

# Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, Phase 9 ML 2026 Request for Funding

## General Information

**Date:** 06/26/2025

**Proposal Title:** DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, Phase 9

**Funds Requested:** $16,558,200

**Confirmed Leverage Funds:** $2,214,000

**Is this proposal Scalable?:** Yes

### Manager Information

**Manager's Name:** Dean Paron **Title:** Stream Habitat Supervisor **Organization:** Mn DNR Section of Fisheries **Address:** 525 Lake Ave South Suite 415  **City:** Duluth, MN 55802 **Email:** dean.paron@state.mn.us **Office Number:** 651-259-5205 **Mobile Number:**   **Fax Number:**   **Website:**

### Location Information

**County Location(s):** Cook, Pine, Rice, Wright, Becker, Swift, Hubbard, Olmsted, Stevens, Carver, Scott, Le Sueur, Freeborn, Blue Earth, Mower, Faribault, Kandiyohi, Fillmore, Wabasha, Redwood, Meeker, Douglas, Pope, Dakota, Washington, Clay, Marshall, Chisago, Kanabec, Itasca, Lake, St. Louis, Carlton, Crow Wing, Cass, Aitkin, Beltrami and Otter Tail.

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

Northern Forest

Forest / Prairie Transition

Southeast Forest

Metro / Urban

Prairie

**Activity types:**

Enhance

Restore

**Priority resources addressed by activity:**

Habitat

## Narrative

### Abstract

The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MNDNR) will complete projects in seven different rivers including four fish-passage projects and three channel-restoration projects that restore habitat for fish and other aquatic life, creating over 5 miles of diverse habitat. The funds will also be used to enhance 2,226 acres of riparian and terrestrial habitat on Aquatic Management Areas. The footprint of fish passage projects is small, but projects will reconnect miles of lake and river habitat. Stream projects were selected from a statewide list, prioritized by factors such as ecological benefit, scale of impact, urgency of completion, and local support.

### Design and Scope of Work

The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MNDNR) annually updates a statewide list of stream habitat projects. Submissions come both from MNDNR staff and from partner organizations. Projects are prioritized based on scale-of-impact, urgency, local support, and critical habitat for rare species. Based on this list, MNDNR and our partners are proposing four fish passage projects and three channel restorations, leveraging $4,514,000.00.  
  
Access to different habitats is critical for fish and other aquatic organisms to complete various life stages. The habitats they use to spawn, live as juveniles, over-winter, and feed as adults may all be different. These habitats can be fairly unique, such as high-gradient riffles favored by many spawning fish and may be miles apart. When dams or other obstructions prevent aquatic life from reaching ideal habitat, they are forced to use less optimal locations that can reduce their success. In some cases, this leads to the complete loss of sensitive species upstream of a barrier. Modifying or removing the barriers through our four proposed fish passage projects would have a footprint of 4 acres but create upstream access to 3,821 acres of lake and river habitat and restore river ecological processes that have ecosystem wide benefits. This will benefit fish such as Walleye, Northern Pike, and Lake Sturgeon present in these rivers, as well as five mussel species classified as threatened or special concern.  
  
Streams naturally form habitat through the meandering of the river. Deeper, slower habitat is created by scour into the bed of the river around the outside of bends, while faster water and a rockier bottom is found in the straight sections in between. Wood, overhanging vegetation, and boulders serve as important habitat. In degraded sections of river, these natural processes are disrupted. Degraded habitat affects all life stages of river fishes. Working with partners, we will restore over 5 miles of habitat on three streams. These restored reaches also will connect reaches of quality habitat.  
  
We propose to enhance 2,226 acres and restore 25 acres of riparian habitat and associated uplands on 124 Aquatic Management Areas (AMA). The DNR manages these lands to protect critical shoreline habitat used by spawning fish, waterfowl, wading birds, reptiles and amphibians and species of special concern. Uplands in these parcels provide a buffer to protect water quality, and habitat for more terrestrial species. Our enhancement work includes shoreline plantings, invasive species control, and prescribed burns. Projects are selected based on management guidance documents that have been written for each AMA.  
  
Department resources for stream habitat work falls short of the need; funding from the Outdoor Heritage Fund has been critical to an acceleration of stream habitat work by the department and partners. Funding for two stream habitat specialists, and three AMA staff are included in this proposal. These positions provide critical technical assistance, and construction oversight to partners working on Legacy-funded restoration and enhancement projects. These positions improve coordination efficiency by providing single points of contact and enhance outcomes of aquatic habitat.

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

The Necktie and Bucks Mills projects are key components to Lake Sturgeon restoration efforts in the Red River basin. Lake Sturgeon are an important game species and also listed as a species of Special Concern in Minnesota. Dams that blocked migrations to spawning habitat, overharvest, and poor water quality contributed to the extirpation of Lake Sturgeon from the Red River basin in the early 1900's. Lake Sturgeon reintroduction in the Red River basin has been ongoing for 20 years and mature fish are being captured during spring surveys now. However, barriers such as this project, block upstream migrations of mature Lake Sturgeon on the Otter Tail River. Removing these barriers to fish passage is key to restoring a naturally reproducing population of Lake Sturgeon in the Red River basin.   
  
Endangered and threatened species often rely on migratory corridors. Or AMA riparian parcels serve as important habitat corridors for threatened and endangered species. Restoring and enhancing these parcels provides the optimal habitat for these species to recover and reach other critical habitat. In North America riparian habitat has the most diverse and rich array of bird, amphibian, and mammal species, maintaining this habitat is critical for biodiversity as well as threatened and endangered species.   
  
There are 68 species of greatest conservation need that utilize headwaters to large streams, including birds, turtles, frogs, fish, and insects. Stream habitat projects are not designed with one species in mind, but instead are intended to benefit multiple functions and habitats of the river both within the stream and in the riparian area, which will have benefits for rare species.

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

The projects on our list have local support that may not be present in the future if public sentiment were given time to change, which can happen with dam removal or modification projects.   
  
Matching funds are currently available for $4,514,000 of our projects. Completing these projects would take advantage of those funds while they are available.  
  
There are multiple one-time federal funding opportunities for aquatic habitat restoration and enhancement. We have been aggressively pursuing these funding sources using Outdoor Heritage Fund appropriations as leverage. Working out the timing between federal funding and Outdoor Heritage Fund appropriations is always challenging so we only include federal funding that has already been committed as leverage. However, we will continue to aggressively pursue all federal funding opportunities with these appropriations.

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

Science-based targeting was used to identify, design, and prioritize restoration and enhancement projects included in this proposal. Projects were prioritized based on multiple criteria, including scale-of-impact, critical habitat, technical feasibility, and compatibility with other resource initiatives. Projects that benefit or reconnect areas of high or outstanding biological significance or lakes of biological significance are targeted and prioritized.  
  
Our proposal features projects intended to reduce fragmentation. Dams and other obstructions in rivers fragment areas of suitable habitat, similar to when pieces of prairie are separated by large areas of row-crop farmland. By removing or modifying barriers in streams, we will allow fish and other aquatic life to move between different patches of habitat that may be critical for their life-processes, such as spawning. Connectivity also expands fishing opportunities by acting as a conduit for recolonization after catastrophic events such as drought happen in one portion of a watershed. We have prioritized fish passage projects that connect large areas of high-quality habitat.   
  
Similarly, our stream channel restoration projects and AMA enhancement projects target reaches of river where habitat is poor due to past alterations. Lengths of poor habitat can themselves act as barriers to animal movement, where a fish may choose not to migrate through a reach without adequate depth or cover to reach more suitable habitat upstream. Restoring the stream channel removes that "barrier" of poor habitat that fragments the stream. In the process, we also create high-quality habitat within the formerly degraded reach.

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

Minnesota DNR Strategic Conservation Agenda

Red River of the North Fisheries Management Plan

### 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.

Improving fish passage is one of the most effective ways to help conserve vulnerable species and improve climate resilience. Access to different habitats is critical for fish and other aquatic organisms to complete various life stages. The habitats they use to spawn, live as juveniles, over-winter, and feed as adults may all be different. These habitats can be fairly unique, such as high-gradient riffles favored by many spawning fish and may be miles apart. When dams or other obstructions prevent aquatic life from reaching ideal habitat, they are forced to use less optimal locations that can reduce their success. These projects will also restore river processes that allow for rivers to adjust to changing hydrology associated with climate change and therefore remain more resilient in the future.

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

**Forest / Prairie Transition**

Protect, enhance, and restore wild rice wetlands, shallow lakes, wetland/grassland complexes, aspen parklands, and shoreland that provide critical habitat for game and nongame wildlife

**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

**Prairie**

Protect, enhance, or restore existing wetland/upland complexes, or convert agricultural lands to new wetland/upland habitat complexes

**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 fish passage and channel restoration projects included in this proposal represent opportunities to make major and lasting positive changes for those streams. Fish passage projects such as at the Swift Falls project, Bucks Mill Culvert project, Deer Lake Outlet, and Woolen Mills dam project have the potential to create access to high-quality upstream habitat for species that are currently blocked, which includes game fish and state-listed mussel species. A defined project done in one location can benefit several of miles of river upstream, and the benefit will last in perpetuity. Little to no follow-up maintenance is needed. Similarly, our stream channel restoration projects would restore previously-altered reaches of river back to high quality habitats. This not only creates habitat within the project area, but also makes it easier for fish and other aquatic life to move between upstream and downstream habitats. All of this enhanced connectivity makes for much healthier and resilient populations.

## Outcomes

### Programs in forest-prairie transition region:

Rivers and streams provide corridors of habitat including intact areas of forest cover in the east and large wetland/upland complexes in the west ~ *The Bucks Mills project aligns with “Reconnect the Red” efforts (Goal #3, Red River Fisheries Management plan; Phase 2 Lake Sturgeon Restoration Plan), and the Otter Tail River 1W1P (“enhancing aquatic connectivity” goal). This multi-phase collaboration builds on 30 years of Red River connectivity progress to date, 47 of 79 major barriers on the Red River and Minnesota tributaries have been removed or modified to allow fish passage. For this project, we will compare warmwater fish communities before and after project completion. We will also compare catch rates for critical species before and after project completion as indicators of population.*

### Programs in metropolitan urbanizing region:

Improved aquatic habitat indicators ~ *The Deer Lake Outlet on Mill Creek will evaluate instream habitat and use routine fish surveys to gauge changes to the fish community to compare to pre-project data. Our AMA enhancement program will monitor all projects to insure that outcome goals are being met by looking at the diversity and abundance of native plant species that are supported by project sites as compared to pre-project.*

### Programs in the northern forest region:

Improved aquatic habitat indicators ~ *The Necktie project the coldwater and warmwater fish communities will be assessed before and after project completion. Our AMA enhancement program will monitor all projects to insure that outcome goals are being met by looking at the diversity and abundance of native plant species that are supported by project sites as compared to pre-project.*

### Programs in prairie region:

Other ~ *The Pomme de Terre River at Chrissy Dam channel restoration project will use metrics that evaluate instream and floodplain habitat to assess our success also monitoring the geomorphic stability of the channel restoration. For the Woolen Mills dam passage project, we will use routine fish surveys to gauge changes to the fish community, and compare with pre-project data. Our AMA enhancement program will monitor all projects to insure that outcome goals are being met by looking at the diversity and abundance of native plant species that are supported by project sites as compared to pre-project.*

### Programs in southeast forest region:

Rivers, streams, and surrounding vegetation provide corridors of habitat ~ *In this region the Cascade Creek Phase II project will improve in-channel and riparian habitat. We will use metrics that evaluate instream and floodplain habitat to assess our success. Our AMA enhancement program will monitor all projects to insure that outcome goals are being met by looking at the diversity and abundance of native plant species that are supported by project sites as compared to pre-project.*

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

Clean Water Fund

### 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 request is an acceleration of DNR aquatic habitat work to a level not attainable but for the appropriation.

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

MNDNR has multiple potential avenues that could be used for ongoing maintenance of projects, including the Game and Fish Fund which is supported by license sales, the Heritage Enhancement account funded by taxes on lottery tickets, funds raised through the sale of Trout Stamps, the General Fund, and people who volunteer to help the department with projects.

### Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Source of Funds** | **Step 1** | **Step 2** | **Step 3** |
| Annual | Game and Fish | Inspect Project | Control Invasives | Make instream adjustments as 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:

The DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement proposal has the following specific ties to BIPOC and diverse communities:  
• Projects included in this proposal provide benefits at the watershed scale. These benefits extend well beyond the footprint of each individual project and benefit all Minnesotans.  
• Tribal partners have been significant partners in efforts to restore Lake Sturgeon in the Red River basin. Multiple projects included in this proposal contribute to these efforts.  
  
DNR’s OHF projects aim to serve all Minnesotans. At the same time, we are bringing more focus in all our work to BIPOC and diverse communities. The Minnesota DNR has adopted advancing diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) as a key priority in its strategic plan. The plan focuses on increasing the cultural competence of our staff, creating a workforce that is reflective of Minnesota, continuing to strengthen tribal consultation and building partnerships with diverse communities.   
  
The OHF funds high quality habitat projects that provide ecosystem services like clean water and carbon sequestration that support environmental justice. OHF also supports public access and recreational opportunities on these lands. OHF projects and outcomes benefit BIPOC and diverse communities through recreational opportunities that are close-to-home, culturally responsive and accessible to Minnesotans with disabilities.   
  
The DNR has diversity, equity and inclusion strategies that benefit all OHF projects:  
• Multilingual and culturally specific hunting and fishing education programs take place on public lands.   
• All hiring is equal opportunity, affirmative action, and veteran friendly. Contracting seeks out Targeted Group, Economically Disadvantaged and Veteran-Owned businesses.   
• Public engagement seeks out BIPOC voices and involves diverse communities. Outreach and marketing of projects has this focus as well.   
• Partnerships are at the center of all projects. Tribes in particular are consulted in all pertinent areas of the DNR’s work, under EO 19-24.

## Activity Details

### Requirements

**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?**

WMA

AMA

County/Municipal

Public Waters

### 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

### 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** |
| 2024 | $4,206,000 | $1,023,113 | $3,182,887 | 24.33% |
| 2023 | $4,122,000 | $1,902,382 | $2,219,618 | 46.15% |
| 2022 | $5,177,000 | $1,814,403 | $3,362,597 | 35.05% |
| 2021 | $2,790,000 | $1,787,997 | $1,002,003 | 64.09% |
| 2020 | $3,790,000 | $3,600,662 | $189,338 | 95.0% |
| Totals | $20,085,000 | $10,128,557 | $9,956,443 | 50.43% |

## Timeline

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity Name** | **Estimated Completion Date** |
| Design of fish passage and channel restoration projects | March 2027 |
| Permitting and environmental review of fish passage and channel restoration projects | December 2027 |
| Construction of fish passage and channel restoration projects | September 2029 |
| Vegetation maintenance on fish passage and channel restoration projects | June 2029 |

## Budget

### Totals

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Funding Request** | **Total Leverage** | **Leverage Source** | **Total** |
| Personnel | $2,563,400 | - | - | $2,563,400 |
| Contracts | $12,652,000 | $4,514,000 | EPA, City of Rochester, Federal Bridge fund | $17,166,000 |
| Fee Acquisition w/ PILT | - | - | - | - |
| Fee Acquisition w/o PILT | - | - | - | - |
| Easement Acquisition | - | - | - | - |
| Easement Stewardship | - | - | - | - |
| Travel | $100,000 | - | - | $100,000 |
| Professional Services | $30,000 | - | - | $30,000 |
| Direct Support Services | $411,800 | - | - | $411,800 |
| DNR Land Acquisition Costs | - | - | - | - |
| Capital Equipment | - | - | - | - |
| Other Equipment/Tools | - | - | - | - |
| Supplies/Materials | $801,000 | - | - | $801,000 |
| DNR IDP | - | - | - | - |
| **Grand Total** | **$16,558,200** | **$4,514,000** | **-** | **$21,072,200** |

### Personnel

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Position** | **Annual FTE** | **Years Working** | **Funding Request** | **Total Leverage** | **Leverage Source** | **Total** |
| Stream Habitat Specialist | 2.0 | 5.0 | $1,154,400 | - | - | $1,154,400 |
| AMA technician | 1.0 | 5.0 | $384,000 | - | - | $384,000 |
| AMA specialist | 2.0 | 5.0 | $1,025,000 | - | - | $1,025,000 |

**Amount of Request:** $16,558,200 **Amount of Leverage:** $4,514,000 **Leverage as a percent of the Request:** 27.26% **DSS + Personnel:** $2,975,200 **As a % of the total request:** 17.97% **Easement Stewardship:** - **As a % of the Easement Acquisition:** -

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Leverage (from above)** | **Amount Confirmed** | **% of Total Leverage** | **Amount Anticipated** | **% of Total Leverage** |
| $4,514,000 | $2,214,000 | 49.05% | $2,300,000 | 50.95% |

**Detail leverage sources and confirmation of funds:**Cascade Creek Phase II $274,000 City of Rochester  
Necktie River $290,000 EPA 319  
Deer Lake Outlet $900,000 Federal Off-system bridge fund, $300 Local Option sales tax (1.2m tot)   
Woolen Mills $2.75 FEMA unsecured

**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?**Projects come from a prioritized list. With partial funding, we would fund only the top projects from our list that fit within the amount allocated. At 50% funding, we estimate that we would still be able to achieve approximately 40-50% of enhancement and restoration acres.

**Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?**Personnel would reduce to 50 to 60% of the requested amount. Staff time would focus on project coordination, administration, and project development.   
  
Direct Support Services is determined by a standard DNR process taking into account the amount of funding and the number of allocations made with that funding.

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

**Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?**Top ranked projects are watershed-scale connectivity projects; at 30% funding we will achieve approximate 30-40% of our initial proposed acres for enhancement and 11% of our initial restoration acres.

**Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?**Personnel would reduce to 30 to 40% of the requested amount. Staff time would focus on project coordination, administration, and project development.   
  
Direct Support Services is determined by a standard DNR process taking into account the amount of funding and the number of allocations made with that funding.

### 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 positions of Stream Habitat Specialists were funded in the ML22 and ML24 appropriations and AMA Specialists were funded in the and ML23 appropriations. Once the personnel funds from those appropriations are extinguished, we will shift to charging salary to this appropriation.

### Contracts

**What is included in the contracts line?**100% of contracts are for Restoration and Enhancement work.

### Professional Services

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

Surveys

### 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**All travel line costs will be used for mileage, food, and lodging.

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

### Direct Support Services

**How did you determine which portions of the Direct Support Services of your shared support services is direct to this program?**DNR calculates the program’s fair share to pay for support costs directly related to and necessary for the appropriation, and an internal Service Level Agreement (contract) guarantees each program will receive the services for the calculated amount.

## 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 | 89 | 89 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 |
| Enhance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,255 | 2,255 |
| **Total** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **2,344** | **2,344** |

### 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) | 20 | 61 | 369 | 1,886 |
| Non-DNR Lands (city, state, federal, etc.) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Easements | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | **28** | **61** | **369** | **1,891** |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Wetland** | **Prairie** | **Forest** | **Habitat** | **Total Funding** |
| Restore | - | - | - | $2,083,600 | $2,083,600 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | - | - | - | - |
| Enhance | - | - | - | $14,474,600 | $14,474,600 |
| **Total** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **$16,558,200** | **$16,558,200** |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Metro/Urban** | **Forest/Prairie** | **SE Forest** | **Prairie** | **N. Forest** | **Total Acres** |
| Restore | 0 | 0 | 8 | 34 | 47 | 89 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Enhance | 154 | 337 | 97 | 714 | 953 | 2,255 |
| **Total** | **154** | **337** | **105** | **748** | **1,000** | **2,344** |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Metro/Urban** | **Forest/Prairie** | **SE Forest** | **Prairie** | **N. Forest** | **Total Funding** |
| Restore | - | - | $1,034,700 | $831,500 | $217,400 | $2,083,600 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Enhance | $745,400 | $1,333,700 | $177,700 | $5,170,400 | $7,047,400 | $14,474,600 |
| **Total** | **$745,400** | **$1,333,700** | **$1,212,400** | **$6,001,900** | **$7,264,800** | **$16,558,200** |

### Average Cost per Acre by Resource Type (Table 5)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Wetland** | **Prairie** | **Forest** | **Habitat** |
| Restore | - | - | - | $23,411 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | - | - | - |
| Enhance | - | - | - | $6,418 |

### Average Cost per Acre by Ecological Section (Table 6)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Metro/Urban** | **Forest/Prairie** | **SE Forest** | **Prairie** | **N. Forest** |
| Restore | - | - | $129,337 | $24,455 | $4,625 |
| Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | - | - | - | - | - |
| Protect in Easement | - | - | - | - | - |
| Enhance | $4,840 | $3,957 | $1,831 | $7,241 | $7,394 |

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

5 miles

## Parcels

**Sign-up Criteria?**No

**Explain the process used to identify, prioritize, and select the parcels on your list:**MN DNR uses a prioritized list to select stream habitat projects for submission. Project submissions are solicited from MN DNR staff as well as partner organizations. Criteria used to rank projects includes the scale of impact, critical habitat for rare species, the urgency of completing the project, feasibility, and local support. From that list we select the highest-ranked projects that we feel could be completed during the life of the OHF appropriation.

### Restore / Enhance Parcels

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **County** | **TRDS** | **Acres** | **Est Cost** | **Existing Protection** | **Description** |
| Spirit Lake | Aitkin | 04627224 | 1 | $4,000 | Yes | Buckthorn control |
| Big Cormorant Lk. - D Farnham/H. Bolley AMA | Becker | 13843224 | 15 | $16,000 | Yes | buckthorn |
| Bucks Mill - Culvert | Becker | 13841231 | 1 | $800,000 | Yes | Culvert Replacements |
| Bucks Mill AMA | Becker | 13841231 | 10 | $9,000 | Yes | buckthorn |
| Detroit Lakes Headquarters AMA | Becker | 13842236 | 25 | $16,000 | Yes | buckthorn |
| Long Lake AMA | Becker | 13941211 | 5 | $5,000 | Yes | wild parsnip |
| Toad Lake AMA | Becker | 13938216 | 5 | $9,000 | Yes | common tansy |
| Bemidji Lake South AMA | Beltrami | 14633215 | 4 | $8,000 | Yes | Invasive Spp. Control |
| Preece Point | Beltrami | 14633230 | 10 | $2,500 | Yes | Invasive Spp. Control |
| Ida Lake AMA | Blue Earth | 10528212 | 5 | $20,000 | Yes | homestead enhancement |
| Ida Lake AMA | Blue Earth | 10528212 | 8 | $7,000 | Yes | tree control |
| Blackhoof River | Carlton | 04716230 | 10 | $45,000 | Yes | Tree planting maintenance |
| Lotus Lake AMA | Carver | 11623201 | 7 | $7,000 | Yes | buckthorn/invasive control |
| Agate Rearing Pond | Cass | 13529232 | 9 | $50,000 | Yes | Invasives species control |
| Sunrise Lake | Chisago | 03420217 | 10 | $10,000 | Yes | Buckthorn Follow-up/Trash clean-up |
| Silver Lake AMA | Clay | 13945225 | 30 | $9,500 | Yes | Prescribed burn |
| Silver Lake AMA | Clay | 13945225 | 20 | $6,000 | Yes | invasives, birdsfoot |
| Cascade River AMA | Cook | 06221204 | 5 | $21,000 | Yes | Gap planting |
| Devil Track River AMA | Cook | 06211201 | 5 | $5,000 | Yes | Gap planting |
| Swamp River AMA | Cook | 06304229 | 5 | $10,000 | Yes | Gap planting |
| Bertha Moody lake | Crow Wing | 13528232 | 100 | $4,000 | Yes | Buckthorn follow-up |
| Nokasissippi River | Crow Wing | 04529228 | 50 | $8,000 | Yes | Ash Diversification |
| North Long Lake | Crow Wing | 13428229 | 20 | $8,000 | Yes | Oak TSI |
| Roosevelt | Crow Wing | 13826204 | 30 | $8,000 | Yes | Tree cage maintenance |
| South Branch Vermillion River AMA | Dakota | 11418229 | 20 | $15,000 | Yes | oak savanna maintenance |
| South Branch Vermillion River AMA | Dakota | 11418229 | 30 | $8,500 | Yes | prairie invasive control |
| Vermillion River AMA | Dakota | 11418220 | 30 | $10,000 | Yes | prairie invasive control |
| Bliss AMA | Douglas | 13037221 | 10 | $3,300 | Yes | buckthorn control |
| Ida Lake AMA | Douglas | 12938226 | 12 | $13,400 | Yes | buckthorn control |
| Jessie Lake AMA | Douglas | 12837227 | 15 | $5,000 | Yes | wild parsnip control |
| Miltona Lake AMA | Douglas | 15750230 | 6 | $8,000 | Yes | buckthorn control |
| Miltona Lake AMA | Douglas | 15750230 | 30 | $10,000 | Yes | caragana, thistles |
| Tegel's Slough AMA | Douglas | 12838226 | 20 | $8,000 | Yes | wild parsnip control |
| Blue Earth River AMA | Faribault | 10428228 | 10 | $9,000 | Yes | prescribed burn |
| Blue Earth River AMA | Faribault | 10428228 | 50 | $4,200 | Yes | tree control |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Etna Creek AMA | Fillmore | 10212236 | 20 | $8,000 | Yes | wild parsnip/vetch control and prescribed burn |
| Lanesboro Hatchery AMA | Fillmore | 10310226 | 45 | $32,000 | Yes | prescribed burn |
| Juglans Woods AMA | Freeborn | 10221225 | 22 | $15,000 | Yes | tree control |
| Juglans Woods AMA | Freeborn | 10221225 | 40 | $6,400 | Yes | buckthorn control follow up |
| Lester Lake | Hubbard | 14232232 | 5 | $10,000 | Yes | Tree planting maintenance |
| Necktie River | Hubbard | 14532222 | 57 | $4,000,000 | Yes | Channel Restoration |
| Dixon Lake | Itasca | 14829225 | 5 | $5,000 | Yes | Prescribed burn/ native seeding |
| Little Knife | Kanabec | 04424228 | 27 | $9,000 | Yes | Rx Burn |
| Little Knife | Kanabec | 04424228 | 20 | $9,000 | Yes | Invasives |
| Games Lake AMA | Kandiyohi | 12235232 | 30 | $7,000 | Yes | garlic mustard control |
| Green Lake AMA | Kandiyohi | 12034203 | 5 | $8,200 | Yes | invasive/buckthorn control |
| Middle Lake AMA | Kandiyohi | 12135209 | 4 | $1,750 | Yes | garlic mustard control |
| New London Hatchery AMA | Kandiyohi | 12134209 | 8 | $30,000 | Yes | buckthorn and herbaceous invasives |
| Norway Lake AMA | Kandiyohi | 12136206 | 5 | $9,400 | Yes | garlic mustard/buckthorn control |
| East Beaver River | Lake | 05608209 | 30 | $20,000 | Yes | Spruce Budworm Rx/Tree Planting |
| East Beaver River | Lake | 05608209 | 15 | $4,000 | Yes | Ash Diversification |
| Manitou River | Lake | 05806233 | 30 | $12,000 | Yes | Planting following harvest/burn and within riparian (Cramer Lake parcel) |
| Split Rock River | Lake | 05509217 | 15 | $2,000 | Yes | Spruce Budworm Rx/Tree Planting- Round 2 |
| Split Rock River | Lake | 05509217 | 80 | $5,000 | Yes | Ash Stand Girdling/Planting |
| Francis Lake AMA | Le Sueur | 10924235 | 15 | $25,000 | Yes | buckthorn control |
| Sakatah Lake AMA | Le Sueur | 10922217 | 25 | $20,000 | Yes | prescribed burn and interseeding |
| St Peter AMA | Le Sueur | 11026214 | 17 | $12,800 | Yes | buckthorn control |
| Waterville Hatchery AMA | Le Sueur | 10923228 | 10 | $15,000 | Yes | prescribed burn |
| Frank Rose | Marshall | 15750230 | 20 | $10,000 | Yes | Prairie enhancement; woody control, invasives |
| Frank Rose | Marshall | 15750230 | 40 | $8,000 | Yes | Prescribed burn |
| Hutchinson FMA | Meeker | 11730235 | 10 | $5,000 | Yes | buckthorn control |
| Minniebelle Lake AMA | Meeker | 11831212 | 15 | $15,000 | Yes | prescribed burn and interseeding |
| Minniebelle Lake AMA | Meeker | 11831212 | 3 | $45,000 | Yes | buckthorn control |
| North Fork Crow River AMA | Meeker | 12132224 | 12 | $3,500 | Yes | prescribed burn and interseeding |
| Cedar River AMA | Mower | 10218215 | 17 | $15,000 | Yes | prescribed burn and interseeding |
| Cascade Creek Phase II | Olmsted | 10614205 | 8 | $952,000 | Yes | Channel Restoration |
| Dead River Walker AMA | Otter Tail | 13440211 | 12 | $20,000 | Yes | Prescribed burn and native seeding |
| Dead River Walker AMA | Otter Tail | 13440211 | 20 | $8,000 | Yes | thistles, invasives |
| Eagle Lake AMA | Otter Tail | 13140215 | 7 | $5,000 | Yes | buckthorn, honeysuckle |
| East Lost Lake AMA | Otter Tail | 13341211 | 10 | $8,000 | Yes | buckthorn |
| Jewett Lake AMA | Otter Tail | 13443224 | 1 | $2,000 | Yes | Prescribed burn |
| North Turtle Lake AMA | Otter Tail | 13341223 | 3 | $5,000 | Yes | buckthorn |
| Toad River AMA | Otter Tail | 13738232 | 5 | $5,000 | Yes | birds foot trefoil |
| Barnes Springs | Pine | 04118212 | 30 | $9,000 | Yes | Invasive Spp. |
| Barnes Springs | Pine | 04118212 | 15 | $15,000 | Yes | Rx Burn |
| Barnes Springs | Pine | 04118212 | 15 | $30,000 | Yes | Tree Planting and maintenance |
| Big Pine | Pine | 04121224 | 40 | $10,000 | Yes | Buckthorn/honeysuckle |
| Pelican Lake AMA | Pope | 12538209 | 15 | $15,000 | Yes | buckthorn control; invasives |
| Sanborn AMA | Redwood | 10936227 | 16 | $9,400 | Yes | remnant woody control |
| Whispering Ridge AMA | Redwood | 11436227 | 20 | $20,000 | Yes | woody invasives on outcrops |
| Whispering Ridge AMA | Redwood | 11436232 | 7 | $9,000 | Yes | S. parking lot prairie reconstruction |
| Whispering Ridge AMA | Redwood | 11436232 | 100 | $19,000 | Yes | prescribed burn |
| Cannon River (Dundas) AMA | Rice | 11120215 | 20 | $8,900 | Yes | prescribed burn |
| Cannon River (Morristown) AMA | Rice | 11120215 | 20 | $4,500 | Yes | tree control |
| Fairbault Dam - Woolen Mills | Rice | 11020230 | 1 | $2,750,000 | Yes | Dam Modification |
| Eagle Creek AMA | Scott | 11521218 | 15 | $21,000 | Yes | buckthorn control and understory seeding |
| Eagle Creek AMA | Scott | 11521218 | 30 | $15,000 | Yes | garlic mustard control |
| Eagle Creek AMA | Scott | 11521218 | 12 | $7,400 | Yes | prescribed burn and prairie invasive control |
| Lester River | St. Louis | 05214223 | 100 | $25,000 | Yes | Buckthorn and exotic honeysuckle control |
| Whiteface River | St. Louis | 05416208 | 20 | $8,000 | Yes | Riparian Planting? Protect/Add Conifer in upland. |
| Pomme de Terre River at Crissy Dam | Stevens | 12442212 | 9 | $650,000 | Yes | Channel Restoration |
| Swift Falls | Swift | 12238203 | 1 | $1,500,000 | Yes | Dam Modification |
| Miller Creek AMA | Wabasha | 11112209 | 44 | $60,000 | Yes | buckthorn control follow up |
| Miller Creek AMA | Wabasha | 11112209 | 26 | $150,000 | Yes | tree control |
| Brown's Creek AMA | Washington | 03020221 | 5 | $15,000 | Yes | woody invasive control |
| Deer Lake Outlet on Mill Creek | Wright | 11926201 | 1 | $400,000 | Yes | Dam Modification |
| Ramsey Lake AMA | Wright | 12026218 | 6 | $20,000 | Yes | buckthorn control and understory seeding |
| Silver Creek AMA | Wright | 12226215 | 4 | $12,800 | Yes | buckthorn and garlic mustard control |

## Parcel Map



