



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Laws of Minnesota 2021 Accomplishment Plan

General Information

Date: 12/09/2020

Project Title: MNDNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements

Funds Recommended: \$500,000

Legislative Citation: ML 2021, Ch. XX, Art. 1, Sec. 2, subd.

Appropriation Language:

Manager Information

Manager's Name: Martin Jennings

Title: Fisheries Habitat Program Manager

Organization: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources

Address: 500 Lafayette Road

City: St Paul, MN 55155

Email: martin.jennings@state.mn.us

Office Number: 651-259-5176

Mobile Number: 612-248-4138

Fax Number:

Website:

Location Information

County Location(s): Winona, Houston, Fillmore, Cook and St. Louis.

Eco regions in which work will take place:

- Northern Forest
- Southeast Forest

Activity types:

- Protect in Easement

Priority resources addressed by activity:

- Habitat

Narrative

Abstract

We propose a programmatic approach to achieve prioritized aquatic habitat protection for trout streams in Minnesota, with an emphasis on Southeast and Northeast Minnesota. We propose to protect 3.75 miles of trout streams, including approximately 75 acres with permanent conservation easements on private land. Protected lands will be designated as Aquatic Management Areas (AMA's) administered by the Minnesota DNR Division of Fish and Wildlife.

Design and Scope of Work

Trout fishing in Minnesota is enjoyed by thousands of anglers. The MNDNR Section of Fisheries administers a conservation easement program that has strong stakeholder support, and protects the habitat that is the foundation of our successful trout management program. Over 90% of our conservation easements protect trout streams. In addition to protecting the riparian corridor of trout streams, easements provide access for the angling public, and also provide access for restoration and enhancement projects. We propose a programmatic approach to achieve prioritized aquatic habitat protection for trout streams across Minnesota. Most trout streams are found in Southeast and Northeast Minnesota, but conservation opportunities in other areas of the state will be evaluated by scoring and ranking candidate parcels as they become available.

We propose to protect 3.75 miles of trout streams and approximately 75 acres with permanent conservation easements on private land. Protected lands will be designated as Aquatic Management Areas (AMA's) administered by the Minnesota DNR Division of Fish and Wildlife.

The dollar value of trout stream conservation easements is set by formula described in M.S.84.0272 subd. 2. The formula uses the length of stream being placed under easement and the area of the easement footprint. The length of the stream easement in feet (length is measured in GIS from a current aerial photo) is multiplied by \$5 per foot. The area of the easement foot print is also measured in GIS. The area in acres is multiplied by the average per acre estimated market value of Agricultural, Rural Vacant, and Managed Forest Land within the township where the easement lies. Estimated market value and total acres by land type for every township in the state are supplied by the Department of Revenue and revised annually. So, easement price is calculated as (feet of stream under easement x \$5) + (acres of easement foot print x average market value/acre within that township). Dollar estimates in this proposal are based on current estimated market value, and are subject to change.

Scoring and ranking candidate parcels for trout stream conservation easement acquisition is based on multiple criteria as described in the proposal attachment. Criteria include fishery quality, rare natural features and other ecological attributes, potential to link with existing easements to increase protected corridors, and the need for access to conduct habitat restoration and enhancement projects with potential to improve the fishery. Please refer to the attachments for details.

The current parcel list is based on parcels meeting a minimum scoring threshold and with landowners expressing an interest in selling an easement. The proposal includes the cost of easements, professional services to complete the transactions, and a deposit to the Easement Stewardship Account to cover future costs of stewardship. The proposal can be scaled by dropping lower scoring parcels.

How does the plan address habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and list targeted species?

The focus of the protection work in this proposal is trout streams and the riparian corridor. Although benefits to fisheries are a primary consideration of the program, riparian areas are also important to game and nongame wildlife, including species of greatest conservation need (SGCN). We will use a scoring system that takes into account multiple considerations including Minnesota Biological Survey sites of biodiversity significance. Some scoring criteria, such as the potential to expand corridors and protected areas benefit many species. The scoring system is described in more detail in the attachments.

The use of scoring criteria allow a programmatic approach that fairly evaluates candidate parcels without eliminating the potential for protection in any geographic region. Because species distribution is not uniform across the state, species benefitting from conservation easements will vary across regions. SCGN's that depend on aquatic and riparian habitat include several turtle species, common mudpuppy, two frog species, and several species of waterfowl and shorebirds.

Describe how the plan uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey:

The scoring criteria include linking with existing easements to expand protected riparian corridors. The scoring criteria also award points to parcels with rare natural features identified in the MBS GIS layer.

Which two sections of the Minnesota Statewide Conservation and Preservation Plan are most applicable to this project?

- H2 Protect critical shoreland of streams and lakes
- H3 Improve connectivity and access to recreation

Which two other plans are addressed in this program?

- Other : MN DNR Fisheries Habitat Strategic Plan
- Strategic Plan for Coldwater Resources Management in Southeastern Minnesota

Which LSOHC section priorities are addressed in this program?

Northern Forest

- Protect shoreland and restore or enhance critical habitat on wild rice lakes, shallow lakes, cold water lakes, streams and rivers, and spawning areas

Southeast Forest

- Protect, enhance, and restore habitat for fish, game, and nongame wildlife in rivers, cold-water streams, and associated upland habitat

Does this program include leveraged funding?

No

Per MS 97A.056, Subd. 24, Please explain whether the request is supplanting or is a substitution for any previous funding that was not from a legacy fund and was used for the same purpose.

OHF funding accelerates trout stream acquisition work beyond what is possible with other funding sources. It does not supplant or substitute other program funds.

Non-OHF Appropriations

Year	Source	Amount
15-20	RIM	\$265,000
15-20	Trout and Salmon Account (Trout Stamp)	\$90,000

How will you sustain and/or maintain this work after the Outdoor Heritage Funds are expended?

The request includes funds to deposit in the Easement Stewardship Account, an interest-bearing account authorized in MS 84.69. Funds will support easement monitoring to be conducted following DNR Operational Order 128 and Division of Fish and Wildlife Easement Monitoring Guidelines.

Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes

Year	Source of Funds	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
2022	OHF appropriation (this proposal)	baseline easement report	Future monitoring per MNDNR guidelines	-

Activity Details

Requirements

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

Yes

Is the land you plan to acquire (easement) free of any other permanent protection?

Yes

Who will manage the easement?

Minnesota DNR Section of Fisheries will conduct easement stewardship.

Who will be the easement holder?

State of Minnesota

What is the anticipated number of easements (range is fine) you plan to accomplish with this appropriation?

Eight, this may vary depending on size of easements at top of rank order after scoring. Large easements will reduce number, small easements will increase number.

Land Use

Will there be planting of any crop on OHF land purchased or restored in this program?

No

Will the eased land be open for public use?

Yes

Describe the expected public use:

In addition to the conservation terms of the easements, access is provided for angling; other public activities are not allowed.

Are there currently trails or roads on any of the proposed acquisitions?

No

Will new trails or roads be developed or improved as a result of the OHF acquisition?

No

Will the acquired parcels be restored or enhanced within this appropriation?

No

Will the land that you acquire (fee or easement) be restored or enhanced within this program's funding and availability?

No

Explain how, when, and source of the R/E work:

The easement terms include access for restoration and enhancement work. Although no work specific to the parcel list is currently planned or funded, future work may be done by DNR or partner organizations using funding from various sources, including OHF.

Timeline

Activity Name	Estimated Completion Date
final parcel scores and ranks, initiate acquisitions	July 2021
complete acquisitions	spring 2024
complete baseline easement reports	spring 2024
monitoring and enforcement	ongoing, no end date

Date of Final Report Submission: 11/01/2024

Budget

Budget reallocations up to 10% do not require an amendment to the Accomplishment Plan.

Totals

Item	Funding Request	Antic. Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	-	-	-	-
Contracts	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	\$395,000	-	-	\$395,000
Easement Stewardship	\$65,000	-	-	\$65,000
Travel	-	-	-	-
Professional Services	\$40,000	-	-	\$40,000
Direct Support Services	-	-	-	-
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	-	-	-	-
Supplies/Materials	-	-	-	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$500,000	-	-	\$500,000

Amount of Request: \$500,000

Amount of Leverage: -

Leverage as a percent of the Request: 0.0%

DSS + Personnel: -

As a % of the total request: 0.0%

Easement Stewardship: \$65,000

As a % of the Easement Acquisition: 16.46%

How will this program accommodate the reduced appropriation recommendation from the original proposed requested amount?

The request was scale-able; the spending in each category was reduced proportionally. Easement stewardship was estimated based on 8 completed easements (original request was 25). Professional services was estimated at 10% of easement costs. The 16% increase made available during December was put into acquisition and professional services.

Describe and explain leverage source and confirmation of funds:

not applicable

Easement Stewardship

What is the number of easements anticipated, cost per easement for stewardship, and explain how that amount is calculated?

We estimate 8 easements. Depending on size of top ranking easements after scoring is completed, this number may change. The amount for stewardship is estimated with a calculator developed by staff in MNDNR's Division of Lands and Minerals, and is roughly \$8K/easement for trout stream easements. The calculator is based on

frequency of monitoring events, staff time, expenses, and probably of future enforcement. If we are successful in acquiring the largest easement on the parcel list, we will exceed current acre goals and have fewer easements. In this case of having fewer easements, we would anticipate requesting an amendment to shift unused easement stewardship to easement acquisition.

Federal Funds

Do you anticipate federal funds as a match for this program?

No

Output Tables

Acres by Resource Type (Table 1)

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat	Total Acres
Restore	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	90	90
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	90	90

Total Requested Funding by Resource Type (Table 2)

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat	Total Funding
Restore	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	\$500,000	\$500,000
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	\$500,000	\$500,000

Acres within each Ecological Section (Table 3)

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest	Total Acres
Restore	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	30	-	60	90
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	30	-	60	90

Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section (Table 4)

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest	Total Funding
Restore	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	\$214,000	-	\$286,000	\$500,000
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	\$214,000	-	\$286,000	\$500,000

Average Cost per Acre by Resource Type (Table 5)

Type	Wetland	Prairie	Forest	Habitat
Restore	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	\$5,555
Enhance	-	-	-	-

Average Cost per Acre by Ecological Section (Table 6)

Type	Metro/Urban	Forest/Prairie	SE Forest	Prairie	N. Forest
Restore	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State	-	-	-	-	-

PILT Liability					
Protect in Easement	-	-	\$7,133	-	\$4,766
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

4.5

Outcomes

Programs in the northern forest region:

- Other ~ *Outcome is coldwater stream corridors have protection and angler access. This is evaluated with easement stewardship. Regular monitoring visits evaluate compliance with easement terms, and MNDNR staff work with landowners to correct any issues that are out of compliance with the agreement.*

Programs in southeast forest region:

- Other ~ *Outcome is coldwater stream corridors have protection and angler access. This is evaluated with easement stewardship. Regular monitoring visits evaluate compliance with easement terms, and MNDNR staff work with landowners to correct any issues that are out of compliance with the agreement.*

Parcels

For restoration and enhancement programs ONLY: Managers may add, delete, and substitute projects on this parcel list based upon need, readiness, cost, opportunity, and/or urgency so long as the substitute parcel/project forwards the constitutional objectives of this program in the Project Scope table of this accomplishment plan. The final accomplishment plan report will include the final parcel list.

Parcel Information

Sign-up Criteria?


[Yes](#)

Explain the process used to identify, prioritize, and select the parcels on your list:

we have a scoring and ranking system to screen parcels; this is provided as an attachment. Parcels scoring below 30 points on the current scoring system are not pursued. We proceed based on score and landowner readiness to sell the easement.

Protect Parcels

Name	County	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection
Two Island River	Cook	05805202	77	\$255,000	No
Camp Creek	Fillmore	10210217	14	\$97,000	No
Camp Creek	Fillmore	10210208	11	\$78,000	No
Willow Creek	Fillmore	10211212	13	\$89,000	No
Camp Creek	Fillmore	10210217	10	\$76,000	No
Badger Creek	Houston	10306234	1	\$7,000	No
Badger Creek	Houston	10306221	7	\$43,000	No
Badger Creek	Houston	10306221	1	\$10,000	No
Bee Creek	Houston	10106232	1	\$7,000	No
Badger Creek	Houston	10306222	6	\$38,000	No
Bee Creek	Houston	10106229	1	\$11,000	No
Bee Creek	Houston	10106229	1	\$10,000	No
Bee Creek	Houston	10106229	1	\$14,000	No
Badger Creek	Houston	10306234	3	\$23,000	No
Chalberg Creek	St. Louis	05117203	22	\$62,000	No
Mission Creek	St. Louis	04915230	25	\$82,000	No
Chalberg Creek	St. Louis	05117210	10	\$29,000	No
Garvin Brook	Winona	10708233	1	\$12,000	No
Garvin Brook	Winona	10708233	1	\$9,000	No
Garvin Brook	Winona	10708233	2	\$20,000	No
Garvin Brook	Winona	10608204	1	\$9,000	No
Garvin Brook	Winona	10608204	1	\$10,000	No
Garvin Brook	Winona	10708234	2	\$15,000	No
Garvin Brook	Winona	10608204	1	\$8,000	No
Garvin Brook	Winona	10708234	3	\$24,000	No
Garvin Brook	Winona	10708233	5	\$38,000	No



- Protect in Easement
- ▲ Protect in Fee with PILT
- Protect in Fee W/O PILT
- ★ Restore
- ✕ Enhance
- ⊕ Other

Parcel Map
MNDNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements
(Data Generated From Parcel List)



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Comparison Report

Program Title: ML 2021 - MNDNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements

Organization: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources

Manager: Martin Jennings

Budget

Requested Amount: \$1,201,000

Appropriated Amount: \$500,000

Percentage: 41.63%

Item	Total Requested		Total Appropriated		Percentage of Request	
	Requested	Leverage	Appropriated	Leverage	Percent of Request	Percent of Leverage
Personnel	-	-	-	-	-	-
Contracts	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	\$910,000	-	\$395,000	-	43.41%	-
Easement Stewardship	\$200,000	-	\$65,000	-	32.5%	-
Travel	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional Services	\$91,000	-	\$40,000	-	43.96%	-
Direct Support Services	-	-	-	-	-	-
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supplies/Materials	-	-	-	-	-	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$1,201,000	-	\$500,000	-	41.63%	-

How will this program accommodate the reduced appropriation recommendation from the original proposed requested amount?

The request was scale-able; the spending in each category was reduced proportionally. Easement stewardship was estimated based on 8 completed easements (original request was 25). Professional services was estimated at 10% of easement costs. The 16% increase made available during December was put into acquisition and professional services.

Output

Acres by Resource Type (Table 1)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	0	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Easement	221	90	40.72%
Enhance	0	-	-

Total Requested Funding by Resource Type (Table 2)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	\$1,201,000	\$500,000	41.63%
Enhance	-	-	-

Acres within each Ecological Section (Table 3)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	0	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	0	-	-
Protect in Easement	221	90	40.72%
Enhance	0	-	-

Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section (Table 4)

Type	Total Proposed	Total in AP	Percentage of Proposed
Restore	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	\$1,201,000	\$500,000	41.63%
Enhance	-	-	-



Scoring Criteria for candidate trout stream easement acquisitions

These criteria were developed with input from MNDNR Fisheries staff who manage trout water and Fish and Wildlife Division (FAW) Acquisition Unit staff. This tool is new, and some criteria and scoring thresholds may still be adjusted.

Scoring may eventually be integrated into FAW's Strategic WMA and AMA Acquisition Tool (SWAAT) GIS application. For the time being however, scores will be calculated "on paper" by staff familiar with the stream & easement candidate, as well as information taken from GIS data. This scoring sheet is intended to walk through the various criteria and give guidance on scoring.

Overall score is derived from sub-scores in six categories: 1) size and proximity; 2) habitat conditions; 3) thermal conditions; 4) fish population characteristics; 5) fish movement; 6) angler use. Some criteria pertain to parcel specific conditions, some pertain to stream stretch conditions, and some on entire stream.

Stream Name _____ Easement length (ft) _____ width (ft) _____
 Landowner Name _____
 County _____ Twp/Rng/Sec _____

Size & Proximity Criteria

Adjacent to existing public ownership/easement 0 points if no existing easement/public land on stream, 1 points if there are easements/public land on stream, but not touching proposed easement, 3 points if proposed easement touches existing easement(s) or public land, 6 points if proposed easement touches existing easements/public land on upstream and downstream ends.

Comments:

Score _____
 Scored by _____ on date ____

Easement Size 0 points if proposed easement is 0 to 999 stream-feet in length, 1 points if proposed easement is 1,000 to 1,999 stream-feet, 2 points if proposed easement is 2,000-2,999 stream-feet, 3 points if proposed easement is 3,000 stream-feet or greater. Stream length should be measured using current aerial imagery and GIS.

Comments:

Easement length in feet _____
 Score _____
 Scored by _____ on date ____

Habitat Condition Criteria

Existing Instream Habitat Condition Points based on site-specific conditions determined. When scoring, consider overall conditions across the entire proposed easement. Conditions in proposed easement should be “measured against” the reference condition in local streams. For instance if instream woody cover is common in local streams, the presence of a few branches in the proposed easement would not justify a “Yes”. Up to 6 points (1 for each) based on the following features: stable bank, channel connected to floodplain, substrate not dominated by fines, pool/riffle complex, in-stream cover or woody debris, overhead bank cover.

Comments:

Overall stable banks (Y/N)____
 Channel connected to floodplain (Y/N)____
 Overall lack of fine substrate dominance (Y/N)____
 Pool/riffle complex present (Y/N)____
 Instream or woody cover present (Y/N)____
 Overhead bank cover present (Y/N)____

 Score _____
 Scored by _____ on date _____

Restoration Potential If existing instream habitat is limiting and based on professional judgment could be improved through standard techniques, award up to 3 points. As with the above criterion, consider the potential against reference condition on local streams. Rely on population data from reaches on the same stream that have better habitat as an indicator of potential for improved trout fishery. **Note: High scores in the existing habitat criterion above, presumably indicate low restoration potential score. A proposed easement should not get high scores in both existing and potential habitat conditions.**

Comments:

Score _____
 Scored by _____ on date _____

Riparian Condition Based on the Watershed Health Assessment Scores - Catchment Scale - Hyd Index – Perennial Cover 2011, GIS layer. Award 1 points for 61-70% cover, 2 points 71-80%, 3 points for 81-90%. **Note: Zero points awarded for catchments with poor (less than 60%) perennial cover, and exceptional (over 90%) perennial cover because additional protection is not likely to have significant effect in either of those circumstances.**

V:\gdrs\data\pub\us_mn_state_dnr\env_watershed_health_assessment\fgdb\env_watershed_health_assessment.gdb

Comments:

Score _____
 Scored by _____ on date _____

Rare Natural Features Award 1 points if proposed easement (buffered by 20m) touches a rare natural feature polygon as identified by in the NHIS Nonpublic Data GIS layer.

Comments:

Score _____
 Scored by _____ on date _____

MBS Sites of Biodiversity Significance Award 2 points if proposed easement (buffered by 20m) touches a polygon on the MBS Sites of Biodiversity Significance GIS layer.

Comments:

Score _____
 Scored by _____ on date _____

Fish Population Criteria

Trout Population Abundance Award 1, 2, or 4 points based on the stretch’s adult trout density. Score using most current trout assessment data with different scales for NE and SE. Draft thresholds:
 SE: 0 points <50 lbs/acre, 1 point 50-99 lbs/acre, 2 points 100-200 lbs/acre, 4 points >200 lbs/acre.
 NE: 0 points <5 fish/1,000’, 1 point 5-14 fish/1,000’, 2 points 14-36 fish/1,000’, 4 points >36 fish/1,000’.

Comments:

Fish density _____
 Data Source _____
 Data year _____
 Score _____
 Scored by _____ on date _____

Natural Reproduction Points are based on professional judgement and existing data regarding trout recruitment in that stretch. Award 0 points for trout populations maintained mostly by stocking, 2 points for stretches with mixed natural recruitment and stocking, or 4 points if population in that stretch is self-sustaining without stocking.

Comments:

Score _____
 Scored by _____ on date _____

Heritage Brook Trout or Coaster Brook Trout Award 3 points if the stretch has a known population of heritage brook trout or coaster run brook trout.

Comments:

Score _____
 Scored by _____ on date _____

Fish Movement Criteria

Longitudinal Connectivity Deduct 1 point if there is an impassible barrier downstream of parcel on same stream.

Comments:

Score _____
Scored by _____ on date _____

Identified Anadromous Importance Award 1 point if the stream stretch is known to support anadromous spawning runs.

Comments:

Score _____
Scored by _____ on date _____

Thermal Criteria

Springs Award 3 points if the proposed easement site has known groundwater springs/seeps.

Comments:

Score _____
Scored by _____ on date _____

Temperature Resiliency Points based on the stretch’s temperature profile using available long-term average data. Award 0 points if water temp exceeds 68 F > 5% of summer (June 1 to September 30) days , 3 points if temp exceeds 68 F on <5% summer days, 6 points if temps do not exceed 68 F. If the stretch exceeds 68 F > 5% of summer days but has a nearby thermal refuge where temperature exceeds 68 F <5% of summer days, award 2 points.

Comments:

% summer days exceeding 68 F _____
Data Source _____
Data year _____
Score _____
Scored by _____ on date _____

Angler Use Criteria

Recreation Potential GIS query of Census 2010 data for population within 30 miles of proposed easement. Award 0 points if <10,000, 1 point if 10,001 to 20,000, 3 if 20,001 to 50,000, 4 if >50,000.

V:\gdrs\data\pub\us_mn_state_leg_commissions_lcc_gis\society_census_2010_mn\society_census_2010_mn.gdb.

Comments:

Population within 30 miles _____
Score _____
Scored by _____ on date _____

Existing/potential angler use Award 1, 2, or 3 points based on professional judgement regarding the stretch’s current angler use and potential future use. 1 point for low use, 2 for moderate, 3 for high use.

Comments:

Score _____
Scored by _____ on date _____

Accessible Award 1 point if the proposed easement is crossed by a road or trail that would provide angler access other than from adjoining easement or public land.

Comments:

Score _____
Scored by _____ on date _____

Landowner Donation Award 1 point per 10% of landowner donation of easement value (e.g., 3 points awarded where landowner donates 30% of value) **CAP OF 4 POINTS**

Comments:

Score _____
Scored by _____ on date _____

Stream Name _____

Landowner Name _____

County _____

Scoring Summary

Adjacent to existing state ownership/easement	score = _____ of 6
Easement Size	score = _____ of 3
Existing Instream Habitat Condition	score = _____ of 6
Restoration Potential	score = _____ of 3
Riparian Condition	score = _____ of 3
Rare Natural Features	score = _____ of 1
MBS Sites of Biodiversity Significance	score = _____ of 2
Trout Population Abundance	score = _____ of 4
Natural Reproduction	score = _____ of 4
Heritage Brook Trout or Coaster Brook Trout	score = _____ of 3
Longitudinal Connectivity	score = _____ of -1
Identified Anadromous Importance	score = _____ of 1
Springs	score = _____ of 3
Temperature Resiliency	score = _____ of 6
Recreation Potential	score = _____ of 4
Existing/potential angler use	score = _____ of 3
Accessible	score = _____ of 1
Landowner Donation	score = _____ of up to 4

Overall Score score = _____

(Maximum score = 57 points)

Comments: