



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

Restoration Evaluations Laws of Minnesota 2017 Final Report

General Information

Date: 05/27/2026

Project Title: Restoration Evaluations

Funds Recommended: \$150,000

Legislative Citation: ML 2017, Ch. 91, Art. 1, Sec. 2, subd. 6(c)

Appropriation Language: \$150,000 in the first year is to the commissioner of natural resources for a technical evaluation panel to conduct up to fifteen restoration and enhancement 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:

Narrative

Summary of Accomplishments

This program annually evaluates a sample of up to twenty Outdoor Heritage Fund habitat restoration projects, provides a report on the evaluations in accordance with state law and delivers communications on project outcomes and lessons learned in restoration practice. Accomplishments are summarized in the attached 2018 Annual Report. All annual restoration evaluation reports are available:

<http://www.leg.state.mn.us/edocs/edocs.aspx?oclcnumber=823766285> .

The current annual restoration evaluation report and summary of recommendations is available on the program website: <https://www.dnr.state.mn.us/legacy/restoration-evaluation.html>

Process & Methods

Process and methods are described in the Appendix to annual reports "Program Process and Project Evaluations" available on the Legislative Library website:

<http://www.leg.state.mn.us/edocs/edocs.aspx?oclcnumber=823766285>

How did the program address habitats of significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, threatened or endangered species, and/or list targeted species?

How did the program use science-based targeting that leveraged or expanded corridors and complexes, reduced fragmentation, or protected areas in the MN County Biological Survey.

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	\$92,000	\$92,000	\$84,000	-	-	-	\$92,000	\$84,000
Contracts	\$44,000	\$44,000	\$49,000	-	-	-	\$44,000	\$49,000
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Stewardship	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Travel	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	-	-	-	\$2,000	\$2,000
Professional Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Support Services	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	-	-	-	\$10,000	\$10,000
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	-	-	-	\$2,000	\$2,000
Supplies/Materials	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$147,000	-	-	-	\$150,000	\$147,000

Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Amount Spent	Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
Evaluation Specialist	0.55	1.0	\$36,000	-	-	\$36,000
Program Coordinator	0.55	1.0	\$48,000	-	-	\$48,000

Direct Support Services

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

DNR direct and necessary calculator

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:

E. This is not applicable as there was no revenue generated.

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

N/A

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