

1/8/07

2003 Project Abstract

For the Period Ending June 30, 2006

TITLE: Minnesota ReLeaf Community Forest Development and Protection**PROJECT MANAGER:** Ken Holman**ORGANIZATION:** Department of Natural Resources, Division of Forestry**ADDRESS:** 500 Lafayette Road**WEB SITE ADDRESS:** <http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/grants/forestmgmt/releaf.html>**FUND:** Natural Resources Trust Fund**LEGAL CITATION:** ML 2003, Ch. 128, Art. 1, Sec. 9, Subd. 05(g)

Appropriation Language: Minnesota ReLeaf Community Development and Protection

\$257,000 the first year and \$257,000 the second year are from the trust fund to the commissioner of natural resources for acceleration of the agency program and a cooperative agreement with Tree Trust to protect forest resources, develop inventory-based management plans, and provide matching grants to communities to plant native trees. At least \$350,000 of this appropriation must be used for grants to communities. For the purposes of this paragraph, the match must be a non-state contribution, but may be either cash or qualifying in-kind. This appropriation is available until June 30, 2006, at which time the project must be completed and final projects delivered, unless an earlier date is specified in the work program.

APPROPRIATION AMOUNT: \$514,000Overall Project Outcome and Results

Minnesota ReLeaf funded 63 projects statewide. Nearly 50% involved more than one of the three activities (results). Technical assistance helped project managers take a comprehensive approach and sustain management efforts.

Promotional activities were improved by working with the DNR Local Grants Program staff on a statewide mailing, web site content and via the League of Minnesota Cities. Grantees were surveyed to assess technical assistance needs. 32 grantees received help conducting workshops, meetings and with printed resources.

However, overall monitoring of grant projects was inadequate. Most grantees overestimated their fiscal needs, and turnover among project managers and financial staff in nearly half of the communities, resulted in 23% of the available grant funds not being used (\$83,470). To correct this in the current 2005 ReLeaf Program, staff has instituted:

- A semi-annual interim reporting and invoicing protocol to routinely monitor progress and use of funds,
- An e-newsletter to improve communications and clarify reporting requirements, and
- An expanded ReLeaf web page, to include all reporting forms and instructions

To further improve program delivery, substantially more DNR financial staff time is needed to assist project managers in meeting financial reporting requirements.

In 2004, Minnesota ReLeaf was featured by the Pew Center for Global Climate Change as an effective program for reducing greenhouse gas emissions (see

<http://www.pewclimate.org/global-warming-in-depth/all-reports/greenhouse-and-statehouse/index.cfm>).

Project Results Use and Dissemination

Experience gained will improve:

- a web portal designed to offer tree care information to communities and homeowners, www.MNtrees.org .
- oak wilt control practices, community programs and policies,
- the Inventory Decision Model to guide cities considering this vital step toward management, and
- use of new cost : benefit software to justify greater local investment in tree management (see www.itreetools.org).

All of these new tools are available via the DNR web page, www.dnr.state.mn.us , or www.MNtrees.org .

1/8/07

Date of Report: January 5, 2007
LCMR 2003 Final Work Program Report

I. PROJECT TITLE: Minnesota ReLeaf Community Forest Development and Protection

Project Manager: Ken Holman
Affiliation: Department of Natural Resources, Division of Forestry
Mailing Address: 500 Lafayette Road
City / State / Zip: Saint Paul, MN 55106
Telephone No.: (651) 259-5269
E-mail Address: ken.Holman@dnr.state.mn.us
FAX Number: (651) 296-5954
Web Address: www.dnr.state.mn.us/fad/forestmgmt/releaf.html

Total Biennial LCMR Project Budget:	LCMR Appropriation:	\$514,000
	Minus Amount Spent:	<u>\$411,807</u>
	Balance:	\$102,193

Legal Citation: ML 2003, [Chap.128], Sec. [9], Subd.05g.

Appropriation Language: Minnesota ReLeaf Community Development and Protection \$257,000 the first year and \$257,000 the second year are from the trust fund to the Commissioner of Natural Resources for acceleration of the agency program and a cooperative agreement with Tree Trust to protect forest resources, develop inventory-based management plans, and provide matching grants to communities to plant native trees. At least \$350,000 of this appropriation must be used for grants to communities. For the purposes of this paragraph, the match must be a non-state contribution, but may be either cash or qualifying in-kind. This appropriation is available until June 30, 2006, at which time the project must be completed and final projects delivered, unless an earlier date is specified in the work program.

II. and III. FINAL PROJECT SUMMARY

Overall Project Outcome and Results

Minnesota ReLeaf funded 63 projects statewide. Nearly 50% involved more than one of the three activities (results). Technical assistance helped project managers take a comprehensive approach and sustain management efforts.

Promotional activities were improved by working with the DNR Local Grants Program staff on a statewide mailing, web site content and via the League of Minnesota Cities. Grantees were surveyed to assess technical assistance needs. 32 grantees received help conducting workshops, meetings and with printed resources.

However, overall monitoring of grant projects was inadequate. Most grantees overestimated their fiscal needs, and turnover among project managers and financial staff in nearly half of the communities, resulted in 23% of the available grant funds not being used (\$83,470). To correct this in the current 2005 ReLeaf Program, staff has instituted:

- A semi-annual interim reporting and invoicing protocol to routinely monitor progress and use of funds,
- An e-newsletter to improve communications and clarify reporting requirements, and
- An expanded ReLeaf web page, to include all reporting forms and instructions

To further improve program delivery, substantially more DNR Forestry staff time is needed to assist project managers in meeting financial reporting requirements.

In 2004, Minnesota ReLeaf was featured by the Pew Center for Global Climate Change as an effective program for reducing greenhouse gas emissions (see http://www.pewclimate.org/global-warming-in-depth/all_reports/greenhouse_and_statehouse/index.cfm).

Project Results Use and Dissemination

Experience gained will improve:

- a web portal designed to offer tree care information to communities and homeowners, www.MNtrees.org .
- oak wilt control practices, community programs and policies,
- the Inventory Decision Model to guide cities considering this vital step toward management, and
- use of new cost : benefit software to justify greater local investment in tree management (see www.itreetools.org).

All of these new tools are available via the DNR web page, www.dnr.state.mn.us , or www.MNtrees.org .

IV. OUTLINE OF PROJECT RESULTS

The overall emphasis of grant projects, as directed by the LCMR Commissioners and confirmed by the Minnesota ReLeaf Steering Committee, was to address current and potential community forest health problems by enabling communities to build their capacity to develop and sustain forest management programs that increase tree diversity and improve tree vigor. This fundamental shift in ReLeaf Program priorities surprised and confused many previous and potential applicants, who had come to know ReLeaf as primarily a program for planting trees for energy conservation and carbon

sequestration. While this was an overriding reason given for not participating, other key factors contributed to unusually large balances of unused grant funds. These are enumerated in the Results summaries below.

The DNR measures local program development on a continuum from inactive to a sustained program level based on a set of criteria established by the USDA Forest Service. Since 1991, ReLeaf grants have helped over 300 communities initiate or expand their tree management programs. Assistance and grants during the 2003 ReLeaf Program for tree inventories and management plans enabled 8 additional cities to become self-sufficient, as evidenced by their level of staff technical competency, routine maintenance, monitoring, funding, citizen support, and public education activities. This brings the total number of cities with fully functional forest management programs to 59.

Result 1: Local Matching Grants - Community Forest Health Projects

Local matching grants were provided to 28 communities to complete forest health protection projects. The emphasis was on practices that protect the resource as a whole rather than those that solely benefit individual landowners, and was limited to those on 20 acres or less to avoid overlapping other grant programs (i.e. conservation reserve and stewardship incentive programs).

The interagency ReLeaf Steering Committee determined priority forest health issues (i.e. damage agents or forest pests) while the DNR forest health team established management guidelines. Eligible practices included sanitation, mechanical root disruption, the use of herbicides and/or biological pesticides and silviculture. Silvicultural practices included timber stand improvement, partial harvests to increase stand vigor and diversity. Where advised, restoration and understory plantings were used to enhance pest resistance and maintain forest cover.

To become eligible, communities were required to demonstrate their need (i.e. likelihood of tree loss) through a tree inventory, pest occurrence map, life stage survey (for example MDA trapping results) or risk map (for example DNR gypsy moth risk map). Where needed, communities were encouraged to assess the health status of their forest resources through a cost-shared tree inventory.

Budget	LCMR	Other Funding
Grant Administration	\$ 0	
Education/Technical Assistance	\$ 9,233	\$186,000 - DNR/Coop.
Contracts (LMIC mapping)	\$ 21,600	
Matching grants to local communities	<u>\$ 40,800</u>	<u>\$390,000</u> - Local & Federal
Subtotal	\$ 71,633	\$576,000
Total spent	<u>\$ 68,045</u>	
Balance	\$ 3,588	

Result 2: Local Matching Grants - Community Forest Assessment Projects

Grants were provided for 16 inventory and assessment projects, allowing these communities to complete management plans, and integrate natural resources protection with their public

infrastructure, zoning, and comprehensive planning. Plans helped identify existing tree species and promote greater species diversity.

Several communities performed an inventory of public trees on boulevards, schools and parks. One impressive example was in the City of Mountain Lake, a first-time ReLeaf grantee. Tree Trust led an initial workshop with community volunteers in the use of PDAs and Palms to perform inventories. Their ReLeaf grant leveraged another grant to purchase palm pilots, and these were used to inventory city boulevard trees. The results were used to guide the removal of 18 hazardous trees and prioritize tree planting needs. As part of their ReLeaf project, they formed a Tree Board and worked with the City to develop a tree ordinance.

Several communities produce a forest health assessment to drive management decisions. Others hired a consultant to develop an assessment and management plan for a specific resource within their community. The Northside Residents Redevelopment Council in Minneapolis used their grant to complete an inventory with neighborhood volunteers using PDAs and iTree software provided by USDA Forest Service. The neighborhood established a “Green Team” of volunteers who used the inventory analysis to guide future tree planting efforts.

The \$25,212 balance of unused grant funds was due primarily to technical staff’s unsuccessful efforts to promote the use of inventories as a management tool, grantees’ overestimation of project costs and turnover among local project managers and administrative staff, causing several projects to be cancelled.

Budget	LCMR	Other Funding
Grant Administration	\$ 0	
Education/Technical Assistance	\$ 7,433	\$ 18,000 - DNR/Coop.
Contracts (LMIC mapping)	\$ 10,800	
Matching grants to local communities	\$ <u>71,675</u>	<u>\$72,000</u> - Local
Subtotal	\$ 89,908	\$90,000
Total spent	\$ <u>64,696</u>	
Balance	\$ 25,212	

Result 3: Local Matching Grant Tree Planting Projects

Grants were provided for 42 tree planting projects including locations such as parks, school grounds, city boulevards, replacements for hazardous or forest health related removals, buffers and private property. Other project goals included increasing species diversity to reduce gypsy moth defoliation, restore habitats, improve air and water quality, reduce energy costs, reduce erosion, replant oak wilt pockets and areas ravaged by severe storms.

Examples include the Hennepin County Regional Rail Authority that planted trees along recently completed extensions of the Midtown Greenway in south Minneapolis and Ogilvie Shool District, where trees were planted to create both a pleasant landscape and living classroom at its elementary school.

Accelerated technical assistance and education by Tree Trust in cooperation with DNR staff, community forestry consultants and Extension-trained Tree Care Advisors improved the outcomes of projects. Technical assistance, especially in rural Minnesota, was provided so that all communities, regardless of limited resources, were able to compete for grant funding. On-site field inspections helped determine needs and final field inspections by Tree Trust and DNR field staff ensured compliance with stated project goals and use of funds.

Some grant funds were held in reserve to respond to emerging demands for assistance from communities that received storm damage during the course of the program. Two communities in southern Minnesota that received damage early in the summer of 2005 took advantage of these funds. In September, 2005, a strong thunderstorm caused damage to several suburbs north of the Twin Cities. A few of these communities inquired about grant funds, but as their recovery progressed they found that either they did not have adequate resources to match a grant for tree planting, or their recovery efforts were still focused on clean-up and they did not have the time to manage a tree planting project.

The \$54,670 balance of unused tree planting grant funds was due in large part to the technical team's overestimation of the need for replanting following 2 significant storms. Many communities also gave the severe cuts in state aid as a reason for cutting back tree care programs and canceling grant projects. Again, as with the inventory projects, grantees' overestimation of project costs and turnover among local project managers and administrative staff caused several projects to be cancelled.

Budget	LCMR	Other Funding
Grant Administration	\$ 0	
Education/Technical Assistance	\$ 10,654	\$ 56,000 - DNR
Resource Materials/Printing	\$ 2,780	\$ 10,000 - DNR/Coop.
Contracts (LMIC mapping)	\$ 7,600	
Matching grants to local communities	\$ 293,525	\$290,000 - Local
Subtotal	\$ 314,559	\$356,000
Total spent	\$ 250,091	
Balance	\$ 54,670	

Result 4: Landscape-level Oak Wilt Assessment

270 townships in areas with known or suspected oak wilt (not before or since 1998) were flown and photographed using color infrared photography. The photographs were interpreted, digitized and analyzed to evaluate the following:

- 1.) The current extent of general oak wilt infection, defined as the area where oak wilt can no longer be eradicated as measured by the relative density of infection pockets.
- 2.) The occurrence of oak wilt outside the area of general oak wilt infection (where eradication might be possible), with particular focus on sites at high risk of infection (with a history of significant disturbance and soils conducive to extensive root grafting).

- 3.) The change in disease incidence and severity inside the area of general oak wilt infection as a result of the DNR suppression program. Comparisons were made between communities that manage oak wilt:
 - a. Across the entire community
 - b. Across specified control zones
 - c. By land owner request only
 - d. Without DNR assistance

The oak wilt assessment was completed and shows that cooperative disease suppression efforts are having a positive impact in many places. DNR staff developed a three-tier plan based on the results of the assessment. It calls for very intensive eradication of the disease on the advancing front, continued suppression in zones where the disease can be positively managed, and reduced cost-share funding for zones where the rate of disease is so high that it cannot be effectively controlled.

A preliminary report on the assessment project was published in the Spring 2004 issue of the *Minnesota Shade Tree Advocate* newsletter (see attached). Because Federal Suppression funds were able to be used to complete the oak wilt assessment, ReLeaf staff requested and received approval to use \$37,900 of LCMR funds originally budgeted for DNR grants administrative staff to contract for mapping services with the Land Management Information Center (LMIC). LMIC produced printed and digital natural resources base maps for all ReLeaf grantees.

Budget	LCMR	Other Funding
Grant Administration	\$ 0	
Contracts		
Additional LMIC mapping	\$ 37,900	
DNR Resource Assessment	\$ 0	\$ 40,000 -- Federal
Matching grants to local communities	\$ 0	
Subtotal	\$ 37,900	
<u>Total spent</u>	<u>\$ 28,975</u>	
Balance	\$ 8,925	

V. TOTAL LCMR PROJECT BUDGET

All Results: Personnel	\$ 0
All Results: Equipment	\$ 0
All Results: Development (grants)	\$ 406,000
All Results: Other ¹	<u>\$ 108,000</u>
Total LCMR Project Budget:	\$ 514,000
Total amount spent	<u>\$ 411,807</u>
Balance	\$ 102,193

¹ This budget line item includes a professional and technical service contract with LMIC for community mapping at \$77,900.00 and a professional services arrangement with Tree Trust for \$30,100.00.

Explanation of Capital Expenditures Greater Than \$35,000: Not Applicable

VI. PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE SPENDING

A. Past Spending

Community Forest Health Programs (Mn ReLeaf Oak Wilt Suppression Program)

For 1994 -1998:	LCMR Budget History	\$ 866,000
	Non-LCMR Budget History	\$5,615,000
(Includes \$5,140,000 in local and federal cash and in-kind; \$475,000 from state general fund; does not include state agency in-kind and staff)		
	Total:	\$6,481,000

Minnesota ReLeaf Planting and Assessments Program

For 1994 - 1998:	LCMR Budget History	\$1,866,000
	Non-LCMR Budget History	\$4,790,000
(Includes \$2,529,000 in local and federal cash and in-kind; \$2,000 in state general fund; does not include state agency in-kind and staff)		
	Total:	\$6,656,000

B. Current Spending

Federal Oak Wilt Suppression Funds: The DNR applied for and received notice on June 5, 2003, that Minnesota would receive \$390,000 of US Forest Service Oak Wilt Suppression funds for use in the biennium (state FY '04-'05). Furthermore, the Forest Service allowed 20% of these funds to be used for oak wilt survey and assessment activities. This allowed us to redirect the LCMR funds originally budgeted for oak wilt grants and the statewide oak wilt assessment to fund other ReLeaf grant activities. A separate "Oak Wilt Budget Breakdown" form was included with the ReLeaf grant application form to ensure a separate accounting of the activities and costs covered by federal funds versus LCMR funds.

C. Required Match

The programmatic intent was to attain an overall match, including both cash and in-kind contribution value, averaging 1.4 local dollars per state dollar. Local and Federal cash and in-kind contributions resulted in a significant overmatch of LCMR funds.

D. Future Spending: No work in FY 2004 to 2006 was dependent on future funding.

VII. PROJECT PARTNERS

The following staff contributions will be made at no cost to the project:

DNR staff has committed to be part of the project team:

DNR Central Office and Region Staff	5 FTE's
Ken Holman, DNR Program Liaison, Regions 1 and 2	
Don Mueller, DNR Program Liaison, Regions 3 and 4	
Jana Albers, Region 1 Forest Health Liaison	
Mike Albers, Region 2 Forest Health Liaison	
Susan Burks, Region 3 Forest Health Liaison	
Ed Hayes, Region 4 Forest Health Liaison	
14 DNR Area Field Foresters Statewide	

MN ReLeaf Statewide Steering Committee	<.01FTE
(Representing Extension, utilities, non-profit or volunteer organizations)	
Community and County staff conducting projects	.10 FTE each
Soil and Water Conservation Districts staff	.05 FTE each
US Forest Service, Research and State & Private Forestry	0.5 FTE each
Other cooperators:	
University of Minnesota Extension Service	
Minnesota Shade Tree Advisory Committee (MnSTAC)	

Partners Receiving LCMR Funds:

Tree Trust staff:		
Rebekah VanWieren	\$16,050	31%
Gail Nozal	\$ 3,750	7%
Janette Monear	\$ 3,520	4%

VIII. DISSEMINATION

Brochures and other public information produced through this project are disseminated through the DNR Information Center, local DNR offices, local and state educational events, and through local project sponsors. This final report and its appendixes detail project accomplishments, organizations and groups who participated, project highlights, and recommendations for future programs. All new publications and management tools are or will be available via the DNR web page, www.dnr.state.mn.us or www.MNtrees.org .

IX. LOCATION

Inventory, Management Plans, Planting and General Forest Health Projects:

Communities in all ECS subsections are eligible

Oak Forest Protection:

Targeted at ECS subsections P, S, W, and X with some projects in selected areas of subsections R and V.

X. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Periodic work program progress reports were submitted March 30, 2005 and June 30, 2006. The final work program report and associated products was submitted on January 5, 2007.

XI. RESEARCH PROJECTS

Not applicable

Date of Report: January 5, 2007
LCMR 2003 Final Work Program Report

I. PROJECT TITLE: Minnesota ReLeaf Community Forest Development and Protection

Project Manager: Ken Holman
Affiliation: Department of Natural Resources, Division of Forestry
Mailing Address: 500 Lafayette Road
City / State / Zip: Saint Paul, MN 55106
Telephone No.: (651) 259-5269
E-mail Address: ken.Holman@dnr.state.mn.us
FAX Number: (651) 296-5954
Web Address: www.dnr.state.mn.us/fad/forestmgmt/releaf.html

Total Biennial LCMR Project Budget:	LCMR Appropriation:	\$514,000
	Minus Amount Spent:	<u>\$411,807</u>
	Balance:	\$102,193

Legal Citation: ML 2003, [Chap.128], Sec. [9], Subd.05g.

Appropriation Language: Minnesota ReLeaf Community Development and Protection \$257,000 the first year and \$257,000 the second year are from the trust fund to the Commissioner of Natural Resources for acceleration of the agency program and a cooperative agreement with Tree Trust to protect forest resources, develop inventory-based management plans, and provide matching grants to communities to plant native trees. At least \$350,000 of this appropriation must be used for grants to communities. For the purposes of this paragraph, the match must be a non-state contribution, but may be either cash or qualifying in-kind. This appropriation is available until June 30, 2006, at which time the project must be completed and final projects delivered, unless an earlier date is specified in the work program.

II. and III. FINAL PROJECT SUMMARY

Overall Project Outcome and Results

Minnesota ReLeaf funded 63 projects statewide. Nearly 50% involved more than one of the three activities (results). Technical assistance helped project managers take a comprehensive approach and sustain management efforts.

Promotional activities were improved by working with the DNR Local Grants Program staff on a statewide mailing, web site content and via the League of Minnesota Cities. Grantees were surveyed to assess technical assistance needs. 32 grantees received help conducting workshops, meetings and with printed resources.

However, overall monitoring of grant projects was inadequate. Most grantees overestimated their fiscal needs, and turnover among project managers and financial staff in nearly half of the communities, resulted in 23% of the available grant funds not being used (\$83,470). To correct this in the current 2005 ReLeaf Program, staff has instituted:

- A semi-annual interim reporting and invoicing protocol to routinely monitor progress and use of funds,
- An e-newsletter to improve communications and clarify reporting requirements, and
- An expanded ReLeaf web page, to include all reporting forms and instructions

To further improve program delivery, substantially more DNR Forestry staff time is needed to assist project managers in meeting financial reporting requirements.

In 2004, Minnesota ReLeaf was featured by the Pew Center for Global Climate Change as an effective program for reducing greenhouse gas emissions (see <http://www.pewclimate.org/global-warming-in-depth/all-reports/greenhouse-and-statehouse/index.cfm>).

Project Results Use and Dissemination

Experience gained will improve:

- a web portal designed to offer tree care information to communities and homeowners, www.MNtrees.org.
- oak wilt control practices, community programs and policies,
- the Inventory Decision Model to guide cities considering this vital step toward management, and
- use of new cost : benefit software to justify greater local investment in tree management (see www.itreetools.org).

All of these new tools are available via the DNR web page, www.dnr.state.mn.us, or www.MNtrees.org.

IV. OUTLINE OF PROJECT RESULTS

The overall emphasis of grant projects, as directed by the LCMR Commissioners and confirmed by the Minnesota ReLeaf Steering Committee, was to address current and potential community forest health problems by enabling communities to build their capacity to develop and sustain forest management programs that increase tree diversity and improve tree vigor. This fundamental shift in ReLeaf Program priorities surprised and confused many previous and potential applicants, who had come to know ReLeaf as primarily a program for planting trees for energy conservation and carbon

sequestration. While this was an overriding reason given for not participating, other key factors contributed to unusually large balances of unused grant funds. These are enumerated in the Results summaries below.

The DNR measures local program development on a continuum from inactive to a sustained program level based on a set of criteria established by the USDA Forest Service. Since 1991, ReLeaf grants have helped over 300 communities initiate or expand their tree management programs. Assistance and grants during the 2003 ReLeaf Program for tree inventories and management plans enabled 8 additional cities to become self-sufficient, as evidenced by their level of staff technical competency, routine maintenance, monitoring, funding, citizen support, and public education activities. This brings the total number of cities with fully functional forest management programs to 59.

Result 1: Local Matching Grants - Community Forest Health Projects

Local matching grants were provided to 28 communities to complete forest health protection projects. The emphasis was on practices that protect the resource as a whole rather than those that solely benefit individual landowners, and was limited to those on 20 acres or less to avoid overlapping other grant programs (i.e. conservation reserve and stewardship incentive programs).

The interagency ReLeaf Steering Committee determined priority forest health issues (i.e. damage agents or forest pests) while the DNR forest health team established management guidelines. Eligible practices included sanitation, mechanical root disruption, the use of herbicides and/or biological pesticides and silviculture. Silvicultural practices included timber stand improvement, partial harvests to increase stand vigor and diversity. Where advised, restoration and understory plantings were used to enhance pest resistance and maintain forest cover.

To become eligible, communities were required to demonstrate their need (i.e. likelihood of tree loss) through a tree inventory, pest occurrence map, life stage survey (for example MDA trapping results) or risk map (for example DNR gypsy moth risk map). Where needed, communities were encouraged to assess the health status of their forest resources through a cost-shared tree inventory.

Budget	LCMR	Other Funding
Grant Administration	\$ 0	
Education/Technical Assistance	\$ 9,233	\$186,000 - DNR/Coop.
Contracts (LMIC mapping)	\$ 21,600	
Matching grants to local communities	<u>\$ 40,800</u>	<u>\$390,000</u> - Local & Federal
Subtotal	\$ 71,633	\$576,000
Total spent	<u>\$ 68,045</u>	
Balance	\$ 3,588	

Result 2: Local Matching Grants - Community Forest Assessment Projects

Grants were provided for 16 inventory and assessment projects, allowing these communities to complete management plans, and integrate natural resources protection with their public

infrastructure, zoning, and comprehensive planning. Plans helped identify existing tree species and promote greater species diversity.

Several communities performed an inventory of public trees on boulevards, schools and parks. One impressive example was in the City of Mountain Lake, a first-time ReLeaf grantee. Tree Trust led an initial workshop with community volunteers in the use of PDAs and Palms to perform inventories. Their ReLeaf grant leveraged another grant to purchase palm pilots, and these were used to inventory city boulevard trees. The results were used to guide the removal of 18 hazardous trees and prioritize tree planting needs. As part of their ReLeaf project, they formed a Tree Board and worked with the City to develop a tree ordinance.

Several communities produce a forest health assessment to drive management decisions. Others hired a consultant to develop an assessment and management plan for a specific resource within their community. The Northside Residents Redevelopment Council in Minneapolis used their grant to complete an inventory with neighborhood volunteers using PDAs and iTree software provided by USDA Forest Service. The neighborhood established a “Green Team” of volunteers who used the inventory analysis to guide future tree planting efforts.

The \$25,212 balance of unused grant funds was due primarily to technical staff’s unsuccessful efforts to promote the use of inventories as a management tool, grantees’ overestimation of project costs and turnover among local project managers and administrative staff, causing several projects to be cancelled.

Budget	LCMR	Other Funding
Grant Administration	\$ 0	
Education/Technical Assistance	\$ 7,433	\$ 18,000 - DNR/Coop.
Contracts (LMIC mapping)	\$ 10,800	
Matching grants to local communities	\$ <u>71,675</u>	<u>\$72,000</u> - Local
Subtotal	\$ 89,908	\$90,000
Total spent	\$ <u>64,696</u>	
Balance	\$ 25,212	

Result 3: Local Matching Grant Tree Planting Projects

Grants were provided for 42 tree planting projects including locations such as parks, school grounds, city boulevards, replacements for hazardous or forest health related removals, buffers and private property. Other project goals included increasing species diversity to reduce gypsy moth defoliation, restore habitats, improve air and water quality, reduce energy costs, reduce erosion, replant oak wilt pockets and areas ravaged by severe storms.

Examples include the Hennepin County Regional Rail Authority that planted trees along recently completed extensions of the Midtown Greenway in south Minneapolis and Ogilvie Shool District, where trees were planted to create both a pleasant landscape and living classroom at its elementary school.

Accelerated technical assistance and education by Tree Trust in cooperation with DNR staff, community forestry consultants and Extension-trained Tree Care Advisors improved the outcomes of projects. Technical assistance, especially in rural Minnesota, was provided so that all communities, regardless of limited resources, were able to compete for grant funding. On-site field inspections helped determine needs and final field inspections by Tree Trust and DNR field staff ensured compliance with stated project goals and use of funds.

Some grant funds were held in reserve to respond to emerging demands for assistance from communities that received storm damage during the course of the program. Two communities in southern Minnesota that received damage early in the summer of 2005 took advantage of these funds. In September, 2005, a strong thunderstorm caused damage to several suburbs north of the Twin Cities. A few of these communities inquired about grant funds, but as their recovery progressed they found that either they did not have adequate resources to match a grant for tree planting, or their recovery efforts were still focused on clean-up and they did not have the time to manage a tree planting project.

The \$54,670 balance of unused tree planting grant funds was due in large part to the technical team's overestimation of the need for replanting following 2 significant storms. Many communities also gave the severe cuts in state aid as a reason for cutting back tree care programs and canceling grant projects. Again, as with the inventory projects, grantees' overestimation of project costs and turnover among local project managers and administrative staff caused several projects to be cancelled.

Budget	LCMR	Other Funding
Grant Administration	\$ 0	
Education/Technical Assistance	\$ 10,654	\$ 56,000 - DNR
Resource Materials/Printing	\$ 2,780	\$ 10,000 - DNR/Coop.
Contracts (LMIC mapping)	\$ 7,600	
Matching grants to local communities	\$ <u>293,525</u>	<u>\$290,000</u> - Local
Subtotal	\$ 314,559	\$356,000
Total spent	\$ <u>250,091</u>	
Balance	\$ 54,670	

Result 4: Landscape-level Oak Wilt Assessment

270 townships in areas with known or suspected oak wilt (not before or since 1998) were flown and photographed using color infrared photography. The photographs were interpreted, digitized and analyzed to evaluate the following:

- 1.) The current extent of general oak wilt infection, defined as the area where oak wilt can no longer be eradicated as measured by the relative density of infection pockets.
- 2.) The occurrence of oak wilt outside the area of general oak wilt infection (where eradication might be possible), with particular focus on sites at high risk of infection (with a history of significant disturbance and soils conducive to extensive root grafting).

- 3.) The change in disease incidence and severity inside the area of general oak wilt infection as a result of the DNR suppression program. Comparisons were made between communities that manage oak wilt:
 - a. Across the entire community
 - b. Across specified control zones
 - c. By land owner request only
 - d. Without DNR assistance

The oak wilt assessment was completed and shows that cooperative disease suppression efforts are having a positive impact in many places. DNR staff developed a three-tier plan based on the results of the assessment. It calls for very intensive eradication of the disease on the advancing front, continued suppression in zones where the disease can be positively managed, and reduced cost-share funding for zones where the rate of disease is so high that it cannot be effectively controlled.

A preliminary report on the assessment project was published in the Spring 2004 issue of the *Minnesota Shade Tree Advocate* newsletter (see attached). Because Federal Suppression funds were able to be used to complete the oak wilt assessment, ReLeaf staff requested and received approval to use \$37,900 of LCMR funds originally budgeted for DNR grants administrative staff to contract for mapping services with the Land Management Information Center (LMIC). LMIC produced printed and digital natural resources base maps for all ReLeaf grantees.

Budget	LCMR	Other Funding
Grant Administration	\$ 0	
Contracts		
Additional LMIC mapping	\$ 37,900	
DNR Resource Assessment	\$ 0	\$ 40,000 -- Federal
Matching grants to local communities	\$ 0	
Subtotal	\$ 37,900	
<u>Total spent</u>	<u>\$ 28,975</u>	
Balance	\$ 8,925	

V. TOTAL LCMR PROJECT BUDGET

All Results: Personnel	\$ 0
All Results: Equipment	\$ 0
All Results: Development (grants)	\$ 406,000
All Results: Other ¹	<u>\$ 108,000</u>
Total LCMR Project Budget:	\$ 514,000
Total amount spent	<u>\$ 411,807</u>
Balance	\$ 102,193

¹ This budget line item includes a professional and technical service contract with LMIC for community mapping at \$77,900.00 and a professional services arrangement with Tree Trust for \$30,100.00.

Explanation of Capital Expenditures Greater Than \$35,000: Not Applicable

VI. PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE SPENDING

A. Past Spending

Community Forest Health Programs (Mn ReLeaf Oak Wilt Suppression Program)

For 1994 -1998: LCMR Budget History \$ 866,000

Non-LCMR Budget History \$5,615,000

(Includes \$5,140,000 in local and federal cash and in-kind; \$475,000 from state general fund; does not include state agency in-kind and staff)

Total: \$6,481,000

Minnesota ReLeaf Planting and Assessments Program

For 1994 - 1998: LCMR Budget History \$1,866,000

Non-LCMR Budget History \$4,790,000

(Includes \$2,529,000 in local and federal cash and in-kind; \$2,000 in state general fund; does not include state agency in-kind and staff)

Total: \$6,656,000

B. Current Spending

Federal Oak Wilt Suppression Funds: The DNR applied for and received notice on June 5, 2003, that Minnesota would receive \$390,000 of US Forest Service Oak Wilt Suppression funds for use in the biennium (state FY '04-'05). Furthermore, the Forest Service allowed 20% of these funds to be used for oak wilt survey and assessment activities. This allowed us to redirect the LCMR funds originally budgeted for oak wilt grants and the statewide oak wilt assessment to fund other ReLeaf grant activities. A separate "Oak Wilt Budget Breakdown" form was included with the ReLeaf grant application form to ensure a separate accounting of the activities and costs covered by federal funds versus LCMR funds.

C. Required Match

The programmatic intent was to attain an overall match, including both cash and in-kind contribution value, averaging 1.4 local dollars per state dollar. Local and Federal cash and in-kind contributions resulted in a significant overmatch of LCMR funds.

D. Future Spending: No work in FY 2004 to 2006 was dependent on future funding.

VII. PROJECT PARTNERS

The following staff contributions will be made at no cost to the project:

DNR staff has committed to be part of the project team:

DNR Central Office and Region Staff 5 FTE's

Ken Holman, DNR Program Liaison, Regions 1 and 2

Don Mueller, DNR Program Liaison, Regions 3 and 4

Jana Albers, Region 1 Forest Health Liaison

Mike Albers, Region 2 Forest Health Liaison

Susan Burks, Region 3 Forest Health Liaison

Ed Hayes, Region 4 Forest Health Liaison

14 DNR Area Field Foresters Statewide

MN ReLeaf Statewide Steering Committee	<.01FTE
(Representing Extension, utilities, non-profit or volunteer organizations)	
Community and County staff conducting projects	.10 FTE each
Soil and Water Conservation Districts staff	.05 FTE each
US Forest Service, Research and State & Private Forestry	0.5 FTE each
Other cooperators:	
University of Minnesota Extension Service	
Minnesota Shade Tree Advisory Committee (MnSTAC)	

Partners Receiving LCMR Funds:

Tree Trust staff:		
Rebekah VanWieren	\$16,050	31%
Gail Nozal	\$ 3,750	7%
Janette Monear	\$ 3,520	4%

VIII. DISSEMINATION

Brochures and other public information produced through this project are disseminated through the DNR Information Center, local DNR offices, local and state educational events, and through local project sponsors. This final report and its appendixes detail project accomplishments, organizations and groups who participated, project highlights, and recommendations for future programs. All new publications and management tools are or will be available via the DNR web page, www.dnr.state.mn.us or www.MNtrees.org .

IX. LOCATION

Inventory, Management Plans, Planting and General Forest Health Projects:
 Communities in all ECS subsections are eligible

Oak Forest Protection:

Targeted at ECS subsections P, S, W, and X with some projects in selected areas of subsections R and V.

X. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Periodic work program progress reports were submitted March 30, 2005 and June 30, 2006. The final work program report and associated products was submitted on January 5, 2007.

XI. RESEARCH PROJECTS

Not applicable

Attachment B: 2003-2005 MN ReLeaf List of Projects

CITY	LCMR AWARD	AMOUNT SPENT	LCMR GRANT BALANCE	FEDERAL GRANT	COMBINED GRANT
Aitkin	\$4,500.00	\$0.00	\$4,500.00		\$9,000.00
Andover	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$0.00	\$11,000.00	\$17,000.00
Anoka County	\$3,000.00		\$3,000.00		\$6,000.00
Baldwin Twp	\$1,350.00		\$1,350.00	\$11,000.00	\$13,700.00
Big Lake Twp.	\$1,350.00	\$726.00	\$624.00	\$13,000.00	\$15,700.00
Blackduck	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$0.00		\$10,000.00
Blaine			\$0.00	\$7,500.00	\$7,500.00
Braham	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$0.00		\$20,000.00
Buffalo Lake	\$6,000.00	\$6,000.00	\$0.00		\$12,000.00
Chanhassen	\$6,000.00	\$5,507.00	\$493.00		\$12,000.00
Chisago County			\$0.00	\$28,000.00	\$28,000.00
Clarkfield	\$8,000.00	\$8,000.00	\$0.00		\$16,000.00
Coon Rapids			\$0.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
Cottage Grove	\$7,500.00	\$7,500.00	\$0.00		\$15,000.00
Crystal	\$12,000.00	\$12,000.00	\$0.00		\$24,000.00
East Bethel	\$5,000.00	\$0.00	\$5,000.00	\$9,500.00	\$19,500.00
Elk River	\$1,350.00	\$0.00	\$1,350.00	\$13,000.00	\$15,700.00
Erskine Win-E-Mac School	\$6,200.00	\$6,200.00	\$0.00		\$12,400.00
Excelsior	\$6,500.00	\$0.00	\$6,500.00		\$13,000.00
Folwell/Mpls.	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$0.00		\$20,000.00
Grand Marais	\$7,200.00	\$7,200.00	\$0.00		\$14,400.00
Grand Rapids IDS #318	\$5,000.00	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00		\$10,000.00
Granite Falls	\$14,000.00	\$14,000.00	\$0.00		\$28,000.00
Gustavus Adolphus College	\$4,000.00	\$0.00	\$4,000.00		\$8,000.00
Hale Community School	\$4,300.00	\$0.00	\$4,300.00		\$8,600.00
Hartland	\$3,090.00	\$3,090.00	\$0.00		\$6,180.00
Hendricks	\$12,500.00	\$12,211.00	\$289.00		\$25,000.00
Hendrum	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$0.00		\$8,000.00
Hennepin County RR Authority	\$29,000.00	\$29,000.00	\$0.00		\$58,000.00
Hutchinson School Dist. #423	\$9,000.00	\$9,000.00	\$0.00		\$18,000.00
Inver Grove Heights	\$2,500.00	\$2,250.00	\$250.00	\$4,000.00	\$9,000.00
Isanti County			\$0.00	\$28,000.00	\$28,000.00
Lakeville			\$0.00	\$12,500.00	\$12,500.00
LeCenter	\$3,000.00	\$0.00	\$3,000.00		\$6,000.00
Lewiston	\$3,400.00	\$3,400.00	\$0.00		\$6,800.00
Linwood Twp.			\$0.00	\$12,500.00	\$12,500.00
Livonia Twp.	\$1,350.00		\$1,350.00	\$11,000.00	\$13,700.00
Lonsdale	\$10,000.00	\$0.00	\$10,000.00		\$20,000.00
Minneapolis Urban Shoreline Restorat	\$8,500.00	\$0.00	\$8,500.00		\$17,000.00
Minnesota Landscape Arboretum	\$10,000.00	\$0.00	\$10,000.00		\$20,000.00
Moorhead	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00	\$0.00		\$5,000.00
Mounds View	\$5,000.00	\$3,897.00	\$1,103.00		\$10,000.00
Mountain Lake Public School	\$15,000.00	\$15,000.00	\$0.00		\$30,000.00
New Brighton	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,000.00
New Richland	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$0.00		\$10,000.00
Oak Grove			\$0.00	\$14,500.00	\$14,500.00
Oak Park Heights	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$0.00		\$2,000.00
Oakdale			\$0.00	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00
Ogilvie School Dist. #333	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$0.00		\$8,000.00
Olivia	\$6,000.00	\$6,000.00	\$0.00		\$12,000.00
Olmstead SWCD			\$0.00	\$7,000.00	\$7,000.00
Parkers Prairie	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$0.00		\$2,000.00

Prior Lake	\$9,000.00	\$9,000.00	\$0.00		\$18,000.00
Prior Lake	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$0.00		\$20,000.00
Proctor	\$7,000.00	\$7,000.00	\$0.00		\$14,000.00
Ramsey	\$4,500.00	\$4,469.00	\$31.00	\$9,500.00	\$18,500.00
Robbinsdale	\$12,000.00	\$12,000.00	\$0.00		\$24,000.00
Rochester Park & Rec. Dept.	\$14,000.00	\$12,529.00	\$1,471.00		\$28,000.00
Shakopee	\$500.00	\$0.00	\$500.00	\$4,000.00	\$5,000.00
Sherburne Co.	\$2,200.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,000.00	\$27,000.00	\$31,400.00
St. Clair Pulic School Dist #75	\$4,000.00	\$3,398.00	\$602.00		\$8,000.00
St. Francis			\$0.00	\$13,000.00	\$13,000.00
St. Louis Park	\$12,000.00	\$12,000.00	\$0.00		\$24,000.00
South East Asian Project	\$25,500.00	\$21,155.00	\$4,345.00		\$51,000.00
Staples	\$4,500.00	\$4,500.00	\$0.00		\$9,000.00
Stearns Co. SWCD			\$0.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
Waterville	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$0.00		\$6,000.00
Waubun	\$2,500.00	\$0.00	\$2,500.00		\$5,000.00
Webber-Camden/Mpls.	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$0.00		\$20,000.00
	\$391,290.00	\$312,732.00	\$78,558.00	\$250,000.00	\$1,032,580.00

Attachment A: Budget Detail for 2003 Project

Proposal Title: Minnesota ReLeaf Community Forest Development and Protection - 05g

Project Manager Name: Ken Holman

LCMR Requested Dollars: \$514,000

2003 LCMR Project Budget	Result 1 Budget:Local matching grants- Community Forest Health projs. (20 grants @ \$10,800)	Result 1 Amended	Amount Spent (6/30/06)	Balance (6/30/06)	Result 2 Budget:Local matching grants- Comnty. Forest Assessment projects (15 grants @ \$7,333)	Result 2 Amended	Amount Spent (6/30/06)	Balance (6/30/06)	Result 3 Budget: Local matching grants-Native Tree Planting Projects (15 Grants @\$5,000)	Result 3 Amended	Amount Spent (6/30/06)	Balance (6/30/06)	Result 4 Budget: Landscape level Oak Wilt Assessment (270 townships)	Result 4 Amended (see Note #1)	Amount Spent (6/30/06)	Balance (6/30/06)	
BUDGET ITEM																	TOTAL FOR BUDGET ITEM
PERSONNEL: Staff Expenses.DNR Grants Administrator, 1080 hrs @ \$35/hr. Track accounts, produce and process grant agreements, payments and financial reports.	20,300	0	0	0	5,300	0	0	0	12,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PERSONNEL: Tree Trust Technical Assistance. Rebekah VanWieren \$16,050, Gail Nozal \$3,750, Janette Monear \$3,520. Assist applicants with rfp development, manage volunteers, and conduct workshops.	7,233	7,233	7,233	0	5,433	5,433	5,433	0	10,654	10,654	10,654	0	0	0	0	0	23,320
Contracts																	
Other contracts: Land Mgt. Info. Ctr- community mapping	21,600	21,600	21,600	0	10,800	10,800	10,800	0	7,600	7,600	7,600	0	0	0	0	0	40,000
Additional costs for mapping	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37,900	28,975	8,925	37,900
Space rental: NOT ALLOWED	X	X			X	X											X
Other direct operating costs :																	
Communications for Tree Trust	1,200	1,200	1,200	0	1,200	1,200	1,200	0	1,200	1,200	1,200	0	0	0	0	0	3,600
Office supplies for Tree Trust (paper, envelopes)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	364	364	364	0	0	0	0	0	364
Copying, printing for Tree Trust	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	360	360	360	0	0	0	0	0	360
Travel expenses in Minnesota for Tree Trust	800	800	800	0	800	800	800	0	856	856	856	0	0	0	0	0	2,456
Matching Grants to Communities	219,000	40,800	37,212	3,588	110,000	71,675	46,463	25,212	77,000	293,525	229,057	54,670	0	0	0	0	406,000
COLUMN TOTAL	270,133	71,633	68,045	3,588	133,533	89,908	64,696	25,212	110,334	314,559	250,091	54,670	0	37,900	28,975	8,925	514,000

Note #1: Redirection of funds from Personnel:Staff Expenses (\$37,900). DNR personnel expenditure was approved for hiring part-time position in DNR Office of Management and Budget. DNR Forestry initially decided to retain funds for division staff, but later decided these funds were not needed for staff and should be redirected to LMIC community mapping services. The LMIC costs were originally underestimated so redirecting these funds helped cover additional costs.