

## Main Request for Funding Form

### Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Fiscal Year 2014 / ML 2013 Proposal

**Program or Project Title:** MN Moose Habitat Collaborative Phase II

**Funds Requested:** \$2,153,200

**Manager's Name:** Mark Johnson

**Title:** Executive Director

**Organization:** MN Deer Hunters Association

**Street Address:** 460 Peterson Road

**City:** Grand Rapids, MN 55744

**Telephone:** 218-327-1103

**E-Mail:** mark@mndeerhunters.com

**Organization Web Site:** www.mndeerhunters.com

**County Locations:** Cook, Lake, and St. Louis.

#### Ecological Planning Regions:

- Northern Forest

#### Activity Type:

- Enhance

#### Priority Resources Addressed by Activity:

- Forest
- Habitat

### Abstract

The Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative enhances approximately 4,477 acres of moose habitat in northern forests of Northeastern Minnesota within Cook, Lake and St. Louis counties on county, state, federal and tribal lands.

### Activity Detail

#### Design and Scope of Work

#### Problems to be addressed:

Between the late 1980s and early 2000s, the estimated moose population in NW Minnesota declined dramatically from over 4,000 to fewer than 100 animals. Moose population estimates, hunter success rates

and anecdotal observations of residents indicate the population of NE Minnesota moose has been in slow decline for several years. The MN Department of Natural Resources (DNR) reports the NE moose population has declined from 8,000 in 2005 to 4,230 in 2012. Of special concern is that mortality rates of radio collared moose in NE Minnesota are comparable to mortality rates observed during the beginning of the decline in the NW Minnesota moose population.

Moose have iconic status in Minnesota and are a critical component of the cultural identity, hunting heritage, and economy of northern Minnesota. Recognizing this significance and the prospective loss of the species from Minnesota, State Legislature passed legislation in 2008 directing the DNR to develop a management plan for Moose in Minnesota. The DNR created a Moose Advisory Committee (MAC) consisting of 18 individuals with varied perspectives and expertise on the status of Minnesota's moose population. The DNR released its Moose Research and Management Plan (DNR MRMP) in August 2011.

The goals and recommendations in the DNR MRMP are consistent with maintaining healthy, viable forests over the long-term. This proposal represents a synergy of managing for a variety of forest conditions and species, while paying special tribute to moose as an emblematic species. The enhancement actions described in this proposal reflect the intersection of managing for healthy northern forests with an emphasis on moose habitat using techniques such as prescribed fire, brush removal, selective restoration planting, and timber harvest such that the natural variability of northern forests is restored over time. MAC-recommended benefits include providing refugia through restoration and maintenance of high quality cover, restoring habitat complexity, and creating additional high quality browse areas.

#### **Scope of work:**

With over 82% in public ownership, NE Minnesota provides excellent opportunity for large scale collaborative habitat management. Primary moose range in NE Minnesota covers approximately 5,500 square miles (about 3.5 million acres). This proposal includes habitat management prescriptions for projects on approximately 4,477 acres of county, state, federal, and tribal lands in the heart of Minnesota moose range.

#### **How priorities were set:**

The MN Moose Habitat Collaborative established a priority parcel list in 2011 by a habitat sub-committee, composed of scientists and resource management personnel, to vet and rank proposed habitat management projects. This committee evaluated proposed projects based on locations within moose range, degree to which activities support goals of statewide conservation plans, existing moose densities, habitat research results, and how well proposed projects would enhance moose forage and cover. Parcels that were priority ranked in 2011, but could not be funded in Phase I, were selected for this proposal.

#### **Urgency and opportunity:**

This unique opportunity uses ongoing moose research projects to guide habitat enhancement in NE Minnesota to halt and reverse the moose decline. Utilizing the best available science from NE Minnesota, we propose to build on this robust collaborative formed around the moose issue and take early and aggressive steps to enhance habitat suitable for sustaining the NE Minnesota moose population. The disappearance of the NW moose population is a lesson we don't want to be repeated.

The selection committee chose project sites with forest stands that were partially harvested, decadent, poorly stocked with trees, or provided such poor browse condition that they were of little or no benefit to moose. Restoration efforts will result in vigorous new shrub and tree sprouting. Additionally, selective planting of low

density conifers on some units will eventually lead to more cover interspersed with browse. In the longer-term, establishment of conifers will provide thermal and escape covers. Ultimately, this project will encourage a heterogeneous habitat matrix resulting in a healthier landscape that is more resilient providing for an ecologically diverse and balanced landscape condition with greater benefit to moose and a number of Species of Greatest Conservation Need.

Many prescriptions proposed in this project involve regeneration of brush in old cuts, planting sites, and mature forest gaps of various size; and most include conifer planting. In the short-term, these habitat enhancement prescriptions will result in a multitude of regional forestry job opportunities that will include a management staff member for site preparations, contract work oversight and ground-truthing as well as numerous contracting opportunities for businesses in local communities. In the long-term, this project will result in improved forest habitat, forest productivity, and product diversity.

#### **Stakeholder involvement and/or opposition:**

NE Minnesota has a track record of successful landscape collaboratives. A subset of the Moose Habitat Collaborative participants including The Nature Conservancy, Minnesota Forest Resources Council, MN DNR, USFS, St. Louis County, and Lake County, have been working effectively together for over a decade to implement cross-boundary restoration and reforestation projects under the auspices of the Minnesota Forest Resource's Northeast Landscape Plan.

"Stakeholders" include the general populace of Minnesota, but NE MN especially. Moose hunting licenses generate revenue used to fund DNR moose research and management. Each year Minnesota's "once in a lifetime" moose hunt garners tremendous amounts of publicity, public interest and enthusiasm regarding this largest of Minnesota's game species. Tribal members are allowed to hunt moose annually and moose meat is a very important staple of their subsistence. Even more important is the moose's contribution to tribal hunting heritage.

Communities and entrepreneurs use moose in trademarks and as an advertising tool to promote or sell their area or business and are directly impacted by the abundance or scarcity of moose in the NE. Economically, sociologically, and ecologically, moose are intimately beneficial to Minnesota.

We have not encountered stakeholder opposition to this proposal, which is designed to be inclusive of numerous partners:

Organizations: Minnesota Deer Hunters Association (MDHA), The Nature Conservancy (TNC)

Counties: Cook, Lake, and St. Louis

Tribal: 1854 Treaty Authority, Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa

Federal: Superior National Forest (SNF)

University: University of Minnesota Duluth (UMD)

State: MN Department of Natural Resources (consulting)

## Planning

### MN State-wide Conservation Plan Priorities

- H1 Protect priority land habitats
- H3 Improve connectivity and access to recreation
- H5 Restore land, wetlands and wetland-associated watersheds
- LU10 Support and expand sustainable practices on working forested lands

### Plans Addressed

- Minnesota DNR Strategic Conservation Agenda
- Minnesota Forest Resource Council Landscape Plans
- Superior National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan
- The Nature Conservancy's Superior Mixed Forest Ecoregional Plan
- Tomorrow's Habitat for the Wild and Rare
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Strategic Habitat Conservation Model
- Minnesota DNR Moose Research and Management Plan

### LSOHC Statewide Priorities

- Are ongoing, successful, transparent and accountable programs addressing actions and targets of one or more of the ecological sections
- Produce multiple enduring conservation benefits
- Are able to leverage effort and/or other funds to supplement any OHF appropriation
- Allow public access. This comes into play when all other things about the request are approximately equal
- Address conservation opportunities that will be lost if not immediately acted on
- Restore or enhance habitat on state-owned WMAs, AMAs, SNAs, and state forests
- Use a science-based strategic planning and evaluation model to guide protection, restoration and enhancement, similar to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service's Strategic Habitat Conservation model
- Address wildlife species of greatest conservation need, Minnesota County Biological Survey data, and rare, threatened and endangered species inventories in land and water decisions, as well as permanent solutions to aquatic invasive species
- Provide Minnesotans with greater public access to outdoor environments with hunting, fishing and other outdoor recreation opportunities
- Ensures activities for "protecting, restoring and enhancing" are coordinated among agencies, non profits and others while doing this important work
- Target unique Minnesota landscapes that have historical value to fish and wildlife

### LSOHC Northern Forest Section Priorities

- Restore and enhance habitat on existing protected properties, with preference to habitat for rare, endangered, or threatened species identified by the Minnesota County Biological Survey
- Restore forest-based wildlife habitat that has experienced substantial decline in area in recent decades

## Relationship to Other Constitutional Funds

- Environmental and Natural Resource Trust Fund

The Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative will coordinate with other conservation organizations receiving constitutional funding to ensure projects are compatible and complementary; do not have duplicated efforts; and together address the Council's statewide and section priorities.

This project is best suited to apply for funds from the Outdoor Heritage Fund instead of the Environment and Natural Resources Trust Fund, the Clean Water Fund, or the Parks and Trails Fund because it meets the OHF's objective of restoring and enhancing wildlife habitat. This project will have multiple natural resource, economic, and social benefits, but its greatest benefit is in the enhanced habitat it will provide for a unique mammal, the entire suite of plants and wildlife that utilize the same habitat, and citizens who benefit from the continued existence of moose in the State of Minnesota.

## Accelerates or Supplements Current Efforts

This proposal is a progressive extension of the MN Moose Collaborative Phase I. As with Phase I, all Phase II work is restorative enhancement and seeks to expand the landscape reach and beneficial effects of improved and enhanced moose habitat in this critical time for NE Minnesota's moose populations. Phase II expands and extends habitat enhancement efforts currently being made by the collaborative partners under Phase I parameters with logical consideration to treatment of parcels that will yield the greatest return in wildlife benefit.

## Sustainability and Maintenance

Sustained maintenance of the treated parcels will be accomplished through future forest management procedures of the local landowning unit of government. Additional funding for select parcel treatments will be sought by future collaborative partnerships with conservation groups such as individual Chapters of the Minnesota Deer Hunters Association, The Nature Conservancy, Superior National Forest, Ruffed Grouse Society, Woodcock Minnesota, etc.

*Is the activity on permanently protected land and/or public waters per MS 103G.005, Subd. 15? - Yes*  
**(County/Municipal, State Forests, Tribal Lands & Federal Forest)**

## Accomplishment Timeline

Activity	Approximate Date Completed
Funding Available - Secure Contracts	July 2013
Initiate Fall Enhancements	August 2013
Winter Enhancements	February 2014
Spring Enhancements	June 2014
Summer Enhancements	September 2014
Winter Enhancements	February 2015
Spring Enhancements	June 2015

Summer Enhancements	September 2015
Winter Enhancements	February 2016
Spring Enhancements	June 2016
Summer Enhancements	September 2016
Winter Enhancements - Only if needed	February 2017
Spring Enhancements - Only if needed	June 2017

## Outcomes

### Programs in the northern forest region

- Healthy populations of endangered, threatened, and special concern species as well as more common species
- Increased availability and improved condition of riparian forests and other habitat corridors

## Budget Spreadsheet

Total Amount of Request: \$2,153,200

### Budget and Cash Leverage

Budget Name	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Cash Leverage	Cash Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	\$208,400	\$14,400		\$222,800
Contracts	\$1,913,500	\$220,000		\$2,133,500
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	\$0	\$0		\$0
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	\$0	\$0		\$0
Easement Acquisition	\$0	\$0		\$0
Easement Stewardship	\$0	\$0		\$0
Travel (in-state)	\$11,000	\$5,400		\$16,400
Professional Services	\$2,300	\$500		\$2,800
Direct Support Services	\$18,000	\$110,100		\$128,100
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	\$0	\$0		\$0
Capital Equipment	\$0	\$0		\$0
Other Equipment/Tools	\$0	\$0		\$0
Supplies/Materials	\$0	\$0		\$0
DNR IDP	\$0	\$0		\$0
Total	\$2,153,200	\$350,400	-	\$2,503,600

### Personnel

Position	FTE	Over # of years	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Cash Leverage	Cash Leverage Source	Total
TNC Forest Manager	0.25	3.00	\$57,600	\$14,400	TNC	\$72,000
Grant Manager - Fiscal Agent	0.90	3.00	\$150,800	\$0	-	\$150,800
Total	1.15	6.00	\$208,400	\$14,400	-	\$222,800

## Budget and Cash Leverage by Partnership

Budget Name	Partnership	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Cash Leverage	Cash Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	University of MN	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Contracts	University of MN	\$60,000	\$10,000	-	\$70,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	University of MN	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	University of MN	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Easement Acquisition	University of MN	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Easement Stewardship	University of MN	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Travel (in-state)	University of MN	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Professional Services	University of MN	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Direct Support Services	University of MN	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	University of MN	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Capital Equipment	University of MN	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Other Equipment/Tools	University of MN	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Supplies/Materials	University of MN	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
DNR IDP	University of MN	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Total	-	\$60,000	\$10,000	-	\$70,000



Budget Name	Partnership	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Cash Leverage	Cash Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	Grand Portage	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Contracts	Grand Portage	\$150,000	\$40,000	-	\$190,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	Grand Portage	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	Grand Portage	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Easement Acquisition	Grand Portage	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Easement Stewardship	Grand Portage	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Travel (in-state)	Grand Portage	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Professional Services	Grand Portage	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Direct Support Services	Grand Portage	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	Grand Portage	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Capital Equipment	Grand Portage	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Other Equipment/Tools	Grand Portage	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Supplies/Materials	Grand Portage	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
DNR IDP	Grand Portage	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Total	-	\$150,000	\$40,000	-	\$190,000

Budget Name	Partnership	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Cash Leverage	Cash Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	St. Louis County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Contracts	St. Louis County	\$515,100	\$0	-	\$515,100
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	St. Louis County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	St. Louis County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Easement Acquisition	St. Louis County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Easement Stewardship	St. Louis County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Travel (in-state)	St. Louis County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Professional Services	St. Louis County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Direct Support Services	St. Louis County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	St. Louis County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Capital Equipment	St. Louis County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Other Equipment/Tools	St. Louis County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Supplies/Materials	St. Louis County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
DNR IDP	St. Louis County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Total	-	\$515,100	\$0	-	\$515,100

Budget Name	Partnership	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Cash Leverage	Cash Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	MN Deer Hunters Association	\$150,800	\$0	-	\$150,800
Contracts	MN Deer Hunters Association	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	MN Deer Hunters Association	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	MN Deer Hunters Association	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Easement Acquisition	MN Deer Hunters Association	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Easement Stewardship	MN Deer Hunters Association	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Travel (in-state)	MN Deer Hunters Association	\$5,300	\$3,900	-	\$9,200
Professional Services	MN Deer Hunters Association	\$2,300	\$500	-	\$2,800
Direct Support Services	MN Deer Hunters Association	\$18,000	\$110,100	-	\$128,100
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	MN Deer Hunters Association	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Capital Equipment	MN Deer Hunters Association	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Other Equipment/Tools	MN Deer Hunters Association	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Supplies/Materials	MN Deer Hunters Association	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
DNR IDP	MN Deer Hunters Association	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Total	-	\$176,400	\$114,500	-	\$290,900

#### Personnel - MN Deer Hunters Association

Position	FTE	Over # of years	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Cash Leverage	Cash Leverage Source	Total
Grant Manager - Fiscal Agent	0.90	3.00	\$150,800	\$0	-	\$150,800
Total	2.05	3.00	\$150,800	\$0	-	\$150,800

Budget Name	Partnership	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Cash Leverage	Cash Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	The Nature Conservancy	\$57,600	\$14,400	-	\$72,000
Contracts	The Nature Conservancy	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	The Nature Conservancy	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	The Nature Conservancy	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Easement Acquisition	The Nature Conservancy	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Easement Stewardship	The Nature Conservancy	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Travel (in-state)	The Nature Conservancy	\$5,700	\$0	-	\$5,700
Professional Services	The Nature Conservancy	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Direct Support Services	The Nature Conservancy	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	The Nature Conservancy	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Capital Equipment	The Nature Conservancy	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Other Equipment/Tools	The Nature Conservancy	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Supplies/Materials	The Nature Conservancy	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
DNR IDP	The Nature Conservancy	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Total	-	\$63,300	\$14,400	-	\$77,700

#### Personnel - The Nature Conservancy

Position	FTE	Over # of years	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Cash Leverage	Cash Leverage Source	Total
TNC Forest Manager	0.25	3.00	\$57,600	\$14,400	TNC	\$72,000
Total	2.30	3.00	\$57,600	\$14,400	-	\$72,000

Budget Name	Partnership	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Cash Leverage	Cash Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	Lake County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Contracts	Lake County	\$271,300	\$0	-	\$271,300
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	Lake County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	Lake County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Easement Acquisition	Lake County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Easement Stewardship	Lake County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Travel (in-state)	Lake County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Professional Services	Lake County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Direct Support Services	Lake County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	Lake County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Capital Equipment	Lake County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Other Equipment/Tools	Lake County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Supplies/Materials	Lake County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
DNR IDP	Lake County	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Total	-	\$271,300	\$0	-	\$271,300

Budget Name	Partnership	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Cash Leverage	Cash Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	US Forest Service	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Contracts	US Forest Service	\$917,100	\$170,000	-	\$1,087,100
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	US Forest Service	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	US Forest Service	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Easement Acquisition	US Forest Service	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Easement Stewardship	US Forest Service	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Travel (in-state)	US Forest Service	\$0	\$1,500	-	\$1,500
Professional Services	US Forest Service	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Direct Support Services	US Forest Service	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	US Forest Service	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Capital Equipment	US Forest Service	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Other Equipment/Tools	US Forest Service	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Supplies/Materials	US Forest Service	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
DNR IDP	US Forest Service	\$0	\$0	-	\$0
Total	-	\$917,100	\$171,500	-	\$1,088,600

## Output Tables

Table 1. Acres by Resource Type

Type	Wetlands	Prairies	Forest	Habitats	Total
Restore	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Easement	0	0	0	0	0
Enhance	0	0	4,477	0	4,477
Total	0	0	4,477	0	4,477

Table 2. Total Requested Funding by Resource Type

Type	Wetlands	Prairies	Forest	Habitats	Total
Restore	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Enhance	\$0	\$0	\$2,153,200	\$0	\$2,153,200
Total	\$0	\$0	\$2,153,200	\$0	\$2,153,200

Table 3. Acres within each Ecological Section

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	Northern Forest	Total
Restore	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Easement	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enhance	0	0	0	0	4,477	4,477
Total	0	0	0	0	4,477	4,477

Table 4. Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	Northern Forest	Total
Restore	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Enhance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,153,200	\$2,153,200
Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,153,200	\$2,153,200

Table 5. Target Lake/Stream/River Miles

0 miles



## Parcel List

### Section 1 - Restore / Enhance Parcel List

Cook

Name	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection?
GP - Parcel 1	06305219	160	\$75,000	Yes
GP - Parcel 2	06305230	160	\$75,000	Yes
USFS - Mid-Temperance 002	06004209	29	\$14,707	Yes
USFS - Mid-Temperance 003	06005212	44	\$22,221	Yes
USFS - Mid-Temperance 004	06005214	47	\$23,509	Yes
USFS - Mid-Temperance 005	06005213	25	\$12,604	Yes
USFS - Mid-Temperance 006	06005214	25	\$12,550	Yes
USFS - Mid-Temperance 007	06005214	34	\$17,230	Yes
USFS - Mid-Temperance 008	06005213	27	\$13,663	Yes
USFS - Mid-Temperance 009	06005229	38	\$19,083	Yes
USFS - Mid-Temperance 010	06005232	31	\$15,268	Yes
USFS - Mid-Temperance 011	06005234	133	\$66,306	Yes
USFS - Toohey 001	06105201	18	\$8,112	Yes
USFS - Toohey 002	06105212	37	\$16,408	Yes
USFS - Toohey 003	06104217	32	\$14,166	Yes
USFS - Toohey 005	06104214	18	\$8,020	Yes
USFS - Toohey 006	06104214	41	\$18,261	Yes
USFS - Toohey 010	06105228	17	\$7,764	Yes
USFS - Toohey 013	06105207	55	\$24,730	Yes
USFS - Toohey 015	06105217	251	\$112,013	Yes
USFS - Toohey 016	06105217	90	\$40,285	Yes
USFS - Toohey 017	06105217	42	\$18,803	Yes
USFS - Toohey 018	06105217	20	\$8,758	Yes
USFS - Toohey 020	06105231	44	\$19,732	Yes

USFS - Toohey 021	06105234	17	\$7,594	Yes
USFS - Toohey 022	06005205	19	\$8,407	Yes
USFS - Toohey 025	06005206	64	\$28,733	Yes
USFS - Toohey 026	06005205	22	\$9,981	Yes
USFS - Toohey 028	06005207	11	\$4,801	Yes
USFS - Toohey 029	06005218	41	\$18,399	Yes
USFS - Toohey 031	06005218	12	\$5,219	Yes

Lake

Name	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection?
LC 011	05710216	48	\$6,318	Yes
LC 048	05709206	58	\$31,097	Yes
LC 049	05709221	80	\$42,631	Yes
LC 053	05711204	64	\$33,831	Yes
LC 078	05809228	26	\$2,870	Yes
LC 079	05809233	32	\$3,565	Yes
LC 081	05908201	45	\$4,981	Yes
LC 082	05908202	8	\$874	Yes
LC 083	05910212	14	\$1,551	Yes
LC 084	05910223	11	\$1,198	Yes
LC 085	05910226	8	\$935	Yes
LC 086	06007236	34	\$3,698	Yes
LC 087	06310218	13	\$1,424	Yes
LC 088	06310219	5	\$510	Yes
LC 127	05807204	68	\$7,489	Yes
LC 129	05808212	39	\$4,334	Yes
LC 134	05908215	30	\$3,312	Yes
LC 135	06006230	46	\$5,074	Yes
LC 136	06311222	4	\$394	Yes
LC 138	05807206	45	\$24,112	Yes
LC 139	05807207	103	\$54,780	Yes
LC 141	05807217	33	\$17,468	Yes
LC 142	05811220	35	\$18,875	Yes
USFS - Laurentian brush 6	05709231	92	\$18,458	Yes
USFS - Laurentian brush 7	05809218	78	\$15,663	Yes
USFS - Toohey 004	06006202	83	\$36,843	Yes
USFS - Toohey 007	06106223	39	\$17,467	Yes

USFS - Toohey 008	06106223	48	\$21,260	Yes
USFS - Toohey 011	06006212	76	\$33,794	Yes
USFS - Toohey 012	06006210	36	\$16,039	Yes
USFS - Toohey 014	06106213	48	\$21,498	Yes
USFS - Toohey 019	06106225	27	\$12,162	Yes
USFS - Toohey 023	06006201	53	\$23,502	Yes
USFS - Toohey 024	06006201	95	\$42,459	Yes
USFS - Toohey 027	06006212	11	\$4,845	Yes
USFS - Toohey 030	06006214	31	\$13,996	Yes
USFS - Toohey 032	06007235	16	\$7,123	Yes
USFS - Toohey 033	06007235	22	\$9,900	Yes
USFS - Toohey 034	06007235	20	\$9,098	Yes

St. Louis

Name	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection?
SLC 001	05912230	37	\$15,614	Yes
SLC 004	05912231	50	\$21,100	Yes
SLC 005	05813235	65	\$27,430	Yes
SLC 006	05912231	127	\$53,594	Yes
SLC 007	05813225	31	\$13,082	Yes
SLC 008	05812208	74	\$31,228	Yes
SLC 009	05813224	74	\$31,228	Yes
SLC 012	05912231	43	\$18,146	Yes
SLC 014	05812207	29	\$12,238	Yes
SLC 015	05812207	199	\$83,978	Yes
SLC 016	05812208	45	\$18,990	Yes
SLC 017	05713202	29	\$12,238	Yes
SLC 018	05713202	50	\$21,100	Yes
SLC 020	05713203	11	\$4,642	Yes
SLC 021	05712214	9	\$3,798	Yes
SLC 022	05712228	9	\$3,798	Yes
SLC 023	05712234	70	\$29,540	Yes
SLC 025	05813234	53	\$28,196	Yes
SLC 026	05712218	17	\$9,044	Yes
SLC 027	05712227	114	\$60,648	Yes
SLC 029	05712228	29	\$15,428	Yes
USFS - Laurentian brush 2	05712221	44	\$8,778	Yes

USFS - Laurentian brush 9	05713223	34	\$6,848	Yes
------------------------------	----------	----	---------	-----

## Section 2 - Protect Parcel List

No parcels with an activity type protect.

## Section 2a - Protect Parcel with Bldgs

No parcels with an activity type protect and has buildings.

## Section 3 - Other Parcel Activity

No parcels with an other activity type.