improvements will be maintained by specific land managers, contractors like MCC, and volunteers.

The ASP Habitat Partnership will work with land managers to identify and procure financial resources for maintaining these improvements, bring volunteers to bear, and otherwise assist in reducing the financial and capacity burden in the face of fiscal constraints.

## K. Attach a list of your projects listing their county location and edit the map of Minnesota on the next page to show each project as a symbol.

## **Proposed Project Sites**

- **A.** Uncas Dunes SNA (Sherburne County)
- **B.** Rice Lake SNA (Sherburne County)
- C. Mississippi River Islands SNA (Sherburne County
- **D.** Clear Lake SNA (Sherburne County)
- E. Harry W. Cater Homestead SNA (Sherburne County)
- F. Lamprey Pass WMA (Anoka and Washington counties)
- G. Carlos Avery WMA (Anoka and Chisago counties)
- H. Sand Prairie WMA (Sherburne County)
- I. Becklin Homestead WMA & County Park (Isanti County)
- J. Sartell WMA (Benton County)
- K. Rice Area Sportsman Club WMA (Morrison County)
- L. Michaelson Farm WMA (Benton County)
- *M.* McDougall WMA (Morrison County)
- N. Sherburne National Wildlife Refuge (Sherburne County)
- O. Anderson County Park (Isanti County)
- P. Springvale County Park (Isanti County)
- **Q.** Cedar Creek Ecosystem Science Reserve (Anoka & Isanti counties)

