

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Agenda Item Memo

DATE: August 1, 2012

SUBJECT: Green Corridors, Ph. IV Accomplishment Plan Approval M.L. 2012, Ch. 264, Art.1, Sec. 2,
Subd. 2(g)

Background:

This accomplishment plan is brought in for Council consideration of an advance. The Redwood Area Development Corporation (RADC) requests an advance of \$xxxxx for cash flow reasons.

M.L. 2012, Chapter 264, Section 2, Subdivision 8. Payment Conditions and Capital Equipment Expenditures says "Reasonable amounts may be advanced to projects to accommodate cash flow needs, support future management of acquired lands, or match federal share. The advances must be approved as part of the accomplishment plan." RADC claims they have insufficient funds to cover contract payments. Terms of OHF advances are they are against actual invoiced expenses, and no additional money can be advanced until proof of payment of invoices supporting the outstanding advance is provided DNR. RADC requests authority to receive up to \$xxxxx. DNR's pass through management requires proof of payment within 21 days for invoices for which funds are advanced.

Suggested Motion:

In favor of advance: I move to approve the accomplishment plan for Green Corridors, Ph. IV, M.L. 2012, Ch. 264, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd 2(g) as presented including permission of an advance of up to \$xxxxx.

Suggested Procedure:

Place a motion to approve the accomplishment plan before the Council and discuss the advance with RADC representative and motion.

For accomplishment plan with an advance: Vote Yes

Against advance but for the project: Move to amend the accomplishment plan for Green Corridors, Phase IV, M.L. 2012, Chap. 264, Sec. 2, Subd 2(g) to strike the language on page one authorizing an advance and approve the accomplishment plan as amended.

Agenda Item # 7a



A GOOD PLACE TO START***

200 South Mill Street
P.O. Box 481
Redwood Falls, MN 56283
Phone: 507-637-4004
Fax: 507-637-4082
E-Mail: pat@redwoodfalls.org

July 9, 2012

To: Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council (LSOHC)

Subject: ML 2012 Outdoor Heritage Fund Green Corridor Legacy Program Grant

LSOHC;

This letter is in regards to our request for advancement of invoiced reimbursements which are specific and direct to activities associated to our ML 2012 Outdoor Heritage Fund (OHF) grant due to unexpected cash flow challenges. We are not requesting any Accomplishment Plan changes to previously approved Budget items.

These "advancements" will only be for actual work and/or services performed and invoiced (not for future activities which are yet to be invoiced) and which are allowable reimbursements as specified in our state grant agreements based on approved Accomplishment Plans. Proof of payments will be submitted to our DNR Grant Specialist within 21 days of payment.

Green Corridor is requesting permission of advancement up to \$51,000. This is the maximum needed for any 30 day period during the grant period.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Pat Dingels".

Patricia Dingels
Community Development Specialist

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Brad Cobb".

Brad Cobb
Program Manager

May 11, 2012

Green Corridor Legacy Program IV

ML 2012, Ch. 264, Art. 1, Sec. 2, subd.2(g)

Contract section description:

Vendor/Restoration services (material and labor) towards the restoration of the newly acquired acres that require restoration.

Program Administration: To the Redwood Area Development Corp. for program accounting/audit/fiscal oversight, legal review of documents, appraisals, document retention, and travel.

Program Management: To Green Corridor Inc. for program management. The Program Manager will be responsible for all activities directly or indirectly related to the outcomes spelled out in the Green Corridor Legacy Program's FY13 Outdoor Heritage Fund Accomplishment Plan. The following are some of the **primary** activities to be performed:

- Develop and prioritize acquisition list of properties that conform to LSOHC and DNR Criteria Standards.
- Coordinate and/or be directly or indirectly responsible for the accurate and timely completion of normal DNR land acquisition documents with the landowner and/or DNR. Some of these documents include: Development of Party Agreements, Land Acquisition Fact Sheet, Landowner Bill of Rights, Initial Site Assessment/Checklist, Landowner Disclosure Statements, and Landowner Notification Letter. And to ensure these documents are recorded and presented to the appropriate agency.
- Solicit bids for appraisal services which meet DNR/State of Minnesota Appraisal Standards for such activities. Assist appraiser with landowner permission to tour property. And directly and/or indirectly coordinate and secure a timely Appraisal Certification review by the appropriate agency.
- Program manager will be the primary negotiator with landowner regarding all elements of the Purchase Agreement and to ensure that Purchase Agreement elements reflect appropriate standards/safeguards to protect the states and landowner interests in the title transfer of property. Develop Purchase Agreement in coordination with RADC and Green Corridor Inc. and negotiate terms of the Purchase Agreement with landowners and secure the approval of the Purchase Agreements with the prospective landowners.
- Work with landowners to identify and compile required deed/abstract documents and guide landowner to update such information prior to submission to the DNR/Attorney Generals Office (AGO) to help ensure timely and accurate information is being prepared.
- Be responsible for County Board notification processes – such as; submit paperwork documentation to appropriate local units of government and agencies with a need to know, schedule and make oral presentations to the local unit of government as it relates to the sale and transfer of land to the DNR/State of Minnesota. Be available to answer any possible county commissioner's questions.
- Coordinate directly and/or indirectly with the DNR/AGO to ensure the Title Opinion research is going smoothly and stays on track and to assist landowner if AGO has questions regarding information supplied in deed/abstract documents and ensure a satisfactory and complete resolution to such matters.
- Coordinate closing document information between the DNR and RADC to ensure all elements are accomplished and then schedule closing date with landowner.
- Attend required LSOHC meetings, complete required Status Reports and/or documents, and all activities directly or indirectly related to this appropriation.

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Laws of Minnesota 2012 Accomplishment Plan

Date: ~~October 24, 2011~~ May 11, 2012

Program Title: Green Corridor Legacy Program Phase IV

Fiscal Manager: Pat Dingels

Program Manager: Bradley H. Cobb

Applicant Organization: Redwood Area Development Corporation (RADC)

Street Address: 200 S. Mill St. PO Box 481

City Redwood Falls State MN Zip: 56283

Telephone: RADC: 507-637-4004 Program Manager: 320-493-4695

E-Mail: RADC: @redwoodfalls. Program Manager: @charter.

Organization Web Site: .tatankabluffs.

Funds Recommended: \$1,730,000

Legislative Citation: ML 2012, Ch. 264, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 2 (g):

Abstract:

This program proposal will help create a legacy of habitat connectivity, public access, and economic vitality based on increased outdoor recreational opportunities in the mid-Minnesota River Watershed.

Program Narrative

The Green Corridor Legacy Program – Phase IV would be a continuation of previous Lessard-Sam’s Outdoor Heritage Council (LSOHC) appropriations from the Outdoor Heritage Fund (OHF). This regional initiative focuses on the concept of protection and restoration of high quality fish, game, and wildlife habitats using best practices and will target unique landscapes along the mid-Minnesota River watershed that have historical value to fish and game by helping to create new and/or expansions of Wildlife Management Areas (WMA) and/or Aquatic Management Areas (AMA) complexes or “corridors”. This program proposal is in alignment with the DNR Region 4 Focus Area priorities. of funds from the Contract and Travel portion of the Budget per the terms and conditions of the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources grant agreement to the Redwood Area Development Corporation (RADC) upon request and receipt of vendor/subcontractor invoices to assist in organizational cash flow.

Design and Scope of Work

The Glacial River Warren created the Minnesota River Valley as it drained Lake Agassiz 10,000+ years ago. The bluff to bluff wall of water carved out one of Minnesota's most scenic landscapes, creating unique geological features, and unique plant communities along the valley and its primary tributaries.

This program incorporates the basic concepts of sustainability and ecosystem management. Minnesota has lost 99% of the original prairie and has seen dramatic declines in grassland dependent wildlife. Examples of the species showing the greatest conservation need in the Program area; the American Badger, Grasshopper Sparrow, and Bobolink to name just a few. Traditional game species are also affected by the decline in habitat such as pheasants, deer, wild turkey, and a variety of dabbling ducks which are associated to prairie wetland complexes.

Efforts to restore, protect, and enhance our wetlands, prairies, forests, and habitat for fish, game, and wildlife are timely as escalating development pressures threaten remaining natural lands and water resources on both public and private lands. The Green Corridor Legacy Program approach will be based on sound science concepts of plan development, setting conservation priorities, developing short and long term strategies to achieve conservation priorities, implement the strategies, and then continue monitoring the outcomes. All of these concepts and practices will follow existing state wildlife and conservation plans and natural resource management practices in conjunction with agency partners.

Publicly owned natural resource infrastructures (WMA, AMA, SNA, parks/trails, waterways) invigorates local and regional economies by providing outdoor recreation and tourism opportunities supported by hunting, fishing, wildlife observation areas, and other forms of outdoor recreation. New business concepts are likely to arise as a direct result of the recreational and tourism opportunities that will be advanced by this Green Corridor Legacy Program. Because of this concept there is wide support from many stakeholders who will assist the Program activities to achieve the desired outcomes.

The proposed fee title acquisitions will be considered from a priority list of properties based on several key factors of which show the most urgent need and/or opportunities from willing and supportive landowners. All selected projects will have the support and cooperation of the DNR for acceptance into the WMA/AMA inventory system. All proposed projects will provide county notifications and will seek their approval.

The primary work area of the Green Corridor Legacy Program will be Redwood, Renville, Yellow Medicine, Chippewa, Brown, Nicollet, Murray, Lyon, and Cottonwood Counties with an emphasis along the Minnesota River, its tributaries, associated watersheds, and creating/expanding corridor or complexes of habitat. Connecting existing fragments of habitat along and near the Minnesota River and tributaries in the Program area will generate an ecological synergism that will allow game, wildlife, and aquatic species to flourish, while creating multiple outdoor recreational opportunities and improving public access through a series (phases) of funded activities within the nine (9) county Program area.

This Program is directly consistent with the uses of the Outdoor Heritage Fund, as specified in Article XI of the Minnesota Constitution and Minnesota Statute 97A.056: to restore, protect, and enhance wetlands, prairies, forests, and habitat for fish, game, and wildlife. Furthermore, it will produce multiple conservation benefits across a large targeted and planned geographic area.

Planning

The Green Corridor Legacy Program in consultation with area DNR managers will ensure program activities conform to the various state conservation and resources plan objectives and outcomes. This program also conforms to the FY13 Outdoor Heritage Fund (OHF) eleven (11) proposal requirements and the statewide priority criteria for the Prairie Section and Outcomes specifically towards the Minnesota River, associated tributaries, and watersheds.

Some of those state and/or regional plans are:

Outdoor Heritage Fund: A 25- Year Framework: Minnesota's conservation estate, historic conservation investments and future opportunities dated December 15, 2010.

Conservation in the Middle Minnesota Valley: A Blueprint and Action Plan This was a LCCMR funded conservation plan awarded to the Green Corridor Initiative and specific to the mid - section of the Minnesota River Valley.

Native Plant Communities and Rare Species of The Minnesota River Valley Counties This document was created by DNR Ecological Resources and will be another document used to evaluate and/or prioritize potential acquisition for consideration. This document is in conjunction with the Minnesota County Biological Survey (MCBS).

Minnesota Prairie Conservation Plan 2010 This plan is a 25 year strategy for accelerating conservation due to loss/degradation of prairies, grasslands, wetlands, and associated habitat along with the fish and wildlife populations dependent upon them.

Minnesota Statewide Conservation and Preservation Plan identifies habitat loss and degradation as the number one driver of change for wildlife in Minnesota and further states that the prairie regions have experienced the greatest amount of habitat loss of any region.

Minnesota's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for species in greatest conservation need has identified significant loss and degradation of habitat as the number one management challenge and one of the primary strategies is to provide protection through selective acquisition of key habitats in the prairie regions.

Minnesota's Long Range Duck Recovery Plan lists the objective of restoring a breeding population of one (1) million ducks by 2056. The primary strategy to reach this objective is the protection and restoration of two (2) million acres of habitat of which 70% will be grassland habitat in the prairie eco-region.

Minnesota's Long Range Plan for the Ring-neck Pheasant lists the objective of increasing pheasant populations to 1.8 million birds. Numerous strategies were identified to accomplish this objective; one of which calls for an additional 74,000 acres of grasslands to be protected through acquisitions of WMA's in the primary pheasant range.

Citizens report Minnesota's Wildlife Management Area Acquisition – The Next 50 Years recommends acquisition goals of an additional 494,000 in the prairie and transitional region over the next 50 years.

The US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) – Strategic Habitat Conservation (SHC) model outlines several key elements; Planning, implementation, and evaluation which the Green Corridor Legacy Program has been using as a basis for program development. The Green Corridor Legacy Program will continue to use existing state-wide wildlife conservation and strategic plans in partnership with our local and regional natural resource managers and conservation professionals to best achieve desired outcomes. These plans were developed through the most currently available science and the professional expertise of a broad range of wildlife professionals. These plans, along with use of GIS technology, will be used to identify potential projects based on existing and potential habitat resources in the program area. This will allow for selection of acquisition tracts that maximize population responses for both aquatic and game/nongame wildlife.

Finally, this Green Corridor Legacy Program proposal will address many of the visions and priority action items established by the LSOHC for the Prairie Section. The continued emphasis will be on the Minnesota River, associated tributaries, and watersheds within the program area and will protect and restore these unique landscapes that have historical value to fish, game, and wildlife

Relationship to Other Constitutional Funds

The Green Corridor Legacy Program focuses on preserving and restoring natural resources infrastructures while emphasizing habitat connectivity (corridors), viability, and public access to these habitats. Besides funding requests to the Environmental & Natural Resource Trust Fund (ENRTF) by Green Corridor Legacy Program; several SWCD's in the Green Corridor Program area are planning future Clean Water Legacy Fund program proposals. The Green Corridor Legacy Program will assist when asked with submissions to the Outdoor Heritage Fund – Conservation Legacy Program (small grants) from our conservation and wildlife group partners like the Minnesota Deer Hunters Association, Minnesota Waterfowl Association, National Wild Turkey Federation, Ducks Unlimited, and Pheasants Forever. Many other regional initiatives are currently being planned that are in line with Parks & Trails and Arts & Cultural Legacy Funds funding strategies.

Relationship to Current Organizational Budget

This program proposal will supplement other traditional forms of funding (past, current, and future) that the Green Corridor Legacy Program has received such as the Environment and Natural Resource Trust Fund and/or our pending federal North American Wetland Conservation Act (NAWCA) grant.

| Source of Funding | Amount | Status |
|-------------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| ENRTF FY2008 | \$1,000,000 | Completed 2010 |
| OHF FY2010 | \$1,617,000 | Final Report Submitted |
| OHF FY2011 | \$1,651,000 | Final Report Submitted |
| OHF FY2012 | \$1,771,000 | Funding started 7/20/11 |
| ENRTF FY2012 | \$2,000,000 | Funding started 7/20/11 |
| NAWCA | \$650,000 | Pending federal approval |

Sustainability and Maintenance

First, initial site restoration (bare ground with native vegetation) and development (signage, parking lots, fencing) will be accomplished by this appropriation. The DNR Division of Fish & Wildlife will manage these properties into perpetuity. Routine maintenance will be managed and determined by area DNR staff funded by their traditional sources like the Game & Fish Fund. Periodic enhancements or improvements will be funded by special funding requests. The DNR requires management or stewardship plans for each project which identify periodic inspections and continuing management of the property site. These management practices include such things as; prescribed fire, weed control, and invasive tree removal as needed or required and are usually spelled out in the Initial Development Plan (IDP) for each parcel. Regional partners/stakeholders in conjunction with the Green Corridor Legacy

Program will also support these management activities/practices by applying for state funding/grants for on-going maintenance as needed.

Outcomes

The Green Corridor Legacy Program Phase IV is a continuation and expansion of previous OHF appropriations. With previous OHF appropriations (FY10 & FY11) we have permanently protected through fee title 820 acres along the Minnesota River Valley, associated watersheds, and tributaries as WMA’s and AMA’s which are open to public use. These newly acquired properties from willing and supportive landowners have protected remnant native prairies, rock outcrops, provided nearly 2-3 miles of river/stream shoreline protection, expanded existing public infrastructures, and increase the outdoor recreational system within the Green Corridor program area.

With the increase of these public infrastructures of WMA’s and AMA’s the Green Corridor Legacy Program has protected critical wildlife and aquatic habitats for fish, game and wildlife and has increased the opportunity for public enjoyment and use of these newly acquired outdoor recreational systems that are in alignment with many of the state’s conservation plans previously mentioned. These new or expanded public outdoor recreational systems will provide greater public access to these natural resources and will help enhance an outdoor recreational economy for this region.

Citizens, landowners, stakeholders, state/federal agencies, and local units of government involvement and support will play a critical role in the Green Corridor Legacy Program continuing development and success.

Finally the Green Corridor Legacy Program Phase IV will continue its focus in the Prairie region and will use various state conservation plans to include the Minnesota Prairie Conservation Plan 2010 and will tailor activities to help achieve the stated strategic priorities and outcomes from these various plans.

Accomplishment Timeline

| Activity | Milestone | Date completed |
|-------------------------------|---|----------------|
| Property reviews & Appraisals | 4-7 <u>2-4</u> appraisals | November 2012 |
| Purchase Agreements | 4-7 <u>2-4</u> agreements | February 2013 |
| Closings & property transfer | 4-7 <u>2-4</u> fee title acquisitions 270 acres | June 2013 |
| Restoration as needed | 2-5 <u>1-2</u> properties – 100 acres | Spring 2014 |
| | | |

Attachments (*on spreadsheet workbook – 3 separate tabs*):

- A. Budget
- B. Proposed Outcome Tables
- C. Parcel List

No Map is needed for the accomplishment plan

Attachment A. Budget Spreadsheet

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Name of Proposal: | Green Corridor Legacy Program Phase IV |
| Legislative Citation: | ML 2012 Ch.264, Art.1, Sec. 2, subd 2 (g) |
| Date: | 11-May-12 |

[Link HERE to definitions of the budget items below.](#)

Total Amount of Request \$ 1,730,000 *From page 1 on the funding form.*

Personnel

| Position breakdown here | FTE | Over # of years | LSOHC Request | Anticipated Cash | | Total |
|-------------------------|----------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|----------------------|-------|
| | | | | Leverage | Cash Leverage Source | |
| | | | | | | \$ - |
| | | | | | | \$ - |
| | | | | | | \$ - |
| | | | | | | \$ - |
| | | | | | | \$ - |
| | | | | | | \$ - |
| | | | | | | \$ - |
| Total | 0 | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |

Budget and Cash Leverage *(All your LSOHC Request Funds must be direct to and necessary for program outcomes.)*

Please describe how you intend to spend the requested funds.

| Budget Item | LSOHC Request | Anticipated Cash | | Total |
|---|---------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| | | Leverage | Cash Leverage Source | |
| Personnel - <i>auto entered from above</i> | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Contracts | \$ 128,200 | | | \$ 128,200 |
| Fee Acquisition w/ PILT <i>(breakout in table 7)</i> | \$ 1,586,600 | | | \$ 1,586,600 |
| Fee Acquisition w/o PILT <i>(breakout in table 7)</i> | | | | \$ - |
| Easement Acquisition | | | | \$ - |
| Easement Stewardship | | | | \$ - |
| Travel (in-state) | \$ 1,200 | | | \$ 1,200 |
| Professional Services | | | | \$ - |
| Direct Support Services | | | | \$ - |
| DNR Land Acquisition Costs | \$ 14,000 | | | \$ 14,000 |
| Other | | | | \$ - |
| Capital Equipment <i>(auto entered from below)</i> | | | | \$ - |
| Other Equipment/Tools | | | | \$ - |
| Supplies/Materials | | | | \$ - |
| | \$ 1,730,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,730,000 |

Capital Equipment *(single items over \$10,000 - auto entered into table above)*

| Item Name | LSOHC Request | Leverage |
|--------------|---------------|----------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Total | - | - |

Attachment B. Output Tables

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Name of Proposal: | Green Corridor Legacy Program Phase IV |
| Legislative Citation: | |
| Date: | 24-Oct-11 |

Table 1 and Table 3 column totals should be the same AND Table 2 and Table 4 column totals should be the same

If your project has lakes or shoreline miles instead of land acres, convert miles to acres for Tables 1 and 3 using the following conversion:

Lakeshore = 6 acres per lakeshore mile / Stream & River Shore = 12 acres per linear mile, if both sides

Table 1. Acres by Resource Type

Describe the scope of the project in acres (use conversion above if needed)

| | Wetlands | Prairies | Forest | Habitats | Total |
|------------------|----------|----------|--------|----------|-------|
| Restore | | 100 | | | 100 |
| Protect Fee | | 270 | | | 270 |
| Protect Easement | | | | | 0 |
| Protect Other | | | | | 0 |
| Enhance | | | | | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 370 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Total Acres (sum of Total column) 370 *These two cells should be the same figure.*
 Total Acres (sum of Total row) 370

Table 2. Total Requested Funding by Resource Type

| | Wetlands | Prairies | Forest | Habitats | Total |
|------------------|----------|--------------|--------|----------|--------------|
| Restore | | \$ 60,000 | | | \$ 60,000 |
| Protect Fee | | \$ 1,670,000 | | | \$ 1,670,000 |
| Protect Easement | | | | | \$ - |
| Protect Other | | | | | \$ - |
| Enhance | | | | | \$ - |
| Total | \$ - | \$ 1,730,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |

Total Dollars (sum of Total column) \$ 1,730,000 *These two cells should be the same figure.*
 Total Dollars (sum of Total row) \$ 1,730,000

Check to make sure this amount is the same as the Funding Request Amount on page 1 of Main Funding Form.

Table 3. Acres within each Ecological Section

| | Metro/Urban | Forest/Prairie | SE Forest | Prairie | Northern Forest | Total |
|------------------|-------------|----------------|-----------|---------|-----------------|-------|
| Restore | | | | 100 | | 100 |
| Protect Fee | | | | 270 | | 270 |
| Protect Easement | | | | | | 0 |
| Protect Other | | | | | | 0 |
| Enhance | | | | | | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 370 | 0 | 0 |

Total Acres (sum of Total column) 370 *These three cells should be the same figure.*
 Total Acres (sum of Total row) 370
 Total Acres from Table 1. 370

Attachment B. Output Tables

Table 4. Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section

| | Metro/Urban | Forest/Prairie | SE Forest | Prairie | Northern Forest | Total |
|------------------|-------------|----------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Restore | | | | \$ 60,000 | | \$ 60,000 |
| Protect Fee | | | | \$ 1,670,000 | | \$ 1,670,000 |
| Protect Easement | | | | | | |
| Protect Other | | | | | | \$ - |
| Enhance | | | | | | \$ - |
| Total | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,730,000 | \$ - | |

Total Dollars (sum of Total column) \$ 1,730,000 *These two cells should be the same figure.*
 Total Dollars (sum of Total row) \$ 1,730,000
 Check to make sure these amounts are the same as the Funding Request Amount on page 1 of Main Funding Form.

Table 5. Target Lake/Stream/River Miles

NA # miles of Lakes / Streams / Rivers Shoreline

Table 6. Acquisition by PILT Status (enter information in acres)

| | Wetlands | Prairies | Forests | Habitats | Total |
|---|----------|----------|---------|----------|-------|
| Acquired in Fee with State PILT Liability | | 270 | | | 270 |
| Acquired in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | | | | | 0 |
| Permanent Easement PILT Liability | | | | | 0 |
| | 0 | 270 | 0 | 0 | |

Table 7. Estimated Value of Land Acquisition by PILT Status (enter information in dollars)

| | Wetlands | Prairies | Forests | Habitats | Total | |
|---|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|--------------|
| Acquired in Fee with State PILT Liability | | \$ 1,586,600 | | | \$ 1,586,600 | \$ 1,586,600 |
| Acquired in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | | | | | \$ - | \$ - |
| Permanent Easement PILT Liability | | | | | \$ - | \$ - |
| | \$ - | \$ 1,586,600 | \$ - | \$ - | | |

FYI: should match total in budget table that is auto entered below

Attachment C. Parcel List

Name of Proposal: Green Corridor Legacy Program Phase IV
Legislative Citation: ML 2012 Ch. 264, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 2 (g)
Date: 14-Jun-12

| County | Township (25-258) | Range (01-51) | Direction most parcels are 2 with the exception of some areas of Cook County which is 1 | Section (01 thru 36) | TRDS | # of acres | Budgetary Estimate (includes administrative, restoration or other related costs and do not include matching money contributed or earned by the transaction) | Description | Activity PF=Protect Fee PE=Protect Easement PO=Protect Other R=Restore E=Enhance | If Easement, what is the easement cost as a % of the fee acquisition? | Any existing protection? (yes/no) | Open to hunting and fishing? (yes/no) | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------|---|-------------------------|------|---------------|--|-------------|---|--|---|--|-----|
| Parcel Name | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cold Spring WMA add. | Renville | 113 | 36 | 2 | 1 | 113360201 | 80 | \$320,000 | native prairie & bluffland | PF | NA | No | Yes |
| Bashaw WMA add. | Renville | 113 | 35 | 2 | 26 | 113350226 | 80 | \$320,000 | restorable wetlands | PF | NA | No | Yes |
| Pat's Pasture WMA add. | Brown | 108 | 34 | 2 | 16 | 108340216 | 220 | \$880,000 | 40 acres native prairie | PF | NA | No | Yes |
| Arnolds Lake WMA add. | Cottonwood | 105 | 37 | 2 | 29 | 105370229 | 182 | \$728,000 | DesMoine River shoreline | PF | NA | No | Yes |
| St. Leo WMA complex | Yellow Medicine | 115 | 43 | 2 | 8 | 115430208 | 7 | \$28,000 | connecting tract to WMA | PF | NA | No | Yes |
| Beaver Creek WMA | Yellow Medicine | 115 | 43 | 2 | 8 | 115430208 | 91 | \$364,000 | connecting tract to WMA | PF | NA | No | Yes |
| Devil's Run WMA | Murray | 107 | 41 | 2 | 35 | 107410235 | 40 | \$160,000 | old Mud Lake headwater | PF | NA | No | Yes |
| Devil's Run WMA | Murray | 106 | 39 | 2 | 6 | 106390206 | 150 | \$600,000 | wetland CRP expires 2012 | PF | NA | No | Yes |
| Irruption WMA | Murray | 107 | 39 | 2 | 32 | 107390232 | 75 | \$300,000 | DesMoine River, CRP expires 2013 | PF | NA | No | Yes |
| Irruption WMA | Murray | 106 | 39 | 2 | 20 | 106390220 | 80 | \$320,000 | DesMoine River,CRP expires 2012 | PF | NA | No | Yes |
| Lamberton WMA tract #18 | Redwood | 109 | 37 | 2 | 13 | 109370213 | 196 | \$1,300,000 | Connects WMA to Cottonwood River | PF | NA | No | Yes |

Tracts maybe added or subtracted as opportunities arise or change. Any changes in Parcel list will be review with LSOHC.

This list is not in priority order

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Agenda Item Memo

DATE: August 1, 2012

SUBJECT: Knife River Habitat Restoration, M.L. 2012, Ch. 264, Art. 1, Sect. 2, Subd. 5(g)

Background: The Lake Superior Steelhead Association requested funds to restore spawning and rearing habitat in the Upper Knife River. The original July 2011 request contained \$20,000 for personnel. The draft accomplishment plan prepared in October 2011 increased the personnel line to \$30,000. The final draft accomplishment plan before the Council prepared in June of 2012 contains a personnel line item for \$40,000. This is an opportunity to understand the personnel needs of the project before approving the accomplishment plan.

| | Request July 2011 | Draft Accomp. Plan Oct. 2011 | Final Draft Accomp. Plan June 2012 |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| Personnel Line Item | \$20,000 | \$30,000 | \$40,000 |

Suggested Motion:

Move to approve the final draft accomplishment plan as presented.

Suggested Procedure:

Place the above motion before the Council for approval. Discuss the program with the program manager. Amend the above motion if discussions with the program manager indicate an amendment is necessary.

Agenda Item # 7b

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Laws of Minnesota 2012 Accomplishment Plan

Date: 6/13/12

Program Title: Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation

Manager's Name: Craig Wilson

Title: President

Organization: Lake Superior Steelhead Association (LSSA)

Telephone: (218) 722-6013

Email: cwilson@etsmn.com

Fax: (218) 722-6319

Funds Recommended: \$380,000

Legislative Citation: ML 2012, Chp. 264, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 5(g) Knife River Habitat Restoration

\$380,000 in the second year is to the *commissioner* of natural resources for an agreement with the Lake Superior Steelhead Association to restore trout habitat in the Upper Knife River Watershed. A list of proposed restorations must be provided as part of the required accomplishment plan. Notwithstanding rules of the commissioner of natural resources, restorations conducted pursuant to this paragraph may be accomplished by excavation.

Abstract:

Degradation to trout habitat in the upper Knife River Watershed has occurred from past forestry practices resulting in uncontrolled beaver colonization. The result is unfavorable rearing habitat for juvenile trout.

Program Narrative

Knife River Watershed

Situated on the St Louis/Lake County border in NE MN, the Knife River has over 181 miles of stream length within its watershed. The Knife River watershed consists of approximately 54,000 acres, of which 29,000 acres are owned by the State of Minnesota, St. Louis County and Lake County. Approximately 25,000 acres are privately owned and of this privately owned property 6,200 acres, or approximately 25%, are enrolled in stewardship plans. The Knife River has the best and most available steelhead spawning habitat on Minnesota's Northshore.

History of the Knife River

The Knife River once held one of the largest populations of natural reproducing steelhead in the Great Lakes and provided spawning habitat in its upper watershed to thousands of steelhead each spring. Since the late 1970's, the Knife River steelhead population has seen a dramatic decrease. Where thousands of steelhead once traveled upstream to spawn now only three to eight hundred make this

same journey. One of the primary reasons for the decrease in the Knife River's steelhead population is the degradation to the upper Knife River watershed riparian habitat.

The Knife River lacks significant spring-fed flow and is kept cool in the summer by the shade of riparian trees along the stream bank. Without cold water, juvenile trout migrate downstream in search of suitable cold water habitat or perish. According to a DNR fisheries study, the increased water temperature and lack of stream flow causes juvenile steelhead to prematurely migrate to Lake Superior. When these smolts migrate prematurely (before age 2) to Lake Superior they are significantly preyed upon. According to the DNR, 1 out of every 600 juvenile trout that migrate prematurely to Lake Superior return to spawn in the Knife River. In contrast, 1 out of every 10 two-year old smolts (non-early migrants) return from Lake Superior to spawn as adults. This is a primary limiting factor to the recovery of the steelhead population on the Knife River.

Habitat Degradation and its Results to the Upper Knife River Watershed

The historic forest composition within the Knife River watershed was old growth coniferous trees. Extensive clear-cut logging removed the old growth coniferous trees throughout the Knife River watershed, which were replaced by large stands of second growth aspen. This large-scale forest alteration attracted unprecedented beaver populations to the watershed because of the new food source. Once beavers colonized this area, dams were built blocking the stream flow and flooding the riparian tree cover. The flooded trees and shrubs along the riparian zone quickly died resulting in open water ponds. The impoundment of shallow water and lack of tree cover associated with the beaver pond caused the water temperature to quickly warm and has led to an increase in evaporation. This increase in beaver activity has resulted in 30 plus years of habitat degradation to the upper Knife River watershed.

DNR Habitat Work and Studies Conducted in the Upper Knife River Watershed

Recognizing the threat to the upper river, the DNR started performing limited stream improvement projects involving the removal of beavers, breaching of beaver dams and limited improvement to fish passageways in the late 1990s. However, the DNR did not have the resources to restore the original fish passageways or the riparian habitat that originally existed prior to the beaver activity. Today hundreds of areas exist within this upper watershed that contain beaver meadows, dead trees, dam remnants, small woody debris, sediment impoundments and collapsed stream banks.

Various DNR studies have determined this habitat degradation to the upper watershed has resulted in poor rearing conditions for juvenile trout in the summer months. These poor rearing conditions (increase in water temperature, increase in evaporation and decrease in stream flows) are the direct result of beaver activity/habitat degradation in the Knife River watershed.

The DNR has conducted an annual aerial survey of the upper Knife River watershed since the mid 1990's to locate beaver dams, which in part has been funded by the LSSA. The data collected from this annual flight is used by the DNR to trap beavers and performed limited beaver dam removal. However, the DNR has not had the funds to rehabilitate the resulting habitat damage caused to the streambed and

adjacent riparian cover. The habitat damage that remains to the watershed is the loss of overhead tree canopy, increased water temperature, siltation of the streambed, debris in the water, stream flow blockage and stream bank erosion.

Phase I Stream Restoration

The LSSA proposes to use the DNR's existing aerial data and beaver dam location maps to locate and assess the beaver impacted areas on the upper Knife River. The LSSA will discuss and rank the locations for rehabilitation. The area of focus will start with the primary spawning tributary in the Knife River watershed, which is the West Branch of the Main Knife River. Only sites on public land will be considered for this project. There will not be any work performed on private land.

A field reconnaissance will be conducted to determine the stream section's condition and to design the rehabilitation project. The preliminary data that will be collected may include:

- Review aerial photo and GIS maps of beaver impacted areas.
- Mark GPS location of habitat degradation.
- Determine proximity to access points.
- Measure the area of impacted stream.
- Survey the depth of sediment deposition.
- Determine length and thickness of remnant dam(s).
- Survey the stream elevations.
- Quantify the amount of large and small woody debris.
- Calculate the percent of shade covering various stream sections.
- Monitor water temperature.
- Document visual evidence of juvenile fish or adult spawning activity.
- Identify collapsed banks or erosion areas.
- Construct cross-section diagrams.

The design parameters will enable us to:

- Remove in-stream beaver dams, collapsed stream banks and woody debris that inhibit fish migration and negatively alter stream flow.
- Restore stream flow.

- Repair or stabilize eroded stream banks.
- Removal of small woody debris.
- Placement of large woody debris.
- Clear impounded siltation from the streambed.
- Planting of trees to restore the overhead canopy.

The project data and design parameters will be incorporated in a project permit and submitted for approval to the DNR and Army Corp. of Engineers. Once the permit(s) are approved, the LSSA will implement restoration on a portion of the beaver meadows identified for restoration.

Equipment Usage and Project Site Access

The goal of this project is to restore beaver impacted areas within the upper Knife River watershed. To accomplish this goal, mechanical equipment will be used in specified areas that have vehicle access. In areas with vehicle access to the watershed, heavy equipment will be mobilized to remove dams, stabilize stream banks, placement of large woody debris and plant mature trees. These areas will be given a high priority because rehabilitating these stream sections can provide an almost immediate benefit to the watershed.

However, the LSSA realizes that many areas we are proposing to restore have no vehicle river access. In these areas, the LSSA will not build temporary roads, import fill or mobilize heavy equipment, but be relegated to using hand equipment for improvement work. The LSSA does not want to cause more damage to the watershed than what we will be restoring. Thus much of our restoration efforts in remote areas will be limited and consist of a reduced scope of work.

Tree Planting

Tree planting will be a critical component of this restoration project. Tree planting will be focused on the riparian area of the stream or watershed. In remote areas of the watershed tree planting may be the only reasonable method of restoration employed due to lack of heavy equipment access. Plantings will vary between coniferous and deciduous trees and shrubs. The proposed species will consist of a various arrangement of bare root, potted and large root bundled trees. Some of the tree species that may be utilized include: white spruce, black spruce, tamarack, red pine, silver maple, red maple, willows and speckled alder. This new riparian zone will ultimately be a mix of fast growing shrubs and smaller tree species intermixed with slower growing larger trees. The planting of shrub species will provide an immediate canopy, while the tree plantings will provide long-term shade and large woody debris.

Phase II Knife River Watershed Black Ash Stand Replacement Planting

Black ash stands currently comprise a large percentage of the riparian forest community in various sections of the Knife River watershed, most notably in the headwaters where young trout rear. The State of Minnesota and the Minnesota DNR expect that all ash stands in the state to eventually

experience high to total mortality due to an infestation of the emerald ash borer. This project aims to attempt to retain shade cover for the upper Knife River watershed by planting additional tree species within the riparian corridor to diversify the forest. Forest comprised primarily of black ash will be targeted for this component of the project.

According to GIS data provided from the Laurentian RC & D, nearly 10 miles of major Knife River tributary riparian forest stands are comprised primarily of ash. This component of the riparian rehabilitation project on the Knife River will target stands located on public land along the West Branch of the Knife River in St Louis County. The proposed plan will plant a wide variety of trees that will be selected for each location based on site conditions. Preemptive understory tree planting is proposed to utilize tree species including tamarack, silver maple, white spruce, white cedar, white pine, red pine, basswood, etc. Additional GIS and onsite survey work will be utilized to select specific ash stands and locations, as well as target additional locations within the watershed for future plantings.

Tree Planting

Tree planting in remote Knife River watershed headwaters will not be easy. As such, a variety of different planting techniques will be attempted during this project. These techniques include planting larger trees, using a variety of bare root, containerized trees and locally harvested trees, using matting to keep weed growth down, using both caging and tree tubes to inhibit browsing. The success of different techniques will be evaluated to aid in planting additional ash stands during future projects.

Planning

This project has been designed and is consistent with the DNR's Lake Superior Management Plan and the DNR's Rainbow Trout Plan. Both of these DNR management plans place a high priority in habitat conservation and rehabilitation.

Relationship to Other Constitutional Funds

Clean Water Fund money is being used for the Knife River Watershed's middle sections (clay bank sections). This money is being used to stabilize slumping clay banks as part of the TMDL implementation plan. This money has been provided to the South St. Louis Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD). The LSSA and SWCD are working cooperatively on separate sections of river to insure the entire watershed is improved. The LSSA is primarily working on the upper river spawning and rearing tributaries exclusively on public land, while the SWCD is working on the middle river sections (clay bank section) and concentrating primarily on private lands.

Relationship to Current Organizational Budget

The LSSA has provided approximately \$750,000 since 1985 to rehabilitate steelhead runs in the Knife River. The LSSA used non-profit gaming (pull tabs) as a revenue source for these Knife River projects. Unfortunately, non-profit gaming revenues are significantly down and the LSSA does not have a revenue stream that can finance this project or other large habitat projects in the foreseeable future.

Sustainability and Maintenance

A critical component of this project is to insure beaver do not re-impact areas of the West Branch of the Knife River that have been rehabilitated. To insure that the project areas on the West Branch are maintained after the project is complete, annual flights will be conducted to insure beavers do not re-colonize this area. These beaver flights will be conducted in late autumn by the DNR as they have been previously for the past 10 to 15 years. If dams or beaver activity is noted in the annual flight, the DNR will contract trappers to remove the beaver. This has also been performed for the past 10-15 years. The estimated cost of the flight and beaver removal throughout the entire Knife River watershed is \$15,000.

If the DNR loses funding for this project, the TMDL implementation plan has budgeted \$35,000 annually for this task. Included in this budget is beaver flights and trapping, but also other tasks not included in the DNR budget. These other tasks are re-planting of trees, beaver dam removal and bank repair. These other tasks may not be necessary to be performed or funded annually, but have been listed in the TMDL plan in the event future maintenance and funding is necessary.

Outcomes

Qualitative outcomes include short, intermediate and long term outcomes.

Short Term Qualitative Outcomes (3 to 5 years)

- Improve in-stream habitat
- Re-establish hydraulic connectivity
- Provide education and awareness to user groups

Intermediate Term Qualitative Outcomes (6 to 10 years)

- Reduce erosion
- Restore overhead tree/shrub canopy

Long Term Qualitative Outcomes (20+ years)

- Increase smolt retention time in the upper watershed (higher percentage of juvenile steelhead smolting at age 2).
- Observe a higher percentage of repeat adult spawners.
- Restore the forest composition to coniferous trees.

Accomplishment Timeline

| Activity | Milestone | Date completed |
|---|------------------------------|-------------------|
| Site walk-through/Baseline Data Collection/Prepare Permit Application | Permit Approval | 7/1/12 - 12/31/13 |
| In-stream Fieldwork | Dam Removal/Bank Restoration | 6/30/13-6/30/15 |
| Site Preparation/Tree Planting | Riparian Zone Replanted | 6/30/13-6/30/16 |

Table B-2. Other Outcome Table

| | | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|--|
| N/A | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Attachments (*on spreadsheet workbook – 3 separate tabs*):

- A. Budget
- B. Proposed Outcome Tables
- C. Parcel List

No Map is needed for the accomplishment plan

Attachment A. Budget Spreadsheet

Name of Proposal: Knife River Habitat Restoration

Date: 6/18/2012

[Link HERE to definitions of the budget items below.](#)

Total Amount of Request \$ 380,000 *From page 1 on the funding form.*

Personnel

| Position breakdown here | FTE | Over # of years | LSOHC Request | Anticipated Cash | | Total |
|----------------------------|------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| | | | | Leverage | Cash Leverage Source | |
| <i>Manager of Programs</i> | 0.5 | 4 | \$ 40,000 | | | \$ 40,000 |
| <i>Admin Asst</i> | | | | | | \$ - |
| <i>position 3</i> | | | | | | \$ - |
| <i>position 4</i> | | | | | | \$ - |
| <i>position 5</i> | | | | | | \$ - |
| <i>position 6</i> | | | | | | \$ - |
| <i>position 7</i> | | | | | | \$ - |
| Total | 0.5 | | \$ 40,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 40,000 |

Budget and Cash Leverage *(All your LSOHC Request Funds must be direct to and necessary for program outcomes.)*

Please describe how you intend to spend the requested funds.

| Budget Item | LSOHC Request | Anticipated Cash | | Total |
|---|---------------|------------------|----------------------|------------|
| | | Leverage | Cash Leverage Source | |
| Personnel - auto entered from above | \$ 40,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 40,000 |
| Contracts | \$ 250,000 | | | \$ 250,000 |
| Fee Acquisition w/ PILT (breakout in table 7) | | | | \$ - |
| Fee Acquisition w/o PILT (breakout in table 7) | | | | \$ - |
| Easement Acquisition | | | | \$ - |
| Easement Stewardship | | | | \$ - |
| Travel (in-state) | \$ 5,000 | | | \$ 5,000 |
| Professional Services | \$ 30,000 | | | \$ 30,000 |
| Direct Support Services | \$ - | | | \$ - |
| DNR Land Acquisition Costs (\$3,500 per acquisition) | | | | \$ - |
| Other | | | | \$ 55,000 |
| Capital Equipment <i>(auto entered from below)</i> | \$ - | \$ - | | \$ - |
| Other Equipment/Tools | \$ 15,000 | | | \$ 15,000 |
| Supplies/Materials | \$ 40,000 | | | \$ 40,000 |
| | \$ 380,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 380,000 |

Capital Equipment *(single items over \$10,000 - auto entered into table above)*

| Item Name | LSOHC Request | Leverage |
|--------------------------|---------------|----------|
| <i>Item 2 enter here</i> | | |
| <i>Item 3 enter here</i> | | |
| <i>Item 4 enter here</i> | | |
| <i>Item 5 enter here</i> | | |
| <i>Item 6 enter here</i> | | |
| <i>Item 7 enter here</i> | | |
| <i>Item 8 enter here</i> | | |
| Total | - | - |

Attachment B. Output Tables

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Name of Proposal: | Knife River habitat Restoration |
| Date: | 6/18/2012 |
| | |

Table 1 and Table 3 column totals should be the same AND Table 2 and Table 4 column totals should be the same

If your project has lakes or shoreline miles instead of land acres, convert miles to acres for Tables 1 and 3 using the following conversion:

Lakeshore = 6 acres per lakeshore mile / Stream & River Shore = 12 acres per linear mile, if both sides

Table 1. Acres by Resource Type

Describe the scope of the project in acres (use conversion above if needed)

| | Wetlands | Prairies | Forest | Habitats | Total |
|------------------|----------|----------|--------|----------|-------|
| Restore | | | | | 0 |
| Protect Fee | | | | | 0 |
| Protect Easement | | | | | 0 |
| Protect Other | | | | | 0 |
| Enhance | | | | 204 | 204 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 204 | |

Total Acres (sum of Total column)
Total Acres (sum of Total row)

204
204
These two cells should be the same figure.

Table 2. Total Requested Funding by Resource Type

| | Wetlands | Prairies | Forest | Habitats | Total |
|------------------|----------|----------|--------|------------|------------|
| Restore | | | | \$ - | \$ - |
| Protect Fee | | | | | \$ - |
| Protect Easement | | | | | \$ - |
| Protect Other | | | | | \$ - |
| Enhance | | | | \$ 380,000 | \$ 380,000 |
| Total | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 380,000 | |

Total Dollars (sum of Total column)
Total Dollars (sum of Total row)
Check to make sure this amount is the same as the Funding Request Amount on page 1 of Main Funding Form.

\$ 380,000
\$ 380,000
These two cells should be the same figure.

Table 3. Acres within each Ecological Section

| | Metro/Urban | Forest/Prairie | SE Forest | Prairie | Northern Forest | Total |
|------------------|-------------|----------------|-----------|---------|-----------------|-------|
| Restore | | | | | | 0 |
| Protect Fee | | | | | | 0 |
| Protect Easement | | | | | | 0 |
| Protect Other | | | | | | 0 |
| Enhance | | | | | 204 | 204 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 204 | |

Total Acres (sum of Total column)
Total Acres (sum of Total row)
Total Acres from Table 1.

204
204
204
These three cells should be the same figure.

Attachment B. Output Tables

Table 4. Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section

| | Metro/Urban | Forest/Prairie | SE Forest | Prairie | Northern Forest | Total |
|------------------|-------------|----------------|-----------|---------|-----------------|------------|
| Restore | | | | | | \$ - |
| Protect Fee | | | | | | \$ - |
| Protect Easement | | | | | | \$ - |
| Protect Other | | | | | | \$ - |
| Enhance | | | | | \$ 380,000 | \$ 380,000 |
| Total | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 380,000 | |

Total Dollars (sum of Total column)

\$ 380,000

These two cells should be the same figure.

Total Dollars (sum of Total row)

\$ 380,000

Check to make sure these amounts are the same as the Funding Request Amount on page 1 of Main Funding Form.

Table 5. Target Lake/Stream/River Miles

up to 17 # miles of Lakes / Streams / Rivers Shoreline

Table 6. Acquisition by PILT Status (enter information in acres)

| | Wetlands | Prairies | Forests | Habitats | Total |
|---|----------|----------|---------|----------|-------|
| Acquired in Fee with State PILT Liability | | | | | 0 |
| Acquired in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | | | | | 0 |
| Permanent Easement <i>PILT Liability</i> <i>NO State</i> | | | | | 0 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Table 7. Estimated Value of Land Acquisition by PILT Status (enter information in dollars)

| | Wetlands | Prairies | Forests | Habitats | Total | |
|---|----------|----------|---------|----------|-------|------|
| Acquired in Fee with State PILT Liability | | | | | \$ - | \$ - |
| Acquired in Fee w/o State PILT Liability | | | | | \$ - | \$ - |
| Permanent Easement <i>PILT Liability</i> <i>NO State</i> | | | | | \$ - | \$ - |
| | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | | |

FYI: should match total in budget table that is auto entered below

Attachment C. Parcel List

Name of Proposal:

7/14/2011

Knife River Habitat Restoration

| County | Township (25-258) | Range (01-51) | Direction All work will be done within St. Louis County | Section (01 thru 36) | TRDS | # of acres | Budgetary Estimate (includes administrative, restoration or other related costs and do not include matching money contributed or earned by the transaction) | Description | Activity PF=Protect Fee PE=Protect Easement PO=Protect Other R=Restore E=Enhance | If Easement, what is the easement cost as a % of the fee acquisition? | Any existing protection? (yes/no) | Open to hunting and fishing? (yes/no) |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------|-----------------------|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| Parcel Name | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| West Branch of the Knife River | St. Louis | | | portions of | 2 | 204 up to 17 Miles | \$380,000 | Streambed and stream See watershed map | | n/a | Yes See Attached DNR easements link. This link is for reference only and does not represent the exact location of the project because some of the sites in this link may be on private land. Only Public land will be part of the project. | Yes |
| | | T52 N | R11W | Sec 1,4,5,6 | | | | | | | | |
| | | T53N | R11W | Sec 2,3,10,15,16 | | | | | | | | |
| | | T54N | R11W | Sec 22, 23,27,34,35 Sec 31,35,36 | | | | | | | | |

Information provided will be used to map project locations. Incomplete or inaccurate information will result in that parcel or program not being mapped.

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Agenda Item Memo

DATE: August 1, 2012

SUBJECT: Accelerated Prairie Restoration & Enhancement on DNR Lands, Ph IV, M.L. 2012, Ch. 264, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 2(h)

Background: This accomplishment plan is brought to the Council because of a significant reduction in program goals between the November accomplishment plan and the final draft accomplishment plan presented to the Council for approval. The request proposed burning 28,000 acres. The original draft accomplishment plan envisioned 32,000 acres would be enhanced by controlled burns. As project planning advanced the program manager realized there were errors in the basic assumptions used to plan and that the M.L. 2012 burns would be an order of magnitude smaller than prior burns, yielding fewer burn enhanced acres for the dollars appropriated. The error reduced the burn enhanced acres from 32,000 by 14,000 acres to a new goal of 18,000 acres enhanced by burning. The table below summarizes this information.

| | Acres Burned | Total Acres Treated |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Request | 28,000 | 78,300 |
| Draft Accomp. Plan (DAP) | 32,000 | 69,786 |
| Final Draft Accomp. Plan (FDAP) | 18,000 | 55,569 |
| Difference DAP – FDAP | 14,000 | 14,217 |

Staff felt the magnitude of the difference warranted Council discussion with the project manager.

Suggested Motion:

Move to approve the final draft accomplishment plan for Accelerated Prairie Restoration & Enhancement on DNR Lands, Ph IV, M.L. 2012, Chapter 264, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 2(h) as presented

Suggested Procedure:

Place a motion to approve the accomplishment plan before the Council and discuss the factors affecting acreage burned and the importance of accurate estimates on which to base Council recommendations.

Agenda Item # 7c

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Agenda Item Memo

DATE: August 1, 2012

SUBJECT: Mississippi Northwoods Habitat Complex Protection Program, M.L. 2012, Ch. 264, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 3(b)

Background: The Council recommended a \$14,040,000 appropriation to acquire approximately 1,700 acres of forest land with 2.5 miles of Mississippi River frontage in Crow Wing County. The legislature appropriated \$11,040,000 for this program. The legislature included a provision in ML 2012, Ch. 264, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd 5 (h), Protect Aquatic Habitat from Asian Carp, to make available any unexpended balances as of December 15, 2012 to the Mississippi Northwoods Habitat Complex program. The Mississippi Northwoods Habitat Complex Purchase requires two appraisals completed to DNR standards and reviewed by DNR. These appraisals should be completed by July 31, 2012 and a final purchase price known.

Suggested Motion:

Move to approve the final draft accomplishment plan.

Suggested Procedure:

Place a motion to approve the final draft accomplishment plan before the Council. Question the program manager about the progress and the purchase price. Amend the motion by adding “at the appraised purchase price of \$ _____ contingent on sufficient funds available to Subd. 3(b)” after the word plan.

Agenda Item # 7d

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Agenda Item Memo

DATE: August 1, 2012

SUBJECT: Protect Aquatic Habitat from Asian Carp, M.L. 2012, Chapter 264, Sect. 2, Subd. 5(h)

Background: The Council recommended to the legislature that \$5.5 million be appropriated for structures to “design, construct, operate, and evaluate structural deterrents for Asian carp to protect Minnesota’s aquatic habitat. Use of this money requires a one-to-one match for projects on state boundary waters.” The legislature appropriated and the governor signed into law an appropriation for \$7.5 million.

Testimony on this recommendation was heard on three dates: August 23, 2011, September 20, 2011, and January 26, 2012. Staff reviewed transcripts of this testimony and determined that no barrier types or locations were committed to by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR). It was clear from the transcripts that the Council expected to see an accomplishment plan with locations identified. There was some discussion of the legality of expending the funds on waters outside Minnesota through which aquatic invasive species could migrate into Minnesota waters. This discussion was not conclusive and recommended more discussion and project details.

The accomplishment plan identifies one barrier on the Mississippi River in the chamber of Lock and Dam #1 in Hennepin County, Minnesota (\$5.78 million); five barriers in Jackson County, Minnesota: Okabena watershed breach 1, Heron Lake watershed breach, Okabena watershed breach 2, Herlein-Boote WMA watershed breach, and Indian/Iowa lake barrier on W. Fork Little Sioux River (\$1.22 million total); and one barrier on the Lower Gar Lake outlet in Dickenson County, Iowa (\$0.5 million).

Note that the locations of the barriers have been updated from the draft final accomplishment plan posted May 11, 2012.

Suggested Motion:

Move to approve the final draft accomplishment plan for Protect Aquatic Habitat from Asian Carp, M.L. 2012, Chapter 264, Sec. 2, Subd. 5(h).

Suggested Procedure:

Place a motion to approve the final draft accomplishment plan. Discuss issues with program manager including spending of money dedicated to protection of Minnesota habitat outside Minnesota.

Agenda Item # 7e

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Laws of Minnesota 2013 Accomplishment Plan

Date: ~~5/11/12~~7/31/12

Program Title: Protect Aquatic Habitat from Asian Carp

Manager's Name: Tim Schlagenhaft
Title: Mississippi River Planner
Organization: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
Telephone: 651-345-3365 ext. 233
Email: timothy.schlagenhaft@state.mn.us
Fax:

Funds Recommended: \$7,500,000

Legislative Citation: ML 2012, Ch. 264 Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 2 (h):

(h) Protect Aquatic Habitat from Asian Carp

- 14. \$7,500,000 in the second year is to the
- 14. of natural resources to
- 14. construct, operate, and evaluate
- 14. deterrents for Asian carp to protect
- 14. aquatic habitat. Use of this
- 14. requires a one-to-one match for
- 14. on state boundary waters

Abstract:

Funding will be used to design, install and evaluate deterrent barriers in Minnesota and to cost share barriers in northwest Iowa to limit or slow the movement of Asian carp.

Program Narrative

Design and Scope of Work

Asian carp are threatening Minnesota. Recent captures and eDNA evidence highlight the need to limit or slow the movement of Asian carp into the Mississippi, Minnesota, St. Croix and other rivers in Minnesota to prevent damage to native fishes and ecosystems. Most recently, significant catches of bighead and silver carp in Lake Okoboji in northwest Iowa have resulted in new threats of entry into Minnesota from the Missouri River drainage as well. Where Asian carp have established reproducing populations, they have impacted native species and caused safety concerns and impacted recreational activities.

Deterrent barriers that use electricity have proven the most effective in slowing or stopping the spread of Asian carp. In addition, other technologies such as sound and bubbles have proven effective in

laboratory and small-scale field studies. Deterrent barriers are important tools for limiting or slowing the spread of Asian carp in Minnesota while other long-term control methods are developed.

Most locations on the Mississippi are unsuitable for deterrent barriers due to the nature and extent of flooding that often overtops levees and requires the Corps of Engineers to pull the gates out of the water at most locks and dams. The lock chamber at Lock and Dam 1 (Ford Dam) provides a unique opportunity in that it is one of only 3 dams on the commercially navigable portion of the Upper Mississippi River that does not have gates, and the only way fish can pass is by swimming through the lock chamber. Lock and dam 1 provides an opportunity for deterrent barriers to be more effective.

Recent catches of Asian carp in Lake Okoboji in northwest Iowa have prompted significant concern as there are several tributaries into which these fish could enter Minnesota waters. Constructing electrical barriers or other permanent physical barriers on these tributaries will slow or stop the spread of Asian carp. In addition, the Iowa Department of Natural Resources is proposing to construct electrical barriers at key sites in Iowa to prevent additional migration into Lake Okoboji and other tributaries. Providing cost share to construct electrical barriers at these sites would help prevent entry into Minnesota.

Electrical barriers are preferred, however, there are significant safety and structural issues associated with electrical barriers that must be addressed prior to construction, especially with construction at a lock. If these issues are unable to be resolved, other technologies would be considered.

Any barriers would be evaluated pre and post construction to determine their effectiveness in blocking fish movement, including impacts to native species. Evaluations would be completed by implanting radio tags in native fish, including surrogate species for Asian carp, and tracking movements using stationary receivers deployed at locations within the Mississippi, ~~St. Croix, and Lower Minnesota Rivers~~ River near Lock and Dam 1. This evaluation would document native fish movement ~~between systems and~~ around barriers, ~~and help determine the suitability of barriers at other locations~~ and their potential impacts to native species.

Planning

Preventing negative impacts from invasive species is a critical component of Minnesota's State Management Plan for Invasive Species. Specific to Asian carp, the plan identifies barriers as a tool for minimizing impacts. Minnesota's Asian Carp prevention plan, and a 2004 study evaluating alternatives to minimize the spread of Asian carp into Minnesota also identify deterrent barriers as a potential tool.

Many tools are needed to combat invasive species, and barriers are part of an overall strategy that includes education, prevention, control, and improved habitat for native species. Barriers could concentrate Asian carp and other invasive species to more effectively utilize attractants, toxicants, fish traps, and other tools designed to reduce or control populations.

The feasibility of deterrent barriers at various locations in Minnesota has been evaluated. At this time, lock and dam 1 and several tributaries in the Little Sioux River watershed in southwest Minnesota and northwest Iowa are considered the best sites. These locations are suited to modifying existing barriers or constructing new barriers and are considered sites at high risk from Asian carp. Additional locations have been evaluated including the mouth of the St. Croix River, Mississippi River lock and dam #2 at Hastings, and the Minnesota River at Mankato. Barriers at these locations would be very costly and may not prove effective. Nevertheless, more information is needed before determining whether a barrier

could be effective at these sites. Funding will be used to hire an impartial contractor to continue evaluating the feasibility of barriers at these sites.

Relationship to Other Constitutional Funds

A one-to-one match is required for any funds that would be used for barriers in IA.

Relationship to Current Organizational Budget

Traditional sources of funding are not available to construct a deterrent barrier. Without Outdoor Heritage funding this project is not likely to be completed.

Sustainability and Maintenance

Intention would be to maintain and operate barriers as long as necessary to minimize impacts from Asian carp.

Outcomes

Asian carp have less impact on native species and ecosystems. Fishing and boating will not be negatively affected.

Accomplishment Timeline

| Activity | Milestone | Date completed |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| Complete design and specifications and all permit requirements for barriers at Lock and Dam 1 and two-five locations in Southwestern MN | design and specifications report, approved Corps of Engineers Section 408 permit for lock 1, and any permits required for SW MN barriers | 6/308/15/2013 |
| Construct barriers at Lock and Dam 1 and two-five locations in Southwestern MN | Complete construction | Installation completed by 3/31/2014 |
| Develop cost share agreement with State of Iowa to construct barrier at Lower Gar Outlet and between Big and Little Spirit Lakes | Signed cost share agreement | 910/1/2012 |

Table B-2. Other Outcome Table

(This table should be used instead of attachment B for activities that are not counted in acres, miles etc. If you use attachment B you can delete this table from the accomplishment plan.)

| Goal 1 | Activity – P/R/E | Measure | Impact | Ecological Type |
|---|------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| Slow spread of Asian Carp into Upper Mississippi River and Southwestern Minnesota | Protect | Asian carp populations above and below the barriers | Asian carp populations remain low and native species are not being impacted by Asian carp. Native species are minimally affected by | Aquatic habitat |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---------------|--|
| | | | the barrier.* | |
|--|--|--|---------------|--|

*evaluating the impact on native species will include fish tagging and movement studies.

Attachments (*on spreadsheet workbook – 3 separate tabs*):

- A. Budget
- C. Parcel List

No Map is needed for the accomplishment plan

Attachment A. Budget Spreadsheet

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Name of Proposal: | Protect Aquatic Habitat from Asian Carp |
| Legislative Citation: | |
| Date: | 5/11/2012 |

[Link HERE to definitions of the budget items below.](#)

Total Amount of Request \$ 7,500,000 *From page 1 on the funding form.*

Personnel

| Position breakdown here | FTE | Over # of years | LSOHC Request | Anticipated Cash | | Total |
|-----------------------------|----------|--------------------|---------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------|
| | | | | Leverage | Cash Leverage Source | |
| <i>Fisheries Specialist</i> | 1 | 1 | \$ 60,000 | | | \$ 60,000 |
| <i>Admin Asst</i> | | | | | | \$ - |
| <i>position 3</i> | | | | | | \$ - |
| <i>position 4</i> | | | | | | \$ - |
| <i>position 5</i> | | | | | | \$ - |
| <i>position 6</i> | | | | | | \$ - |
| <i>position 7</i> | | | | | | \$ - |
| Total | 1 | | \$ 60,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 60,000 |

Budget and Cash Leverage *(All your LSOHC Request Funds must be direct to and necessary for program outcomes.)*

Please describe how you intend to spend the requested funds.

| Budget Item | LSOHC Request | Anticipated Cash | | Total |
|---|---------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| | | Leverage | Cash Leverage Source | |
| Personnel - <i>auto entered from above</i> | \$ 60,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 60,000 |
| Contracts | \$ 6,991,000 | | | \$ 6,991,000 |
| Fee Acquisition w/ PILT <i>(breakout in table 7)</i> | | | | \$ - |
| Fee Acquisition w/o PILT <i>(breakout in table 7)</i> | | | | \$ - |
| Easement Acquisition | | | | \$ - |
| Easement Stewardship | | | | \$ - |
| Travel (in-state) | | | | \$ - |
| Professional Services | \$ 261,000 | | | \$ 261,000 |
| Direct Support Services | \$ 98,000 | | | \$ 98,000 |
| DNR Land Acquisition Costs | | | | \$ - |
| Other | | | | \$ 180,000 |
| Capital Equipment <i>(auto entered from below)</i> | | | | \$ - |
| Other Equipment/Tools | \$ 90,000 | | | |
| Supplies/Materials | | | | \$ - |
| | \$ 7,500,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 7,590,000 |

Capital Equipment *(single items over \$10,000 - auto entered into table above)*

| Item Name | LSOHC Request | Leverage |
|--------------------------|---------------|----------|
| <i>Truck</i> | | |
| <i>Item 2 enter here</i> | | |
| <i>Item 3 enter here</i> | | |
| <i>Item 4 enter here</i> | | |
| <i>Item 5 enter here</i> | | |
| <i>Item 6 enter here</i> | | |
| <i>Item 7 enter here</i> | | |
| <i>Item 8 enter here</i> | | |
| Total | - | - |

Attachment C. Parcel List

Name of Proposal: Protect Aquatic Habitat from Asian Carp
Legislative Citation:
Date: 7/31/2012

| County | Township (25-258) | Range (01-51) | Direction most parcels are 2 with the exception of some areas of Cook County which is 1 | Section (01 thru 36) | TRDS | # of acres | Budgetary Estimate (includes administrative, restoration or other related costs and do not include matching money contributed or earned by the transaction) | Description | Activity PF=Protect Fee PE=Protect Easement PO=Protect Other R=Restore E=Enhance | If Easement, what is the easement cost as a % of the fee acquisition? | Any existing protection? (yes/no) | Open to hunting and fishing? (yes/no) |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|------------------|---|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------|--|----------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Parcel Name | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lock and Dam #1 lock chamber | Hennepin | 28 | 23 | 2 | 17 | 282317 | N/A | \$5,780,000 | Install deterrent barrier | PO | | Y |
| Big Spirit/Loon Lakes | Jackson | 101 | 36 | 2 | 25 | 10136225 | N/A | \$950,000 | Install deterrent barrier | PO | N | |
| Outlet Round Lake | Jackson | 101 | 38 | 2 | 17 | 10138217 | N/A | \$950,000 | Install deterrent barrier | PO | N | |
| Site 1: Okabena Breach 1 | Jackson | 102 | 38 | 2 | 5 | 1023825 | N/A | \$600,000 | dike or electrical barrier | PO | | N |
| Site 2: Heron Lake Breach | Jackson | 102 | 37 | 2 | 4 | 1023724 | N/A | \$40,000 | reinforce dike | PO | | Partial |
| Site 3: Okabena Breach 2 | Jackson | 102 | 38 | 2 | 7 | 1023827 | N/A | \$30,000 | reinforce dike | PO | | Partial |
| Site 4: Herlein-Boote WMA | Jackson | 102 | 41 | 2 | 12 | 10241212 | N/A | \$150,000 | water control structure | PO | | Partial |
| Site 5: Lower Gar Lake outlet | Dickenson, IA | 98 | 36 | 2 | 6 | 983626 | N/A | \$500,000 | cost share agreement with IA to construct electric barrier | PO | | N |
| Site 6: Indian/Iowa | Jackson | 101 | 37 | 2 | 28 | 10137228 | N/A | \$400,000 | electric barrier | PO | | N |

Information provided will be used to map project locations. Incomplete or inaccurate information will result in that parcel or program not being mapped.

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Agenda Item Memo

DATE August 1, 2012

SUBJECT: Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program , ML 2012, Ch. 264, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 5(i)

Background

The Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program has adopted a menu of pre-approved project grants as part of this program. Expedited Conservation Projects is a non-competitive, open grants program, with applications reviewed and funded every other month. The list of pre-approved project activities is attached.

Suggested Motion

“Motion to require the Department of Natural Resources to incorporate the PAL activity list into the accomplishment plan.”

Suggested Procedure

Once motion is before the Council, it is up for discussion, amendments and final passage.

Agenda Item # 7f

CPL Expedited Conservation Projects (ECP) Activity List

Forest:

- 1 Winter (thermal) cover
- 2 Tree planting
- 3 Promotion of natural regeneration
- 4 Bud capping
- 5 Rx burning within BMP prescription, including aerial support

Prairie:

- 1 Establish new prairie/ grassland
- 2 Seed purchase of native species
- 3 Rx burning within BMP prescription
- 4 Mowing/ herbicide for invasives control in recently established grassland/ prairie
- 5 Tree removal/ woody encroachment management
- 6 Interseeding of monoculture/ low biodiversity sites

Wetland/ water:

- 1 Water level control structures
- 2 Fish Barriers
- 3 Upland vegetation enhancement
- 4 Tile breaks/ ditch blocks

Fish Game and Wildlife Habitat:

- 1 Brushland shearing
- 2 Dam removal/ modification
- 3 In-stream habitat modification
- 4 Trout stream restoration/ habitat improvement
- 5 All other approved habitat activities from this list

FOREST Habitat ECP Activity List Definitions and Details

| # | Activity | Definitions | Requirements | Included treatments/ costs | Excluded costs |
|---|---|--|--------------|---|--|
| 1 | Winter (thermal) cover | Planting woody vegetation (native trees, bushes, shrubs) for the purpose of providing overwinter cover for native animal species. | | Planting tree/ woody vegetation, herbicide, mowing, tree mats/ stake, seedlings/ bare root stock, | Non native species, equipment purchase (including mowers, chainsaws, heavy equipment) |
| 2 | Tree planting/ seeding purchase | Planting and purchase of native tree species for reasons other than replanting of clear cut timber harvest. | | trees, seedlings, contractor costs, equipment rental, herbicide, tree mats/ stakes | Equipment purchase (including hand tools, saws, attachments for heavy equipment), PPE |
| 3 | Promotion of natural regeneration | Activities that promote natural regeneration within native stand types with defined fish and/or wildlife habitat benefit. | | Mowing, shearing, herbicide, hand/ mechanical release, thinning, contractor costs, equipment rental | Equipment purchase (including mowers, chainsaws, heavy equipment) |
| 4 | Bud capping | Protecting young conifer buds overwinter from deer browse with defined fish and/or wildlife habitat benefit.. | | Papers, clips, contractor costs, equipment rental | Equipment purchase |
| 5 | Rx burning within BMP prescription, including aerial support | Burning of understory to remove heavy fuels, improve stand health and promote regeneration of young successional forest species with defined fish and/or wildlife habitat benefit. | | Burn break installation, contractor costs, burn fuel (minimal cost), pre-burn site prep, equipment rental, non-state aerial contractor for current planned burn | Agency staff time, equipment purchase, PPE, burn equipment (sprayers, drip torches, slip-on units), herbicide, chainsaws, vehicles |

END FOREST ECP ACTIVITY LIST

PRAIRIE Habitat ECP Activity List Definitions and Details

| # | Activity | Definitions | Requirements | Included treatments/ costs | Excluded costs |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| 1 | Establish new prairie/ grassland by planting seeding of native species within BMP prescription | Restoring native grassland species (including forbs) in a suitable area currently void of or covered in non-native vegetation. | DNR lands require approved and adopted Restoration Plan; must be submitted with application. | Mowing, herbicide, seed purchase, equipment rental, contractor costs for seeding | Burn costs, equipment (seeder, packer, tractor, ATV, sprayer, etc.) |
| 2 | Seed purchase of native species | Purchase of native, local ecotype grassland seed and forbs from a local contractor to be planted by land manager before end of grant period | | Purchase of seed to provide current agencies/ staff opportunity to complete a restoration or enhancement | Non-native vegetation, woody vegetation, trees |
| 3 | Rx burning within BMP prescription | Burning to restore native grassland/ prairie species as prescribed by current BMP. | | Mowing burn breaks, contractor costs, burn fuel (minimal cost) | PPE, burn equipment (sprayers, drip torches, slip-on units), herbicide, chainsaws, vehicles |
| 4 | Mowing/ herbicide for invasives control in recently established grassland/ prairie | Invasive control within newly planted or newly established grassland/ prairie sites (within 3 years), including both cutting or spraying to eliminate invasive species. | | Herbicide, equipment rental, contractor costs for spraying/ mowing | Equipment purchase (including mower attachments, replacement parts for existing equipment, mowing units, sprayers, sprayer parts, etc), PPE |
| 5 | Tree removal/ woody encroachment management | Removal of individual trees or woody encroachment within grassland/ prairie sites. | | Herbicide, equipment rental, contractor costs for removal | Chainsaws, pruner, brush saw, sprayer, PPE, seed/ seedlings |
| 6 | Interseeding of monoculture/ low biodiversity sites | Increasing the biodiversity of an existing grassland site by adding additional grassland species and forbs by interseeding in the current site. | | Contractor costs for seeding, seed purchase, equipment rental | Equipment purchase (seeder, packer, ATV, tractor, etc.), management activities (mowing, herbicide, etc) |

END PRAIRIE ECP ACTIVITY LIST

WETLAND/ WATER Habitat ECP Activity List Definitions and Details

| # | Activity | Definitions | Requirements | Included treatments/ costs | Excluded costs |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | Water control structures | Installation of a structure to control the level of water, necessary due to altered hydrology of a shallow lake or wetland system. | Engineering, survey and design and construction estimates must be complete and submitted with application. | Fixed crest, variable crest structures, contractor costs, equipment rental, materials, site clean-up, associated upland or lowland restoration | Access or conservation easement acquisition, engineering and design, survey work |
| 2 | Fish Barriers | Barriers places on larger or shallow lake systems to prevent the spread of aquatic invasive species. | Engineering, survey and design and construction estimates must be complete and submitted with application. | Contractor costs, equipment rental, materials, site clean-up, associated upland or lowland restoration | Fish removal (commercial or chemical), access or conservation easement acquisition, engineering and design, survey work |
| 3 | Upland vegetation enhancement | Enhancement or restoration of uplands associated with existing wetlands or water systems that have been degraded. | | Invasives control, Rx burning, herbicide, tree removal, seeding, equipment rental, contractor costs | PPE, burn equipment (sprayers, drip torches, slip-on units), herbicide, chainsaws, vehicles, Chainsaws, pruner, brush saw, Rip-rap, access or conservation easement acquisition, engineering and design, survey work |
| 4 | Tile breaks/ ditch blocks | Decommissioning installed water drainage systems by tile break or removal. | | equipment rental, contractor costs, re-meandering of ditch channels | Tile system improvements, access or conservation easement acquisition, engineering and design, survey work, |

END WETLAND/WATER ECP ACTIVITY LIST

FISH GAME and WILDLIFE Habitat ECP Activity List Definitions and Details

| # | Activity | Definitions | Requirements | Included treatments/ costs | Excluded costs |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | Brushland shearing/ mowing/ chopping | Use of heavy equipment during ground stable conditions to remove over-mature trees and brush at ground level to allow for regeneration. | | Shearing, mowing, chopping, hydro-ax, follow-up site burning, contractor costs, | Equipment purchase |
| 2 | Dam removal/ modification | The removal of an existing dam within a public waterway, or installation of a dam modification or nature-like fishway to allow for fish and other aquatic species to pass the current barrier. | Engineering, survey and design and construction estimates must be complete and submitted with application. | Dam removal and weir placement, nature-like fishway, rock arch rapids, rapids construction, contractor costs, equipment rental, materials, site cleanup, river/ stream channel modification or re-meandering | Equipment purchase, barrier/ structure replacement or maintenance, fish ladders, fish elevators, engineering and design, survey work, access or conservation easement acquisition |
| 3 | In-stream habitat modification | Restoring or enhancing degraded or missing in-stream habitat or access to habitat to provide spawning, resting, feeding areas for aquatic species. | Engineering, survey and design and construction estimates must be complete and submitted with application. | Structure placement, spawning area restoration, natural bank stabilization, log jam removal, equipment rental, contractor costs | Rip-rap, access or conservation easement acquisition, engineering and design, survey work, |
| 4 | Trout stream restoration/ habitat improvement | Restoring or enhancing degraded or missing in-stream habitat or enhancements to upland/ lowlands to provide spawning, resting, feeding areas and for trout species. | Engineering, survey and design and construction estimates must be complete and submitted with application. | Beaver dam removal, equipment rental, contractor costs, structure placement, spawning area restoration, upland restoration | Rip-rap, access or conservation easement acquisition, engineering and design, survey work, |
| | All approved activities from other habitat types | | | | |

END FGW ECP ACTIVITY LIST

Expedited Conservation Projects: Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program

Funding available: \$2 million has been set aside for these projects, \$500,000 for each of the four habitat types. When all funds are used from a habitat type, no more applications will be accepted for that habitat.

Requests: Applicants may request from \$5,000 to \$50,000 for their project.

How to Apply: Eligible projects will be clearly listed by habitat type on the website, along with a definition, included and excluded costs, and a list of any additional documentation that must accompany the application. Applicants will choose their habitat and project from drop down menus from within the application system. This application is considerably shorter than the other categories of grants. Projects must be on the Expedited Conservation Projects list, and must meet all the requirements listed.

The Applicant:

- i. Must apply using the Online Grant Application System.
- ii. Fills out all forms, including the Land Manager Review and Approval, Public Waters projects forms, etc.
- iii. Provides organization's financial information for requests over \$25,000 for an internal financial review (multiple requests are totaled together).
- iv. Is required to have a 10% match.
- v. May apply to complete only the activities present on the Expedited Conservation Projects list, found on the CPL website.
- vi. May complete restoration and enhancement projects only; acquisition projects are not eligible.
- vii. Must work only on public lands open to the public during all seasons of hunting and fishing
- viii. MUST focus their project on habitat improvement, and must use the narrative to specifically state how their project ties into wildlife planning in their area.

Grant Awards: Applications will be accepted continuously throughout the year and funding will be awarded up to six times each year, until funds are depleted for each habitat type.

- i. When all money allotted to a habitat group is awarded, grants will no longer be awarded from that habitat group; the application system and website will be updated with this information.
- ii. All qualifying applications will be funded; these will not be competitive grants.
- iii. The review and approval process is shortened and application will not be scored by a technical panel. The review will be completed by CPL program staff and Fish and Wildlife Division Directors, and final approval will be made by the DNR Fish and Wildlife Division Director.

If a project does not fit the requirements of the Expedited Conservation Projects, the applicant will be given the opportunity to apply to one of the other grant categories, to be reviewed by the technical review committee during the next round.