November 1, 2023

Request for Proposal

Mississippi River Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Mussel Reintroduction Project Design and Engineering Services

Issued by the Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board (MPRB) with funding for this project provided by the Minnesota Environment and Natural Resources Trust Fund as recommended by the Legislative-Citizen Commission on Minnesota Resources (LCCMR).

ADDENDUM NO. 2

PREPROPOSAL MEETING SUMMARY

On Wednesday October 25, 2023, at 9:30 a.m. (CST), MPRB held the preproposal meeting for the project. Addendum No. 2 includes the summary and documentation from that meeting, including any questions answered at the meeting.

This addendum consists of four (4) pages plus the following attachments:

- Preproposal Meeting Sign-In Sheet (1 page)
- Preproposal Meeting Presentation (19 slides)
- Preproposal Meeting Handouts (3 pages)
- MnDNR Survey Summaries (2 pages)
- MnDNR Hall’s Island Informal Site Visit Summary (2 pages)

PREPROPOSAL QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

The following questions were addressed at the preproposal meeting:

1) Question: If a firm were to submit a response to this request and be awarded this contract, would that firm be precluded from bidding on the resulting implementation scope of the project?
   Response: Yes, the firm awarded the consulting contract cannot submit a bid to implement the project.

2) Question: Would the MPRB be interested in receiving a design/build proposal for this project?
   Response: No, the MPRB is not interested in a design/build proposal. MPRB procurement rules do not allow for design/build contracting.

3) Question: If my proposal meets the Small and Underutilized Business Program (SUBP) goal, do I need to provide documentation?
   Response: If the goal is met, you do not need documentation. If the goal is not met, the City of Minneapolis will request your documentation if your proposal is shortlisted to understand your good faith efforts to partner with minority-owned business enterprises (MBEs)/women-owned business enterprises (WBE) firms (i.e., phone call and email log). If you can’t meet the 5 percent goal, we recommend providing a summary of your good faith efforts to partner with an MBE/WBE firm so that it is considered by the proposal review team toward the 10 percent evaluation criteria. Formal documentation is required for contracting after the proposal evaluation phase.
4) Question: Can the City of Minneapolis provide a list of MBE/WBE firms that can be partners in this project?

Response: Yes, the City of Minneapolis can make available a list of MBE/WBE firms. An up-to-date directory of the firms is also available on the SUBP commitment form.

5) Question: For current mussel habitat, is the bottom hardness of the project areas known? If so, is it being used as a metric for habitat?

Response: The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MnDNR) does not currently know the bottom hardness of project areas. Even if an exact number was known, there is no precise metric by which to judge success. Successful mussel habitat includes permeability and stability because mussels need to burrow into the substrate to avoid being carried away by flooding. Mussels need an environment to be held in place, usually in pockets of sand with boulders. A clear definition of ideal mussel habitat is not established, which adds a level of complexity. There is a “Goldilocks” effect, which includes the right blend of diverse particle sizes and boulders that simultaneously provide blocks from high flows and offer stability.

6) Question: Have you considered focusing grant dollars more exclusively on mussel habitat and reintroduction of mussels over shoreline restoration?

Response: The bulk of the grant funding is tied to physical improvements that have a more significant cost than rearing mussels. Although this project is focused on mussels, the Mississippi River islands are actively eroding to a point where they could be lost in future flood events. The MPRB needs stabilization in concert with mussel reintroduction and is interested in completing work on the Mississippi River.

7) Question: Why is shoreline habitat part of a mussel project? Do you have targets where you want shoreline restoration and that are inherently part of the project? Has the MPRB set the criteria for which terrestrial space should be protected?

Response: MPRB Water Resources staff and Education and Outreach staff have anecdotal understanding of problem areas. However, determining these areas is part of the project to understand where we need to promote stabilization and will have the best results for mussel reintroduction. We need to test these assumptions during the design process. We need a consultant team to understand where to promote both stabilization and mussel habitat.

8) Question: For the project team, will the MnDNR serve as the malacology experts on the project? Should we structure our team to include an expert or consider that the MnDNR will fill this role?

Response: The MnDNR is available to answer any questions regarding the mussel habitat and will continue to be an actively engaged resource in the project. The MnDNR staff bring this value, but it is up to consultant teams to determine if providing this specialization on their team will provide added value.

9) Question: What evaluations have you done to understand the factors of mussel habitat (i.e., is there a quantitative measure for success)?

Response: The MnDNR has completed limited monitoring in this area since 2015 (see attached MnDNR Survey Summaries). Before this time, surveys were quantitatively gained through sampling. We understand what types of species and substrates exist, but that is the current scope of knowledge. The MnDNR has not conducted monitoring above Saint Anthony Falls.

10) Question: Have fish species been evaluated in the project area?

Response: Fish species have not been evaluated in the project area.
11) Question: Have you determined the mussel species to be reintroduced?

Response: The MnDNR is targeting two species for the beginning of the reintroduction work. Once these species are placed, the MnDNR will evaluate them for success over a multiyear period because the scope for measuring success will take time. The MnDNR will monitor habitat response and recommend next steps after three to five years to reintroduce the remaining species depending on initial findings.

12) Question: Are data available on the mussel species?

Response: Yes, data were provided with the RFP packet.

13) Question: The deadline for project delivery is August 24, 2024. If mussels are currently in propagation, is this a hard stop to get species in place?

Response: The MnDNR is propagating various classes of mussels for corresponding years of reintroduction. There is a 2024 class of mussels planned for use at Hall’s Island. Once the project is complete at various locations of stabilization, the MnDNR will monitor the areas for one season to view the habitat success as it relates to flooding, drought, and other conditions. Once stabilization success is observed, the MnDNR will reintroduce mussels the following season. The MnDNR will continue to place new mussels each season post-construction to ensure the species’ success. Reintroduction can be conducted for up to two years if needed.

14) Question: Is there an analysis that has been completed on the back channel?

Response: An analysis was completed as part of the design and permitting process of the Hall’s Island project. That analysis will be provided to the selected consultant team to review and use as part of the analysis and design scope of work.

The MnDNR completed a post-construction site inspection of Hall’s Island, which has gone through three seasons and was evaluated to observe the substrate quality. Attached is the summary of the site visit (MnDNR Hall’s Island Informal Site Visit Summary), which provides data on how the MnDNR would rate that site by season while working to understand if the substrate needs additional help.

15) Question: Can you describe the decision-making process between the MPRB and the MnDNR to ultimately select an alternative? If there are more solutions proposed than funding available, how can an effective process be developed?

Response: No single entity makes a final decision. It is a collaborative effort among the consultant team, the MPRB, and the MnDNR to determine the best use of funds. After a data review, a prioritized list should be created with associated high-level cost estimates. The team will make decisions on finding solutions that meet top priorities for all partners. MPRB alternative approval will come through the staff team and not require board authorization. The board will be involved only when authorizing construction. This is a staff-driven decision. The project will include an internal project advisory committee, which includes MPRB staff from various departments (water resources, environmental education, and potentially forestry). The committee will have input into the process but not final decision-making. This offers us the chance to work with the MnDNR as a partner and to do things differently.

16) Question: Can you confirm monitoring is not part of the scope? What is expected from the consultant during the design phase?

Response: The monitoring tasks were included to showcase the full scope of work through the LCCMR grant. However, this task is not part of the design/engineering scope of work.
17) Question: Will construction oversight be part of the scope of work?

Response: We will eventually require a consultant to complete contract administration. This involves confirming all unit prices bid and material submittals are being met in the field. However, this phase of the contract will take the project through bidding but not construction administration.

18) Question: Have you considered making this a request for qualifications versus an RFP? Because there are many potential sites for work, assigning a cost proposal locks consultants and the project team into specific explored sites.

Response: We considered both options and ultimately selected an RFP. However, there is flexibility with cost proposal development. There is a suite of dollars available. If an emphasis should be placed on front-end analysis, there is an opportunity to do that. If one phase takes precedence, you can adjust accordingly. Given the amount of data available, we will require the consultant team to prioritize and make decisions.

19) Question: How will the information on the addendum be pushed out?

Response: We will contact attendees at the preproposal meeting directly. Additional recipients will receive the information via email through standard MPRB procurement emails.

20) Question: Is there a hard deadline by when construction needs to be implemented related to the LCCMR funding? Is there anything that would limit the ability to implement based on the construction schedule?

Response: The proposed timeline in the RFP keeps the MPRB on schedule with the LCCMR work plan (provided as part of the RFP). Although it may be possible to make changes in the timeline, this will require amendments that will complicate project development and potentially disrupt construction.

END OF ADDENDUM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Consultant Team</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jonathon Kusa</td>
<td>Inter-FluvE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jkusa@interfluvemn.com">jkusa@interfluvemn.com</a></td>
<td>612-490-8230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Jastram</td>
<td>RockLeaf Water</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brian.jastram@riwenvironmental.com">brian.jastram@riwenvironmental.com</a></td>
<td>651-274-0419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Holcomb</td>
<td>MN DNR</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kathryn.holcomb@state.mn.us">kathryn.holcomb@state.mn.us</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay Ahlman</td>
<td>MN DNR</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lindsay.ahlman@state.mn.us">lindsay.ahlman@state.mn.us</a></td>
<td>651-314-6809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Engstrom</td>
<td>PE Services</td>
<td><a href="mailto:taylor.engstrom@pescervicesmn.com">taylor.engstrom@pescervicesmn.com</a></td>
<td>651-334-2285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Pranceius</td>
<td>EOR</td>
<td>mpranceius@com</td>
<td>765-533-4262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aidan Dunne</td>
<td>City of Minneapolis</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aidan.dunne@minneapolismn.gov">aidan.dunne@minneapolismn.gov</a></td>
<td>x2607</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preproposal Meeting
October 25, 2023

Request for Proposal:
Mississippi River Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Mussel Reintroduction Project Design and Engineering Services
Welcome

Project Team Hosts

- **Adam Arvidson**, Director of Strategic Planning, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
- **Cliff Swenson**, Project Manager, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
- **Della Schall Young**, Consulting Project Manager, Young Environmental Consulting Group
- **Aidan Dunne**, Compliance Analyst, City of Minneapolis – Dept. of Civil Rights
Project Team

- Adam Arvidson
- Cliff Swenson
- Kate Holcomb
- Lindsay Ohlman
- Isabel Boyce
- Della Schall Young
Project Background

• Industrial development disturbed Upper Mississippi River’s once-rich aquatic habitat
• Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board working to revitalize habitat through shoreline improvements
• Funding from Environmental and Natural Resources Trust Fund (ENRTF) is available to further enhance habitat in the Mississippi Islands

Photo Credit: Minneapolis Parks Foundation
Project Background

Project Activities

• Planning habitat restoration to reintroduce mussels
• Implementing habitat restoration
• Reintroducing up to four native mussel species
• Monitoring mussel species around islands for 3 years
• Developing a long-term management plan to sustain the habitat on 4 islands
Project Area & Access

Project Area

• Potential Sites for Restoration
• Consultants to Prioritize Sites
Project Area & Access

Public Access Points for Site Visits:

- Plymouth Avenue Bridge (View: Hall’s Island)
- Marshall Terrace Park (View: Heron Rookery)
- North Mississippi Regional Park (View: shoreline restoration)
General RFP Information

Proposal Schedule

- Oct 11: Release of RFP
- Oct 25 (9:30 am): Preproposal Meeting
- Oct 27 (3:00 pm): Questions/Clarifications Due
- Nov. 1: Last Addenda Posted; Q&A Released
- Nov. 15 (3:00 pm): Proposals Due
- Nov. 22: Interview Notifications*
- End Nov.: Interviews*
- End Nov.: Consultant Selection

*if required
General Information

Proposal Contacts:
TO: Della Young, Consulting Project Manager, Young Environmental Consulting Group
della@youngecg.com

CC: Cliff Swenson, Project Manager, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
Cswenson@minneapolisparks.org

Additional Questions Due: October 27, 2023 at 3:00pm
Project Development Stages

- Preliminary Design/Schematic Design
- Design Development
- Construction Documents
## Request for Proposals Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Page Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cover Letter</td>
<td>• Introduce your team and proposal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Firm Experience     | • What is your team’s prior experience?  
• What is your experience with monitoring mussel reintroduction?                                                                                                                                      | 3          |
| 3. Project Understanding| • What is your understanding of potential issues, recommended solutions, and unique approaches?  
• How are you incorporating SUBP partners?  
• How have you successfully handled similar projects (i.e. mussels, complex river systems)?                                              | 2          |
# Request for Proposals Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Page Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Key Personnel Experience</td>
<td>• Who are your key personnel and what are their qualifications?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Are there any other roles necessary to perform the work that were not included?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Approach</td>
<td>• What is your approach to the design process?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What deliverables will be important at various stages?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Schedule</td>
<td>• What is your approach to deliver the project by August 2024?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What are your concerns with the schedule and recommendations for improvement?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Request for Proposals Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Page Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Cost/Fees</td>
<td>• What is your proposed cost of services and how were they calculated?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8. Review of Standard Agreement for Professional Services | • Are there any components of the standard agreement that are not acceptable?  
• What changes are suggested?  | 2          |
| 9. Small and Underutilized Business Program (SUBP Form) | • What was your good faith effort to meet SUBP goal?  
• **The SUBP goal for this project is 5%.** | Include Form: Up to 2 |
| 10. Certification                            | • Sign and certify your proposal                                         | 1          |
SUBP Goal

5% goal for MBE/WBE firm participation
3. Request for Proposals

Criteria for Review of Proposals

- Firm Qualifications: 30%
- Project Team Qualifications: 20%
- Experience and Knowledge with Project Components: 20%
- Project Understanding: 20%
- SUBP Commitment: 10%

Total: 100%
Question Received: If a firm were to submit a response to this request and be awarded this contract, would that firm be precluded from bidding on the resulting implementation scope of the project?

MPRB Response: Yes, the firm awarded the consulting contract cannot submit a bid to implement the project.
Question Received: Would the MPRB be interested in receiving a design/build proposal for this project?

MPRB Response: No, we are not interested in a design/build proposal. Our procurement rules do not allow for design/build contracting.
Any additional questions?
Next steps

- **Oct 11** Release of RFP
- **Oct 25 (9:30 am)** Preproposal Meeting
- **Oct. 27 (3:00 pm)** Questions/Clarifications Due
- **Nov. 1** Last Addenda Posted; Q&A Released
- **Nov. 15 (3:00 pm)** Proposals Due
- **Nov. 22** Interview Notifications*
- **End Nov.** Interviews*
- **End Nov.** Consultant Selection

*if required
THIS FORM IS DUE WITH YOUR PROPOSAL.

CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS – DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL RIGHTS

SUBP\(^1\) COMMITMENT FORM

INSTRUCTIONS:

- List **all** known consultants (including your company), sub-consultants, sub-contractors, suppliers, and service providers **that will be used on the project**.
- Make additional copies of this form as necessary.
- This completed form should show how the proposer intends to include minority-owned and women-owned business enterprises (MBEs and WBEs) to meet the SUBP goal. **By completing this form you are committing to using the MBE and WBE firms listed for at least the dollar amounts that you listed in this form.**
- A consultant shall not substitute, reduce participation of, or eliminate MBE/WBE sub-consultants listed in this form without prior written approval of the Minneapolis Department of Civil Rights. A consultant who substitutes or removes an MBE/WBE sub-consultant listed in this form without prior written approval shall be subject to a fine of up to $10,000 per violation, or other penalties listed in ordinance §423.120.
- Only MBEs and WBEs certified as Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE)\(^2\) count toward the SUBP goal. Place a mark “x” in the appropriate column below if a firm is DBE-certified as an MBE or WBE.
  - To count toward the SUBP goal, the MBE/WBE must be DBE certified in the scope of work it will perform, and the MBE/WBE must have its principal place of business located within the Minnesota counties of Anoka, Carver, Chisago, Dakota, Hennepin, Isanti, Le Sueur, Mille Lacs, Ramsey, Scott, Sherburne, Sibley, Washington, and Wright, and the Wisconsin counties of Pierce and St. Croix.
- If an MBE/WBE subcontracts work to a non-MBE/WBE, the value of that work will **not** count toward the SUBP goal.
- An MBE/WBE must perform a commercially useful function to count toward the SUBP goal. An MBE/WBE performs a commercially useful function when it executes a distinct element of work and carries out its responsibilities by actually performing, managing, and supervising the work involved.
- **This form is due with your proposal. Failing to complete and submit this form, or indicating “not applicable,” may result in a non-responsive proposal.**

---

\(^1\) For more information about the Small and Underutilized Business Program (SUBP) goals, see the SUBP Special Provisions published with this RFP, and review Minneapolis Ordinances Chapter 423.

\(^2\) A firm’s DBE certification, and business location, should be verified by checking in the online MnUCP Directory: [http://mnucp.metc.state.mn.us/](http://mnucp.metc.state.mn.us/). A firm’s current profile in that directory is evidence of current DBE certification.
# CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS – DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL RIGHTS

## SUBP COMMITMENT FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Phone &amp; Email</th>
<th>Contact Method (fax, phone, email)</th>
<th>Date of Solicitation</th>
<th>Scope of Work</th>
<th>Quote Amount</th>
<th>DBE-certified MBE</th>
<th>DBE-certified WBE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOUR FIRM HERE &gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rev. July 2021*
**THIS FORM IS DUE WITH YOUR PROPOSAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Phone &amp; Email</th>
<th>Contact Method (fax, phone, email)</th>
<th>Date of Solicitation</th>
<th>Scope of Work</th>
<th>Quote Amount</th>
<th>DBE-certified MBE</th>
<th>DBE-certified WBE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check here if your company intends to self-perform all work and DOES NOT intend to subcontract out any work for this project: ☐

*If your company is not DBE-certified, checking this box means that your company will need to demonstrate good faith efforts (GFE) to meet the SUBP goal, in order to be awarded the contract. All GFE documents and supporting evidence will be due upon request by the City.*

The proposer certifies that the foregoing is correct, and that all known consultants (including your company), sub-consultants, sub-contractors, suppliers, and service providers that will be used on the project are listed herein.

**Failure to complete and submit this form may result in your proposal being deemed non-responsive.**

Proposer Company Name ___________________________ Contact Name & Title ___________________________ Phone & Email ___________________________ Date __________

*Rev. July 2021*
Table 1. Summary of survey results for native freshwater mussel timed searches conducted in the Mississippi River by the MN DNR between St. Anthony Falls and the I-694 bridge during 2015 and 2019. A total of 239 individuals consisting of 14 species (see Table 2) were recorded live. Most mussels (64%; n = 154) were found in substrate consisting of a mixture of sand, gravel, and cobble. An additional 13% (n = 30) were found when boulder was present in the mixture. Mussels were rarely (10%; n = 25) found in homogenous sand and only 5% (n = 11) were found in substrate that included bedrock.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Date</th>
<th>Nearest Landmark</th>
<th>Species Count</th>
<th>Total Live</th>
<th>Sand</th>
<th>Gravel</th>
<th>Cobble</th>
<th>Boulder</th>
<th>Bedrock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/9/2015</td>
<td>Nicollet Island</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5/2019</td>
<td>Heron Rookery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/4/2019</td>
<td>Heron Rookery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9/2015</td>
<td>Hall’s island</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/4/2019</td>
<td>Heron Rookery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5/2019</td>
<td>Heron Rookery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5/2019</td>
<td>Heron Rookery</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2015</td>
<td>Olson’s Island</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9/2015</td>
<td>Nicollet Island</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2015</td>
<td>Kroening Nature Center</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9/2015</td>
<td>Heron Rookery</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2015</td>
<td>Minneapolis City Water Works</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5/2019</td>
<td>Heron Rookery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5/2019</td>
<td>Heron Rookery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9/2015</td>
<td>Olson’s Island</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2015</td>
<td>I-694 Bridge</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9/2015</td>
<td>Nicollet Island</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. List of live native freshwater mussel species collected during timed searches conducted in the Mississippi River by the MN DNR between St. Anthony Falls and the I-694 bridge during 2015 and 2019. Fourteen species (239 individuals) were documented, including the Fawnsfoot and Wartyback (MN Threatened; TH) and Black Sandshell (MN Special Concern; SC).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>State Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Quadrula quadrula</em></td>
<td>Mapleleaf</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Potamilus alatus</em></td>
<td>Pink Heelsplitter</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Obliquaria reflexa</em></td>
<td>Threehorn Wartyback</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lampsilis cardium</em></td>
<td>Plain Pocketbook</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fusconaia flava</em></td>
<td>Wabash Pigtoe</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Potamilus fragilis</em></td>
<td>Fragile Pappershell</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Strophitus undulatus</em></td>
<td>Creeper</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Amblema plicata</em></td>
<td>Threeridge</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ligumia recta</em></td>
<td>Black Sandshell</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Truncilla truncata</em></td>
<td>Deertoe</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pyganodon grandis</em></td>
<td>Giant Floater</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lampsilis siliquoidea</em></td>
<td>Fatmucket</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Truncilla donaciformis</em></td>
<td>Fawnsfoot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cyclonaias nodulata</em></td>
<td>Wartyback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity 1: Habitat Restoration and Wildlife Reintroduction Planning

The MN DNR conducted an informal site visit to Hall’s Island in September to visualize renovated areas, assess substrate and flow conditions, and search for native mussels. We focused our search in the area between the island and bank and found pockets of habitat with several species. We found nine common, native unionids, as well as Fingernail and Asian clams. The approximate ages of mussels ranged 0-4 years, which suggests some individuals were present prior to construction and persisted, while others likely recolonized post-construction. Mussels were found in substrate consisting predominantly of sand, coarse sand, and gravel. Silt, cobble, and boulders were present along the banks. The water depth averaged 2–3 feet and water flow was slightly obstructed by logs at the upstream end of the island. The site visit helped us determine the feasibility of releasing propagated mussels into this area in the coming years. We then began working on a plan to reintroduce up to four species we expect could survive and grow well in renovated habitats (see Figures).

Figure 1: Photos from the site visit to Hall’s Island by MNDNR in September 2023. A) looking downstream at the left descending bank from middle of the island, C) live native mussels found in the side-channel, and C) looking upstream at the left-descending bank from a sand bar in the side-channel.
Figure 2: Photos by MNDNR of native freshwater mussel species identified as candidates for propagation and reintroduction into Hall's Island or future renovated habitats. A) Plain Pocketbook (*Lampsilis cardium*; common), B) Black Sandshell (*Ligumia recta*; State Special Concern), C) Mucket (*Actinonaias ligamentina*; State Threatened), D) Higgins Eye (*Lampsilis higginsii*; State and Federally Endangered).

**Activity 3: Species Reintroduction and Monitoring**

Plain Pocketbook mussels propagated by CAMP in October 2022 grew in the lab overwinter at a rate of ~31.5 microns per day and were large enough to be transferred into secondary culture during May and June 2023 (see Figure). Lab survival was 19% and above average compared to other species reared at CAMP. The MN Zoo received 2,125 mussels averaging 10 mm in length that were placed into a flow-through aquaculture system fed by a pond on site. The Waterville State Fish Hatchery received 4,066 mussels ranging 7–11 mm that were placed into submerged baskets in a catfish pond fed by Tetonka Lake. Growth and survival of these mussels will be assessed during summer 2024 and we will determine if they are ready to be reintroduced at Hall’s Island.
Figure 3. Activities with Plain Pocketbook mussels by MN DNR during summer 2023. A) propagated juvenile mussels approximately seven months old were measured prior to transfer into secondary culture locations, B) flow-through bucket system holding mussels at the MN Zoo, and C) placing mussel baskets into Waterville State Fish Hatchery in May. Currently, approximately 6,100 juvenile Plain Pocketbook are being reared in preparation for reintroduction near Hall’s Island and future renovated habitats.