



## Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council

---

### Laws of Minnesota 2015 Final Report

#### General Information

**Date:** 10/05/2021

**Project Title:** DNR Aquatic Habitat - Phase VII

**Funds Recommended:** \$4,540,000

**Legislative Citation:** ML 2015, First Sp. Session, Ch. 2, Art. 1, Sec. 2, Subd. 5(a)

**Appropriation Language:** \$4,540,000 in the first year is to the commissioner of natural resources to acquire interests in land in fee and permanent conservation easements for aquatic management purposes under Minnesota Statutes, sections 86A.05, subdivision 14, and 97C.02, to acquire interests in land in permanent conservation easements for fish and wildlife habitat under Minnesota Statutes, section 84.66, and to restore and enhance aquatic habitat. Up to \$130,000 is for establishing a monitoring and enforcement fund as approved in the accomplishment plan and subject to Minnesota Statutes, section 97A.056, subdivision 17. A list of proposed land acquisitions and restorations and enhancements must be provided as part of the required accomplishment plan.

#### Manager Information

**Manager's Name:** Martin Jennings

**Title:** Fisheries Habitat Program Manager

**Organization:** Minnesota Department of Natural Resources

**Address:** 500 Lafayette Road

**City:** St Paul, MN 55155

**Email:** martin.jennings@state.mn.us

**Office Number:** 651-259-5176

**Mobile Number:**

**Fax Number:**

**Website:** [http://files.dnr.state.mn.us/fish\\_wildlife/fisheries/habitat/2013\\_fishhabitatplan.pdf](http://files.dnr.state.mn.us/fish_wildlife/fisheries/habitat/2013_fishhabitatplan.pdf)

#### Location Information

**County Location(s):** Crow Wing, Otter Tail, Carver, Douglas, Redwood, Wright, Faribault, Lake, Goodhue, Dakota, Meeker, Becker, Scott, Winona, Hubbard, Cass, Fillmore, Kandiyohi, Pine, Kanabec, St. Louis, Freeborn, Le Sueur, Wabasha, Houston, Itasca, Clay, Mower, Aitkin, Pope, Carlton, Blue Earth and Olmsted.

#### Eco regions in which work will take place:

- Northern Forest
- Forest / Prairie Transition
- Prairie

- Metro / Urban
- Southeast Forest

#### **Activity types:**

- Protect in Easement
- Protect in Fee
- Restore
- Enhance

#### **Priority resources addressed by activity:**

- Prairie
- Forest
- Habitat

## **Narrative**

### **Summary of Accomplishments**

This DNR Aquatic Habitat appropriation used a programmatic approach to achieve prioritized aquatic habitat protection, restoration, and enhancement of lakes and streams across all the LSOHC planning regions. Shoreline protection accomplished with this appropriation consisted of two fee-title acquisitions, nine trout stream easement acquisitions, and three Forest for the Future conservation easements. DNR modified three dams to allow fish passage, restored 21 acres of habitat on three streams, and enhanced 15 acres of stream habitat with this appropriation. Also, habitat enhancement project were completed on 43 Aquatic Management Areas, totaling 850 acres.

### **Process & Methods**

Stream projects were prioritized based on the DNR's Stream habitat Priority List, where projects were ranked based on a number of criteria surrounding support and outcomes. This appropriation funded five stream projects, several of which involved external partners. Individual project details are outlined below.

**Stewart River Restoration:** The Stewart River channel restoration project used Natural Channel Design to restore 4,500 of premier trout stream in Northeastern Minnesota. Historic logging and a berm located in the floodplain had significantly impacted the stream. The project was designed and implemented to create trout habitat including deep pools, overhead cover and abundant spawning gravels. The project also removed the confines of the berm and reconnected the stream with the floodplain. A 100 year flood affected the project just a few years after implementation. Some damage was caused, but the objectives of the projects were still met once repairs were made in 2019 using DNR FAW funding.

**Mission Creek Restoration:** DNR partnered with South St. Louis SWCD to compete this project on Mission Creek. The Mission Creek channel restoration project restored 3150 feet of stream near Duluth, Minnesota. This stream was historically altered and had an in-stream trash rack which affected fish passage and the stability of the stream. The 2012 flood caused the stream to blowout around the trash rack resulting in a highly aggraded and unstable stream. The trash rack was removed and the dimension, pattern and profile of the stream was restored. Additionally, 8.4 miles of the stream was reconnected with the removal of the trash rack. During design, a historic native burial site was discovered just downstream of the project site. This slowed down design as we needed to sort through the risks to artifacts and find a tribal inspector to be onsite during construction. In the end we were able to do the project with oversight from the tribe. No artifacts were discovered during construction. Construction finished in June of 2020.

North Branch of Whitewater River Restoration: This channel restoration project took place within Whitewater State Park in a location that previously had riprap installed on the bank for stabilization. This riprap failed at least two times so a stream restoration was implemented to better address the issues causing the bank erosion. The project utilized toe-wood sodmat to protect the bank and reshaped the channel dimension, pattern and profile based on a nearby stable reference reach. During construction it was found that the bed and bank material were particularly difficult for toe-wood sodmat installation. A unique technique using a trenching bucket was employed to get the toe-wood sod mat installed correctly. Another impact of the bed and bank materials was that it was difficult to get vegetation established. This project had to have additional work done after the original construction was finished. Due to lack of vegetation, a large flood and being in a flashy watershed, some of the stream features were impacted after the flood. Following the damages, the natural pattern that the river laid out was utilized to improve the overall project. The project was replanted with additional straw protection. Since the adjustments were made, the project has been stable and the vegetation is getting established.

Cottonwood River Restoration: DNR partnered with Redwood County to complete this restoration. This project was originally funded to provide fish passage at three dams by modifying the dams to rock arch rapids structures. However during the course of project development, at two of the dam sites, the grantee opted to install riffles along the river corridor to slowly step the river down and to provide more habitat than originally anticipated. Two of the dam sites now have 6-7 riffles and deep pool associated with those riffles. Fish use these pools as is evident by the anglers seen at various riffles. Fish have also been seen passing through the riffles to get upstream. Construction of this project started in February of 2020; that spring construction was put on hold due to high flows and the COVID pandemic. However, as the flows were rising the contractor continued to work. This proved to be an issue when the contractor was unable to finish installing that riffle. As a result, the unfinished structure caused some significant erosion; this lead to additional work at that riffle site for the contractor once flows receded. The COVID-19 pandemic significantly limited the ability of Department staff to provide construction oversight which would likely have avoided the contractor working in rising flows. Construction of the projects were finished in fall of 2020. Overall the project accomplished the goals of fish passage and has the added benefit of additional habitat along the river corridor.

Driftless Area Habitat Enhancement: The DNR's Fisheries Construction crew used this appropriation to purchase rock and equipment rental to enhance 15 acres of stream habitat in the Driftless Area of Minnesota.

Shoreline protection accomplished with this appropriation consisted of two fee-title acquisitions, nine trout stream easement acquisitions, and three Forest for the Future conservation easements. The two fee-title acquisitions protected 52 acres and 4,825 feet of undeveloped shoreline . All nine trout stream easement acquisitions were in the SE Forest Ecological Section. Two easement acquisitions were initiated in the Northern Forest Section, but neither was successfully concluded. The nine trout stream easements protect a total of 132 acres and 31,150 feet of stream. The Forest for the Future project prioritized protecting forests in high priority cisco lake watersheds. With this project, one 32 acre easement was purchased in the Kabekona watershed (Hubbard County), 122 acres in the Ten Mile lake watershed (Cass County), and 193 acres in the Pelican watershed in Crow Wing County. Two large easement acquisitions were not completed when the landowners chose not to accept the DNR offer. These acquisitions were scheduled to be completed close to the end of the appropriation availability and we did not have enough time to move on to other parcels. Therefore, we did not meet goals for easement acquisition and funds were returned to the Council.

## **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?**

Acquisition of easements and fee title AMA's targeted waters with high value fisheries. Trout streams in SE and NE Minnesota support important fisheries, and the riparian habitats protected support numerous wildlife species. Lakes in the north-central forest region support diverse fisheries including walleye, bass, northern pike, muskellunge and panfish. Lakes targeted for watershed protection included coldwater fisheries (lake trout or cisco). Fishery quality was an important criterion in the prioritization process. High quality lakes in the region also support sensitive non-game fish species. Restoration of fish passage benefited multiple fish species by providing access to habitat for all life stages, including spawning areas and benefitting fisheries upstream and downstream of passage projects. Stream channel enhancement work stabilized channels and provided habitat benefits including improved water quality for diverse fish communities.

## **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.**

All work was part of a programmatic approach to aquatic conservation in Minnesota. The prioritization framework for acquisition in the north central forested region of the state was described in the MN DNR Fish Habitat Plan. Trout stream easement acquisition was based on fishery quality and the potential to connect existing easements. Stream restoration and enhancement projects were prioritized by MN DNR EWR and FAW Division staff.

## **Explain Partners, Supporters, & Opposition**

Partners for the Stewart River Restoration project included Lake County SWCD and Trout Unlimited.

South St. Louis SWCD partnered with DNR on the Mission Creek Restoration project.

For the Cottonwood River Restoration project, DNR partnered with Redwood County, the City of Sanborn, and Farmer's Golf and Health Club.

For the Driftless Area Habitat Enhancement project, DNR worked with many private landowners with conservation easements to enhance trout stream habitat.

Our stream restoration coordinator and stream habitat specialists worked with many other local and state partners to develop future restoration and enhancement projects.

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

The scope of the Cottonwood River Restoration project expanded after design started. Including additional habitat features in this project created some design challenges. However, anglers are already using the additional pools that were constructed for this project, suggesting that fish are relating to these habitat features.

During construction of the North Branch of the Whitewater River project, it was found that the bed and bank material were particularly difficult for toe-wood sodmat installation. A unique technique using a trenching bucket was employed to get the toe-wood sod mat installed correctly. The hard bed and bank material also made it difficult to establish vegetation in the restored reach and floods caused some impacts to the project. Adjustments have been made to the project and the stream has been stable since vegetation became established. We will continue to monitor this site.

## What other fund may contribute to this program?

- Clean Water Fund
- Other : Game and Fish funds

## How were the funds used to advance the program?

Work funded by LSOHC and by the Clean Water Fund (CWF) protects and restores aquatic habitat. Clean water is a component of fish habitat. Water quality variables such as oxygen determine suitability for fish. Sedimentation directly changes substrate composition, and determines aquatic plant species composition and extent of growth. Section of Fisheries involvement in the CWF Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies (WRAPS) process helps identify projects eligible for CWF. CWF supports DNR Section of Fisheries monitoring using biological indicators, which are used to track condition of aquatic communities and are part of the evaluation for success of LSOHC funded projects. CWF supported projects restore connectivity, enhance stream channel stability, and restore natural hydrographs. Both funds contribute to sustainable fisheries. CWF complemented, but did not directly leverage this proposal.

Clean Water Funds were utilized for the following project in this appropriation:

Stewart River Restoration: \$54,750

Game and Fish contributed funds directly to the following projects in this appropriation:

Stewart River Restoration: \$260,000

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

Once construction is completed and vegetation is established, stream habitat projects generally do not require ongoing maintenance. DNR has multiple sources of funding that could be used for this purpose, should it arise. These include the Game and Fish Fund, Heritage Enhancement account, and Trout Stamp revenue. AMA enhancement of vegetation often has a limited duration of benefit. Prescribed burns or control of invasive plants may need to be done every 3-5 years to maintain their full benefit. DNR will continue to spend funds from internal sources, but may also make future requests to use OHF money to repeat these actions on the same parcel.

## Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes

Year	Source of Funds	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
2022	Combination of DNR Game and Fish funds and OHF	Evaluate AMA Enhancement Projects for invasive plants	Develop or modify management plan	Prescribed burn or control of invasive plants
2025	Combination of DNR Game and Fish funds and OHF	Monitor effectiveness of stream restoration projects	Determine whether adjustments or maintenance is needed	Complete adjustments as needed

## Budget

### Totals

Item	Requested	AP Amount	Spent	Antic. Leverage	Received Leverage	Leverage Source	Original Total	Final Total
Personnel	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$74,500	-	-	-	\$75,000	\$74,500
Contracts	\$2,170,000	\$2,246,100	\$2,459,300	-	\$348,500	Sustain Our Great Lakes and BWSR Flood Assistance	\$2,170,000	\$2,807,800
Fee Acquisition w/ PILT	\$290,000	\$290,000	\$224,000	-	-	-	\$290,000	\$224,000
Fee Acquisition w/o PILT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Easement Acquisition	\$1,230,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,155,400	-	-	-	\$1,230,000	\$1,155,400
Easement Stewardship	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$130,000	-	-	-	\$130,000	\$130,000
Travel	\$10,000	\$75,000	\$60,000	-	-	-	\$10,000	\$60,000
Professional Services	\$213,000	\$283,000	\$235,400	-	\$56,600	South St. Louis SWCD general fund	\$213,000	\$292,000
Direct Support Services	\$182,000	\$65,900	\$65,700	-	-	-	\$182,000	\$65,700
DNR Land Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Equipment/Tools	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supplies/Materials	\$240,000	\$175,000	\$77,100	-	-	-	\$240,000	\$77,100
DNR IDP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$4,540,000</b>	<b>\$4,540,000</b>	<b>\$4,481,400</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$405,100</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$4,540,000</b>	<b>\$4,886,500</b>

### Personnel

Position	Annual FTE	Years Working	Funding Request	Antic. Leverage	Leverage Source	Total
AMA enhancement contracting	0.5	2.0	\$74,500	-	-	\$74,500

## 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 calculates the fair share to pay for support costs directly related to and necessary for the appropriation.

**Explain any budget challenges or successes:**

The most significant budget challenge with this appropriation was having two large easement acquisitions not completed when landowners changed their mind just prior to the end of funding availability. Going forward, we are working hard to move these acquisitions more quickly so we don't face these same issues.

Stream restoration projects are difficult to time with each appropriation due to unanticipated design and permitting challenges. However, we have successfully moved projects to different appropriations when needed.

**Total Revenue: \$0**

**Revenue Spent: \$0**

**Revenue Balance: \$0**

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

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

## 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	8	22	8	22
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	52	34	52
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	490	347	82	132	572	479
Enhance	0	0	200	330	0	0	437	535	637	865
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>490</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>561</b>	<b>741</b>	<b>1,251</b>	<b>1,418</b>

### 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	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$1,824,000	\$2,306,700	\$1,824,000	\$2,306,700
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$347,000	\$256,800	\$347,000	\$256,800
Protect in Fee w/o State PILT Liability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protect in Easement	-	-	-	-	\$936,000	\$1,154,600	\$625,000	\$334,700	\$1,561,000	\$1,489,300
Enhance	-	-	\$83,000	\$127,500	-	-	\$725,000	\$301,100	\$808,000	\$428,600
<b>Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$83,000</b>	<b>\$127,500</b>	<b>\$936,000</b>	<b>\$1,154,600</b>	<b>\$3,521,000</b>	<b>\$3,199,300</b>	<b>\$4,540,000</b>	<b>\$4,481,400</b>

### 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	1	1	1	7	20	8	22
Protect in Fee with State PILT Liability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	52	34	52



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	42	132	0	0	530	347	572	479
Enhance	65	194	125	163	52	116	240	231	155	161	637	865
<b>Total</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>726</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>1,251</b>	<b>1,418</b>

### 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)
Restor e	-	-	-	-	-	\$344,800	\$1,282,000	\$627,100	\$542,000	\$1,334,800	\$1,824,000	\$2,306,700
Protec t in Fee with State PILT Liabili ty	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$347,000	\$256,800	\$347,000	\$256,800
Protec t in Fee w/o State PILT Liabili ty	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Protec t in Easem ent	-	-	-	-	\$335,000	\$334,700	-	-	\$1,226,000	\$1,154,600	\$1,561,000	\$1,489,300
Enhan ce	\$35,000	\$92,300	\$68,000	\$44,600	\$135,000	\$159,300	\$129,000	\$94,000	\$441,000	\$38,400	\$808,000	\$428,600
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$35,000</b>	<b>\$92,300</b>	<b>\$68,000</b>	<b>\$44,600</b>	<b>\$470,000</b>	<b>\$838,800</b>	<b>\$1,411,000</b>	<b>\$721,100</b>	<b>\$2,556,000</b>	<b>\$2,784,600</b>	<b>\$4,540,000</b>	<b>\$4,481,400</b>

### Target Lake/Stream/River Feet or Miles

7

### Outcomes

#### Programs in forest-prairie transition region:

- Other ~ *Surveys of AMAs will help us to see benefits to riparian habitat.*

#### Programs in metropolitan urbanizing region:

- Other ~ *Surveys of AMAs will help us to see benefits to riparian habitat.*

#### Programs in the northern forest region:

- Other ~ *Surveys of AMAs will help us to see benefits to riparian habitat.*

### Programs in prairie region:

- Other ~ *Future fish surveys of Cottonwood River will detect any changes from restored fish passage. Surveys of AMAs will help us to see benefits to riparian habitat.*

### Programs in southeast forest region:

- Rivers, streams, and surrounding vegetation provide corridors of habitat ~ *Surveys of AMAs will help us to see benefits to riparian habitat.*

## Parcels

### Sign-up Criteria?

[Yes](#)

### Restore / Enhance Parcels


Name	County	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection
Glacier Lake AMA	Aitkin	05023226	2	\$1,218	Yes
Long Lake AMA	Becker	13941231	1	\$1,044	Yes
Upper Cormorant AMA	Becker	13843205	1	\$1,044	Yes
Bucks Mill AMA	Becker	13842236	17	\$3,290	Yes
Ida Lake AMA	Blue Earth	10528212	15	\$5,500	Yes
Little Otter Creek AMA	Carlton	04817207	11	\$2,500	Yes
Lotus Lake AMA	Carver	11623201	6	\$3,080	Yes
Silver Lake AMA	Clay	13945226	1	\$2,110	Yes
Silver Lake AMA	Clay	13945225	4	\$575	Yes
North Long Lake AMA	Crow Wing	13428204	21	\$3,804	Yes
Bertha Moody AMA	Crow Wing	13528232	26	\$3,840	Yes
Vermillion River AMA	Dakota	11418220	65	\$6,146	Yes
S. Branch Vermillion River AMA	Dakota	11418229	79	\$49,118	Yes
Geneva Lake AMA	Douglas	12837216	2	\$2,164	Yes
Bliss AMA	Douglas	13037221	13	\$4,933	Yes
Miltona Lake AMA	Douglas	13037232	112	\$19,124	Yes
Blue Earth River AMA	Faribault	10428221	38	\$8,900	Yes
Duschee Creek	Fillmore	10310236	1	\$10,000	Yes
South Branch Root River	Fillmore	10310221	3	\$19,000	Yes
Lost Creek	Fillmore	10411218	1	\$12,000	Yes
Gribben Creek	Fillmore	10309228	1	\$12,000	Yes
Little Jordan Creek	Fillmore	10412227	1	\$2,000	Yes
Rice Creek	Fillmore	10411223	4	\$17,000	Yes
Etna Creek AMA	Fillmore	10213236	43	\$5,435	Yes
Juglans Woods AMA	Freeborn	10221225	46	\$2,100	Yes
Gemini AMA	Goodhue	11217207	37	\$32,100	Yes
Winnebago Creek	Houston	10105216	3	\$18,000	Yes
Bender Lake AMA	Itasca	15028210	2	\$1,000	Yes
Little Knife AMA	Kanabec	04424228	17	\$1,200	Yes
Games Lake AMA	Kandiyohi	12235232	32	\$1,260	Yes
Elizabeth Lake AMA	Kandiyohi	11833203	9	\$11,959	Yes
Middle Lake AMA	Kandiyohi	13941231	7	\$24	Yes
Stewart River Restoration	Lake	05311215	8	\$409,500	Yes
Francis Lake AMA	Le Sueur	10924235	7	\$4,275	Yes
St. Peter AMA	Le Sueur	11026214	4	\$6,100	Yes
Minniebelle Lake AMA	Meeker	11831212	4	\$3,900	Yes
N Fork Crow River AMA	Meeker	12132235	9	\$8,504	Yes
Thompson Lake AMA	Meeker	11732217	17	\$1,500	Yes
Jennie Lake AMA	Meeker	11829233	2	\$200	Yes
Cedar River AMA	Mower	10218215	2	\$4,246	Yes
North Branch Root River	Olmsted	10512221	1	\$17,000	Yes
Eagle Lake AMA	Otter Tail	13140215	3	\$989	Yes
Dead River-Walker Lake AMA	Otter Tail	13440202	13	\$4,467	Yes
Barnes Springs AMA	Pine	04118212	25	\$9,000	Yes
Glenwood Headquarters AMA enhancement	Pope	12538202	30	\$16,500	Yes
Sanborn AMA	Redwood	03627228	7	\$800	Yes
Cottonwood R. Dam removals	Redwood	10936226	1	\$900,000	Yes
Eagle Creek AMA	Scott	11521218	44	\$13,946	Yes
Donna Lake AMA	St. Louis	05412201	1	\$400	Yes

Mission Creek restoration	St. Louis	04815208	12	\$1,200,000	Yes
French R Headquarters AMA	St. Louis	05213209	42	\$5,640	Yes
Lester River AMA	St. Louis	05114201	14	\$3,580	Yes
Miller Creek AMA	Wabasha	11112209	17	\$6,873	Yes
Rush Creek	Winona	10508220	5	\$15,000	Yes
Middle Branch Whitewater River	Winona	10710220	1	\$87,500	Yes
Coolridge AMA	Winona	10509223	4	\$4,200	Yes
Ramsey Lake AMA	Wright	12026218	1	\$4,700	Yes

## Protect Parcels

Name	County	TRDS	Acres	Est Cost	Existing Protection
McGill (Ten Mile Lake)	Cass	14031208	121	\$181,000	No
Little Pelican Lake AMA	Crow Wing	13628228	33	\$44,000	No
Pelican Lake Elks Camp	Crow Wing	13528202	193	\$289,000	No
Wisel Creek	Fillmore	10108205	1	\$5,000	No
Wisel Creek	Fillmore	10108206	1	\$10,000	No
Winnebago Creek	Houston	10105224	61	\$290,000	No
Thompson Creek	Houston	10108206	11	\$70,000	No
Winnebago Creek	Houston	10105223	12	\$140,000	No
West Beaver Creek	Houston	10206219	19	\$125,000	No
Lower Bottle Lake AMA	Hubbard	14134214	19	\$150,000	No
Anderson Trust (Kabekona watershed)	Hubbard	14332205	34	\$51,000	No
Garvin Brook	Winona	10708233	1	\$10,000	No
Garvin Brook	Winona	10708233	3	\$95,000	No
Garvin Brook	Winona	10608204	1	\$5,000	No





- Protect in Easement
- ▲ Protect in Fee with PILT
- Protect in Fee W/O PILT
- ★ Restore
- ✕ Enhance
- ⊕ Other

**Parcel Map**  
**DNR Aquatic Habitat - Phase VII**  
**(Data Generated From Parcel List)**