



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Moose Habitat Collaborative, Phase V- NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement
Laws of Minnesota 2025 Accomplishment Plan

General Information

Date: 12/23/2024

Project Title: Moose Habitat Collaborative, Phase V- NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement

Funds Recommended: \$2,050,000

Legislative Citation: ML 2025, Ch. XXX, Art. 1, Sec. 2, subd. 3(g)

Appropriation Language:

Manager Information

Manager's Name: Scott Johnson

Title: Forest Conservation Coordinator

Organization: The Ruffed Grouse Society/ American Woodcock Society

Address: 100 Hightower Blvd

City: pittsburgh, PA 15205

Email: scottj@ruffedgrousesociety.org

Office Number:

Mobile Number: 4128603481

Fax Number:

Website: ruffedgrousesociety.org

Location Information

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

Eco regions in which work will take place:

- Northern Forest

Activity types:

- Enhance

Priority resources addressed by activity:

- Habitat

Narrative

Abstract

The Ruffed Grouse Society (RGS), in collaboration with federal, state, county, tribal, university and non-governmental organizational (NGO) partners, seeks to continue the successful work of previous Moose Habitat Collaborative (MHC) grants to stabilize/sustain Minnesota's moose population by enhancing ~3,092 acres of cover/forage habitat for moose. The project builds on the Collaborative's Phase I-IV efforts to improve degraded forest habitats by increasing stand complexity through mixed density/cover type recruitment and maintenance methods which, applied in conjunction with other planned forest management activities enhances overall moose habitat across the landscape.

Design and Scope of Work

Moose have an iconic status and are a critical component of the cultural identity, heritage and recreational economy of northern Minnesota. In recent decades Minnesota's moose population has fallen from an estimated 8,840 in 2006 to 3,470 in 2024. Due to growing concerns of population decline, the following actions have been undertaken:

- Multiple agency listings of moose as a species of concern, state hunting season closure in 2013
- Minnesota Legislature directed MNDNR to establish a Moose Advisory Committee (MAC; 2009 report). It recommended that management focus on increasing stand complexity, promoting browse production and thermal cover mimicking natural disturbance patterns.
- Primarily based on recommendations in MAC report, DNR completed a Minnesota Moose Research and Management Plan (Moose Plan; 2011). It includes objectives for research, quality habitat, social science considerations, and dissemination of plan information.
- To address research objectives: an adult moose mortality study (2013-16), moose calf mortality study (2013-17), and a winter nutrition study (2016-2020).
- To address habitat objectives, habitat management efforts have been accomplished through the Moose Habitat Collaborative through LSOHC MHC grants: Phase I (2,049 acres), Phase II (5,164 acres), Phase III (10,227 acres), currently funded Phase IV (8,000 proposed acres).

With the success of MHC Phase I-IV grants, collaborative partners would like to continue efforts through this ML2025 LSOHC proposal. This effort will again be steered by a broad range of partners that make up the Moose Habitat Collaborative. Current partners and roles are:

- NGOs: Ruffed Grouse Society (grant sponsor, program manager duties, fiscal agent), The Nature Conservancy, (site, project, and public land administrator coordination), MN Deer Hunters Association.
- Public land administrators: Superior National Forest; MNDNR – Divisions of Forestry and Fish and Wildlife; Cook, Lake; St. Louis Counties (site/land manager and technical)
- Tribal authorities: 1854 Treaty Authority, Fond du Lac, Bois Forte and Grand Portage Bands of Lake Superior Chippewa (research/technical).

- Habitat research: University of Minnesota Duluth, Natural Resources Research Institute (UMD, NRRI, research/technical).
- America The Beautiful Moose Habitat Planning grant and initiative. This initiative and the current OHF MHC are well integrated and complimentary with shared participants, goals and objectives. The ATB grant is in core planning stages and endeavors to produce plans for implementation of large-scale moose habitat restoration and enhancement efforts on three selected landscape locations within the NE moose range. The ATB grant differs from the MHC only in it's concentrated nature and specific focal areas. These efforts are complimentary and are an opportunity for further impact in shared moose habitat objectives. Application of OHF funds within sites currently being evaluated by the ATB grant have been extensively discussed and are included in portions of this proposal.

Collaborative partners will work together to choose forested stands where enhancement actions will benefit moose. This process is guided by the initial designation of priority moose landscapes and project areas through modeling and professional knowledge, and the use of site level guidelines with accompanying project documentation forms and ongoing monitoring.

Explain how the plan addresses habitat protection, restoration, and/or enhancement for fish, game & wildlife, including threatened or endangered species conservation

As noted in previous sections of this proposal, since 2009 Minnesota has undertaken a series of moose assessments, plans, research, monitoring and habitat enhancement efforts which includes the listing of moose as a species of special concern in 2013, it's notation as such in Minnesota's current Wildlife Action Plan (WAP), and the use of moose as a wildlife habitat indicator in DNR's Conservation Agenda, 10-year Strategic Plan. While enhancement actions described in this proposal reflect a primary goal of managing northern forests with an emphasis on moose habitat, numerous other wildlife populations and species of greatest conservation need (SGCN) are also benefited through the enhancement of forest vegetation species and spacing diversity and interspersation at large patch scale through: site preparation including prescribed fire, mechanical preparation of brush, trees and soils, tree planting, release and browse protection.

In addition to moose, restoration of ecologically appropriate conditions in two of the primary affected native plant communities (FDn43a and b) will also positively affect habitat for many associated SGCN at some portion of their life stage and habitat succession. This project will encourage a heterogeneous forest habitat matrix at large patch scale resulting in a landscape that is more resilient, providing for an ecologically diverse and balanced landscape condition with greater benefit to moose, SGCN species, and wildlife as a whole. Degraded habitat is identified as stress concern for moose in the WAP and MN Moose Plan. Further, climate related impacts to these habitats are projected to increase into the future. Restoring ecologically appropriate and diverse forest vegetation is both a direct management strategy to enhance present habitat for moose and to provide climate related resilience to these forest habitats. Large landscapes of habitat which include moose browse in large patches through young, early successional woody vegetation while recruiting an interspersation of variable density and mixed conifer species along with retention and restoration of escape and thermal cover patches of mature deciduous stands with a clumped conifer component have been identified as a vision for quality moose habitat (MHC professional partner expertise, ATB group interpretations, MN Moose Management

What are the elements of this plan that are critical from a timing perspective?

While there are numerous issues in this moose population decline (i.e. climate change, parasites, predation,), a key observation and recommendation in all of the plans referenced in this proposal is to promptly provide resilient, high quality cover and forage habitat across moose range. This Phase V proposal seeks to continue the excellent landscape and site level documentation/vetting process the Collaborative has utilized to enhance ~25,000 acres of

moose habitat under previous Phase I-IV grants.

Timber harvest/management activities have and will continue to be a primary driver of forest change, including disturbance that can positively affect forest composition, pattern and structure in moose range. However, they are not always financially feasible nor do they ideally provide moose habitat where/when needed. Requested grant funds will support, engage with and build on this ongoing work and are an incentive to public land administrators to ensure consideration for moose habitat.

Describe how the plan expands habitat corridors or complexes and/or addresses habitat fragmentation:

Collaborative biologists, foresters, ecologists and GIS specialists engage in a collaborative process utilizing local expertise and field knowledge, GIS modeling and spatial analysis of landscapes to select priority enhancement areas that will compliment and expand on current habitat conditions to achieve moose and associated wildlife species habitat objectives at significant scale. Connecting and relating moose habitat attributes at landscape scale with an enhanced or restored mosaic of large patches of deciduous browse and variably spaced regenerating conifer and patches of mature conifer dominated escape and thermal cover are explicitly part of this proposal's accomplishment strategy. Working to compliment or directly support other forest management activities such as timber harvesting that can ensure landscape significance of moose habitat enhancement is also a core strategy of the MHC when determining when and where to place enhancement efforts. At a landscape scale this will involve use of moose habitat focused modeling, USFS moose project management areas, pending DNR moose management opportunity areas as well as complimentary partner America The Beautiful moose habitat concentrated management focal areas. At the site and project level this is vetted through the use of a Moose Habitat Project Documentation and Guidelines form that includes: 1) Site Level Current Conditions, Native Plant Community dynamics and a Landscape Context, 2) Short-term desired future condition, 3) Long-term desired future condition, 4) Methods (treatment), 5) Biologist comments, and 6) moose habitat guidelines or best management practices.

Collaborative partners will also continue to assess and utilize the outcomes of different treatment methods and their effectiveness in regard to vegetative response, use by moose and other wildlife species. This analysis has been ongoing since Phase I, includes:

- Site Verification of Moose Habitat Restoration Report (NRRI, UMD, 2017),
- Monitoring of Moose Habitat Restoration Site Reports (annual 2017-2022) by the 1854 Treaty Authority, and,
- Moose Habitat Survey Reports (annual) by the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa.

Which top 2 Conservation Plans referenced in MS97A.056, subd. 3a are most applicable to this project?

- Moose Advisory Committee Report to the Minnesota DNR
- Other : Other: MN Moose Research and Management Plan(MRMP); MN Forest Resources Council - NE Forest Resources Plan(MFRC); MN Wildlife Action Plan, 2010-2025(WAP); Superior National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan; Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa; Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa; DNR's Ruffed Grouse in MN:Long-Range Plan for Management.

Explain how this plan will uniquely address habitat resilience to climate change and its anticipated effects on game, fish & wildlife species utilizing the protected or restored/enhanced habitat this proposal targets.

The MFRC NE Plan and NIACS's Climate Change Impacts project significant warming and changed precipitation patterns with subsequent increased stress and decline of boreal vegetation species in northern Minnesota, including many of those important for moose habitat attributes. Similarly, in addition to habitat degradation, the MRMP anticipates increased direct climate related stress to moose. NIACS's Climate Adaptation Strategies and Approaches and MFRC Plan list enhancing vegetation species/structural diversity as a primary means of adaptation to climate change. Similarly, MAC habitat recommendations suggest maintaining high quality habitat through diversity and ecological silviculture as primary moose habitat considerations. Fortunately, enhancement for short term moose habitat needs and longer term climate related forest vegetation adaptation strategies are complimentary and are integrated in the work indicated in this proposal. Implementing ecologically guided vegetation diversity with an emphasis on appropriate distribution of moose habitat needs is the core objective of this proposal.

Which LSOHC section priorities are addressed in this program?

Northern Forest

- Restore and enhance habitat on existing protected properties, with preference to habitat for rare, endangered, or threatened species identified by the Minnesota County Biological Survey

Outcomes

Programs in the northern forest region:

- Healthy populations of endangered, threatened, and special concern species as well as more common species ~ *Moose are an iconic species of special conservation concern in Minnesota, important to the region's economy, ecology and cultural heritage values. The habitat enhancement proposed aims to help sustain at least the current moose population of ~3,500 animals. Our primary metric for measuring enhancement of moose habitat will be acres of treatments which achieve our best management practices and habitat guidelines. Treatments are monitored continuously during implementation through professional assessments and the Collaborative process, and post-treatment monitoring of a subset of sites for moose use will be conducted by the 1854 Treaty Authority with support by Collaborative members.*

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.

Grant funds requested are for moose habitat enhancement efforts (site preparation, RXfire and diverse variable density cover and forage establishment and protection) that have typically not been met by traditional commercial timber harvest and forest management practices, which truly provide and incentivize or supplement public- land forest management efforts.

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

The primary goal of this project proposal is to enhance moose habitat. The broad objectives include enhancing winter and summer thermal and escape cover with an interspersed of quality browse in an appropriate distribution and quantity in consideration of current landscape scale forest conditions. All affected moose habitat enhancement acres to be completed under this grant are on public lands managed by Collaborative partners. Site or project level objectives of this and previous grants have been to establish enhanced cover and forage areas

through a process that can take from 1-5 years (i.e. grants supplemental use for prescribed fire, mechanical or hand site preparation, planting, bud capping, and release efforts). Once these moose habitat/forest stands are established they typically have a 80-100 year stand life, and are sustainably managed by their respective public land administrator. Additionally, past and proposed monitoring protocols of site level best habitat treatment practices have been developed by NRRI and 1854 Treaty Authority in conjunction with the MHC and will be employed under this proposal as in-kind contributions. This will guide adaptive management during proposal implementation and maintenance into the future.

Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes

Year	Source of Funds	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
2029 and beyond	Governmental partners budget	Manage and monitor lands consistent with grant objectives.	-	-

Provide an assessment of how your program celebrates cultural diversity or reaches diverse communities in Minnesota, including reaching low- and moderate-income households:

Diverse stakeholder communities are participants in the regular Moose Habitat Collaborative meetings and processes. Deliberately welcoming and including diverse communities' perspectives by seeking and embracing their involvement when opportunities to do so arise and consulting them through existing and newly developed channels of communication will be utilized as a part of all aspects of this effort. Furthermore, in the spirit of collaboration, this Collaborative will endeavor to offer engagement opportunity and produce outreach and shareable content through invitations to field tours and media outlets.

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 or on lands to be acquired in this program?

Yes

Where does the activity take place?

- County/Municipal
- State Forests
- Other : Superior National Forest

Land Use

Will there be planting of any crop on OHF land purchased or restored in this program, either by the proposer or the end owner of the property, outside of the initial restoration of the land?

No

Will insecticides or fungicides (including neonicotinoid and fungicide treated seed) be used within any activities of this program either in the process of restoration or use as food plots?

No

Timeline

Activity Name	Estimated Completion Date
Winter/spring habitat enhancements (i.e. site prep, cover planting, etc.)	8/1/29 (Final Report)
Summer/fall habitat enhancements (i.e. rxfire, cover protection efforts, forage enhancements, etc.)	2/1/29 (6 month status update)
Winter/spring habitat enhancements (i.e. site prep, cover planting, etc.)	8/1/28 (6 month status update)
Summer/fall habitat enhancements (i.e. rxfire, cover protection efforts, forage enhancements, etc.)	2/1/28 (6 month status update)
Winter/spring habitat enhancements (i.e. site prep, cover planting, etc.)	8/1/27 (6 month status update)
Summer/fall habitat enhancements (i.e. rxfire, cover protection efforts, forage enhancements, etc.)	2/1/27 (6 month status update)
Winter/spring habitat enhancements (i.e. site prep, cover planting, etc.)	8/1/26 (6 month status update)
Summer/fall habitat enhancements (i.e. rx fire, cover protection efforts, forage enhancements, etc.)	2/1/26 (6 month status update)
Funding available, secure contracts with TNC, USFS. Initiate specific Collaborative engagement.	august 2025

Date of Final Report Submission: 08/01/2029

Availability of Appropriation: Subd. 7. Availability of Appropriation

(a) Money appropriated in this section may not be spent on activities unless they are directly related to and necessary for a specific appropriation and are specified in the accomplishment plan approved by the Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council. Money appropriated in this section must not be spent on indirect costs or other institutional overhead charges that are not directly related to and necessary for a specific appropriation. Money appropriated for fee title acquisition of land may be used to restore, enhance, and provide for public use of the land acquired with the appropriation. Public-use facilities must have a minimal impact on habitat in acquired lands.

(b) Money appropriated in this section is available as follows:

- (1) money appropriated for acquiring real property is available until June 30, 2029;
- (2) money appropriated for restoring and enhancing land acquired with an appropriation in this section is available for four years after the acquisition date with a maximum end date of June 30, 2033;
- (3) money appropriated for restoring or enhancing other land is available until June 30, 2030;
- (4) notwithstanding clauses (1) to (3), money appropriated for a project that receives at least 15 percent of its funding from federal funds is available until a date sufficient to match the availability of federal funding to a maximum of six years if the federal funding was confirmed and included in the original approved draft accomplishment plan; and
- (5) money appropriated for other projects is available until the end of the fiscal year in which it is appropriated.

Budget

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

Totals

Item	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Personnel	\$166,800	\$5,000	RGS	\$171,800
Contracts	\$1,847,300	\$60,000	Partners' in-kind and \$5,000 RGS	\$1,907,300
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-
Travel	\$2,100	-	-	\$2,100
Professional Services	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	\$33,800	\$20,900	RGS Waived Indirect	\$54,700
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	-	-	-	-
Supplies/Materials	-	-	-	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$2,050,000	\$85,900	-	\$2,135,900

Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Funding Request	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Multiple RGS positions-accounting, contract specialists, admin and conservation staff	0.4	4.0	\$166,800	\$5,000	RGS	\$171,800

Amount of Request: \$2,050,000

Amount of Leverage: \$85,900

Leverage as a percent of the Request: 4.19%

DSS + Personnel: \$200,600

As a % of the total request: 9.79%

Easement Stewardship: -

As a % of the Easement Acquisition: -

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

Accomplishment output will be approximately reduced proportionately with the reduced appropriation. Funded personnel budget was first reduced proportionately to allocation reduction percentage except for the \$30,000

stagnant administrative support noted below, then DSS calculated based on this number plus travel and balance of funding allocation applied to contracts .5154

Detail leverage sources and confirmation of funds:

Leverage from public land and 1854 Treaty Authority staff in -kind for site reconnaissance, contract administration inspection, project review and monitoring (\$55,000), 12.38% waived federal indirect (.3238) and \$5,000 RGS In-Kind, \$5,000 RGS contracts

Does this project have the ability to be scalable?

Yes

If the project received 50% of the requested funding

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

Acreage accomplishment would be approximately proportionately reduced. Sites with lower prioritization would simply not be included for enhancement treatment.

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

Personnel and DSS would be reduced by about 60% because about \$30,000 of personnel accounting and administration costs would be stagnant for process development.

Personnel

Has funding for these positions been requested in the past?

Yes

Contracts

What is included in the contracts line?

\$1,801,300 for contracts (agency administrator bid/contract process) and private contractors for moose habitat enhancement efforts (site preparation-mechanical with timber utilization and non-harvest, RXfire and supplies, trees and tree planting, release, budcapping, GIS support, assessment/monitoring needs, and grant management including support agreement with TNC and SNF).

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

na

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?

RGS has a federally predetermined NICRA rate of 32.38%. We reduced that NICRA to 20% and applied to our personnel and travel costs. The remaining 12.38% was waived as in-kind contribution.

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	-	-	-	3,153	3,153
Total	-	-	-	3,153	3,153

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	-	-	-	\$2,050,000	\$2,050,000
Total	-	-	-	\$2,050,000	\$2,050,000

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	-	-	-	-	3,153	3,153
Total	-	-	-	-	3,153	3,153

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	-	-	-	-	\$2,050,000	\$2,050,000
Total	-	-	-	-	\$2,050,000	\$2,050,000

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	-	-	-	\$650

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	-	-	-	-	\$650

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

Parcels

Parcel Information

Sign-up Criteria?

No

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

This parcel list notes potential enhancement sites by approximate legal description for identified opportunity or focused effort areas proposed by Collaborative participants. Exact placement of enhancement work, quantity of acres treated and regime of treatments used must be flexible to allow application of enhancement treatment efforts with opportunistic and efficient timing. Listed potential parcels and acres are also much greater than the quantity actually proposed for enhancement completion under this grant proposal in order to further allow this flexibility in implementation- especially in consideration of the complex and weather dependent limitations inherent in prescribed fire, timber removal and other mechanical site preparation treatments.


Additionally, the treatment regime indicated for proposed enhancement sites must be adaptable to habitat vegetation conditions documented at the time of implementation. Some sites will require a full suite of treatments from site preparation to planting to release to browse protection because of heavy vegetation competition conditions, while others will not. This determination must be made at the time of implementation and will be guided and documented with the Moose Habitat Project Documentation Form. Ultimately treatment acres will be greater than final completed acres because of the frequent need for multiple steps utilized to achieve full enhancement objectives.

Restore / Enhance Parcels

Name	County	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection	Description
Blueberry Hill Burn SNF	Cook	06302231	15,000	\$50,000	Yes	Prep and supplies in support of Rx burn
Duncan BWCA Burn- SNF	Cook	06501227	2,800	\$50,000	Yes	Prep and supplies in support of Rx burn
LUX BWCA Burn- SNF	Cook	06401221	3,300	\$50,000	Yes	Prep and supplies in support of Rx burn
RACR Burn SNF	Cook	06205236	1,880	\$100,000	Yes	Prep and supplies in support of Rx burn
Sunfish Burn SNF	Cook	06402235	2,000	\$30,000	Yes	Prep and supplies in support of Rx burn
Swamp River Burn SNF	Cook	06304205	1,500	\$50,000	Yes	Prep and supplies in support of Rx burn
Twin Green and other EA project sites- SNF	Cook	06302201	500	\$300,000	Yes	Diversification Treatments in ATB Focal Area
Basswood Burn- SNF	Lake	06409204	1,680	\$50,000	Yes	Prep and supplies in support of Rx burn
Beaver River Burn SNF	Lake	05710235	1,000	\$20,000	Yes	Prep and supplies in support of Rx burn
Beaver River Road- Lake	Lake	05709234	500	\$300,000	Yes	Site Prep with utilization and or diversification treatments
Claire Nelson- Lake	Lake	05807205	500	\$300,000	Yes	Site Preparation with utilization and or diversification treatments in ATB Focal Area
Kangas Burn SNF	Lake	06212218	200	\$50,000	Yes	Prep and supplies in support of Rx burn

Tofte Landscape Project Sites- SNF	Lake	06007201	500	\$300,000	Yes	Diversification Treatments in ATB Focal Area
Trident Burn- SNF	Lake	06408203	1,817	\$50,000	Yes	Prep and supplies in support of Rx burn
Two Harbors Diversification STL	Lake	05708203	401	\$240,600	Yes	Diversification Treatments
Two Harbors SBW Projects- STL	Lake	05808221	454	\$272,400	Yes	Site Prep with utilization and or diversification treatments
BO15897- State	St. Louis	06517236	500	\$300,000	Yes	Site Prep with utilization and or Diversification Treatments in ATB Focal Area
Big Nugget- SLC	St. Louis	06517214	100	\$60,000	Yes	Site prep with utilization and or diversification treatments
Crab Lake- BWCA Burn- SNF	St. Louis	06314214	2,400	\$50,000	Yes	Prep and supplies in support of Rx burn
Finkus SNF	St. Louis	06517223	300	\$180,000	Yes	Site Prep with utilization and or Diversification Treatments in ATB Focal Area
North Hilda Complex SNF	St. Louis	06516231	500	\$300,000	Yes	Diversification Treatments in ATB Focal Area
Partridge River and Colvin Creek- SNF and SLC	St. Louis	05813209	1,000	\$600,000	Yes	Site Prep with utilization and or diversification treatments

Parcel Map



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



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Moose Habitat Collaborative, Phase V- NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement Comparison Report

Program Title: ML 2025 - Moose Habitat Collaborative, Phase V- NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement

Organization: The Ruffed Grouse Society/ American Woodcock Society

Manager: Scott Johnson

Budget

Requested Amount: \$3,851,300

Appropriated Amount: \$2,050,000

Percentage: 53.23%

Item	Requested Proposal	Leverage Proposal	Appropriated AP	Leverage AP	Percent of Request	Percent of Leverage
Personnel	\$292,900	\$5,000	\$166,800	\$5,000	56.95%	100.0%
Contracts	\$3,495,000	\$105,000	\$1,847,300	\$60,000	52.86%	57.14%
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-	-	-
Travel	\$4,000	-	\$2,100	-	52.5%	-
Professional Services	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	\$59,400	\$36,800	\$33,800	\$20,900	56.9%	56.79%
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supplies/Materials	-	-	-	-	-	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$3,851,300	\$146,800	\$2,050,000	\$85,900	53.23%	58.51%

If the project received 70% of the requested funding

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

Acreage accomplishment would be approximately proportionately reduced. Sites with lower prioritization would simply not be included for enhancement treatment.

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

Personnel and DSS would be reduced by about 40% because about \$30,000 of personnel accounting and administration costs would be stagnant for process development.

If the project received 50% of the requested funding

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

Acreage accomplishment would be approximately proportionately reduced. Sites with lower prioritization would simply not be included for enhancement treatment.

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

Personnel and DSS would be reduced by about 60% because about \$30,000 of personnel accounting and administration costs would be stagnant for process development.

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	6,000	3,153	52.55%

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	\$3,851,300	\$2,050,000	53.23%

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	6,000	3,153	52.55%

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	\$3,851,300	\$2,050,000	53.23%