Jim Cox

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-5. **1=Strongly Disagree through 5=Strongly Agree**

Maximum score per request is 50 points.

For those not evaluating a proposal due to a **conflict of interest**, put "COI" in the score box.

	Overall proposal evaluation scores will be avera	aged using the nu		s evaluating that i		aı.							
		Design and Se	cope of Work		Planning		Other Funds	Bue	dget	Sustainability	Outcomes		
										and			
										Maintenance			
		The strategies are		The request is	The request is	The request	The request	The budget	The budget	The request	The stated		
		clear, effective,	problem needing		fully grounded in	effectively	maximizes	supplements the	clearly identifies	clearly specifies	outcomes are		
		and appropriate	attention.	multiple MN	conservation	addresses one or	leverage and	organizations	how the OHF	who is	measurable and		
		to the problem(s)		conservations	science.	more relevant	coordination with	traditional	money will be	responsible for,	provide		
		outlined.		plans.		LSOHC section	other funding	funding sources	used and the level		meaningful		
						priorities	sources.	rather than	of funding is	sources for the	evaluative data.		
								substitute.	reasonable for	accomplishments			
									each component.	will be sustained and maintained.			
										and maintained.			
Project ID	Project Title											Total	Member Comments
P A 01	Conserving Grasslands and Working Lands for	4	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	27	
	Wildlife		5	J. J	-	5	5	-	-	5	-		
P A 02	SNA and Native Prairie Bank Easement	4	4	4	4	4	2	3	2	3	3	33	
FA02	Acquisition	4	4	4	4	4	2	5	2	5	5	55	
P A 03	MN Buffers for Water and Wildlife - II	2	2	2	2	2	4	3	2	2	2	23	
P A 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project 3	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	38	
D A 05	Company Diversity of the divertees the bitst Company II	4		4	4	3	3	3	4	2	4	20	
P A 05	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex II	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	36	
D A OC	DND Wildlife Management Area Acquisition	2	4	2	2	3	3	2	2	4	4	20	
P A 06	DNR Wildlife Management Area Acquisition	3	4	3	2	5	5	2	2	4	4	30	
P A 07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife	4	4	2	2	3	4	4	4	4	2	20	
PAU	Refuge Land Acquisition	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	36	
D 4 00	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area					2	2			2	2	26	
P A 08	Program Phase 4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	36	
	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area	_	_		_			_	_	_			
P A 09	Program, Phase 4	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	43	
		_						_		-			
P A 10	Prairie Chicken Wildlife Habitat Partnership	4	5	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	40	
P A 11	Green Corridor Legacy Program Phase IV	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	34	
D. D.C. 04	DNR Prairie/Grassland Habitat Restoration	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2		2	20	
P RE 01	and Enhancement	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	4	3	29	
	Habitat Restoration/Enhancement in the		_										
P RE 02	Anoka Sandplain -Phase 2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	27	
	Mid-Minnesota River Corridor Habitat	_			_			_			-		
P RE 03	Restoration and Enhancement	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	26	
P RE 04	Enhanced Public Land Grasslands	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	29	
	Protecting Mississippi River Corridor Habitat		_										
F A 01	ACUB Partnership	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	29	
	Mississippi River Northwoods Habitat	1											
F A 02	Complex Protection	4	5	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	39	
		-											
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase 4											0	
L		1	I	I	I I	I	I	l	I	I I	I		I

		The strategies are clear, effective, and appropriate to the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing attention.	The request is well supported by multiple MN conservations plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage and coordination with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organizations traditional funding sources rather than substitute.	The budget clearly identifies how the OHF money will be used and the level of funding is reasonable for each component.	The request clearly specifies who is responsible for, how, and funding sources for the accomplishments will be sustained and maintained.	The stated outcomes are measurable and provide meaningful evaluative data.	
Project ID	Project Title											Total Member Comments
F A 04	Root River Watershed Acquisition and Restoration	4	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	30
F A 05	Conservation Easements in the Avon Hills using MMAPLE	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	27
F A 06	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	29
F A 07	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands Cass County	4	3	3	3	3	2	3	4	4	4	33
F A 08	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	28
F A 09	Acquisition: State Forest Land	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	26
F RE 01	MN DNR Accelerated Forest Wildlife Habitat Program	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	26
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	30
W A 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	38
W A 02	Columbus Lake Conservation Area	3	3	3	2	3	4	3	3	4	3	31
W RE 01	Living Shallow Lakes & Wetlands Initiative	4	4	4	4	3	2	3	4	3	4	35
W RE 02	Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement	3	4	4	4	3	2	3	3	3	3	32
W RE 03	Marsh Lake Enhancement	2	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	29
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Program	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	29
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 3											0
H A 03	Riparian and Lakeshore Protection/ Managemment in Dakota County	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	28
H RE 01	Lower St. Louis River Habitat Restoration	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	29
H RE 02	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Habitat Enhancement Program	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	36
H RE 03	Grand Marais Creek Outlet Restoration	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	34
H RE 04	Seven Mile Creek Watershed Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	28
H RE 05	Knife River Habitat Restoration	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	28
H RE 06	Zequanox as the control for Zebra Mussels	1	4	1	1	1	2	1	3	2	2	18
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program	4	4	4	4	4	2	3	3	4	4	36
X 02	Contract Management	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	27
X 03	Restoration Evaluations Program	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	20
		l	l	l	I	l		l	l		ļ	

Scott Rall

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-5. **1=Strongly Disagree through 5=Strongly Agree**

Maximum score per request is 50 points.

For those not evaluating a proposal due to a **conflict of interest**, put "COI" in the score box.

		Design and Scop	e of Work	Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability	Outcomes	
		The strategies are clear, effective, and appropriate to the problem(s) outlined.	problem needing attention.	The request is well supported by multiple MN conservations plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage and coordination with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organizations traditional funding sources rather than substitute.	The budget clearly identifies how the OHF money will be used and the level of funding is reasonable for each component.	and Maintenance The request clearly specifies who is responsible for, how, and funding sources for the accomplishments will be sustained and maintained.	The stated outcomes are measurable and provide meaningful evaluative data.	
	Project Title											Total Member Comments
P A 01	Conserving Grasslands and Working Lands for	4	5	5 4	. 2	4 5	0)	4 4	. 2	4 4	38 75K per years seems high for project leader. Can we use
D A 02	Wildlife	-				-				-		existing FBA's w/o need for additional money?
P A 02	SNA and Native Prairie Bank Easement Acquisition	5	4		2	+ 5) 2	4 4	4	<u> </u>	37 Maintenance \$ is dependant on future allocations
P A 03	MN Buffers for Water and Wildlife - II	4	4	4 3	. 2	4 5	3	8 4	4 5	5	5 4	41 Only support is tied to clean water buffers. No stand alone buffers
P A 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project 3	3	4	L 5	. 2	4 4	5	5 2	4 3	3	3 4	39 Capital exp seem necessary, unclear as to what 352 K. Additional dollars for supplies will entail
P A 05	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex II	5	; 3	3 4	. 2	4 5	6 C) 3	3 3	. 2	1 4	35 With 11 listed partners, why is there no cash leverage for this project? It states matching funds wil be provided, why are they not listed as leverage?
P A 06	DNR Wildlife Management Area Acquisition	5	4	4 5	. 2	4 5	; () 2	4 4	. 2	1 5	40
P A 07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition	5	4	4	. 2	4 4	. 2	1 2	4 4	. 2	ļ 5	42 Want solid % of acquisitions vs. easements
P A 08	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program Phase 4	5	4	۶ 5	2	4 4) 2	4 4	. 2	¥ 5	39
P A 09	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase 4	5	4	L 5		4 5	5 5	5 4	4 4	. 2	4 5	45
P A 10	Prairie Chicken Wildlife Habitat Partnership	5	6 4	L 5	. 2	4 5	5	5 2	4 4	. 2	ļ 5	45 Who will own fee acquisition title on purchase w/o pilt liability? How do you obtain access on eased lands?
P A 11	Green Corridor Legacy Program Phase IV	4	. 3	3 4		1 4)	4 4	. 2	1 4	35 Acquiring land already protected are questionable. Why not acquire UN-protected lands? Can donation or other funding sources be counted on to purchase currently protected property?
P RE 01	DNR Prairie/Grassland Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	5	4	4	. 2	4 4	. C) 2	4 4	. 2	4	37 Will you be drilling wells? Is this more cost effective than burning?
P RE 02	Habitat Restoration/Enhancement in the Anoka Sandplain -Phase 2	4	4	4	. 2	4 4	. 3	8 4	4 4	. 2	4	39
P RE 03	Mid-Minnesota River Corridor Habitat	4	. 2	2 3	3	3 3	() (0 2		0 0	17
	Restoration and Enhancement											
P RE 04	Enhanced Public Land Grasslands	4	3	3	3	3 3	0) 4	4 3	2	2 2	27 This is a re-grant program
F A 01	Protecting Mississippi River Corridor Habitat	4	- 3	4	. 2	4 4	5	°	4 4	. 2	4 4	40
	ACUB Partnership	I	1	1	1	I	1	I	I	1	1 I	I I

		The strategies are clear, effective, and appropriate to the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing attention.	The request is well supported by multiple MN conservations plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage and coordination with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organizations traditional funding sources rather than substitute.	The budget clearly identifies how the OHF money will be used and the level of funding is reasonable for each component.	The request clearly specifies who is responsible for, how, and funding sources for the accomplishments will be sustained and maintained.	The stated outcomes are measurable and provide meaningful evaluative data.		
Project ID	Project Title											Total	Member Comments
F A 02	Mississippi River Northwoods Habitat	5	5	5	4	3	C) 5	5 5	4	4	40	With so many partners, why no cost share?
	Complex Protection												
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase 4											0	
F A 04	Root River Watershed Acquisition and	4	5	4	4	5	C) 4	L 3	3	3	35	
	Restoration												
F A 05	Conservation Easements in the Avon Hills using MMAPLE	3	2	3	3	1	4	4 3	8 2	4	4	29	
F A 06	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership	5	j 4	. 5	4	4	С) 4	4	. 4	5	39	
F A 07	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands Cass County	4	. 3	3	3	3	З	3 3	3 3	4	4	33	
F A 08	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership	2	2	2	2	2	C) 2	2 2	. 2	2	18	
F A 09	Acquisition: State Forest Land	4	4	3	4	4	C	0 4	4 3	3	3	32	
F RE 01	MN DNR Accelerated Forest Wildlife Habitat	3	2	3	4	2	C	3	1	. 2	3	23	
	Program	_	_			_		-	_	_			
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative	2	. 1	2	2	2	2	2 4	1	. 1	2	19	
W A 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership	4	4	4	4	4	5	5 4	l 1	. 4	4	38	
W A 02	Columbus Lake Conservation Area	5	4	5	4	4	4	L 5	5 4	. 4	5	44	
W RE 01	Living Shallow Lakes & Wetlands Initiative	5	5	4	4	5	5	5 3	3	5	5	44	
W RE 02	Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement	5	5	4	4	5	C) 3	3	0	5	34	Is pre-design constitutional?
W RE 03	Marsh Lake Enhancement	5	5	4	4	5	5	5 4	4 4	. 4	5		Is match in hand?
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Program	3	4	3	4	4	1	4	1	. 2	3	29	Can more money be directed to metro region?
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 3	4	3	4	4	4	3	3 4	l 3	3	3	35	
H A 03	Riparian and Lakeshore Protection/	3	2	4	3	3	5	5 3	3 3	4	2	32	
	Managemment in Dakota County												
H RE 01	Lower St. Louis River Habitat Restoration	3	3	3	4	4	4	4 4	l 1	. 2	3	31	
H RE 02	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Habitat	4	4	4	4	5	0) 4	4 3	4	5	37	1
	Enhancement Program												
H RE 03	Grand Marais Creek Outlet Restoration	4	2	3	4	4	4	4	4 3	3	3	34	
H RE 04	Seven Mile Creek Watershed Habitat	2	. 3	2	2	3	5	5 3	3 3	4	3	30	
	Restoration and Enhancement												
H RE 05	Knife River Habitat Restoration	5	5	4	4	4	C) 4	4 4	5	4	39	
H RE 06	Zequanox as the control for Zebra Mussels	2	5	1	1	2	2	2 2	3	1	1	20	
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program	4	5	5	5	5	С) 4	2	: 5	5	40	
X 02	Contract Management	2	2	2	2	2	C) 2	2 2	2	0	16	
X 03	Restoration Evaluations Program	2	2	2	2	2	с	2	2 2	2	0	16	1

Ryan Bronson

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-5. **1=Strongly Disagree through 5=Strongly Agree**

Maximum score per request is 50 points.

For those not evaluating a proposal due to a **conflict of interest**, put "COI" in the score box.

	F - F	Design and Scope of Work			Planning		Other Funds	Bu	dget	Sustainability	Outcomes		
			This is an urgent	The request is well supported by multiple MN conservations plans.	The request is	The request effectively addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage and coordination with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organizations traditional funding sources rather than substitute.	The budget clearly identifies how the OHF money will be used and the level of funding is reasonable for each component.	and Maintenance The request clearly specifies who is responsible for, how, and funding sources for the accomplishments will be sustained and maintained.	The stated outcomes are measurable and provide meaningful evaluative data.		
Project ID	Project Title											Total	Member Comments
P A 01	Conserving Grasslands and Working Lands for Wildlife	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	4	4	4	44	"office" parcel needs discussion
P A 02	SNA and Native Prairie Bank Easement Acquisition	5	4	5	5	4	2	3	4	3	4	39	Big Stone Lake parcel better as WPA
P A 03	MN Buffers for Water and Wildlife - II	5	5	4	5	5	3	4	4	3	4	42	
P A 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project 3	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	3	4	44	
P A 05	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex II	4	4	5	5	5	2	3	4	3	3	38	
P A 06	DNR Wildlife Management Area Acquisition	4	3	5	5	5	2	3	4	3	4	38	
P A 07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition	4	4	5	5	5	3	3	3	3	4	39	
P A 08	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program Phase 4	4	4	5	5	5	3	3	4	3	4	40	
P A 09	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase 4	4	4	5	5	5	4	3	4	4	4	42	
P A 10	Prairie Chicken Wildlife Habitat Partnership	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	3	3	4	44	
P A 11	Green Corridor Legacy Program Phase IV	4	4	4	5	4	2	1	3	3	3	33	projects getting far from MN River
P RE 01	DNR Prairie/Grassland Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	4	4	4	45	grazing revenue?
P RE 02	Habitat Restoration/Enhancement in the Anoka Sandplain -Phase 2	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	4	45	
P RE 03	Mid-Minnesota River Corridor Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	3	5	4	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	31	golf course planting in state park? Green Corridor?
P RE 04	Enhanced Public Land Grasslands	4	5	5	5	4	2	4	4	4	4	41	
F A 01	Protecting Mississippi River Corridor Habitat ACUB Partnership	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	49	
F A 02	Mississippi River Northwoods Habitat Complex Protection	5	5	5	5	5	2	4	5	4	4	44	
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase 4											0	

		The strategies are clear, effective, and appropriate to the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing attention.	The request is well supported by multiple MN conservations plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage and coordination with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organizations traditional funding sources rather than substitute.	The budget clearly identifies how the OHF money will be used and the level of funding is reasonable for each component.	The request clearly specifies who is responsible for, how, and funding sources for the accomplishments will be sustained and maintained.	The stated outcomes are measurable and provide meaningful evaluative data.		
Project ID	Project Title											Total	Member Comments
F A 04	Root River Watershed Acquisition and Restoration	4	3	4	5	4	2	4	4	3	3	36	MLT staff seems high
F A 05	Conservation Easements in the Avon Hills using MMAPLE	3	3	3	3	4	2	5	4	4	3	34	
F A 06	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership	5	4	4	4	4	3	4	5	5	5	43	
F A 07	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands Cass County	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	44	
F A 08	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership	4	3	4	4	4	2	4	3	3	4	35	
F A 09	Acquisition: State Forest Land	4	3	4	4	2	2	3	4	4	4	34	
F RE 01	MN DNR Accelerated Forest Wildlife Habitat Program	4	2	4	4	4	2	3	4	4	3	34	
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	36	
W A 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	50	
W A 02	Columbus Lake Conservation Area	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	4	44	
W RE 01	Living Shallow Lakes & Wetlands Initiative	4	5	4	4	5	4	3	4	4	4	41	
W RE 02	Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement	5	5	4	5	5	3	4	4	4	4	43	
W RE 03	Marsh Lake Enhancement	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	49	
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Program	5	3	5	5	4	4	3	4	4	3	40	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 3	4	2	4	4	4	4	3	2	4	4	35	
H A 03	Riparian and Lakeshore Protection/ Managemment in Dakota County	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	3	4	4	40	
H RE 01	Lower St. Louis River Habitat Restoration	4	3	4	4	4	5	3	4	4	4	39	
H RE 02	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Habitat Enhancement Program	5	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	45	
H RE 03	Grand Marais Creek Outlet Restoration	4	3	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	43	
H RE 04	Seven Mile Creek Watershed Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	44	
H RE 05	Knife River Habitat Restoration	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	5	4	3	39	
H RE 06	Zequanox as the control for Zebra Mussels	3	3	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	3	18	pure research not appropriate
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	
X 02	Contract Management	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	
X 03	Restoration Evaluations Program	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	

Wayne Enger

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-5. **1=Strongly Disagree through 5=Strongly Agree**

Maximum score per request is 50 points.

For those not evaluating a proposal due to a **conflict of interest**, put "COI" in the score box.

							1	1		1	1		
		Design and Scop	e of Work	Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability	Outcomes		
										and			
			I		I	I			1	Maintenance			
		The strategies are		The request is	The request is	The request	The request	The budget	The budget	The request	The stated		
		clear, effective, and appropriate	problem needing attention.	multiple MN	conservation	effectively addresses one or	maximizes leverage and	supplements the organizations	clearly identifies how the OHF	clearly specifies who is	outcomes are measurable and		
		to the problem(s)	attention.	conservations	science.	more relevant	coordination with	-	money will be	responsible for,	provide		
		outlined.		plans.	selence.	LSOHC section	other funding	funding sources	used and the level	how, and funding			
						priorities	sources.	rather than	of funding is	sources for the	evaluative data.		
								substitute.	reasonable for	accomplishments			
									each component.	will be sustained			
										and maintained.			
Project ID Pr	roject Title											Total	Member Comments
P A 01 C	onserving Grasslands and Working Lands for	5	3	4	5	5	0	5	3	3	5	38	
W	Vildlife												
P A 02 St	NA and Native Prairie Bank Easement	4	3	4	4	5	0	3	8 4	3	4	34	
A	cquisition												
	IN Buffers for Water and Wildlife - II	3	2	4	4	3	0	3	4	3	4	30	
	Ainnesota Prairie Recovery Project 3	4	3	4	4	4	5	4	4 3	3	3	37	
P A 05 Ca	annon River Headwaters Habitat Complex II	3	3	4	4	4	0	3	3	3	4	31	
P A 06 D	NR Wildlife Management Area Acquisition	4	4	4	4	4	0	3	8 4	4	4	35	
P A 07 N	Iorthern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	8 4	4	. 4	39	
R	efuge Land Acquisition												
P A 08 A	ccelerating the Wildlife Management Area	4	4	4	4	4	0	3	4	4	4	35	
Pi	rogram Phase 4												
P A 09 A	ccelerating the Waterfowl Production Area	4	5	4	4	4	5	5	5 4	4	4	43	
Pi	rogram, Phase 4												
P A 10 Pi	rairie Chicken Wildlife Habitat Partnership	3	3.00	4	4	4	5	5	5 4	4	. 4	40	
P A 11 G	reen Corridor Legacy Program Phase IV	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	35	
P RE 01 D	NR Prairie/Grassland Habitat Restoration	5	5	5	5	5	0	4	4	4	. 4	41	
aı	nd Enhancement												
P RE 02 H	labitat Restoration/Enhancement in the	5	3	5	5	5	2	3	8 4	4	4	40	
A	noka Sandplain -Phase 2												
P RE 03 N	/id-Minnesota River Corridor Habitat	5	3	5	5	5	0	4	4 3	4	4	38	
R	estoration and Enhancement												
P RE 04 EI	nhanced Public Land Grasslands	4	3	5	5	5	0	4	4 3	4	. 4	37	
	rotecting Mississippi River Corridor Habitat	4	3	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	43	
	CUB Partnership												
	lississippi River Northwoods Habitat	4	3	4	4	4	0	3	3 3	4	4	33	
C	omplex Protection		l		I	l	l	I	1	l			

		to the problem(s) outlined.	attention.	multiple MN conservations plans.	conservation science.	addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	coordination with other funding sources.	organizations h traditional funding sources rather than substitute.	how the OHF money will be used and the level of funding is reasonable for	sources for the accomplishments	g meaningful evaluative data. Is		
	Project Title	<u></u>		<u> </u>		<u> </u>	`	`	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		Member Comments
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase 4	3	, 4	4 2	4 3	3 3	3 0	3	, 3	3	3 3	29	9
	Root River Watershed Acquisition and Restoration	4	, 4	4	4	4 4	4 0	4	4	4	4 4	30	6
	Conservation Easements in the Avon Hills using MMAPLE	3	<i>;</i> З	3 ?	3	3 3	3 3	, 4	4	4 3	3 3	33	2
	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership	3	3 3	3 /	4	4 3	0 ک	3	د 4	4	4 4	33	2
	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands Cass County	4	¢	4 ?	3 ?	3 4	4 3	ر 4	4 3	3	4 3	3	5
	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership	4	+ 3	3 ?	3 ?	3 4	4 0	لا م	4 4	4	4 4	3	3
F A 09	Acquisition: State Forest Land	0	4 ?	3	3	3 /	4 C	J 0	4 0	4	4 4	3	
	MN DNR Accelerated Forest Wildlife Habitat Program	5	ج ر	3 .5	5	4 4	4 0	4	4	4	4 4	3.	7
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative		5 /	4	3	4 ?	3 ?	3 .	5 F	5	4 4	4	.0
W A 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership	D	4 3.00	,0	3	3 /	4 5	<u>خ</u> 5	5 0	4	4 4	3	
W A 02	Columbus Lake Conservation Area	5	3 F	5	4	4 /	4 4	4 4	4 0	4	4 4	42	2
W RE 01	Living Shallow Lakes & Wetlands Initiative	5	, 4	4	4 3	3 4	4 4	. 4	4	4	4 4	4(0
W RE 02	Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement	5	ا اذ	4 /	4	3 ′	4 C	۵ ر	4 0	4	4 4	3	
W RE 03	Marsh Lake Enhancement	5	/ ذ	4	4	4 ?	3 4	+ C	J 0	4 (4 4	3	6 Only Design with construction
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Program	5	5 3.00		4	4 /	4 0	4 0	4 0	4	4 4	40	-
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 3	0	4 3.00	,0 ⁻	3	4 /	4 5	ه ز	4 ?	3	4 4	3	
H A 03	Riparian and Lakeshore Protection/	2	2 ?	3	3	3 ?	3 0	4 ?	3 ?	3	3 3	3	.0
()	Managemment in Dakota County	1									!		
H RE 01	Lower St. Louis River Habitat Restoration		s /	4	4	4 /	4 5	<u>:</u> د	3 ?	3	4 3	3	
	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Habitat	4	4 ?	3	3 /	4 4	4 0	4	4 4	4 /	4 4	34	4
	Enhancement Program	-			4	2	2	-		2	<u>م</u>	3	
	Grand Marais Creek Outlet Restoration	- *	, J	3	4	3 3	ر ز	-	i 3	ء ا		3	
	Seven Mile Creek Watershed Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	4	4	4 4	4 3	3 4	/ D	4	4	r é	4 4		0 Funding on Public Land Only
	Knife River Habitat Restoration	4	4 ?	3 /	4 /	4 0	4 0	ן 4	4 3	3 /	4 4	34	
H RE 06	Zequanox as the control for Zebra Mussels	2	. 5	2 اذ	2 7	2 5	, 4	4	, 4	4	4 4	30	6
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program	5	5 (ر	5 5	5 5	5 5	ذ 3	, 4	4 4	4	4 4	44	4
X 02	Contract Management	۲ ۱	s r	0 (0 ′	0 r	0 C	ა r	ა r	<u>ه</u> ر	0 0	(0
	Restoration Evaluations Program	۲ (o r	0	0	0 r	0 r	ა r	0 r	o /	0 0		0

David Hartwell

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-5. **1=Strongly Disagree through 5=Strongly Agree**

Maximum score per request is 50 points.

For those not evaluating a proposal due to a **conflict of interest**, put "COI" in the score box.

	Overall proposal evaluation scores will be aver	1	cope of Work	0	Planning		Other Funds	Buc	dget	Sustainability	Outcomes		
		The strategies are clear, effective, and appropriate to the problem(s) outlined.		The request is well supported by multiple MN conservations plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage and coordination with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organizations traditional funding sources rather than substitute.	The budget clearly identifies how the OHF money will be used and the level of funding is reasonable for each component.	and Maintenance The request clearly specifies who is responsible for, how, and funding sources for the accomplishments will be sustained and maintained.	The stated outcomes are measurable and provide meaningful evaluative data.		
Project ID	Project Title											Total	Member Comments
P A 01	Conserving Grasslands and Working Lands for Wildlife	3	3	4	4	5	1	3	3	3	4	33	
P A 02	SNA and Native Prairie Bank Easement Acquisition	5	4	5	5	5	1	3	4	4	5	41	
P A 03	MN Buffers for Water and Wildlife - II	4	3	4	4	5	1	3	4	3	5	36	
P A 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project 3	3	4	4	4	5	2	2	2	5	5	36	
P A 05	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex II	4	3	5	5	5	1	4	4	4	4	39	
P A 06	DNR Wildlife Management Area Acquisition	4	3	5	4	5	1	3	3	3	4	35	
P A 07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition	4	3	5	5	5	2	3	4	4	4	39	
P A 08	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program Phase 4	3	3	5	4	5	1	3	3	3	4	34	
P A 09	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase 4	3	3	5	4	5	4	4	3	3	4	38	
P A 10	Prairie Chicken Wildlife Habitat Partnership	4	3	5	4	5	1	3	3	3	4	35	
P A 11	Green Corridor Legacy Program Phase IV	3	2	4	3	4	1	3	3	3	3	29	
P RE 01	DNR Prairie/Grassland Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	3	3	3	4	5	1	2	2	2	3	28	
P RE 02	Habitat Restoration/Enhancement in the Anoka Sandplain -Phase 2	3	2	3	3	5	1	3	2	2	3	27	
P RE 03	Mid-Minnesota River Corridor Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	2	2	4	3	4	1	2	1	1	2	22	
P RE 04	Enhanced Public Land Grasslands	3	3	4	4	4	1	3	1	1	3	27	
F A 01	Protecting Mississippi River Corridor Habitat ACUB Partnership	4	3	4	4	5	4	3	3	3	4	37	
F A 02	Mississippi River Northwoods Habitat Complex Protection	4	4	4	3	5	1	4	3	3	4	35	
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase 4											0	

		The strategies are clear, effective, and appropriate to the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing attention.	The request is well supported by multiple MN conservations plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage and coordination with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organizations traditional funding sources rather than substitute.	The budget clearly identifies how the OHF money will be used and the level of funding is reasonable for each component.	The request clearly specifies who is responsible for, how, and funding sources for the accomplishments will be sustained and maintained.	The stated outcomes are measurable and provide meaningful evaluative data.		
Project ID	Project Title											Total	Member Comments
F A 04	Root River Watershed Acquisition and Restoration	4	3	5	4	5	3	4	4	4	4	40	
F A 05	Conservation Easements in the Avon Hills using MMAPLE	4	3	5	4	5	1	3	4	5	5	39	
F A 06	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership	4	3	5	3	5	1	4	4	3	4	36	
F A 07	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands Cass County	5	3	5	2	5	1	4	4	4	4	37	
F A 08	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership	3	2	5	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	29	
F A 09	Acquisition: State Forest Land	4	3	5	2	5	1	3	3	4	4	34	
F RE 01	MN DNR Accelerated Forest Wildlife Habitat Program	3	2	3	3	4	1	3	3	2	3	27	
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative	2	2	3	2	3	1	3	3	3	3	25	
W A 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership	5	4	5	3	5	5	3	3	4	4	41	
W A 02	Columbus Lake Conservation Area	5	3	5	4	5	3	5	4	5	5	44	
W RE 01	Living Shallow Lakes & Wetlands Initiative	3	3	5	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	33	
W RE 02	Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement	3	3	5	3	4	1	3	3	3	3	31	
W RE 03	Marsh Lake Enhancement	3	3	5	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	34	
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Program	4	3	5	4	5 5	2 3	4 3	4	3 3	4 3	38 36	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 3 Riparian and Lakeshore Protection/	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	50	
H A 03	Managemment in Dakota County	4	3	5	5	5	4	4	4	2	4	40	
H RE 01	Lower St. Louis River Habitat Restoration	5	3	5	5	5	4	4	3	5	4	43	
H RE 02	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Habitat	5	3	5	4	5	1	4	4	3	4	38	
	Enhancement Program	-	-	_						_			
H RE 03	Grand Marais Creek Outlet Restoration	3	2	3	2	3	3	4	3	3	3	29	
H RE 04	Seven Mile Creek Watershed Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	27	
H RE 05	Knife River Habitat Restoration	3	4	4	4	3	1	4	3	2	3	31	
H RE 06	Zequanox as the control for Zebra Mussels	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program	5	3	5	4	5	3	5	5	5	4	44	
X 02	Contract Management	5	3	4	3	5	3	4	4	5	3	39	
X 03	Restoration Evaluations Program	4	3	3	3	4	1	4	4	5	4	35	

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-5. 1=Strongly Disagree through 5=Strongly Agree

Maximum score per request is 50 points.

For those not evaluating a proposal due to a **conflict of interest**, put "COI" in the score box.

		Design and Sco	ope of Work	Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability & Maintenance	Outcomes		
		The strategies are clear, effective, and appropriate to the problem(s) outlined.	e This is an urgent problem needing o attention.	The request is we supported by multiple MN conservations plans.	II The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage and coordination with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organizations traditional funding sources rather than substitute.	The budget clearly identifies how the OHF money will be used and the level of funding is reasonable for each component.	clearly specifies who is responsible for, how, and	The stated outcomes are measurable and provide meaningful evaluative data.		
ID	Title											Total	Member Comments
P A 01	Conserving Grasslands and Working Lands for Wildlife	5	5	3.5	3.5	5	0	4	3	4	2	35	Exclude Lyndwood Tr5B
P A 02	SNA and Native Prairie Bank Easement Acquisition	5	4	5	5	4	0	4	4	3	5	39	Half not open
P A 03	MN Buffers for Water and Wildlife - II	4	4	3.5	3.5	3.5	0	4	3	3	2	30.5	Dimension of most productive nesting buffer? Parcel list missing.
P A 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project 3	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	
P A 05	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex II	5	3	5	4	4	0	4	4	3	0	32	Percent population with hunt/fish license ("1 hour drive for 1/2 MN population")? Species list source? Parcel description missing.
P A 06	DNR Wildlife Management Area Acquisition	5	4	5	4	5	0	5	4	3	3	38	Janet Johnson Memorial parcel included. Parcel contains cabin & well.
P A 07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife- Refuge Land Acquisition	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	
P A 08	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program Phase 4	4	4	4.5	4	5	0	4	1	3	4	33.5	\$275K/FTE? \$6K/acre. Parcel descriptions missing.
P A 09	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase 4	5	4	5	4	5	4	4.5	3	3	4	41.5	Parcel descriptions missing.
P A 10	Prairie Chicken Wildlife Habitat Partnership	4	3	3	4	3	0	3	1	3	4	28	\$333K/FTE?
P A 11	Green Corridor Legacy Program Phase IV	4	4	5	4	3	2	5	4	3	4	38	Includes old gravel pit
P RE 01	DNR Prairie/Grassland Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	5	3	5	4	5	0	5	5	3	3	38	Some not open
P RE 02	Habitat Restoration/Enhancement in the Anoka Sandplain -Phase 2	4	5	5	5	4.5	1	4	2	3	4	37.5	\$211K/FTE? Some not open.
P RE 03	Mid-Minnesota River Corridor Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	3	4	5	4	3	0	3	4	2	2	30	Some not open
P RE 04	Enhanced Public Land Grasslands	4	3	5	3	2	0	4	2	2	3	28	\$285K/FTE? \$44K/acre. Parcel list missing.
F A 01	Protecting Mississippi River Corridor Habitat ACUB Partnership	4	4	3	3	4	3.5	4	4	3	2	34.5	Truck @ \$0 listed under capital equipment. Not open.
F A 02	Mississippi River Northwoods Habitat Complex Protection	5	5	4	4	3	0	4	3	3	3	34	\$7K/acre. Parcel descriptions missing.
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase 4	W/D	W/D	W/D	W/D	W/D	W/D	W/D	W/D	W/D	W/D	W/D	
F A 04	Root River Watershed Acquisition and Restoration	4	5	4	4	4	0	4	4	3	3	35	Truck @ \$0 listed under capital equipment. Parcel descriptions missing. Some not open.
F A 05	Conservation Easements in the Avon Hills using MMAPLE	4	5	3	4	3	2	5	4	3	3	36	Not open.
F A 06	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership	3	3	4	4	4	0	4	4	3	4	33	East Central MN, not NE MN. Parcel descriptions missing.
F A 07	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands Cass County	3	4	2	2	2	1	4	4	4	2	28	What in-holdings? Parcel descriptions missing.

		The strategies are Th clear, effective, pr and appropriate to at the problem(s) outlined.	oblem needing	The request is wel supported by multiple MN conservations plans.	I The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage and coordination with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organizations traditional funding sources rather than substitute.	The budget clearly identifies how the OHF money will be used and the level of funding is reasonable for each component.	clearly specifies who is responsible for, how, and	The stated outcomes are measurable and provide meaningful evaluative data.		
ID	Title											Total	Member Comments
F A 08	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership	5	5	5	5	5	0	4	4	3	4	40	
F A 09	Acquisition: State Forest Land	5	5	5	4	5	0	5	4	3	3	39	Parcel descriptions missing.
F RE 01	MN DNR Accelerated Forest Wildlife Habitat Program	5	3	5	5	5	0	3	5	3	3	37	\$19K/acre? A couple not open.
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative	5	5	5	5	4	1	5	5	4	4	43	MAC Roster? \$18K/acre?
W A 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	3	4	45	\$17K/acre?
W A 02	Columbus Lake Conservation Area	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	35	Truck @ \$0 listed under capital equipment.
W RE 01	Living Shallow Lakes & Wetlands Initiative	5	5	5	5	5	2	4	4	3	3	41	Easements are not open.
W RE 02	Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement	4	4	5	4	5	0	4	5	3	3	37	
W RE 03	Marsh Lake Enhancement	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	42	Truck @ \$0 listed under capital equipment.
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Program	5	5	5	5	5	3	3	3	4	4	42	More details on parcels?
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 3	5	3	5	4	4	2	4	3	4	3	37	Mostly not open.
H A 03	Riparian and Lakeshore Protection/ Managemment in Dakota County	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	2	28	Truck @ \$0 listed under capital equipment. Not open.
H RE 01	Lower St. Louis River Habitat Restoration	4	4	5	5	5	3	4	2	5	3	40	\$19K/acre?
H RE 02	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Habitat Enhancement Program	5	3	5	4	5	0	5	3	4	4	38	
H RE 03	Grand Marais Creek Outlet Restoration	5	3	5	3	3	5	4	2	4	4	38	\$7K/acre. Parcel descriptions missing.
H RE 04	Seven Mile Creek Watershed Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	35	Buckthorn/honeysuckle control non-critical - more H2O Quality than habitat.
H RE 05	Knife River Habitat Restoration	4	3	3	4	4	0	4	4	3	3	32	
H RE 06	Zequanox as the control for Zebra Mussels	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	0	Ineligible - inconsistent with Constitution.
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	50	Utilizing same ranking system as programs/projects is illogical. Should be Y/N question, followed by level of \$ to be funded.
X 02	Contract Management											45	Utilizing same ranking system as programs/projects is illogical. Should be Y/N question, followed by level of \$ to be funded. Funding source should be 1% administrative portion of annual LSOHC dollars. 43% increase over last year.
X 03	Restoration Evaluations Program											45	Utilizing same ranking system as programs/projects is illogical. Should be Y/N question, followed by level of \$ to be funded. Funding source should be 1% administrative portion of annual LSOHC dollars.
											AVG	36.1	

AVG

36.1

Leon Lillie

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-5. **1=Strongly Disagree through 5=Strongly Agree**

Maximum score per request is **50 points.**

For those not evaluating a proposal due to a **conflict of interest**, put "COI" in the score box.

		Design and S	cope of Work		Planning		Other Funds	Buc	dget	Sustainability	Outcomes	
		The strategies are clear, effective, and appropriate to the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing attention.	The request is well supported by multiple MN conservations plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage and coordination with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organizations traditional funding sources rather than substitute.	The budget clearly identifies how the OHF money will be used and the level of funding is reasonable for each component.	and Maintenance The request clearly specifies who is responsible for, how, and funding sources for the accomplishments will be sustained and maintained.	The stated outcomes are measurable and provide meaningful evaluative data.	
Project ID	Project Title											Total Member Comments
P A 01	Conserving Grasslands and Working Lands for Wildlife	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	38
P A 02	SNA and Native Prairie Bank Easement Acquisition	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	39
P A 03	MN Buffers for Water and Wildlife - II	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	38
P A 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project 3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	48
P A 05	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex II	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	44
P A 06	DNR Wildlife Management Area Acquisition	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	39
P A 07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	37
P A 08	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program Phase 4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	38
P A 09	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase 4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	38
P A 10	Prairie Chicken Wildlife Habitat Partnership	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	38
P A 11	Green Corridor Legacy Program Phase IV	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	38
P RE 01	DNR Prairie/Grassland Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	47
P RE 02	Habitat Restoration/Enhancement in the Anoka Sandplain -Phase 2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	38
P RE 03	Mid-Minnesota River Corridor Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	37
P RE 04	Enhanced Public Land Grasslands	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	37
F A 01	Protecting Mississippi River Corridor Habitat ACUB Partnership	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	38
F A 02	Mississippi River Northwoods Habitat Complex Protection	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	50
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase 4]										0

		The strategies are clear, effective, and appropriate to the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing attention.	The request is well supported by multiple MN conservations plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage and coordination with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organizations traditional funding sources rather than substitute.	The budget clearly identifies how the OHF money will be used and the level of funding is reasonable for each component.	The request clearly specifies who is responsible for, how, and funding sources for the accomplishments will be sustained and maintained.	The stated outcomes are measurable and provide meaningful evaluative data.		
Project ID	Project Title											Total	Member Comments
F A 04	Root River Watershed Acquisition and Restoration	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	38	
F A 05	Conservation Easements in the Avon Hills using MMAPLE	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	41	
F A 06	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	37	
F A 07	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands Cass County	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	37	
F A 08	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	37	
F A 09	Acquisition: State Forest Land	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	38	
F RE 01	MN DNR Accelerated Forest Wildlife Habitat Program	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	38	
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	46	
W A 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	38	
W A 02	Columbus Lake Conservation Area	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	39	
W RE 01	Living Shallow Lakes & Wetlands Initiative	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	39	
W RE 02	Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	39	
W RE 03	Marsh Lake Enhancement	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	37	
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Program	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	38	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 3	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	43	
H A 03	Riparian and Lakeshore Protection/ Managemment in Dakota County	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	49	
H RE 01	Lower St. Louis River Habitat Restoration	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	42	
H RE 02	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Habitat Enhancement Program	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	39	
H RE 03	Grand Marais Creek Outlet Restoration	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	37	
H RE 04	Seven Mile Creek Watershed Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	38	
H RE 05	Knife River Habitat Restoration	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	37	
H RE 06	Zequanox as the control for Zebra Mussels	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	36	
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	40	
X 02	Contract Management	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	34	
X 03	Restoration Evaluations Program	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	34	
						1	I	1	l	I			

Denny McNamara

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-5. **1=Strongly Disagree through 5=Strongly Agree**

Maximum score per request is 50 points.

For those not evaluating a proposal due to a **conflict of interest**, put "COI" in the score box.

		Design and Scop	e of Work	Planning			Other Funds	Budget		-	Outcomes		
		The strategies are clear, effective, and appropriate to the problem(s) outlined.		The request is well supported by multiple MN conservations plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage and coordination with other funding sources.	-	The budget clearly identifies how the OHF money will be used and the leve of funding is reasonable for each component.	and Maintenance The request clearly specifies who is responsible for, how, and funding sources for the accomplishments will be sustained and maintained.	The stated outcomes are measurable and provide meaningful evaluative data.		
Project ID	Project Title											Total	Member Comments
P A 01	Conserving Grasslands and Working Lands for Wildlife	4	4	4	4	. 4	3	4	4	3	3	37	
P A 02	SNA and Native Prairie Bank Easement Acquisition	3	2	2 3	3	3	2	4	3	3	3	29	Hunting open unless action to close?
P A 03	MN Buffers for Water and Wildlife - II	5	4	4 4	5	6 4	. 3	4	4	4 4	4	41	
P A 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project 3	4	4	4 4	5	6 4	. 3	4	4	3	4	39	
P A 05	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex II	3	2	4 3	3	3	1	3	3	3	1	27	
P A 06	DNR Wildlife Management Area Acquisition	4	2	4	4	4 4	3	4	. 2	4	4	39	
P A 07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition	3	3	3 3	4	. 3	3	3	3	4	3	32	l assume not open to public hunting
P A 08	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program Phase 4	4	4	4	4	. 4	4	3	4	4	4	39	
P A 09	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase 4	4	4	4	4	. 4	4	3	2	4	4	39	
P A 10	Prairie Chicken Wildlife Habitat Partnership	4	3.00) 3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	32	
P A 11	Green Corridor Legacy Program Phase IV	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	1	2	24	
P RE 01	DNR Prairie/Grassland Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	5	5	5 5	4	. 4	3	4	2	4	4	42	
P RE 02	Habitat Restoration/Enhancement in the Anoka Sandplain -Phase 2	5	4	4 5	4	. 5	4	4		4	4	43	
P RE 03	Mid-Minnesota River Corridor Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	3	2	4 3	3	. 4	3	4	3	3	3	33	
P RE 04	Enhanced Public Land Grasslands	5	5	5 5	4	5	3	4		4	4	43	
F A 01	Protecting Mississippi River Corridor Habitat ACUB Partnership	3	4	1 3	4	. 4	3	4		4 3	3	35	Can more of area be open to public hunting?
F A 02	Mississippi River Northwoods Habitat Complex Protection	3	2	4 4	4	. 2	3	4	3	3 4	4	37	
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase 4											0	

		The strategies are clear, effective, and appropriate to the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing attention.	The request is well supported by multiple MN conservations plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage and coordination with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organizations traditional funding sources rather than substitute.	The budget clearly identifies how the OHF money will be used and the level of funding is reasonable for	The request clearly specifies who is responsible for, how, and funding sources for the accomplishments	evaluative data.		
									each component.	will be sustained and maintained.			
Due is st ID												та	tal Member Comments
	Project Title					<u> </u>							
F A 04	Root River Watershed Acquisition and Restoration	3	4	3	3	2	4 3	4	4	. 2	+ :	3	35
F A 05	Conservation Easements in the Avon Hills			2			2				2	2	35 Open to public hunting?
FAUS	using MMAPLE		4	5	-	_	F 5	~	, ,	-		5	55 Open to public hunding:
F A 06	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse	. 3	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	-	3	2	26 Should we be buying more public lands in this area now?
	Habitat Partnership	_	-	_	-	_	_	_	_				
F A 07	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands	2	2 3	3	3	3	3 3	3	2		2	2	26
	Cass County												
F A 08	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership	4	4	4	4	. 2	1 3	4	4	. 3	3	3	37 Really, this is inhancement more than acquisition?
F A 09	Acquisition: State Forest Land	3	3 3	3	4	. 4	ц З	4	ч з	3	3	4	34
F RE 01	MN DNR Accelerated Forest Wildlife Habitat	4	4	4	4	. 2	4 3	4	ч з	. 2	1 .	4	38
	Program												
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative	5	5 4	4	4	. 4	4 3	4	L 4	. 2	1 .	4	40
W A 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership	4	3.00	4	4	. 2	4 4	3	8 4	. 2	1	3	37
W A 02	Columbus Lake Conservation Area	4	L 5	4	4	. 2	1 4		L 4	. 4	1 .	4	41
W RE 01	Living Shallow Lakes & Wetlands Initiative	4	5	5	4	. 5	5 4	4	4	. 2	t !	5	44
W RE 02	Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement	4	L 5	5	4	. 5	5 4	4	4 3		2	3	39
W RE 03	Marsh Lake Enhancement	5	5 5	5	4	. 4	4 4	4	4	. 2	1 .	4	43
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Program	4	4.00	4	4	. 5	5 4	4	L 4	. 4	1 4	4	41
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 3	4	5.00	3	4	. 2	4 3	4	4	. 2	1 4	4	39
H A 03	Riparian and Lakeshore Protection/	4	l 5	3	4	. 4	4 3	4	4 4	. 2	1 4	4	39
	Managemment in Dakota County												
H RE 01	Lower St. Louis River Habitat Restoration	4	4 4	4	3	3	3 3	4	L 3		3	3	34
H RE 02	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Habitat	5	5 4	5	4	. 4	4 5	4	L 4	. 2	1	5	44
	Enhancement Program	-											
H RE 03	Grand Marais Creek Outlet Restoration	4	4	4	4	. 2	4 3	۷	4 4	. 2	1 4	4	39
H RE 04	Seven Mile Creek Watershed Habitat	4	4 4	4	4	. 2	4 3	4	4 4	. 4	1	3	38
	Restoration and Enhancement	-											
H RE 05	Knife River Habitat Restoration	4	4 3	3	3	4	4 4	4	4	. 4	1	3	36
H RE 06	Zequanox as the control for Zebra Mussels	4	5	4	2	. 2	4	4	5		1	3	39
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program	5	5	5	4	. 5	5 4	5	j 4	. 2	1 4	4	45
X 02	Contract Management	5	5 5	3	4	. 3	1	4	4	. 2	1 .	4	37
X 03	Restoration Evaluations Program	5	5 5	4	5	5	5 1	5	5 4	. 2	1	5	43
	·	1									ļ		

Les Bensch

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-5. **1=Strongly Disagree through 5=Strongly Agree**

Maximum score per request is 50 points.

For those not evaluating a proposal due to a **conflict of interest**, put "COI" in the score box.

	Overall proposal evaluation scores will be aver	1					1	i i					
		Design and S	cope of Work		Planning		Other Funds	Bu	dget	Sustainability	Outcomes		
		The strategies are clear, effective, and appropriate to the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing attention.	The request is well supported by multiple MN conservations plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage and coordination with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organizations traditional funding sources rather than substitute.	The budget clearly identifies how the OHF money will be used and the level of funding is reasonable for each component.	and Maintenance The request clearly specifies who is responsible for, how, and funding sources for the accomplishments will be sustained	The stated outcomes are measurable and provide meaningful evaluative data.		
										and maintained.			
Project ID	Project Title											Total	Member Comments
P A 01	Conserving Grasslands and Working Lands for Wildlife	4	4	4	5	4	4	3	3	4	5	40	
P A 02	SNA and Native Prairie Bank Easement Acquisition	4	4	3	4	3	2	3	3	3	4	33	
P A 03	MN Buffers for Water and Wildlife - II	5	5	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	38	
P A 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project 3	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	3	4	4	41	
P A 05	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex II	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	44	
P A 06	DNR Wildlife Management Area Acquisition	5	5	5	5	4	3	4	4	3	4	42	
P A 07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	37	
P A 08	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program Phase 4	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	4	4	4	44	
P A 09	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase 4	5	4	4	5	4	3	4	4	3	4	40	
P A 10	Prairie Chicken Wildlife Habitat Partnership	5	4	4	5	4	3	4	3	3	3	38	
P A 11	Green Corridor Legacy Program Phase IV	4	5	3	5	4	3	3	4	3	3	37	
P RE 01	DNR Prairie/Grassland Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	3	3	3	4	4	2	3	3	3	3	31	
P RE 02	Habitat Restoration/Enhancement in the Anoka Sandplain -Phase 2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30	
P RE 03	Mid-Minnesota River Corridor Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	3	5	4	3	3	2	2	2	2	4	30	
P RE 04	Enhanced Public Land Grasslands	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30	
F A 01	Protecting Mississippi River Corridor Habitat ACUB Partnership	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	33	
F A 02	Mississippi River Northwoods Habitat Complex Protection	4	3	3	3	3	1	2	3	3	3	28	
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase 4											0	

		The strategies are clear, effective, and appropriate to the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing attention.	The request is well supported by multiple MN conservations plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage and coordination with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organizations traditional funding sources rather than substitute.	The budget clearly identifies how the OHF money will be used and the level of funding is reasonable for each component.	The request clearly specifies who is responsible for, how, and funding sources for the accomplishments will be sustained and maintained.	The stated outcomes are measurable and provide meaningful evaluative data.		
Project ID	Project Title											Total	Member Comments
F A 04	Root River Watershed Acquisition and Restoration	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	27	
F A 05	Conservation Easements in the Avon Hills using MMAPLE	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	20	
F A 06	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	40	
F A 07	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands Cass County	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	40	
F A 08	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	25	
F A 09	Acquisition: State Forest Land	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30	
F RE 01	MN DNR Accelerated Forest Wildlife Habitat Program	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	37	
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	29	
W A 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	48	
W A 02	Columbus Lake Conservation Area	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30	
W RE 01	Living Shallow Lakes & Wetlands Initiative	5	5	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	36	
W RE 02	Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	37	
W RE 03	Marsh Lake Enhancement	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	45	
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Program	5	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	43	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	40	
H A 03	Riparian and Lakeshore Protection/ Managemment in Dakota County	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30	
H RE 01	Lower St. Louis River Habitat Restoration	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30	
H RE 02	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Habitat Enhancement Program	3	3	4	4	3	2	3	3	3	4	32	
H RE 03	Grand Marais Creek Outlet Restoration	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	35	
H RE 04	Seven Mile Creek Watershed Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	32	
H RE 05	Knife River Habitat Restoration	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	25	
H RE 06	Zequanox as the control for Zebra Mussels	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	20	
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	50	
X 02	Contract Management	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30	
X 03	Restoration Evaluations Program	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	20	1

Ron Schara

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-5. 1=Strongly Disagree through 5=Strongly Agree

Maximum score per request is **50 points.**

For those not evaluating a proposal due to a **conflict of interest**, put "COI" in the score box.

		Design and S	cope of Work		Planning		Other Funds	Bue	dget	Sustainability	Outcomes		
		The strategies are clear, effective, and appropriate to the problem(s) outlined.	-	The request is well supported by multiple MN conservations plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage and coordination with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organizations traditional funding sources rather than substitute.	The budget clearly identifies how the OHF money will be used and the level of funding is reasonable for each component.	and Maintenance The request clearly specifies who is responsible for, how, and funding sources for the accomplishments will be sustained and maintained.	The stated outcomes are measurable and provide meaningful evaluative data.		
Project ID	Project Title											Total	Member Comments
P A 01	Conserving Grasslands and Working Lands for Wildlife	3	4	4	5	5	3	4	2	3	4	37	cost per acre seems excessive
P A 02	SNA and Native Prairie Bank Easement Acquisition	3	3	3	5	5	3	4	3	2	2	33	cautious
P A 03	MN Buffers for Water and Wildlife - II	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	47	badly needed
P A 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project 3	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	3	3	4	43	
P A 05	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex II	3	5	4	4	5	5	4	3	2	4	39	badly needed
P A 06	DNR Wildlife Management Area Acquisition											0	cautious
P A 07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition	3	5	4	5	5	2	4	2	3	4	37	need more
P A 08	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program Phase 4	4	4	4	5	5	2	3	3	3	4	37	management questions
P A 09	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase 4	4	5	4	5	5	3	3	4	4	4	41	
P A 10	Prairie Chicken Wildlife Habitat Partnership	3	5	4	5	5	3	4	2	3	3	37	DNR land costs?
P A 11	Green Corridor Legacy Program Phase IV											0	needs work
P RE 01	DNR Prairie/Grassland Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	4	5	3	5	5	3	4	4	4	4	41	
P RE 02	Habitat Restoration/Enhancement in the Anoka Sandplain -Phase 2	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	46	
P RE 03	Mid-Minnesota River Corridor Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	3	3	43	needs work
P RE 04	Enhanced Public Land Grasslands	4	4	4	5	5	3	3	3	3	4	38	needs work, trees / 200 / acre??
F A 01	Protecting Mississippi River Corridor Habitat ACUB Partnership											0	unsure, fee aqquisition
F A 02	Mississippi River Northwoods Habitat Complex Protection	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	3	4	43	can DNR handle?
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase 4											0	

		The strategies are clear, effective, and appropriate to the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing attention.	The request is well supported by multiple MN conservations plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage and coordination with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organizations traditional funding sources rather than substitute.	The budget clearly identifies how the OHF money will be used and the level of funding is reasonable for each component.	The request clearly specifies who is responsible for, how, and funding sources for the accomplishments will be sustained and maintained.	The stated outcomes are measurable and provide meaningful evaluative data.		
Project ID	Project Title											Total	Member Comments
F A 04	Root River Watershed Acquisition and Restoration	4	5	5	5	5	3	4	3	4	4	42	
F A 05	Conservation Easements in the Avon Hills using MMAPLE	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	4	5	5	47	
F A 06	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership	4	3	5	5	4	3	4	3	3	5	39	
F A 07	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands Cass County	3	3	4	5	4	3	4	5	3	3	37	
F A 08	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	4	3	3	40	need more information
F A 09	Acquisition: State Forest Land	4	4	5	5	5	4	3	5	4	4	43	
F RE 01	MN DNR Accelerated Forest Wildlife Habitat Program	4	4	3	5	4	3	3	4	5	4	39	
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	31	questions
W A 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	48	
W A 02	Columbus Lake Conservation Area	5	4	4	3	4	2	3	5	5	5	40	
W RE 01	Living Shallow Lakes & Wetlands Initiative	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	47	
W RE 02	Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement	3	5	5	4	5	2	3	2	3	4	36	
W RE 03	Marsh Lake Enhancement	4	3	3	5	5	3	3	3	4	4	37	
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Program			_								0	needs clearer explanation
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 3	4	4	5	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	39	
H A 03	Riparian and Lakeshore Protection/ Managemment in Dakota County	4	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	45	
H RE 01	Lower St. Louis River Habitat Restoration	4	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	46	
H RE 02	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Habitat Enhancement Program	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	47	
H RE 03	Grand Marais Creek Outlet Restoration	-										0	needs more information
H RE 04	Seven Mile Creek Watershed Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	47	remove burn / tux (?)
H RE 05	Knife River Habitat Restoration	4	5	5	5	4	3	5	3	3	4	41	
H RE 06	Zequanox as the control for Zebra Mussels	4	5	5	5	4	3	5	4	4	5	44	research?
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	50	
X 02	Contract Management]										0	need explanation
X 03	Restoration Evaluations Program	-										0	approve
		I	l						1		l I		

Tom Saxhaug

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-5. **1=Strongly Disagree through 5=Strongly Agree**

Maximum score per request is **50 points.**

For those not evaluating a proposal due to a **conflict of interest**, put "COI" in the score box.

		Design and S	cope of Work		Planning		Other Funds	Bue	dget	Sustainability	Outcomes		
		The strategies are clear, effective, and appropriate to the problem(s) outlined.	-	The request is well supported by multiple MN conservations plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage and coordination with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organizations traditional funding sources rather than substitute.	The budget clearly identifies how the OHF money will be used and the level of funding is reasonable for each component.	and Maintenance The request clearly specifies who is responsible for, how, and funding sources for the accomplishments will be sustained and maintained.	The stated outcomes are measurable and provide meaningful evaluative data.		
Project ID	Project Title											Total	Member Comments
P A 01	Conserving Grasslands and Working Lands for Wildlife	3	3	3	2	2	1	3	4	2	4	27	
P A 02	SNA and Native Prairie Bank Easement Acquisition	3	2	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	27	
P A 03	MN Buffers for Water and Wildlife - II	3	2	3	3	2	4	2	2	3	2	26	
P A 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project 3	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	3	4	36	
P A 05	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex II	4	3	4	4	4	1	3	4	3	4	34	
P A 06	DNR Wildlife Management Area Acquisition	3	2	4	3	3	1	2	2	4	4	28	
P A 07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition	3	2	4	4	3	2	2	3	2	3	28	
P A 08	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program Phase 4	4	3	4	4	4	1	2	4	2	4	32	
P A 09	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase 4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	38	
P A 10	Prairie Chicken Wildlife Habitat Partnership	2	2	4	4	3	2	3	3	3	4	30	
P A 11	Green Corridor Legacy Program Phase IV	2	2	4	4	3	2	3	4	2	3	29	
P RE 01	DNR Prairie/Grassland Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	4	3	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	5	37	
P RE 02	Habitat Restoration/Enhancement in the Anoka Sandplain -Phase 2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	38	
P RE 03	Mid-Minnesota River Corridor Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	3	3	35	
P RE 04	Enhanced Public Land Grasslands	3	4	4	4	4	1	4	3	3	4	34	
F A 01	Protecting Mississippi River Corridor Habitat ACUB Partnership	4	4	3	3	4	3	2	4	3	4	34	
F A 02	Mississippi River Northwoods Habitat Complex Protection	4	5	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	38	
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase 4											0	

		The strategies are clear, effective, and appropriate to the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing attention.	The request is well supported by multiple MN conservations plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage and coordination with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organizations traditional funding sources rather than substitute.	The budget clearly identifies how the OHF money will be used and the level of funding is reasonable for each component.	The request clearly specifies who is responsible for, how, and funding sources for the accomplishments will be sustained and maintained.	The stated outcomes are measurable and provide meaningful evaluative data.		
Project ID	Project Title											Total	Member Comments
F A 04	Root River Watershed Acquisition and Restoration	2	2	4	4	4	1	3	3	2	4	29	
F A 05	Conservation Easements in the Avon Hills using MMAPLE	2	2	4	2	4	3	3	3	3	3	29	
F A 06	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership	4	3	4	4	4	1	4	4	2	4	34	
F A 07	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands Cass County	4	5	3	3	4	2	3	4	4	4	36	
F A 08	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership	3	3	4	4	4	1	3	3	2	4	31	
F A 09	Acquisition: State Forest Land	4	5	4	4	4	1	4	4	2	4	36	
F RE 01	MN DNR Accelerated Forest Wildlife Habitat Program	4	5	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	5	39	
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative	4	5	4	4	3	5	4	4	4	4	41	
W A 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership	4	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	3	4	41	
W A 02	Columbus Lake Conservation Area	4	4	4	4	4	2	3	3	4	4	36	
W RE 01	Living Shallow Lakes & Wetlands Initiative	4	4	4	4	4	2	3	3	3	4	35	
W RE 02	Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement	4	4	4	4	4	1	3	4	4	4	36	
W RE 03	Marsh Lake Enhancement	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	3	5	37	
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Program	5	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	2	4	38	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	2	4	36	
H A 03	Riparian and Lakeshore Protection/ Managemment in Dakota County	2	2	4	4	4	2	3	3	2	2	28	
H RE 01	Lower St. Louis River Habitat Restoration	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	5	4	38	
H RE 02	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Habitat Enhancement Program	4	4	4	4	4	1	3	4	5	4	37	
H RE 03	Grand Marais Creek Outlet Restoration	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	37	
H RE 04	Seven Mile Creek Watershed Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	3	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	36	
H RE 05	Knife River Habitat Restoration	4	4	3	4	4	1	3	4	4	4	35	
H RE 06	Zequanox as the control for Zebra Mussels	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	14	
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	50	
X 02	Contract Management	5	1	1	1	5	5	5	5	1	5	34	
X 03	Restoration Evaluations Program	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	5	22	

Bill Ingebrigtsen

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-5. **1=Strongly Disagree through 5=Strongly Agree**

Maximum score per request is 50 points.

For those not evaluating a proposal due to a **conflict of interest**, put "COI" in the score box.

	Overall proposal evaluation scores will be avera	1	cope of Work		Planning		Other Funds	Bu	dget	Sustainability	Outcomes		
		The strategies are clear, effective, and appropriate to the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent	The request is well supported by multiple MN conservations plans.	The request is	The request effectively addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage and coordination with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organizations traditional funding sources rather than substitute.	The budget	and Maintenance The request clearly specifies who is responsible for, how, and funding sources for the accomplishments will be sustained and maintained.	The stated outcomes are measurable and provide meaningful evaluative data.		
Project ID	Project Title											Total	Member Comments
P A 01	Conserving Grasslands and Working Lands for Wildlife	4	4	5	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	31	
P A 02	SNA and Native Prairie Bank Easement Acquisition	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	2	3	3	33	
P A 03	MN Buffers for Water and Wildlife - II	3	2	3	3	2	4	2	2	2	2	25	
P A 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project 3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	39	
P A 05	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex II	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	37	
P A 06	DNR Wildlife Management Area Acquisition	3	3	3	2	3	3	1	2	4	4	28	
P A 07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30	no public access - problematic
P A 08	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program Phase 4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	39	
P A 09	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase 4	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	43	
P A 10	Prairie Chicken Wildlife Habitat Partnership	4	5	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	38	
P A 11	Green Corridor Legacy Program Phase IV	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	3	36	
P RE 01	DNR Prairie/Grassland Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	1	4	3	27	
P RE 02	Habitat Restoration/Enhancement in the Anoka Sandplain -Phase 2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	27	
P RE 03	Mid-Minnesota River Corridor Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	36	
P RE 04	Enhanced Public Land Grasslands	3	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	34	
F A 01	Protecting Mississippi River Corridor Habitat ACUB Partnership	3	2	3	2	3	3	4	3	3	3	29	
F A 02	Mississippi River Northwoods Habitat Complex Protection	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	40	

		The strategies are clear, effective, and appropriate to the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing attention.	The request is well supported by multiple MN conservations plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses one or more relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage and coordination with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organizations traditional funding sources rather than substitute.	The budget clearly identifies how the OHF money will be used and the level of funding is reasonable for each component.	The request clearly specifies who is responsible for, how, and funding sources for the accomplishments will be sustained and maintained.	The stated outcomes are measurable and provide meaningful evaluative data.		
Project ID	Project Title											Total Member Comments	
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase 4											0	
F A 04	Root River Watershed Acquisition and Restoration	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	4	4	32	
F A 05	Conservation Easements in the Avon Hills using MMAPLE	3	2	3	4	4	2	3	3	3	2	29	
F A 06	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	34	
F A 07	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands Cass County	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	39	
F A 08	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	24	
F A 09	Acquisition: State Forest Land	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	2	4	3	32	
F RE 01	MN DNR Accelerated Forest Wildlife Habitat Program	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	26	
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	40	
W A 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	38	
W A 02	Columbus Lake Conservation Area	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	39	
W RE 01	Living Shallow Lakes & Wetlands Initiative	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	37	
W RE 02	Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	34	
W RE 03	Marsh Lake Enhancement	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	40	
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Program	5	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	43	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	38	
H A 03	Riparian and Lakeshore Protection/ Managemment in Dakota County	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	2	3	30	
H RE 01	Lower St. Louis River Habitat Restoration	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	32	
H RE 02	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Habitat Enhancement Program	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	36	
H RE 03	Grand Marais Creek Outlet Restoration	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	36	
H RE 04	Seven Mile Creek Watershed Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	27	
H RE 05	Knife River Habitat Restoration	3	3	2	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	33	
H RE 06	Zequanox as the control for Zebra Mussels											Conflict of Interest	
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	50	
X 02	Contract Management	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	22	
X 03	Restoration Evaluations Program	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 LSOHC work plan in place	
										l		I	