Bob Anderson

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding.	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	Out of 72	
PA 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase VIII	3	1.5	1.5	0	0	4	5	4	5	6	6	4	4	4	4	52	
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase VIII	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	5	5	6	6	6	6	3	4	3	4	57.5	
PA 03	Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Acquisition	4	1.5	1.5	0	0	5	5	5	4	6	6	3	4	3	4	52	
PA 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VII	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	4	4	3	5	6	6	3	4	5	4	52.5	
PA 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VI	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	5	5	5	6	6	6	4	5	4	5	59.5	
PA 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection	3	0	0	1.5	0	2	3	3	5	6	6	2	3	3	3	40.5	
PA 07	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VI	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	2	6	6	3	3	3	2	34	
PA 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley Phase II	5	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	5	5	5	6	6	6	5	6	6	5	64.5	
PA 09	Lower Wild Rice River Corridor Habitat Restoration -- Phase II	3	1.5	0	0	1.5	4	4	4	4	6	6	4	5	5	4	52	
PA 10	Grassland Conservation Partnership Phase II	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	4	5	6	6	4	4	4	5	59	
PRE 01	DNR Grassland - Phase 8	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	4	4	5	6	6	4	4	3	4	55	
PRE 02	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase IV	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	4	3	4	6	6	3	4	4	3	51	
FA 01	Young Forest Conservation Phase II	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	3	4	4	6	6	4	3	3	4	50	
FA 02	Jack Pine Forest/Crow Wing River Watershed Habitat Acquisition	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	4	4	6	6	4	4	4	4	57	
FA 03	Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VI	4	1.5	0	1.5	0	6	5	5	5	6	6	5	5	3	5	58	
FA 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase IV	4	1.5	0	1.5	0	5	5	4	4	6	6	4	5	5	4	55	
FA 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase IV	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	4	4	6	6	4	5	5	4	58	
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VII	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	5	5	6	6	4	5	5	4	60	
FA 07	State Forest Acquisitions Phase III	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	5	5	6	6	6	4	5	4	4	59	
FA 08	Forest Habitat Protection Revolving Account	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4	0	0	2	5	4	4	28	
FA 09	Protecting Forest Wildlife Habitat in the Wild Rice River Watershed	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	3	0	6	1	3	2	4	26	
FRE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase 2	3	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	3	3	5	5	6	6	2	4	5	4	50.5	
WA 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase VIII	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	5	6	6	6	5	5	6	5	64	
WA 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase V	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	4	6	3	6	6	6	4	5	3	5	56.5	

Bob Anderson

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding.	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	Out of 72	
WA 03	RIM Wetlands: Phase 7	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	5	3	5	6	6	4	5	2	4	54	
WA 04	Wetland Habitat Protection Program – Phase 2	4	0	0	1.5	1.5	3	5	3	4	6	6	4	5	6	5	54	
WRE 01	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase VIII	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	5	3	4	6	6	4	6	4	6	58	
WRE 02	Marsh Lake Phase II	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	5	6	6	5	6	5	5	67	
HA 01	MN DNR Aquatic Habitat Protection Phase 8	5	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	5	5	4	5	6	6	4	5	2	4	55.5	
HA 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 7	4	0	0	1.5	0	4	5	3	5	6	6	4	6	5	5	54.5	
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	3	6	6	6	5	6	5	5	65	
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes: Phase II	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	5	5	6	6	4	5	5	5	61	
HA 05	Restoring Duluth's Cold Water Streams	0	1.5	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	0	6	2	2	4	4	31.5	
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement, Phase 8	6	1.5	0	1.5	0	5	5	6	5	6	6	4	5	5	5	61	
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	5	5	4	6	6	4	5	4	5	60	
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative Phase 3	4	1.5	0	0	0	4	3	4	3	6	6	2	4	5	4	46.5	
HRE 04	Sand Hill River Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement -- Phase II	3	0	1.5	0	0	3	3	6	3	6	6	2	4	5	4	46.5	
HRE 05	Root River Restoration	5	0	1.5	0	0	4	4	6	4	6	6	3	4	5	4	52.5	
HRE 06	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program - Phase V	5	0	1.5	0	0	4	4	6	4	6	6	3	4	5	5	53.5	
HRE 07	Restoring the Northern Gateway	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	3	6	6	2	3	4	4	40	
HRE 08	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4	6	6	2	4	4	4	46	
CPL 1	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase 8: Statewide and Metro Habitat	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	3	6	6	2	4	4	4	44	
O 1	Contract Management 2016																0	
O 2	Restoration Evaluation																0	
N/A	Roseau Lake Rehabilitation	4	1.5	0	1.5	0	5	5	6	6	6	6	4	6	2	5	58	

Jane Kingston

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding..	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	72	
PA 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase VIII	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	5	5	6	6	5	6	0	6	63	
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase VIII	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	5	5	6	6	5	6	1	6	64	
PA 03	Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Acquisition	3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	5	5	6	6	5	5	0	5	56	
PA 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VII	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	6	6	5	5	6	6	5	6	2	6	63.5	No PILT for 1100ac/$3.9M
PA 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VI	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	6	5	5	4	6	6	5	6	2	6	60.5	
PA 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	4	5	6	6	6	6	0	6	62	
PA 07	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VI	3	1.5	1.5	0	0	3	5	5	5	6	6	3	5	6	5	55	Great leverage.
PA 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley Phase II	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	4	5	5	5	6	6	5	5	1	5	56.5	No PILT for 517ac/$1.8M
PA 09	Lower Wild Rice River Corridor Habitat Restoration -- Phase II	3	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	5	5	4	4	6	6	1	5	2	6	51.5	#1 DNR Stream Restoration Priority List. No PILT for 716ac/$2.5M
PA 10	Grassland Conservation Partnership Phase II	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	6	5	6	6	6	5	5	1	5	61	
PRE 01	DNR Grassland - Phase 8	4	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	5	6	5	4	6	6	4	4	0	5	53.5	
PRE 02	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase IV	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	4	4	6	6	4	4	1	6	56	Invasives Control dominant. No PILT for 10ac/$120K
FA 01	Young Forest Conservation Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	5	5	5	4	6	6	5	6	0	5	57.5	
FA 02	Jack Pine Forest/Crow Wing River Watershed Habitat Acquisition	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	4	5	5	6	6	3	4	1	6	56	High personnel cost.
FA 03	Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VI	2	1.5	0	0	0	2	2	2	4	6	6	3	5	0	5	38.5	
FA 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase IV	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	4	4	6	6	5	5	1	5	58	No PILT for 275ac/$1.5M
FA 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase IV	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	4	5	6	6	4	5	0	6	58	
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VII	2	1.5	0	0	1.5	3	2	4	4	6	4	5	5	1	6	45	No PILT for 72ac/$1.3M
FA 07	State Forest Acquisitions Phase III	5	1.5	0	0	0	3	2	2	4	6	6	6	6	1	5	47.5	
FA 08	Forest Habitat Protection Revolving Account	3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	4	4	4	6	6	5	4	0	4	49	
FA 09	Protecting Forest Wildlife Habitat in the Wild Rice River Watershed	3	1.5	0	0	1.5	4	2	1	4	6	6	5	5	1	6	46	No PILT for 2034ac/$2.1M
FRE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase 2	3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	4	5	3	6	6	3	2	2	5	48	44% Supplies & Materials
WA 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase VIII	6	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	6	6	6	4	6	6	5	6	3	4	62.5	No PILT for 2600ac/$19.3M
WA 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase V	6	1.5	1.5	0	0	6	6	6	5	6	6	3	6	0	5	58	
WA 03	RIM Wetlands: Phase 7	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	5	6	6	4	5	0	6	62	
WA 04	Wetland Habitat Protection Program – Phase 2	3	1.5	1.5	0	0	5	5	6	5	6	6	4	5	2	6	56	

Jane Kingston

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding..	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	72	
WRE 01	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase VIII	3	1.5	1.5	0	0	5	6	4	4	6	6	3	5	0	5	50	
WRE 02	Marsh Lake Phase II	3	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	5	5	4	5	6	6	6	5	6	5	60.5	Excellent leverage.
HA 01	MN DNR Aquatic Habitat Protection Phase 8	6	1.5	1.5	0	0	5	6	5	5	6	6	2	6	0	5	55	
HA 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 7	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	5	4	5	5	6	6	5	6	2	4	56.5	Grey Cloud Slough "Phase 1" $523K, not recommended in FY'15. No PILT for 250ac/$1.5M.
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	6	6	4	4	1	5	44	Parcel list doesn't match map provided. No letter from Clearwater County. Is Forest Mgmt Plan by DNR State Standards or county? Technical Committee comprised of whom? Ranking protocol unclear. No PILT for 167ac/$654K.
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes: Phase II	4	1.5	1.5	0	0	2	3	5	4	6	6	4	4	3	4	48	Parcel cost estimates missing
HA 05	Restoring Duluth's Cold Water Streams	1	1.5	1.5	0	0	0	2	1	5	6	3	4	4	6	3	38	Parks and Stormwater Management project. No cost estimates on R&E parcel lists. Clean Water Fund? Exorbitant $/acre. No PILT for 19ac/$877K.
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement, Phase 8	5	1.5	1.5	0	0	5	5.0	6	6	6	6	6	5	2	5	60	
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat	6	1.5	1.5	0	0	5	5	2	5	6	6	5	5	1	5	54	Excessive $/acre.
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative Phase 3	6	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	5	4	2	5	6	6	4	5	6	5	58.5	Outstanding community & partner support & leverage.
HRE 04	Sand Hill River Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement -- Phase II	3	1.5	0	0	0	5	4	4	4	6	6	5	5	6	6	55.5	#2 DNR Stream Restoration Priority List. Excellent leverage. Clean Water funds?
HRE 05	Root River Restoration	2	1.5	1.5	0	0	2	3	4	3	6	6	3	3	1	1	37	Excessive $/acre.
HRE 06	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program - Phase V	3	1.5	0	0	0	3	4	4	4	6	6	6	5	1	5	48.5	No PILT for 218ac/$2.7 M
HRE 07	Restoring the Northern Gateway	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	6	3	2	2	3	3	27	Impaired waters. Clean Water funds? Supplies & materials high, OTG low. No cost breakdown or specific work plan/schedule. Exorbitant $/acre.
HRE 08	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	3	1.5	0	0	0	3	3	3	4	6	6	1	5	2	5	42.5	Clean Water funds? No PILT for 37ac/$298K.
CPL 1	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase 8: Statewide and Metro Habitat	3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	6	4	4	6	5	6	6	2	6	58	Recommend Hearing
O 1	Contract Management 2016	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na		Recommend Hearing
O 2	Restoration Evaluation	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na		Recommend Hearing
N/A	Roseau Lake Rehabilitation	4	1.5	0	0	0	6	5	4	5	6	6	3	5	4	5	54.5	No common CWC or LCCMR proposal. Zero easements on Output tables, $1M on Budget. Which is preferred Option & why?

David Hartwell

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding..	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	72	
PA 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase VIII	5	1.5	1.5	0	0	4	5	4	4	0	6	3	5	0	4	47.5	IDP is very high
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase VIII	5	1.5	0	0	0	4	5	4	4	0	6	3	5	1	5	48	Why not easements? What if no match not know until 7/1/16?
PA 03	Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Acquisition	5	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	5	5	4	4	0	6	3	5	0	5	51	
PA 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VII	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	6	5	6	5	6	6	4	6	2	5	66	
PA 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VI	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	4	6	4	6	6	3	5	2	5	60.5	
PA 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	5	6	6	6	5	6	0	5	67.5	
PA 07	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VI	5	1.5	0	0	1.5	5	4	5	5	0	6	4	6	6	5	58.5	Buffers not required - but does the new law not do that? How to protect stewardship from raid? - Like WA03
PA 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley Phase II	6	1.5	0	0	0	4	5	6	5	0	6	3	5	0	5	51	PLIT and non PILT?
PA 09	Lower Wild Rice River Corridor Habitat Restoration -- Phase II	5	1.5	1.5	0	0	4	3	6	5	6	6	3	5	4	5	59.5	
PA 10	Grassland Conservation Partnership Phase II	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	3	6	5	0	6	3	6	1	5	54.5	How is value of easements determined?
PRE 01	DNR Grassland - Phase 8	5	1.5	0	1.5	0	4	3	4	5	0	6	3	5	0	5	47.5	What is the difference between restore and enhance? - Evaluation of enhancement?
PRE 02	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase IV	5	1.5	0	0	0	4	3	4	4	6	6	3	5	1	5	52	
FA 01	Young Forest Conservation Phase II	3	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	3	3	4	4	6	6	4	3	0	2	47	Staff cost is high. $3000/acre for forest? Why would timber sales not be cheaper?
FA 02	Jack Pine Forest/Crow Wing River Watershed Habitat Acquisition	6	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	6	5	6	6	6	6	5	6	1	5	67	Staff cost seem high.
FA 03	Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VI	4	1.5	1.5	0	0	3	3	4	3	6	6	3	4	0	4	47.5	No leverage. In the past there was a match.
FA 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase IV	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	5	6	6	6	6	5	5	2	5	68.5	
FA 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase IV	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	5	5	6	6	6	6	6	0	6	68.5	
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VII	6	1.5	0	0	0	5	2	5	5	6	6	4	5	1	6	57	
FA 07	State Forest Acquisitions Phase III	6	1.5	0	0	0	5	4	4	5	6	6	4	5	1	5	57	
FA 08	Forest Habitat Protection Revolving Account	6	1.5	0	1.5	0	5	4	6	6	6	6	5	6	0	5	62.5	
FA 09	Protecting Forest Wildlife Habitat in the Wild Rice River Watershed	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	2	6	71.5	
FRE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase 2	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI		
WA 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase VIII	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	4	6	6	6	6	5	6	4	6	71.5	
WA 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase V	6	1.5	0	0	0	5	5	4	5	0	6	4	6	0	4	51	

David Hartwell

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding..	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	72	
WA 03	RIM Wetlands: Phase 7	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	4	5	5	0	6	4	6	6	5	62.5	What is the difference between this and PA07?
WA 04	Wetland Habitat Protection Program – Phase 2	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	4	6	6	6	6	5	6	4	6	71.5	
WRE 01	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase VIII	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	4	4	4	6	6	4	4	0	5	59.5	
WRE 02	Marsh Lake Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	6	6	6	6	5	6	6	6	69	
HA 01	MN DNR Aquatic Habitat Protection Phase 8	6	1.5	0	0	0	5	5	5	6	6	6	5	6	0	6	62	
HA 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 7	6	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	5	4	5	5	6	6	4	5	3	5	63	
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project	6	1.5	0	0	0	5	5	6	5	6	6	4	4	1	3	57	How many transactions? Is this an access or habitat proposal?
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes: Phase II	6	1.5	0	0	0	6	5	6	6	6	6	4	5	4	5	65	
HA 05	Restoring Duluth's Cold Water Streams	6	1.5	0	0	0	4	3	6	6	6	6	4	5	6	3	61	What protections are in place for development under zoning? Would zoning setbacks, etc. be cheaper? Will water still be used for golf course?
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement, Phase 8	6	1.5	0	0	0	5	5	5	4	6	6	5	6	4	6	64	
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	5	5	6	6	6	6	1	5	66.5	
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative Phase 3	6	1.5	0	0	0	4	6	6	6	6	6	5	6	6	6	69	
HRE 04	Sand Hill River Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement -- Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	6	6	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	69	
HRE 05	Root River Restoration	4	1.5	0	0	0	3	4	4	2	6	6	4	3	1	6	49	Does this address the root cause of the problem (nothing holding back the water on the uplands)?
HRE 06	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program - Phase V	5	1.5	0	0	0	3	3	5	4	6	6	4	4	1	5	52	
HRE 07	Restoring the Northern Gateway	5	1.5	0	0	0	3	4	5	4	6	6	4	5	5	4	57	Supplies budget seems high.
HRE 08	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	5	1.5	0	0	0	4	4	6	5	6	6	5	4	4	5	60	
CPL 1	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase 8: Statewide and Metro Habitat	6	1.5	0	0	0	5	5	6	5	6	6	5	5	2	5	62	Personnel budget seems high.
O 1	Contract Management 2016	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	6	6	5	5	0	6	39	
O 2	Restoration Evaluation	3	5	0	0	0	0	6	3	0	6	6	5	5	0	6	45	We should require evaluation of both enhance and restore.
N/A	Roseau Lake Rehabilitation	6	1.5	0	0	0	3	3	6	4	6	6	6	4	5	5	55.5	

Julie Blackburn

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding.	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	72	
PA 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase VIII	5	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	5	5	6	5	6	6	4	4	0	4	54.5	
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase VIII	5	1.5	0	0	0	5	6	6	5	6	6	4	4	2	4	54.5	
PA 03	Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Acquisition	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	4	6	5	6	6	5	4	0	4	54	
PA 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VII	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	6	5	6	6	5	4	3	5	61	
PA 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VI	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	5	6	6	4	4	3	5	62	
PA 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection	5	0	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	5	6	5	6	6	5	5	0	4	57.5	
PA 07	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VI	4	1.5	0	0	0	5	4	6	5	6	6	4	5	6	5	57.5	
PA 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley Phase II	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	6	6	6	6	5	5	1	5	61	
PA 09	Lower Wild Rice River Corridor Habitat Restoration -- Phase II	3	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	4	5	5	4	6	6	4	3	6	4	54.5	
PA 10	Grassland Conservation Partnership Phase II	4	0	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	4	6	5	6	6	4	4	1	4	52.5	
PRE 01	DNR Grassland - Phase 8	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	4	6	6	6	6	6	6	0	4	59	
PRE 02	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase IV	4	1.5	0	0	1.5	4	4	5	5	6	6	4	4	3	4	52	
FA 01	Young Forest Conservation Phase II	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	6	5	6	6	5	4	0	3	56	
FA 02	Jack Pine Forest/Crow Wing River Watershed Habitat Acquisition	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	3	6	4	6	6	4	4	1	4	53	
FA 03	Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VI	4	1.5	1.5	0	0	4	4	6	6	6	6	3	4	0	5	51	
FA 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase IV	4	0	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	5	6	5	6	6	4	4	3	4	55.5	
FA 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase IV	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	3	6	6	6	6	4	5	0	4	54	
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VII	4	1.5	0	0	0	4	2	6	6	6	6	3	4	2	5	49.5	
FA 07	State Forest Acquisitions Phase III	5	1.5	0	1.5	0	4	3	6	6	6	6	3	4	2	4	52	
FA 08	Forest Habitat Protection Revolving Account	2	1.5	0	0	0	2	2	3	3	6	6	2	2	0	3	32.5	
FA 09	Protecting Forest Wildlife Habitat in the Wild Rice River Watershed	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	3	6	5	6	6	4	4	3	5	58	
FRE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase 2	3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	4	6	4	6	6	3	3	3	5	52	
WA 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase VIII	5	1.5	1.5	0	0	4	5	6	6	6	6	3	4	6	4	58	
WA 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase V	5	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	5	4	6	6	6	6	3	4	0	4	53.5	

Julie Blackburn

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding.	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	72	
WA 03	RIM Wetlands: Phase 7	5	1.5	0	0	0	5	6	6	6	6	6	3	4	0	4	52.5	
WA 04	Wetland Habitat Protection Program – Phase 2	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	4	3	6	6	6	6	3	4	6	6	59.5	
WRE 01	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase VIII	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	4	5	6	6	6	4	5	0	5	56	
WRE 02	Marsh Lake Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	6	6	68.5	
HA 01	MN DNR Aquatic Habitat Protection Phase 8	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	6	6	5	6	6	5	5	2	5	63	
HA 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 7	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	4	3	6	5	6	6	5	5	5	5	59.5	
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project	5	1.5	0	0	0	5	4	6	5	6	6	4	4	4	4	54.5	
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes: Phase II	5	1.5	1.5	0	0	4	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	6	6	64	
HA 05	Restoring Duluth's Cold Water Streams	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	6	5	6	6	5	5	6	6	66	
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement, Phase 8	6	1.5	1.5	0	0	5	5	6	4	6	6	5	6	5	6	63	
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	5	67	
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative Phase 3	6	1.5	0	0	0	4	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	6	5	62.5	
HRE 04	Sand Hill River Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement -- Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	5	6	6	4	6	6	5	5	6	5	64.5	
HRE 05	Root River Restoration	4	1.5	1.5	0	0	4	4	6	5	6	6	5	6	3	5	57	
HRE 06	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program - Phase V	5	1.5	1.5	0	0	4	4	6	6	6	6	5	5	3	4	57	
HRE 07	Restoring the Northern Gateway	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	5	6	6	3	3	6	3	48	
HRE 08	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	5	1.5	1.5	0	0	4	5	6	4	6	6	4	4	6	5	58	
CPL 1	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase 8: Statewide and Metro Habitat										6	6					12	
O 1	Contract Management 2016										6	6					12	
O 2	Restoration Evaluation										6	6					12	
N/A	Roseau Lake Rehabilitation	6	1.5	0	0	0	5	4	6	6			5	6	6	5	50.5	

Senator Tom Saxhuag

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding..	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	Out of 72	
PA 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase VIII	2	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	0	6	0	0	6	6	3	3	0	1	31.5	$9,000/acre
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase VIII	2	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	0	6	0	0	6	6	3	3	0	3	33.5	$7,700/acre
PA 03	Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Acquisition	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	6	6	0	6	6	3	3	0	2	40	$8,000/acre
PA 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VII	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	6	6	3	6	6	3	3	2	6	49	$3,000/acre
PA 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VI	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	6	3	0	6	6	3	3	0	4	39	$6,500/acre
PA 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection	2	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	0	6	3	6	6	6	3	3	0	4	43.5	$6,000/acre
PA 07	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VI	2	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	0	6	3	0	6	6	3	3	6	3	42.5	$7,500/acre
PA 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley Phase II	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	6	6	0	6	6	3	3	0	6	44	$3,540/acre
PA 09	Lower Wild Rice River Corridor Habitat Restoration -- Phase II	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	6	1	6	6	6	3	3	1	6	47	$3,500/acre
PA 10	Grassland Conservation Partnership Phase II	2	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	0	6	0	4	6	6	3	3	0	6	40.5	$3,640/acre
PRE 01	DNR Grassland - Phase 8	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	6	0	2	6	6	3	3	0	6	44	$84/acre
PRE 02	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase IV	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	6	0	4	6	6	3	3	1	2	43	$956/acre
FA 01	Young Forest Conservation Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	3	6	6	6	3	6	3	6	63	$597/acre
FA 02	Jack Pine Forest/Crow Wing River Watershed Habitat Acquisition	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	6	2	4	63	$1,894/acre
FA 03	Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VI	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	3	6	6	3	6	0	3	57	$2,272/acre
FA 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase IV	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	1	6	6	3	6	1	3	56	$2,555/acre
FA 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase IV	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	6	0	6	63	$547/acre
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VII	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	6	1	4	62	$1830/acre
FA 07	State Forest Acquisitions Phase III	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	3	3	6	6	3	6	1	2	54	$3,331/acre
FA 08	Forest Habitat Protection Revolving Account	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	3	6	6	3	6	1	3	58	$2,633/acre
FA 09	Protecting Forest Wildlife Habitat in the Wild Rice River Watershed	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	6	1	5	63	$1,075/acre
FRE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase 2	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	6	1	5	61	$1,000/acre
WA 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase VIII	2	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	1	6	6	3	6	6	3	3	4	2	46.5	$7,400/acre

Senator Tom Saxhuag

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding..	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	Out of 72	
WA 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase V	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	6	6	0	6	6	3	6	0	2	43	$7,300/acre
WA 03	RIM Wetlands: Phase 7	2	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	0	6	0	0	6	6	3	3	0	4	34.5	$5,500/acre
WA 04	Wetland Habitat Protection Program – Phase 2	2	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	0	6	0	6	6	6	3	3	3	6	45.5	$2,100/acre
WRE 01	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase VIII	4	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	2	6	3	0	6	6	3	3	0	6	43.5	$473/acre
WRE 02	Marsh Lake Phase II	4	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	2	6	6	0	6	6	3	3	6	6	52.5	$392/acre
HA 01	MN DNR Aquatic Habitat Protection Phase 8	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	6	6	6	6	6	3	3	0	4	48	$4,000/acre
HA 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 7	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	2	6	6	3	4	1	4	52	$3,900/acre
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	2	6	6	3	4	4	5	56	$3,000/acre
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes: Phase II	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	6	4	6	6	3	3	4	6	55	$2,300/acre
HA 05	Restoring Duluth's Cold Water Streams	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	6	6	6	6	6	3	3	3	1	52	$49/acre
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement, Phase 8	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	6	6	6	6	6	3	3	3	4	57	$19,000/acre
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	6	4	6	6	3	3	1	1	49	$98,000/acre
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative Phase 3	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	4	6	6	3	3	6	4	60	$13,000/acre
HRE 04	Sand Hill River Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement -- Phase II	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	5	6	6	6	3	3	6	6	63	$2,000/acre
HRE 05	Root River Restoration	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	6	6	6	6	6	3	3	1	1	52	$96,000/acre
HRE 06	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program - Phase V	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	6	6	6	6	6	3	3	1	6	57	$2,500/acre
HRE 07	Restoring the Northern Gateway	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	6	4	2	6	6	3	3	4	2	50	$61,000/acre
HRE 08	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	6	5	4	6	6	3	3	3	5	55	$6,700/acre
CPL 1	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase 8: Statewide and Metro Habitat	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	0	6	6	3	3	6	6	60	
O 1	Contract Management 2016	6	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	0	6	60	
O 2	Restoration Evaluation	6	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	0	6	60	
N/A	Roseau Lake Rehabilitation																	

Senator Bill Ingebrigtsen

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding..	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	Out of 72	
PA 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase VIII	4	1.5	1.5	0	0	4	5	0	5	6	6	1	4	2	4	44	
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase VIII	4	1.5	1.5	0	0	4	5	3	5	6	6	1	5	4	5	51	
PA 03	Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Acquisition	4	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	4	4	5	5	6	6	1	4	1	4	48.5	
PA 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VII	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	2	5	6	6	1	6	5	4	55	
PA 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VI	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	5	5	6	6	2	5	3	3	55	
PA 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection	4	1.5	1.5	0	0	2	1	2	3	6	6	1	2	1	2	33	
PA 07	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VI	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	6	6	1	1	1	2	23	
PA 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley Phase II	4	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	3	4	3	3	6	6	1	3	3	2	42.5	
PA 09	Lower Wild Rice River Corridor Habitat Restoration -- Phase II	1	0	1.5	0	1.5	2	1	2	2	0	6	1	3	3	4	28	
PA 10	Grassland Conservation Partnership Phase II	4	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	5	3	1	3	6	6	1	2	2	3	40.5	
PRE 01	DNR Grassland - Phase 8	4	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	5	3	1	3	6	6	1	2	2	2	39.5	
PRE 02	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase IV	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	3	2	3	6	6	1	3	3	1	42	
FA 01	Young Forest Conservation Phase II	4	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	4	4	4	4	6	6	1	3	2	3	45.5	
FA 02	Jack Pine Forest/Crow Wing River Watershed Habitat Acquisition	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	3	4	3	6	6	2	3	3	4	50	
FA 03	Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VI	4	1.5	0	0	1.5	4	3	5	4	6	6	1	3	3	3	45	
FA 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase IV	4	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	4	4	5	4	6	6	2	4	3	2	48.5	
FA 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase IV	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	3	2	2	6	6	1	4	1	4	43	
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VII	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4	6	6	1	3	2	3	38	
FA 07	State Forest Acquisitions Phase III	4	0	1.5	0	0	3	2	3	3	6	6	1	3	3	3	38.5	
FA 08	Forest Habitat Protection Revolving Account	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	6	6	1	2	1	2	27	
FA 09	Protecting Forest Wildlife Habitat in the Wild Rice River Watershed	3	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	4	3	4	3	0	6	1	3	2	3	36.5	
FRE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase 2	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	3	4	2	6	6	1	3	2	4	44	
WA 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase VIII	4	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	4	5	5	5	6	6	1	4	3	4	51.5	
WA 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase V	4	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	4	5	5	5	6	6	1	6	5	5	56.5	

Senator Bill Ingebrigtsen

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding..	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	Out of 72	
WA 03	RIM Wetlands: Phase 7	2	1.5	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	6	1	2	3	2	21.5	
WA 04	Wetland Habitat Protection Program – Phase 2	4	1.5	0	0	0	3	3	4	2	6	6	1	3	3	2	38.5	
WRE 01	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase VIII	3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	3	2	3	6	6	1	4	2	0	41	
WRE 02	Marsh Lake Phase II	4	1.5	0	0	1.5	5	1	3	3	6	6	1	2	3	4	41	
HA 01	MN DNR Aquatic Habitat Protection Phase 8	4	0	1.5	0	1.5	4	4	3	2	6	6	1	2	3	2	40	
HA 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 7	4	1.5	0	0	0	3	3	3	2	6	6	1	3	3	1	36.5	
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project	4	1.5	0	0	0	4	2	4	4	6	6	1	3	2	3	40.5	
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes: Phase II	3	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	3	3	4	3	6	6	1	3	3	2	41.5	
HA 05	Restoring Duluth's Cold Water Streams	4	1.5	0	0	0	4	3	3	3	6	6	1	3	4	4	42.5	
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement, Phase 8	4	1.5	1.5	0	0	4	5	5	4	6	6	1	4	4	5	51	
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat	3	0	1.5	0	0	2	2	2	3	6	6	1	2	4	4	36.5	
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative Phase 3	4	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	4	3	4	3	6	6	1	3	3	4	45.5	
HRE 04	Sand Hill River Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement -- Phase II	3	0	1.5	0	1.5	2	2	2	2	0	6	1	2	4	4	31	
HRE 05	Root River Restoration	4	0	1.5	0	0	3	3	4	3	6	6	1	3	3	4	41.5	
HRE 06	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program - Phase V	4	0	1.5	0	0	3	3	3	4	6	6	1	4	4	4	43.5	
HRE 07	Restoring the Northern Gateway	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	6	6	1	2	4	4	32	
HRE 08	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	6	6	1	2	4	4	34	
CPL 1	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase 8: Statewide and Metro Habitat	4	0	0	0	0	5	4	5	3	6	6	1	3	5	5	47	
O 1	Contract Management 2016																	
O 2	Restoration Evaluation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	6	1	4	0	1	23	
N/A	Roseau Lake Rehabilitation																	

Representative Denny McNamara

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding..	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	Out of 72	
PA 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase VIII	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	69	
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase VIII	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	69	
PA 03	Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Acquisition	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	5	5	5	6	6	5	5	3	5	60	
PA 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VII	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	5	5	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	68	
PA 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VI	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	5	5	5	6	6	5	5	5	5	62	
PA 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection	3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	5	5	4	6	6	4	3	2	3	50	
PA 07	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VI	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	5	6	6	5	5	5	5	67	
PA 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley Phase II	3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	4	2	2	6	6	3	2	2	3	41	
PA 09	Lower Wild Rice River Corridor Habitat Restoration -- Phase II	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	4	5	6	6	4	4	6	5	60	
PA 10	Grassland Conservation Partnership Phase II	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	4	5	6	6	5	5	4	5	61	
PRE 01	DNR Grassland - Phase 8	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	5	4	5	6	6	5	6	4	6	65	
PRE 02	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase IV	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	5	4	5	6	6	5	5	5	5	63	
FA 01	Young Forest Conservation Phase II	3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	3	4	5	6	6	4	2	4	4	50	
FA 02	Jack Pine Forest/Crow Wing River Watershed Habitat Acquisition	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	4	5	4	6	6	4	5	3	4	56	
FA 03	Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VI	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	5	6	6	6	5	5	6	5	65	
FA 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase IV	3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	3	4	4	6	6	4	3	3	4	49	
FA 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase IV	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	4	4	6	6	5	5	5	5	61	
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VII	3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	4	4	4	6	6	4	2	4	3	48	
FA 07	State Forest Acquisitions Phase III	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	4	4	4	6	6	5	3	3	3	52	
FA 08	Forest Habitat Protection Revolving Account	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	3	2	4	6	6	4	3	3	3	47	
FA 09	Protecting Forest Wildlife Habitat in the Wild Rice River Watershed	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	4	5	6	6	6	5	5	6	5	63	Should consider as a DNR WMA or AMA
FRE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase 2	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	5	6	6	6	5	5	5	6	65	
WA 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase VIII	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	70	

Representative Denny McNamara

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding..	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	Out of 72	
WA 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase V	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	68	
WA 03	RIM Wetlands: Phase 7	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	69	
WA 04	Wetland Habitat Protection Program – Phase 2	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	6	5	5	6	6	5	4	4	5	62	
WRE 01	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase VIII	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	4	5	6	6	5	6	5	5	64	
WRE 02	Marsh Lake Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	4	5	5	6	6	5	5	6	5	65	
HA 01	MN DNR Aquatic Habitat Protection Phase 8	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	4	5	6	6	5	4	6	6	63	
HA 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 7	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	4	5	5	6	6	4	4	5	5	58	
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	4	4	4	6	6	4	5	4	4	55	
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes: Phase II	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	4	4	4	6	6	5	4	5	4	56	
HA 05	Restoring Duluth's Cold Water Streams	3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	3	2	3	6	6	3	3	3	3	43	
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement, Phase 8	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	6	5	6	6	6	5	6	5	5	67	
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	4	5	6	6	5	5	4	5	61	
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative Phase 3	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	4	5	5	6	6	4	4	6	5	59	
HRE 04	Sand Hill River Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement -- Phase II	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	5	5	5	6	6	4	5	6	5	61	
HRE 05	Root River Restoration	3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	3	4	3	6	6	3	3	2	3	45	
HRE 06	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program - Phase V	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	4	4	5	6	6	4	4	3	3	52	
HRE 07	Restoring the Northern Gateway	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	4	4	4	6	6	4	3	5	3	52	
HRE 08	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	3	4	4	6	6	4	4	6	4	54	
CPL 1	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase 8: Statewide and Metro Habitat	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	5	5	6	6	5	5	4	5	65	
O 1	Contract Management 2016	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	60	
O 2	Restoration Evaluation	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	60	
N/A	Roseau Lake Rehabilitation																	

Susan Olson

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding..	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	72	
PA 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase VIII	6	1.5	1.5	0	0	4	6	6	6	6	0	3	4	0	4	48	**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase VIII	6	1.5	0	0	0	4	5	4	4	6	0	4	6	2	4	46.5	**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.
PA 03	Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Acquisition	6	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	3	3	2	3	6	0	6	6	0	2	41.5	**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.
PA 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VII	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	6	3	6	0	6	6	6	6	60	**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.
PA 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VI	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	4	3	6	0	3	3	6	5	51	**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.
PA 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection	6	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	3	6	6	3	6	6	6	6	0	5	57.5	
PA 07	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VI	6	1.5	0	0	1.5	6	6	6	5	6	0	6	6	6	4	60	**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.
PA 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	3	3	6	0	6	6	1	6	52	**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.
PA 09	Lower Wild Rice River Corridor Habitat Restoration -- Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	6	6	6	0	6	6	6	6	63	**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.
PA 10	Grassland Conservation Partnership Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	6	5	6	6	0	6	6	1	6	59	**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.
PRE 01	DNR Grassland - Phase 8	6	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	3	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	0	6	61.5	
PRE 02	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase IV	3	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	3	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	2	59.5	The majority of these projects could have been submitted as individual projects through CPL
FA 01	Young Forest Conservation Phase II	3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	0	6	63	Why does leverage % show as zero when the narrative mentions $1 million in other funds?
FA 02	Jack Pine Forest/Crow Wing River Watershed Habitat Acquisition	3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	2	6	65	
FA 03	Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VI	3	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	3	6	6	3	6	0	6	6	0	6	49.5	**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.
FA 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase IV	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	70	
FA 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase IV	3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	0	6	6	0	6	57	**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VII	3	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	3	4	6	6	6	0	6	6	2	6	52.5	**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.

Susan Olson

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding..	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	72	
FA 07	State Forest Acquisitions Phase III	5	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	3	6	6	6	6	0	6	6	2	6	56.5	**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.
FA 08	Forest Habitat Protection Revolving Account	3	0	0	1.5	1.5	3	6	6	3	6	0	3	3	0	5	41	Not sure that this project would be allowed by the constitutional restrictions of LSOHC funding. **Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to
FA 09	Protecting Forest Wildlife Habitat in the Wild Rice River Watershed	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	0	6	6	6	6	66	Thank you for bringing this project back to the Council, it should never have been removed by the legislature for the last funding cycle. Good job addressing all of the points of contention raised by legislators during discusions of the bill. **Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.
FRE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase 2	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	72	
WA 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase VIII	4	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	3	6	6	6	6	0	6	6	6	4	57.5	**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.
WA 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase V	4	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	3	6	6	6	6	0	6	6	0	4	51.5	**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.
WA 03	RIM Wetlands: Phase 7	6	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	0	6	6	0	6	58.5	**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.
WA 04	Wetland Habitat Protection Program – Phase 2	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	6	6	6	6	0	6	6	6	6	63	**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.
WRE 01	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase VIII	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	0	6	61	
WRE 02	Marsh Lake Phase II	3	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	67.5	Seems to be more of a Clean Water Funds project than LSOHC
HA 01	MN DNR Aquatic Habitat Protection Phase 8	5	1.5	1.5	0	0	3	5	6	6	6	0	6	6	0	6	52	**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.
HA 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 7	2	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	3	6	6	6	6	6	3	3	6	3	54.5	Several of these projects should have been submitted as individual projects through CPL. Several should be submitted to Parks & Trails.
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project	3	1.5	0	0	0	3	6	3	6	6	0	6	6	2	6	48.5	**Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is not possible to award any points based on the criteria.
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes: Phase II	3	1.5	1.5	0	0	3	6	6	6	6	0	1	1	6	6	47	Supporting a "powerful economic engine" is NOT THE GOAL of LSOHC funding. The goal is conservation and habitat. **Note re: criteria #8 - phrasing is specific to only restoration or enhancements, so a straight acquisition will be penalized because it is
HA 05	Restoring Duluth's Cold Water Streams	2	1.5	0	0	0	3	6	3	6	6	6	3	3	6	0	45.5	This is a Parks &Trails or perhaps Clean Water project, not a habitat and conservation project -- see recent article in Duluth newspaper regarding this proposal.
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement, Phase 8	5	1.5	1.5	0	0	5	6	6	4	6	6	6	6	6	4	63	
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat	5	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	1	60.5	

Susan Olson

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding..	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	72	
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative Phase 3	3	1.5	1.5	0	0	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	6	3	62	
HRE 04	Sand Hill River Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement -- Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	69.5	
HRE 05	Root River Restoration	6	1.5	1.5	0	0	3	3	6	6	6	6	6	6	4	0	55	
HRE 06	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program - Phase V	6	1.5	1.5	0	0	3	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	2	4	60	
HRE 07	Restoring the Northern Gateway	3	1.5	0	0	0	4	6	6	6	6	6	3	5	6	0	52.5	
HRE 08	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	6	1.5	1.5	0	0	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	67	
CPL 1	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase 8: Statewide and Metro Habitat	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	6	3	6	6	3	3	5	3	56	
O 1	Contract Management 2016	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	6	0	0	6	18	
O 2	Restoration Evaluation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	6	0	0	6	18	
N/A	Roseau Lake Rehabilitation	4	1.5	0	0	0	5	6	6	4	6	6	3	6	6	6	59.5	

Ron Schara

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding..	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	Out of 72	
PA 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase VIII	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	3	5	6	6	6	6	3	6	62	
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase VIII	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	3	5	6	6	6	6	4	6	63	
PA 03	Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Acquisition	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	6	69	
PA 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VII	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	70	
PA 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VI	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	71	
PA 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	6	3	6	6	6	6	6	3	6	65	
PA 07	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VI	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	3	6	6	6	6	3	3	6	60	
PA 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	5	6	4	6	6	3	3	6	4	58	
PA 09	Lower Wild Rice River Corridor Habitat Restoration -- Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	3	6	6	6	6	3	6	6	6	63	
PA 10	Grassland Conservation Partnership Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	6	66	
PRE 01	DNR Grassland - Phase 8	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	3	6	6	6	6	6	3	6	63	
PRE 02	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase IV	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	6	6	5	6	6	6	4	4	3	63	
FA 01	Young Forest Conservation Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	6	5	6	6	3	6	3	6	62	
FA 02	Jack Pine Forest/Crow Wing River Watershed Habitat Acquisition	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	3	6	6	6	6	4	6	4	6	62	
FA 03	Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VI	6	1.5	0	0	1.5	3	3	6	6	6	6	3	6	3	6	57	
FA 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase IV	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	3	6	6	6	6	3	6	3	6	60	
FA 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase IV	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	6	5	6	6	6	5	6	3	6	65	
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VII	6	1.5	0	1.5	0	3	3	6	6	6	6	3	6	3	6	57	
FA 07	State Forest Acquisitions Phase III	6	1.5	0	0	0	3	0	3	3	6	6	0	3	3	3	37.5	
FA 08	Forest Habitat Protection Revolving Account	3	1.5	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	6	6	3	3	3	6	41.5	Need to discuss this proposal about changes. Legislature already eliminated it???
FA 09	Protecting Forest Wildlife Habitat in the Wild Rice River Watershed	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	3	6	6	6	6	3	3	6	6	60	
FRE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase 2	6	1.5	0	1.5	0	3	3	6	6	6	6	3	3	6	6	57	
WA 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase VIII	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	3	6	6	6	3	3	6	6	60	
WA 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase V	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	3	5	6	6	3	3	3	6	56	
WA 03	RIM Wetlands: Phase 7	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	6	3	6	6	3	3	6	6	60	

Ron Schara

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding..	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	Out of 72	
WA 04	Wetland Habitat Protection Program – Phase 2	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	3	3	3	6	6	3	2	3	3	47	
WRE 01	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase VIII	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	3	3	3	6	6	3	3	3	3	48	
WRE 02	Marsh Lake Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	3	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	68	
HA 01	MN DNR Aquatic Habitat Protection Phase 8	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	4	6	6	6	3	6	3	6	61	
HA 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 7	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	3	5	6	6	6	4	6	6	6	63	
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	6	6	6	6	3	6	3	3	60	
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes: Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	3	6	6	6	6	3	6	6	6	63	Is this a park???? Go to parks fund. Doubt fishing value
HA 05	Restoring Duluth's Cold Water Streams	6	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	6	6	0	0	6	3	37.5	
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement, Phase 8	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	69	
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	6	6	6	6	3	6	3	6	63	
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative Phase 3	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	6	6	6	6	5	6	6	6	69	
HRE 04	Sand Hill River Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement -- Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	3	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	69	Check track record???
HRE 05	Root River Restoration	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	3	3	3	6	6	3	3	3	3	48	Clean water fund may be best way to go
HRE 06	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program - Phase V	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	6	6	6	6	6	3	6	3	6	63	Sounds more like flood control than fish habitat???
HRE 07	Restoring the Northern Gateway	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	6	6	3	3	6	6	42	Clean water fund may be best way to go
HRE 08	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	69	
CPL 1	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase 8: Statewide and Metro Habitat	"Need more info"																
O 1	Contract Management 2016	"OK"																
O 2	Restoration Evaluation	"OK"																
N/A	Roseau Lake Rehabilitation	2	1.5	0	1.5	0	3	3	0	2	3	6	0	3	6	6	37	This is more flood control than habitat development.

Barry Tilley

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding..	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	72	
PA 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase VIII	6	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	6	3	4	6	6	6	3	6	3	6	59.5	
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase VIII	6	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	6	4	6	65.5	
PA 03	Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Acquisition	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	0	6	6	66	
PA 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VII	6	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	70.5	
PA 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VI	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	6	6	6	69	
PA 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection	6	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	3	6	0	4	6	6	6	6	0	6	53.5	
PA 07	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VI	6	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	6	6	4	6	6	6	6	5	6	6	67.5	
PA 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	4	6	70	
PA 09	Lower Wild Rice River Corridor Habitat Restoration -- Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	72	
PA 10	Grassland Conservation Partnership Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	0	6	6	6	3	5	3	6	59	
PRE 01	DNR Grassland - Phase 8	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	6	0	6	6	6	3	3	0	6	52	
PRE 02	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase IV	6	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	4	4	3	3	6	6	2	3	3	2	46.5	
FA 01	Young Forest Conservation Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	6	3	6	6	6	6	6	4	2	61	
FA 02	Jack Pine Forest/Crow Wing River Watershed Habitat Acquisition	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	72	
FA 03	Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VI	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	3	0	4	6	6	0	3	0	6	38	
FA 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase IV	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	4	5	6	6	5	4	6	4	55.5	
FA 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase IV	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	5	4	6	6	6	4	4	0	6	56	
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VII	6	1.5	0	0	0	5	2	3	6	6	6	2	5	6	6	54.5	
FA 07	State Forest Acquisitions Phase III	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	6	2	6	6	6	0	4	3	6	55	
FA 08	Forest Habitat Protection Revolving Account	6	1.5	0	0	0	3	4	0	4	6	6	0	3	0	6	39.5	
FA 09	Protecting Forest Wildlife Habitat in the Wild Rice River Watershed	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	72	
FRE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase 2	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	4	6	6	70	
WA 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase VIII	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	72	
WA 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase V	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	6	71	

Barry Tilley

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding..	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	72	
WA 03	RIM Wetlands: Phase 7	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	3	6	6	6	6	6	0	6	63	
WA 04	Wetland Habitat Protection Program – Phase 2	6	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	4	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	0	6	62.5	
WRE 01	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase VIII	6	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	4	6	2	6	6	6	6	6	0	6	58.5	
WRE 02	Marsh Lake Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	3	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	69	
HA 01	MN DNR Aquatic Habitat Protection Phase 8	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	5	5	6	6	6	6	6	0	4	60	
HA 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 7	6	1.5	0	1.5	0	4	4	4	4	6	6	4	6	6	2	55	
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project	6	1.5	0	0	0	4	3	0	5	6	6	4	4	4	6	49.5	
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes: Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	6	6	4	6	6	6	6	6	4	6	66.5	
HA 05	Restoring Duluth's Cold Water Streams	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	2	68	
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement, Phase 8	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	5	4	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	64	
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	5	3	6	6	6	6	6	4	1	59	
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative Phase 3	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	4	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	67	
HRE 04	Sand Hill River Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement -- Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6	6	3	6	6	6	6	6	6	4	67	
HRE 05	Root River Restoration	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	5	3	5	6	6	5	5	3	1	55	
HRE 06	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program - Phase V	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	6	4	6	6	6	5	5	3	4	61	
HRE 07	Restoring the Northern Gateway	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	6	6	0	0	5	1	24	
HRE 08	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	5	0	4	6	6	5	5	6	3	53	
CPL 1	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase 8: Statewide and Metro Habitat	6	1.5	0	0	1.5	6	6	4	6	6	6	0	6	0	6	55	
O 1	Contract Management 2016																0	
O 2	Restoration Evaluation																0	
N/A	Roseau Lake Rehabilitation	4	1.5	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	5	6	0	4	4	4	38.5	

Elizabeth Wilkens

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding..	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	72	
PA 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase VIII	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	6	2	5	6	6	5	5	0	5	56	Use of GMO seed and row crops reduces soil health and pollinator benefits.
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase VIII	2	1.5	0	0	0	4	4	4	5	6	6	5	5	1	5	48.5	Same as PA01 plus not following DNR policy regarding local government approval.
PA 03	Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Acquisition	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3	3	4	5	6	6	6	5	0	2	48	Same as PA01 plus not following DNR policy regarding local government approval.
PA 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VII	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	4	5	6	6	5	5	2	5	58	Use of GMO seed and row crops reduces soil health and pollinator benefits.
PA 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VI	2	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	4	3	4	5	6	6	4	2	2	5	47.5	Should seek local government approval on land going to DNR as WMA.
PA 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	5	2	5	6	6	5	5	0	5	55	
PA 07	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VI	4	1.5	0	0	0	4	3	2	5	6	6	5	3	0	3	42.5	Why are food plots still allowed? CWF is not appropriate leverage. CREP language confuses the proposal.
PA 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley Phase II	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	2	4	5	6	6	2	4	0	5	47	Same as PA01 plus not following DNR policy regarding local government approval.
PA 09	Lower Wild Rice River Corridor Habitat Restoration -- Phase II	5	0	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	4	5	5	6	6	0	4	0	5	48.5	
PA 10	Grassland Conservation Partnership Phase II	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	4	4	4	5	6	3	3	4	0	6	50	Only 45 acres in natives. Clarify farming practices on restoration.
PRE 01	DNR Grassland - Phase 8	5	1.5	0	0	1.5	5	4	2	5	6	6	4	5	0	5	50	Clarify farming practices, crops, GMO seed use, on private easements.
PRE 02	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase IV	5	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	4	4	4	5	6	6	5	5	2	5	55.5	
FA 01	Young Forest Conservation Phase II	5	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	4	3	4	5	6	6	1	3	0	5	46.5	
FA 02	Jack Pine Forest/Crow Wing River Watershed Habitat Acquisition	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	3	6	4	6	0	1	4	1	6	47	If goes to county or public entity other than DNR, need to define trails, structures, uses, etc. prior to sale.
FA 03	Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VI	4	1.5	1.5	0	0	3	3	3	5	6	6	0	3	0	5	41	
FA 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase IV	2	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	5	5	5	5	6	3	2	4	2	5	48.5	Clarify restoration process and possible use of row crops, GMO seed, etc.
FA 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase IV	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	4	4	5	6	6	1	4	0	6	52	
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VII	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4	2	2	0	3	24	Does not align with constitutional mandate.
FA 07	State Forest Acquisitions Phase III	2	1.5	1.5	0	0	4	2	2	4	6	6	3	4	0	3	39	Cost per acre high.
FA 08	Forest Habitat Protection Revolving Account	4	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	5	4	6	5	6	6	2	4	0	5	51.5	Good process; should inform county board.
FA 09	Protecting Forest Wildlife Habitat in the Wild Rice River Watershed	5	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	5	2	6	6	6	6	3	4	2	6	55.5	
FRE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase 2	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	4	4	5	6	6	2	5	2	6	56	
WA 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase VIII	2	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	3	5	5	5	6	6	3	5	4	5	53.5	Row crops and bare ground are not good for soil health or pollinators.
WA 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase V	2	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	5	5	2	5	6	6	3	5	0	5	48.5	Row crops and bare ground are not good for soil health or pollinators.
WA 03	RIM Wetlands: Phase 7	4	1.5	0	0	0	3	5	0	5	6	6	1	3	0	3	37.5	CREP language confusing. For soil and pollinator health, bare ground should not be allowed. CWF not appropriate leverage.

Elizabeth Wilkens

Maximum score per request is 72 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 averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	1.The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	2a. The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	2b. The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	2c. The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	2d. The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	3. This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	4. The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	5. The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding..	6. It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	7. The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	8. The proposed restoration and enhancement is on land, or the land acquired, be permanently protected – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	9. The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	10. The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	11. The proposal identifies leverage, funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success	12. The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
		0 thru 6	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 or 1.5	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 or 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	0 thru 6	72	
WA 04	Wetland Habitat Protection Program – Phase 2	6	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	5	5	5	4	6	0	5	6	4	6	56.5	
WRE 01	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase VIII	5	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	5	4	2	4	6	0	4	5	0	5	44.5	
WRE 02	Marsh Lake Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	5	4	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	67	
HA 01	MN DNR Aquatic Habitat Protection Phase 8	6	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	5	6	4	6	6	6	5	6	0	4	58.5	High cost per acre.
HA 02	Metro Big Rivers Habitat Phase 7	4	1.5	0	0	1.5	4	4	4	5	6	4	6	5	4	5	54	Grey Cloud Slough does not align with constitutional mandate.
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project	5	1.5	0	0	0	3	4	4	3	6	6	4	4	1	3	44.5	Easement costs same as acquisition.
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes: Phase II	4	1.5	1.5	0	0	2	2	3	3	6	6	0	2	4	5	40	All 38 lakes already 75% protected. Define trails and structures.
HA 05	Restoring Duluth's Cold Water Streams	4	1.5	1.5	0	0	5	4	5	5	6	6	5	5	6	5	59	Define trails and structures.
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement, Phase 8	5	1.5	1.5	0	0	4	5	4	5	6	6	4	5	4	5	56	
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat	5	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	5	4	4	6	6	6	5	5	1	5	56.5	CWF not appropriate leverage.
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative Phase 3	5	1.5	0	0	0	5	5	5	3	6	6	3	4	6	5	54.5	
HRE 04	Sand Hill River Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement -- Phase II	6	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	5	5	4	5	6	6	4	6	6	5	62.5	
HRE 05	Root River Restoration	5	1.5	0	0	0	3	4	5	2	6	2	3	4	1	5	41.5	Specify landowner agreement that will keep riverine system restoration in place into the future.
HRE 06	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program - Phase V	5	1.5	1.5	0	0	3	4	5	5	6	6	4	5	1	4	51	Who will own acquired lands?
HRE 07	Restoring the Northern Gateway	5	1.5	0	0	0	3	3	3	2	6	6	3	4	3	4	43.5	Explain use of state bonding dollars.
HRE 08	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	5	1.5	1.5	0	0	3	3	5	4	6	6	3	4	3	4	49	Describe restoration of perennial wetland and prairie plant communities.
CPL 1	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase 8: Statewide and Metro Habitat																	YES – HEARING
O 1	Contract Management 2016																	YES – HEARING
O 2	Restoration Evaluation																	YES – HEARING
N/A	Roseau Lake Rehabiliation																	"Yes"

Council Member Dill was not able to complete his rankings due to outstanding circumstances. The division factor for all proposals has been reduced accordingly.