



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Enhancing Metro and North Shore Trout Stream Habitats
Laws of Minnesota 2022 Accomplishment Plan

General Information

Date: 01/05/2022

Project Title: Enhancing Metro and North Shore Trout Stream Habitats

Funds Recommended: \$1,130,000

Legislative Citation: ML 2022, Ch. XX, Art. 1, Sec. 2, subd.

Appropriation Language:

Manager Information

Manager's Name: John Lenczewski

Title: Program Manager

Organization: Minnesota Trout Unlimited

Address: P O Box 845

City: Chanhassen, MN 55317

Email: jlenczewski@comcast.net

Office Number: 612-670-1629

Mobile Number: 612-670-1629

Fax Number:

Website: www.mntu.org

Location Information

County Location(s): St. Louis, Lake, Winona and Dakota.

Eco regions in which work will take place:

- Northern Forest
- Metro / Urban
- Southeast Forest

Activity types:

- Enhance

Priority resources addressed by activity:

- Forest

- Habitat

Narrative

Abstract

Minnesota Trout Unlimited will enhance and restore degraded habitat for fish and wildlife along coldwater streams with existing protections. We will utilize a crew of young people from diverse backgrounds to enhance habitat along Twin Cities area trout streams. Increasing threats to North Shore streams require accelerating work improving riparian forest habitat to improve stream flows and lower water temperatures, and buffering streams from larger, more frequent rainfall and flooding. Restoring connectivity of habitat through culvert replacements will maximize outcomes for fish and wildlife populations. Timely maintenance of old projects will ensure habitat outcomes continue for many years.

Design and Scope of Work

Degraded habitat is severely limiting the productivity of many Minnesota trout streams. The few remaining Twin Cities area streams suffer from invasive or poor-quality vegetation. We will recruit a diverse crew from the community to restore native vegetation - forest, prairie, and wetland - along these streams. Climate change is damaging North Shore forests, raising water temperatures, and increasing destructive floods. Minnesota Trout Unlimited ("MNTU") will counter this by restoring connectivity and enhancing riparian forests in priority watersheds. Work will be done on public lands and on streams with existing protections under the Aquatic Management Area system. We propose to restore or enhance habitat in and along these public waters (in these counties):

1. Metro trout streams;
2. Baptism & Manitou Rivers (Lake);
3. Keene Creek (St. Louis);
4. Split Rock River (Lake);
5. Manitou River (Lake); and
6. Southeast MN streams (maintenance in numerous counties).

Individual project descriptions are provided in an attachment.

Goals and scope of work:

The goals of projects are to increase the carrying capacity and trout population of the stream, increase angling access and participation, improve water quality, and provide other benefits to aquatic and terrestrial wildlife. Each project will accomplish one or more of these objectives: (a) increase adult trout abundance, (b) reduce stream bank erosion and associated sedimentation downstream, (c) reconnect the stream to its floodplains to reduce negative impacts from severe flooding, (d) increase natural reproduction of trout and other aquatic organisms, (e) increase habitat for invertebrates and non-game species, (f) improve connectivity of habitat along aquatic and riparian (terrestrial) corridors, (g) improve riparian forest health and function, (h) improve angler access and participation, and (i) protect productive trout waters from invasive species. The scope of work and methods utilized vary by project site conditions and are discussed in the individual project descriptions provided in the attachment.

How priorities were set:

MNTU focuses habitat enhancement and restoration efforts on those watersheds likely to continue to support viable, fishable populations of naturally reproducing trout and steelhead fifty years and more from now. Work is done only where degraded habitat is a limiting factor for a quality, sustainable fishery. Priority locations are determined using MNTU members' knowledge of watersheds, MNDNR management plans and surveys, other habitat and conservation planning efforts, consultations with MNDNR professionals, and science-based criteria. All things being equal, we consider the potential to draw new anglers outdoors, increase public awareness, engage landowners in conservation, foster partnerships, and increase public support for OHF projects.

Stakeholder support:

We continue receiving strong support from anglers, landowners, rural communities, and local civic and sporting organizations. We will continue gathering local input and developing partnerships in the planning and implementation stages. Landowners are consistently very enthusiastic partners.

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 projects will restore or enhance degraded habitat for fish and wildlife in and along coldwater streams and rivers which historically supported naturally reproducing trout or steelhead populations highly valued by generations of anglers. While trout are the apex predator and key indicator species for the health of coldwater ecosystems, a host of rare aquatic and riparian species are uniquely associated with these systems. Well-functioning coldwater aquatic ecosystems are far fewer in number than the 6% of Minnesota's total stream and river miles which theoretically can still support trout. Even many streams considered to be the best remaining trout streams have badly degraded segments which disrupt connectivity and significantly impact the productivity and long-term resilience and sustainability of the overall trout population. Streams face growing threats from warming temperatures, increased frequency of severe flooding, and rising demand for groundwater extraction from the aquifers which supply inputs of vitally important cold water. The proposed projects are focused on streams and stream segments which will benefit from improved connectivity and help ensure Minnesota retains at least some high quality coldwater fisheries for future generations. A small portion of an appropriation would be used to maintain or add enhancements to past projects to ensure continuing habitat benefits.

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:

In selecting project sites, MNTU reviews MNDNR watershed specific fisheries management plans and other conservation planning efforts, consults with MNDNR professionals, and applies ranking criteria developed by the MNDNR. Projects must have the potential to increase the carrying capacity (fish numbers), the streams have natural reproduction, and the public have access to them. Improving the connectivity of good aquatic and riparian habitat is an important consideration and the projects are selected to expand or connect gaps in these corridors. We are increasingly targeting stream segments which build off earlier habitat or protection work in the same stream or connected watershed. Targeted work improving forest habitat in connected corridors along the Split Rock River will benefit not only trout and steelhead fisheries, but numerous wildlife populations and native plant communities.

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

- H3 Improve connectivity and access to recreation
- H6 Protect and restore critical in-water habitat of lakes and streams

Which two other plans are addressed in this program?

- Long Range Plan for Fisheries Management
- Other : Fisheries Management Plan for the Minnesota Waters of Lake Superior

Which LSOHC section priorities are addressed in this program?

Metro / Urban

- Enhance and restore coldwater fisheries systems

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?

Yes

Explain the leverage:

We will leverage private funding of Trout Unlimited. TU members and chapters will donate in-kind labor/services. Several partners (MNDNR, SWCD offices, etc.) will likely contribute significant amounts of time and/or dollars assisting on several projects. We also hope to leverage substantial federal and other funding, especially for fish passage/culvert replacement work in key Lake Superior tributaries.

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.

The request is not supplanting or a substitution for previous funding. The work proposed for funding is for new or additional work.

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

MNTU's coldwater aquatic habitat restoration and enhancement projects are designed for long-term ecological and hydraulic stability. Construction contracts include maintenance/warranty provisions to ensure habitat work is well established. After this period and once riparian vegetation is well established, major maintenance work is not typically required in order to sustain the habitat outcomes for decades. Reconnected floodplains allow flood water to quickly spread out and dissipate energy, reducing the destructive impact of a flood. Flood waters typically flatten streamside vegetation temporarily and do not damage the in-stream structures. The significant increases in trout populations resulting from the habitat work are sustainable long-term through natural reproduction.

We anticipate that long-term monitoring of the integrity of the improvements will be done in conjunction with routine inspections and biological monitoring conducted by local MNDNR staff, MNTU members, and landowners as appropriate. This monitoring will not require separate OHF or other constitutional funding. In the event that there are other maintenance costs, potential sources of funding and volunteer labor include MNTU, MNDNR AMA

maintenance funding, and other grant funds and organizations. MNTU volunteers will help provide long-term monitoring and periodic labor.

Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes

Year	Source of Funds	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Every 3 years thereafter	MNTU volunteers and/or agency.	Inspect structural elements and vegetation.	If needed, develop action plan with DNR.	Perform or assist DNR with maintenance if needed.
One year after grant ends	MNTU volunteers or part of agency staff visits.	Inspect structural elements and vegetation.	If needed, alert DNR and develop action plans.	Conduct maintenance with volunteers and/or contractors if DNR does not.

How will the program directly involve, engage, and benefit BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, People of Color) and diverse communities:

Our metro trout stream project will provide opportunities to racially, ethnically, and economically diverse people to learn conservation skills and work in the outdoors. We will actively recruit young people from BIPOC communities to participate in this project. Opportunities to join the habitat crew will be open to all, but we will specifically target recruitment efforts in the high schools, community colleges and community organizations serving the urban center. We hope this will be a gateway for some members of the BIPOC communities to enjoy the outdoors who previously have had few opportunities to do so. Hopefully, participation as a member of a work crew will inspire the members to pursue education and careers in natural resource management and conservation. Since these metro area habitat projects will be close to home, we hope crew members will inspire friends and community members to also engage with these natural resources.

Activity Details

Requirements

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

Yes

Will restoration and enhancement work follow best management practices including MS 84.973 Pollinator Habitat Program?

Yes

Is the restoration and enhancement activity on permanently protected land per 97A.056, Subd 13(f), tribal lands, and/or public waters per MS 103G.005, Subd. 15?

Yes

Where does the activity take place?

- AMA
- Permanently Protected Conservation Easements
- County/Municipal
- Public Waters
- State Forests
- Other : National Forest land

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

No

Timeline

Activity Name	Estimated Completion Date
Utilize work crew on metro trout streams	Summers 2023, 2024, and 2025
Complete implementation of habitat enhancements, including tree plantings and vegetation work.	June 2027
Begin planning, design and implementation of habitat enhancements.	July 2022

Date of Final Report Submission: 11/01/2027

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	\$437,000	-	-	\$437,000
Contracts	\$323,000	\$50,000	USFWS, USFS, and other partners	\$373,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-
Travel	\$20,000	-	-	\$20,000
Professional Services	\$100,000	-	-	\$100,000
Direct Support Services	\$60,000	\$20,000	Trout Unlimited	\$80,000
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$20,000	-	-	\$20,000
Supplies/Materials	\$170,000	\$50,000	USFWS, USFS, and other partners	\$220,000
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$1,130,000	\$120,000	-	\$1,250,000

Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Funding Request	Antic. Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Other Habitat Enhancement Staff	1.5	5.0	\$75,000	-	-	\$75,000
Metro habitat crew members	2.0	3.0	\$362,000	-	-	\$362,000

Amount of Request: \$1,130,000

Amount of Leverage: \$120,000

Leverage as a percent of the Request: 10.62%

DSS + Personnel: \$497,000

As a % of the total request: 43.98%

Easement Stewardship: -

As a % of the Easement Acquisition: -

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

The Keene project will be cut, and the scale of the fish passage and Split Rock watershed projects reduced. Remaining projects are personnel intensive, especially the Metro conservation corps, whose members, recruited from the BIPOC community, will be employees not contractors. Thus personnel costs (and DSS) cannot be proportionally reduced.

Describe and explain leverage source and confirmation of funds:

Leverage estimates are estimates only. We hope to secure approximately \$100,000 from federal sources, especially to assist with tree planting and removal of fish passage barriers/culvert replacements in key Lake Superior tributaries. We will aggressively pursue leverage here and on all projects.

Personnel

Has funding for these positions been requested in the past?

Yes

Please explain the overlap of past and future staffing and position levels previously received and how that is coordinated over multiple years?

Funding for the metro habitat crew, recruited from the BIPOC community, has not been requested in the past. However, funding for the current personnel who perform similar work to that required to implement the other FY2023 projects has been requested in the past. All staff code each hour they work to the particular OHF grant which funds the particular project worked on. The personnel costs in each OHF grant are estimates. Any unused dollars budgeted for personnel and travel in a given grant will be shifted into contracts and materials budget categories to do additional habitat work under that grant. Funding for the metro habitat crew has not been requested in the past.

Contracts

What is included in the contracts line?

This is for contracted services on habitat enhancement construction projects, and includes heavy equipment use and other labor, including for tree plantings (site preparation, planting, protection).

Travel

Does the amount in the travel line include equipment/vehicle rental?

No

Explain the amount in the travel line outside of traditional travel costs of mileage, food, and lodging

None.

I understand and agree that lodging, meals, and mileage must comply with the current MMB Commissioner Plan:

Yes

Direct Support Services

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

The Direct Support Services requested represents a portion of Trout Unlimited's federal rate, which is approved annually. The requested amount is less than we would be eligible to claim based upon DNR approval of earlier grant agreements. Trout Unlimited is donating the other portion.

Other Equipment/Tools

Give examples of the types of Equipment and Tools that will be purchased?

Primarily hand tools for cutting trees and brush, raking and seeding areas, etc.

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	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	100	232	332
Total	-	-	100	232	332

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	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	\$140,000	\$990,000	\$1,130,000
Total	-	-	\$140,000	\$990,000	\$1,130,000

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	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	150	-	24	-	158	332
Total	150	-	24	-	158	332

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	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	\$545,000	-	\$85,000	-	\$500,000	\$1,130,000
Total	\$545,000	-	\$85,000	-	\$500,000	\$1,130,000

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	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	\$1,400	\$4,267

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	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	\$3,633	-	\$3,541	-	\$3,164

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

18 miles

Outcomes

Programs in metropolitan urbanizing region:

- Improved aquatic habitat indicators ~ *Measured through surveys of fish, macro invertebrates and/or exposed substrates. Abundance, size structure and species diversity are considered.*

Programs in the northern forest region:

- Improved aquatic habitat indicators ~ *Measured through surveys of fish, macro invertebrates and/or exposed substrates. Abundance, size structure and species diversity are considered.*

Programs in southeast forest region:

- Rivers, streams, and surrounding vegetation provide corridors of habitat ~ *Outcomes in aquatic life are measured through surveys of fish, macro invertebrates and/or exposed substrates. Abundance, size structure and species diversity are considered.*

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?


No

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

MNTU focuses habitat enhancement and restoration efforts on those watersheds likely to continue to support viable, fishable populations of naturally reproducing trout, steelhead, and salmon fifty years and more from now. Work is done only where degraded habitat is a limiting factor for a quality, sustainable fishery. Priority locations are determined using MNTU members' knowledge of watersheds, MNDNR management plans and surveys, other habitat and conservation planning efforts, consultations with MNDNR professionals, and science-based criteria.

Restore / Enhance Parcels

Name	County	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection
Metro streams (prioritized)	Dakota	11420236	150	\$0	Yes
Baptism & Manitou Rivers	Lake	05708229	24	\$0	Yes
Manitou River	Lake	05907227	10	\$0	Yes
Split Rock River	Lake	05509227	100	\$0	Yes
Keene Creek	St. Louis	04915212	0	\$0	Yes
Southeast Maintenance & Additional Enhancements	Winona	10510230	24	\$0	Yes



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

Parcel Map
Enhancing Metro and North Shore Trout Stream
Habitats
(Data Generated From Parcel List)



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Comparison Report

Program Title: ML 2022 - Enhancing Metro and North Shore Trout Stream Habitats

Organization: Minnesota Trout Unlimited

Manager: John Lenczewski

Budget

Requested Amount: \$1,990,000

Appropriated Amount: \$1,130,000

Percentage: 56.78%

Item	Total Requested		Total Appropriated		Percentage of Request	
	Requested	Leverage	Appropriated	Leverage	Percent of Request	Percent of Leverage
Personnel	\$497,000	-	\$437,000	-	87.93%	-
Contracts	\$768,000	\$150,000	\$323,000	\$50,000	42.06%	33.33%
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-	-	-
Travel	\$20,000	-	\$20,000	-	100.0%	-
Professional Services	\$150,000	-	\$100,000	-	66.67%	-
Direct Support Services	\$80,000	\$20,000	\$60,000	\$20,000	75.0%	100.0%
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$20,000	-	\$20,000	-	100.0%	-
Supplies/Materials	\$455,000	\$150,000	\$170,000	\$50,000	37.36%	33.33%
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$1,990,000	\$320,000	\$1,130,000	\$120,000	56.78%	37.5%

If the project received 70% of the requested funding

Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?

We anticipate that acre amounts could be proportionately reduced.

Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?

We anticipate that personnel and DSS expenses could be proportionately reduced.

If the project received 50% of the requested funding

Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?

We anticipate that acre amounts could be proportionately reduced.

Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?

We anticipate that personnel and DSS expenses could be proportionately reduced.

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	0	-	-
Enhance	485	332	68.45%

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	-	-	-
Enhance	\$1,990,000	\$1,130,000	56.78%

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	0	-	-
Enhance	485	332	68.45%

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	-	-	-
Enhance	\$1,990,000	\$1,130,000	56.78%