

# Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Protection and Restoration of Money Creek and its Natural Riparian Communities ML 2026 Request for Funding

## General Information

**Date:** 06/26/2025

**Proposal Title:** Protection and Restoration of Money Creek and its Natural Riparian Communities

**Funds Requested:** $2,966,100

**Confirmed Leverage Funds:** -

**Is this proposal Scalable?:** Yes

### Manager Information

**Manager's Name:** Amy Crews **Title:** Client and Resiliency Solutions Manager **Organization:** RES, LLC **Address:** 20276 Delaware Avenue  **City:** Jordan, MN 55352 **Email:** acrews@res.us **Office Number:** 573-263-2174 **Mobile Number:** 5732632174 **Fax Number:**   **Website:** www.res.us

### Location Information

**County Location(s):** Winona.

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

Southeast Forest

**Activity types:**

Protect in Easement

Restore

**Priority resources addressed by activity:**

Habitat

## Narrative

### Abstract

This project will restore 69 acres of riparian habitat and over two miles of Money Creek, a designated trout stream within the Root River Watershed in Winona County. The project is located within a Conservation Focus Area of the Wildlife Action Plan and contains numerous species of greatest conservation need (SGCN). The riparian restoration, streambank stabilization, reestablished floodplain connections, habitat enhancements, and new 69-acre BWSR RIM easement will provide perpetual protection to terrestrial and aquatic habitats, connect existing easements, and reduce fragmentation. The project is a collaboration among BWSR, Winona County SWCD, and RES (private ecological restoration company).

### Design and Scope of Work

Money Creek is impaired by sediment and bacteria. Its incised channel, eroding streambanks, and invasive riparian vegetation have reduced the quality and quantity of habitat available for native flora and fauna. While the creek supports trout and the floodplain contains rare plants, this riparian corridor has experienced significant degradation due to upstream and adjacent land use.   
The project’s objectives, priorities, and desired outcomes are tailored to regionally relevant plans. The Wildlife Action Plan designated the Root River Watershed as a priority for focused conservation actions. The Root River One Watershed One Plan (1W1P) identifies Money Creek as one of eight priority sub-watersheds for restoration due to its contribution of sediment and E. coli to the Root River. In addition, this project accomplishes LSOHC’s priority to protect, restore, and enhance important habitat for terrestrial and aquatic species.  
Restoration and enhancement of the site will entail reshaping streambanks to more stable slopes, stabilizing with wood and rock toes, installing riffles, incorporating large woody material to provide channel stability and aquatic habitat/shelter, reconnecting incised stream segments with floodplain benches and oxbows, establishing native riparian vegetation (including woody plantings to provide shading and cooling of the trout waters), and removal of invasive riparian vegetation.  
This collaboration among multiple organizations working together for common good consists of RES, an ecosystem restoration company, and the Board for Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) as co-applicants, with Winona County SWCD and the DNR Fisheries and the Nature Conservancy providing needed support. First, to provide permanent protection in the form of an easement, BWSR, the landowners and RES propose a new 69-acre BWSR Reinvest in Minnesota (RIM) Easement. The RIM easement program has been selected because one of its purposes is permanent protection of riparian corridors. Second, RES has provided a letter of support from the Winona County SWCD, who is supporting the BWSR RIM Program long-term for oversight. Third, TNC has agreed to provide independent 3rd party evaluation of the project’s ecological performance. Fourth, the Southeast DNR Fisheries office advised on the project design concept, participated in meetings and a site visit and will be supporting TNC’s evaluation during implementation. Finally, RES has worked with the landowner to develop an easement boundary and restoration strategy that is compatible with the landowner’s priorities and the regional conservation goals, and will perform the design, construction and permitting. Each of these stakeholders have outlined their support, which are provided in the attachments.  
This project demonstrates how collaboration, combined with a performance-based approach to accomplishing project and program outcomes, can streamline ecological uplift, reduce inefficiencies, and provide resources to understaffed communities. Collaborations like this one enable positive force multiplier effects toward habitat restoration and resiliency. As Winona County SWCD has identified, technical and administrative resources are limited in many counties in Southeast MN, and collaboration with private companies for restoration can reduce the burden of the overall project administration, thereby enabling conservation projects to move forward that would otherwise be delayed or even unachievable.

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

The project presents opportunities for meaningful and immediate outcomes to rare flora and fauna. Not only is this section of Money Creek a designated trout stream, it's also home to at least eight SGCN, including some that are threatened or endangered. The project also abuts a rare calcareous fen - one of the rarest natural communities in Minnesota and one of only five fens in the entire Root River Watershed. The site’s rare native plant communities and moderate-to-high biodiversity significance rating contributed to the site’s designation as “medium-high priority” by the MN Wildlife Action Network. The rare species and their habitats will benefit from a holistic approach that includes restoration as well as permanent protections via easements.  
According to the Root River 1W1P, in-stream habitat degradation in this ecoregion is primarily the result of streambank erosion; therefore, addressing unstable banks is a priority outlined in the plan. Restoration will include a variety of bioengineering techniques. Bankfull floodplain benches will be installed at strategic locations to allow for more frequent flooding outside of the incised channel and improved channel integrity. Abandoned side channels and oxbows will be re-connected to the creek, providing improved floodwater storage, reduced peak flows and erosion, and enhanced floodplain habitats. Beneficial reuse of excess sediments will be integrated into design to create nesting habitat for swallows and other riparian species where feasible. Habitat will be further enhanced by removing invasive vegetation, installing diverse native seed (consistent with the Minnesota Pollinator Plan), and planting native woody vegetation to shade and cool Money Creek. If available, hyper-local ecotype foundation seed of rare species could be collected from elsewhere on the parcel to supplement the commercially available species and encourage the expansion of rare plant populations.   
The project site represents a missing link in a series of existing DNR easements including AMA and DNR easements; however, they are fragmented. Past efforts to protect this critical segment of trout stream and associated riparian corridor have been unsuccessful. Due to its current private ownership, there is urgency in securing the perpetual protection of this unique site.

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

This application’s importance with respect to timing is primarily a function of the extensive trust-building and negotiations that have occurred with this collaboration. Strong projects sometimes come with uncommon allies and approaches, and forge new opportunities. While the landowner is conservation minded, previous efforts have failed. The collaborative coalition built around this project is a direct result of the integrity and dedication of the project team, which hinges on relationships that exist right now among the various groups. The landowner is currently committed to this project because it includes both restoration and the easement; without funding, the conservation outcome may not be feasible in the future. It is also important to consider that degradation of this critical habitat has occurred over time and will continue without interventions and protection. By restoring this impaired headwater stream and priority riparian corridor, immediate benefits will be realized both onsite and downstream.

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

As described above, the proposed project is located in a significant ecological area in the headwaters of Money Creek; hence, it is a state-recognized conservation priority. The site is privately owned and used for grazing cattle, so it is especially vulnerable to fragmentation and grazing impacts. The proposed restoration project area is contained within the proposed BWSR 1W1P Easement area, and connects two existing easements on the property, alleviating fragmentation. Existing easements consist of a 14-acre DNR Aquatic Management Areas (AMA) Easement on the southern reach of the creek, and a new 54-acre DNR Prairie Easement on the northern tributary. The existing AMA easement is only 75 feet on each side of the creek, providing limited protection of the riparian corridor. The proposed BWSR 1W1P Easement’s boundary has undergone a series of negotiations between the landowner and BWSR (with RES facilitating), and now ensures that a minimum 200-ft wide corridor is protected along a 2.25-mile section of Money Creek. This new easement area represents the remaining entirety of the riparian corridor and stream channel within the 558-acres owned by this landowner. Finally, this new easement area is directly adjacent to one of five calcareous fens in the Root River Watershed, and protects the connection from the fen to the stream channel. The fen has not been formally delineated, but it is likely that at least a portion of the fen is within the proposed BWSR Easement.   
Although the BWSR 1W1P Easement will not grant additional public access to the creek, since there is already access granted from the 14-acre AMA Easement on the property and fisherman already have easy access for wading within the banks in this reach. The project’s specific priorities for restoration and enhancement of aquatic and terrestrial habitats have been carefully considered and are discussed in detail in the ‘design and scope of work’ section.

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

Minnesota's Wildlife Action Plan 2015-2025

Other : Root River One Watershed One Plan (1W1P)

### 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.

The Root River Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategy (WRAPS) Update Report (2024) speaks directly to how climate change affects riparian habitat. As stated on page 71, hydrology is tied to nearly all stressors to aquatic life, and therefore, is one of the most important variables impacting stream. Reconnecting the stream to its floodplain and abandoned oxbows will provide increased storage and reduced peak flows that will protect streambanks from erosion - especially following increasingly severe rain events. Furthermore, the bioengineering approach will enhance in-stream habitat for trout and other sensitive aquatic species and help maintain cooler water temperatures during periods of climate-induced drought. Channel realignment, re-shaped banks, bioengineering, and restoration of functional processes will also make Money Creek more resilient to large storm events. Finally, this project will connect a corridor of permanently protected habitat which will help species to adapt to changing conditions.

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

**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:

The anticipated outcomes for this project align with priority #2 of the LSOHC Southeast Forest Section priority actions: protect, enhance, and restore habitat for fish, game and non-game wildlife in rivers, cold water streams and associated upland habitat. Lasting conservation legacies include: stabilization of eroding stream banks, in-stream habitat creation / enhancement, revegetation and reestablishment of the riparian corridor and buffer, reconnection of the stream to its floodplain, and removal of invasive species. Permanent protections include establishment of a BWSR easement and connection of existing fragmented easements.   
Timeliness considerations of this project include:  
- Banks will continue to fail, causing alterations to the flow pattern, exacerbating bank erosion and further widening. This will continue degradation of in-stream habitat and loss of function, resulting in increased restoration expense and complexity as streams decline in functionality over time,  
- Performing restoration in the headwaters of a watershed suffering from increased peak flows and incised streams generally poses less risk of failure,  
- The owner is conservation minded; however, the land is currently used for cattle grazing, and previous attempts to acquire this priority easement have not been successful. RES has facilitated significant negotiations among BWSR and the landowner, and if this easement is not secured now, efforts to reach the current agreements may be lost and the property would continue to be unprotected,  
- These projects require ongoing stewardship during establishment to set them up for enduring success. Our approach includes intensive adaptive management for the first three years following construction.

## Outcomes

### Programs in southeast forest region:

Large corridors and complexes of biologically diverse wildlife habitat typical of the unglaciated region are restored and protected ~ *The objectives of this project are adopted from the MN Wildlife Action Plan and the Root River 1W1P. TNC will provide technical evaluation and ensure accomplishment of project milestones/outcomes established in the accomplishment plan. Specific project outcome measures have been developed based on SQT and MSHA stream assessment methodologies with TNC. Measurable outcomes represent true ecological uplift and performance.  
RES has extensive experience providing measurable performance outcomes, particularly where payment is conditioned on satisfactory accomplishment of outcomes. RES proposes to complete the habitat restoration under a progressive design/build reimbursement model tied to specific performance outcomes.*

### 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.

This is not supplanting or is a substitution for any previous funding that was not from a legacy fund and was used for the same purpose.

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

The BWSR and MNDNR easements will be maintained per the respective agency’s policies. The proposal entails a three-year maintenance and monitoring period to ensure that the project’s vegetation is established and sustaining at the time of grant close-out. An approved operation and maintenance plan will be provided to the landowner and BWSR for long-term management after the project is complete, and requirements for maintenance will be placed into the easement agreement. The landowner has agreed to a managed grazing plan and easement fencing, in accordance with the terms of the easement agreement.  
DNR Fisheries staff at Lanesboro Area Fisheries Office will work alongside the Winona County SWCD to support the easement. The Lanesboro Area Fisheries Office has stocked the heritage MN Driftless brook trout for the last three years and plans to begin monitoring for success soon. Additional DNR commitments to ensure project long-term success include overseeing the installation of the project, monitoring the project long-term for maintenance or repair needs, and working with Partners through the design and permitting process to help ensure a quality project is constructed.

### Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Source of Funds** | **Step 1** | **Step 2** | **Step 3** |
| 2029 - perpetually | SWCD (using SWCD staff time and funding) | Annual easement monitoring | On-going site inspections to ensure easement conditions are maintained in perpetuity, monitor vegetation for maintenance needs until it is fully established. Enforcement as necessary. | - |
| 2029 - perpetually | Landowner | Implement O&M plan (grazing plan and fence maintenance) | Implement grazing plan, repair fence as needed, keep cattle out of creek. | - |
| 2029 - perpetually | BWSR (BWSR staff time and funding) | Maintain easement in cooperation with SWCD | - | - |
| 2027-2029 | RES (via OHF funds) | RES post-construction period to ensure outcomes are met | Annual monitoring. RES implements adaptive management to ensure establishment. | Maintenance and repair as needed. Annual monitoring report with photos, condition and outcome measure results sent to TNC. |
| 2027-2029 | SWCD (BWSR Appropriation) | Assistance as needed with BWSR easement | Accomplishment plan review, site visits, landowner engagements, easement set-up administration and support, etc. | - |
| 2027-2029 | TNC (via Private Funds) | TNC performs independent 3rd party verification to confirm and quantify ecological uplift | Verify RES in the form of reviews/comments on design, construction quality assurance oversight, checking performance standards are accomplished in accordance with state of the practice and DNR Fisheries requirements. | - |
| 2026-2027 | BWSR (BWSR staff time and funding) | Work with landowner to place the easement | - | - |

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

RES plans to engage local stakeholders if this project is funded, including any local tribal groups and other BIPOC organizations in the region, to obtain their input on priority stream reaches, workforce development, and to capture local expertise on native plants and habitat conditions. For example, RES is working in another state with a local tribe to collect native seed materials for a large-scale riparian restoration project. RES values the tribe’s local expertise around native vegetation communities and the importance of these habitats to indigenous populations. Alternatively, RES will seek to source seed from known local small businesses that specialize in regionally relevant species of seed.  
The project can benefit BIPOC communities by improving access to outdoor spaces close to the higher populated areas of the state, which tend to have more diverse communities than other rural parts of Minnesota. Many BIPOC and diverse communities may have limited access to outdoor spaces, which can negatively impact their health and well-being. By restoring streams and improving the surrounding ecosystem, the project can provide a safe and accessible outdoor space for these communities to enjoy.   
RES will strive to engage communities of color in recreational activities that promote a deeper connection to nature. For example, RES may work with local stakeholders to organize fishing events or other outdoor activities that allow residents to experience the restored stream firsthand. RES will look for opportunities to work with school groups in low-income communities to study and recreate in this area post-construction. This can help to build community relationships and foster a sense of pride and ownership in the restoration project. We will also ensure that any signage produced for this project that results in angling access for the public will be printed in Spanish, Somali, and Hmong in addition to English.

## Activity Details

### Requirements

**Is the land you plan to acquire (easement) free of any other permanent protection?**No

**Describe the expected public use:**There is an existing 14.4-acre Aquatic Management Area (AMA) Easement on a portion of the property, including the proposed project area. The new BWSR 1W1P Easement will incorporate and expand this area, to widen the protected riparian area from 66 feet on each side of the creek to 100 feet on each side of the creek. For clarification, there is also a new MDNR Prairie Easement on the property, however the proposed project area does not overlap this easement area.

**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

### 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?**No

**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?**Yes

### Other OHF Appropriation Awards

**Have you received OHF dollars through LSOHC in the past?**No

## Timeline

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity Name** | **Estimated Completion Date** |
| TNC and MDNR Fisheries Approval of 60% Design | October 2026 |
| Issuance of all necessary permits | February 2027 |
| BWSR Easement Finalized (RES Supported) | March 2027 |
| Approval of As-Builts following Construction | September 2027 |
| Achievement of Initial Success Criteria | July 2028 |
| Achievement of Final Success Criteria | July 2030 |

## Budget

### Grand Totals Across All Partnerships

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Funding Request** | **Total Leverage** | **Leverage Source** | **Total** |
| Personnel | - | - | - | - |
| Contracts | $2,666,800 | - | - | $2,666,800 |
| Fee Acquisition w/ PILT | - | - | - | - |
| Fee Acquisition w/o PILT | - | - | - | - |
| Easement Acquisition | $274,500 | - | - | $274,500 |
| Easement Stewardship | $24,800 | - | - | $24,800 |
| Travel | - | - | - | - |
| Professional Services | - | - | - | - |
| Direct Support Services | - | - | - | - |
| DNR Land Acquisition Costs | - | - | - | - |
| Capital Equipment | - | - | - | - |
| Other Equipment/Tools | - | - | - | - |
| Supplies/Materials | - | - | - | - |
| DNR IDP | - | - | - | - |
| **Grand Total** | **$2,966,100** | **-** | **-** | **$2,966,100** |

### Partner: BWSR

#### Totals

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Funding Request** | **Total Leverage** | **Leverage Source** | **Total** |
| Personnel | - | - | - | - |
| Contracts | - | - | - | - |
| Fee Acquisition w/ PILT | - | - | - | - |
| Fee Acquisition w/o PILT | - | - | - | - |
| Easement Acquisition | $274,500 | - | - | $274,500 |
| Easement Stewardship | $24,800 | - | - | $24,800 |
| Travel | - | - | - | - |
| Professional Services | - | - | - | - |
| Direct Support Services | - | - | - | - |
| DNR Land Acquisition Costs | - | - | - | - |
| Capital Equipment | - | - | - | - |
| Other Equipment/Tools | - | - | - | - |
| Supplies/Materials | - | - | - | - |
| DNR IDP | - | - | - | - |
| **Grand Total** | **$299,300** | **-** | **-** | **$299,300** |

### Partner: RES Great Lakes, LLC

#### Totals

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Funding Request** | **Total Leverage** | **Leverage Source** | **Total** |
| Personnel | - | - | - | - |
| Contracts | $2,666,800 | - | - | $2,666,800 |
| Fee Acquisition w/ PILT | - | - | - | - |
| Fee Acquisition w/o PILT | - | - | - | - |
| Easement Acquisition | - | - | - | - |
| Easement Stewardship | - | - | - | - |
| Travel | - | - | - | - |
| Professional Services | - | - | - | - |
| Direct Support Services | - | - | - | - |
| DNR Land Acquisition Costs | - | - | - | - |
| Capital Equipment | - | - | - | - |
| Other Equipment/Tools | - | - | - | - |
| Supplies/Materials | - | - | - | - |
| DNR IDP | - | - | - | - |
| **Grand Total** | **$2,666,800** | **-** | **-** | **$2,666,800** |

**Amount of Request:** $2,966,100 **Amount of Leverage:** - **Leverage as a percent of the Request:** 0.0% **DSS + Personnel:** - **As a % of the total request:** 0.0% **Easement Stewardship:** $24,800 **As a % of the Easement Acquisition:** 9.03%

**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?**If the project received 50% of the requested funding, the partners would prioritize the easement, and approximately 35% of the total linear footage of the project could be restored.

**Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?**No DSS and personnel expenses are being itemized, however the amount of restoration is disproportionately reduced due to mobilization and project planning costs. The current size of the project has been selected based on a need to achieve economy of scale while balancing total project cost requested.

### If the project received 30% of the requested funding

**Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?**If the project received 30% of the requested funding, the partners would prioritize the easement, and approximately 20% of the total linear footage of the project could be restored, however it is uncertain whether the landowner would support moving forward with the project.

**Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?**No DSS and personnel expenses are being itemized, however the amount of restoration is disproportionately reduced due to mobilization and project planning costs. The current size of the project has been selected based on a need to achieve economy of scale while balancing total project cost requested.

### Contracts

**What is included in the contracts line?**The contracts line entails a performance-based, firm, fixed price that includes all costs associated with the project, including planning, design, construction, materials, equipment, and monitoring/maintenance. RES proposes to be paid upon successful accomplishment of payment milestones.

### Easement Stewardship

**What is the number of easements anticipated, cost per easement for stewardship, and explain how that amount is calculated?**There is one 69-acre easement anticipated, with approximately $24,800 total easement cost allowed for stewardship, or 9% of the up-front easement cost. This is a flat rate used by BWSR.

## 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 | 69 | 69 |
| Enhance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **69** | **69** |

### 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 | 55 | - | 55 | - | - | 0 |
| **Total** | **55** | **-** | **55** | **-** | **-** | **-** |

### 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) | 0 | 14 | - | - |
| Non-DNR Lands (city, state, federal, etc.) | - | - | - | - |
| Easements | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| **Total** | **0** | **14** | **-** | **-** |

### Total Requested Funding by Resource Type (Table 2)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Wetland** | **Prairie** | **Forest** | **Habitat** | **Total Funding** |
| Restore | - | - | - | $2,666,800 | $2,666,800 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | - | - | $299,300 | $299,300 |
| Enhance | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Total** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **$2,966,100** | **$2,966,100** |

### 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 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 69 |
| Enhance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | **0** | **0** | **69** | **0** | **0** | **69** |

### Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section (Table 4)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Metro/Urban** | **Forest/Prairie** | **SE Forest** | **Prairie** | **N. Forest** | **Total Funding** |
| Restore | - | - | $2,666,800 | - | - | $2,666,800 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | - | $299,300 | - | - | $299,300 |
| Enhance | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Total** | **-** | **-** | **$2,966,100** | **-** | **-** | **$2,966,100** |

### 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 | - | - | - | $4,337 |
| 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 | - | - | $4,337 | - | - |
| Enhance | - | - | - | - | - |

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

2.25

## Parcels

**Sign-up Criteria?**No

**Explain the process used to identify, prioritize, and select the parcels on your list:**The Riparian Adjacent Quality (RAQ) was used to score/rank the priority of these parcels. Please see illustration for a map of the RAQ ranking for each parcel.

### Protect Parcels

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **County** | **TRDS** | **Acres** | **Est Cost** | **Existing Protection** |
| Aaron and Elsa Lacher | Winona | 10507209 | 72 | $51,900 | Yes |
| Aaron and Elsa Lacher | Winona | 10507203 | 56 | $57,351 | No |

### Protect Parcels with Buildings

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **County** | **TRDS** | **Acres** | **Est Cost** | **Existing Protection** | **Buildings** | **Value of Buildings** |
| Aaron and Elsa Lacher | Winona | 10507204 | 83 | $95,733 | Yes | 5 | $64,600 |
| Aaron and Elsa Lacher | Winona | 10507204 | 120 | $69,605 | No | 1 | $2,600 |

## Parcel Map



