

FINAL ABSTRACT

RELEAF: PLANTING FOR ENERGY CONSERVATION IN COMMUNITIES

Number 8c (D5)

Program Manager: Peggy Sand

Agency Affiliation: Department of Natural Resources, Division of Forestry

Mail Address: 1200 Warner Road St. Paul, MN 55106

Phone: (612) 772-7562 **E-mail:** peggy.sand@dnr.state.mn.us

Fax: (612) 772-7599

Statement of Objectives

- A. Develop the infrastructure, procedures and materials necessary to effectively implement the Mn ReLeaf cost-share program, including educational materials and programs.
- B. Implement the Mn ReLeaf cost-share program in order to provide matching grants to local units of government and non-profit organizations for energy conservation tree planting projects using predominately native species.

Project Results & Dissemination

Over 15,000 trees (81% native) and about 4600 shrubs (86% native) were planted in 75 projects across the state. Most projects achieved strategic planting of shade trees to reduce air conditioning costs and creation of community windbreaks to reduce winter fuel costs and snow plowing costs. Local project sponsors contributed over \$624,000 in a 1.9:1 match to the state funding. The ReLeaf program provided about \$31,500 for plantings implemented by youth in 5 school districts through the TREES for Teens Program (jointly co-sponsored by the Tree Trust, Minnesota Extension Service and DNR). Hundreds of community volunteers, volunteer Master Gardener and Tree Care Advisors, and over 50 local service groups were directly involved in planting in their local communities. In addition, the projects resulted in partnerships between local communities and several Soil and Water Conservation Districts, RC&D's, school districts, municipal utilities, etc. Most of the projects were successfully implemented as planned, with many communities able to plant more trees than originally budgeted. Several grantees had to scale back their projects and three grantees ending up with withdrawing from the program primarily due to delays in on-site construction and inability to secure windbreak land. Four projects (including 3 schools) were added after the original grant cycle, but other unspent monies were available too late to reallocate the funds and complete projects during the biennium.

The goal to plant predominantly native trees was very satisfactorily met. A scientifically-based method to define what is native in each of six ecologically-determined zones in the state was developed and lists of what was finally planted at each site was carefully compared to that list. As a result, 25 (of 75) projects used 100% native plants, about 2/3's of the projects had 80% or more native plants. Generally, the projects which had lower percentages of natives were in the southwestern (prairie) area of the state and some of the school projects which were achieving a greater number of environmental, educational, and safety issues.

Minnesota ReLeaf's broad reaching educational program on effectively implementing and maintaining energy-conservation plantings native to Minnesota resulted in development of nine new publications; traveling displays and scripted slide show sets; and a series of statewide magazine articles and workshops done in cooperation with the Minnesota State Horticultural Society. Not only did communities participating in funded projects receive and use Minnesota ReLeaf educational materials, but broader audiences were reached through the series in the *Minnesota Horticulturist* and numerous regional and local events (e.g. New Ulm's Annual Home & Self Improvement Show). The only problem with the educational program is that some of the materials were not available as soon as some communities needed them.

Date of Report: July 11, 1997

LCMR Final Work Program Update Report

I. Project Title and Project Number:

RELEAF: PLANTING FOR ENERGY CONSERVATION IN COMMUNITIES

Number 8c (D5)

Program Manager: Peggy Sand

Agency Affiliation: Department of Natural Resources, Division of Forestry

Mail Address: 1200 Warner Road St. Paul, MN 55106

Phone: (612) 772-7562 **E-mail:** peggy.sand@dnr.state.mn.us

Fax: (612) 772-7599

A. Legal Citation: ML1995, Chp. 220, Sec. 19, Subd. 8(c).

Total biennial LCMR appropriation: \$400,000

Balance: \$34,112.34

Appropriation Language: This appropriation is from the oil overcharge money to the commissioner of administration for an agreement with the department of natural resources for the second biennium of a project to achieve the strategic planting of predominately native shade trees and community windbreaks for statewide energy conservation and carbon dioxide abatement through acceleration of the Minnesota releaf program by providing grants administered on a reimbursement basis. This program shall be administered to maximize local contributions on a cash and service basis.

B. Status of Match Requirement:

Match Required: \$ N/A (Note: the programmatic intent was to attain an overall match, including both cash and in-kind contribution value, averaging two local dollars per state dollar.)

Amount Committed to Date: \$ N/A

Match Spent to Date: \$ N/A

II. Project Summary: The Minnesota ReLeaf (Mn ReLeaf) program was established to encourage the planting, maintenance, and improvement of trees in communities throughout the state to help in reducing atmospheric carbon dioxide levels, promote energy conservation and provide multiple aesthetic and environmental benefits. This project, ReLeaf: Planting For Energy Conservation in Communities, built upon this original intent, by achieving strategic tree planting of predominately native shade trees for energy conservation in communities throughout the state. It provided the financial incentives necessary for local non-profit groups, communities and school districts to plant about 15,000 trees statewide. The Department of Natural Resources, Division of Forestry partnered with others to provide the technical assistance necessary to assure proper planting and maintenance of the trees. Promotion, review and approval of project proposals was accomplished through five regional Mn ReLeaf committees, which include representatives from the University of Minnesota Extension Service, utility companies, non-profit or volunteer organizations and others. These committees used established criteria for the selection of community tree planting projects within their region.

III. Final Work Program Update Summary:

Statewide publicity and grant application guidelines were developed and distributed. Initially, the Regional Steering Committees reviewed project applications and approved funding 61 projects

totaling \$319,186 in State funds to be done through Minnesota ReLeaf. Subsequently, TREES for Teens projects with youth in five school districts using over \$31,500 in ReLeaf funds were also developed in cooperation between DNR, Tree Trust and other sponsors, as well as several additional projects. For each applicant, project grant agreements were signed and planting took place in spring and fall 1996 and some followup work in spring 1997. In total, 75 projects were completed costing over \$961,000 including about \$337,000 in legislative funds which resulted in the planting of over 15,000 trees (81% native) and about 4600 shrubs (86% native). Various educational materials were developed and distributed through ReLeaf, including two publications on using native trees and shrubs and a new brochure and display on energy conservation. Additional educational materials and programs were produced in cooperation with MnDOT, the Minnesota State Horticultural Society, and Twin Cities Tree Trust (for their TREES for Teens program).

IV. Statement of Objectives:

- A. Develop the infrastructure, procedures and materials necessary to effectively implement the Mn ReLeaf cost-share program. At the completion of this objective, regional committees were formed in each of the six DNR regions, evaluation criteria were revised, educational and promotional needs were assessed with materials developed, and administrative procedures clearly defined.
- B. Implement the Mn ReLeaf cost-share program. Grants were provided on a reimbursement basis to local units of government and non-profit organizations for energy conservation tree planting projects using predominately native species. Projects were competitively selected by Regional Steering Committees and grant recipients matched state funds with in-kind services or local dollars so that the statewide overall match averaged two local dollars per state dollar.

Timeline for Completion of Objectives:

	7/95	1/96	6/96	1/97	6/97
Objective A					
Develop infrastructure, procedures and materials.	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx				
Objective B					
Implement the ReLeaf cost-share program.	xx				

Cash Advances: Local units of government and non-profit organizations whose projects were approved for funding through Mn ReLeaf could request and obtain cash advances for up to 75% percent of their grant as necessary for approved costs of tree and, under special circumstances, for land purchase.

V. Objectives/Outcome:

A. Title of Objective/Outcome: Develop the infrastructure, procedures and all materials necessary to implement the program.

A.1 Activity: Re-establish Mn ReLeaf Steering Committees in each of the six DNR regions.

A.1.a. **Context within the project:** Each regional committee was responsible to adopt eligible regional practices and set regional priorities for evaluating projects within the guidelines set at the state level, solicit project proposals, evaluate and rank proposals, and assist with promotion implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the program.

A.1.b. **Methods:** Regional committees were formed as per the direction provided in the Mn ReLeaf Program Implementation Plan dated May, 1992. Each regional committee consisted of a DNR representative acting as chair and seven other appointed committee members representing (but not limited to) each of the following organizations; regional development commissions, extension service, horticulture or landscape organization, non-profit volunteer organization, citizen and municipal utility.

A.1.c. **Materials:** No materials nor equipment was purchased with LCMR monies.

A.1.d. **Budget**

Total Biennial LCMR Budget: \$0.00

LCMR Balance: \$0.00

MATCH: \$0.00

MATCH BALANCE: \$0.00

A.1.e. **Timeline:**

	7/95	9/95	12/95
ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONAL STEERING COMMITTEES.	xx		
REGIONAL GUIDELINES & PRIORITIES.		xx	

A.1.f. **Workprogram Update:** Five Regional Mn ReLeaf Steering Committees were organized to cover each DNR Region (the southern Regions 4 and 5 had one combined Steering Committee). Each committee and/or its Region DNR Forestry staff developed regional priorities and their process for project selection based upon the state Project Selection Criteria.

A.2 Activity: Determine regional funding allocation.

A.2.a. **Context within the project:** The entire funding amount for this project was distributed as subgrants to communities and non-profits as determined by regional committees. Therefore, each region needed to know the amount of funding available for projects within their regions.

A.2.b. **Methods:** As per the Mn ReLeaf Program Implementation Plan, May 1992, funds available for cost-sharing to communities were distributed to each DNR Region based upon a formula approach. The formula gives equal consideration to both the number of

communities and dwelling units (from the 1990 census) per region to determine percentages of funds distributed to each region.

A.2.c. Materials: No materials nor equipment will be purchased with LCMR monies.

A.2.d. Budget

Total Biennial LCMR Budget: \$0.00

LCMR Balance: \$0.00

MATCH: \$0.00

MATCH BALANCE: \$0.00

A.2.e. Timeline:

7/95 9/95 12/95

FUNDING ALLOCATION TO REGION.

xx

A.2.f. Workprogram Update: Using the formula from the 1992 Implementation Plan, the cost share monies were allocated as follows: Region 1 (\$52,500), Region 2 (\$33,750), Region 3 (\$60,000), Region 4 (\$75,000), Region 5 (\$41,250), and Region 6 (\$112,500). Subsequent to the initial allocations, some funds were redistributed based upon project needs. (The final allocations per region are listed in the table in section B.2.f. below.)

A.3 Activity: Identification and production of educational resources necessary to implement the cost-share project.

A.3.a. Context within the project: An educational component of the project is critical to assure successful planting and long-term maintenance of the trees. Many of the projects were accomplished by neighborhood organizations, school districts or others who needed detailed information to accomplish their objectives and assure that energy conservation benefits are realized. Especially important was increasing the awareness of project organizers as to what native tree species are for their area and where to obtain them.

A.3.b. Methods: A team of individuals who are familiar with this program from the past, was formed to assess the educational needs and recommend actions for meeting them. The DNR implemented their recommendations in partnership with others as appropriate. *Energy Conserving Landscapes: The Minnesota Homeowner's Guide* and *Energy Conservation Through Community Forestry* were distributed and fact sheets, sample project descriptions, displays, slide shows, PSA's, and other new materials were prepared and reproduced as needed.

A.3.c. Materials: No materials nor equipment will be purchased with LCMR monies.

A.3.d. Budget

Total Biennial LCMR Budget: \$25,000 (increased to \$28,728.55 with permission of LCMR staff)

LCMR Balance: \$0.00

MATCH: \$0.00

MATCH BALANCE: \$0.00

A.3.e. Timeline:

7/95 9/95 4/96 6/96

ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL NEEDS. xxxxxxxx

MATERIALS DEVELOPED & REPRODUCED. xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

A.3.f. Workprogram Update: A statewide Mn ReLeaf Advisory Committee met, reviewed past educational materials, generated ideas for new materials, and made recommendations for the 1995-97 Mn ReLeaf Educational Program. A plan of action for educational materials and programs was developed and implemented. The two publications produced for this Mn ReLeaf program with financial support from the USDA Forest Service) are: *Trees and Large Shrubs: Species Native to Minnesota's Ecological Regions* and *Sources of Native Trees & Large Shrubs Survey Results*. Other new publications developed and distributed are: a short brochure called *Planting Strategies for Energy Conservation*, a sample plant material order form called "Request for Bid on Nursery Stock"; a series of four new How-To brochures ("How to Plant a Tree," "How to Care for Your Tree," "How to Care for Street & Park Trees," and "How to Maintain Windbreaks") - which are in high demand with many thousands of each distributed). A Mn ReLeaf tree hanger was produced and distributed so that each tree planted can be "signed" as part of this LCMR project. Also, a set of Mn ReLeaf related clip art was compiled and distributed upon request. Special new materials produced and utilized for this biennium's ReLeaf program are: multiple sets of 2 new slide shows (1 on energy conservation, 1 on native plants), 3 copies of a traveling table top display, and. In addition, DNR worked cooperatively with MnDOT, Minnesota State Horticultural Society (MSHS), and Twin Cities Tree Trust to develop other workshops, to assist in costs of volunteers to attend workshops, to develop and distribute other materials, etc. intended to improve the quality of Mn ReLeaf project and broaden public information on the program's objectives. Specifically, as part of the ReLeaf educational program, the MSHS published a series of articles on "Minnesota's Native Trees" in the *Minnesota Horticulturist* and held a series of workshops on using native trees for energy conservation at various locations across the state. Samples of the Mn ReLeaf printed materials have been compiled and given to the LCMR office in a 3-ring binder.

A.4 Activity: Develop procedures, forms, application packages and other items necessary to successfully administer this project.

A.4.a. Context within the project: This activity resulted in the completion of all procedures, forms, etc. which were required to be completed for each community project. This helped assure a consistent and fair administration of the program between the participating regions and communities.

A.4.b. Methods: An evaluation of the procedures, forms, application packages, etc. that were used previously for the Mn ReLeaf program in the past was conducted. Where appropriate, changes were be made and implemented.

A.4.c. Materials: No materials nor equipment will be purchased with LCMR monies.

A.4.d. Budget

Total Biennial LCMR Budget: \$0.00

LCMR Balance: \$0.00

MATCH: \$0.00

MATCH Balance: \$0.00

A.4.e. Timeline:

	7/95	9/95	11/95	6/96
IDENTIFIED PROCEDURES FOR ADMINISTERING THE PROGRAM.	xx			
STANDARD GRANT APPLICATION PACKAGE.	xxxx			
ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORTING FORM.			xxxxxxx	

A.4.f. Workprogram Update: Standard statewide application packets with application forms, prototype grant agreements, and final report/invoice forms have been completed and distributed to community participants. Needs determination and compliance check forms were developed and distributed to DNR Forestry staff to use in field checking projects. (Samples of these forms are included in the binder of printed materials given to the LCMR office.)

B. Title of Objective/Outcome: Implementation of the Mn ReLeaf cost-share program.

B.1 Activity: Promote the Mn ReLeaf cost-share program statewide and regionally.

B.1.a. Context within the project: It was necessary to promote the availability of this program to assure quality project proposals and increased awareness of the benefits of trees in conserving energy.

B.1.b. Methods: Promotional materials such as news releases were developed at the state level and provided to the regional committees for their use in promoting the program locally. The project manager also promoted the program through statewide media opportunities.

B.1.c. Materials: No materials nor equipment will be purchased with LCMR monies.

B.1.d. Budget

Total Biennial LCMR Budget: \$0.00

LCMR Balance: \$0.00

MATCH: \$0.00

MATCH BALANCE: \$0.00

B.1.e. Timeline:

	7/95	9/95	12/95
REGIONAL PROMOTIONAL MATERIAL PKG.	xxxx		
STATEWIDE NEWS RELEASES, ADS. ETC	xxxx		
STATEWIDE PROMOTIONAL PROGRAM.	xxxxxxxxx		

B.1.f. Workplan Update: A statewide news release and program announcement were prepared and distributed through all DNR Regional offices, statewide media, and various other organizations. The announcement was also directly mailed to every

municipality in the state. Articles announcing funding availability appeared in the statewide publications including the League of Minnesota Cities' *Bulletin* and Department of Agriculture's *Overstory* (with a circulation of 2000 to city tree inspectors, etc.). A factsheet listing communities funded was prepared and distributed in March 1996.

B.2 Activity: Regional committees will review proposals and award grants to the communities and non-profits organizations who will implement the approved projects.

B.2.a. Context within the project: The Regional Committees had responsibility to assure that quality projects receive funding by deciding which projects within their region to fund.

B.2.b. Methods: Local units of government and non-profit groups (including school districts) completed grant applications and submitted them to their respective Regional Committee. The committees reviewed each application (with technical input from DNR staff) and made decisions as to funding them based on already established criteria, priorities and other factors. Once the decisions were made on allocation of funds, grant recipients were notified so they could implement their approved projects.

B.2.c. Materials: No materials nor equipment will be purchased with LCMR monies.

B.2.d. Budget

Total Biennial LCMR Budget: \$375,000 (reduced by \$3,728.55 for ed. matls)

LCMR Balance: \$34,112.34

MATCH: A total inkind and cash match of 1.9 local dollars for each LCMR-approved state dollar was achieved.

MATCH BALANCE: TBD

B.2.e. Timeline:

	9/95	1/96	6/96	1/97
COMPLETED GRANT APPLICATIONS.	xxx			
REVIEW & COMMENT ON APPLICATIONS.	xxxx			
APPROVAL OF SELECTED PROJECTS.	xx			
IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECTS BY COMMUNITIES.	xxxxxxxxxxxx			

B.2.f. Workprogram Update: In fall 1995, 79 grants requesting approximately \$506,000 in state funds were received and 61 projects were approved totaling \$319,186 in State funds to be done through Minnesota ReLeaf. At the close of this biennium, 75 projects were completed totaling \$961,264.09 (with \$337,159.11 in state funds and \$236,009.26 in local cash match plus \$388,095.72 in local inkind match for a total of 624,104.98 equating to a 1.9 to 1 local to state ratio. This included TREES for Teens projects with youth in five school districts using over \$31,500 in ReLeaf funds which were developed in cooperation between ReLeaf, Tree Trust and other sponsors, as well as several additional projects. Not all the allocated funds were expended because approved grantees spent less than budgeted to achieve their project results or they canceled the project relatively late in the biennium because of delays in on-site construction, inability

to secure windbreak land, and related reasons. The money could not be reallocated to and spent by qualifying projects before the end of the biennium.

A total of 15,176 trees and 4587 shrubs were planted. Of these, 81% of the trees were native and 86% of the shrubs were native to the ecological Tree Rating Zone in which they were planted. In addition, project accomplishments also included the injection of ten large elms to extend their energy conservation benefits and various maintenance and tree improvement practices related to the tree and windbreak plantings.

The following table shows for each Region, the original number of grants and their dollar amounts requested as well as the final number of projects and dollar amounts spent. Three of the supplemental documents submitted with this report on Minnesota ReLeaf 1995-97 program which give information on each of the 75 completed projects are: 1) "Project Summaries," "Grant Recipients & Final Budget (Table A)" and "Total Trees & Shrubs Planted".

DNR Region	Original Applications (Fall 1995)		Projects As Completed				
	# of Appl.	\$ Re-quested	# of Projects	Local Cash Match	Local Inkind Match	ReLeaf Grant	Total Project
1	17	\$96,426	13	\$ 18,318.81	\$ 56,749.95	\$ 50,265.00	\$ 125,333.76
2	6	\$51,076	5	\$ 26,423.89	\$ 27,750.27	\$ 38,280.00	\$ 92,454.16
3	8	\$64,575	8	\$ 22,212.95	\$ 53,331.92	\$ 46,649.50	\$ 122,194.37
4	15	\$88,067	14	\$ 54,135.58	\$ 59,786.01	\$ 64,289.50	\$ 178,211.09
5	11	\$39,899	18	\$ 34,080.48	\$ 63,404.04	\$ 33,295.11	\$ 130,779.63
6	22	\$165,525	17	\$ 80,837.55	\$ 127,073.53	\$ 104,380.00	\$ 312,291.08
TOTAL	79	\$505,568	75	\$ 236,009.26	\$ 388,095.72	\$ 337,159.11	\$ 961,264.09

B.3 Activity: Provide technical assistance and educational programs, and review completed projects.

B.3.a. Context within the project: Technical assistance was provided throughout different stages of the project to assure that tree planting was completed in a technically sound manner. While educational efforts largely focused on larger audiences, technical assistance focused more on providing assistance to specific individuals or groups at the site of their activities.

B.3.b. Methods: Technical assistance was necessary to assure that proposed practices were needed and could be accomplished (i.e. needs determinations), that the practice was installed properly and follow-up maintenance was incorporated into the plan (i.e. compliance checks). In most cases a DNR Forester or representative conducted needs determinations and/or compliance checks. DNR staff, Master Gardeners and other resource people helped communities conduct educational programs for project participants.

B.3.c. Materials: No materials nor equipment will be purchased with LCMR monies.

B.3.d. Budget

Total Biennial LCMR Budget: \$0.00

LCMR Balance: \$0.00

MATCH: \$0.00

MATCH BALANCE: \$0.00

B.3.e. Timeline:

	7/95	1/96	6/96	9/96	1/97	6/97
ASSISTANCE IN APPLICATION PREPARATION.	xxxx					
NEEDS DETERMINATIONS ON ALL PROPOSALS.	xxx					
TECHNICAL ADVICE & EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS.	xx					
COMPLIANCE CHECKS.			xx	xx	xx	
ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORTS.			xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx			

- B.3.f. Workprogram Update:** DNR staff and consultants have provided technical assistance to communities in completing their applications and have conducted on-site inspections and needs determinations of all the projects approved for funding. Also, many communities received additional on-the-ground technical assistance by DNR staff and the Tree Trust, particularly in the Trees for Teens projects.

VI. Evaluation: DNR and others involved in the 1991-93 Mn ReLeaf tree planting program met in early July 1995 to evaluate many aspects of that program pertaining to promotion, administration, technical assistance and other items which offered opportunity for improvement in this biennium. After this 1995-97 round of grants, the program manager, regional committees, technical agents and others will be asked to identify strengths and weaknesses of the program with the intent of making additional changes for future programs. Also, those participating in the program were polled as to how effective the program was in meeting their needs and suggestions for its improvement. A compilation of the "Program Evaluations & Recommendations" included in each grantees final report was submitted with this report as a fourth supplemental document.

VII. Context within field: Mn ReLeaf was funded through LCMR during the 1991-93 biennium with an appropriation of \$1.25 million for "Tree and Shrub Planting for Energy in Minnesota Communities". The 1991-93 program included \$959,250 for community project grants, \$199,450 for research through the University of Minnesota, and \$91,300 for the Implementation Plan and publications. Minnesota ReLeaf has continued in 1993-95 through reprinting and extensive distribution of the publications and through various educational programs, including hosting the regional *Power with Trees* symposium. Minnesota is a leader in the nation in planting trees for energy conservation, in large part due to the research conducted, publications produced, and experience gained through the 1991-93 Mn ReLeaf plantings. The DNR, Division of Forestry has considerable experience in working with other tree planting programs, primarily through the Federal Farm programs. This experience was used in providing leadership and direction for the administration and technical aspects of this new program.

VIII. Budget context: No additional dollars were spent by DNR or other state agencies on the

purchase or planting of trees for this project. However, all technical assistance, educational and outreach efforts, and other support for the project conducted by DNR and members of the Regional Steering Committees were provided at no cost to the program. Also, all costs for printing and publications, above the LCMR expenditures, was at the expense of DNR and its partners in this effort.

IX. Dissemination: Brochures and other public information produced through this project were and will continue to be disseminated through the DNR Information Center, local DNR offices, local and state educational events, and through local project sponsors. This report and its appendixes detail the number of trees planted, organizations and groups who participated, project highlights, and recommendations for future programs.

X. Time: N/A

XI. Cooperation: The primary cooperators who agreed to assist with this program include Northern States Power Company, Minnesota Power, Minnesota Department of Public Service (DPS) and the Minnesota State Shade Tree Advisory Committee (Mn STAC). Both NSP and Minnesota Power were involved in promotion of the program, participation on Regional Steering Committees, providing technical assistance, and/or review and evaluation of projects within their service areas. DPS assisted in promotion of the program, assessment of educational needs, and in providing for those needs. Members of Mn STAC individually participated in many different phases of the projects including promotion, providing technical and educational assistance, reviews and evaluations, and support for follow-up maintenance to the plantings. Members also served on Regional Steering Committees and assist local units of government and non-profit organizations in the development and implementation of individual projects. It was estimated that the program manager from DNR spent up to 25% time on this project over the course of the biennium.

XII. Reporting Requirements: Semiannual six-month workprogram update reports will be submitted not later than January 1, 1996, July 1, 1996, January 1, 1997, and a final six-month workprogram update and final report by June 30, 1997.

XIII. REQUIRED ATTACHMENT:

1. Qualifications:

2. Project Staffing Summary:



MINNESOTA ReLEAF 1995-97 PROJECT SUMMARIES

(adapted from the community's final reports)

REGION 1

Audubon ReLeaf:

The trees were planted on the east side of the city ball fields, (which are located on the west side of Audubon) as a windbreak to protect the residential area from the west and north. The planting was done by the City of Audubon with help from the Agricultural Dept. of the school. The ongoing maintenance will be performed by the City of Audubon.

Project ReLeaf, Badger:

Community windbreaks were planted in two locations: 1) on city parkland directly west of a new mobile home court, and 2) northwest of the Summerfield Place Apartments. Shade trees were planted directly west of the new community center, west and south of the new Summerfield Place, and at optimum positions at five new homes.

Bagley Public Schools, Bagley:

Trees have been planted east and west of the windows in the district's high school that was recently constructed on a 30+ acre site on Highway 92 North, Bagley. Windbreaks have also been planted north/northwest of the building. Planting was completed under the supervision of a certified landscaper.

Bemidji:

In fall 1996, 35 native shade trees were planted to shade pavement and downtown buildings.

East Grand Forks ReLeaf:

Eighty-two trees were planted within 25 feet of an east or west facing window of new residential homes.

Tree Plant '96, Fosston:

Three sites were planted for energy conservation: the school, the Super 8 motel, and at the Industrial Park. The educational materials were distributed to the elementary school and all grades took part in an Arbor Day poster contest.

Frazee ReLeaf:

Trees were planted along the new ball fields, in order to be a windbreak for the school. Trees were also planted near the city beach area and 2nd Street for to shade pavement and reduce wind in adjoining residential areas.

Greenbush ReLeaf:

A total of 150, 3-4' tall trees were planted as a windbreak and strategic shade around a new housing development area. The Black Hills spruce were planted by volunteer adults and students. Trees will be watered, checked and pruned by city employees and/or volunteers.

Hendrum ReLeaf:

A total of 125 trees were planted including at the Norman County West Elementary. The windbreak northwest of the city had to be modified due to wet conditions and road configuration. Flooding, cold and rain delayed the planting schedule/events and the planting took three weeks instead of the planned one week.

Kelliher ReLeaf:

A group effort of students, staff, maintenance, construction, DNR, and USFS workers located and planted nursery stock. This was a large effort with individual trees weighing in at up to 300 lbs.

Osakis ReLeaf:

Thirty trees were planted on public property by volunteers from the local 4-H group and the school. Sixty-four trees were planted by area residents on private property. Prior to planting a workshop was held for residents to instruct them on proper tree planting and how to locate trees for maximum energy savings. Sixteen trees, originally planned to be planted on public property were subsequently planted on private property. Thus, a total of 110 trees were planted in the City of Osakis as part of this project.

Rothsay ReLeaf:

Trees were planted to shade city streets and to develop a windbreak, thus providing as energy savings and wildlife habitat. The trees were planted by a nursery and our elementary classes as an Arbor Day celebration. Mayor Paul Fosse spoke at the celebration and the local newspaper took pictures of the children planting the tree.

City Forestation, Wolverton:

Trees were planted along city streets particularly in areas that have never been planted. Volunteers not only planted 94 new trees in cold, rainy weather, but cleaned existing planting beds, replaced trees lost during the severe winter, and pruned many trees and shrubs.

REGION 2**Grand Rapids High School, Tree Trust Trees for Teens Program, Grand Rapids:**

Four Habitat for Humanity houses were landscaped for energy efficiency. Riverview Elementary School was landscaped for energy efficiency. Centennial Park was planted for oxygen yield/ beauty and wind blockage.

Itasca Community College, Grand Rapids:

New trees planted will shade most of the west and east facing windows that currently lacked shade. Native wildlife attracting food sources were used. The campus northwest windbreak was refurbished by selectively harvesting with a cut-to-length processor (25% of the basal area) and then underplanting with shade tolerant conifers and native fruit bearing shrubs.

Littlefork-Big Falls School Landscape Project, Littlefork:

The project included conservation planting of B&B trees on the west and east sides of building and a windbreak on the north side of building that provides windbreak/shelter advantages as well as shade for the parking lot. Throughout the project, landscapers and construction workers have taken steps to protect and preserve 59 existing trees as well.

Proctor ReLeaf '96:

Forty-three planting sites were selected by Proctor Beautification Committee, MN DNR, and Minnesota Power. Sites were prepared by City of Proctor crews. Trees were planted by community and school volunteers in May 1996. Prior to planting a seminar was held to advise private citizens on proper care of trees. A plan was put in force to insure ongoing maintenance.

Minnesota Veterans Home, Silver Bay:

Ninety trees were planted in fall 1996 on the property surrounding the Silver Bay Veteran's Home. The project will shield the building from wind, snow, and sun and offer a "home" feel for the 89 residents and their guests. The trees were planted in two phases. The evergreens and amur maples were planted in early September 1996. The rest of the hardwoods were planted in October. This project received a Partnership Minnesota award including a Governor's Certificate of Commendation to DNR.

REGION 3**Middle Level Alternative Program (MLAP) Planting Project, Brainerd School District, Brainerd:**

Students and facilitators in Brainerd's Middle Level Alternative Program designed and implemented a planting plan for energy conservation for their school. In addition to the planning and planting, students conducted studies on growth rates of different species of trees and the impact trees have on non-game wildlife. They also implemented energy conservation within the school.

Trailview Middle School, Mora:

The project had three parts: an Arbor Day planting, a family planting day and the windbreak planting by the Mora FFA class. The Arbor Day planting had 675 students each planting a tree in the windbreak with many reading a poem to their tree. The FFA students helped the younger ones, which really give it the look of a school project. The Saturday Family Day planting had over 200 planters and 18 organizers. Fifty trees have been selected whose growth will be

measured for the next five years. A card will be sent to each person telling both height and diameter of their tree. The windbreak gave the FFA a valuable and satisfying project. They measured and planted over 250 poplar trees and many conifers.

Paynesville ReLeaf:

Trees were planted in the preferable location east and west of building sites to create canopy cover for greater energy efficiency. A windbreak was established to the northwest of the Historical Society. Planting was done by a variety of volunteers including: the Historical Society, students, hospital staff, the Girl Scouts, and neighborhood residents. All participants attended planting and tree care workshops. The residential planting program started when people came in and filled out a permit, attended a workshop, called Gopher State, then exchanged their permits for vouchers which they used to pick up the trees.

Arbor Day, Rice:

A total of 36 trees were planted. DNR staff came to Rice Elementary to show planting techniques and 2 trees were planted. The next day, residents of Rice, representing different groups, came and viewed a MnDOT planting video tape and proceeded to plant 34 trees.

Pequot Lakes:

Various groups and organizations planted on three separate occasions to create windbreaks, noise and pollution buffers.

St. Cloud ReLeaf:

Over 560 boulevard trees were planted on north and south avenues to provide shade for east and west sides of homes and help fill in the canopy cover lost to Dutch elm disease. Planting was done by various volunteer groups and maintenance will be done by adjacent homeowners and the City Forestry crew.

Staples Boulevard Reforestation:

Seven hundred and twenty boulevard trees were planted. Site preparation consisted of holes dug with the City's power auger. Trees were mulched and watered after planting.

Public Parking Tree Planting, Walker:

Trees were planted in the boulevard along Front Street and Railway Ave. over a three-block length.

REGION 4

Fairmont Community Hospital ReLeaf, Fairmont:

Fairmont Community Hospital planted 51 trees and 125 shrubs on hospital grounds in an approximate 15-acre site. Trees were planted directly west of FCH to shade west exposure windows. Trees and shrubs were also planted to the west of Clinic Circle Drive. The planting

was done by the Bulfer Tree Farm with assistance from Sentence to Serve and the City Park/Utilities Departments. In addition to ReLeaf grant funds and the hospital cash/ in-kind match, the following provided funding for "Trees for Health," Hospital Auxiliary and Foundation, five area schools, four 4-H clubs, and many organizations and individuals. The DNR Region 4 Arbor Day Ceremony was held at the site, served to kick-off "Trees for Health", and provide additional publicity for the project.

Shade for Hutchinson, Hutchinson:

The 1996 project implemented an application system by which homeowners who's homes qualified could select and obtain a tree for energy conservation. Also a community windbreak on the extreme southwestern part of the city was planted to protect homes in new development.

Kerkhoven Middle School ReLeaf, Kerkhoven:

Twenty-three trees were planted at the new school site at Kerkhoven to shade east/west-facing windows and the parking lot. Included were American linden, sugar maple, and green ash.

Lake Wilson ReLeaf:

Trees were planted on private property to shade west and east windows and evergreens to the north for wind protection. Also, shade trees were planted on city boulevards and parks. Work was done by the Lake Wilson Lion's in addition to city staff and local property owners.

Community Tree Project, Watonwan SWCD, Madelia:

Trees were planted on city owned boulevards and on private lots, primarily on east and west sides of homes for energy conservation. Fifteen trees were planted on private property and 31 were planted on public property.

'96 Madison Lake Tree Project, Madison Lake:

One hundred and twenty-one trees and shrubs were planted after bid ads were answered. Trees were planted on boulevards on the west and east of homes for shade. One windbreak was planted on the north side of residentially developing subdivision. Shrubs were planted near overhead electric lines; medium to large species were spaced south of shrub line 20-30'. Maintenance work was done by staff, volunteers, homeowners, and alternate service workers.

Marietta Community Windbreaks, Lac qui Parle SWCD, Marietta:

After 2 pre-planning meetings with organization leaders and a community planning meeting, a total of 55 volunteers helped with the actual planting event. Almost 50 volunteers planted the trees and shrubs (most of them by hand) to create windbreaks at two sites (one along West Main Street, the other along Highway 40). Fabric mulch was laid by machine and tree tubes installed in three hours on May 4. The remaining volunteers prepared and served a delicious noon meal for participants. Organizations involved included the Marietta City Council, American Legion, Auxiliary, and Junior Auxiliary, Commercial Club, 4-H, and Senior Citizens.

New Ulm ReLeaf, Public Utilities Commission:

New Ulm ReLeaf used the New Ulm Retail Association's Annual Home & Self Improvement

Show as well as local newspaper and radio advertizing to encourage city residents to strategically plant trees for energy conservation. Participating property owners completed application forms prior to planting. The PUC Energy Coordinator reviewed the planting plan on all applications and made changes as needed. After receiving notice of project approval, homeowners purchased and planted their trees and submitted receipts to PUC staff for planting reimbursement (about 2/3 purchase price). Plantings included 190 new shade and windbreak trees and 14 to replace trees removed under power lines.

Porter Community Windbreak, Prairie Country RC&D, Porter:

Trees and shrubs were planted predominantly on the north and west sides of the City of Porter as a community windbreak for energy conservation, wildlife habitat, recreational, educational, and aesthetic purposes. With the amount of land involved in the windbreak (11 acres), the cost of the land (\$18,673.25) is a significant factor in the total cost of the project. But, with funding provided the ReLeaf Program and the concern and dedication for this project by the community, the land needed for the windbreak was acquired and the project successfully completed. Site preparation went well and the plan was incorporated on the entire planting site. Maintenance efforts since the trees were planted have been excellent and our windbreak has experienced extremely good survival and growth rates. To aid in growth and survival, tree mats were installed on all conifers and all remaining areas between shrubs and deciduous trees will be kept black for three years, then seeded down as per recommendations from Yellow Medicine SWCD.

Raymond Community Windbreak, Raymond:

Because of this project, the City of Raymond has additional protection from the northwest winds. Dogwoods and ponderosa pine were planted to provide a shelterbelt on the northwest edge of the community, while Black Hills spruce and other hardwoods were planted to provide the buffer zone from the winds east of County Rd 7. The parts of Raymond that are most affected by the new protection are residential neighborhoods, a mobile home park, a church and a public school.

St. Clair ReLeaf:

Twenty-three boulevard trees were planted. Eighty-two trees and shrubs were planted on Memorial park site. Sixty-four trees and shrubs were planted on school grounds.

St. Peter ReLeaf:

After the grant was approved, the city picked up trees from the nursery and the homeowners picked up trees and planted them on city boulevards. Windbreaks were planted by city crews.

ReLeaf Grant, Winsted:

This project provided affordable tree planting for the purpose of energy conservation. Participants selected specific trees and location of plantings which were east and west of homes. The City also established a windbreak consisting of Black Hills spruce to protect housing developments through energy conservation.

REGION 5

East Side Lake Windbreak, Austin:

A neighborhood windbreak was created along Interstate 90 on city land adjacent to the interstate fence. The planting was within 200 feet of homes it will shelter. In April 1996 volunteers planted 40 spruce, 85 arborvitae and 120 dogwood and mulched them as they were planted.

Growing Into the Future Together, Trees for Teens, Austin High School:

Student members of a Green Team and student Update Reps. designed and implemented a landscaping project for the grounds of Austin High School. The project includes 23 trees of five different species.

Banfield Elementary, Austin:

This project is a partnership between Banfield School, Tree Trust (Time for Trees program) and USEM automobile dealership. Staff, students, parents and community members were educated about trees and other vegetation. The project culminated in a whole school planting effort on Arbor Day of 46 trees.

Blooming Prairie:

The location was determined, trees ordered and planted by a volunteer FFA group for planting directly east and west of public buildings and by Alliance for Building community for a trailer court windbreak and shade.

Byron Elementary Conservation Project, Olmsted SWCD, Byron:

The project was located on a newly constructed elementary school property with no prior protection on the north and west sides of the property. The Olmsted SWCD along with help from the Byron School District, Olmsted Co. Extension, and many community volunteers completed the windbreak. An eight row windbreak measuring approx. 1200' was completed, with an additional 3 rows at 400' each. Many benefits are seen with this project including energy conservation, water and wind erosion control, enhanced wildlife habitat, and numerous educational opportunities for students and the community. The Olmsted SWCD provided technical assistance in planning, site prep, and planting. School staff, community volunteers, and the boy scouts completed the mulching needs. During a field day, in May 1996, over 500 students assisted in planting the trees.

Cannon Falls ReLeaf:

A total of 289 trees were planted on public and private property. An educational workshop was held promoting private property plantings focused on shading east and west sides of homes.

Chatfield ReLeaf:

The City replaced trees that were lost to Dutch elm disease and planted park trees to shade campers and playground equipment. Participating homeowners received an o.k. on where they would plant for energy conservation.

Roosevelt Elementary, Faribault:

A shelterbelt of native shrubs and trees was established to control wind and snow drift. Native tree seedlings were planted in a 4 acre grove.

Redman Addition, LeRoy:

This project established windbreaks for protection of a new subdivision which is in the developmental stage. The windbreak will provide wind, visual, and sound protection as well as beautifying the area and providing food and shelter for wildlife. The enthusiasm of the Boy Scouts, Cub Scouts, and their leaders spread throughout the whole group involved.

Owatonna ReLeaf:

Bare root and B&B stock were purchased. Service clubs assisted city personnel in planting trees on street boulevards oriented north/south. City personnel will continue to maintain all plantings. Tree hangers were distributed to homeowners in early July, regarding watering instructions.

Olmsted County Extension Office, Trees for Teens, Rochester:

Trees were planted and mulched around the County Extension Office building. Plantings were placed on east and west sides of the building for energy conservation and in parking areas to increase tree cover.

Grace Lutheran Landscape, Trees for Teens, Rochester:

As a completion phase of the 1995 building addition, the landscaping was finished including the planting of 8 trees by Trees for Teens and adding mulch to the new and existing trees.

Holy Spirit School Tree Planting, Trees for Teens, Rochester:

A windbreak was planted on the west boundary. Shade trees were planted on the west and south of the ball field. Some trees were planted on the north slope of the wildlife area.

Hoover Elementary Nature Area Project, Trees for Teens, Rochester:

Trees were planted on the Hoover Elementary School grounds on the east, north, and west sides of the school building. Trees were placed to shade all windows on the east side of the building and supplement existing trees on the north and west sides of the building. Tree species were chosen based on mature size, compatibility with the site, native species, and species that attract birds. Trees were planted by the Boy Scout troop that meets at the school, interested students, and adult volunteers. A windbreak planted in the NE corner of the site included red-twiggled dogwood, serviceberry, arborvitae, and viburnum.

Rollingstone Elementary, Rollingstone:

Trees were planted east of the new school providing shade for the air conditioned building, parking lot, and playground area. Trees provide a natural outdoor oak theater for the school children. Trees were also planted west of the building along the property line between the back of the building and a subdivision of single family homes. These trees provide a neighbor/school tree break, windbreak, shade for the building and air conditioning unit. Planting was completed by elementary students, community volunteers, Jaycee members, and city and district staff. Ongoing

maintenance will be provided by trained city and district staff, students, park rec children, parents, area plant experts, and volunteer community residents.

Rose Creek:

A community windbreak was planted in the ditch north along the highway. Trees were also planted on the east or west side of homes in the city. Trained city staff and neighborhood residents will be in charge of ongoing maintenance.

Spring Valley ReLeaf:

The project established an urban forest new subdivisions and reestablished an urban forest in areas with recent road work. Planting was done with energy conservation guidelines.

Wanamingo:

The tree project consisted of planting on city property, boulevards, private property, and replacing boulevard trees. Special effort was applied to watering and mulching new and old trees.

REGION 6

Chanhassen Tree Coupon Project, Chanhassen:

Tree coupons were distributed at energy conservation workshops. Remaining coupons were given to homeowners and associations after individual meetings on planting for energy conservation. Residents purchased selected trees at local nurseries with coupons that were valid for a limited time. Follow-up visits were made by project supervisor.

Dayton:

Trees were planted in a windbreak directly west of City Hall and the city's only elementary school. Planting was done by volunteers, including city employees, park board members, and residents. Maintenance has been done by city staff. Fifty trees were made available to homeowners on a first come first serve basis at \$20. Homeowners participated in a workshop held at City Hall.

Countryside Elementary, Edina:

Twenty-one trees were planted on school grounds. Thirteen shade trees were planted directly west of the building. The rest were planted on the south side (5 ornamental trees - 31 ft from the building, and 3 deciduous trees were planted near the playground), primarily for carbon sequestration. An educational workshop was provided for teachers in January.

Little Canada ReLeaf:

In April/May 1996, residents of the City of Little Canada ordered trees through the City, they signed an agreement regarding use and maintenance. They picked up the trees at Green Value Nursery and planted the trees in their yards according to the program guidelines. A total of 287 trees were planted by residents. The City planted 187 trees on park land and other public properties.

J. Hauble Environmental Campus, Carver Elementary School, Maplewood:

Carver School grounds has been planted for energy saving and conservation purposes. Native trees were planted along the east and west sides of the building. The property line border along the north and west sides was planted as a windbreak area. Additional plantings along the west border in the Battle Creek Park were planted which will increase the windbreak density as trees develop. Environmental education training programs have been and will continue to be conducted providing information and training to staff and students. The school campus continues to be developed into an "Environmental Campus" for school and community use. Grounds maintenance will be coordinated by school staff with leadership and assistance from Gary Perrault. The Maplewood Nature Center, Ramsey Co. Master Gardeners, Parent Teacher Organization, and other groups will continue to assist in student environmental education, habitat improvements, and site modifications.

Bancroft School Playground, Tree Trust, Minneapolis:

Thirty-three trees and 76 shrubs were planted in May 1996 around the playground and 15 trees and 213 shrubs/vines were planted around the new parking lot in September. For both plantings, school and community volunteers were utilized for volunteer labor.

Lyndale Neighborhood, Minneapolis:

Residential tree planting and care programs were promoted and implemented in spring of both 1996 and 1997. A group of volunteers met and selected the species of trees to make available to neighborhood property owners. Through extensive flyering and advertizing in the neighborhood paper, the neighborhood took orders for trees. The trees were delivered on May 10. Residents participated in 3 workshops; one on tree maintenance in 1996, and one each on tree selection/care, and on proper planting/maintenance in 1997. In 1996, 34 trees were planted, and in 1997, 28 trees were planted. In addition, 10 large American elms were injected to prevent Dutch elm disease.

Lincoln Beautification Project, Lincoln Elementary School, Minneapolis:

Children have planted a 35 x 50 foot garden in Lincoln Field, a 40 x 60 courtyard, a windbreak in Lincoln Field, and 20 trees around the school building (with this grant primarily funding wholesale purchase of the trees). During spring 1996, a graduate student worked with kindergarten students, 4 third, 4 fourth, 2 fifth, and 4 second grade classes to choose their trees to plant on Arbor Day in May 1996. The children planted the trees with the help of the Minnesota Conservation Corps (MCC). The staff and community watered the trees during the summer. During the spring of 1997, a parent worked with the students to choose trees to be planted around the school building and in the windbreak. Two fifth grade classes chose trees to be planted in spots where trees were vandalized. Two third grade classes and two special needs classes chose flowering trees to be planted in front of the building. Trees were also selected for the courtyards and planted by kindergarten and second grade classrooms. The trees were planted with the help of the MCC in May. The summer programs, staff and community will maintain the trees in the summer. This project resulted in an award from the Minnesota Shade Tree Advisory Committee for the Best Student Organized project in 1996.

Seward Neighborhood Tree Planting Project, Minneapolis:

Educational programs were presented at Seward School and at the Minneapolis Neighborhood's "Earth and Tree Fair." Trees were planted throughout the neighborhood (primarily on north-south streets to shade west and east windows of nearby homes) and at Seward School and Matthews Park. Trees were planted for energy conservation, to shade paved areas and for general tree canopy coverage. Trees were also planted as a gateway project for people entering the neighborhood from the west at the Cedar/Franklin intersection. Partnerships were formed with many groups and volunteers (including Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, Seward Neighborhood Group and Tree Trust). Public information was provided by local papers as well as the Star Tribune. Neighborhood rep's provided information about the project on public radio. Youth throughout the neighborhood helped with the planting and provided watering information on a continuing basis. Watering is being provided with funds from NRP and from the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board Forestry Division. Neighborhood residents are watering trees that can be reached with a hose. All trees throughout the neighborhood are continually being monitored for tree health. This project received the "Outstanding Partnership Award" from MnSTAC and also a Media Certificate for outstanding promotion and coverage of the Mpls Neighborhood's "Earth and Tree Fair."

Osseo High School, Tree Trust Trees for Teens Program (Part 1 & 2), Osseo:

Through the Tree Trust's Trees for Teens program, trees and large shrubs were planted east and west of school windows to provide shade and enhance school grounds. Trees were also planted along the north and northwest borders of the school to provide a windbreak.

Beat the Heat, Plymouth:

Three homeowner associations (HOA) and their respective individual residents were encouraged to plant trees in their new subdivisions for energy conservation. Each resident and HOA attended a tree selection workshop to assess the property needs in regard to species selection and energy conservation. Orders and payments were collected at this time. Each resident and HOA was notified of spring pick up/planting workshop date. All participants were encouraged to plant trees immediately and most seemed to be done the day of pick up.

Robbinsdale ReLeaf:

Trees were planted on public boulevards along north-south streets to shade east and west sides of homes and to shade street pavements. Trees were also planted in City parks to provide shade and energy conservation with the help of 50 youth baseball players and parents.

Parkview Center School, Tree Trust, Roseville:

Trees and shrubs were planted at the school to reduce winter winds, provide habitat for wildlife, shade pavement and sequester carbon dioxide, and increase overall tree canopy.

Central High School, Tree Trust Trees for Teens Program, St. Paul:

Two projects were implemented by students from Central High through the Tree Trust's Trees for Teens program, volunteers from the community and J.J. Hill Elementary School students. Teachers were involved and partners worked together. Mayor Norm Coleman helped celebrate

the Skyline Towers project, spoke at the ribbon cutting and spoke to Central High students. Both projects provided a great community service project and are an added asset to St. Paul.

Wabasha & Robert St. Gateway, Greening the Great River Park, St. Paul:

This project, the planting of the Robert Street and Wabasha Street Gateway areas, was completed through a series of volunteer planting events during the spring of 1996. One-hundred and seven native trees were funded by this grant. A total of 1420 native trees and shrubs were planted by 560 volunteers in the Robert St. and Wabasha St. Gateway areas through the Greening the Great River Park. All the trees will help reduce the urban heat island effect and create a pleasing aesthetic quality for this industrial area.

Heat ReLeaf, St. Paul Neighborhood Energy Consortium, St. Paul:

One hundred and four native trees were planted at 74 St. Paul residences, including 21% conifers planted to create or contribute to a windbreak. The rest were deciduous trees planted to shade east or west facing windows or air conditioners. Residents heard about this program of the St. Paul Neighborhood Energy Consortium (NEC) through community newsletters, newspapers, and meetings. Those interested in participating were encouraged to attend a workshop on planting trees for energy conservation, and proper planting and maintenance of trees. Site visits were done to each of the properties to determine the best location and variety of tree, and also answer any planting and maintenance questions. Container grown trees were delivered, and planted by homeowners with some assistance from NEC staff or volunteers.



MINNESOTA ReLEAF 1995-1997
Grant Recipient & Budget
(Table A)

Project Location	Project Name	App Elg	Grantee Organization Name	Project Budget Summary			
				Cash	In-kind	ReLeaf	Total
Audubon	Audubon ReLeaf	M	City of Audubon	\$ 65.72	\$ 1,529.00	\$ 1,400.00	\$ 2,994.72
Badger	Badger ReLeaf Project	M	City of Badger	\$ 1,202.00	\$ 11,000.00	\$ 8,408.00	\$ 20,610.00
Bagley	Bagley Public School	S	Bagley Public Schools	\$ 0.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 7,500.00	\$ 17,500.00
Bemidji	City of Bemidji	M	City of Bemidji	\$ 3,135.00	\$ 1,440.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 7,575.00
East Grand Forks	East Grand Forks ReLeaf	M	City of East Grand Forks	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 6,000.00
Fosston	Tree Plant '96	M	City of Fosston	\$ 583.47	\$ 2,488.00	\$ 2,465.00	\$ 5,536.47
Frazee	Frazee ReLeaf	M	City of Frazee	\$ 135.00	\$ 5,400.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 9,535.00
Greenbush	Greenbush ReLeaf Grant	M	City of Greenbush	\$ 0.00	\$ 7,249.00	\$ 5,113.00	\$ 12,362.00
Hendrum	Hendrum ReLeaf	M	City of Hendrum	\$ 3.79	\$ 4,899.20	\$ 2,515.00	\$ 7,417.99
Kelliher	Kelliher ReLeaf	S	Kelliher School District #36	\$ 5,756.58	\$ 5,810.00	\$ 4,119.00	\$ 15,685.58
Osakis	Osakis ReLeaf	M	City of Osakis	\$ 1,451.00	\$ 3,619.00	\$ 3,975.00	\$ 9,045.00
Rothsay	Rothsay ReLeaf	M	City of Rothsay	\$ 2,486.25	\$ 45.75	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 3,532.00
Wolverton	City Forestation	M	City of Wolverton	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 1,770.00	\$ 3,770.00	\$ 7,540.00
Region 1 Totals				\$ 18,318.81	\$ 56,749.95	\$ 50,265.00	\$ 125,333.76
Grand Rapids 1	Trees for Teens, GR High Sc.	NP/S	Tree Trust	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 11,097.66	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 24,097.66
Grand Rapids 2	Consv., Wildlife, & Educ. Pltg.	O	Itasca Community College	\$ 3,263.89	\$ 7,389.25	\$ 6,780.00	\$ 17,433.14

Project Location	Project Name	App Elg	Grantee Organization Name	Project Budget Summary			
				Cash	In-kind	ReLeaf	Total
Littlefork	L-BF School Landsc. Project	S	Littlefork-Big Falls School District	\$ 9,350.00	\$ 4,372.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 19,722.00
Proctor	Proctor ReLeaf'96	M	Proctor Beautification Committee	\$ 650.00	\$ 4,891.36	\$ 5,500.00	\$ 11,041.36
Silver Bay	MN Veterans Home-Silver Bay	O	Minnesota Veterans Home	\$ 10,160.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 20,160.00
Region 2 Totals				\$ 26,423.89	\$ 27,750.27	\$ 38,280.00	\$ 92,454.16
Brainerd	MLAP Planting Project	S	Brainerd School Dist. #181	\$ 0.00	\$ 2,948.00	\$ 2,900.00	\$ 5,848.00
Mora	Trailview Middle School	S	Mora School District #332	\$ 1,217.95	\$ 12,160.00	\$ 5,245.00	\$ 18,622.95
Paynesville	Paynesville ReLeaf	M	City of Paynesville	\$ 2,929.50	\$ 8,078.00	\$ 7,034.50	\$ 18,042.00
Rice	City of Rice Arbor Day	M	City of Rice	\$ 470.00	\$ 1,500.50	\$ 1,530.00	\$ 3,500.50
Pequot Lakes	City of Pequot Lakes	M	City of Pequot Lakes	\$ 6,661.00	\$ 3,689.00	\$ 7,500.00	\$ 17,850.00
St. Cloud	St. Cloud ReLeaf	M	City of St. Cloud Park Dept.	\$ 274.50	\$ 19,131.42	\$ 7,500.00	\$ 26,905.92
Staples	Staples Boulevard Reforest.	M	City of Staples	\$ 6,200.00	\$ 3,825.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 20,025.00
Walker	Public Parking Tree Planting	M	City of Walker	\$ 4,460.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 4,940.00	\$ 11,400.00
Region 3 Totals				\$ 22,212.95	\$ 53,331.92	\$ 46,649.50	\$ 122,194.37
Fairmont	Fairmont Comm. Hospital RL	NP	Fairmont Comm. Hospital	\$ 3,928.00	\$ 5,379.32	\$ 6,052.00	\$ 15,359.32
Hutchinson	Shade for Hutchinson	M	City of Hutchinson	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 4,646.78	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 24,646.78
Kerkehoven	Kerk. Middle School ReLeaf	S	Kerkehoven M.S. Public School #775	\$ 0.00	\$ 4,229.00	\$ 3,270.00	\$ 7,499.00
Lake Wilson	Lake Wilson ReLeaf	M	City of Lake Wilson	\$ 392.86	\$ 1,893.00	\$ 1,813.00	\$ 4,098.86
Madelia	Community Tree Project	O	Watsonwan SWCD	\$1,101.30	\$1,082.90	\$1,225.50	\$ 3,409.70

Project Location	Project Name	App Elig	Grantee Organization Name	Project Budget Summary			
				Cash	In-kind	ReLeaf	Total
Madison Lake	96 Madison Lake Tree Project	M	City of Madison Lake	\$ 1,046.00	\$ 696.00	\$ 1,458.00	\$ 3,200.00
Marietta 1	Marietta Com. Wdbk, Main St.	M	Lac qui Parle SWCD	\$ 494.66	\$ 1,827.00	\$ 845.00	\$ 3,166.66
Marietta 2	Marietta Com. Wndbk, Hwy 40	M	Lac qui Parle SWCD	\$ 456.74	\$ 1,367.00	\$ 681.00	\$ 2,504.74
New Ulm	New Ulm ReLeaf '96	M	City of New Ulm Public Utilities Com.	\$ 7,242.33	\$ 12,955.31	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 30,197.64
Porter	City of Porter	O	Prairie County RC & D	\$ 19,796.75	\$ 1,904.80	\$ 9,995.00	\$ 31,696.55
Raymond	Raymond Comm. Windbreak	M	City of Raymond	\$ 103.94	\$ 7,616.00	\$ 6,500.00	\$ 14,219.94
St. Clair	St. Clair ReLeaf	M	City of St. Clair	\$ 2,001.00	\$ 5,950.00	\$ 4,800.00	\$ 12,751.00
St. Peter	St. Peter ReLeaf	M	City of St. Peter	\$ 0.00	\$ 5,926.90	\$ 2,005.00	\$ 7,931.90
Winsted	ReLeaf Grant - Winsted	M	City of Winsted	\$ 7,572.00	\$ 4,312.00	\$ 5,645.00	\$ 17,529.00
Region 4 Totals				\$ 54,135.58	\$ 59,786.01	\$ 64,289.50	\$ 178,211.09
Austin 1	East Side Lake Wind Break	M	City of Austin	\$ 0.00	\$ 3,418.12	\$ 3,080.00	\$ 6,498.12
Austin 2	Trees for Teens, GIFT (TFT)	S	Austin H.S. (Olmsted Co. Ext. - TFT)	\$ 270.00	\$ 5,190.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 8,460.00
Austin 3	Time for Trees, Banfield Elem.	S	Banfield Elem., Austin Pub. Schools	\$ 5,165.00	\$ 8,670.00	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 15,035.00
Blooming Prairie	City of Blooming Prairie	M	City of Blooming Prairie	\$ 0.00	\$ 4,500.00	\$ 3,269.19	\$ 7,769.19
Byron	Byron Elem. Csv. Proj. (TFT)	O	Olmsted SWCD (Olmsted CE -TFT)	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,330.00	\$ 630.00	\$ 2,960.00
Cannon Falls	Cannon Falls ReLeaf	M	City of Cannon Falls	\$ 1,632.11	\$ 5,102.00	\$ 2,804.00	\$ 9,538.11
Chatfield	Chatfield ReLeaf	M	City of Chatfield	\$ 2,125.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 2,625.00	\$ 5,750.00
Faribault	Roosevelt Elementary	S	Faribault Public Schools	\$ 610.00	\$ 7,974.50	\$ 3,812.23	\$ 12,396.73

Project Location	Project Name	App Elg	Grantee Organization Name	Project Budget Summary			
				Cash	In-kind	ReLeaf	Total
LeRoy	Redman Addition	M	LeRoy Tree Board	\$ 500.00	\$ 1,410.00	\$ 995.00	\$ 2,905.00
Owatonna	Owatonna ReLeaf	M	City of Owatonna	\$ 4,191.97	\$ 6,759.42	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 11,951.39
Rochester 1	Olmsted Co. Extension Office	O	Olmsted Extension Service (TFT)	\$ 2,480.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 583.82	\$ 4,563.82
Rochester 2	Grace Lutheran Landscape	O	Grace Lutheran (Olmsted CE - TFT)	\$ 2,938.00	\$ 1,906.00	\$ 630.00	\$ 5,474.00
Rochester 3	Holy Spirit School Tree Pltg.	O	H.S. Catholic Chu.(Olmsted CE-TFT)	\$ 300.00	\$ 657.50	\$ 456.50	\$ 1,414.00
Rochester 4	Hoover Elem. Nature Area Prj.	O/S	Hoover Elem., (Olmsted CE - TFT)	\$ 185.00	\$ 2,635.00	\$ 1,233.37	\$ 4,053.37
Rollingstone	Rollingstone Elementary	M/S	City of Rollingstone	\$ 3,720.80	\$ 6,066.50	\$ 3,776.00	\$ 13,563.30
Rose Creek	City of Rose Creek	M	City of Rose Creek	\$ 208.60	\$ 1,240.00	\$ 1,400.00	\$ 2,848.60
Spring Valley	Spring Valley ReLeaf	M	Spring Valley Tree Board	\$ 4,544.00	\$ 3,550.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 9,594.00
Wanamingo	City of Wananmingo	M	City of Wanamingo	\$4210..37	\$ 495.00	\$ 1,300.00	\$ 6,005.00
Region 5 Totals				\$ 34,080.48	\$ 63,404.04	\$ 33,295.11	\$ 130,779.63
Chanhassen	Chanhassen Tree Coupon Pj.	M	City of Chanhassen	\$ 2,308.50	\$ 683.00	\$ 2,891.50	\$ 5,883.00
Dayton	City of Dayton	M	City of Dayton	\$ 6,950.00	\$ 6,084.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 23,034.00
Edina	Countryside Elementary	S	Countryside Elementary School	\$ 3,200.00	\$ 812.00	\$ 1,939.00	\$ 5,951.00
Little Canada	Little Canada ReLeaf Program	M	City of Little Canada	\$ 11,202.60	\$ 0.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 21,202.60
Maplewood	J. Hauble Environ. Campus	S	Carver Elementary School	\$ 4,470.00	\$ 30,957.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 45,427.00
Minneapolis 1	Bancroft School Playground	NP/S	Tree Trust	\$ 3,623.75	\$ 1,875.00	\$ 4,505.00	\$ 10,003.75
Mpls 2	Lyndale Neighbhd, Tree Pltg.	NP	Lyndale Neighborhood Association	\$ 1,497.75	\$ 1,920.00	\$ 2,230.50	\$ 5,648.25
Mpls 3	Lincoln Beautification Project	S	Lincoln Community School	\$ 196.98	\$ 6,152.10	\$ 2,040.00	\$ 8,389.08

Project Location	Project Name	App Elg	Grantee Organization Name	Project Budget Summary			
				Cash	In-kind	ReLeaf	Total
Mpls 4	Seward Neigh. Partn. TP Proj.	M	MPRB/ Seward Neighborhood Group	\$ 21,500.00	\$ 35,812.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 67,312.00
Osseo 1	Osseo High Tree Planting (Trees for Teens)	NP/S	Tree Trust	\$ 0.00	\$ 1,100.00	\$ 885.00	\$ 1,985.00
Osseo 2	Osseo High School (TFT)	NP/S	Tree Trust	\$ 0.00	\$ 5,060.00	\$ 4,109.00	\$ 9,169.00
Plymouth	Beat the Heat	M	City of Plymouth	\$ 10,505.00	\$ 3,400.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 23,905.00
Robbinsdale	Robbinsdale ReLeaf	M	City of Robbinsdale	\$ 10,962.50	\$ 4,975.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 25,937.50
Roseville	Parkview Center School	NP/S	Tree Trust	\$ 0.00	\$ 2,174.00	\$ 940.00	\$ 3,114.00
St. Paul 1	Central High School (TFT)	NP/S	Tree Trust	\$ 0.00	\$ 11,089.43	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 21,089.43
St. Paul 2	Wabasha & Robert St. Gateway	NP	Greening the Great River Park	\$ 3,267.00	\$ 4,459.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 12,726.00
St. Paul 3	Heat ReLeaf	NP	St. Paul Neighborhood Energy Cons.	\$ 1,153.47	\$ 10,521.00	\$ 9,840.00	\$ 21,514.47
Region 6 Totals				\$ 80,837.55	\$ 127,073.53	\$ 104,380.00	\$ 312,291.08
State Totals				\$ 236,009.26	\$ 388,095.72	\$ 337,159.11	\$ 961,264.09

KEY

APP ELG: Applicant Eligibility

M: Municipality

S: School District

NP: Non-profit

O: Other (e.g. SWCD, RC&D, College, Extension Service, State Veteran's Home)



MINNESOTA ReLEAF 1995-1997
 Numbers of Trees & Shrubs Planted per Community
 (Table B)

Project Location	Tree Seedlings			Trees			total Trees	NATIVE TREES		SHRUBS			NATIVE SHRUBS		TOTAL
	PRIV	PUB	TOTAL	PRIV	PUB	TOTAL		#	%	PRIV	PUB	TOTAL	#	%	
Audubon	0	0	0	1	71	72	72	72	100%	0	0	0	-	-	72
Badger	-	-	-	5	55	60	60	60	100%	0	155	155	155	100%	215
Bagley	-	-	-	0	36	36	36	36	100%	-	-	-	-	-	36
Bemidji	-	-	-	0	35	35	35	35	100%	-	-	-	-	-	35
East Grand Forks	-	-	-	82	0	82	82	74	90%	-	-	-	-	-	82
Fosston	0	120	120	9	7	16	136	136	100%	-	-	-	-	-	136
Frazee	-	-	-	0	72	72	72	72	100%	0	40	40	0	0%	112
Greenbush	-	-	-	-	150	150	150	150	100%	-	-	-	-	-	150
Hendrum	-	-	-	42	83	125	125	65	52%	-	-	-	-	-	125
Kelliher	-	-	-	0	112	112	112	112	100%	0	20	20	20	100%	132
Osakis	-	-	-	81	29	110	110	110	100%	-	-	-	-	-	110
Rothsay	0	50	50	-	-	-	50	43	86%	-	-	-	-	-	50
Wolverton	-	-	-	0	94	94	94	71	75%	-	-	-	-	-	94
Region 1 Totals	0	170	170	220	744	964	1134	1036	91%	0	215	215	175	81%	1349
Grand Rapids 1	0	16	16	23	68	91	107	107	100%	-	-	-	-	-	107
Grand Rapids 2	0	69	69	0	92	92	161	147	91%	0	64	64	55	86%	225

PROJECT LOCATION	TREE SEEDLINGS			TREES			TOTAL TREES	NATIVE TREES		SHRUBS			NATIVE SHRUBS		TOTAL
	PRIV	PUB	TOTAL	PRIV	PUB	TOTAL		#	%	PRIV	PUB	TOTAL	#	%	
Littlefork	-	-	-	0	86	86	86	37	43%	-	-	-	-	-	86
Proctor	-	-	-	21	22	43	43	43	100%	-	-	-	-	-	43
Silver Bay	-	-	-	0	90	90	90	75	84%	-	-	-	-	-	90
Region 2 Totals	0	85	85	44	358	402	487	409	84%	0	64	64	55	86%	551
Brainerd	-	-	-	0	50	50	50	41	82%	-	-	-	-	-	50
Mora	0	1500	1500	0	430	430	1930	1690	88%	-	-	-	-	-	1930
Paynesville	-	-	-	98	51	149	149	112	75%	-	-	-	-	-	149
Rice	-	-	-	11	25	36	36	32	89%	-	-	-	-	-	36
Pequot Lakes	-	-	-	0	146	146	146	103	71%	-	160	160	160	100%	306
St. Cloud	-	-	-	0	564	564	564	448	79%	-	-	-	-	-	564
Staples	-	-	-	0	720	720	720	350	49%	-	-	-	-	-	720
Walker	-	-	-	0	38	38	38	31	82%	-	-	-	-	-	38
Region 3 Totals	0	1500	1500	109	2024	2133	3633	2807	77%	0	160	160	160	100%	3793
Fairmont	-	-	-	51	0	51	51	48	94%	125	0	125	125	100%	176
Hutchinson	-	-	-	180	133	313	313	273	87%	125	0	125	125	100%	438
Kerkehoven	-	-	-	0	23	23	23	23	100%	-	-	-	-	-	23
Lake Wilson	-	-	-	20	27	47	47	36	77%	-	-	-	-	-	47
Madelia	-	-	-	15	31	46	46	31	67%	-	-	-	-	-	46

PROJECT LOCATION	TREE SEEDLINGS			TREES			TOTAL TREES	NATIVE TREES		SHRUBS			NATIVE SHRUBS		TOTAL
	PRIV	PUB	TOTAL	PRIV	PUB	TOTAL		#	%	PRIV	PUB	TOTAL	#	%	
Madison Lake	-	-	-	0	61	61	61	49	80%	0	108	108	36	33%	169
Marietta 1	0	82	82	-	-	-	82	56	68%	0	108	108	108	100%	190
Marietta 2	0	68	68	-	-	-	68	44	65%	0	94	94	94	100%	162
New Ulm	-	-	-	209	0	209	209	188	90%	-	-	-	-	-	209
Porter	0	1051	1051	-	-	-	1051	644	61%	0	1694	1694	1694	100%	2745
Raymond	0	260	260	0	147	147	407	95	23%	0	207	207	207	100%	614
St. Clair	-	-	-	0	93	93	93	68	73%	0	74	74	30	41%	167
St. Peter	0	200	200	0	115	115	315	315	100%	0	500	500	500	100%	815
Winsted	-	-	-	65	60	125	125	100	80%	-	-	-	-	-	125
Region 4 Totals	0	1661	1661	540	690	1230	2891	1970	68%	250	2785	3035	2919	96%	5926
Austin 1	-	-	-	0	125	125	125	125	100%	0	120	120	120	100%	245
Austin 2	-	-	-	0	23	23	23	16	70%	-	-	-	-	-	23
Austin 3	0	1	1	0	45	45	46	31	67%	-	-	-	-	-	46
Blooming Prairie	-	-	-	16	76	92	92	49	53%	-	-	-	-	-	92
Byron	1050	0	1050	-	-	-	1050	714	68%	350	0	350	210	60%	1400
Cannon Falls	-	-	-	194	95	289	289	234	81%	-	-	-	-	-	289
Chatfield	-	-	-	60	45	105	105	94	90%	-	-	-	-	-	105
Faribault	0	1200	1200	0	28	28	1228	1228	100%	0	40	40	40	100%	1268

PROJECT LOCATION	TREE SEEDLINGS			TREES			TOTAL TREES	NATIVE TREES		SHRUBS			NATIVE SHRUBS		TOTAL
	PRIV	PUB	TOTAL	PRIV	PUB	TOTAL		#	%	PRIV	PUB	TOTAL	#	%	
LeRoy	138	0	138	-	-	-	138	102	74%	62	0	62	62	100%	200
Owatonna	-	-	-	0	146	146	146	93	64%	-	-	-	-	-	146
Rochester 1	-	-	-	0	11	11	11	10	91%	-	-	-	-	-	11
Rochester 2	-	-	-	8	0	8	8	8	100%	-	-	-	-	-	8
Rochester 3	147	0	147	18	0	18	165	144	87%	36	0	36	18	50%	201
Rochester 4	-	-	-	0	22	22	22	14	64%	-	-	-	-	-	22
Rollingstone	-	-	-	0	54	54	54	54	100%	-	-	-	-	-	54
Rose Creek	-	-	-	25	15	40	40	40	100%	-	-	-	-	-	40
Spring Valley	93	31	124	120	0	120	244	193	79%	-	-	-	-	-	244
Wanamingo	-	-	-	15	75	90	90	69	77%	-	-	-	-	-	90
Region 5 Totals	1428	1232	2660	456	760	1216	3876	3218	83%	448	160	608	450	74%	4484
Chanhassen	-	-	-	52	0	52	52	52	100%	-	-	-	-	-	52
Dayton	-	-	-	150	0	150	150	101	67%	-	-	-	-	-	150
Edina	-	-	-	0	21	21	21	16	76%	-	-	-	-	-	21
Little Canada	-	-	-	287	187	474	474	417	88%	-	-	-	-	-	474
Maplewood	0	500	500	0	168	168	668	668	100%	0	58	58	58	100%	726
Minneapolis 1	-	-	-	0	41	41	41	22	54%	0	289	289	46	16%	330
Mpls 2	-	-	-	72	0	72	72	72	100%	-	-	-	-	-	72
Mpls 3	0	56	56	0	20	20	76	70	92%	-	-	-	-	-	76

PROJECT LOCATION	TREE SEEDLINGS			TREES			TOTAL TREES	NATIVE TREES		SHRUBS				% NATIVE	TOTAL
	PRIV	PUB	TOTAL	PRIV	PUB	TOTAL		#	%	PRIV	PUB	TOTAL			
Mpls 4	-	-	-	0	425	425	425	268	63%	-	-	-	-	-	425
Osseo 1	-	-	-	0	24	24	24	24	100%	-	-	-	-	-	24
Osseo 2	-	-	-	0	39	39	39	37	95%	0	12	12	12	100%	51
Plymouth	-	-	-	751	0	751	751	751	100%	-	-	-	-	-	751
Robbinsdale	-	-	-	0	120	120	120	120	100%	-	-	-	-	-	120
Roseville	-	-	-	0	4	4	4	4	100%	0	40	40	40	100%	44
St. Paul 1	-	-	-	0	57	57	57	42	74%	0	75	75	20	27%	132
St. Paul 2	3	0	3	104	0	104	107	107	100%	-	-	-	-	-	107
St. Paul 3	-	-	-	74	0	74	74	74	100%	22	0	22	22	100%	96
Region 6 Totals	3	556	559	1490	1106	2596	3155	2845	90%	22	474	496	198	40%	3651
State Totals	1431	5204	6635	2859	5682	8541	15176	12285	81%	720	3858	4578	3957	86%	19754



MINNESOTA ReLEAF 1995-97

PROGRAM EVALUATIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

(compiled from community final reports)

Project Changes & Problems

REGION 1

- Planting was delayed due to late, wet spring [frequent in Reg 1]; cold & wet weather decreased volunteer participation, particularly by elementary school; changed due to wet conditions; cold, rainy weather made planting a long and somewhat difficult experience.
- Cost per tree was less, so purchased more trees [frequent comment].
- Poor soil (hard clay construction fill) complicated & delayed planting.
- Large stock difficult to move without machinery.
- Some trees were winter killed before delivery, so they are being replaced at no cost to program.
- Only 60 trees, rather than the planned 80, were ordered by local residents.
- A water main was discovered running down the center of a boulevard so the trees had to be relocated on to private property.
- Stock of a native tree wasn't available so a non-native was substituted.

REGION 2

- Plans had to be modified where underground utilities got in the way.
- Native species stock is difficult to find, particularly without going to a horticultural variety (e.g. *Prunus nigra* and *Sorbus americana*).
- Some stock never arrived or was in poor quality.

REGION 3

- Trees were at a better price than expected, so more trees were planted [common response].
- People flocked in too fast at the beginning of the Family Planting day (9:00 am on Saturday).
- The planting video was added which helped a lot of volunteers incorporate good planting techniques; also volunteers were given city maps with the planting areas highlighted.
- Engineering costs to prepare specifications and oversee bidding process were not anticipated.
- Ironwood trees were unavailable.
- The addition of T-bars to protect the plantings from snowmobiles and snowblowing was expensive.
- Delay and changes occurred due to city's decision to install storm sewer in center of town park & because long winter delayed tree spading.

REGION 4

- One windbreak was not installed because of advise that it was too close to the road for snow drifting and too close to a field for danger of chemical drift.
- The number of shrubs needed for windbreak was underestimated; a wet spring meant part of windbreak could not be planted.
- Species had to be changed because of lack of availability; at last minute, green ash were substituted for basswood because of availability.
- Because of wet conditions and rocks, the tree planter didn't work, but enough volunteers were available so it didn't matter.
- Lath used to stake tree tubes broke in the wind and had to be replace with stakes.
- During the time of land purchase, an opportunity came up to purchase and plant 2 additional acres of windbreak which will provide additional wind protection and other benefits to residents.
- Owner of the property proposed for a neighborhood windbreak backed out of the project and the trees had to be relocated to different areas.
- Equipment breakdown delayed planting of the windbreaks for a few days.
- Initially local organizations were interested, but when the project was implemented interest was at a minimum, so a City crew plant all the trees with assistance from property owners.

REGION 5

- Plant size had to be reduced to come within budget.
- Construction delayed one component of the project.
- The project was expanded and late delivery of some trees meant a 3-day planting.
- Soil did not need to be replaced in as many places as anticipated.
- Residents were not aware of the project and the commitment to care for trees.
- More trees were planted.

REGION 6

- Turnout at workshop was less than expected & initially only 75 of 100 coupons were distributed to homeowners, the rest were distributed through individual contacts, but only 52 were redeemed; because residents chose trees, species diversity was less (33% red maple and 25% sugar maple).
- Educational materials requested of DNR arrived too late to be useful at workshops; alternative materials received through the Mn Hort Society were timely and what was needed.
- At the request of school principal and maintenance staff, planting locations of ornamental trees were moved to south side of building where they would not affect direct solar gain and species were switched from natives to flowering crabs better adapted to site conditions.
- The program was implemented over 2 years instead of one, primarily due to the cold spring followed by the very dry summer of 1996.
- Project was expanded due to increased interest by school staff and students, thus it also included National Tree Trust seedling planting, wildflower planting, etc.
- Watering was a problem during summer 1996 drought.
- Wood chip deliveries less frequent than expected.
- Smaller trees were planted than originally planned to avoid injury to children, so more trees

- could be planted.
- Tree locations had to be adjusted because of underground utilities (including a million dollar fiber optics cable).
 - Species list was changed to increase diversity of trees on public boulevards; numbers were reduced from 150 to 120 because bids were higher than anticipated.
 - Several residents made last minute decisions to not have a tree planted on their boulevard which meant that new sites had to be found, utilities checked and residents notified; this delayed planting and increased staff time.
 - Use of the Homeowner's Associations as the collection agency for the resident project made handling money very easy.
 - Since few people volunteered, the Homeowner's Association contracted to have holes augured so volunteers spent time enlarging hole and backfilling (saved time and volunteer effort) - importance of unglazing sides of hole was stressed, but not all work could be supervised.
 - Having Homeowner Association representative attend the MnDOT training was very beneficial in support city forester's tree selection and planting workshops; the representatives understood the importance of proper tree care from selection through ongoing maintenance and voiced those ideas to all their residents.
 - Sweating bare root oaks was very hard.
 - Changes were made in species type, size, and location because of 1) weather-related nursery shortages, 2) property owner concerns (including utility corridors, sprinkler systems, snow plowing/storage, street sight lines, employee safety/visibility), and 3) site suitability.
 - Inability to find a reliable forestry intern meant that work planned for intern (site visits, planting and delivery help, and database management) had to be done by non-profit group's regular staff.
 - Group was unable to find small businesses interested planting eligible trees.
 - Nurseries bidding were not able to provide several varieties of trees requested so more common varieties were planted.
 - Workshop component was held too early (late March/early April) for most participants and too early for tree planting demonstration; so demonstrations also had to be held during delivery dates.

Helpful Organizations/Individuals

(other than DNR-related, see below)

REGION 1

- FFA
- county's Sentence to Serve
- 4-H
- firemen
- Lester Beck (Clearwater Nursery)
- city forester/tree inspector

- Cub Scouts
- US Forest Service (local office)
- Wolverton Telephone Company (backhoe, lunch, refreshments)

REGION 2

- Tree Trust (Janette Monear)
- Blandin Paper (clean chips)
- local power tool rental company (power soil auger)
- city
- county forester
- Forest Experiment Station (Dave Hensel, equipment)

REGION 3

- NRCS (Steve Hart)
- Girl Scouts (setting up, planting, & caring for trees)
- Historical Society
- master gardener (John Wimmer)
- Baseball Booster Club
- High School Natural Resources Club
- firemen
- volunteer Forestry & Beautification Board
- women's club

REGION 4

- Russ Nelson, Fairmont Tree Inspector/City Park Department manager (mulch, water tank)
- Lion's Club
- Boy Scouts
- 4-H
- Key City Conservation Club & Gun Training Class
- alternative service workers
- American Legion, Legion Auxiliary, and Junior Auxiliary
- Commercial Club
- Senior Citizens group
- Fire Department
- ambulance service
- local churches
- SWCD

REGION 5

- SWCD (technical assistance in planning, site prep, & planting)
- school staff & students
- community volunteers
- Boy Scouts & Cub Scouts
- Sertoma Club

- Elks Club
- Knights of Columbus
- Izaak Walton League
- city Shade Tree Commission
- Tree Care Advisors & Master Gardeners (Charlie Sparks, Kay Karsell, & Pat Friederichs)
- Extension Service
- 8th grade class and teachers
- Jaycees
- SWCD (Bev Nordby & Rick Morrison of Mower County)

REGION 6

- Terri Goodfellow-Heyer (Mn State Horticultural Society)
- local nurseries (assisting at workshops, promoting energy conservation at their business, handling all trees & replacements in homeowner program)
- Ramsey County Corrections Department (nursery work program inmates)
- school staff
- neighborhood association & garden committee members
- University of Minnesota Landscape Architecture Graduate student
- master gardeners (specifically Donn McCoy)
- Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board staff (Paul Domholt & others)
- Americorps
- Steve Thran (Larson Brothers Landscaping)
- Seward Neighborhood Group
- Tree Trust Time for Trees program
- City of St Paul - Division of Parks & Recreation (Dave Sundmark & T.K. Walling)
- Mississippi National River & Recreation Area
- Army Reserves

DNR Role

REGION 1

- Gary Johnson (Wannaska) - good suggestions on revising species selection/location
- John Colford (Bagley DNR Forestry extremely helpful, especially John)
- DNR Forestry (Kelliher/Blackduck) - supplied shovels, ATV's, water, stand-by fire crews, professional expertise to coordinate student activities
- Detroit Lakes DNR office - choosing sites & varieties
- Minnesota Conservation Corps (MCC)

REGION 2

- MCC
- Pegg O'Laughlin Julson (Littlefork) - very helpful through the whole grant process, available for technical assistance, offered her support for ongoing maintenance and future inspection.
- Mike Albers and John Dowd were very helpful on planting day with some of the technical details of planting.

REGION 3 [no comments received]

REGION 4

- Greg Russell answered our questions on the grant program, our responsibilities, & other related concerns on the actual tree planting project.
- DNR employees and consultants have been easy to work with and helpful; St. Paul & Regional DNR Forestry staff were very helpful in planning the program; excellent advice and cooperation was received from DNR, including, but not limited to, Jerry Jensen, Katie Himanga, Greg Russell, and Ed Hayes.
- Katie Himanga (DNR contractor); Katie added her expertise through the planning process and gave several interesting presentations at the Home & Self Improvement Show on energy efficient planting strategies and proper tree maintenance; Katie provided information, technical publications and bulletins developed by DNR and other sources (on benefits of trees, planting, care and maintenance).
- Forestry people from DNR were very helpful, printed materials to establish the program were easy to understand and follow; this assistance from DNR made the project a positive project, and a very workable program to implement.
- Helpful publications: "Species Native to Mn..." & door hanger (very helpful to educate homeowners)
- Mn ReLeaf slide set was well received; Mn ReLeaf clip art is good, but didn't fit local purposes so Mn Arbor Month Partnership clip art was used instead; all education materials could have been used earlier in the year.

REGION 5

- Some materials were received from DNR too late to use; tree hanger should be available to attach to the trees when they were distributed.
- Input from Katie Himanga was essential in obtaining grant application; her input, suggestions, materials & hands-on help was a major reason for the success in implementation; minimal assistance was requested from local DNR because city was not aware that this assistance was available.

REGION 6

- MCC
- Metro Forestry staff, Peggy Sand & educational materials provided
- Project Learning Tree/Project Wild

Suggestions for Changes & Improvements / Other Comments

REGION 1

- Plan for more community involvement because school students may not be as available as you plan due to weather or other conflicts

REGION 2

- Allow use of shrubs and ground covers in plantings for realistic design for wildlife value, etc.
- Encourage nurseries to supply native plants and help locate these sources.
- Provide training to maintenance staff.
- Provide incentives to reduce turf grass by promoting native grass, in order to reduce fuel use, noise, air pollution, and herbicides.
- Encourage groups/communities to save green areas.
- Make grant project schedules more flexible and allow 2 years to complete project [from time grant is made].

REGION 3

- Help received from NRCS (Steve Harr) and Doug Rowlett from Forestry was without question a large contribution to the success of the project.
- The application form is simple, though it should be kept to the 8 pages and not made any longer.

REGION 4

- Training received was very useful; in future training, include more area cities staff.
- Mn/DOT video was used, but it was difficult to isolate planting methods needed from the rest of the information.
- Community members attended a DNR sponsored workshop on tree planting, pruning etc, other recipients should also do the same.
- Provide hands-on training to city employees on site.

REGION 5

- Instead of filling out the final report which is a near duplication of the application, have grantee only make note of changes to the application.
- Have better understanding of requirements by recipients.

REGION 6

- Homeowner program was so successful, another 100 trees could have been used.
- Grant monies would be helpful for teacher training.
- Publicity and word of mouth have attracted eight potential homeowner associations to any future programs or grants.
- Find out location of underground utilities before developing the site plan.
- Inform applicants and recipients about other related funding opportunities.
- Use a broader interpretation of which trees conserve energy (e.g. looking at cumulative effect of trees in groves in urban/industrial areas).