



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Restoration Evaluations - ML 2022

Laws of Minnesota 2022 Accomplishment Plan

General Information

Date: 01/05/2022

Project Title: Restoration Evaluations - ML 2022

Funds Recommended: \$200,000

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

Appropriation Language:

Manager Information

Manager's Name: Wade Johnson

Title: Restoration Evaluations Program Coordinator

Organization: MN 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: <https://www.dnr.state.mn.us/legacy/restoration-evaluation.html>

Location Information

County Location(s):

Eco regions in which work will take place:

Activity types:

Priority resources addressed by activity:

Narrative

Abstract

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

Design and Scope of Work

The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) are jointly responsible for convening a Restoration Evaluation Panel (Panel) of technical experts to annually evaluate a sample of habitat restoration projects completed with Outdoor Heritage funding, as provided in M.S. 97A.056, Subd. 10. Primary goals of the restoration evaluation program are to provide on the ground accountability for the use of Legacy funds and to improve future habitat restorations in the State. Per statute, the Panel will evaluate the selected habitat restoration projects relative to the law, current science, and the stated goals in the restoration plan. Program staff will identify projects to be evaluated, coordinate field assessments and provide a report to the Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council (LSOHC) and the legislature determining if the restorations are meeting planned goals, any problems with implementation, and, if necessary, recommendations on improving restorations. The anticipated long-term outcomes of this program are increased success of habitat restorations, increased awareness among practitioners and decision-makers of common challenges associated with restorations and recommended management options to improve future projects.

Up to twenty-five initial Outdoor Heritage Fund project evaluations will be reported in the 2023 annual report, an additional three to five follow up evaluations of previously assessed sites will also be reported. Follow up assessments will provide valuable insight in tracking progress and estimating trajectory towards planned goals. Appropriations to this program for the past 4 years have been stable at \$150,000. This ML22 request for \$200,000 allows for current expenditures and continued level of program activity as prior appropriation funds have been expended.

This request supports a portion of the inter-agency Legacy Fund Restoration Evaluations Program, which provides for the evaluation of habitat restoration projects completed with funds from the Parks and Trails Fund (M.S. 85.53 Subd. 5), Outdoor Heritage Fund (M.S.97A.056 Subd.10), and Clean Water Fund (M.S. 114D.50 Subd. 6) as required by state law.

Current Restoration Evaluation Reports, appendix of project evaluations and selected project stories are available on the MN DNR website <https://www.dnr.state.mn.us/legacy/restoration-evaluation.html>

A permanent record of all Legacy Fund Restoration Evaluation reports beginning in 2012 are available from the Legislative Library: <http://www.leg.state.mn.us/edocs/edocs.aspx?oclcnumber=823766285>

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?

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:

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

Which two other plans are addressed in this program?

Which LSOHC section priorities are addressed in this program?

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.

This program is entirely dedicated to Legacy Fund work and does not supplant or substitute for previous funding.

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

It is anticipated that the evaluation program outputs will help to create a framework for continuous improvement in restoration practice. Direct work of the Legacy Fund Restoration Evaluation Program will be sustained for the period of funding.

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

Activity Details

Requirements

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

Yes

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
2020 Restoration Evaluation report submitted to Legislature and LSOHC	April 28, 2024
Site assessors (State staff and contractors) conduct field surveys of selected sites	August 30, 2023
Program staff select up to twenty-five project sites for evaluation	July 1, 2022
Evaluation Panel establishes annual priorities	July 1, 2022

Date of Final Report Submission: 06/30/2025

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	\$165,000	-	-	\$165,000
Contracts	\$16,500	-	-	\$16,500
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-
Travel	\$2,000	-	-	\$2,000
Professional Services	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	\$12,500	-	-	\$12,500
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	-	-	-	-
Supplies/Materials	\$4,000	-	-	\$4,000
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$200,000	-	-	\$200,000

Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Funding Request	Antic. Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Site Assessors (State Agency Staff)	0.1	1.0	\$10,000	-	-	\$10,000
Program Specialist	0.66	1.0	\$75,000	-	-	\$75,000
Program Coordinator	0.66	1.0	\$80,000	-	-	\$80,000

Amount of Request: \$200,000

Amount of Leverage: -

Leverage as a percent of the Request: 0.0%

DSS + Personnel: \$177,500

As a % of the total request: 88.75%

Easement Stewardship: -

As a % of the Easement Acquisition: -

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

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?

Program staff positions, Coordinator and Specialist, have remained the same for the past four appropriations. FTE equivalents for these positions has increased from 0.60 in the ML21 to 0.66 in this ML22 request.

Contracts

What is included in the contracts line?

Technical evaluation of completed restorations and enhancements.

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

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?

DNR Direct and Necessary Calculator

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	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	-

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	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	-

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	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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	-	-	-	-

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	-	-	-	-	-

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

Outcomes

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:



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Comparison Report

Program Title: ML 2022 - Restoration Evaluations - ML 2022

Organization: MN DNR

Manager: Wade Johnson

Budget

Requested Amount: \$200,000

Appropriated Amount: \$200,000

Percentage: 100.0%

Item	Total Requested		Total Appropriated		Percentage of Request	
	Requested	Leverage	Appropriated	Leverage	Percent of Request	Percent of Leverage
Personnel	\$165,000	-	\$165,000	-	100.0%	-
Contracts	\$16,500	-	\$16,500	-	100.0%	-
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-	-	-
Travel	\$2,000	-	\$2,000	-	100.0%	-
Professional Services	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	\$12,500	-	\$12,500	-	100.0%	-
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supplies/Materials	\$4,000	-	\$4,000	-	100.0%	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$200,000	-	\$200,000	-	100.0%	-

If the project received 70% of the requested funding

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

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

If the project received 50% of the requested funding

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

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

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	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	-	-	-
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	0	-	-
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	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-