



**Environment and Natural Resources Trust Fund (ENRTF)  
M.L. 2011 Work Plan**

**Date of Status Update:**

**Date of Next Status Update:** 2/1/2012

**Date of Work Plan Approval:** 8/11/2011

**Project Completion Date:** 6/30/2014

**Is this an amendment request?** \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Title: MeCC VI - Dakota County Riparian and Lakeshore Protection (2.7 / 3.7)**

**Project Manager:** Alan Singer

**Affiliation:** Dakota County

**Address:** 14955 Galaxie Ave

**City:** Apple Valley **State:** MN **Zipcode:** 55124

**Telephone Number:** (952) 891-7001

**Email Address:** al.singer@co.dakota.mn.us

**Web Address:** http://www.co.dakota.mn.us

**Location:**

**Counties Impacted:** Dakota

**Ecological Section Impacted:** Minnesota and Northeast Iowa Morainal (222M), Paleozoic Plateau (222L)

<b>Total ENRTF Project Budget:</b>	<b>ENRTF Appropriation \$:</b>	1,035,000
	<b>Amount Spent \$:</b>	<u>0</u>
	<b>Balance \$:</b>	1,035,000

**Legal Citation:** M.L. 2011, First Special Session, Chp. 2, Art.3, Sec. 2, Subd. 04i2.7/3.7

**Appropriation Language:**

\$1,737,000 the first year and \$1,738,000 the second year are from the trust fund to the commissioner of natural resources for the acceleration of agency programs and cooperative agreements. Of this appropriation, \$150,000 the first year and \$150,000 the second year are to the commissioner of natural resources for agency programs and \$3,175,000 is for the agreements as follows: \$100,000 the first year and \$100,000 the second year with Friends of the Mississippi River; \$517,000 the first year and \$518,000 the second year with Dakota County; \$200,000 the first year and \$200,000 the second year with Great River Greening; \$220,000 the first year and \$220,000 the second year with Minnesota Land Trust; \$300,000 the first year and \$300,000 the second year with Minnesota Valley National Wildlife Refuge Trust, Inc.; and \$250,000 the first year and \$250,000 the second year with The Trust for Public Land for planning, restoring, and protecting priority natural areas in the metropolitan area, as defined under Minnesota Statutes, section 473.121, subdivision 2, and portions of the surrounding counties, through contracted services, technical assistance, conservation easements, and fee title acquisition. Land acquired with this appropriation must be sufficiently improved to meet at least minimum management standards, as determined by the commissioner of natural resources. Expenditures are limited to the identified project corridor areas as defined in the work program. This appropriation may not be used for the purchase of habitable residential structures, unless expressly approved in the work program. All conservation easements must be perpetual and have a natural resource management plan. Any land acquired in fee title by the commissioner of natural resources with money from this appropriation must be designated as an outdoor recreation unit under Minnesota Statutes, section 86A.07. The commissioner may similarly designate any lands acquired in less than fee title. A list of proposed restorations and fee title and easement acquisitions must be provided as part of the required work program. An entity that acquires a conservation easement with appropriations from the trust fund must have a long-term stewardship plan for the easement and a fund established for monitoring and enforcing the agreement. Money appropriated from the trust fund for easement acquisition may be used to establish a monitoring, management, and enforcement fund as approved in the work program. An annual financial report is required for any monitoring, management, and enforcement fund established, including expenditures from the fund. This appropriation is available until June 30, 2014, by which time the project must be completed and final products delivered.

## **I. PROJECT TITLE: MeCC6 Dakota County Lakeshore and Riparian Protection**

### **II. PROJECT STATEMENT:**

The long history of settlement and long-accepted agricultural land use has resulted in the loss, degradation and fragmentation of our natural resource systems. In Dakota County, only 3% of the pre-settlement plant communities remain. Despite, increased public awareness of water quality issues and improvement methods and multi-agency efforts to assist landowners, nearly every river, stream and lake is officially impaired in some fashion. In recent decades, the County has experienced tremendous residential development. That development is attracted to the remaining natural features - especially lakes and rivers. The County has a wealth of high quality soils and a vibrant agricultural economy, and with recently high commodity prices, the pressure to plant corn and soybeans fence row to fence row has never been greater. This combination of large-scale impacts and trends must be approached comprehensively, long-term and collaboratively if we are to maintain and improve our natural resource heritage and its many associated benefits. At the same time, there are tremendous opportunities to proactively and successfully address these challenges. The economic downturn has halted residential development for now and significantly lowered land prices. Sound plans have been developed and adopted which collectively focus on protecting and improving our natural infrastructure. The County has an excellent track record of working effectively with a wide variety of agencies, jurisdictions and organizations and has the capacity to acquire and manage conservation easements and implement increased natural resource stewardship.

The project will acquire an estimated 27 permanent conservation easements, totaling 266 acres from willing landowners, along the Vermillion River and North, Middle and South Creek, South Branch and their tributaries; the Cannon River and its primary tributaries within the County (Dutch, Mud, Chub, Darden and Pine Creeks, and Trout Brook); acquire permanent easements totaling 21 acres along Marcott Lakes in Inver Grove Heights; and prepare natural resource management plans on 287 acres and restore/enhance 75 acres of protected property.

The scale and scope of this project is both feasible and significant. It encompasses some of the best natural resource features found in the metropolitan region across a combination of urban, suburban and rural landscapes. It takes a precise and sound fiscal and ecological systems approach to conservation while attempting to balance the interests, rights and responsibilities of private landowners with the public's concerns about water, wildlife habitat, outdoor recreation, and climate change.

### **III. PROJECT STATUS UPDATES:**

**Project Status as of February 2012:**

**Project Status as of August 2012:**

**Project Status as of February 2013:**

**Project Status as of August 2013:**

### **IV. PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND OUTCOMES:**

#### **ACTIVITY 1: Acquisition of Conservation Easements**

##### **Description:**

This shoreline corridor initiative is part of a comprehensive Dakota County Land Conservation Vision that also includes regional parks, multi-purpose greenways and the protection of high quality natural areas and working lands.

The recently completed LCCMR-funded Vermillion River Corridor Plan provide the basis for land protection within the Vermillion River system. The plan integrates and prioritizes the combined protection and improvement of water quality, wildlife habitat and appropriate outdoor recreational opportunities. A system of established criteria including reducing non-point pollution; improving stream channel, floodplain and wetland functions; ecological quality and size; length of shoreline; proximity to other protected land; landowner commitment to current and future stewardship; cost and leveraged funds; improving appropriate outdoor recreational opportunities; and other considerations will be used to evaluate and rank projects. The easements do not require public access, but projects including public access receive higher scores. In addition, payment for public access easements, similar to the DNR Angler Access Easement Program, will be available to landowners. Easements will be written in a way so as to not preclude public trails at a future date to reflect changes in demographics and local land use. A similar plan and criteria system is being developed for the north Cannon River system. A technical staff team from the County's Park and Open Space and Water Resources Departments and the Dakota County SWCD will review and rank projects and forward recommendations to the County Board for approval. See Attached: Criteria

The most significant and expensive easement is part of the 250-acre Marcott Lakes project in Inver Grove Heights. This project involves multiple landowners, phases and funding sources including Dakota County, state Outdoor Heritage, and landowner donation. This phase involves acquiring an easement on 10 platted lots with lakeshore and/or lake views. The remainder of the projects will involve riparian buffers. GIS and outreach efforts have and will identify critical and willing landowners interested in protecting and managing important parcels as part of the County's comprehensive initiative to provide buffers along all rivers and streams.

Easement values for projects in cities or with an estimated cost exceeding \$50,000 will be based upon an independent fair market appraisal. Due to the lack of comparables for small riparian easements in the metro region and increased staff and financial efficiency, a formula based on rural agricultural tax assessed value and variably adjusted according to regulatory conditions, floodplain, amount of cultivated land taken out of production, and vegetation types will be used to determine per acre easement value. Updated aerial photography and Minnesota Land Cover Classification System data, official FEMA floodplain boundaries, and site visits will be used to determine the following respective acreage components of each easement:

- Agricultural Land - within and outside of 50 feet from shoreline
- Woodlands - within and outside of 100-year floodplain
- Fields and wetlands - within and outside of 100-year floodplain

These acreages will then be multiplied by the relevant valuation amount to determine the value of each respective component to produce the overall easement value. Payment for public access will be based upon \$5/foot for stream length or lakeshore within the easement. This process was reviewed and approved by the County Attorney's Office, County Assessor's Office, County Administration and the County Board of Commissioners. In addition, the process was reviewed by three independent appraisers and their comments were integrated within the approach. See Attached: Valuation Formula.

Phase I Environmental Assessments will be completed for all projects and all solid waste will have to be removed as a condition of participation. Easements are surveyed by the County Surveyor's Office and the resulting information is used for legal documents and boundary markers. Baseline Property Reports, referenced in the easement deed, are reviewed and signed by the landowner and the County and completed prior to acquisition. All information is entered into a land management data base. As previously adopted by the County Board, the County's standard practice is to monitor each easement on an annual basis. A combination of remotely reviewing the easement using available technology and then scheduling a site visit is used for determining easement compliance. Each written monitoring report is reviewed and signed by the landowner and the County and then entered into the data base.

Monitoring and future enforcement, if necessary, is an ongoing County obligation and is budgeted accordingly.

**Summary Budget Information for Activity 1:**

**ENRTF Budget: \$899,000**  
**Amount Spent: \$ 0**  
**Balance: \$899,000**

**Activity Completion Date:**

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>	<b>Budget</b>
1. <i>acquisition of easements on 287 acres</i>	June 30, 2013	\$899,000

**Activity Status as of February 2012:**

**Activity Status as of August 2012:**

**Activity Status as of February 2013:**

**Activity Status as of August 2013:**

**Final Report Summary:**

**ACTIVITY 2: Development and Implementation of Natural Resource Management Plans**

**Description:**

All easements require the completion of a Natural Resource Management Plan (NRMP) jointly developed by the County and the landowner. The NRMP describes the current and preferred habitat and other conditions with recommendations on how to achieve mutual goals. A detailed, three-year work plan, describing priority activities and responsibilities, is also completed as a core element of the NRMP. Due to the two-year time constraint and staff limitations, an estimated 50 percent of the easements will have final NRMPs completed by June 30, 2013 with the remaining 50 percent having preliminary NRMPs. Easement deed language requires completion of the final NRMP within six months of closing and funds are escrowed until the plan is completed.

In addition, restoration and enhancement activities will take place on existing 75 acres of public land and private lands already encumbered by a conservation easement.

**Summary Budget Information for Activity 2:**

**ENRTF Budget: \$136,000**  
**Amount Spent: \$ 0**  
**Balance: \$136,000**

**Activity Completion Date:**

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>	<b>Budget</b>
1. Final Natural Resource Management Plans and work plans for 150		\$50,000

acres of new easement acquisitions. Preliminary Natural Resource Management Plans for 150 acres for new easement acquisitions.	June 30, 2013	
2. Restoration and Enhancement of 75 acres of previously protected areas or early easement acquisitions.	June 30, 2013	\$86,000

**Activity Status as of February 2012:**

**Activity Status as of August 2012:**

**Activity Status as of February 2013:**

**Activity Status as of August 2013:**

**Final Report Summary:**

**V. DISSEMINATION:**

**Description:** Information about the project will be included on the Dakota County web page, the Vermillion River Watershed web page, press releases, newsletters, Dakota County Township Officers meetings, and other venues.

**Status as of August 2012:**

**Status as of August 2012:**

**Status as of February 2013:**

**Status as of August 2013:**

**Final Report Summary:**

**VI. PROJECT BUDGET SUMMARY:**

**A. ENRTF Budget:**

Budget Category	\$ Amount	Explanation
Professional/Technical Contracts:	\$95,000	.2 FTE Real estate specialist for two years .2 FTE Natural Resource Specialist for two years
Service Contracts	\$86,000	Natural resource restoration and enhancement
Easement Acquisition:	\$834,000	Permanent conservation easements
Professional Services for Acquisition	\$20,000	Appraisals
<b>TOTAL ENRTF BUDGET:</b>	<b>\$1,035,00</b>	

**Explanation of Use of Classified Staff:** N/A

**Explanation of Capital Expenditures Greater Than \$3,500:** None

**Number of Full-time Equivalent (FTE) funded with this ENRTF appropriation:** .4

**B. Other Funds:**

Source of Funds	\$ Amount Proposed	\$ Amount Spent	Use of Other Funds
Non-state	\$1,035,000		Additional acquisition funds and staff support

<b>TOTAL OTHER FUNDS:</b>	<b>\$1,035,000</b>	<b>\$</b>	
---------------------------	--------------------	-----------	--

**VII. PROJECT STRATEGY:**

**A. Project Partners:** This proposal will be part of the Metro Conservation Corridor Partnership proposal. Dakota County has used a very collaborative approach to its land conservation efforts over the past seven years. All land acquisition has been done on the basis of willing sellers- most often on a bargain sale basis. The cities of Lakeville, and Hastings, Farmington and the Vermillion River Watershed Joint Powers Organization have contributed funds or in-kind services on past and current projects and are likely to continue those productive partnerships during this project phase. All eleven townships have been very supportive. The Soil and Water Conservation District and the Friends of the Mississippi River have been a critical partner in providing outreach, technical assistance and easement monitoring services. The County has worked very cooperatively with the DNR on a number of land conservation projects from contributing funds for state acquisitions and transferring County lands for a new WMA to jointly managing the Vermillion Highlands complex. The Natural Resource Conservation Service has been a critical partner in facilitating the use of over \$10M of federal Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program (FRPP) funds to the County for acquiring permanent easements along waterways each year since 2003. Budgeted 2011 FRPP funds are available for conservation corridor projects.

**B. Project Impact and Long-term Strategy:**

The County is currently finalizing an ambitious, comprehensive, long-term approach to land and water conservation vision and strategic implementation plan. This vision and plan will integrate acquisition of regional park in-holdings, development of a 200-mile multi-purpose greenway system, and protecting and improving riparian and lakeshore buffers, and natural area and agricultural conservation zones. County staff has preliminarily estimated an additional 15,000 acres will need to be protected and managed to fully achieve a variety of public benefits at an estimated cost of \$45M.

The County Board of Commissioners adopted the protection of riparian and lakeshore buffers as one of its top 25 county wide goals for 2011 and has included an additional \$2 million of Environmental Fund balance over the next five years to augment the \$1.3M of remaining Farmland and Natural Areas Program bond funds.

Protection of approximately 2,200 acres through the County's Farmland and Natural Areas Program and FY 2010 and 2011 Outdoor Heritage funding are currently underway. Acquisition of an easement on a 193.2-acre restored upland and wetland prairie that is the headwaters for the South Branch of the Vermillion River will be completed on June 29, 2011.

The County will continue to work proactively with landowners and numerous partners to strategically protect the highest quality natural resource lands that provide multiple public benefits.

**C. Spending History:**

<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>M.L. 2005</b>	<b>M.L. 2007</b>	<b>M.L. 2008</b>	<b>M.L. 2009</b>	<b>M.L. 2010</b>
-----------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

	<b>or FY 2006-07</b>	<b>or FY 2008</b>	<b>or FY 2009</b>	<b>or FY 2010</b>	<b>or FY 2011</b>
County bond funds	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$1,500,000
Federal Farm and Ranchland Protection Program funds	\$800,000	\$750,000	\$600,000	1,300,000	\$1,000,000
Vermillion River Corridor Plan (ENRTF)			\$549,965		
Vermillion River Watershed JPO	\$50,000	\$119,000	\$50,000	\$60,000	\$70,000
Outdoor Heritage funds					\$1,000,000

**VIII. ACQUISITION/RESTORATION LIST:**

Multiple, platted residential lots on the E. Leland Lindberg property on Marcott Lakes in Inver Grove Heights. Various parcels along the Mississippi, Vermillion and Cannon Rivers; Chub, Darden, Mud, and Pine Creeks; and Trout Brook.

**IX. MAP(S):** See attached.

**XI. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS:**

Periodic work plan status update reports will be submitted not later than February 2012, August 2012, and February 2013. A final report and associated products will be submitted between June 30 and August 1, 2013 as requested by the LCCMR.

# Dakota County

## Determining Riparian Buffer Easement Values

Note: This formula is used for projects located within a township and with an estimated cost less than \$50,000.

<u>Fee Title Basis</u>	<u>Estimated Market Value</u>
2010 County 2a Agricultural Land - Soil Class III Grade B:	\$5,250 per acre
2010 County 2b Agricultural Land - Woodlands:	\$3,450 per acre
2010 County 2b Agricultural Land - Field and Wetlands:	\$2,550 per acre

<u>Valuation Adjustments</u>	<u>Easement Value</u>
A. 2010 County 2a Agricultural Land- Soil Class III Grade B: 90% of Fee Title Value	\$4,725 per acre
B. 2010 County 2a Agricultural Land within 50 feet of Stream Shoreline: Use 2010 County 2b Agricultural Land- Field/Wetland within 100-year floodplain	\$1,275 per acre
C. 2010 County 2b Agricultural Land- Woodlands within 100-year floodplain: 50% of Fee Title Value	\$1,725 per acre
D. 2010 County 2b Agricultural Land- Field/Wetland within 100-year floodplain: 50% of Fee Title Value	\$1,275 per acre
E. 2010 County 2b Agricultural Land- Woodlands outside 100-year floodplain: 70% of Fee Title Value	\$2,415 per acre
F. 2010 County 2b Agricultural Land- Field/Wetland outside 100-year floodplain: 60% of Fee Title Value	\$1,530 per acre

### Buffer Description

Buffers will generally be a minimum of 150 feet in width from the stream bank or edge of meander belt. Existing natural areas or former wetlands extending beyond the 150 foot width would also be eligible for protection and be buffered by an additional 50 to 100 feet of restored vegetation. Cultivated land will be taken out of commodity production and restored using native species. Easement boundaries would be squared off to accommodate adjoining agricultural production and facilitate monitoring.



**Buffer Use**

Landowner would be allowed to selectively harvest hay or timber, grow specialty crops such hazelnuts or ornamentals, or develop or maintain sustainable trails, all according to a jointly developed Natural Resource Management Plan.

**Buffer Easement Valuation Components**

- A. \$4,725 x the number of acres of land with recent crop history being taken out of agricultural production and located between 50 and 150 feet from stream shoreline or to buffer associated natural areas
- B. \$1,725 x the number of acres of land with recent crop history being taken out of agricultural production located within 50 feet from the stream shoreline
- C. \$1,725 x the number of acres of non-agricultural woodlands located within the floodplain portion of the buffer
- D. \$1,275 x the number of acres of non-agricultural land such as fields or wetlands located within the floodplain portion of the buffer
- E. \$2,415 x the number of acres of non-agricultural woodlands outside of the floodplain portion of the buffer
- F. \$1,530 x the number of acres of non-agricultural land such as fields or wetlands located outside of the floodplain portion of the buffer

**Calculating Easement Value**

Using aerial photography, land cover mapping, FEMA data, Farm Service Agency records, and site visits as necessary, this information would be used to calculate the respective acreages for components A through F. The buffer easement value would be the cumulative total of all appropriate components.

**Public Access Easement and Valuation**

Dakota County may acquire permanent, public access stream easements for a onetime payment based on the length of the stream within the easement. The payment shall equal \$5 per linear foot of shoreline on both sides of the stream within the easement.

# Riparian/Lakeshore Evaluation Criteria

Category	Criteria	Points
<b>Protects and Improves Water Quality</b>		<b>200</b>
	<b>Potential to significantly Reduce Sediments, Nutrients, Chemicals, and Bacteria Corresponding to Documented Impairments and Corridor Location</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High (headwaters or tributaries) 55 – 80 points</li> <li>• Medium 20 – 54 points</li> <li>• Low 0 – 19 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 80</b>
	<b>Potential to Improve Stream Channel Stability and Functions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High 40 – 55 points</li> <li>• Medium 15 – 39 points</li> <li>• Low 0 – 14 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 55</b>
	<b>Potential to Improve Wetland and/or Floodplain Functions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High 25 – 35 points</li> <li>• Medium 12 – 24 points</li> <li>• Low 0 – 11 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 35</b>
	<b>Potential to Reduce Water Temperature in Designated Trout Stream and Upstream Portions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High 15 – 20 points</li> <li>• Medium 8 – 14 points</li> <li>• Low 0 – 7 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 20</b>
	<b>Potential to Mitigate Drain Tile Impacts</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High 7 – 10 points</li> <li>• Medium 4 – 6 points</li> <li>• Low 0 – 3 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 10</b>
	<b>Achieves Buffer Compliance</b> 20 bonus points	<b>20</b>
<b>Protects and Improves Wildlife Habitat</b>		<b>200</b>
	<b>Significance</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regionally Significant Natural Area 40 – 50 points</li> <li>• County Significant Natural Area 25 – 39 points</li> <li>• Corridor Significant Natural Area 15 – 24 points</li> <li>• Locally Significant Natural Area 0 – 14 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 50</b>

	<p><b>Length of Shoreline <u>and</u> Amount of Acreage</b></p> <p><u>City</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More than 200 feet and more than .25 acre 35 – 40 points</li> <li>• 100 - 199 feet and .07 - .24 acre 20 – 34 points</li> <li>• 50 – 99 feet and .03 - .07 acre 0 – 19 points</li> </ul> <p><u>Township</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More than 2,640 feet and 18.2 acres (300' width) 35 – 40 points</li> <li>• More than 2,640 feet and 9.1 acres (150' width) 30 – 35 points</li> <li>• 1,320 – 2,639 feet and 9.1 – 18.1 acres (300' width) 25 – 35 points</li> <li>• 1,320 – 2,639 feet and 4.5 – 9.0 acres (150' width) 20 – 30 points</li> <li>• 300 – 1,319 feet and 2.1 – 9.0 acres (300" width) 15 – 25 points</li> <li>• 300 – 1,319 feet and 1.1 – 4.4 acres (150" width) 10 – 20 points</li> <li>• Less than 299 feet and .9 acres (300' width) 0 – 10 points</li> <li>• Less than 299 feet and 1.0 acre (150' width) 0 – 6 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 40</b>
	<p><b>Proximity to Protected Lands</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connects two, non-contiguous protected areas 30 points</li> <li>• Adjacent to a protected property 25 points</li> <li>• Separated from protected property by one parcel <u>and</u> less than 1/8 mile 15 – 20 points</li> <li>• Separated from protected property by one parcel <u>and</u> more than 1/8 mile 12 – 18 points</li> <li>• Separated from protected property by two parcels <u>and</u> less than .25 mile 10 – 15 points</li> <li>• Separated from protected property by more than two parcels and less than .25 miles 7 – 12 points</li> <li>• Separated from protected property by more than two parcels and more than .25 miles 0 – 6 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 30</b>
	<p><b>Landowner's Current/Previous Commitment to Stewardship</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High 20 – 25 points</li> <li>• Medium 10 – 19 points</li> <li>• Low 0 – 9 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 25</b>
	<p><b>Potential to Improve In-stream Habitat Quality</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High 20 – 25 points</li> <li>• Medium 10 – 19 points</li> <li>• Low 0 – 9 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 25</b>
	<p><b>Potential to Improve Shoreline and Riparian Habitat Quality</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High 15 – 20 points</li> <li>• Medium 8 – 14 points</li> <li>• Low 0 – 7 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 20</b>
	<p><b>Potential to Improve Upland Habitat Quality</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High 8 – 10 points</li> <li>• Medium 4 – 7 points</li> <li>• Low 0 – 3 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 10</b>

<b>Enhances Natural Resource-based Recreation</b>		<b>150</b>
	<b>Improves Upon Previous Public Recreational Investments</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High 30 – 50 points</li> <li>• Medium 15 – 29 points</li> <li>• Low 0 – 14 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 50</b>
	<b>Provides Improved Public River Access</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High 25 – 40 points</li> <li>• Medium 10 – 24 points</li> <li>• Low 0 – 9 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 40</b>
	<b>Improves Fishing Opportunities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High 15 – 20 points</li> <li>• Medium 8 – 14 points</li> <li>• Low 0 – 7 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 20</b>
	<b>Improves Canoeing/Kayaking Opportunities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High 12 – 15 points</li> <li>• Medium 6 – 11 points</li> <li>• Low 0 – 5 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 15</b>
	<b>Provides for New Trail Opportunities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High 12 – 15 points</li> <li>• Medium 6 – 11 points</li> <li>• Low 0 – 5 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 15</b>
	<b>Improves Interpretative/Educational Opportunities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High 8 – 10 points</li> <li>• Medium 4 – 7 points</li> <li>• Low 0 – 3 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 10</b>
<b>Financial</b>		<b>150</b>
	<b>Leverages Other Resources or Cost Share</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires less than 50% cost 40 – 50 points</li> <li>• Requires less than 60% cost 30 – 39 points</li> <li>• Requires less than 70% cost 20 – 29 points</li> <li>• Requires less than 80% cost 10 – 19 points</li> <li>• Requires less than 90% cost 0 – 9 points</li> </ul> <p>10 Bonus Points for every 5% cost reduction beyond 50%</p>	<b>0 to 50</b>
	<b>Total Project Cost</b>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than \$10,000 27 – 30 points</li> <li>• \$10,001 - \$20,000 22 – 26 points</li> <li>• \$20,001 – \$30,000 16 – 21 points</li> <li>• \$30,001 - \$50,000 11 – 15 points</li> <li>• \$50,001 - \$100,000 6 – 10 points</li> <li>• More than \$100,000 0 – 5 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 30</b>
	<b>Landowner Commitment to Future Stewardship</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial commitment 20 – 25 points</li> <li>• In-kind commitment 10 – 19 points</li> <li>• Expressed interest/willingness 0 – 9 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 25</b>
	<b>Component of a More Sustainable Economic/Residential/Agricultural Development Project</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regionally significant 15 – 20 points</li> <li>• County significant 10 – 14 points</li> <li>• Corridor significant 5 – 9 points</li> <li>• Locally significant 0 – 4 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 20</b>
	<b>Potential to Reduce Long-term Public Costs</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High 12 – 15 points</li> <li>• Medium 6 – 11 points</li> <li>• Low 0 – 5 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 15</b>
	<b>Level of Private Partnerships in Addition to Landowner Involvement</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High 8 – 10 points</li> <li>• Medium 5 – 7 points</li> <li>• Low 0 – 4 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 10</b>
<b>Other</b>		<b>100</b>
	<b>Level of Document Public Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High 20 – 30 points</li> <li>• Medium 10 – 19 points</li> <li>• Low 0 – 9 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 30</b>
	<b>Level of Threat/Urgency</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High 20 – 25 points</li> <li>• Medium 10 – 19 points</li> <li>• Low 0 – 9 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 25</b>
	<b>Project Readiness and/or Difficulty</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High - Ready <u>and</u> not difficult 14 – 20 points</li> <li>• Medium - Not ready/not difficult <u>or</u> ready/difficult 7 – 13 points</li> <li>• Low - Not ready <u>and</u> difficult 0 – 6 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 20</b>
	<b>Applicability as a Model for Other Projects/Areas</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High 12 – 15 points</li> <li>• Medium 6 – 11 points</li> <li>• Low 0 – 5 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 15</b>
	<b>Aesthetic /Scenic Qualities as Viewed by the Public</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High 8 – 10 points</li> <li>• Medium 5 – 7 points</li> <li>• Low 0 – 4 points</li> </ul>	<b>0 to 10</b>

**Environment and Natural Resources Trust Fund**  
**M.L. 2011 Acquisition/Restoration List**

Project Title: MeCC 6: Dakota County Riparian and Lakeshore Protection

Project Manager Name: Alan Singer

M.L. 2011 ENRTF Appropriation: \$1,035,000

#	Acquisition or Restoration Parcel Name	Geographical Coordinates (Provide Latitude/Longitude OR UTM-X/UTM-Y)		Ecosystem Description	Ecological Significance	Activity Description	# of Acres	# of Shoreline Miles (if applicable)	Proposed Fee Title or Easement Holder (if applicable)	Status
		Latitude or UTM-X	Longitude or UTM-Y							
1	Lindberg Acquisition	44°48'58.35 5"N	93°4'3.402" W	Lakeshore	Very high water quality and undeveloped lakeshore	Eaement Acquisition	21		Dakota County	Appraised w/Offer
2										
3	1. Vermillion River Headwaters and western Main Stem	44°36'53.02 2"N	93°13'44.82 "W	Riparian	Designated Trout Stream	Easement and restoration	40	8,712	Dakota County	In process
4	2. South, Middle, and North Creek and central Main Stem of the Vermillion River	44°39'13.48 5"N	93°8'2.475" W	Riparian	Portions of a Designated Trout Stream	Easement and restoration	25	5,445	Dakota County	In process
5	3. Vermillion River South Branch	44°37'27.68 8"N	93°3'1.348" W	Riparian	Portions of a Designated Trout Stream	Easement and restoration	40	8,712	Dakota County	In process
6	4. Eastern Main Stem of the Vermillion River	44°41'9.871 "N	92°57'18.63 8"W	Riparian		Easement and restoration	40	8,712	Dakota County	In process
7	5. Chub, Dutch, and Mud Creeks	44°30'26.84 3"N	93°8'4.189" W	Riparian	Stream and tributaries with high fish diversity and	Easement and restoration	40	8,712	Dakota County	In process
8	6. Cannon River	44°30'12.29 "N	93°4'47.368 "W	Riparian	Scenic State River	Easement and restoration	36	7,840	Dakota County	In process
9	7. Pine and Darden Creeks	44°32'35.93 5"N	92°56'1.554 "W	Riparian	Trout Stream	Easement and restoration	25	5,445	Dakota County	In process
10	8. Trout Brook	44°33'56.49 1"N	92°49'29.34 6"W	Riparian	Trout Stream	Easement and restoration	20	4,356	Dakota County	In process



NOTES:

Attachment A: Budget Detail for M.L. 2011 (FY 2012-13) Environment and Natural Resources Trust Fund Projects								
<b>Project Title: MeCC6 Dakota County Lakeshore and Riparian Protection</b>								
<b>Legal Citation:</b> <i>Fill in your project's legal citation from the appropriation language</i>								
<b>Project Manager: Alan Singer</b>								
<b>M.L. 2011 (FY 2012-13) ENRTF Appropriation: \$1,035,000</b>								
<b>Project Length and Completion Date: June 30, 2013</b>								
<b>Date of Update: June 14, 2011</b>								
ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES TRUST FUND BUDGET	Activity 1 Budget	Amount Spent	Balance	Activity 2 Budget	Amount Spent	Balance	TOTAL BUDGET	TOTAL BALANCE
BUDGET ITEM	Easement Acquisition			Natural Resource Management				
<b>Personnel (Wages and Benefits)</b>								
<b>Professional/Technical Contracts</b> A 0.2 FTE Real Estate Specialist will be contracted by Dakota County to do real estate acquisition work associated with acquiring conservation easements. This work will include, but not be limited to landowner meetings, appraisal, negotiation, documentation and closings.	45,000		45,000				45,000	45,000
<b>Service Contracts</b> A 0.2 FTE Natural Resource Specialist will be contracted by Dakota County to develop and implement natural resource management plans according to the project work plan on existing or newly protected property.				50,000		50,000	50,000	50,000
<b>Equipment/Tools/Supplies</b> Native seed, trees, shrubs, erosion control materials, rental equipment use, and other related expenses for restoration,				86,000		86,000	86,000	86,000
<b>Easement Acquisition</b>	834,000		834,000				834,000	834,000
<b>Professional Services for Acquisition</b>	20,000		20,000				20,000	20,000



**2011-2012 LCCMR Proposal**  
**MeCC 6: Dakota County Riparian and Lakeshore Protection**  
**Acquisition Location Map**

**Legend**

-  Representative Riparian Project Locations
-  Tributary Corridors
-  Conservation Corridors
-  Aquatic Corridors
-  Cannon River
-  Additional Cannon River Tributary Creeks

