



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Restoration Evaluations Laws of Minnesota 2014 Final Report

General Information

Date: 05/27/2026

Project Title: Restoration Evaluations

Funds Recommended: \$100,000

Legislative Citation: ML 2014, Ch. 256, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 6(c)

Appropriation Language: \$100,000 in the second year is to the commissioner of natural resources for a technical evaluation panel to conduct up to ten restoration evaluations under Minnesota Statutes, section 97A.056, subdivision 10.

Manager Information

Manager's Name: Wade Johnson

Title:

Organization: DNR

Address: 500 Lafayette Road Box 25

City: St Paul, MN 55155-4025

Email: Wade.A.Johnson@state.mn.us

Office Number: 651-259-5075

Mobile Number:

Fax Number:

Website:

Location Information

County Location(s):

Eco regions in which work will take place:

Activity types:

Other : Restoration Evaluation

Priority resources addressed by activity:

Wetlands

Prairie

Forest

Narrative

Summary of Accomplishments

This program annually evaluates a sample of up to ten Outdoor Heritage Fund habitat restoration projects and provides a report on the evaluations in accordance with state law (M.S. 97A.056, Subd. 10).

Process & Methods

The 2014 Restoration Evaluation Report includes a new recommendation from the technical panel for improved design criteria for lakeshore projects and expands on the ongoing recommendation for improved documentation with an example restoration and management plan template.

The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) are jointly responsible for convening a Restoration Evaluation Panel (Panel) of technical experts to annually evaluate a sample of up to 10 habitat restoration projects completed with Outdoor Heritage funding, as provided in M.S. 97A.056, Subd. 10. Primary goals of the restoration evaluations program are to provide on the ground accountability for the use of Legacy funds and to improve future habitat restorations in the State. Per statute, the Panel will evaluate the selected habitat restoration projects relative to the law, current science, and the stated goals and standards in the restoration plan. The program coordinator will identify projects to be evaluated, coordinate field assessments and provide a report to the Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council (LSOHC) and the legislature determining if the restorations are meeting planned goals, any problems with the implementation of restorations, and, if necessary, recommendations on improving restorations.

In 2011 an interagency team of BWSR and DNR staff developed recommendations for consistent and effective implementation of the program across the three Legacy Funds that call for restoration evaluations; Parks and Trails, Clean Water and Outdoor Heritage Funds. In 2012 the DNR hired a full time Restoration Evaluation Coordinator to manage implementation of the program. The restoration evaluation Panel was also seated. During 2012 and 2013 the Panel consisted of:

Chris Weir-Koetter – DNR, Parks and Trails

Greg Larson – BWSR

Sue Galatowitsch – University of Minnesota

Greg Berg – Stearns County SWCD

Greg Hoch - DNR, Wildlife

Mark Oja – MN NRCS

The first set of restoration evaluations and recommendations is available in the Fiscal Year 2012 report: <http://archive.leg.state.mn.us/docs/2012/mandated/121281.pdf>.

The anticipated long-term outcomes of this program are the increased success of habitat restorations and an

increased awareness among practitioners and decision-makers of common challenges associated with habitat restorations and recommended management options to improve future restorations.

This request supports a portion of the interagency Legacy Restoration Evaluations Program, which provides for the evaluation of habitat restoration projects completed with funds from the Parks and Trails Fund (M.S. 85.53), Outdoor Heritage Fund (M.S. 97A.056), and Clean Water Fund (M.S. 114D.50) as required by state law. Up to ten Outdoor Heritage Fund projects will be evaluated and reported on in the Fiscal Year 2015 report.

Explain Partners, Supporters, & Opposition

Exceptional challenges, expectations, failures, opportunities, or unique aspects of program

What is the plan to sustain and/or maintain this work after the Outdoor Heritage Funds are expended?

Budget

Totals

Item	Requested	AP Amount	Spent	Leverage	Received Leverage	Leverage Source	Original Total	Final Total
Personnel	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$83,000	-	-	-	\$40,000	\$83,000
Contracts	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$7,000	-	-	-	\$48,000	\$7,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Travel	\$2,000	\$2,000	-	-	-	-	\$2,000	-
Professional Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	\$8,500	\$8,500	\$8,500	-	-	-	\$8,500	\$8,500
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	-	-	-	\$1,500	\$1,500
Supplies/Materials	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	-	-	-	\$100,000	\$100,000

Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Amount Spent	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Site Assessors (Various State Employees)	0.1	1.0	\$5,000	-	-	\$5,000
Restoration Evaluation Coordinator	0.4	1.0	\$78,000	-	-	\$78,000

Direct Support Services

How did you determine which portions of the Direct Support Services of your shared support services is direct to this program?

Explain any budget challenges or successes:

Total Revenue: -

Revenue Spent: -

Revenue Balance: -

Of the money disclosed above, what are the appropriate uses of the money:

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

Clean Water Fund

Parks and Trails Fund

How were the funds used to advance the program?

The Restoration Evaluation Program for Legacy Projects concurrently fulfills requirements to conduct restoration evaluations (M.L. 2011, First Special Session, Ch. 6) for projects completed with funds from the Clean Water Fund (M.S. 114D.50) and Parks and Trails Fund (M.S. 85.53).

Output Tables

Acres by Resource Type (Table 1)

Type	Wetland (AP)	Wetland (Final)	Prairie (AP)	Prairie (Final)	Forest (AP)	Forest (Final)	Habitat (AP)	Habitat (Final)	Total Acres (AP)	Total Acres (Final)
Restore	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Easement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enhance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Total Requested Funding by Resource Type (Table 2)

Type	Wetland (AP)	Wetland (Final)	Prairie (AP)	Prairie (Final)	Forest (AP)	Forest (Final)	Habitat (AP)	Habitat (Final)	Total Funding (AP)	Total Funding (Final)
Restore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Acres within each Ecological Section (Table 3)

Type	Metro / Urban (AP)	Metro / Urban (Final)	Forest / Prairie (AP)	Forest / Prairie (Final)	SE Forest (AP)	SE Forest (Final)	Prairie (AP)	Prairie (Final)	N. Forest (AP)	N. Forest (Final)	Total (AP)	Total (Final)
Restore	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protect in Easement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enhance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Total Requested Funding within each Ecological Section (Table 4)

Type	Metro/ Urban (AP)	Metro/ Urban (Final)	Forest / Prairie (AP)	Forest / Prairie (Final)	SE Forest (AP)	SE Forest (Final)	Prairie (AP)	Prairie (Final)	N. Forest (AP)	N. Forest (Final)	Total (AP)	Total (Final)
Restore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enhance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

Explain the success/shortage of acre goals

Outcomes

Parcels

Sign-up Criteria?

No