

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Laws of Minnesota 2014 Final Report



Date: November 06, 2019

Program or Project Title: Prairie and Oak Savanna Restoration along Mississippi and Rum Rivers

Funds Recommended: \$380,000

Manager's Name: Glenn Fuchs
Organization: Anoka County
Address: 550 Bunker Lake Blvd. NW
City: Andover, MN 55304
Office Number: 763-324-3413
Mobile Number: 763-568-3054
Fax Number: 763-755-1750
Email: glenn.fuchs@co.anoka.mn.us
Website: www.anokacountyparks.com

Legislative Citation: ML 2014, Ch. 256, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 2(k)

Appropriation Language: \$380,000 in the second year is to the commissioner of natural resources for an agreement with Anoka County to restore and enhance riparian and upland habitat in the Rum River Central Regional Park/Cedar Creek Conservation Area complex and in the Mississippi West Regional Park. A restoration and enhancement plan and a list of proposed land restorations and enhancements must be provided as part of the required accomplishment plan.

County Locations: Anoka

Eco regions in which work was completed:

- Metro / Urban

Activity types:

- Restore
- Enhance

Priority resources addressed by activity:

- Forest
- Prairie

Summary of Accomplishments:

This project restored and enhanced 165 acres of prairie & woodland habitat along the Mississippi and Rum Rivers. Outcomes include increased plant diversity and habitat for game and non-game species and is beneficial to migratory waterfowl on the Mississippi River flyway as well as to pollinators and resident wildlife.

Process & Methods:

This project restored and enhanced 120 acres of native short dry and mixed height mesic prairie habitat and enhanced riparian woodland along the Mississippi River. In addition, this project continues a program of wildlife habitat restoration in the 984 acre "Rum River Central Regional Park/Cedar Creek Conservation Area complex." The scope of work restored 45 acres of prairie and oak savanna. The process of restoration included prescribed burning, herbicide application, removal of invasive species and woody vegetation, seeding of native ecotype short dry prairie grasses and forbs, maintenance mowing, and planting of native trees and shrubs. This restoration along the Mississippi and Rum Rivers is consistent with the Minnesota Statewide Conservation and Preservation Plan to protect critical shorelands of streams and lakes, and protect priority land habitats of native prairie, as well as, Mississippi West Regional

Park Master Plan, the 2030 Regional Parks Policy Plan, Tomorrow's Habitat for the Wild and Rare, and the statewide management plans for duck recovery, pheasants, and turkeys. Former brome dominated parcels were converted to a mix of native short/dry grass and forbs species which mimics local remnant prairies. A planted stand of red pines were removed and their stumps ground out to accommodate conversion to prairie and increase the amount of a habitat that was once prevalent in this area. The weather played a role in our spring management efforts as we couldn't get the needed wind direction to burn the parcels along Highway 10. We instead opted to mow the parcels. Canada thistle and hoary alyssum were two of our biggest weed problems and the tenacity of the brome to hold on in places also challenged us. We used a mix of herbicide applications, mowing and supplemental seeding to address these problems.

Explain Partners, Supporters, & Opposition:

We have enjoyed some volunteer invasive species control courtesy of the Anoka Conservation District and also by the Mississippi Park Connection. Both groups brought in volunteers to work on Canada Thistle and Spotted knapweed control.

Additional Comments:

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

We had an almost 100% failure of one species of tree (Bur Oak) in the riparian restoration. But fortunately it was covered by the contractor's warranty so they were replaced at no additional cost. The reason for the failure of these trees isn't known for sure but could be due to its response to the sweating process. It's not likely that moisture was a factor as the other species planted among the oaks had good survival. Since Bur oaks are native and historically hardy in this area they should have been a good choice for the area. The replacement oaks have proven to be healthy and vigorous so far.

Other Funds Received:

- Not Listed

How were the funds used to advanced the program:

Not Listed

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

Maintenance will include the control of invasive species as they present themselves, along with a regiment of prescribed burns and/mowing in the prairie/savanna areas to manage woody species encroachment. In the riparian areas additional trees will be added as resources allow to promote diversity in an effort to offset the impact of future disease and pest agents. The tree planting will also be used to replace the existing ash trees that will be lost due to the Emerald Ash Borer.

Outcomes:

The original accomplishment plan stated the program would

Programs in metropolitan urbanizing region:

- Core areas protected with highly biologically diverse wetlands and plant communities, including native prairie, Big Woods, and oak savanna

How will the outcomes be measured and evaluated?

Outcomes are measured in the number of acres converted to higher quality prairie, savanna and riparian forests within the metro urban area. These habitats are dwindling in this area and maintenance of them will provide valuable wildlife habitat for both home ranges and for stops during migration. These areas also expand corridors and create larger blocks of habitat in a much fragmented area.

Budget Spreadsheet

Final Budget line item reallocations are allowed up to 10% and do not need require an amendment to the Accomplishment Plan

Total Amount: \$380,000

Budget and Cash Leverage

BudgetName	Request	Spent	Cash Leverage (anticipated)	Cash Leverage (received)	Leverage Source	Total (original)	Total (final)
Personnel	\$0	\$0	\$24,500	\$24,500	Anoka County, Anoka County	\$24,500	\$24,500
Contracts	\$160,000	\$160,600	\$16,500	\$30,200	Anoka County Equipment use	\$176,500	\$190,800
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0
Easement Acquisition	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0
Easement Stewardship	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0
Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0
Professional Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0
Direct Support Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0
Capital Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0
Other Equipment/Tools	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0
Supplies/Materials	\$220,000	\$165,600	\$0	\$0		\$220,000	\$165,600
DNR IDP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0
Total	\$380,000	\$326,200	\$41,000	\$54,700		\$421,000	\$380,900

Personnel

Position	FTE	Over # of years	Spent	Cash Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Natural Resource Technician	2.00	3.00	\$0	\$15,000	Anoka County	\$15,000
Seasonal Resource Technician	4.00	3.00	\$0	\$9,500	Anoka County	\$9,500
Total	6.00	6.00	\$0	\$24,500		\$24,500

Explain any budget challenges or successes:

Not Listed

All revenues received by the recipient that have been generated from activities on land with money from the OHF:

Total Revenue: \$0

Revenue Spent: \$0

Revenue Balance: \$0

Output Tables

Table 1a. Acres by Resource Type

Type	Wetlands (original)	Wetlands (final)	Prairies (original)	Prairies (final)	Forest (original)	Forest (final)	Habitats (original)	Habitats (final)	Total (original)	Total (final)
Restore	0	0	95	95	0	0	0	0	95	95
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Easement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enhance	0	0	45	45	25	25	0	0	70	70
Total	0	0	140	140	25	25	0	0	165	165

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

Type	Native Prairie (original)	Native Prairie (final)
Restore	0	50
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	0	45
Total	0	0

Table 2. Total Funding by Resource Type

Type	Wetlands (original)	Wetlands (final)	Prairies (original)	Prairies (final)	Forest (original)	Forest (final)	Habitats (original)	Habitats (final)	Total (original)	Total (final)
Restore	\$0	\$0	\$280,000	\$193,600	\$0	\$65,900	\$0	\$0	\$280,000	\$259,500
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Enhance	\$0	\$0	\$60,000	\$66,700	\$40,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$66,700
Total	\$0	\$0	\$340,000	\$260,300	\$40,000	\$65,900	\$0	\$0	\$380,000	\$326,200

Table 3. Acres within each Ecological Section

Type	Metro Urban (original)	Metro Urban (final)	ForestPrairie (original)	Forest Prairie (final)	SEForest (original)	SE Forest (final)	Prairie (original)	Prairie (final)	N Forest (original)	N Forest (final)	Total (original)	Total (final)
Restore	95	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	95
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Easement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enhance	70	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	70
Total	165	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165	165

Table 4. Total Funding within each Ecological Section

Type	Metro Urban (original)	Metro Urban (final)	ForestPrairie (original)	Forest Prairie (final)	SE Forest (original)	SE Forest (final)	Prairie (original)	Prairie (final)	N Forest (original)	N Forest (final)	Total (original)	Total (final)
Restore	\$280,000	\$259,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$280,000	\$259,500
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Fee W/O State PILT Liability	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Protect in Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Enhance	\$100,000	\$66,700	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$66,700
Total	\$380,000	\$326,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$380,000	\$326,200

Automatic system calculation / not entered by managers

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles (original)

0

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles (final)

0

Explain the success/shortage of acre goals:

Not Listed

Parcel List

Section 1 - Restore / Enhance Parcel List

Anoka

Name	TRDS	Acres	Total Cost	Existing Protection?	Description
Mississippi West RP	03225228	90	\$153,087	Yes	Prairie restoration and enhancement
Mississippi West RP	03225233	25	\$65,854	Yes	Riparian forest enhancement
Rum River Central RP	03224231	45	\$107,231	Yes	Prairie and oak savanna restoration

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.

Completed Parcel: Mississippi West RP

# of Total Acres:	25
County:	Anoka
Township:	032
Range:	25
Direction:	2
Section:	33
# of Acres: Wetlands/Upland:	
# of Acres: Forest:	25
# of Acres: Prairie/Grassland:	
Amount of Shoreline:	
Name of Adjacent Body of Water (if applicable):	
Has there been signage erected at the site:	Yes
Total cost of Restoration/Enhancement:	\$65,854

Completed Parcel: Mississippi West RP

# of Total Acres:	90
County:	Anoka
Township:	032
Range:	25
Direction:	2
Section:	28
# of Acres: Wetlands/Upland:	
# of Acres: Forest:	
# of Acres: Prairie/Grassland:	90
Amount of Shoreline:	
Name of Adjacent Body of Water (if applicable):	
Has there been signage erected at the site:	Yes
Total cost of Restoration/Enhancement:	\$153,087

Completed Parcel: Rum River Central RP

# of Total Acres:	45
County:	Anoka
Township:	032
Range:	24
Direction:	2
Section:	31
# of Acres: Wetlands/Upland:	
# of Acres: Forest:	
# of Acres: Prairie/Grassland:	45
Amount of Shoreline:	
Name of Adjacent Body of Water (if applicable):	
Has there been signage erected at the site:	Yes
Total cost of Restoration/Enhancement:	\$107,231

Parcel Map

Prairie and Oak Savanna Restoration along Mississippi and Rum Rivers

