Request for Funding

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Fiscal Year 2016 / ML 2015

Program or Project Title: Lower Wild Rice River Corridor Habitat Restoration -- Phase 1

Funds Requested: \$6,420,000

Manager's Name: Kevin Ruud Title: Adminstrator Organization: Wild Rice River Watershed District Street Address: 11 East 5th Avenue City: Ada, MN 56510 Telephone: (218)-784-5501 E-Mail: kevin@wildricewatershed.org Organization Web Site: www.wildricewatershed.org

County Locations: Norman

Ecological Planning Regions:

• Prairie

Activity Type:

- Protect in Easement
- Protect in Fee

Priority Resources Addressed by Activity:

- Wetlands
- Forest
- Prairie
- Habitat

Abstract:

This is the first phase of a project to restore 23 channelized river miles to 50 miles of natural stream channel and protect and restore 1,850 acres of floodplain forest, wetland, and grassland habitat along the Wild Rice River.

Design and Scope of Work:

In the past 100 years, many rivers and streams in the Red River Basin were straightened, ditched, cleared, and snagged with a goal of improving drainage. These activities destroyed hundreds of miles of aquatic habitat and eliminated thousands of acres of riparian forest, wetland and grassland habitat. These habitat losses continue today and have directly resulted in reduced fish and wildlife populations within the channelized reaches of river corridors.

The Wild Rice River is a major Red River tributary, with a drainage area encompassing approximately 1,560 square miles. The Red River Drainage Commission channelized the Lower Wild Rice River in the late 1800's with further channel "improvement" completed in the 1950's. These projects converted over 50 miles of natural sinuous channel and floodplain corridor into a 23 mile straightened channel. The channelized reach of the Wild Rice River currently provides little functional aquatic or riparian corridor habitat and reduces connectivity between the lower 49 miles of the river to the upstream 130 miles. Agriculture is the primary land use in this area, with only small remnants of natural habitat remaining.

Restoration of this river corridor is the highest rated project on the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources stream restoration priority list (attached). The Wild Rice Watershed District, in partnership with federal, state, and local agencies has developed a long term plan to restore the Wild Rice River. Acquisition of the corridor is the first

phase on this long-term project, which will restore 50 miles of natural channel and over 6,500 acres of riparian forest, wetland, and prairie habitat. The long-term vision for the project includes establishment of a ½-mile wide protected corridor along the river channel, setting back existing ditch banks from the river channel, reconnecting oxbows and construction of natural river habitat, and restoration of perennial forest, wetland, and prairie plant communities. The stream rehabilitation will be based on the principles of natural channel design with an understanding of the hydrology and fluvial geomorphology at the site. The enhanced stream and associated riparian wetlands will improve habitat for Channel Catfish, Lake Sturgeon, Northern Pike, Smallmouth Bass, Walleye, and the other 50+ fish species documented in the Wild Rice River.

In addition to the fish habitat directly provided in the 50 mile restored stream channel, the associated floodplain forest, wetland, and grassland habitat will provide critical wildlife habitat. The Minnesota Prairie Conservation Plan lists restoration of channelized prairie river segments and cultivation of lands immediately adjacent to streams and ditches as critical challenges. This project addresses both of these concerns. In addition, the upstream portion of the project area lies within the corridor-based conservation area targeted to address connectivity of prairie plants and animals. Currently, 46% of the 6,359 acres within the primary Wild Rice River Corridor is classified as cultivated land (see attached Land Use document). The second most common type of land cover is wooded wetlands; accounting for 35% of the lands within the corridor.

Phase 1 of this project is targeted land acquisition. As part of the long term plan, the river has been divided into Reaches A to F. This funding request will target acquisition to Reach C of the corridor. This reach was selected for Phase 1 due to expressed landowner interest and the high percentage of cultivated land within the reach. Of the 1,425 acres within the primary corridor of this reach, 947 acres (67%) are classified as cultivated crops. The other primary land classifications within this reach are woody wetland (249 acres) and open water (149 acres). While land acquisition will be targeted to Reach C, any other opportunities to acquire and protect lands within the main corridor (A-F) and adjacent lands to the primary corridor in Reach C will also be considered. A total of 1,850 acres of land is targeted for acquisition in this phase of the project (1,425 acres within the primary corridor of Reach C and 425 acres adjacent land and opportunities for acquisition in other reaches).

The Wild Rice River Watershed District will lead this project. Numerous partners will be needed to ensure success. In this land acquisition phase of the project, the local Soil and Water Conservation District and Natural Resources Conservation Service will be critical to success. The largest impediment to acquiring land in this corridor is limiting landowner options for easements. LSOHC funding will strengthen the number of options available for the watershed district to acquire land in this targeted corridor.

In future channel restoration oriented phases of the project, the MNDNR and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will provide technical assistance, funding, and project monitoring to evaluate outcomes. The watershed district will be responsible for final design, engineering, and construction of the project. If funding for this corridor rehabilitation is not secured, the opportunity to rehabilitate this reach of the Wild Rice River Corridor will be lost and it will remain a poor functioning channelized river segment.

How the request addresses MN habitats:

This project is the land acquisition phase of a long term project that will restore 50 miles of river and over 6,500 acres of habitat for associated fish and wildlife communities. The Wild Rice River and associated prairie and forest lowland habitats were identified as key habitats for species of greatest conservation need in the Red River Prairie ecoregion. Key among aquatic species is the Lake Sturgeon, a species of special concern. The Wild Rice River provides sturgeon habitat and restoration of the river will help ensure successful reestablishment of sturgeon populations in the Red River basin. This project will also likely benefit mussel and insect populations in the Wild Rice River. Two species of mussels, black sandshell and fluted-shell are listed as species of special concern are known to be present in the upstream reaches of the Wild Rice River. Two species of caddisfly present in the Wild Rice River are also listed as species of special concern. Acquisition and restoration of the stream and associated riparian wetlands will also improve habitat for Channel Catfish, Northern Pike, Smallmouth Bass, Walleye, and more than 50 other fish species present in other reaches of the Wild Rice River.

Please explain the nature of urgency:

Land acquisition is the critical first step in the restoration of over 6,500 acres of riparian habitat and converting 23 miles of ditch to over 50 miles of river channel. Once land acquisition is complete, Army Corps of Engineers will likely contribute much of the channel restoration implementation.

Planning

MN State-wide Conservation Plan Priorities:

- H2 Protect critical shoreland of streams and lakes
- H6 Protect and restore critical in-water habitat of lakes and streams

Plans Addressed:

- Minnesota Prairie Conservation Plan
- Tomorrow's Habitat for the Wild and Rare

Please describe the science based planning and evaluation model used:

The restoration of the Lower Wild Rice River corridor is the highest priority project on the state river restoration priority list. The Minnesota Prairie Plan also lists restoration of channelized prairie river segments and cultivation of lands immediately adjacent to streams and ditches as critical challenges.

LSOHC Prairie Section Priorities:

• Protect, enhance, or restore existing wetland/upland complexes, or convert agricultural lands to new wetland/upland habitat complexes

Accelerates or Supplements Current Efforts:

The Watershed District has a long interest in restoration of the Wild Rice River Corridor. This project was initiated in the 1990's and a Feasibility Study was completed by the Corps of Engineers in 2005. Lack of funding has stalled implementation of this plan. Funding through the LSOHC is critical to accelerating and completing the land acquisition phase of this project. Securing funds now will allow the watershed district and partners to create a package of acquisition options for landowners to choose from and will ensure leveraging of available federal conservation program funds. If this LSOHC funding is not secured, the watershed district will continue to work on the project in small scale pieces as opportunities and funding become available.

Non-OHF Money Spent in the Past:

Appropriation Year	Source	Amount
Multiple Years	Wild Rice Watershed District	1,270,000
Multiple Years	US Army Corps of Engineers	1,270,000

Sustainability and Maintenance:

The Wild Rice River Watershed District will be responsible for all maintenance of this project. Sustainability and maintenance of this channel restoration is required within watershed district law (Minnesota Statutes 103D). Long term project maintenance is authorized and funded through established watershed district construction and maintenance funds. This project is designed to mimic natural, stable stream channels and should require less maintenance than the current channelized stream segment.

The watershed district is leading the land acquisition, project development, and engineering of this project with full cooperation of a watershed-based team composed of landowners and representatives of local, state, and federal agencies.

Maintain	Dro	loct	Outcomoci
Maiilaiii	FIU	CLL	Outcomes.

Year	Source of Funds	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Annual	Watershed District	Monitoring and Maintenance of Channel Restoration		
Annual	Watershed District	Monitoring and Maintenance of Restoration in Acquired Lands		

Applicable Criteria:

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

Government Approval:

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

Permanent Protection:

Is the land you plan to acquire free of any other permanent protection? - Yes

Current Hunting and Fishing Plan:

Is this land currently open for hunting and fishing? - No

Future Hunting and Fishing Plan:

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

All waters will be open for fishing. Any land purchased in fee will be open to hunting. Land with easement acquisitions will likely remain closed to hunting.

Public Use:

Will the eased land be open for public use? - No

Permanent Protection:

Is the land you plan to acquire free of any other permanent protection? - Yes

Accomplishment Timeline

Activity	Approximate Date Completed
Finalize Acquisition and Marketing Plan with Partners	September, 2015
Contact Landowners in Corridor	January, 2016
Land Acquisition	June, 2018

Outcomes

Programs in prairie region:

• Key core parcels are protected for fish, game and other wildlife *This funding request will target acquisition* to Reach *C* of the corridor. This reach was selected for this part of Phase 1 due to expressed landowner interest and the high percentage of cultivated land within the reach. Of the 3,235 acres within this reach, 2,647 acres (82%) are classified as cultivated crops. The other primary land classifications within this reach are woody wetland (275 acres) and open water (154 acres). While land acquisition will be targeted to Reach *C*, any other opportunities to acquire and protect lands within the main corridor (A-F) will also be considered.

Relationship to Other Funds:

• No Relationships Listed

Budget Spreadsheet

Total Amount of Request: \$6,420,000

Budget and Cash Leverage

Budget Name	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	\$0	\$0		\$0
Contracts	\$834,600	\$556,400	NRCS	\$1,391,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	\$3,043,100	\$2,028,700	NRCS	\$5,071,800
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	\$0	\$0		\$0
Easement Acquisition	\$2,028,700	\$1,352,500	NRCS	\$3,381,200
Easement Stewardship	\$0	\$0		\$0
Travel	\$0	\$0		\$0
Professional Services	\$513,600	\$342,400	NRCS	\$856,000
Direct Support Services	\$0	\$0		\$0
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	\$6,420,000	\$4,280,000	-	\$10,700,000

Amount of Request:	\$6,420,000
Amount of Leverage:	\$4,280,000
Leverage as a percent of the Request:	66.67%

Output Tables

Table 1a. Acres by Resource Type

Туре	Wetlands	Prairies	Forest	Habitats	Total
Restore	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	195	738	32	145	1,110
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Easement	130	492	22	96	740
Enhance	0	0	0	0	0
Total	325	1,230	54	241	1,850

Table 1b. How many of these Prairie acres are Native Prairie?

Туре	Native Prairie
Restore	0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	0
Protect in Easement	0
Enhance	0
Total	0

Table 2. Total Requested Funding by Resource Type

Туре	Wetlands	Prairies	Forest	Habitats	Total
Restore	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	\$675,000	\$2,559,000	\$113,000	\$505,000	\$3,852,000
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Easement	\$450,000	\$1,707,000	\$75,000	\$336,000	\$2,568,000
Enhance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$1,125,000	\$4,266,000	\$188,000	\$841,000	\$6,420,000

Table 3. Acres within each Ecological Section

Туре	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	1,110	0	1,110
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Easement	0	0	0	740	0	740
Enhance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	1,850	0	1,850

Table 4. Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section

Туре	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	\$3,852,000	\$0	\$3,852,000
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,568,000	\$0	\$2,568,000
Enhance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,420,000	\$0	\$6,420,000

Table 5. Average Cost per Acre by Resource Type

Туре	Wetlands	Prairies	Forest	Habitats
Restore	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	\$3,462	\$3,467	\$3,531	\$3,483
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Easement	\$3,462	\$3,470	\$3,409	\$3,500
Enhance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Table 6. Average Cost per Acre by Ecological Section

Туре	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	Northern Forest
Restore	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,470	\$0
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,470	\$0
Enhance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

23

Parcel List

Section 1 - Restore / Enhance Parcel List

No parcels with an activity type restore or enhance.

Section 2 - Protect Parcel List

Ν	l	0	r	r	r	۱	а	r	١

Name	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection?	Hunting?	Fishing?
ADA ELEVATOR CO - PRIMARY	14347203	46	\$212,400	No	Limite d	Full
ADA ELEVATOR CO- PRIMARY	14447235	117	\$625,800	No	Limite d	Full
ADA ELEVATOR CO- PRIMARY	14447234	75	\$392,300	No	Limite d	Full
BORGEN/CHARLES A/JR- PRIMARY	14447226	7	\$37,200	No	Limite d	Full
HANSON/CLIFFORD/INC PRIMARY	14347203	51	\$299,000	No	Limite d	Full
HEITMAN/DWIGHT A & MARY L- PRIMARY	14447225	3	\$2,900	No	Limite d	Full
HEITMAN/DWIGHT A & MARY L- PRIMARY	14447225	4	\$10,100	No	Limite d	Full
HEITMAN/DWIGHT A & MARY L- PRIMARY	14447225	12	\$60,400	No	Limited	Full
HEITMAN/DWIGHT A & MARY L- PRIMARY	14447225	56	\$268,000	No	Limited	Full
HEITMAN/DWIGHT A & MARY L- PRIMARY	14446230	28	\$54,100	No	Limited	Full
HEITMAN/HOWARD & DELORES- PRIMARY	14447225	7	\$25,200	No	Limite d	Full
HEITMAN/HOWARD & DELORES- PRIMARY	14447225	33	\$194,500	No	Limite d	Full
HEITMAN/HOWARD & DELORES- PRIMARY	14447236	63	\$372,600	No	Limite d	Full
LEE/MARGARET A/TRUST- PRIMARY	14347204	90	\$597,600	No	Limite d	Full
LEE/WARREN & SHARON- PRIMARY	14447225	33	\$219,400	No	Limited	Full
LEE/WARREN & SHARON- PRIMARY	14347203	6	\$32,000	No	Limite d	Full
LEE/WARREN & SHARON- PRIMARY	14447236	7	\$22,400	No	Limited	Full
LEE/WAYNE & LYNN- PRIMARY	14347203	64	\$359,900	No	Limite d	Full
LEE/WAYNE & LYNN- PRIMARY	14347203	45	\$212,000	No	Limite d	Full
LEE/WILLIAM R/TRUST- PRIMARY	14347203	31	\$131,400	No	Limite d	Full
NELSON/DAVID ARTHUR - PRIMARY	14447236	24	\$163,800	No	Limite d	Full
NELSON/DAVID ARTHUR- PRIMARY	14446231	46	\$208,400	No	Limite d	Full
NELSON/DAVID ARTHUR- PRIMARY	14447225	30	\$152,100	No	Limite d	Full
NELSON/DAVID ARTHUR- PRIMARY	14446230	35	\$90,700	No	Limite d	Full
PAXTON/ARLO D- PRIMARY	14447235	51	\$349,300	No	Limited	Full
PLATT/ROBERT E - PRIMARY	14447225	42	\$49,600	No	Limited	Full
PLATT/ROBERT E- PRIMARY	14447225	3	\$21,300	No	Limited	Full
PLATT/ROBERT E-	14447225	10	¢45 100	No	Limited	E

PRIMARY	14447223	10	\$43,100		LITTILE U	ruii
THIEL/WALTER A/JR ET AL- PRIMARY	14347203	9	\$24,400	No	Limited	Full
TOMMERDAHL/WILLIAM D- PRIMARY	14447235	31	\$148,300	No	Limited	Full
TOMMERDAHL/WILLIAM D- PRIMARY	14447235	31	\$158,400	No	Limite d	Full
TUFTE/BRUCE, BLAIR & BRENT- PRIMARY	14347202	33	\$89,500	No	Limite d	Full
TUFTE/BRUCE, BLAIR & BRENT- PRIMARY	14347203	59	\$185,700	No	Limite d	Full
VIK/EUGENE G - PRIMARY	14447236	83	\$482,300	No	Limite d	Full
VIK/EUGENE G- PRIMARY	14447235	126	\$691,300	No	Limite d	Full

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.



Prioritized Stream Restoration Projects Scoring Worksheet

Please use this sheet in conjunction with the Stream Restoration Prioritization Criteria. Select a score from the Stream Restoration Prioritization Criteria and give a justification. The Stream Habitat Program will determine final scores. Criterion without written justification will be scored with the lowest possible score for that criterion. Concise answers are appreciated.

Stream Name: Wild Rice River
Proposer: Jamison Wendel, Red River Fisheries Specialist Contact Information: 218-846-8350
Location (county, nearest town, twp/range/section, UTM coordinates, etc.): County: Norman Nearest Town: Ada, MN *Note: Please include an aerial photo of the project area whenever possible.
Estimated cost: Total – Requested amount -
Priority within your region (1 being the highest priority):
1) Restoration Project Score: 10 Project Type (channel restoration, dam removal, dam modification, fish passage or other):
Channel Restoration Insert Conceptual Design and Sketch:
Channel Restoration: Channel width (ft) Project length (ft) Cross sectional area Dam Projects: Dam height Dam width Scour depth
Justification (What problems are being addressed?):

This project would restore approximately 23 miles of channelized river. Lack of habitat complexity and high sediment loads characterize this straightened reach of river. Several feet of aggradation has occurred in the river below the channelized section. Active headcutting is occurring upstream of the channelized section.

The project would establish an approximately ¹/₂-mile wide corridor around the Wild Rice River channel. Existing levees would be setback ¹/₄-mile from the Wild Rice River channel, near the boundary of the corridor. Selected oxbows within the corridor would be reconnected to restore natural river habitat, increase sinuosity, and stabilize slopes. Plugs will be placed in the channelized river to direct flows into the restored channel. Areas adjacent to the river will be restored or configured to provide natural riparian habitat.

2) Resource potential Score: 10

Justification (e.g., What are the ecological benefits of this project? What is the potential for stream improvement?):

The restored natural channels and protected corridors will provide high quality aquatic, riparian, and upland habitats for fish and wildlife species. Improved lateral connectivity will occur by moving levees further away from the river channel. Restored river channels will increase sinuosity and decrease sedimentation. Also, improved riparian buffers will decrease nutrient input. The restored river channel will improve stability and alleviate longitudinal aggradation and degradation. Also, protecting the stream corridor through purchase or easement will enable natural channel migration.

3) Scale of impact Score: 10

Justification (e.g., What is the scale of the project and are there impacts beyond the immediate project area?)

Channel restoration will occur along an approximately 23 mile segment of river. This restoration will alleviate many of the latitudinal and longitudinal impacts created by the channelized, leveed river channel. Reconnecting the floodplain will also benefit adjacent prairie and wetlands.

4) Critical habitat Score: 8

Justification (e.g., What species will benefit? Are there any rare, declining, state or federally listed species that will benefit? Is the habitat reconnected or restored?):

This project will restore critical habitat for Lake Sturgeon, a species of special concern present in the Wild Rice River. The enhanced stream and associated riparian wetlands will also improve habitat for Channel Catfish, Northern Pike, Smallmouth Bass, Walleye, and the other 50+ fish species documented in the Wild Rice River.

5) AIS: 10

There is no existing barrier within the project site. By increasing habitat complexity, this project will strengthen populations of existing native species in the Wild Rice River. Also, this project will reduce or eliminate the simplified habitat created by this channelized river segment that favors invasive species.

6) Community support/acceptance Score: 5

Justification (e.g., Who in the community has expressed support and to what degree? Is there any significant opposition?):

The Wild Rice River Watershed District has been actively involved in this restoration project. The Army Corps of Engineers has also been involved in initial planning of the project.

7) Timing Score: 5

Justification (e.g., How does timing play into the success of this project?): This is the first phase of a multi-year project. Once land acquisition or flowage easements have been secured, it is likely that Army Corps of Engineers will be able to contribute much of the channel restoration engineering and implementation. However, the longer it takes to complete the first phase of this project, the less likely it becomes that funding from the Army Corps of Engineers would still be available. Also, the Wild Rice River Watershed District currently is committed to this project.

8) Technical feasibility Score: 4

Justification (e.g., What are the technical and logistical problems?): Many similar stream restorations have been successfully completed. However, any restoration project of this scale will inevitably encounter many minor logistical issues.

9) Compatibility with other resource initiatives Score: 3

Justification (e.g., How does this project fit in with what others are doing? Are there any partnership opportunities?)

In addition to restoring natural stream processes, this project will also increase the amount of riparian habitat within the corridor. There may also be opportunities for prairie restoration. As this project progresses, development of parks, trails, and canoe access may be possible. This project would also reduce flood damage impacts, a high priority within the Red River Basin.

10) Professional Judgment Score: 4

Justification (e.g., What are the unique qualities of this project that are not addressed by the other Stream Restoration Criteria?)

This project would be a high profile example of a large scale stream restoration in the Red River Basin. Positive progress on this project may stimulate further stream restoration efforts in the basin.

Will the project be funded by multiple sources? YES

If so, which agency/source will contribute? Wild Rice River Watershed District, Army Corps of Engineers

Does the project meet the requirements for Lessard Sams Outdoor Heritage Council funding? YES

Additional Comments:



Example of channelized river segment in upper end of project area.



*Note: If photos of project area exist please insert here.

Reach	Acres in Priority			Acres in Expanded		Total
A	1,196.29	-0.06		1,728.28	0.00	2,924.51
	11 Open Water	218.25	11	Open Water	36.22	
	21 Developed, Open Space	38.33	21	Developed, Open Space	99.92	
	22 Developed, Low Intensity	0.80	22	Developed, Low Intensity	0.00	
	31 Barren Land (Rock / Sand / Clay)	0.00	31	Barren Land (Rock / Sand / Clay)	0.00	
	41 Deciduous Forest	3.11	41	Deciduous Forest	2.67	
	42 Evergreen Forest	0.00	42	Evergreen Forest	0.00	
	81 Pasture / Hay	0.00	81	Pasture / Hav	0.00	
	82 Cultivated Crops	556.43	82	Cultivated Crops	1.570.12	
	90 Woody Wetlands	372.20	90	Woody Wetlands	19.36	
	95 Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands	7 12	95	Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands	0.00	
в	1 402 23	0.00		1 491 18	0.00	2,893,41
D	11 Open Water	230.20	11	Open Water	6.78	2,033.41
	21 Developed Open Space	44.36	21	Developed Open Space	69.28	
	22 Developed, Open Space	1 /3	22	Developed, Open Space	1 11	
	31 Barren Land (Bock / Sand / Clay)	0.00	22	Barren Land (Bock / Sand / Clav)	0.00	
	41 Deciduous Forest	5.60	41	Desiduous Forest	2 21	
	41 Decidious Forest	3.09	41	Evergreen Forest	2.31	
	42 Evergreen Forest	2.22	42	Evergreen Forest	0.00	
	81 Pasture / Hay	0.00	81	Pasture / Hay	0.00	
	82 Cultivated Crops	749.02	82		1,403.41	
	90 woody wetlands	369.30	90	woody wetlands	8.30	
c	95 Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands	0.00	95	Emergent Herbaceous wetlands	0.00	2 224 00
L	1,425.45	-0.55		1,810.00	0.01	3,234.90
	11 Open Water	149.48	11	Open Water	4.79	
	21 Developed, Open Space	34.11	21	Developed, Open Space	69.05	
	22 Developed, Low Intensity	0.00	22	Developed, Low Intensity	1.56	
	31 Barren Land (Rock / Sand / Clay)	3.11	31	Barren Land (Rock / Sand / Clay)	0.00	
	41 Deciduous Forest	37.02	41	Deciduous Forest	8.57	
	42 Evergreen Forest	4.70	42	Evergreen Forest	0.20	
	81 Pasture / Hay	0.00	81	Pasture / Hay	0.00	
	82 Cultivated Crops	946.65	82	Cultivated Crops	1,700.17	
	90 Woody Wetlands	248.73	90	Woody Wetlands	25.68	
	95 Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands	1.11	95	Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands	0.00	
D	781.92	0.00		944.78	0.00	1,726.70
	11 Open Water	87.52	11	Open Water	27.94	
	21 Developed, Open Space	30.05	21	Developed, Open Space	70.52	
	22 Developed, Low Intensity	0.16	22	Developed, Low Intensity	1.74	
	31 Barren Land (Rock / Sand / Clay)	0.00	31	Barren Land (Rock / Sand / Clay)	0.00	
	41 Deciduous Forest	27.28	41	Deciduous Forest	9.14	
	42 Evergreen Forest	1.11	42	Evergreen Forest	0.00	
	81 Pasture / Hay	0.00	81	Pasture / Hay	0.00	
	82 Cultivated Crops	231.88	82	Cultivated Crops	780.29	
	90 Woody Wetlands	402.72	90	Woody Wetlands	53.90	
	95 Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands	1.21	95	Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands	1.24	
E	886.96	0.00		1,652.29	0.00	2,539.25
	11 Open Water	109.89	11	Open Water	13.97	
	21 Developed, Open Space	10.56	21	Developed, Open Space	37.64	
	22 Developed, Low Intensity	6.26	22	Developed, Low Intensity	6.98	
	31 Barren Land (Rock / Sand / Clay)	1.11	31	Barren Land (Rock / Sand / Clay)	0.00	
	41 Deciduous Forest	11.48	41	Deciduous Forest	10.97	
	42 Evergreen Forest	0.00	42	Evergreen Forest	2.19	
	81 Pasture / Hay	0.00	81	Pasture / Hay	0.00	
	82 Cultivated Crops	343.93	82	Cultivated Crops	1.507.14	
	90 Woody Wetlands	403.73	90	Woody Wetlands	73.41	
	95 Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands	0.00	95	Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands	0.00	
F	665.73	-1.12	55	833.79	0.00	1.498.40
	11 Open Water	121.77	11	Open Water	0.19	,
	21 Developed, Open Space	6.23	21	Developed. Open Space	46.63	
	22 Developed, Low Intensity	0.00	22	Developed, Low Intensity	1 17	
	31 Barren Land (Rock / Sand / Clav)	0.00	21	Barren Land (Bock / Sand / Clav)	0.00	
	41 Deciduous Forest	20.27	/1	Deciduous Forest	Q E /	
	A2 Evergreen Forest	20.37	/∩ //⊃	Evergreen Forest	0.54	
	81 Pacture / Hay	2.02	42 01	Dacture / Hav	10.07	
	82 Cultivated Crops	3.30 101 10	01 01		19.48	
	90. Woody Wetlands	101.10	02	Woody Wetlands	723.70 57 FT	
	95 Emergent Herbaceous Watlands	400.74	90	Emergent Herbaceous Watlands	32.0/	
Total		0.00	30		1.33	14 817 19
	11 Open Water	917 11	11	Open Water	29 29	,317.10
	21 Developed Open Space	163.64	21	Developed Open Space	203 UN	
	22 Developed, open space	0 61	21	Developed, Open Space	10 55	
	31 Barren Land (Rock / Sand / Claw)	0.04 1 72	22	Barren Land (Rock / Sand / Clay)	12.35	
	41 Deciduous Forest	4.20	11	Darien Lanu (NOCK / Sanu / Cidy)	0.00	
	42 Evergroop Forest	10.95	41	Evergroon Forest	42.20	
	42 LVEIGIEEII FUIESL 91 Dasturo / Hav	2 50	42	Lvergreen Forest Dacture / Hay	2.46	
	OI PASLUTE / Hay	3.50	81	rasiure / Hay	19.48	
	oz cultivated crops	2,929.07	82		7,684.83	
		2,205.42	90	woody wetlands	213.31	
	95 Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands	9.43	95	Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands	2.57	





Wild Rice River straightened channel and remnant channel oxbows.

0.375

1.5 Miles

Wild Rice River Corridor Restoration Overview







Red River Watershed Management Board

June 04, 2014

Board of Managers Wild Rice Watershed District 11 5th Ave. E Ada, MN 56510

RE: Support for Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council "Lower Wild Rice River Project Stream Restoration Project"

Dear Board of Managers:

Please accept this letter acknowledging the Red River Watershed Management Board's (RRWMB's) support for the Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council "Lower Wild Rice River Project Stream Restoration Project" as proposed by Kevin Ruud, Administrator - Wild Rice Watershed District.

We anticipate that this project will help our board in its mission to institute, coordinate and finance projects and programs to alleviate flooding and assure the beneficial use of water in the watershed of the Red River and its tributaries. As a member of the Red River Basin Flood Damage Reduction Work Group, the RRWMB has significant interest in supporting projects that seek to achieve the flood damage reduction and natural resource enhancement goals included in the 1998 Mediation Agreement. The stream restoration component of this project is consistent with the objective of the Work Group to incorporate natural resource enhancements within flood damage reduction projects.

The RRWMB offers our support for this proposal in order to advance our efforts to utilize comprehensive approaches for flood damage reduction and natural resource enhancements in the Red River Basin.

Naomi Ericpson

Naomi L. Erickson Administrator



1120 28th Ave N - Suite B - West, Fargo, ND 58102 - Phone: 701-356-6644

June 4, 2014

Board of Managers Wild Rice Watershed District 11 5th Ave. E Ada, MN 56510

RE: Lower Wild Rice River Project – Stream Restoration – Support

Dear Watershed Board,

The Red River Retention Authority and its members, we would like to offer our support for this stream restoration project to enhance wildlife habitat and improve water quality. This project as planned will be win for all; – people – plants – animals and all other creatures.

It is wonderful when we can marry significant environmental improvements with returning a stream to its more natural state and its natural floodplain. Funding for such projects is difficult to obtain. It is even more difficult from the local financing level to add these type of habitat and wildlife improvements as well. The Outdoor Heritage Council funding will be essential to restore the meandering stream features and habitat corridor in the plan.

We certainly hope the Outdoor Heritage Council Board can see the merits and fund your project request. We fully support your application for Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council funding. We believe the citizens of Minnesota, when they voted for this funding mechanism would concur this project would be a worthy investment of these funds and the project is of the type they envisioned for the use of these funds.

If we can offer additional assistance or support, please let us know.

Pat Downs, Executive Director Red River Retention Authority

June 5, 2014

Board of Mangers Wild Rice Watersehd District 11 5th Avenue East Ada, MN 56510

Dear Watersehd Board:

Subject: Lower Wild Rice River Corridor Restoration Project Letter of Support

The USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service appreciates the continued efforts of the Wild Rice River Watersehd District to address water resources and other related natural resources along the Wild Rice River in Norman County. With the new Farm Bill, and specifically the Regional Conservation Partnership Program, the NRCS looks forward to working with the Watersehd District in improving water quality, reducing the impacts of annual flooding, and enhancing riparian health and wildlife habitat.

Through sound resource planning, this project provides for many opportunites, not withstanding the rivers ability to better access its floodplain and improve the quality of life of those who live and farm next to it. Returning the river to a more natural state will provide for countless environmental benefits to aquatic life and improved water quality downstream.

The NRCS looks forward to discussions with your Board and the other partnering agencies and groups on how to implement your restoration project. The NRCS supports your application to the Outdoor Heritage Coucil for Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage funds. The Council's funding will be an essential component to restoring the river and improving the riparian corridor.

DON A. BALOUN State Conservationist



June 11, 2014

Board of Managers Wild Rice Watershed District 11 5th Avenue East Ada, MN 56510

Dear Board of Managers;

Please accept this letter of support for the Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council "Lower Wild Rice River Stream Restoration Project" as proposed by Kevin Ruud, Administrator – Wild Rice Watershed District

As an organization with the mission "to promote sportsmanship, conservation & education with respect to walleye fishing", FM Walleyes Unlimited, Inc. sees the benefit of habitat restoration in supporting healthy populations of all fish species. We therefore, wish to offer our support for this proposal and the work outlined within to restore sections of the Wild Rice River in Western Minnesota to natural habitat, benefiting the entire Red River Basin.

Kyle Cyce

Kyle Agre, Vice President Representing, FM Walleyes Unlimited, Inc. P.O. Box 1077 Moorhead, MN 56560