



## Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Restoration Evaluations  
Laws of Minnesota 2015 Final Report

---

### General Information

**Date:** 05/27/2026

**Project Title:** Restoration Evaluations

**Funds Recommended:** \$100,000

**Legislative Citation:** ML 2015, First Sp. Session, Ch. 2, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 6(c )

**Appropriation Language:** \$100,000 in the first year is to the commissioner of natural resources for a technical evaluation panel to conduct up to ten restoration evaluations under Minnesota Statutes, section 97A.056, subdivision 10.

### Manager Information

**Manager's Name:** Wade Johnson

**Title:** Evaluation Coordinator

**Organization:** DNR

**Address:** 500 Lafayette Road Box 25

**City:** St Paul, MN 55155-4025

**Email:** Wade.A.Johnson@state.mn.us

**Office Number:** 651-259-5075

**Mobile Number:**

**Fax Number:**

**Website:** [www.dnr.state.mn.us/](http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/) [www.bwsr.state.mn.us/](http://www.bwsr.state.mn.us/)

### Location Information

**County Location(s):**

**Eco regions in which work will take place:**

**Activity types:**

Other : Restoration Evaluation

**Priority resources addressed by activity:**

Wetlands

Prairie

Forest

## Narrative

### **Summary of Accomplishments**

This program annually evaluates a sample of up to ten Outdoor Heritage Fund habitat restoration projects, provides a report on the evaluations in accordance with state law and delivers communications on project outcomes and lessons learned in restoration practice.

### **Process & Methods**

Process and methods described in 2015 report appendix.

### **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?**

This program supports the habitat work of all evaluated projects through the assessment of implementation and progress towards planned goals.

### **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.**

### **Explain Partners, Supporters, & Opposition**

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

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

## Budget

### Totals

Item	Requested	AP Amount	Spent	Leverage	Received Leverage	Leverage Source	Original Total	Final Total
Personnel	\$37,500	\$37,500	\$40,900	-	-	-	\$37,500	\$40,900
Contracts	\$49,000	\$49,000	\$47,600	-	-	-	\$49,000	\$47,600
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Travel	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$500	-	-	-	\$2,000	\$500
Professional Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	-	-	-	\$10,000	\$10,000
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,000	-	-	-	\$1,500	\$1,000
Supplies/Materials	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$100,000</b>	<b>\$100,000</b>	<b>\$100,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$100,000</b>	<b>\$100,000</b>

### Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Amount Spent	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Program Coordinator	0.4	1.0	\$39,900	-	-	\$39,900
Site Assessors (Various State Employees)	0.1	1.0	\$1,000	-	-	\$1,000

### Direct Support Services

**How did you determine which portions of the Direct Support Services of your shared support services is direct to this program?**

DNR calculates direct support services costs that are directly related to and necessary for each request based on the type of work being done and which division it's being done by.

**Explain any budget challenges or successes:**

**Total Revenue:** -

**Revenue Spent:** -

**Revenue Balance:** -

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

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

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

Clean Water Fund

**How were the funds used to advance the program?**

The Restoration Evaluation Program for Legacy Projects concurrently fulfills requirements to conduct restoration evaluations (M.L. 2013, Ch. 137) for projects completed with funds from the Clean Water Fund (M.S. 114D.50) and Parks and Trails Fund (M.S. 85.53).

## Output Tables

### Acres by Resource Type (Table 1)

Type	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	0
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### Total Requested Funding by Resource Type (Table 2)

Type	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>

### Acres within each Ecological Section (Table 3)

Type	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 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section (Table 4)**

Type	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles**

**Explain the success/shortage of acre goals**

**Outcomes**

**Parcels**

**Sign-up Criteria?**

No