

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Goose Prairie Laws of Minnesota 2017 Final Report

General Information

Date: 07/27/2023

Project Title: Goose Prairie

Funds Recommended: \$600,000

Legislative Citation: ML 2017, Ch. 91, Art. 1, Sec. 2, subd. 5(c)

Appropriation Language: \$600,000 in the first year is to the commissioner of natural resources for an agreement with the Wild Rice Watershed District, in cooperation with the Department of Natural Resources, to enhance aquatic and upland habitat within and adjacent to the Goose prairie Marsh Wildlife Management Area in Clay County. A list of proposed land enhancements must be provided as part of the required accomplishment plan.

Manager Information

Manager's Name: Tara Jensen Title: Administrator Organization: Wild Rice Watershed District Address: 11 5th Ave E City: Ada, MN 56510 Email: tara@wildricewatershed.org Office Number: 218-784-5501 Mobile Number: Fax Number: Website: www.wildricewatershed.org

Location Information

County Location(s): Clay.

Eco regions in which work will take place:

• Prairie

Activity types:

• Enhance

Priority resources addressed by activity:

- Wetlands
- Prairie

• Habitat

Narrative

Summary of Accomplishments

The Goose Prairie Marsh Enhancement Project was completed to allow resource mangers the capacity to manage water levels in Goose Prairie Marsh through installation of a water control structure and a new outlet channel from the marsh to the control structure.

The primary purpose of the project was to improve habitat conditions within the shallow lake and the associated upland habitats within and adjacent to the existing WMA. Secondary benefits included additional protections of lands adjacent to the WMA, improved water quality, and spring flood risk reduction downstream.

Process & Methods

The Goose Prairie Marsh Enhancement project is located approximately 2 miles northeast of Hitterdal, MN in Goose Prairie Township, Clay County. The marsh is part of the Goose Prairie Wildlife Management Area (WMA). Clay County Ditch 18 (CD 18) was constructed through this area in about 1915. As a result, prior the project, water levels in Goose Prairie Marsh could not be managed to improve wildlife habitat using the lake's natural outlet.

Since the early 1990's the lake had been at historically high levels due to above average precipitation and constricted flow through the historic outlet channel due to a buildup of sediment and cattails. These high-water levels resulted in substantially degraded habitat conditions in the marsh.

The Goose Prairie Marsh Enhancement project consisted of three primary components: installation of a water control structure, realignment of the outlet channel from the marsh to the water control structure, and land acquisition adjacent to the existing WMA. Each are described in more detail in the following sections.

1) Water control structure – The water control structure was constructed of reinforced concrete with six, 5-foot stoplog bays to allow water level manipulation between from 1203.6 and 1208.5 feet (NAVD 88). The water control structure is located near the center of Section 22, T141, R44W adjacent to 115th Avenue North. A reinforced concrete outlet pipe was installed to convey water leaving the structure under the road.

2) Realignment of the existing outlet channel - The project constructed a new channel between the Goose Prairie Marsh and the water control structure. The new channel effectively conveys water from the marsh to the new outlet and will avoids future wetland impacts and habitat loss associated with cleaning out the previous channel (CD18).

How did the program address habitats of significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, threatened or endangered species, and/or list targeted species?

The Goose Prairie Marsh is almost entirely contained within Goose Prairie WMA. The WMA is 490 acres and consists of approximately 318 acres of wetlands and 172 acres of upland grassland and forest. Native northern dry prairie has been identified on 23.5 acres of the WMA by MN DNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources.

In addition, the Goose Prairie WMA is part of a large habitat complex in the general area. Within five miles of the Goose Prairie WMA, there are approximately 1,420 acres of WMA, 5,520 acres of WPA, and 120 acres of Reinvest in Minnesota (RIM) easements. This project will protect approximately an additional 270 acres of wetland and upland habitats adjacent to the WMA.

Goose Prairie WMA is rated a moderate biodiversity significance rating by the Minnesota Biological Survey meaning that the site contains occurrences of rare species and/or moderately disturbed native plant communities, and/or landscapes that have a strong potential for recovery.

How did the program use science-based targeting that leveraged or expanded corridors and complexes, reduced fragmentation, or protected areas in the MN County Biological Survey.

Goose Prairie Marsh is a shallow lake which has historically provided quality wildlife habitat. This project will substantially improve habitat conditions within this degraded shallow lake to provide important open water habitats for this area.

According to Breeding Pair Accessibility Maps (Thunderstorm Maps), produced by the USFWS Habitat and Population Evaluation Team (HAPET), 41-50 pairs of upland nesting waterfowl could potentially nest in each 40acre block around Goose Prairie Marsh. The purpose of the Thunderstorm Map is to identify priority sites for land managers to apply treatments such as grassland restorations. Goose Prairie Marsh is within the second highest priority level within the Thunderstorm Map criteria.

Explain Partners, Supporters, & Opposition

In addition to the Wild Rice Watershed District, other funding partners on this project included the Mn Department of Natural Resources and Red River Watershed Management Board. In addition, coordination on the project was provided by the Goose Prairie Township and local landowners

Exceptional challenges, expectations, failures, opportunities, or unique aspects of program

The largest challenge of the project was the coordination and communication of local landowners. Coordination required individual meetings with all adjacent landowners to explain the project intent and expected outcome.

In the end, the project was completed as expected without any significant failures.

The most unique aspect of the project involved the coordination with the Mn Department of Natural Resources to take advantage of the opportunity to construct a project that provided multiple purposes.

What other dedicated funds may collaborate with or contribute to this program?

• N/A

What is the plan to sustain and/or maintain this work after the Outdoor Heritage Funds are expended?

The watershed district in cooperation with the MN DNR will be responsible for long term maintenance of this project. Long term project maintenance will be authorized and funded through established watershed district construction and maintenance funds and DNR wildlife funds based on a joint power's agreement.

Budget

Totals

Item	Requested	AP Amount	Spent	Leverage	Received Leverage	Leverage Source	Original Total	Final Total
Personnel	-	-	-	-	-		-	-
Contracts	\$550,000	\$550,000	\$550,000	\$90,000	\$90,000	Wild Rice Watershed District	\$640,000	\$640,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Travel	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional Services	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$137,000	\$137,000	Wild Rice Watershed District	\$187,000	\$187,000
Direct Support Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supplies/Materials	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$227,000	\$227,000	-	\$827,000	\$827,000

Explain any budget challenges or successes:

No budgetary challenges were incurred. The project was completed within the established budget using available funding.

Total Revenue: \$0

Revenue Spent: \$0

Revenue Balance: \$0

Of the money disclosed above, what are the appropriate uses of the money:

• E. This is not applicable as there was no revenue generated.

Output Tables

Acres by Resource Type (Table 1)

Туре	Wetland (AP)	Wetland (Final)	Prairie (AP)	Prairie (Final)	Forest (AP)	Forest (Final)	Habitat (AP)	Habitat (Final)	Total Acres (AP)	Total Acres (Final)
Restore	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(rmar) 0
Protect in	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fee with										
State										
PILT										
Liability										
Protect in	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fee w/o										
State										
PILT										
Liability										
Protect in	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Easement										
Enhance	318	318	24	24	0	0	148	148	490	490
Total	318	318	24	24	0	0	148	148	490	490

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

Туре	Native Prairie (AP)	Native Prairie (Final)
Restore	0	0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	0
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	0	0
Protect in Easement	0	0
Enhance	24	24
Total	24	24

Total Requested Funding by Resource Type (Table 2)

Туре	Wetland (AP)	Wetland (Final)	Prairie (AP)	Prairie (Final)	Forest (AP)	Forest (Final)	Habitat (AP)	Habitat (Final)	Total Funding (AP)	Total Funding (Final)
Restore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee with										
State										
PILT										
Liability										
Protect in	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee w/o										
State										
PILT										
Liability										
Protect in	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement										
Enhance	\$600,000	\$600,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$600,000	\$600,000
Total	\$600,000	\$600,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$600,000	\$600,000

Acres within each Ecological Section (Table 3)

Туре	Metro / Urban (AP)	Metro / Urban (Final)	Forest / Prairie (AP)	Forest / Prairie (Final)	SE Forest (AP)	SE Forest (Final)	Prairie (AP)	Prairie (Final)	N. Forest (AP)	N. Forest (Final)	Total (AP)	Total (Final)
Restore	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Fee w/o State PILT Liability												
Protect in	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Easement												
Enhance	0	0	0	0	0	0	490	490	0	0	490	490
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	490	490	0	0	490	490

Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section (Table 4)

Туре	Metro/ Urban (AP)	Metro/ Urban (Final)	Forest / Prairie (AP)	Forest / Prairie (Final)	SE Forest (AP)	SE Forest (Final)	Prairie (AP)	Prairie (Final)	N. Forest (AP)	N. Forest (Final)	Total (AP)	Total (Final)
Restore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee with												
State												
PILT												
Liability												
Protect in	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee w/o												
State												
PILT												
Liability												
Protect in	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement												
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$600,000	\$600,000	-	-	\$600,000	\$600,000
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$600,000	\$600,000	-	-	\$600,000	\$600,000

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

Outcomes

Programs in prairie region:

 Protected, restored, and enhanced shallow lakes and wetlands ~ This project will result in improved water level management and habitat conditions throughout the WMA. Success will be measured by achieving desired water levels based on a shallow lake operating plan, improvement in water clarity, composition of the plant community within the marsh, and increased use of the WMA by waterfowl during nesting and migration. Indicator species indicated for restoration, protection, and enhancement of shallow lakes include mallards and trumpeter swans. This WMA contains approx. 318 acres of wetlands which have the potential to support 129 mallards and 2 pairs of trumpeter swans, This project will directly improve the habitat

Parcels

Sign-up Criteria?

No

Restore / Enhance Parcels

Name	County	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection
KJOS TODD M	Clay	1414422	1	\$100,000	Yes
Wild Rice Watershed District	Clay	1414422	10	\$100,000	Yes
GJEVRE JOHN A & MARJORIE A	Clay	1414422	1	\$300,000	Yes

