

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Laws of Minnesota 2012 Accomplishment Plan

Date: October 6, 2011

Program Title: Habitat Restoration/Enhancement in the Anoka Sandplain – Phase 2

Manager's Name: Wayne Ostlie
Title: Director of Conservation Programs
Organization: Great River Greening
Telephone: 651-665-9500 x19
Email: wostlie@greatrivergreening.org
Fax: 651-665-9409

Funds Recommended: \$1,050,000

Legislative Citation: ML 2012, Ch. X, Art. X, Sec. X, Subd. 2 (i): *(to be completed when signed by Governor)*

Abstract:

The Anoka Sandplain Partnership will restore and enhance 1,352 acres of priority wildlife habitat within the Sandplain and along the Rum River in the east-central Minnesota.

Program Narrative

Design and Scope of Work

Urgency and Opportunity: Problems Addressed Through this Program

The ASP Habitat Partnership recognizes that a multi-pronged conservation approach of protection (fee simple and easement), restoration and enhancement of public and private lands, and education/outreach is required to significantly advance and build support for conservation of these imperiled habitats. Collectively, we are working toward that goal. In this proposal, the Partnership will make significant gains to reverse the following trends:

1. Native habitats have become rare and continue to be lost. Oak savanna and prairie habitat now persist over <1% of their historic range in the state, making them the two most imperiled ecological systems in Minnesota. Oak woodland and white pine forests have also diminished. Due to its proximity to the Twin Cities, the ASP is among the fastest growing areas of the state, placing significant pressures on what remains.
2. Degradation of habitats on public lands threatens associated wildlife populations. Encroachment of exotic and woody species, loss or an imbalance in natural processes (fire, etc.), and other factors have had profound impacts on wildlife in the ASP; some 97 Species of Greatest

Conservation Need (SGCN) occur in the region. Remaining high quality habitat is insufficient to support robust game and non-game populations.

3. State, federal and local government agencies often lack sufficient capacity and resources for managing important public lands. Obligations over time of local, state and federal land management agencies are well above current funding levels, resulting in declines in important wildlife habitat. As habitat declines in quality, restoration/enhancement costs rise markedly. This program will address restoration/enhancement actions at sites deemed most urgent, and bring them to a position where they can be managed effectively and efficiently within existing funding streams.

Scope of Work

With the requested funding, and with other funds leveraged by this money and brought by other partners, the following actions and outcomes will be realized:

1. Anoka Sandplain Partnership will expand its ongoing restoration and enhancement efforts to 9 new project areas on public lands and in public waters.
2. estimated 1,352 acres of oak savanna, prairie, forest and wetland habitat will be restored or enhanced across priority public lands and waters managed for wildlife and their natural resources. Sites include 3 state WMAs, 2 state SNAs, 1 county park, 1 national wildlife refuge, 1 city nature reserve, and the public waters of the Rum River.
3. rice will be restored to an estimated 100 acres of public waters along the Rum River, a state-designated wild and scenic river, for the benefit of a wide array of wildlife species. Restoration will occur in public waters (often backwaters and oxbows) associated with the river.
4. will be let to vendors to perform much of the on-the-ground restoration and enhancement work conducted on public lands and in public waters. Activities will include woody invasive species removal, exotic species control, prescribed fire, seeding/planting, and other associated activities. These contracts will provide jobs to an array of local businesses.
5. possible and practical, projects will incorporate volunteer events and other mechanisms to connect local communities, sportsman's clubs, and other groups with these important lands and waters.
6. management and administrative responsibilities will be handled by respective grant recipients, ensuring ecologically sound, science-based practices and results.

How Priorities are Set

The ASP Partnership uses several existing priority-setting efforts that, in line with its goals, serve to highlight areas of greatest need for conservation action. We have used MCBS Sites of Biodiversity Significance, Regionally Ecological Significant Areas (RESA), and Habitat Corridors (all developed by the MN DNR) to define priorities at the regional scale. Weighting factors as detailed below are used to define priorities:

1. Presence of high quality ecological system(s) and/or concentration of SGCN/T&E species – indicators of the long-term viability and conservation efficiency. Weighting = High;
2. Size of habitat block or managed area – one indicator of long-term viability. Weighting = High;

3. Occurrence within DNR mapped habitat corridors – an indicator of potential for restoring/conserving habitat connectivity between protected areas. Weighting = Moderate;
4. Multiple conservation benefits to both game and non-game species and other natural resources – an indicator of conservation efficiency. Weighting = Moderate;
5. Immediacy of need/action as determined by Minnesota County Biological Survey and other sources – an indicator of conservation urgency. Weighting = High.;
6. Ability to effectively manage lands over the long term through established means – an indicator of conservation capability of potential partner. Weighting = High.

When considering projects for restoration and enhancement action, we consider the additional following criteria: likelihood of long-term success, cost, feasibility, and long-term benefit to wildlife.

Wild rice restoration priorities along the Rum River will be set in line with the following criteria:

- Presence of preferred ecological requirements for long-term persistence;
- Buy-in from adjacent private landowners

What Habitat will be Affected?; How will the Proposed Actions Directly Restore, Enhance and/or Protect Prairies, Wetlands, Forests or Habitat?

Restoration and enhancement work will be completed on the following projects. These projects are listed under respective lead organizations/agencies and include:

Tier 1 Projects

Anoka Conservation District

A. *Anoka Nature Preserve (Anoka County)*

The Anoka Nature Preserve is a 200-acre parcel with over a mile of frontage on the Wild and Scenic Rum River in the City of Anoka. The Anoka Conservation District holds a conservation easement on the park. **Actions:** Enhancement of 130 acres of oak woodland habitat through woody invasive species management (principally buckthorn).

River Greening

B. *Carlos Avery WMA (Anoka County)*

This 25,000-acre WMA is the largest in the Twin Cities Metro Area and is one of the iconic WMAs in the state of Minnesota. The site is composed principally of wetlands and oak woodland and savanna. **Actions:** Enhancement work will be completed at two locations within the WMA characterized as high to outstanding quality; 200 acres of woody invasive species will be controlled at these locations.

C. *Twin Lakes SNA (Isanti County)*

This 50-acre Scientific and Natural Area protects a high quality white pine-hardwood forest remnant on the shores of Horseshoe Lake. White pine-hardwood forest restoration will take place over 3 acres of agricultural field, complemented by woody invasive species management over 47 acres of mature forest.

D. *Rice Lake SNA (Sherburne County)*

Rice Lake Savanna SNA contains important examples of oak savanna and oak woodland habitat. A first phase of enhancement and restoration work was funded by the OHF in 2010; this funding concludes enhancement work at the site. **Actions:** Woody invasive species control and prescribed burning will take place over 23 acres of the site.

E. Belle Prairie County Park (Morrison County)

The 143-acre park flanks the east bank of the Mississippi River, and is a site of statewide high biodiversity significance containing prairie, oak savanna, and oak woodland. **Actions:** Enhancement of 35 acres of oak savanna and prairie habitat through woody invasive species control, prescribed fire; restoration of 4 acres of native prairie.

F. Wild Rice Restoration Program – Rum River (Mille Lacs, Isanti & Anoka counties)

Wild rice is used by a diverse array of wildlife species and is under-utilized as a restoration tool. Nowhere is wild rice as important a resource for wildlife as in Minnesota, and the Rum River watershed was historically at the center of its range. **Actions:** As an initial phase of this project, partners will restore 100 acres of wild rice to public waters along the Rum River (backwaters, oxbows).

Wild Turkey Federation

G. Ereaux WMA (Morrison County)

This 527-acre WMA is a diverse mosaic of wetlands, and high-quality oak-aspen forest and prairie that provides habitat for a diverse assemblage of game and non-game wildlife. **Actions:** Enhancement of 178 acres of high quality oak woodland and prairie through woody invasive species management (buckthorn, honeysuckle and Siberian elm).

H. Sartell WMA (Benton County)

This 368-acre WMA is bisected by Little Rock Creek, and contains significant oak savanna, oak woodland and prairie in various stages of restoration/enhancement. **Actions:** Enhancement of 112 acres of oak-brush savanna, oak woodland and prairie through exotic and native woody species control.

.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

I. Sherburne National Wildlife Refuge (Sherburne County)

This 30,700-acre refuge was in 1965 to protect and restore the habitats associated with the St. Francis River Valley for migratory birds and other wildlife. The focus of the Refuge is restoration of oak savanna, wetland and Big Woods habitat. **Actions:** Prescribed fire will be introduced over 220 acres; 10 acres of land will be seeded with native prairie seed to aid restoration of oak savanna habitat; 300 acres of overgrown oak savanna habitat will be mechanically thinned to aid oak savanna restoration efforts.

Tier 2 (Potential) Projects

These projects might come online if additional funding is procured through other sources or proposed activities fail to materialize with Tier 1 sites.

J. Dalbo WMA (Isanti County)

This 3000-acre WMA consists of a diversity of upland/lowland forests (conifer, birch, ash), brushlands, grasslands, and wetlands (including a 200-acre wild rice lake). **Actions:** Enhancement of 200 acres of conifer/birch/ash woodlands and sedge meadow habitat through woody invasive species management (glossy buckthorn).

K.

McDougall WMA (Morrison County)

This 228-acre WMA occurs along the Mississippi River and is characterized by high-quality floodplain forest and oak woodland, with restored prairie. **Actions:** Enhancement of 200 acres of oak woodland, oak savanna and grassland through control of exotic and native woody invasive species.

Duration of Benefits

All restoration and enhancement actions will be occurring on public lands where respective land management agencies have committed to maintaining the investment put forward through OHF funds over time. In addition, the ASP partners are committed to further elevating the protection, restoration and enhancement of the region's natural resources, and will work to ensure this investment is maintained and added upon.

Return on Investment

The State of Minnesota (along with federal and local governments) has spent considerable resources procuring the conservation lands that appear in this proposal for the benefit of the state's wildlife resources. These areas often contain state- and at times globally-imperiled habitats, are highly treasured for their recreational opportunities, and offer critical habitats for both game and nongame species alike. Their inherent value to the State of Minnesota cannot be measured merely by stated land values. The Anoka Sandplain Partnership is working to ensure that the State's investment in these important lands is maintained indefinitely.

Accomplishing this goal requires that funds are brought to bear from a wide variety of sources, that we build connections to local communities as a means of building long-term support for these lands, and that we use resources effectively and efficiently. In many of the sites appearing in this proposal, invasive species are just now beginning to make a demonstrable impact on the health of these habitats. Addressing the problem head-on as the problems arise is the most effective and cost-efficient mechanism for ensuring long-term success.

Level of Stakeholder Opposition to and Involvement in this Proposal

The ASP Partnership has been working to build connections to and engage local stakeholders not only in the development of the proposal, but in the work that is underway. We are reaching out to local chapters of the various hunting groups that use many of these lands, asking for their input in shaping these proposals and the direction of the Partnership. We are engaging local community volunteers in the performance of aspects of this work. We are meeting with local organizations, city councils, and other local groups to inform them of the work underway. We believe the public stakeholder is generally highly supportive of these efforts to improve the condition of habitat on existing public lands. Prior to embarking upon wild rice restoration along the Rum River, and in line with DNR protocol, we will gain approval from landowners immediately adjacent to proposed restoration sites.

Planning

Projects put forward in this proposal are informed by a science-based strategic planning and evaluation model that is discussed in the above section, "How Priorities are Set." The actions highlighted by this proposal are prominently featured in the Minnesota Conservation and Preservation Plan and an array of other published resource management plans, as detailed below:

Minnesota Conservation and Preservation Plan

Oak savanna habitat is specifically detailed as a protection priority (as is prairie) in the Minnesota Conservation and Preservation Plan (Habitat Recommendation 1; page 66). Habitat Recommendation 3 (pages 74-78) identifies the improvement of connectivity and access to outdoor recreation. Habitat Recommendation 5 (pages 80-81) identifies restoration of land, water and wetland-associated watersheds as priorities for conservation. Since oak savanna was identified as a statewide protection priority, it naturally follows that it is a restoration priority as well, as is prairie. Habitat recommendation 9 (pages 88-89) identifies overall research on land and aquatic habitat as a priority need, emphasizing our relationship to Cedar Creek ESR as a critical element to that end. Habitat Recommendation 13 (habitat and landscape conservation and training programs for all citizens) links to our efforts to engage local communities in the implementation of restoration/enhancement activities through appropriate volunteer activities.

Minnesota Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy

Several habitat types (oak savanna, prairie, grassland and dune systems) occurring within the ASP are identified as a statewide conservation priorities in *Tomorrow's Habitat for the Wild and Rare: Minnesota's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy* (An Action Plan for Minnesota Wildlife; pages 81-86). The Action Plan identifies maintenance, enhancement and protection of oak savannas as the state's highest priority for the ASP ecological subsection.

Minnesota Forest Resources Council

The Minnesota Forest Resources Council (MFRC), a state agency responsible for implementing the Minnesota Sustainable Forest Resources Act (SFRA) of 1995, serves as the chief advisors to the Governor and Legislature on sustainable forestry matters. In 2005, the MFRC approved the East Central Forest Resource Management Plan as developed by its East Central regional landscape committee. The plan envisions healthy and sustained forests across the region in an ecologically appropriate manner, and provides a framework of goal and strategies for four ECS subsections including the ASP. The Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Partnership project is supported by the East Central Committee as one of its pilot projects to promote sustainable forestry in the region.

Specific pertinent Visions and Goals for the East Central Landscape include:

4. Enhanced Wildlife Habitat and Wildlife Populations (page 12)
 - Goal: Monitor and promote increased populations of fish and wildlife
 - Goal: Improve habitat through vegetation management

8. Diversity of forests, plants, ecosystems (page 16)
 - Goal: Protecting and enhancing biological and structural diversity
 - Goal: To restore areas to native prairie and wetlands

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

This proposal addresses all of the identified statewide priorities and several ecological section conservation priorities of L-SOHC for FY2012 as outlined below:

Metro Section

1. Protect, enhance and restore remnant native prairie, Big Woods forests and oak savanna with an emphasis on areas with high biological diversity.

Prairie Forest Border

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

2. Protect, enhance and restore rare native remnant prairie.
3. Protect, enhance and restore migratory habitat for waterfowl and related species, so as to increase migratory and breeding success.

Northern Forests:

1. Restore and enhance habitat on existing protected properties, with preference to habitat for rare, endangered or threatened species identified by the Minnesota County Biological Survey.
2. Restore forest-based wildlife habitat that has experienced substantial decline in aerial extent in recent decades.

Minnesota DNR Strategic Conservation Agenda

Restoration and enhancement of imperiled resources through conservation partnerships is captured as explicit goals of the Minnesota DNR in its Strategic Conservation Agenda (2009-2013):

Goals:

- A. Minnesota's natural lands and habitats will be conserved and enhanced
 - a. *Remaining natural ecosystems are conserved* - Healthy habitats are connected by natural corridors. Native prairies are protected, and grasslands and riparian forest are restored. We are responsible stewards of DNR-administered lands and good neighbors to adjacent landowners. Uncommon and rare habitats are protected.
 - b. *Degraded habitats are restored* - Grasslands and forests have been restored.
 - c. *Natural resources thrive in the context of human influences. Urban and developing areas support a diversity of plant and animal communities and offer diverse recreational opportunities* - Local decisions are supported by public-private partnerships, with DNR providing technical assistance and coordination.
- B. Minnesota's fish and wildlife populations will be healthy and provide great recreation opportunities
 - a. *Fish and wildlife populations and the habitats that support them are healthy* - Habitat types in jeopardy, such as prairies, wetlands, and shallow lakes, are restored. Endangered and threatened species are protected.
 - b. *Conservation partnerships and stewardship ethics are strong* - Public- and private-sector partners work together to support Minnesota's resources and promote conservation.

DNR Wild Rice Study submitted to the Minnesota Legislature, 2008

Recommendation 6: Increase intensive natural wild rice lake management efforts and accelerate the restoration of wild rice stands within its historic range (page 38).

Relationship to Other Constitutional Funds

Although the ASP Partnership is using and pursuing funds available through other constitutional funds (Environmental and Natural Resources Trust Fund and Clean Water Fund, specifically) to achieve its goals in the Anoka Sandplain, none of those funds are being tapped to simultaneously address the habitat restoration and enhancement needs proposed here.

This proposal to LSOHC for Outdoor Heritage Fund support does not supplant any other sources of existing funds, but in all cases accelerates habitat work in the Anoka Sandplain.

Relationship to Current Organizational Budget

The OHF grant funds will be used exclusively to complete the proposed project activities, thereby accelerating the protection, restoration and enhancement of high priority habitat in the Anoka Sandplain region. The grant funds are in addition to the organizational operating budget of each partner and other funds secured for habitat work. These grant funds will not substitute for or supplant other funding sources.

Sustainability and Maintenance

Management plans (if not already in place) will be developed for each site to guide effective long-term management. Land managers associated with sites included in this proposal have committed to the long-term maintenance of these habitat improvements in line with prescribed actions.

In addition, the ASP Partnership is committed to working with respective land management agencies (local, state and federal) and conservation organizations in an on-going basis to identify and procure financial resources for maintaining these improvements as needed, bring volunteers to bear, and otherwise assist in reducing the financial and capacity burden in the face of fiscal constraints.

State Scientific and Natural Areas (SNAs)

SNA field staff will monitor project sites and take necessary actions to sustain the habitat improvements as part of their public land management responsibilities. Maintenance work will be carried out by existing staff, CCM crews, temporary project staffing or through vendor contracting. Periodic enhancements (beyond routine management) will be funded through annual funding requests from a variety of funding sources, including Bonding, Gifts, Federal Sources, Environmental Trust, and Outdoor Heritage Fund.

State Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs)

Wildlife field staff will monitor project sites and take any necessary actions to sustain the habitat improvements as part of their public land management responsibilities. Maintenance work will be carried out by existing staff, CCM crews, temporary project staffing or through vendor contracting. Periodic enhancements (beyond routine management) will be funded through annual funding requests from a variety of funding sources, including Dedicated Wildlife Funding (Pheasant, Deer, Bear, Turkey, Surcharge, Heritage), Bonding, Gifts, Federal Sources, Environmental Trust, and Outdoor Heritage Fund.

Sherburne National Wildlife Refuge

Land management at Sherburne NWR is guided by its 2005 Comprehensive Conservation Plan. One of the major goals of habitat management at the refuge is to restore the oak savanna habitat to pre-European settlement conditions. Restoration of this habitat involves prescribed burning, forest thinning, invasive species work, and planting of native local ecotype seeds. National Wildlife Refuges are purchased in perpetuity and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is committed to conserving National Wildlife Refuges for the American public and the future generation of the United States of America.

Anoka Nature Preserve

Anoka Conservation District will use the initial project to train volunteers on proper buckthorn treatment methods, and use the existing partnership between the City of Anoka, the Friends of the Anoka Nature Preserve, and volunteer sources to ensure long term maintenance activities are carried out.

Rum River Public Waters

The partners collaborating on wild rice restoration along the Rum River will monitor the success of initial establishment efforts to gauge the long-term potential for expansion of this program throughout the watershed.

Outcomes

Short-Term/Intermediate Outcomes	Long-Term Outcomes
Habitat restoration and enhancement goals are achieved across priority public lands, improving conditions for native game and non-game species.	Habitats of sufficient size, quality exist and are sufficiently connected to sustain healthy populations of most game and non-game species native to the region.
Areas where habitat restoration and enhancement work has occurred are occupied by key indicator species linked to ecosystem health.	The number of species characterized as Species of Greatest Conservation Need has significantly declined due to population recovery.
Local community engagement in restoration and enhancement activities within the Anoka Sandplain grows.	An engaged and informed public actively uses and supports the conservation of natural resources in the Anoka Sandplain.

Accomplishment Timeline

Activity	Milestone	Date completed
Development of natural resource management plans where needed	Natural Resource management plans completed	1/1/2013
Commencement of restoration/enhancement activities on public lands	Actions initiated at 4 sites	6/30/2013
Commencement of restoration/enhancement activities on public lands	Actions initiated at 4 sites	6/30/2014
Writing of wild rice habitat guidelines for Rum River	Guidelines established and distributed to partners	1/1/2013
Wild rice seeding	Seeding completed at 3 sites	6/1/2015
Conclusion of restoration/enhancement activities on public lands	Actions concluded at 4 sites	6/30/2014
Conclusion of restoration/enhancement activities on public lands	Actions concluded at all 8 sites	6/1/2015

Attachments:

Equipment/tools and materials/supplies purchased through this grant for restoration and enhancement purposes may include but are limited to those identified in Attachment D.

- A. Budget – See Excel Spreadsheet
- B. Proposed Outcome Tables – See Excel Spreadsheet
- C. Parcel List – See Excel Spreadsheet
- D. Project-Relate Materials/Supplies, Equipment and Volunteer-Related Expenses (below)

Attachment D: Project-Related Materials/Supplies, Equipment/Tools, and Volunteer-Related Expenditures

Equipment/Tools

Chainsaw - chainsaws, chains, files, grinding wheels, bar oil, replacement parts, fuel, 2-stroke oil
Brush cutter, parts, blades, fuel, 2-stroke oil
Hand equipment – shovels, rakes, trowels, hammers, dibble bars, pruners, loppers, hammers, etc.
Mowers, blades, parts
Dingo parts and maintenance
Truck – tie down ratchets, bungee chords, bed tie downs
Chemical application materials – herbicide applicator tanks and sprayers
UTV – tires, battery, wench, tracks for winter use
Radios
GPS units and software
Sleds
Snow shoes
Burn equipment – hoses, radio harnesses
Safety PPE –

- Chain Saw - boots, chaps, helmets, gloves
- Fire - Nomex shirts and pants, respirators, helmets, gloves
- Pesticide application – rubber boots, rubber gloves, respirators, safety glasses
- General - reflective jackets and vests

Repair/maintenance (including parts) for all equipment, including trucks, suburbans, ATV's, tractors, small engine equipment, trailers, disks, pumping units, and so forth.

Seed drill
300-gallon tank/slip
Vehicle trailer
Auger, tiller (including rental)
Nut pickers
Maps
Equipment/tool rental

Materials/Supplies

Plant material (trees, shrubs, native plants, native seed, cover crop seed)
Erosion blanket (coconut and straw)
Kraft paper
Mulch
Tree protectors
Bamboo stakes
Tree gators
Chicken wire
Steel posts (U and T)

Plastic fencing
Band ties
Marking paint
Paper towels
Hand cleaner
Mineral spirits
Wooden stakes
Erosion/Bio logs
Herbicides, pesticides, fertilizers

Volunteer Recruitment

Tents, tent rental
Signs
Cups, plates, napkins
Serving gloves
Event rentals (sanitation units, security, tables/chairs)

Event food (granola bars, apples/bananas, orange juice/apple juice, coffee, sandwiches, etc)
Recruitment materials (flyers, fact sheets, etc.)
Staff time for recruiting volunteers

Travel

Staff mileage reimbursement (crews, ecologists, volunteer coordinator, etc.)

Vehicle rental

Training

Prescribed fire certification training (S130, S190, etc.; annual refresher
Commercial pesticide applicator license (annual)

Chainsaw certification
First aid and CPR certificatio

Attachment A. Budget Spreadsheet

Name of Proposal:

P RE 02 Accelerating Restoration and Enhancement of Key Public Lands in the Anoka Sandplain
7-Sep-11

Date:

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

Total Amount of Request \$ 1,050,000 *From page 1 on the funding form.*

Personnel

Position breakdown here	FTE	Over # of years	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Cash		Cash Leverage Source	Total
				Leverage	Leverage		
<i>Manager of Programs (ACD)</i>	0.02	3	\$ 3,000				\$ 3,000
<i>Project Manager/Ecologist (Greening)</i>	0.24	3	\$ 37,000	\$ 37,000		Morrison County, Greening, NFWF, NWTF	\$ 74,000
<i>Dir. Cons. Programs (Greening)</i>	0.09	3	\$ 18,575				\$ 18,575
<i>Finance Director (Greening)</i>	0.06	3	\$ 15,575				\$ 15,575
<i>Volunteer Coordinator (Greening)</i>	0.03	3	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000		Morrison County, Greening	\$ 8,000
<i>Restoration Crew (Greening)</i>	0.17	3	\$ 14,500	\$ 14,500		Morrison County, Greening	\$ 29,000
<i>Burn Crew (FWS)</i>	0.23	3	\$ 17,000				\$ 17,000
<i>Finance (NWTF)</i>	0.04	3	\$ 5,655				\$ 5,655
<i>Seeding Crew (Various)</i>	0.07	3	\$ 5,000				\$ 5,000
<i>Project Manager - NWTF</i>	0.09	3	\$ 23,195	\$ 8,000		NWTF	\$ 31,195
Total	1.04	3	\$ 143,500	\$ 63,500	\$ -		\$ 175,805

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>	\$ 143,500	\$ 63,500	\$ -	\$ 175,805
Contracts	\$ 802,481			\$ 802,481
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)	\$ 17,000			\$ 17,000
Professional Services				\$ -
Direct Support Services				\$ -
DNR Land Acquisition Costs (\$3,500 per acquisition)				\$ -
Other				\$ 92,019
Capital Equipment <i>(auto entered from below)</i>	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -
Other Equipment/Tools	\$ 7,500			\$ 7,500
Supplies/Materials	\$ 79,519	\$ 5,000	NFWF	\$ 84,519
Total	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 68,500	\$ -	\$ 1,087,305

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:	Accelerating Restoration and Enhancement of Key Public Lands in the Anoka Sandplain
Date:	18-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		4	3		7
Protect Fee					0
Protect Easement					0
Protect Other					0
Enhance	100	878	377		1355
Total	100	882	380	0	

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

1362
1362
These two cells should be the same figure.

Table 2. Total Requested Funding by Resource Type

	Wetlands	Prairies	Forest	Habitats	Total
Restore		\$ 23,100	\$ 46,725		\$ 69,825
Protect Fee					\$ -
Protect Easement					\$ -
Protect Other					\$ -
Enhance	\$ 50,000	\$ 557,550	\$ 372,625		\$ 980,175
Total	\$ 50,000	\$ 580,650	\$ 419,350	\$ -	

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.

\$ 1,050,000
\$ 1,050,000
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	3	4				7
Protect Fee						0
Protect Easement						0
Protect Other						0
Enhance	990	325			40	1355
Total	993	329	0	0	40	

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

1362
1362
1362
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	\$ 46,725	\$ 23,100				\$ 69,825
Protect Fee						\$ -
Protect Easement						\$ -
Protect Other						\$ -
Enhance	\$ 505,375	\$ 454,800			\$ 20,000	\$ 980,175
Total	\$ 552,100	\$ 477,900	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,000	

Total Dollars (sum of Total column) \$ 1,050,000 *These two cells should be the same figure.*
 Total Dollars (sum of Total row) \$ 1,050,000
 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

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>NO State PILT Liability</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>NO State PILT Liability</i>					\$ -	\$ -
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		

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

Attachment C. Parcel List

Name of Proposal: 2(i) Anoka Sandplain
Date: _____

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=Prot ect Fee PE=Prot ect Easeme nt PO=Prot ect Other	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													
Tier 1													
Carlos Avery WMA	Anoka/Chisago	33	21	2	16	3321216	200	\$248,830	Woody invasive species management across 200 acres of oak woodland classified as being of High and Exceptional MCBS quality.	E	NA	Yes	Yes
Sartell WMA	Benton	38	29	2	15	3829215	112	\$207,900	Enhancement of oak-brush savanna, oak woodland and prairie through exotic and native woody species control.	E	NA	Yes	Yes
Ereaux WMA	Morrison	41	31	2	30	4131230	178	\$187,950	Enhancement of high quality oak woodland and prairie through woody invasive species management.	E	NA	Yes	Yes
Twin Lakes SNA	Isanti	34	22	2	11	3422211	50	\$66,150	White pine-hardwood forest restoration over 3 acres of agricultural field; woody invasive management.	R, E	NA	Yes	Yes
Rice Lake SNA (Phase 2)	Sherburne	35	29	2	11	3529211	23	\$38,850	Prescribed fire and woody invasive removal across oak woodland and savanna habitat.	E	NA	Yes	No
Anoka Nature Preserve	Anoka	32	25	2	25	3225225	130	\$104,370	Invasive species treatment/removal across oak woodland habitat	E	NA	Yes	No
Belle Prairie County Park	Morrison	41	14	2	32	4114232	39	\$85,050	Woody invasive removal in oak savanna and prairie habitats; prescribed fire; prairie restoration.	R, E	NA	Yes	No
Sherburne NWR	Sherburne	35	28	2	16	3528216	530	\$60,900	Prescribed fire added to two new burn units totalling 220 acres; 10 acres seeded for oak savanna restoration; thinning of overgrown oak savanna across 300 acres to aid restoration efforts.	R, E	NA	Yes	Yes
Rum River Wild Rice	Anoka, Isanti, Mille Lacs	36	24	2	24	3624224	100	\$50,000	Wild rice restoration in backwaters and oxbows along the Rum River.	E	NA	Yes	Yes
Tier 2													

Attachment C. Parcel List

Name of Proposal:
Date:

2(i) Anoka Sandplain

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=Prot ect Fee PE=Prot ect Easeme nt PO=Prot ect Other	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													
Dalbo WMA	Isanti	42	22	2	9	4222209	200	\$175,350	Enhancement of conifer/birch/ash woodlands and sedge meadow habitat through woody invasive species management (glossy buckthorn).	E	NA	Yes	Yes
McDougall WMA	Morrison	39	28	2	29	3928229	201	\$150,150	Enhancement of oak woodland, deciduous woodland, oak savanna and grassland through control of exotic and native woody invasive species.	E	NA	Yes	Yes

Attachment A. Budget Spreadsheet

Name of Proposal:	Anoka Sandplain Phase 2 - Anoka Conservation District
Legislative Citation:	
Date:	

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

Total Amount of Request \$ 99,400 *From page 1 on the funding form.*

Personnel

Position breakdown here	FTE	Over # of years	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Cash Leverage	Cash Leverage Source	Total
<i>Manager of Programs (ACD)</i>	0.02	3	\$ 3,000			\$ 3,000
						\$ -
						\$ -
						\$ -
						\$ -
						\$ -
Total	0.02		\$ 3,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,000

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 Leverage	Cash Leverage Source	Total
Personnel - <i>auto entered from above</i>	\$ 3,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,000
Contracts	\$ 78,000			\$ 78,000
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				\$ -
Direct Support Services				\$ -
DNR Land Acquisition Costs				\$ -
Other				\$ 23,400
Capital Equipment <i>(auto entered from below)</i>				\$ -
Other Equipment/Tools				\$ -
Supplies/Materials	\$ 18,400	\$ 5,000	City of Anoka	\$ 23,400
	\$ 99,400	\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ 104,400

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>		
Total	-	-

Attachment A. Budget Spreadsheet

Name of Proposal:	Anoka Sandplain Phase 2 - Great River Greening
Legislative Citation:	
Date:	

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

Total Amount of Request \$ From page 1 on the funding form.

Personnel

Position breakdown here	FTE	Over # of years	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Cash Leverage	Cash Leverage Source	Total
<i>Project Manager/Ecologist (Greening)</i>	0.24	3	\$ 37,000	\$ 37,000	Morrison County, Greening, NFWF, NWTF	\$ 74,000
<i>Dir. Cons. Programs (Greening)</i>	0.09	3	\$ 18,575			\$ 18,575
<i>Finance Director (Greening)</i>	0.06	3	\$ 15,575			\$ 15,575
<i>Volunteer Coordinator (Greening)</i>	0.03	3	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000	Morrison County, Greening	\$ 8,000
<i>Restoration Crew (Greening)</i>	0.17	3	\$ 14,500	\$ 14,500	Morrison County, Greening	\$ 29,000
<i>Seeding Crew (Various)</i>	0.07	3	\$ 5,000			\$ 5,000
Total	0.66		\$ 94,650	\$ 55,500	\$ -	\$ 150,150

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 Leverage	Cash Leverage Source	Total
Personnel - <i>auto entered from above</i>	\$ 94,650	\$ 55,500	\$ -	\$ 150,150
Contracts	\$ 382,481			\$ 382,481
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)	\$ 13,000			\$ 13,000
Professional Services				\$ -
Direct Support Services				\$ -
DNR Land Acquisition Costs				\$ -
Other				\$ 73,619
Capital Equipment (<i>auto entered from below</i>)				\$ -
Other Equipment/Tools	\$ 7,500			\$ 7,500
Supplies/Materials	\$ 61,119	\$ 5,000	NFWF	\$ 66,119
	\$ 558,750	\$ 60,500	\$ -	\$ 619,250

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

Item Name	LSOHC Request	Leverage
<i>Item 2 enter here</i>		
Total	-	-

Attachment A. Budget Spreadsheet

Name of Proposal:	Anoka Sandplain Phase 2 - National Wild Turkey Federation
Legislative Citation:	
Date:	

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

Total Amount of Request \$ 391,850 *From page 1 on the funding form.*

Personnel

Position breakdown here	FTE	Over # of years	LSOHC Request	Anticipated Cash Leverage	Cash Leverage Source	Total
<i>Finance (NWTF)</i>	0.04	3	\$ 5,655			\$ 5,655
<i>Project Manager - NWTF</i>	0.09	3	\$ 23,195	\$ 6,000	NWTF	\$ 29,195
						\$ -
						\$ -
						\$ -
						\$ -
Total	0.13		\$ 28,850	\$ 6,000	\$ -	\$ 34,850

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 Leverage	Cash Leverage Source	Total
Personnel - auto entered from above	\$ 28,850	\$ 6,000	\$ -	\$ 34,850
Contracts	\$ 359,000			\$ 359,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT (breakout in table 7)				\$ -
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT (breakout in table 7)				\$ -
Easement Acquisition				\$ -
Easement Stewardship				\$ -
Travel (in-state)	\$ 4,000			\$ 4,000
Professional Services				\$ -
Direct Support Services				\$ -
DNR Land Acquisition Costs				\$ -
Other				\$ -
<i>Capital Equipment (auto entered from below)</i>				\$ -
<i>Other Equipment/Tools</i>				\$ -
<i>Supplies/Materials</i>				\$ -
	\$ 391,850	\$ 6,000	\$ -	\$ 397,850

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>		
Total	-	-