

Conservation Partners Legacy Grants - Online Applications

Jamie Gangaware

Admin

[List Applications](#)

[Summary Spreadsheet](#)

[Log Out](#)

Project Summary Project Info Site Info Budget Info Review & Approval Additional Info Application Submission

Project Summary

Project Name and Contact

Project Name:	Mixed Hardwood/Conifer Restoration #2	Project Manager:	Nathan Eide
		Title:	GIS Specialist/Forester
		Phone:	218-834-8340
Organization Name:	Lake County Forestry	Email:	nate.eide@co.lake.mn.us
Organization Type:	Government		
Mailing Address 1:	601 3rd Ave		
Mailing Address 2:			
City:	Two Harbors		
State:	MN		
Zip Code:	55616		

Project Location Summary

Primary County:	Lake	Secondary Land
Nearest City:	Two Harbors	Ownerships:
Project Site Name:	Mink Creek	
Primary Land Ownership:	County	

Project Activity Summary

Primary Activity:	Restoration	Primary Habitat Type:	Forest
Additional Activities:		Additional Habitats:	
Total Project Sites:	220		
Total Project Acres:	220		

Project Funding Summary

Total Grant Amount Requested:	\$81,518
Total Match Amount Pledged:	\$8,700
Additional Funding:	
Total Project Cost:	\$90,218
Estimated Project Completion Date:	2013-07-15

Summary

Lake County Forestry is seeking \$81,518 grant dollars to assist in the restoration of 220 off-site aspen acres, divided into five stands, to a mature mixed hardwood and conifer forest. This grant has the same goal as a previous grant Lake County was awarded. This grant will continue the successes and create a larger area of beneficial habitat. A mixture of spruce, pine and tamarack will be planted, protected and released in this area with a goal of retaining as much hardwood as possible. This grant will fund tree planting site preparation, tree seedlings, seedling planting, seedling protection, and seedling release. The resulting stands of trees will include a mixture of trees that benefits many wildlife species and restores a habitat type once fairly common in the North Shore area.

Problem Statement

The region these stands are located in is known for poor quality aspen. According to a Range of

Natural Variation study, these aspen stands are in a sugar maple, mesic white/red pine, or lowland conifer area. Much of the area is classed as a Mesic Hardwood Native Plant Community. Assumedly, past silviculture and/or cultural activities resulted in the establishment of aspen. The resulting aspen stands are poor quality with high incidences of disease. Therefore, this area has been determined by Lake County Forestry as an area to promote species other than aspen. It is also a goal of Lake County Forestry to re-establish conifer species on the landscape. Combining what we know about this area and working in conjunction with DNR non-game wildlife and wildlife division, Lake County Forestry has set goals for the eastern half of Township 55, Range 10 and western half of Township 55, Range 9. Specifically the goals for this area are to move towards a mature mixed hardwood and conifer forest. The stands were harvested within the last three years. All of the stands were included on a previous grant from Lake County and The Nature Conservancy, but failed to receive funding. Typical to the rest of the country, Lake County Forestry has seen a drastic decrease in timber revenue compared with the last five years' average. Because of the financial situation, we have suspended all forest regeneration activities. Without grant money we will not be planting any trees next spring. By receiving grant money we will be able to continue our reforestation and benefit wildlife by restoring habitat to its natural state.

Project Objectives

This project's goal is to have a mixed hardwood and conifer forest. By restoring conifer on the landscape, certain wildlife species will be benefited by restoring habitat that was present in pre-settlement days. A mixed coniferous mature forest provides multiple benefits for many species. Conifer provides thermal cover for deer and moose. Mature trees provide nesting habitat for many bird species. Because this entire area will be managed similarly, a large contiguous area of public land will provide the necessary habitat for species such as the Northern Goshawk, a species of greatest conservation need. Once the conifer trees have been established, a forest inventory will be conducted to measure the number of surviving planted trees as well as natural regenerating trees.

Methods

This project's activities are standard reforestation practices. To create a good planting base and clear debris, a skidder mounted disc trencher will be used to create trenches. Trees will then be planted in the spring of 2011 at 450 trees per acre. 450 trees per acres is lower than a standard planting. This is to create a greater mixture of conifer and hardwood species. The following fall of 2011, the newly planted pine trees will be bud capped to protect from browsing. Deer densities are high in this area necessitating pine trees to be bud capped. Spruce trees are unsusceptible to deer browse and do not require bud caps. In the fall of 2012, a second round of bud caps will be applied. In the spring of 2013, the trees will be released by hand to reduce competition. In Lake County, herbicide is typically used for competition release. Hand release will be used in this case to keep the hardwood component intact. All of the work will be done on a contract basis.

Project Timeline

Time Frame	Goal
Early Spring 2011	Disc Trench
Late Spring 2011	Plant Trees
Fall 2011	Bud Cap
Fall 2012	Bud Cap
Summer 2013	Hand Release

Identify short and long term maintenance and management work required to sustain this project and source(s) of funding

Work needed	Who is responsible	Funding source
Monitor	Lake County Forestry	Lake County Forestry
Maintanance	Lake County Forestry	Lake County Forestry

Conservation Partners Legacy Grants - Online Applications

Jamie Gangaware

Admin

[List Applications](#)

[Summary Spreadsheet](#)

[Log Out](#)

Project Summary

Project Info

Site Info

Budget Info

Review & Approval

Additional Info

Application Submission

Project Information

Answer each of the following questions in 1000 characters or less; descriptions/definitions are available in the [Criteria and Scoring Table](#).

1. Describe the local support for this project.

Lake County has met with local DNR wildlife staff to identify the benefits of a mixed conifer and hardwood habitat type. The DNR is very supportive of the project and had input in the planning.

2. Describe the degree of collaboration for this project.

Along with the collaboration of local DNR wildlife, this project also aligns with efforts from The Nature Conservancy who also has a goal to increase conifer on the landscape.

3. Describe any urgency associated with this project.

Part of the urgency of this project relates to our budget shortfall. To meet reforestation needs, we plant trees every year. Without grant funding next spring, we will be unable to plant. The other part of the urgency relates to site conditions. Because the stand was harvested, pioneer species will soon be establishing themselves. If these pioneer species become too established, planting efforts are hindered. It is best to have trees planted before the competition becomes too great.

4. Discuss if there are multiple benefits resulting from your project, identifying those species, habitats, etc.

From the meeting with the DNR, it was discovered that a mixed coniferous/hardwood mature forest provides multiple benefits for many species. Conifer provides thermal cover for deer and moose. Mature trees provide nesting habitat for many bird species. Because this entire area will be managed similarly, a large contiguous area of public land will provide the necessary habitat for species such as the Northern Goshawk, a species of greatest conservation need.

5. Discuss the habitat benefits resulting from your project.

The stands are located in a fairly contiguous segment of public land. The area contains approximately 38,000 acres of public land, 5,000 of which are DNR managed land. The entire area will be managed with restoring conifer and maintaining a patchwork of mature forest as a main goal. This large block of land will provide quality unfragmented habitat that was once common on the landscape.

6. Describe how your project is consistent with sound conservation science.

Without intervention, these stands will grow back to the same low quality aspen that was harvested. Many sources and landscape plans suggest restoring conifer to Northeastern Minnesota. By planting conifer in this area, we will be restoring a critical habitat type. Having a mixed stand of trees is important for many wildlife species. Also, by having a mixed stand of trees, any disease that comes through affecting a species of trees will have less impact because other tree species will remain.

7. Indicate if your project is adjacent to protected lands, describing those lands (ownership, public access, etc.)

The project is in an area of approximately 38,000 acres of DNR and County land. This project fits with the goal of the surrounding area to increase the conifer component amongst a hardwood coverytype. Public access is very good with a highway bisecting the area.

8. Discuss if there is full funding secured for this project and the sources of funding.

Staff time as well as money for the match is available.

9. Discuss if CPL Grant funds will supplement or supplant existing funding. Discuss how these CPL funds will impact your organization's current budget.

The only way this project will get done is with grant dollars. Because of budget limitations, no projects such as these are planned within the budget. We do, however, have funds to administer the project as well as funds to meet the match criteria.

10. Describe public access at project site for hunting and fishing, identifying all open seasons.

This project is entirely on public land is open to the public for all hunting and fishing as well as other recreational activities. A main road bisects the project area giving very good access for hunting and recreational activities.

11. Describe the sustainability of your project.

The project will be sustained through monitoring and maintenance. Tree plantings are regularly monitored for survival and competition. If survival is low, a plantation will be replanted. If competition is high, a release process will be applied.

12. Discuss use of native vegetation (if applicable).

We will be using native tree species grown in similar climates.

13. Discuss your budget and why it is cost effective.

Because work done for this project is contract based, we award the contracts to the lowest bidder. The work done for this project is standard reforestation practices and proven to be cost effective. The trees for this project are purchased from tree nurseries that have proven to have quality stock with acceptable survival.

14. Describe your organization's ability to successfully complete this work, including experience in the area of interest and ability to successfully implement the proposed project. Include descriptions of your most recent grant experience and if the expected outcomes were achieved.

Lake County Forestry has been managing forest land for 30 years. Lake County forester have been involved with reforestation each year and have had much success. Our experience and expertise has proven itself with many successful reforestation project. We also were recently awarded a Conservation Partners Legacy grant for a similar reforestation/restoration project which to date has been very successful.

15. Discuss how your project supports landscape level plans. Use additional sources for information if needed or available.

The project fits very nicely with other landscape goals. For example, as stated in Tomorrow's Habitat for the Wild and Rare: An Action Plan for Minnesota Wildlife (MNDNR, 2006), one of key habitats is upland coniferous red-white pine forests. The Northeast Regional Landscape Committee plan also lists moving towards the range of variability as goal.

16. Discuss how your project supports species plans. Use additional sources for information if needed or available.

A mixed coniferous mature forest provides multiple benefits for many species. Conifer provides thermal cover for deer and moose. Mature trees provide nesting habitat for many bird species. Because this entire area will be managed similarly, a large contiguous area of public land will provide the necessary habitat for species such as the Northern Goshawk, a species of greatest conservation need.

17. Discuss how your project conforms to the Statewide Conservation and Preservation Plan.

Aligning with the Minnesota Statewide Conservation and Preservation Plan recommendations, this land will always remain a large block of public land. Lake County Forestry's goal is to maintain large blocks of public land to avoid fragmentation.

18. Discuss how your project conforms to the State Wildlife Action Plan (if applicable).

This project conforms to the State Wildlife Action Plan by mimicking a large disturbance through the timber harvest. It also conforms by introducing conifer.

Conservation Partners Legacy Grants - Online Applications

Jamie Gangaware

Admin

[List Applications](#)

[Summary Spreadsheet](#)

[Log Out](#)

Project Summary

Project Info

Site Info

Budget Info

Review & Approval

Additional Info

Application Submission

Site Information

*you may group your project sites together as long as land ownership, activity and habitat information is the same for the land manager

Land Manager

Name:

Bill Nixon

Phone:

218-834-8340

Organization:

Lake County Forestry

Email:

tom.martinson@co.lake.mn.us

Title:

**Assistant Land
Commissioner**

Site Information

Land Ownership:

County

Acres:

220

Site Name(s):

Mink Creek



Click here to [View Site Map](#)

Activity:

Restoration

Habitat:

Forest



CPL FY11-064
Mixed Hardwood/Conifer Restoration #2
Lake County Forestry
Lake County
LSOHC Northern Forest Planning Section



Conservation Partners Legacy Grants - Online Applications

Jamie Gangaware

Admin

[List Applications](#)

[Summary Spreadsheet](#)

[Log Out](#)

Project Summary

Project Info

Site Info

Budget Info

Review & Approval

Additional Info

Application Submission

Budget Information

Organization's Fiscal Contact Information

Name:	Steve McMahon	Street Address 1:	601 3rd Ave
Title:	County Auditor	Street Address 2:	
Email:	steve.mcmahon@co.lake.mn.us	City:	Two Harbors
Phone:	218-834-8316	State:	MN
		Zip Code:	55616

Budget Subtotals

Budget Item	Grant	Match	Total		
Personnel		\$2,700	\$2,700		
Contracts	\$57,318	\$6,000	\$63,318		
Fee Acquisition with PILT					
Fee Acquisition without PILT					
Easement Acquisition					
Easement Stewardship				In-kind Total	Cash Total
Travel (in-state)				\$2,700	\$6,000
Professional Services					
DNR Land Acquisition Cost					
Equipment/Tools/Supplies	\$24,200		\$24,200		
Additional Budget Items					
Total:	\$81,518	\$8,700	\$90,218		

Details

Personnel

Name	Title / work to be completed	Amount	Grant/Match	In-kind/Cash
Lake County Foresters	Adminster Contracts	\$2,700	Match	In-kind
Totals	Grant: \$0 Match: \$2,700	Total: \$2,700		

Contracts

Contractor Name	Contracted Work	Amount	Grant/Match	In-kind/Cash
Awarded by bid	Planting Site Preparation	\$22,000	Grant	
Awarded by bid	Seedling Protection	\$2,159	Grant	
Awarded by bid	Tree Planting	\$15,400	Grant	
Awarded by bid	Tree Release	\$15,600	Grant	
Awarded by bid	Seedling Protection	\$2,159	Grant	
Awarded by bid	Seedling Protection	\$3,000	Match	Cash
Awarded by bid	Seedling Protection	\$3,000	Match	Cash
Totals	Grant: \$57,318 Match: \$6,000	Total: \$63,318		

Equipment/Tools/Supplies

Item	Purpose	Amount	Grant/Match	In-kind/Cash
Tree Seedlings	Plant	\$24,200	Grant	
Totals	Grant: \$24,200 Match: \$0	Total: \$24,200		

Conservation Partners Legacy Grants - Online Applications


Jamie Gangaware

Admin

[List Applications](#)

[Summary Spreadsheet](#)

[Log Out](#)


 Project Summary


 Project Info

 Site Info

 Budget Info

 **Review & Approval**

 Additional Info

 Application Submission

Project Review and Approval

A Project Review and Approval Form must be completed by each Land Manager named within the Site Info tab and Land Managers only need to complete one form for all sites they manage. Submitting this form fulfills the following requirements:

- Provides the results of the Natural Heritage Database Review,
- Allows for technical review of the project by the Land Manager, and
- Verifies that the public agency approves the work to be done (or acquisition) on land they manage.

You, as the applicant, are responsible for meeting with the Land Manager and receiving a completed Project Review and Approval Form. This form must contain an original signature from the Land Manager and you must upload it below as a PDF.

Each project will require at least one Project Review and Approval form. You may attach up to 4 forms on this page, but if you need more room you may attach up to three more on the "Additional Info" tab. If your project is working under 3 Land Managers, you must receive and submit a form from each manager.

No late Project Review and Approval Forms will be accepted. Applications lacking any necessary approval forms will be deemed incomplete and not considered for funding.

Answer the following questions, then attach the form(s)

No **Natural Heritage** elements were found within my project site(s):

Project Review and Approval Forms

[Uploaded Form 1](#)

CPL Project Review and Approval Form

REVIEWER INFORMATION:

Land manager/ easement holder name:	Bill Nixon
Agency:	Lake County Forestry
Title:	Assistant Land Commissioner
Phone:	218-834-8340
Email:	bill.nixon@co.lake.mn.us

PROJECT INFORMATION:


Project Name:	Mixed Hardwood/Conifer Restoration #2
Contact Person:	Nate Eide
Organization:	Lake County Forestry
Email:	nate.eide@co.lake.mn.us

Please check the appropriate boxes:

- I have read the application and discussed this proposed project with the above listed Organization Contact Person.
 For work on easements, the private landowner has been contacted and has given support and approval for this project.

I have performed a Natural Heritage Database review and found:

- this project to have no features within one mile.
 this project to have features within one mile, but project is not likely to adversely affect those features. I have listed the features below and recommended the following minimization strategy:

 for species occurrence and avoid impact Species is very wide spread across ownership for species occurrence and avoid impact
--

- this project is likely to adversely affect Natural Heritage features. I feel that this project is important and should be forwarded to DNR Ecological Resources staff for further review.

I do not have access to the Natural Features database and will forward this completed form to DNR by Friday, August 27th 2010 to CPL Staff at LSCPLGrants.DNR@state.mn.us to complete the Natural Heritage Review.

I have discussed what role my office will be expected to have in this project and find that the project, as described will require:

- minimal or no involvement from my office for completion.
 a commitment of involvement by staff that is reasonable and can be accomplished with current staffing levels and workload.
 an amount of staff involvement that cannot be committed during the project time period with current staffing levels. Unless additional staffing can be committed from other offices, Divisions or appropriate partners, I feel this project cannot be completed within the project timeline to our desired standards.

I have discussed permits and applications that the applicant may be responsible for using the Working on DNR Lands and Working on Public Lands, or Working on Private Lands documents.

CPL Project Review and Approval Form

For Acquisitions Only:

- This project is for an acquisition to be transferred to a public agency by applicant:
- I have discussed any required Initial Development (facilities, habitat, etc.) work that is required before the transfer with the applicant.
 - I have discussed all applicable costs of those developments and what party is responsible for those costs.

Complete the following cost tables (required work to bring to agency standards).

Habitat Development	# Acres	Cost/ Acre	Total	Funding Source	Applicant is responsible for:
Prairie Grassland					Choose
Forest/ Woody Cover					Choose
Wetland					Choose
Totals					

Facility Development	Cost	Funding Source	Applicant is responsible for:
Boundary Survey			Choose
Posting/ Fencing			Choose
Wood Routed Sign			Choose
Access Roads and Trails			Choose
User Facilities, Access, Parking Lots			Choose
Well Sealing/ Site Clean-up			Choose
Total			

Upon final review of this project:

- I find this project to be consistent with sound conservation science. This work will benefit area fish, game and wildlife by restoring, enhancing or protecting forests, wetlands, prairies and habitat and is consistent with the management or stewardship plan for this land. (APPROVAL)
- I find that this project does not follow the management or stewardship plan for this land and does not fit within the long range goals for this land at this time on the local level. (DECLINE)
- I find that this project should be sent up to a higher level within the agency for further review and decision. I have forwarded the Project Planning Form and this Review and Approval Form for further review to:

Name:	Phone:
-------	--------

By checking this box and signing my name below I certify that I have met with the above applicant and discussed the proposed project and have provided feedback to the applicant. I understand I must provide this document as a PDF with my original signature on it to the applicant to submit a complete application.

Name: _____

Date: _____

9/18/2010

Comments:

Conservation Partners Legacy Grants - Online Applications

Jamie Gangaware

Admin

[List Applications](#)

[Summary Spreadsheet](#)

[Log Out](#)

Project Summary

Project Info

Site Info

Budget Info

Review & Approval

Additional Info

Application Submission

Additional Information

List any additional details about your project here. Include your organization's history or charter to receive private contributions for local conservation or habitat projects. This is not required.

Supplemental Documents

If you / your project does not need to upload any of these documents, you may leave these upload boxes empty.

Upload additional information here, limited to Partner Commitment Letters, Letters of Support, Easement information, etc. You may email easement information only if it exceeds size limit while trying to submit the application; all other supporting documentation must be uploaded. Reference CPL Application # and name when emailing (provided upon application submission) or your email will be returned. Send emails to LSCPLGrants.DNR@state.mn.us

Conservation Partners Legacy Grants - Online Applications

Jamie Gangaware

Admin

[List Applications](#)

[Summary Spreadsheet](#)

[Log Out](#)

Project Summary

Project Info

Site Info

Budget Info

Review & Approval

Additional Info

Application Submission

Final Application Submission

This completes your CPL Grant Application. Please take the time to revisit the previous sections and make sure you have entered everything completely and correctly. Once you hit the submit button below, you will not be able to return to this application to make changes.

I certify that I have read the Conservation Partners Legacy Grants Program Request for Proposal, Program Manual and other program documents, and have discussed this project with the appropriate public land manager, or private landowner and easement holder.

I certify I am authorized to apply for and manage these grant and match funds, and the project work by the organization or agency listed below. I certify this organization to have the financial capability to compete this project and that it will comply with all applicable laws and regulations.

I certify that all of the information contained in the application is correct as of the time of the submission. If anything should change, I will contact CPL Grant Staff immediately to make corrections.

I certify that if funded I will give consideration to and make timely written contact to Minnesota Conservation Corps or its successor for consideration of possible use of their services to contract for restoration and enhancement services. I will provide CPL staff a copy of that written contact within 10 days after the execution of my grant, should I be awarded.

I certify that I am aware at least one Project Review and Approval form is required for every application and I must submit all completed forms by uploading them into this application. I have attached one form as necessary for each different Land Manager within my project.

I am aware that by typing my name in the box below, I am applying my signature to this online document.

Signature:

Nathan Eide

Organization / Agency:

Lake County Forestry

Title:

**GIS Specialist /
Forester**

Date:

2010-09-16

Proj ID	Organization Name	Project Name	Technical Review Committee Scoring Comments	Amount Requested	Score	Technical Review Committee Final Rank Comments	Regional Comments	Meets Regional Plan?	Rank	Region	Division Director's Comments
64	Lake County Forestry	Mixed Hardwood/Conifer Restoration #2	Update from last's project, relationship? (different sites than what was funded last yr, grantee is making good progress) Any use of cedar? (no, likely because deer clobber it) same work as last year. Where is the hardwood planting--only see conifers. Cost looks reasonable for project--all encompassing.	\$81,518	140	Should this be approved while last year's is still in progress? Not many other projects in this area.		Y		2	Silviculture is being used to plan this. Cedar will grow under mixed hardwood. Is an enhancement for specific purposes: better habitat. ECS descriptions linked to silvicultural descriptions would be helpful for review. Only project in area.

General ranking comments- all habitat projects

All are good projects, meet goals of program. All should move forward.	All could have had better partnerships--go to NGOs for \$\$ and support.	County projects--tree planting: is it supplanting? Are these over and above regular funding?	Land purchases have more urgency than plantings.	No fluff in the costs for any of these.	If need to cut, spread \$\$ out among all applicants.
--	--	--	--	---	---

	1)Amount of Habitat	2)Local Support	3)Degree of Collaboration	4)Urgency	5)Multiple Benefits	6)Habitat Benefits	7)Sound Conservation Science	8)Adjacent to Protected Lands	9)Full Funding of Project	10)Supplants Existing Funding	11)Public Access for Hunting and Fishing	12)Sustainability	13)Use of Native Plant Materials	14)Budget and Cost Effectiveness
	8.00	7.00	6.00	5.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	9.00	9.00	5.00	10.00	9.00	5.00	8.00
	8.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	7.00	9.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	5.00	9.00	9.00	8.00	8.00
	8.00	6.00	7.00	6.00	8.00	8.00	9.00	9.00	8.00	5.00	8.00	6.00	8.00	8.00
	7.00	7.00	2.00	5.00	6.00	6.00	8.00	5.00	9.00	5.00	10.00	4.00	9.00	7.00
	7.00	7.00	6.00	5.00	8.00	7.00	8.00	7.00	9.00	5.00	9.00	8.00	9.00	8.00
AVERAGES	7.60	6.40	5.20	5.20	7.20	7.40	8.00	7.60	8.60	5.00	9.20	7.20	7.80	7.80
TOTAL SCORE	139.60													

15)Capacity to Successfully Complete Work	16)Supports Existing Landscape Level Plans	17)Supports Species Plans	18)Conforms to Statewide Conservation and Preservation Plan	19)Conforms to State Wildlife Action Plan
8.00	9.00	9.00	7.00	8.00
9.00	8.00	9.00	8.00	8.00
9.00	10.00	9.00	9.00	9.00
9.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	5.00
7.00	7.00	7.00	6.00	6.00
8.40	8.20	8.20	7.40	7.20