

# Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Minnesota Statewide Trout Habitat Enhancement & Protection ML 2026 Request for Funding

## General Information

**Date:** 06/17/2025

**Proposal Title:** Minnesota Statewide Trout Habitat Enhancement & Protection

**Funds Requested:** $4,800,000

**Confirmed Leverage Funds:** -

**Is this proposal Scalable?:** Yes

### Manager Information

**Manager's Name:** John Lenczewski **Title:** Executive Director **Organization:** Minnesota Trout Unlimited **Address:** P O Box 845  **City:** Chanhassen, MN 55317 **Email:** john.lenczewski@mntu.org **Office Number:** 6126701629 **Mobile Number:** 6126701629 **Fax Number:**   **Website:** www.mntu.org

### Location Information

**County Location(s):** Dakota, Olmsted, Fillmore, Winona, Lake, Cook, St. Louis, Carlton and Pine.

**Eco regions in which work will take place:**

Northern Forest

Southeast Forest

Metro / Urban

**Activity types:**

Enhance

Protect in Easement

**Priority resources addressed by activity:**

Habitat

## Narrative

### Abstract

Minnesota Trout Unlimited will enhance degraded habitat for wild trout and diverse wildlife in and along priority streams. Increasing threats to these scarce resources require accelerating habitat work to fix degraded sections and buffer streams from the increased frequency and intensity of large rainfall and flooding. While restoring in-stream habitat, we also increase resilience by reconnecting streams to their floodplains and removing barriers to trout movement. We will address the urgent need to protect priority habitat by protecting 3 miles on the most important trout streams. Outcomes include increased fish and wildlife populations, and more angling opportunities near people's homes.

### Design and Scope of Work

Badly degraded habitat on those trout streams that are most accessible to the public severely limits their productivity and public enjoyment. Minnesota Trout Unlimited (“MNTU”) will directly enhance or restore degraded habitat on 9.6 miles of priority streams with existing permanent protections. In addition, because most trout water has no permanent protection or public fishing access, and the DNR is not addressing the urgent need to protect the finite number of remaining trout streams, we will acquire easements protecting 3 miles of the most important trout streams in the metro and in outstate areas.  
   
We will enhance habitat in and along these public waters (in these counties):  
1. Vermillion River (Dakota);  
2. Hay Creek (Pine);  
3. Midway River (Carlton);  
4. Anderson Creek (Carlton);  
5. Us-Kab-Wan-Ka River (St. Louis);  
6. Stewart River (Lake);  
7. Greenwood River (Cook);   
8. Cobblestone Creek (Winona);   
9. Maple Creek (Fillmore);  
10. Gribben Creek (Fillmore);  
11. Numerous streams statewide (numerous counties); and  
12. Additional Enhancement of older projects (numerous counties).  
  
We also will purchase trout stream conservation easements (using DNR templates) to protect important streams such as the Vermillion River (Dakota County), Hay Creek (near Red Wing), Midway River, and Stewart River (Two Harbors). The rate of easement acquisition has not increased since before passage of the Legacy Amendment seventeen years ago. MNTU will correct this.   
  
Individual project descriptions are provided in an attachment.  
  
Goals and scope of habitat work:  
Project goals are to increase the carrying capacity and trout population of the stream, increase climate resilience, increase angling access and participation, improve water quality, and provide benefits to other wildlife. Each project will accomplish one or more of these objectives: (a) increase adult trout abundance, (b) reduce stream bank erosion and associated smothering of habitat (sedimentation) downstream, (c) reconnect the stream to its floodplains to reduce 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 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 an 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 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 through consultations with MNDNR professionals, MNDNR management plans and surveys, other habitat and conservation planning efforts, MNTU’s knowledge of watersheds, 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, local governments and communities.

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

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 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 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 most from in-stream work 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 and add habitat enhancements to past projects to ensure continuing habitat benefits.

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

Minnesota’s trout streams are among the highest quality aquatic systems remaining, but a majority have badly degraded habitat. Leaving degraded segments untreated creates impacts that extends throughout the stream. Degraded sections are no longer providing habitat, clean water benefits, or angling opportunities. A warming climate and more frequent heavy rains require action now to increase floodplain connectivity and increase durability of in-stream habitat. Increased restoration is needed now to increase long term resilience and sustainability of these rare fisheries. Timely maintenance on older projects will extend habitat function and maximize outcomes well into the future.  
  
Threats to trout streams are growing, but most have no permanent protection. DNR acquisition rates have not increased since passage of the Legacy Amendment, despite a growing list of willing riparian landowners. Securing permanent protection before land is transferred to less enlightened landowners is critical to preserve these scarce resources.

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

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 stream's carrying capacity (fish numbers), the stream must have natural reproduction, and the public must have access to fish it. Improving the connectivity of good aquatic and riparian habitat is an important consideration and the projects are selected to expand complexes 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. Projects reverse fragmentation and increases long term resilience of trout and other wildlife.

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

Long Range Plan for Fisheries Management

Strategic Plan for Coldwater Resources Management in Southeastern Minnesota

### Explain how this proposal 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.

Our projects directly increase climate resilience by restoring streams’ access to more of their floodplains. This allows rising streams to quickly spread flood energy outside the stream channel, preserving in-stream habitat and minimizing impacts on fish and wildlife. Projects are also designed using modeling of the increased flows predicted by NOAA's most recent climate projections. Reconnecting habitat also ensures fish and wildlife can move to areas to escape low, warm water. Tree planting on projects in northern forests utilize a mix a tree species predicted to do well 30 years or more from now under climate projections.

### Which LSOHC section priorities are addressed in this proposal?

**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

### Describe how this project/program will produce and demonstrate a significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or outcomes for fish, game, and wildlife, and if not permanent outcomes, why it is important to undertake at this time:

We will directly restore or enhance critical habitat for fish, game, and nongame wildlife on key segments of coldwater streams and rivers around the state. The projects will restore or enhance habitat in and along 9.6 miles of streams and rivers, and connect much larger corridors of habitat, while also extending myriad benefits (including water quality improvements, reduced sedimentation, etc.) far downstream of each project site. Most trout water in Minnesota has no permanent protection or public fishing access. We will create a significant and permananet conservation legacy by permanently protecting 3 miles of the most important trout streams in the state, including the last remaining large trout stream in the Twin Cities.

## 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 ~ *Enhancement of in-stream and riparian corridor habitat creates miles of connected 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.*

### What other dedicated funds may collaborate with or contribute to this proposal?

N/A

### 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 tenfold increase in trout populations and threefold increase in large trout which are common following completion of a southeast Minnesota project, are typically 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 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** |
| One year after grant ends | Agency staff visits and/or MNTU volunteers | Inspect structural elements and vegetation. | If needed, alert DNR and develop action plans. | Conduct maintenance with volunteers and/or contractors if DNR does not. |
| Every 3 years thereafter | Agency staff visits and/or MNTU volunteers | Inspect structural elements and vegetation. | If needed, develop action plan with DNR. | Perform or assist DNR with maintenance if needed. |

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

Our habitat projects provide easy public access to fishable trout populations in relatively small, approachable streams. These streams are accessible to diverse communities, including low- and moderate-income households. They can be fished from the streambanks and no expensive boat, waders, or special gear is required. In southeast MN there are no natural lakes, so anglers of all economic and cultural backgrounds focus angling on the region’s accessible, productive trout streams.

## Activity Details

### Requirements

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

AMA

Permanently Protected Conservation Easements

County/Municipal

Public Waters

State Forests

WMA

### 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 proposal either in the process of restoration or use as food plots?**No

**Will the eased land be open for public use?**Yes

**Describe the expected public use:**Trout angling during the open season.

**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 land that you acquire (fee or easement) be restored or enhanced within this proposal's funding and availability?**No

**Explain how, when, and source of the R/E work:**The need or level of enhancement has not been determined yet.

### Other OHF Appropriation Awards

**Have you received OHF dollars through LSOHC in the past?**Yes

**Are any of these past appropriations still OPEN?**Yes

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Approp Year** | **Funding Amount Received** | **Amount Spent to Date** | **Funding Remaining** | **% Spent to Date** |
| 2023 | $1,690,000 | $154,000 | $1,536,000 | 9.11% |
| 2022 | $1,158,000 | $60,000 | $1,098,000 | 5.18% |
| 2021 | $1,033,000 | $420,000 | $613,000 | 40.66% |
| 2020 | $1,474,000 | $931,000 | $543,000 | 63.16% |
| 2019 | $2,359,000 | $1,939,000 | $420,000 | 82.2% |
| Totals | $7,714,000 | $3,504,000 | $4,210,000 | 45.42% |

## Timeline

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity Name** | **Estimated Completion Date** |
| Begin planning, design and implementation of habitat enhancements. | July 2026 |
| Complete implementation of habitat enhancements, including native vegetation work. | June 2031 |

## Budget

### Totals

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Funding Request** | **Total Leverage** | **Leverage Source** | **Total** |
| Personnel | $360,000 | - | - | $360,000 |
| Contracts | $3,195,000 | $608,000 | NRCS, USFWS, and other partners | $3,803,000 |
| Fee Acquisition w/ PILT | - | - | - | - |
| Fee Acquisition w/o PILT | - | - | - | - |
| Easement Acquisition | $330,000 | - | - | $330,000 |
| Easement Stewardship | $33,000 | - | - | $33,000 |
| Travel | $20,000 | - | - | $20,000 |
| Professional Services | $649,000 | - | - | $649,000 |
| Direct Support Services | $165,000 | - | - | $165,000 |
| DNR Land Acquisition Costs | - | - | - | - |
| Capital Equipment | - | - | - | - |
| Other Equipment/Tools | $3,000 | - | - | $3,000 |
| Supplies/Materials | $45,000 | - | - | $45,000 |
| DNR IDP | - | - | - | - |
| **Grand Total** | **$4,800,000** | **$608,000** | **-** | **$5,408,000** |

### Personnel

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Position** | **Annual FTE** | **Years Working** | **Funding Request** | **Total Leverage** | **Leverage Source** | **Total** |
| Habitat enhancement staff | 2.5 | 5.0 | $360,000 | - | - | $360,000 |

**Amount of Request:** $4,800,000 **Amount of Leverage:** $608,000 **Leverage as a percent of the Request:** 12.67% **DSS + Personnel:** $525,000 **As a % of the total request:** 10.94% **Easement Stewardship:** $33,000 **As a % of the Easement Acquisition:** 10.0%

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Leverage (from above)** | **Amount Confirmed** | **% of Total Leverage** | **Amount Anticipated** | **% of Total Leverage** |
| $608,000 | - | 0.0% | $608,000 | 100.0% |

**Detail leverage sources and confirmation of funds:**NRCS in southeast MN projects; USFWS on Greenwood River. The leverage estimates are estimates only. We will aggressively pursue leverage, including federal Farm Bill funding on southeast Minnesota and other federal funding for trout passage projects.

**Does this proposal 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?**We anticipate that acre amounts could be proportionately reduced.

**Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?**Personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted downward but not strictly proportionally. Some projects with lower construction costs can require as much or more staff time as projects with much larger construction costs. Program oversight costs also remain consistent regardless of appropriation amount.

### If the project received 30% 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. However, individual projects will cost more per acre if they are of larger scope than other smaller scope projects that enhance a similar number of acres.

**Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?**Personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted downward but not strictly proportionally. Some projects with lower construction costs can require as much or more staff time as projects with much larger construction costs. Program oversight costs also remain consistent regardless of appropriation 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?**Funding for the current personnel who perform similar work to that required to implement the FY2027 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 only. We may hire new staff to implement work in northern MN. Any unused dollars budgeted for personnel and travel in a given grant will be shifted into contracts and materials budget categories to complete additional habitat work under that grant.

### Contracts

**What is included in the contracts line?**This is for contracted services to construct the project on the ground, and includes heavy equipment use (with operators), other labor, and materials that the construction contractor must incorporate into the project features.

### Professional Services

**What is included in the Professional Services line?**

Design/Engineering

Other : Permitting and construction oversight.

Title Insurance and Legal Fees

### Easement Stewardship

**What is the number of easements anticipated, cost per easement for stewardship, and explain how that amount is calculated?**The stewardship amount is ten percent of the purchase price. It was calculated based upon DNR's experience with trout stream easements.

### 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 parallels Trout Unlimited's federal rate, which is approved every two years. It is based only upon the amount of personnel time, travel, and professional services actually expended on the individual habitat projects in this proposal.

### Other Equipment/Tools

**Give examples of the types of Equipment and Tools that will be purchased?**Primarily hand tools and safety gear 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Protect in Easement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 36 |
| Enhance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 | 116 |
| **Total** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **152** | **152** |

### Restoration/Enhancement Acres of OHF Acquired Lands (Table 1a.1)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **RESTORE** | | **Total** | **ENHANCE** | | **Total** |
|  | **Lands acquired in this proposal** | **Lands acquired with previous OHF approprations (<5yrs old)** |  | **Lands acquired in this proposal** | **Lands acquired with previous OHF approprations (<5yrs old)** |  |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** |

### Restoration/Enhancement Acres Breakdown of Existing Protected Lands (Table 1a.2)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **RESTORE** | | **ENHANCE** | |
|  | **Lands acquired with OHF** | **Lands NOT acquired with OHF** | **Lands acquired with OHF** | **Lands NOT acquired with OHF** |
| DNR Lands (WMA, State Forests, etc) | - | - | - | - |
| Non-DNR Lands (city, state, federal, etc.) | - | - | - | - |
| Easements | - | - | - | - |
| **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 | - | - | - | $429,000 | $429,000 |
| Enhance | - | - | - | $4,371,000 | $4,371,000 |
| **Total** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **$4,800,000** | **$4,800,000** |

### Acres within each Ecological Section (Table 3)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Metro/Urban** | **Forest/Prairie** | **SE Forest** | **Prairie** | **N. Forest** | **Total Acres** |
| Restore | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Protect in Easement | 12 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 36 |
| Enhance | 10 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 55 | 116 |
| **Total** | **22** | **0** | **63** | **0** | **67** | **152** |

### 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 | $143,000 | - | $143,000 | - | $143,000 | $429,000 |
| Enhance | $407,000 | - | $2,151,000 | - | $1,813,000 | $4,371,000 |
| **Total** | **$550,000** | **-** | **$2,294,000** | **-** | **$1,956,000** | **$4,800,000** |

### 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 | - | - | - | $11,916 |
| Enhance | - | - | - | $37,681 |

### 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 | $11,916 | - | $11,916 | - | $11,916 |
| Enhance | $40,700 | - | $42,176 | - | $32,963 |

### Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

12.6 miles

## Parcels

**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 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 through consultations with MNDNR professionals, MNDNR management plans and surveys, other habitat and conservation planning efforts, MNTU members’ knowledge of watersheds, and science-based criteria.

### Restore / Enhance Parcels

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **County** | **TRDS** | **Acres** | **Est Cost** | **Existing Protection** | **Description** |
| Anderson Creek | Carlton | 04916212 | 3 | $0 | Yes | Re-meneander cold brook trout stream |
| Midway River | Carlton | 04916212 | 5 | $0 | Yes | Enhance habitat for brook trout in larger area stream |
| Greenwood River | Cook | 06302102 | 24 | $0 | Yes | Restore acess to 2 miles of habitat for native brook trout. |
| Vermillion River | Dakota | 11420236 | 5 | $0 | Yes | Enhance habitat on previously straightened section and recapture 1,800 feet of stream channel |
| Gribben Creek | Fillmore | 10309221 | 7 | $0 | Yes | Enhance habitat for wild brown trout |
| Maple Creek | Fillmore | 10208203 | 10 | $0 | Yes | Enhance habitat from recent project down to So Fork Root to connect habitat corridor |
| Numerous streams statewide - via vegetation esp. | Lake | 05510217 | 12 | $0 | Yes | Enhance habitat primarily through riparian vegetation management. |
| Stewart River | Lake | 05310229 | 7 | $0 | Yes | Restore forest canopy to cool river |
| Additional Enhancements & Maintenance in SE MN | Olmsted | 10711235 | 24 | $0 | Yes | Maintenance and additional enhancements on older projects to ensure continued habitat benefits for years |
| Hay Creek | Pine | 04118232 | 5 | $0 | Yes | Enhance brook trout habitat on nearest stream to north metro anglers |
| Us-Kab-Wan-Ka River | St. Louis | 05216202 | 4 | $0 | Yes | Re-meander coldest reach of native brook trout stream |
| Cobblestone Creek | Winona | 10607213 | 10 | $0 | Yes | Enhance habitat for heritage brook trout on entire main stem of cold stream. |

### Protect Parcels

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **County** | **TRDS** | **Acres** | **Est Cost** | **Existing Protection** |
| Protect key trout habitat (statewide) | Dakota | 11419236 | 36 | $0 | No |

## Parcel Map



