



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Laws of Minnesota 2019 Final Report

General Information

Date: 09/16/2020

Project Title: Sauk River Dam Fish Passage

Funds Recommended: \$737,000

Legislative Citation: ML 2019, 1st Sp. Session, Ch. 2, Art. 1, Sec. 2, subd. 5(l)

Appropriation Language: \$737,000 the first year is to the commissioner of natural resources for an agreement with the Stearns County Soil and Water Conservation District to restore and enhance riverine habitat in the Sauk River and provide fish passage by removing the dam and modifying and installing structures at the Melrose dam site. ML 2020, Ch. 104, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 11. Cancellations (b) The appropriation in Laws 2019, First Special Session chapter 2, article 1, section 2, subdivision 5, paragraph (l), is canceled.

Manager Information

Manager's Name: Greg Berg

Title:

Organization: Stearns County SWCD

Address: 110 Second St. South Suite #128

City: Waite Park, MN 56387

Email: greg.berg@mn.nacdnet.net

Office Number: 320-345-6479

Mobile Number:

Fax Number:

Website:

Location Information

County Location(s):

Eco regions in which work will take place:

- Prairie

Activity types:

- Restore
- Enhance

Priority resources addressed by activity:

- Habitat

Narrative

Summary of Accomplishments

The Stearns County SWCD will not be using the LSOHC funding for the Sauk River Dam Fish Passage project due to the main project partner (City of Melrose) moving in a different direction with the dam and stream restoration.

Process & Methods

February 11, 2020

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Attn: Mark Johnson, Executive Director

100 Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.

State Office Building, Room 95

St. Paul, MN 55155

Dear Mr. Johnson:

This letter is to update you on the proposed Sauk River Dam Fish Passage proposal that was approved for funding through the LSOHC (ML 2019, First Special Session, Ch. 2, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 5(1)).

On December 12, 2019, the Melrose City Council adopted Resolution 2019-60, rescinding its previous consent to the Rock Arch Rapids Fish Passage proposal and making them ineligible to receive funds that had been approved by LSOHC and separately by the Legislative Coordinating Commission on Natural Resources. Therefore, the Stearns County SWCD Board of Supervisors requests withdrawal of the \$737,000 Outdoor Heritage Fund allocation in its entirety.

We apologize for the confusion this situation has caused. The SWCD's intent has been and will always be to utilize Outdoor Heritage Fund (OHF) monies to restore and protect high-quality habitat; unfortunately, this project no longer meets those criteria. In continuing to work with the City of Melrose and other partners within the County, the SWCD will ensure that future proposals are communicated clearly, have buy-in from all stakeholders, and adhere to all OHF requirements.

The Stearns County SWCD staff and Supervisors would like to sincerely thank you for your efforts to protect natural resources in Stearns County.

Feel free to contact our office at 320-251-7800, extension 3, if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,

Thomas Gregory

Chair, Board of Supervisors

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?

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 other funds contributed to this program?

- Other : City of Melrose

How were the funds used to advance the program?

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

Budget

Totals

Item	Request	Spent	Antic. Leverage	Received Leverage	Leverage Source	Original Total	Final Total
Personnel	\$17,600	-	-	-	-	\$17,600	-
Contracts	\$719,400	-	\$3,268,000	-	City of Melrose & LCCMR	\$3,987,400	-
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Travel	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supplies/Materials	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$737,000	-	\$3,268,000	-	-	\$4,005,000	-

Explain any budget challenges or successes:

No funding spent due to project direction change by the City of Melrose.

Total Revenue: -

Revenue Spent: -

Revenue Balance: \$0

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

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	2	0	2	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	192	0	192	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	194	0	194	0

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	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$737,000	-	\$737,000	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$737,000	-	\$737,000	-

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	2	0	0	0	2	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	192	0	0	0	192	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	194	0	0	0	194	0

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	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$737,000	-	-	-	\$737,000	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$737,000	-	-	-	\$737,000	-

Average Cost per Acre by Resource Type (Table 5)

Type	Wetland (AP)	Wetland (Final)	Prairie (AP)	Prairie (Final)	Forest (AP)	Forest (Final)	Habitat (AP)	Habitat (Final)
Restore	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$368,500	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0	-

Average Cost per Acre by Ecological Section (Table 6)

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)
Restore	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$368,500	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0	-	-	-

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

Outcomes

Programs in prairie region:

- Protected, restored, and enhanced habitat for migratory and unique Minnesota species ~

Parcels

Sign-up Criteria?

No