Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2017/FY 2018

WRE 03

Wetlands in Rainy Lake

BOB ANDERSON July 21, 2016 Due Date: Thursday, July 21, 2016 by 4 p.m. Email to amanda.brazee@lsohc.leg.mn Maximum score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest * Criteria Proposal addresses priority Proposal uses science-based . Proposal addresses habitats L. Proposal abstract provides a ections and outcomes of one or clear and succinct overview of more of the ecological sections targeting that leverages or hat have significant value for the proposal activity, outputs, and is likely to produce and pands corridors and wildlife species of greatest Proposal identifies and outcomes. Proposal is clearly demonstrate significant and indicator species and Performance measures are mplexes, reduces nservation need, and/or Proposal Proposal includes leverage 10. Proposed budget is ritten and adequately rmanent conservation legacy hreatened or endangered clearly identified, and have a outcomes will be . Degree of timing/ in funds or other effort to ragmentation or protects area: oclated quantities this appropriate to accomplish addresses: Who, What, Where, and/or habitat outcomes for lentified in the MN County pecies, and lists targeted habitat will typically pecific plan for measuring and naintained over pportunistic upplement any OHF the outcomes described in When, Why, and How. fish, game and wildlife. Biological Survey. pecles. support. evaluating outcomes. eppropriation. the scope of work. Score Comments Out of ID# 10 Program Title Max points: 10 15 100 8 13 PA 01 ONR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase IX Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program 8 8 3 7 6 Phase IX PA 02 8 1 4 4 10 10 MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VII PA 03 Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife 5 3 5 4 4 4 5 6 PA 04 Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VIII 9 8 14 8 8 17 4 82 Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VII PA 05 9 5 4 6 6 5 5% 6 2 Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection - Phase III 4 4 10 4 56 RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VII PA 07 Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the 7 40 5 2 8 3 5 PA 08 Southern Red River Valley - Phase III Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Aquisition - Phase 7 5 46 4 2 6 Z PA 09 4 40 6 4 5 2 4 2 PRE 01 DNR Grasslands - Phase IX 5 6 6 Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase V 3 5 56 5 10 <u>6</u> FA 01 Carnellan Creek Conservation Corridor 8 9 85 Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat 8 5 6 FA 02 Project 8 8 8 8 8 10 Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration 10 FA 04 Phase V 9 9 8 4 10 6 FA 05 Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase V 3 8 82 10 14 rotect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitats in Cass 14 8 4 FA 06 County - Phase VIII 8 State Forest Acquisition - Richard J. 8 7 7 5 4 3 2 FA 07 Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase IV Critical Shoreland Habitat Protection Program - Phase 3 7 4 4 FA 08 5 4 4 6 7 FA 09 Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program 8 5 10 10 WA 01 Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase 7 10 6 6 WA 02 0 7 10 5 RIM Wetlands - Phase VIII WA 03 a 8 9 5 79 12 WA 04 Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase V Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland 7 2 1 7 Enhancement - Phase IX WRE 01 8 9 9 81 8 හි 8 lving Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland 11 WRE 02 Restoration Initiative - Phase V lestoration of Non-native Cattail Dominated a 0

0

						Criteria						Г	
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and suctinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal in clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or espands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greetest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	S. Proposal identifies Indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.		10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score	Comments
(D#	Program Title	Max points: 30	15	10	15	10	10	10	S	20	5	Out of 100	
HA 01	MN DNR Aquatic Protection and Enhancement - Phase IX	7	10	5	10	6	4	6	3	2	3	56	
HA DZ	Metro Big Rivers - Phase VIII	7	10	7	7	7	6	7	2	8	3	64	
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase II	9	14	9	14	9	7	8	4	7	4	8.5	
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase III	7	10	7	10	9	6	7	3	2	3	64	
HA 05	Wildlife and Rare Species Habitat	4	5	4	6	4	4	5	3	5	.3	43	
HA 06	Goose Prairle	9	14	9	13	9	7	7	4	6	3	81	
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration - IX	9	14	9	14	9	7	7	4	7	4	84	
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat - Phase II	8	12	7	11	8	6	6	3	3	3	67	
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase IV	9	14	9	13	10	8	6	4	9	3	රිජ	
HRE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	6	6	5	6	4	4	5	3	2	.3	44	
HRE Q5	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VI	9	14	9	14	9	8	8	5	6	4	186	
HRE 06	Lake Wakanda Enhancement Project	9	14	9	14	9	9	8	5	6	4	87	
HRE 07	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	9	14	9	14	8	8	8	5	10	4	89	
HRE OS	Fairmont Lakes Foundation Dutch Creek Habitat Restoration	9	14	9	14	පි	8	8	5	8	5	88	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat	-			_	-		_		GII CASSON ST	Market I	100	
01	Contract Management 2017				-							100	
02	Restoration Evaluations	724										100	

^{*}Overall proposal evaluation scores will be averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

HA 02

Metro Big Rivers - Phase VIII

Maximum score per request is 100 points. "COI" indicates a member is not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest. Overall proposal evaluation scores will be averaged using the number of members evaluating each proposal. Proposal addresses priority . Proposal abstract provides a actions and outcomes of one or 3. Proposal uses science-based Proposal addresses habitats clear and succinct overview of nore of the ecological sections targeting that leverages or hat have significant value for Proposal identifies the proposal activity, outputs, nd is likely to produce and expands corridors and wildlife species of greatest and outcomes. Proposal is clearly demonstrate significant and omplexes, reduces onservation need, and/or indicator species and Performance measures are Proposal includes leverage 10. Proposed budget is Proposal ermanent conservation legacy reatened or endangered 8. Degree of timing/ in funds or other effort to written and adequately fragmentation or protects areas associated quantities this clearly identified, and have a itcomes will be appropriate to accomplish Total addresses: Who. What. Where. and/or habitat outcomes for fish. identified in the MN County pecies, and lists targeted habitat will typically specific plan for measuring and maintained over nnortunistic supplement any OHF the outcomes described in When, Why, and How ame and wildlife. Biological Survey valuating outcomes rgency. appropriation. the scope of work. Score Comments Out of ID# **Program Title** Max points: 10 DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase IX PA 01 Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program PA 02 Phase IX PA 03 MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VII Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VIII PA 04 Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VII Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection - Phase III PA 07 RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VII Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the PA 08 Southern Red River Valley - Phase III Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Aquisition - Phase PA 09 DNR Grasslands - Phase IX PRE 01 Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase V annot evaluate without additional information already request Carnelian Creek Conservation Corridor Who will actually own the land? It only states SLC administers. Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat How does immediate threat related to habitat quality for ranking FA 02 Project FA 03 Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration FA 04 Phase V Please clarify parcel 4 prioritization regarding proximity to other 10.0 8.0 14.0 9.0 onservation areas Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase V Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitats in Cass 12.0 7.0 9.0 FA 06 County - Phase VIII State Forest Acquisition - Richard J. 14.0 9.0 FA 07 Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase IV Critical Shoreland Habitat Protection Program - Phase FA 08 What will USFWS do with the mineral rights? FA 09 Bushmen Lake Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program WA 01 Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase WA 02 RIM Wetlands - Phase VIII Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase V Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland WRE 01 Enhancement - Phase IX iving Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland WRE 02 Restoration Initiative - Phase V Restoration of Non-native Cattail Dominated Wetlands in Rainy Lake MN DNR Aquatic Protection and Enhancement -HA 01 Phase IX

	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase II	8	12	7	10	9	8	9	3	2	4	72	
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase III	9	10	9	12	9	9	6	3	8	4	79	
HA 05	Wildlife and Rare Species Habitat	6	12	9	12	9	9	7	3	3	4	74	Explain what happens with the building on track 18 - Kandiyohi county
HA 06	Goose Prairie	8	12	7	10	9	9	9	3	3	4		What about providing fish passage, not just barriers? How does the realignment provide better public access?
	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration - IX	6	12	9	14	9	8	8	3	8	4	81	
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat - Phase II	6	12	9	14	9	9	7	3	2	4	75	
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase IV	8	12	9	14	9	5	7	4	8	4	80	
HRE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	6	12	10	14	9	9	7	3	0	4	74	
HRE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VI	8	10	8	12	9	8	8	3	3	4	73	
HRE 06	Lake Wakanda Enhancement Project	8	8	8	12	9	7	7	3	4	4	70	
HRE 07	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	9	10	8	10	9	7	8	3	9	4	77	
HRE 08	Fairmont Lakes Foundation Dutch Creek Habitat Restoration	3	5	5	6	9	6	6	2	0	2	44	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat	8	14	9	14	7	9	9	3	5	4	82	
01	Contract Management 2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	=	-	-	
02	Restoration Evaluations	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2017/FY 2018

PACE Authorizing the Wildlife Management Area Register. Phase VII. 19 11 15 18 12 19 18 17 19 19 19 19 19 19 19		Hartwell												
Part	Maximur	n score per request is 100 points. "COI" indicates a member is not eva	aluating a proposal due	to a conflict of interest. O	verall proposal evalu			imber of member	ers evaluatin	g each pro	posal.			
Part					3 Proposal uses	Crite	Id			I				
Process Proc			· ·	2. Proposal addresses priority	science-based	4. Proposal addresses								
Secondary Seco											l l			
Part														
Part										-	l l			
Program Title													Total	
Proceedings			How.	game and wildlife.	Survey.	species.	typically support.	outcomes.	over time.	urgency.	appropriation.	. work.	Score	Comments
Property Comment Property Property Comment Property Property Comment Property Property Comment Property Property Property Comment Property Prop	ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5		In General, the use of GMO crops for fooed plots needs discussion.
A Continue of the Worlde Management Area Program - Phase VII Section S														
PAD Ancetotage no wildlife Management Area Program -Place IX S 12 S 22 S P S 7 S 2 S P P P P P P P P P	PA 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase IX	Q	12	10	15	R	8	7	5	2	5	80	
A District Content to Middle Management According to Middle		DIN WINA and SNA Acquisition Thase IX	, and the second	12	10	15	, and the second	Ü	,		_			
Proceedings Process														
A contracting the Wilder Management Area Program - Phase IX														FOCUS??? - where is the need greatest?
PA 2														The proposal makes clear that the long term maintenance may require legacy funds. Are we okay with this?
FACO Not Frame Recovery Project - Prises Will B 13 7 12 B 7 6 4 2 4 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase IX	8	12	8	12	9	8	7	5	2	5	76	
PA														
A Column Market														
PACE Northern Tolgran Printin Nethonal Willife 10 15 10 15 10 15 8 9 20 5 2 4 88 88 4 2 15 70 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	PA 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VII	8	10	7	12	8	7	6	4	2	4	68	
PAC Northern Tallgrass Prairie bastonul Widdle 10 15 10 15 10 15 8 9 10 5 2 4 88 7 7 7 7 8 8 9 10 5 2 4 88 7 9 4 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	17105	WINT TUITE Recovery Froject Frase VII	, and the second	10	,	12	Ü	,	· ·		_			Why would funds be necessary to do enhancment on Federal lands when they have assumed that obligation in past
Roof Refiger and Augustion - Phase VII														requests?
PAGE Camon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VII		Northorn Tallgrace Prairie National Wildlife												
Acceptance Native Valentified in Section (Online): Visials Val Section Native Valentified in Section Native Valentified Nat	PA 04		10	15	10	15	8	9	10	5	2	4		
Accelerated Native Praints Rank Protection - Phase III	PA 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VII	8	10	7	12	6	8	8	4	2	5	70	How many parcels would be protected? How many over each year? Need for .45 staff x 3 years?
PA 07 RIM Buffers for Wildife and Water - Phase VII 8 12 8 12 9 9 8 8 5 10 5 86 Care seasment and time Duffer esaments as % of FMV or appraised value? Buffers for Wildife and Water - Phase VII 8 12 8 12 8 12 9 9 8 8 5 10 5 86 Care seasment and time Duffer esaments as % of FMV or appraised value? Buffer size (wilding). Control training for cities 1 12 8 12 8 7 9 4 0 4 7 12 8 12 8 12 8 7 9 4 0 4 7 12 8 12 8 8 7 9 4 0 4 7 12 8 8 12 8 8 7 9 4 0 4 7 12 8 8 12 8 8 7 9 4 0 4 7 12 8 8 12 8 8 7 9 1 12 8 8 8 7 9 1 12 8 8 8 8 7 9 1 12 8 8 8 8 7 9 1 12 8 8 8 8 7 1 12 8 8 8 8 1 12 8 8 8 8 1 12 8 8 8 8	PA 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection - Phase III	8	12	8	15	10	7	5	5	0	4	74	
PA 07 RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VII 8 12 8 12 9 9 8 5 10 5 86								·				·		
PA 07 RM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VII 8 12 8 12 9 9 8 5 10 5 86 Boffer size (width?)														
PA 08 Southern Red River Valley - Phase III PA 09 Shariin Country/Fox Lake DNR WMAA Aquisition - Phase II PR 01 DNR Grasslands - Phase IX PR 02 Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase V B 12 B 12 B 12 B 15					_					_	4.0	_		
PA 08 Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase III PA 09 Mortin Country/Tox Lake DNR WMA Aquisition - Phase II PR 09 Mortin Country/Tox Lake DNR WMA Aquisition - Phase II PR 01 DNR Grassfands - Phase IX 9 15 8 15 10 7 4 3 0 4 75 What is the cumulative total of creek/contractors acting year by year with OHF and other funding? If this is a Prairie of the contraction of th	PA 07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VII	8	12	8	12	9	9	8	5	10	5	86	
PA 08 Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase III 7 12 8 12 8 7 9 4 0 4 71 Why would grassland type on the of highest priority - nature prairie? Southern Red River Valley - Phase III 8 12 7 12 8 8 8 7 9 4 0 4 77 Why would grassland type on the of highest priority - nature prairie? If this is a Prairie Chicken project, why would grassland type on the of highest priority - nature program? If this is a Prairie Chicken project, why would grassland type on the of highest project and the project of the project project and the project project and the project pro														Good to note that there will be no GMO crops in food plots.
PA 09 Martin Cunterin Habitat Partnership of the Softween Red River Valley - Phase III 8 12 8 7 9 4 0 4 71 With yound grassland type not be of highest priority - native praire? PA 09 Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Aquisition - Phase II 8 12 7 12 8 8 8 7 4 0 4 7 1 With yound grassland type not be of highest proirity - native praire? PA 09 Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Aquisition - Phase II 8 12 7 12 8 8 8 7 4 0 4 7 1 With not be part of PA I instead of separate proposal? Fa of Grasslands - Phase IX 9 15 8 15 10 7 4 3 0 4 7 7 1 With not be part of PA I instead of separate proposal? Fa of Grasslands - Phase IX 9 15 8 15 10 7 4 3 0 4 7 7 1 With not be a part of PA I instead of separate proposal? Fa of Grasslands - Phase IX 9 15 8 15 10 7 4 3 0 4 7 7 1 With not be a part of PA I instead of separate proposal? Fa of Grasslands - Phase IX 9 15 8 15 10 7 4 3 0 4 7 7 1 With not be part of PA I instead of separate proposal? Fa of Grasslands - Phase IX 9 15 8 15 10 7 4 3 0 4 7 7 1 With not be a part of PA I instead of separate proposal? Fa of Grasslands - Phase IX 9 15 8 15 10 7 4 3 0 4 7 7 1 With not be of PA I instead of Separate proposal? Fa of Grasslands - Phase IX 9 15 8 15 10 7 5 3 2 4 4 66 8 Unit of Part of Part of Part of PA I instead of Separate proposal? Fa of Grasslands - Phase IX 9 15 8 12 8 8 10 5 10 5 87 10 5 87 10 10 5 87 10 10 5 87 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10														
Southern Red River Valley - Phase III PA 09 Martin Country/Fox Lake DNR WMA Aquisition - Phase II 8 12 7 12 8 8 8 7 4 0 4 70 With not be part of PA 1 is liseal of separate proposal? FRE 01 DNR Grasslands - Phase IX 9 15 8 15 10 7 4 3 0 4 75 With not part of PA 1 is liseal of separate proposal? FRE 02 Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase V FA 01 Carnelian Creek Conservation Corridor 9 12 8 12 8 8 7 5 3 2 4 66 Blaine Wetland - are there known T&E species there? FA 02 Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project 9 12 7 14 9 7 8 5 0 4 75 Dillic access for hunting may be a benefit but the primary purpose must be habitat protection for will income from the timbers alse? FA 03 Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII 5 10 5 10 7 6 8 3 3 0 3 57 Dillitary in the proposal Pilot, why would wetlands for valent of valent of valent project, why would wetlands for valent on valent project, why would wetlands for valent on valent project, why would wetlands for valent project, why would wetland step valent project, why would wetland step valent project, why would wetland step valent project, why would wetlands for valent project, why would wetland step valent project, why would wetland step valent project, why would wetlands for valent project, why would wetlands for valent project, why would vetlands for valent project what is the cumulative total of certain project, why would vetlands for valent pr	ΡΔ Ω8	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the	7	12	8	12	8	7	Q	4	0	4	71	
PA 09 Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Aquisition - Phase II 8 12 7 12 8 8 8 7 4 0 4 70 Why not be part of PA 1 Instead of separate proposal? PRE 01 DNR Grasslands - Phase IX 9 15 8 15 10 7 4 3 0 4 75 Why not be part of PA 1 Instead of separate proposal? PRE 01 DNR Grasslands - Phase IX 9 15 8 15 10 7 4 3 0 4 75 No real plan for maintenance after OHF funding? If this is for grasslands, why outcomes in the northern forest? No real plan for maintenance after OHF funding? If this is for grasslands, why outcomes in the northern forest ones to plan for maintenance after OHF funds are available. Does this overlap with the proposal for work on Prairie Bank easements? Federal match is not on leverage and it; confusing. PRE 02 Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase V 8 12 7 10 8 7 5 3 2 4 66 Blaine Wetland - are there known T&E species there? FA 01 Carnelian Creek Conservation Corridor 9 12 8 12 8 8 10 5 10 5 87 FA 02 Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project 9 12 7 14 9 7 8 5 0 4 75 No new trails or roads unless exclusively for management. PRE 03 Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII 5 10 5 10 7 6 8 8 3 0 3 5 5 millitary? Why are they not participating to long the maintenance of the funding? If this is important to Camp Ripley Argust for Management. PRE 04 No new trails or roads unless exclusively for management. PRE 05 Public access for hunting may be a benefit but the primary purpose must be habitat protection for will increase from the timber sale? This is a one time acousition. Why would there be a need for 3 wears of leaves the sale of the	17.00	Southern Red River Valley - Phase III	,	12		12	Ü	'		_	Ü	1	/-	
PRE 01 DNR Grasslands - Phase IX 9 15 8 15 10 7 4 3 0 4 75 If this is the cumulative total of crews/contractors acting year by year with OHF and other funding? If this is for grasslands, why outcomes in the norstern great by ear with OHF and other funding? If this is for grasslands, why outcomes in the norstern great of the possible of the proposal for work on Praise Bank easements? Federal match is not on leverage and it is confusing. PRE 02 Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase V 8 12 7 10 8 7 5 3 2 4 66 Blaine Wetland - are there known T&E species there? FA 01 Carnelian Creek Conservation Corridor 9 12 8 12 8 8 10 5 10 5 87 FA 02 Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project 9 12 7 14 9 7 8 5 0 4 75 No new trails or roads unless exclusively for management. No new trails or roads unless exclusively for management. No new trails or roads unless exclusively for management. PRO Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII 5 10 5 10 7 6 8 8 3 0 3 5 57 Does this vowed pain from the timbe are unabled. Show the proposal control of the primary purpose must be habitat protection for will income from the timbe sales? This is a one time acquisition. Why would there be a need for 3 years of personnel? There is no match although it is stated this is stated this is stated this is stated this is the stated this is maintenance activities only? Will they restrict the new acads/trails to maintenance activities only?	PA 09	Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Aquisition - Phase II	8	12	7	12	8	8	7	4	0	4	70	
PRE 01 DNR Grasslands - Phase IX 9 15 8 15 10 7 4 3 0 4 75 If this is for grasslands, why outcomes in the northern forest? No real plan for maintenance after OH funds are available. Does this overlap with the proposal for work on Prairie Bank easements? Federal match is not on leverage and it is public accessed and its individual management costs)? PRE 02 Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase V 8 12 7 10 8 7 5 3 2 4 66 Blaine Wetland - are there known T&E species there? FA 01 Carnelian Creek Conservation Corridor 9 12 8 12 8 8 8 10 5 10 5 87 Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project 9 12 7 14 9 7 8 5 0 4 75 Public access for hunting may be a benefit but the primary purpose must be habitat protection for will income from the timber sales? FA 02 Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII 5 10 5 10 7 6 8 3 0 3 57 Does the SWOC have a restricted fund to hold the stewardship dollars in? Will they restrict the new radokfyratils to maintenance activities only?														Federal lands included when they have told us they will take responsibility for long term maintenance?
PRE 02 Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase V 8 12 7 10 8 7 5 3 2 4 66 Blaine Wetland - are there known T&E species there? FA 01 Carnelian Creek Conservation Corridor FA 02 Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project 9 12 7 14 9 7 8 5 0 4 75 Public access for hunting may be a benefit but the primary purpose must be habitat protection for will not mere from the timber sales? FA 03 Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII 5 10 5 10 7 6 8 3 3 0 3 5 7 There is no match although it is stated this is important to Camp Ripley. Why should OHF funds be us military? Why are they not participating? Will they restrict the are varied fund to hold the stewardship dollars in? Will they restrict the are varied fund to hold the stewardship dollars in? Will they restrict the are varied fund to hold the stewardship dollars in? Will they restrict the are varied fund to hold the stewardship dollars in? Will they restrict the are varied fund to hold the stewardship dollars in?							1	1						
Does this overlap with the proposal for work on Prairie Bank easements? Federal match is not neverage and its confusings. Explain cost effective us leverage and its confusings. Explain cost effective us leverage and its confusings. Explain cost effective us leverage and its confusings. Explain cost effective us leverage and its confusings. Explain cost effective us leverage and its confusings. Explain cost effective us leverage and its confusings. Explain cost effective us leverage and its confusings. Explain cost effective us leverage and its confusings. Explain cost effective us leverage and its confusings. Explain cost effective us leverage and its confusings. Explain cost effective us leverage and its confusings. Explain cost effective us leverage and its confusings. Explain cost effective us leverage and its confusing management costs)? Explain cost effective us leverage and its confusings. Explain cost effective us leverage and its confusing management costs)? Explain cost effective us leverage and its confusing management costs)? Explain cost effective us leverage and its confusing management costs)? Explain cost effective us leverage and its confusing management costs)? Explain cost effective us leverage and its confusing management costs)? Explain cost effective us leverage and its confusing management costs)? Explain cost effective us entities fund used the primary purpose must be habitat protection for will income from the timber sales? The public access for hunting may be a benefit but the primary purpose must be habitat protection for will income from the timber sales? The public access for hunting may be a benefit but the primary purpose must be habitat protection for will income from the timber sales? This is a one time acquisition. Why would there be a need for 3 years of personnel? There is no match althought to confusion will be stead this is important to Camp Ripley. Why should OHF funds be us military? Why are they not participating? Does the SWDC have a restricted fund to hold	PRE 01	DNR Grasslands - Phase IX	9	15	8	15	10	7	4	3	0	4	75	
FA 01 Carnelian Creek Conservation Corridor FA 02 Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project FA 03 Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII FA 03 Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII FA 04 Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase V FA 05 Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase V FA 08 Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase V FA 09 Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase V FA 01 Carnelian Creek Conservation Corridor 9 12 8 12 8 8 8 10 5 10 5 87 14 9 7 8 5 0 4 75 The conservation Corridor - Phase VII FA 02 Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project FA 03 Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII FA 04 Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII FA 05 Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII FA 06 Blaine Wetland - are there known T&E species there? No new trails or roads unless exclusively for management. Public access for hunting may be a benefit but the primary purpose must be habitat protection for will necess from the timber sales? There is no mit adhough it is stated this is important to Camp Ripley. Why should OHF funds be us military? Why are they not participating? Does the SWDC have a restricted fund to hold the stewardship dollars in? Will they restrict the new rands/trails to maintenance activities only?							1	1						
PRE 02 Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase V 8 12 7 10 8 7 5 3 2 4 66 Explain cost effective use of local communities (including management costs)? FA 01 Carnelian Creek Conservation Corridor 9 12 8 12 8 8 10 5 10 5 87 FA 02 Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project 9 12 7 14 9 7 8 5 0 4 75 FA 03 Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII 5 10 5 10 7 6 8 8 3 0 3 57 Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII 5 10 5 10 5 87 There is no match although it is stated this is important to Camp Ripley. Why should OHF funds be us military? Why are they not participating? Does the SWDC have a restricted fund to hold the stewardship dollars in? Will they restrict the new racide full they new racide full they restrict the new racide full to hold the stewardship dollars in?								<u> </u>						
FA 01 Carnelian Creek Conservation Corridor 9 12 8 12 8 10 5 10 5 87 Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project 9 12 7 14 9 7 8 5 0 4 75 Public access for hunting may be a benefit but the primary purpose must be habitat protection for will income from the timber sales? This is a one time acquisition. Why would there be a need for 3 years of personnel? FA 03 Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII 5 10 5 10 7 6 8 3 3 0 3 57 Will they restricted fund to hold the stewardship dollars in? Will they restrict the new raods/trails to maintenance activities only?	PRE 02	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase V	8	12	7	10	8	7	5	3	2	4	66	Explain cost effective use of local communities (including management costs)?
FA 02 Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project 9 12 7 14 9 7 8 5 0 4 75 No new trails or roads unless exclusively for management. Public access for humber sales? This is a new trails or roads unless exclusively for management. Public access for humber sales? This is a new trails or roads unless exclusively for management. Public access for humber sales? This is a new trails or roads unless exclusively for management. Public access for humber sales? This is a new trails or roads unless exclusively for management. Public access for humber sales? This is a new trails or roads unless exclusively for management. Public access for humber sales? This is a new trails or roads unless exclusively for management. Public access for humber sales? This is a new trails or roads unless exclusively for management. Public access for humber sales? This is a new trails or roads unless exclusively for management. Public access for humber sales? This is a new trails or roads unless exclusively for management. Public access for humber sales? This is a new trails or roads unless exclusively for management. Public access for humber sales? This is a new trails or roads unless exclusively for management. Public access for humber sales? This is a new trails or roads unless exclusively for management. Public access for humber sales? This is a new trail in come from the time acquisition. Why would there be a need for 3 years of personnel? There is no match although it is stated this is important to Camp Ripley. Why set they not participating? There is no match although it is stated this is important to Camp Ripley. Why set they not participating? Does the SWDC have a restricted fund to hold the stewardship dollars in? Will they restrict the new rands/trails to maintenance activities only?			-				_	·		,	_	·		pianie wedanu - are there known rac species there:
FA 02 Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project 9 12 7 14 9 7 8 5 0 4 75 Public access for hunting may be a benefit but the primary purpose must be habitat protection for will lncome from the timber sales? This is a one time acquisition. Why would there be a need for 3 years of personnel? There is no match although it is stated this is important to Camp Ripley. Why should OHF funds be us military? Why are they not participating? Ones the SWDC have a restricted fund to hold the stewardship dollars in? Will they restrict the new raods/trails to maintenance activities only?	FA 01	Carnelian Creek Conservation Corridor	9	12	8	12	8	8	10	5	10	5	87	No nous traile or roade unless evelusively for management
FA 02 Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project 9 12 7 14 9 7 8 5 0 4 75 Income from the timber sales? This is a one time acquisition. Why would there be a need for 3 years of personnel? There is no match although it is stated this is important to Camp Ripley. Why should OHF funds be us military? Why are through the properties of the proper														
FA 03 Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII 5 10 5 10 7 6 8 3 0 3 5 This is a one time acquisition. Why would there be a need for 3 years of personnel? There is no match although it is stated this is important to Camp Ripley. Why should OHF funds be us military? Why are they not participating? Does the SWDC have a restricted fund to hold the stewardship dollars in? Will they restrict the new raods/trails to maintenance activities only?	FA 02	Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project	9	12	7	14	9	7	8	5	0	4	75	
FA 03 Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII 5 10 5 10 7 6 8 3 0 3 57 military? Why are they not participating? Does the SWDC have a restricted fund to hold the stewardship dollars in? Will they restrict the new raods/trails to maintenance activities only?														This is a one time acquisition. Why would there be a need for 3 years of personnel?
Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII 5 10 7 0 8 3 10 Does the SWDC have a restricted fund to hold the stewardship dollars in? Will they restrict the new raods/trails to maintenance activities only?							1	1						There is no match although it is stated this is important to Camp Ripley. Why should OHF funds be used to help the
Does the SWDC have a restricted fund to hold the stewardship dollars in? Will they restrict the new raods/trails to maintenance activities only?	FA 03	Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII	5	10	5	10	7	6	8	3	0	3	57	
							1	1						
FA 04 Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase V 8 12 8 10 10 8 8 5 2 5 76 Why not concentrate on goat prairies - the most threatened habitiat for this entire proposal?				12	8	10	10			5				Why not concentrate on goat prairies - the most threatened habitiat for this entire proposal?
FA 05 Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase V 9 15 6 10 7 7 8 4 4 5 75 Why would public beneift be more important than ecological benefit?	FA 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase V	9	15	6	10	7	7	8	4	4	5	75	Why would public beneift be more important than ecological benefit?

													Not sure why the loss of raods eliminated ariel seeding.
													Design section says land not being acquired for management but then says the county plan directs acquisition for
													management access. Seems like a conflict. Not sure what landlocked parcels do to decrease wildlife habitat.
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitats in Cass County - Phase VIII	6	8	5	7	7	5	8	4	1	5	56	The urgency rationale is that center pivit agriculture is creating a need for acquision but this is not what the reat of
													the proposal seems to be focused on.
													What does the forest roads section of the county forest resources manangement plan say? can new roads/trails be
													used for recreational purposes?
FA 07	State Forest Acquisition - Richard J. Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase IV	8	7	7	7	7	6	8	4	0	5	59	Why keep roads now in privte use open after acquistion?
FΔ 08	Critical Shoreland Habitat Protection Program - Phase IV	9	12	q	12	10	8	10	5	4	5	84	Would new roads only be used for sustainable forestry?
17100	entited shorteland hastact roccolon rogram. Thase it			,		10	Ü	10					Retire mineral rights if acquired so they cannot be sold or leased in the future?
FA 09	Bushmen Lake	10	15	8	10	8	10	10	5	5	4	85	Staffing, while small, seems like a bit much for one acquision.
													Is there an appraisal to justify price?
WA 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase IX	9	13	7	10	8	8	10	3	4	5	77	Why not operate as part of PA 02?
													Is match a fixed amount or likely to be scaled back if the amount requested is not what is requested? Why not combined with PA 01?
													Total amounts currently available in OHF funding?
WA 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase VI	8	12	7	10	8	8	7	0	0	4	64	Does MN DNR have funds to maintain these properties?
													Match notification in July of 2020? Does not seem like a match.
													Why not focus on land not in row crops? Little urgency if it is just to purchase farmland.
													Why not combined with PA 07? Total paid for CREP 15 year easement and Rim Buffer easements as % of FMV or appraised value?
													Good to note that there will be no GMO crops in food plots.
WA 03	RIM Wetlands - Phase VIII	9	13	8	12	8	8	8	4	10	5		With major funding for staff from LCCMR, why do you need more staff support?
													How does this effect last years CREP grant to BWSR?
													Who holds the easement stewardship funds?
													TRails and roads - Utmost flexibility - why not NO. New trails only for maintenance purposes?
WA 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase V	9	15	10	15	9	9	8	4	0	4	83	Upland easement buffer size? Why 5 years of program management?
							_		_	_			Why not combine with WA 02?
WRE 01	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase IX	8	8	6	8	7	6	4	0	0	4	51	What is plan for maintenance after OHF expires?
	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative - Phase												Why not combine with WA 02 and WRE 01?
WRE 02	V	8	12	8	10	8	6	8	0	0	3	63	July 2020 notification of match is not really a match.
													Travel seems very high. Intersting project but it seems like two proposals - one to do the work and one to reseach the work done.
	Restoration of Non-native Cattail Dominated		_	_				_				72	5 years seems like a long time to do the work.
WRE 03	Wetlands in Rainy Lake	8	8	8	12	10	8	5	3	8	2	/2	Scaleability concerns.
				_		_							Sustainability - not really an answer to what would keep the cattail from returning.
	MN DNR Aquatic Protection and Enhancement - Phase IX Metro Big Rivers - Phase VIII	8	12 15	7	10 10	5 8	7	8	4	0 4	4		Accelerated habitat assessments - is this "protect, enhance or restore"? Should some of the smaller projects be CPL focused?
				,		Ü	8			0		70	is this project really in agriculturally doninated landscape and therefore need food plots?
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase II	7	12	8	10	8	8	10	4	U	3	70	Will they commit to new trails only being for maintenance purposed instead of "utmost flexibility" standard?
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North	8	12	7	12	10	9	10	4	4	4	80	LLAWF hold easements? Why not MLT?
-	Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase III												Improve stakeholder communications?
HA 05	Wildlife and Rare Species Habitat	7	12	8	10	8	7	8	3	2	4	69	How does this not overlap other programs? What is the coordination?
													is this a flood reduction or habitat project?
													Could excessive vegitation at outlet be removed to increase water flow and accomplish the same objective for less \$?
HA 06	Goose Prairie	8	10	6	10	7	8	8	3	0	4	64	Road heightening does not seem like habitat enhancment.
1	Goode France	Ü	10		10	,	, and the second	Ü			·	-	Is new channel mostly about access and not habitat?
													Could this be part of other shallow lakes proposals? NO scaleability.
	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and												Teo Scaleability.
HRE 01	Restoration - IX	9	12	8	12	10	10	10	3	3	5	82	
	DNR Stream Habitat - Phase II	7	12	8	10	10	9	8	3	1	3		is personnel suplanting or excessive?
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase IV	9	12	8	13	10	8	9	3	8	5	85	Long term control of cattail and phragmites?
						1							Seems like part of the work (shocking, tracking, identifying, monitoring are not habitat restoration but research. Lack of a barrier provides 70 miles of habitat but lower and middle stretches are not suitable habitat? Is not lethal
						1							zones a barrier like a waterfall?
HRE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	6	10	5	10	10	6	7	2	0	2	58	DNR has funds for beaver monitoring and removal but applicant has had to use their funds for this activity?
						1							6 years of funding for personnel seems like a great amount. Also sbould this really take 1.25 people per year to
						1							oversee the contracts?
HRE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VI	7	8	5	10	7	6	7	2	1	4	57	Rotone treatment but how to avoid new rough fish infestations?
													if the source problem is agricultural and municipal runoff, water control and fish barriers would not seem to be the
HRE 06	Lake Wakanda Enhancement Project	7	8	5	8	7	5	5	2	2	5	54	solution.
HRE 07	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	8	10	8	10	8	7	8	4	10	5	78	How would rough fish be removed one they are isolated?
	Fairmont Lakes Foundation Dutch Creek Habitat Restoration	7	8	5	7	8	8	7	3	1	4	58	Is work being proposed on private property without permanent protection?
	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and	C	2	-	40		40	_					Proposal covers staff for 2 years. Are they not covered with prior appropriations or is this not some type of overlap?
CPL	Metro Habitat	9	8	7	10	6	10	8	4	1	3	66	
01	Contract Management 2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
02	Restoration Evaluations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

ane Kingstor

Maximum score per request is 100 points. "COI" indicates a member is not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest. Overall proposal evaluation scores will be averaged using the number of members evaluating each proposal. Criteria Proposal addresses priority . Proposal abstract provides a ctions and outcomes of one or Proposal uses science-based . Proposal addresses habitats lear and succinct overview of ore of the ecological sections targeting that leverages or hat have significant value for . Proposal identifies the proposal activity, outputs. and is likely to produce and expands corridors and wildlife species of greatest and outcomes. Proposal is clearly demonstrate significant and omplexes, reduces onservation need, and/or indicator species and Performance measures are Proposal includes leverage O. Proposed budget is . Degree of timing/ written and adequately ermanent conservation legacy ragmentation or protects areas hreatened or endangered associated quantities thi clearly identified, and have a utcomes will be in funds or other effort to propriate to accomplish addresses: Who, What, Where, ind/or habitat outcomes for fish dentified in the MN County pecies, and lists targeted habitat will typically specific plan for measuring and naintained over pportunistic upplement any OHF ne outcomes described in Total When, Why, and How. me and wildlife. iological Survey. aluating outcomes. ne scope of work. rgency. Out of **Program Title** Max points: 10 15 5 100 12 10 12 4 73 10 5 0 ONR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase IX PA 01 Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program 10 10 74 12 12 9 5 1 PA 02 Phase IX 10 12 10 12 9 7 3 4 78 PA 03 MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VII ow does UTV save \$? Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife 10 12 10 12 9 5 2 3 74 PA 04 Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VIII 12 10 10 9 5 3 3 72 PA 05 Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VII igh Personnel \$ 10 12 10 11 9 5 0 72 PA 06 Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection - Phase III 10 12 10 10 4 78 PA 07 RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VII Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the 71 10 12 10 8 9 6 7 1 4 Southern Red River Valley - Phase III PA OS Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Aquisition - Phase 9 12 10 8 9 5 7 0 3 67 PA 09 ligh \$/acre. Estimated cost = 0 several parcels. 5 10 5 0 3 59 PRE 01 ONR Grasslands - Phase IX Describe \$764K equip/materials. 3 3 56 3 PRF 02 Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase V xclude private property & parks. Frails map required. High Personnel \$. High \$/acre. Lacks sufficient 64 Carnelian Creek Conservation Corridor detail on WNC. Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat 10 10 0 58 6 4 FA 02 roject rails map needed. 9 5 5 5 7 5 2 0 3 48 Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII FA 03 No match, no access, expensive. Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration 10 10 9 5 5 1 3 61 FΔ 04 vian indicator? Phase V 10 10 7 7 4 7 65 Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase V FA 05 Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitats in Cass 5 5 5 5 1 5 County - Phase VIII Why not scalable? Why 7 years? State Forest Acquisition - Richard I 9 7 7 5 5 1 59 Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase IV Critical Shoreland Habitat Protection Program - Phase 10 5 5 3 4 FA 08 arcels estimated cost = 0? 10 10 12 8 5 76 4 FA 09 Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program 10 10 4 76 12 12 8 5 4 7 WA 01 hase IX Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase 10 10 12 12 1 3 71 WA 02 ligh \$/acre. 10 12 10 12 8 5 10 3 82 RIM Wetlands - Phase VIII estoration \$/acre? WA 03 66 10 10 10 9 8 5 0 3 Vild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase V WA 04 Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancemen 7 9 5 7 4 0 3 53 WRE 01 Phase IX wan population/acre? Outcome parameters? 61 Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland 9 10 5 1 3 Restoration Initiative - Phase V WRE 02 ligh Personnel \$. Outcome parameters? ligh Admin, Low On-the-Ground. Proven where? Clean Water Restoration of Non-native Cattail Dominated Fund appropriate. Temporary, not Permanent. Research. Wetlands in Rainy Lake Constitutionality in question.

1

HA 01	MN DNR Aquatic Protection and Enhancement - Phase IX	7	12	10	12	6	4	5	4	0	3	63	Accelerated habitat ASSESSMENT?
HA 02	Metro Big Rivers - Phase VIII	8	10	9	3	7	6	7	4	3	3	60	Exclude GRG Park work.
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase II	9	10	9	5	7	5	7	3	1	3	59	
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase III	9	10	9	10	5	5	6	4	2	4	64	Fee Title to Leech Lake Band. Need Portage Bay map illustrating parcels.
HA 05	Wildlife and Rare Species Habitat	9	10	9	12	7	4	5	3	1	4	64	Who is ultimate owner? Building on Kandiyohi Tract 18? Outcome parameters?
HA 06	Goose Prairie	8	7	5	4	4	5	7	2	1	4	47	Page 2 "CD18"?
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration - IX	10	9	8	6	6	7	7	3	3	4	63	
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat - Phase II	7	9	8	9	7	7	7	3	1	3	61	
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase IV	8	9	8	5	6	3	6	3	6	4	58	Dredged materials to Interstate Island?
HRE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	6	7	7	5	4	2	2	2	0	3	38	Evaluation criteria and priorities should be done first, & by LSSA volunteers - this is research & survey work. No in kind match as in past.
HRE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VI	6	6	7	5	7	5	6	2	1	3	48	Is this project ongoing 2 more years?
HRE 06	Lake Wakanda Enhancement Project	9	7	6	7	2	3	5	2	2	3	46	High Personnel 4. Why not scalable?
HRE 07	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	7	6	5	3	7	2	3	1	10	4	48	Civil Engineering does not equate to Scientific Targeting for Habitat.
HRE 08	Fairmont Lakes Foundation Dutch Creek Habitat Restoration	5	5	4	3	7	4	3	1	1	3	36	Private property? Who is financial agent? Why not scalable? High S/acre. Can't claim leverage from several years ago.
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	7	8	8	5	3	7	3	1	3	55	
01	Contract Management 2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
02	Restoration Evaluations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

HA 01

Rep. Leon Lillie Maximum score per request is 100 points. "COI" indicates a member is not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest. Overall proposal evaluation scores will be averaged using the number of members evaluating each proposal. Criteria 2. Proposal addresses priority . Proposal abstract provides a actions and outcomes of one or . Proposal uses science-based 1. Proposal addresses habitats nore of the ecological sections clear and succinct overview of targeting that leverages or that have significant value for he proposal activity, outputs, and is likely to produce and expands corridors and vildlife species of greatest . Proposal identifies and outcomes. Proposal is clearly monstrate significant and omplexes, reduces onservation need, and/or indicator species and . Performance measures are Proposal includes leverage written and adequately permanent conservation legacy threatened or endangered associated quantities this clearly identified, and have a itcomes will be 8. Degree of timing/ in funds or other effort to appropriate to accomplish fragmentation or protects areas addresses: Who. What. Where. and/or habitat outcomes for lentified in the MN County habitat will typically specific plan for measuring and naintained over pecies, and lists targeted pportunistic supplement any OHF the outcomes described in Biological Survey. Score Comments When, Why, and How, fish, game and wildlife. support. evaluating outcomes. ppropriation the scope of work. Out of ID# Program Title Max points: 10 PA 01 ONR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase IX Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program PA 02 Phase IX MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VII PA 03 Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VIII Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VII Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection - Phase III RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VII Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the PA 08 outhern Red River Valley - Phase III Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Aquisition - Phase PA 09 DNR Grasslands - Phase IX Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase V FA 01 Carnelian Creek Conservation Corridor Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat FA 02 FA 03 Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration -FA 04 Phase V FA 05 Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase V Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitats in Cass County - Phase VIII State Forest Acquisition - Richard J. Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase IV Critical Shoreland Habitat Protection Program - Phase Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program WA 01 Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase WA 02 WA 03 RIM Wetlands - Phase VIII Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase V Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland WRE 01 Enhancement - Phase IX Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland WRE 02 estoration Initiative - Phase V Restoration of Non-native Cattail Dominated Vetlands in Rainy Lake MN DNR Aquatic Protection and Enhancement -

HA 02	Metro Big Rivers - Phase VIII	9	14	9	14	9	10	10	5	10	5	95	1
	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase II	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	2
	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase III	8	13	8	13	8	9	9	4	9	4	85	3
HA 05	Wildlife and Rare Species Habitat	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	2
HA 06	Goose Prairie	8	13	8	13	8	9	9	4	9	4	85	3
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration - IX	9	14	9	14	9	10	10	5	10	5	95	1
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat - Phase II	9	14	9	14	9	10	10	5	10	5	95	1
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase IV	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	2
HRE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	9	14	9	14	9	10	10	5	10	5	95	1
	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VI	9	14	9	14	9	10	10	5	10	5	95	1
HRE 06	Lake Wakanda Enhancement Project	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	2
HRE 07	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	2
HRE 08	Fairmont Lakes Foundation Dutch Creek Habitat Restoration	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	2
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat	9	14	9	14	9	10	10	5	10	5	95	1
01	Contract Management 2017	9	14	9	14	9	10	10	5	10	5	95	1
02	Restoration Evaluations	9	14	9	14	9	10	10	5	10	5	95	1

Rep. Denny McNamara

Maximum score	per request is 100 points. "COI" indicates a member	er is not evaluating a propos	al due to a conflict of interest	t. Overall proposal evaluation	n scores will be averaged usir		ers evaluating each proposa	l.				
			I	1		Criteria	1			1		
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	 Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife. 	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.		Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	Out of 100
PA 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase IX	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	5	5	95
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase IX	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	5	5	95
PA 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	3	2	5	90
PA 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VIII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	5	5	95
PA 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VII	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	3	10	5	88
PA 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection - Phase III	5	7	10	10	10	10	10	3	5	5	75
PA 07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100
PA 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase III	5	5	10	10	5	5	10	3	2	5	60
PA 09	Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Aquisition - Phase II	10	15	10	15	5	5	10	3	2	5	80
PRE 01	DNR Grasslands - Phase IX	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100
PRE 02	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase V	5	7	10	8	5	10	10	5	5	5	70
FA 01	Carnelian Creek Conservation Corridor	5	5	5	5	5	5	10	5	10	5	60
FA 02	Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project	5	5	10	10	10	5	10	3	2	5	65
FA 03	Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	5	10	5	90
FA 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase V	5	10	5	10	5	8	10	3	5	5	66
FA 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase V	5	7.0	10.0	8.0	5.0	10	10	3	8	5	71
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitats in Cass County - Phase VIII	5	8.0	10.0	7	5.0	5	10	3	8	5	66
FA 07	State Forest Acquisition - Richard J. Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase IV	10	10.0	10	10	10.0	10	10	5	2	5	82
FA 08	Critical Shoreland Habitat Protection Program - Phase IV	10	10	10	10	10	5	10	3	5	5	78
FA 09	Bushmen Lake	5	10	10	10	10	5	10	5	10	5	80
	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase IX	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	5	5	95
WA 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase VI	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	5	5	95
WA 03	RIM Wetlands - Phase VIII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100
	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase V	10	13	10	12	10	10	10	3	2	5	85
	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase IX	10	13	10	15	10	10	10	5	2	5	90
WRE 02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative - Phase V	10	13	10	15	10	10	10	5	3	5	91

WRE 03	Restoration of Non-native Cattail Dominated Wetlands in Rainy Lake	5	5	5	5	10	10	5	2	5	5	57	
HA 01	MN DNR Aquatic Protection and Enhancement - Phase IX	5	10	10	10	10	5	10	3	2	5	70	
HA 02	Metro Big Rivers - Phase VIII	5	7	10	8	10	5	10	3	5	5	68	
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase II	5	10	10	10	10	5	10	3	2	5	70	
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase III	5	10	10	10	10	5	10	5	5	5	75	
HA 05	Wildlife and Rare Species Habitat	3	8	10	8	7	5	10	3	3	5	62	
HA 06	Goose Prairie	5	10	10	10	7	5	10	5	3	5	70	
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration - IX	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat - Phase II	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	5	10	5	90	
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase IV	7	10	10	10	8	10	10	5	10	5	85	
HRE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	10	10	10	10	10	5	10	3	2	5	75	
HRE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VI	10	10	10	10	7	8	10	5	3	5	78	
HRE 06	Lake Wakanda Enhancement Project	5	7	10	10	10	3	10	3	4	5	67	
HRE 07	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	10	10	10	10	10	5	10	3	10	5	83	
HRE 08	Fairmont Lakes Foundation Dutch Creek Habitat Restoration	5	5	10	10	10	5	3	2	3	5	58	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	10	10	10	5	5	5	5	10	5	75	_
01	Contract Management 2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
02	Restoration Evaluations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2017/FY 2018

Maximum score per request is 100 points. "COI" indicates a member is not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest. Overall proposal evaluation scores will be averaged using the number of members evaluating each proposal. Criteria . Proposal addresses priority . Proposal abstract provides a actions and outcomes of one or Proposal addresses habitats Proposal uses science-based clear and succinct overview of more of the ecological sections argeting that leverages or that have significant value for the proposal activity, outputs, and is likely to produce and xpands corridors and wildlife species of greatest . Proposal identifies 10. Proposed budget is and outcomes, Proposal is emonstrate significant and onservation need, and/or indicator species and . Performance measures are). Proposal includes leverage omplexes, reduces . Proposal clearly written and adequately ermanent conservation legacy ragmentation or protects areas threatened or endangered associated quantities this clearly identified, and have a utcomes will be 3. Degree of timing/ in funds or other effort to opropriate to accomplish dentified in the MN County addresses: Who, What, Where, and/or habitat outcomes for species, and lists targeted habitat will typically specific plan for measuring and aintained over pportunistic supplement any OHF e outcomes described in When, Why, and How. fish, game and wildlife. valuating outcomes ppropriation. ne scope of work. iological Survey. Score Program Title Max points: 10 10 15 10 Out of 100 DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition 10 15 10 15 10 10 10 0 5 PA 01 Phase IX Accelerating the Wildlife 10 15 10 15 5 Management Area Program -10 10 10 PA 02 Phase IX MN Prairie Recovery Project 15 10 10 15 10 10 10 10 5 PA 03 Phase VII Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife 15 10 15 10 10 2 7 10 10 Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase Cannon River Watershed Habitat 10 15 10 15 10 10 10 4 10 4 PA 05 Complex - Phase VII Accelerated Native Prairie Bank 10 15 10 15 10 10 PA 06 Protection - Phase III RIM Buffers for Wildlife and I recommend full 100% funding of this proposal. Any funding 10 15 10 15 10 10 10 5 10 PA 07 Water - Phase VII awarded should be contingent on "no new recreational trails" Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the 15 10 12 10 10 10 Southern Red River Valley PA 08 Phase III Martin County/Fox Lake DNR 10 15 10 15 10 10 0 3 PA 09 WMA Aguisition - Phase II 10 15 10 15 10 10 10 1 0 86 PRE 01 DNR Grasslands - Phase IX Anoka Sand Plain Habitat 10 10 10 15 10 10 10 1 10 91 PRE 02 Conservation - Phase V Carnelian Creek Conservation recommend full 100% funding of this proposal. 10 15 15 10 10 10 5 10 10 FA 01 Laurentian Forest - St. Louis Any funding awarded should be contingent on "no new County Habitat 10 15 10 15 10 recreational trails" Any funding awarded should be contingent on "no new 10 15 10 15 10 10 0 10 3 5 FA 03 Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII ecreational trails" Southeast Minnesota Protection 10 15 10 15 10 10 10 1 5 FA 04 and Restoration - Phase V Minnesota Forests for the Future Any funding awarded should be contingent on "no new 10 15.0 10.0 15.0 10.0 10 10 5 10 5 FA 05 - Phase V Protect (Acquire) Key Forest recommend full 100% funding of this proposal; project is not Habitats in Cass 10.0 7.0 12 10.0 10 FA 06 County - Phase VIII State Forest Acquisition -Any funding awarded should be contingent on "no new Richard J. ecreational trails" 10 10.0 10 15 10.0 10 10 82 Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase Critical Shoreland Habitat 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 2 10 FA 08 Protection Program - Phase IV recommend full 100% funding of this proposal. 10 15 10 15 10 10 10 5 10 FA 09 Rushmen Lake Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program -10 15 10 15 10 10 10 10 5 WA 01 Shallow Lake & Wetland 10 15 10 15 10 10 10 3 2 WA 02 Protection Program - Phase VI Any funding awarded should be contingent on "no new 10 10 15 10 15 10 10 10 5 5 WA 03 RIM Wetlands - Phase VIII Wild Rice Shoreland Protection recommend full 100% funding of this proposal. Any funding 10 15 10 15 10 10 10 WA 04 warded should be contingent on "no new recreational trails" Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase 10 10 10 10 10 1 WRE 01

WRE 02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative - Phase V	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	1	2	5	88	
WRE 03	Restoration of Non-native Cattail Dominated Wetlands in Rainy Lake	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	4	10	5	99	I recommend full 100% funding of this proposal.
HA 01	MN DNR Aquatic Protection and Enhancement - Phase IX	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	1	0	5	86	
HA 02	Metro Big Rivers - Phase VIII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	1	10	3	94	
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase II	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	1	3	5		Any funding awarded should be contingent on "no new recreational trails"
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase III	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	1	10	5	96	
HA 05	Wildlife and Rare Species Habitat	10	10	10	15	10	10	10	1	2	3	81	
HA 06	Goose Prairie	10	12	10	15	10	10	10	5	4	5	91	I recommend full 100% funding of this proposal - project is shovel ready and can be executed immediately.
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration - IX	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	1	10	5	96	
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat - Phase II	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	3	3	5	91	I recommend full 100% funding of the Mound Creek portion of this proposal, at a minimum.
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase IV	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	I recommend full 100% funding of this proposal.
HRE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	3	0	5	88	I recommend full 100% funding of this proposal - project is shovel ready and can be executed immediately.
HRE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VI	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	1	4	4	89	
HRE 06	Lake Wakanda Enhancement Project	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	3	10	5	98	I recommend full 100% funding of this proposal.
HRE 07	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	4	10	5	99	I recommend full 100% funding of this proposal.
HRE 08	Fairmont Lakes Foundation Dutch Creek Habitat Restoration	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	6	5	96	I recommend full 100% funding of this proposal.
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	15	10	12	6	6	10	1	10	0	80	Recommend funding at \$10,000,000
01	Contract Management 2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Recommend full 100% funding of this proposal
02	Restoration Evaluations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Recommend full 100% funding of this proposal

Sen. Tom Saxhaug

Maximum score per request is 100 points. "COI" indicates a member is not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest. Overall proposal evaluation scores will be averaged using the number of members evaluating each proposal. . Proposal addresses priority 1. Proposal abstract provides a actions and outcomes of one or Proposal uses science-based 1. Proposal addresses habitats clear and succinct overview of nore of the ecological sections targeting that leverages or that have significant value for the proposal activity, outputs, and is likely to produce and expands corridors and wildlife species of greatest Proposal identifies and outcomes. Proposal is clearly demonstrate significant and omplexes, reduces conservation need, and/or indicator species and 6. Performance measures are . Proposal includes leverage 10. Proposed budget is . Proposal written and adequately permanent conservation legacy fragmentation or protects areas threatened or endangered associated quantities this clearly identified, and have a outcomes will be B. Degree of timing/ in funds or other effort to appropriate to accomplish addresses: Who, What, Where, and/or habitat outcomes for fish, identified in the MN County species, and lists targeted habitat will typically specific plan for measuring and naintained over opportunistic supplement any OHF he outcomes described in When, Why, and How, ame and wildlife. Biological Survey the scope of work species. upport. evaluating outcomes. rgency. appropriation. Score Comments Out of ID# **Program Title** Max points: 10 15 10 100 4451/acre Leverage: 0% 11 10 15 10 2 2 5 DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase IX PA 01 5534/acre Leverage: 5% Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program 5 7 10 10 3 2 2 2 15 1 PA 02 4723/acre Leverage: 11% 7 10 10 15 10 5 5 1 4 3 MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VII 3431/acre Leverage: 8% Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife 10 10 15 10 5 2 PA 04 Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VIII 6421/acre Leverage: 10% 10 15 10 5 4 2 Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VII 5996/acre Leverage: 0% 7 10 10 15 10 7 7 0 2 1 Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection - Phase III 1254/acre Leverage: 500% 12 10 7 5 10 4 RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VII 15 10 PA 07 Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the 3255/acre Leverage: 1% 7 15 10 5 2 4 1 Southern Red River Valley - Phase III 7467/acre Leverage 0% Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Aquisition - Phase 4 10 15 10 3 5 1 0 2 PA 09 NA Leverage 0% 5 10 10 15 10 5 5 3 4 3 70 PRF 01 DNR Grasslands - Phase IX 3642/acre Leverage: 11% 7 4 74 10 10 10 5 3 15 Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase V 7164/acre Leverage: 98% 10 15 10 7 5 8 Carnelian Creek Conservation Corridor 1108/acre Leverage 0% Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat 12 10 15 10 7 7 5 2 5 FA 02 2273/acre Leverage: 0% 7 5 4 4 81 8 12 10 10 15 FA 03 Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII 3666/acre Leverage: 8% Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration 7 10 10 15 10 6 7 5 2 3 75 Phase V FA 04 711/acre Leverage: 25% 9 12.0 10.0 15.0 10.0 8 5 FA 05 Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase V 1565/acre Leverage: 4% Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitats in Cass 10.0 10.0 15 10.0 5 2 4 FA 06 County - Phase VIII 2535/acre Leverage: 2% State Forest Acquisition - Richard J. 7 11.0 10 15 10.0 5 2 3 FΔ 07 Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase IV 5227/acre Leverage: 14% Critical Shoreland Habitat Protection Program - Phase 7 5 4 3 8 12 10 15 10 7 FA 08 2050/acre Leverage: 76% 6 5 7 4 9 12 10 15 8 8 Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program 5513/acre Leverage: 27% 10 10 15 10 5 2 5 3 73 WA 01 10205/acre Leverage: 3% Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase 11 10 15 10 7 2 72 WA 02 2500/acre Leverage: 200% 7 9 12 10 15 10 WA 03 RIM Wetlands - Phase VIII 1400/acre Leverage: 0% 11 10 15 10 7 7 2 2 4 Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase V WA 04 Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland 363/acre Leverage: 0% Left a section 5 10 15 10 7 3 0 4 WRE 01 Enhancement - Phase IX 2403/acre Leverage: 2% Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland 10 15 10 3 2 2 Restoration Initiative - Phase V

WRE 03	Restoration of Non-native Cattail Dominated Wetlands in Rainy Lake	9	11	10	15	10	8	7	4	7	4	85	1800/acre Leverage: 70%
HA 01	MN DNR Aquatic Protection and Enhancement - Phase IX	8	10	10	15	10	8	7	2	0	3	73	3696/acre Leverage: 0%
HA 02	Metro Big Rivers - Phase VIII	8	10	10	15	10	7	7	2	5	2	76	4124/acre Leverage: 23%
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase II	8	12	10	15	10	8	8	5	2	3	81	2724/acre Leverage: 3%
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase III	9	11	10	15	10	8	8	4	4	2	81	5193/acre Leverage: 18%
HA 05	Wildlife and Rare Species Habitat	8	10	10	15	10	8	6	2	2	4	75	1923/acre Leverage: 4%
HA 06	Goose Prairie	7	10	10	15	10	8	7	2	2	2	73	6741/acre Leverage: 5%
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration - IX	8	10	10	15	10	7	6	4	5	1	76	16219/acre Leverage: 21%
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat - Phase II	8	10	10	15	10	8	7	4	2	1	75	113519/acre Leverage: 3%
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase IV	8	10	10	15	10	8	3	4	7	1	76	36657/acre Leverage: 56%
HRE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	7	12	10	15	10	8	6	3	1	1	73	NA Leverage 0%
HRE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VI	8	10	10	15	10	7	8	2	2	2	74	7145/acre Leverage: 5%
HRE 06	Lake Wakanda Enhancement Project	8	10	10	15	8	8	8	2	3	4	76	525/acre Leverage: 12%
HRE 07	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	8	11	10	15	10	8	7	2	8	2	81	4074/acre Leverage: 124%
HRE 08	Fairmont Lakes Foundation Dutch Creek Habitat Restoration	7	10	10	15	10	6	7	2	2	1	70	45143/acre Leverage: 7%
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	Leverage 9%
01	Contract Management 2017	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
02	Restoration Evaluations	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2017/FY 2018

Name: Ron Schara

Date:

Due Date: Thursday, July 21, 2016 by 4 p.m. Email to amanda.brazee@lsohc.leg.mn

Maximum score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest.*

Maximum sco	ore per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in t	ne lotal Score field if no	et evaluating a proposal du	e to a conflict of interest.	•	.						
ID#	Program Title	1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How. Max points: 10	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science- based targeting that	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities		7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	effort to supplement any	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Score Comments Out of
			0	0		0		Е	2		E	100
PA 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase IX Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area	9	8	9	15	8	5	5	3	0	5	67
PA 02	Program - Phase IX	9	8	9	15	8	5	5	3	5	5	72
PA 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VII	9	11	9	15	8	5	3	3	7	5	75
PA 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VIII	9	11	9	15	8	5	3	3	6	5	74
PA 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VII	9	10	9	15	8	5	3	3	7	5	74
PA 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection - Phase III	9	10	9	15	8	5	4	3	0	5	68
PA 07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VII	9	12	9	15	8	5	4	5	10	5	82
PA 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase III	7	8	8	12	8	5	5	3	0	5	61
PA 09	Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Aquisition - Phase II	9	11	9	15	9	7	5	3	0	5	73
PRE 01	DNR Grasslands - Phase IX	7	8	9	15	8	5	3	3	0	5	63
PRE 02	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase V	5	12	9	12	8	5	3	3	5	5	67
FA 01	Carnelian Creek Conservation Corridor	9	10	9	12	8	5	3	4	10	5	75
FA 02	Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project	9	8	9	12	8	5	3	3	0	5	62
		9	5	5	12	8	5	3	2	0	5	54
FA 03	Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration	n g	8	8	15	8	5	3	3	5	5	69
FA 04	- Phase V	,	9.0	8.0		9.0	5	2	2	3	E	
FA 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase V	7	8.0	8.0	12.0	8.0	j	3	3	<u></u>	3	63.0
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitats in Cass County - Phase VIII	9	5.0	5.0	12	8.0	5	5	3	2	5	59.0
FA 07	State Forest Acquisition - Richard J. Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase IV	9	8.0	8	15	8.0	5	5	3	2	5	68.0
FA 08	Critical Shoreland Habitat Protection Program - Phase IV	9	5	5	10	5	3	3	3	5	5	53
FA 09	Bushmen Lake	9	10	8	10	5	3	3	3	10	5	66
WA 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase IX	9	12	8	12	8	3	5	3	10	5	75
WA 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase VI	9	12	9	12	8	3	3	3	5	5	69
WA 03	RIM Wetlands - Phase VIII	9	8	8	12	8	3	5	3	10	5	71
WA 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase V	9	5	5	10	5	3	5	3	0	5	50
WRE 01	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase IX	7	5	5	10	5	3	3	3	5	5	51
WK2 01		9	10	8	12	5	3	3	3	5	5	63
WRE 02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative - Phase V Restoration of Non-native Cattail Dominated	·		-		_		-				
WRE 03	Wetlands in Rainy Lake	7	5	5	10	5 Criteria	3	3	3	5	5	51
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science- based targeting that	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities		7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	Out of 100
HA 01	MN DNR Aquatic Protection and Enhancement - Phase IX	9	10	8	10	8	9	8	3	0	5	70
HA 02	Metro Big Rivers - Phase VIII	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	3	8	5	73
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase II	g 9	10	8	10	8	8	8	3	5	5	74
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase III	9	10	8	10	10	5	8	3	6	5	74
HA 05	Wildlife and Rare Species Habitat	9	8	8	12	8	5	5	3	3	5	66
HA 06	Goose Prairie	9	12	10	12	10	7	8	5	5	5	83
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration - IX	9	12	8	10	8	8	8	3	8	5	79
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat - Phase II	9	10	8	10	10	8	8	3	3	5	74
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase IV	9	12	10	12	8	8	8	3	10	5	85
HRE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	8	8	8	10	8	8	8	3	0	5	66
HRE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VI	9	12	8	12	8	8	8	3	5	5	78
HRE 06	Lake Wakanda Enhancement Project	10	12	8	12	8	8	8	5	8	5	84
HRE 07	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	10	12	8	10	7	8	8	5	10	5	83
HRE 08	Fairmont Lakes Foundation Dutch Creek Habitat Restoration	10	12	8	10	8	8	8	5	8	5	82
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat	8	12	8	10	10	8	8	3	8	5	80
01	Contract Management 2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100
02	Restoration Evaluations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100
*Overall propo	osal evaluation scores will be averaged using the n	 number of members evaluatin	ng that individual proposal.									

Maximum score	per request is 100 points. "COI" indicates a membe	er is not evaluating a proposa	I due to a conflict of interest	Overall proposal evaluation	scores will be averaged usin		ers evaluating each proposal.						
			2. Proposal addresses priority			Criteria	1	1	I	1			
		Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	15	10	15	10	10	10	3	10	5	Out of 100	
PA 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase IX	9	15	10	15	10	6	9	3	0	4	81	
	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase IX	10	15	10	15	10	7	10	4	2	4	87	
PA 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VII	10	15	10	15	8	6	8	3	6	3	84	
PA 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VIII	10	15	10	15	8	6	6	3	6	4	83	Narative says open to hunting but parcel list says not open to hunting
PA 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VII	9	15	10	15	10	6	10	5	8	4	92	
PA 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection - Phase III	10	15	10	15	10	6	10	3	0	4	83	
PA 07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	4	10	4	98	
PA 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase III	10	15	10	15	10	6	8	3	2	4	83	
PA 09	Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Aquisition - Phase II	10	15	10	15	10	8	8	4	1	4	85	In kin conribution not listed
PRE 01	DNR Grasslands - Phase IX	10	15	10	15	8	8	8	3	0	4	81	
PRE 02	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase V	10	15	10	15	8	8	8	2	6	4	86	Ligh accoment sect
FA 01	Carnelian Creek Conservation Corridor	10	15	10	15	10	6	9	4	10	4	93	High easement cost
FA 02	Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project	10	15	10	15	10	9	9	5	0	5	88	Narative says open to hunting but parcel list says not open to hunting
FA 03	Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII	10	15	10	10	6	7	9	3	0	3	73	
FA 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase V	10	15	8	8	6	6	9	3	6	4	75	Van Jaw are most sect. Navative save apperts hunting but
FA 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase V	10	15	10	15	10	5	6	4	10	4	89	Very low easement cost. Narative says open to hunting, but parcel list says not open to hunting.
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitats in Cass County - Phase VIII	10	15	10	10	8	4	9	3	4	5	78	Will other land be sold? Need to see County Forestry Management Plan for trail usage
FA 07	State Forest Acquisition - Richard J. Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase IV	10	15	10	12	5	7	8	3	2	5	77	Boot brushes? What is TIS?
FA 08	Critical Shoreland Habitat Protection Program - Phase IV	10	15	10	12	6	5	6	3	7	3	77	
FA 09	Bushmen Lake	10	15	10	15	10	7	8	5	10	5	95	
WA 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase IX	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	with the
WA 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase VI	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	8	5	98	High land costs
WA 03	RIM Wetlands - Phase VIII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
WA 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase V	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	0	5	90	
WRE 01	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase IX	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	0	5	90	
WRE 02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative - Phase V	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	2	5	92	
WRE 03	Restoration of Non-native Cattail Dominated Wetlands in Rainy Lake	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	

HA 01	MN DNR Aquatic Protection and Enhancement - Phase IX	10	15	10	15	10	8	8	3	0	3	82	Very high land costs.
HA 02	Metro Big Rivers - Phase VIII	10	15	10	15	10	8	8	4	8	5	93	
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase II	10	15	10	15	8	6	8	1	4	4	81	Very high land costs.
	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase III	10	15	10	15	10	10	9	3	6	2	90	
HA 05	Wildlife and Rare Species Habitat	10	15	10	15	10	5	6	2	4	3	80	
HA 06	Goose Prairie	10	15	10	15	8	8	8	1	1	5	81	Different cost amounts for enhancement?
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration - IX	10	15	10	15	7	8	8	3	8	4	88	High enhabcement costs
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat - Phase II	10	15	10	15	10	6	8	3	3	2	82	Very high restoration and enhancement costs
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase IV	10	15	10	15	8	5	2	3	8	4	80	High restoration costs
HRE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	10	15	10	15	8	8	8	3	0	3	80	
	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VI	10	15	10	15	9	8	8	3	5	4	87	High restoration costs
HRE 06	Lake Wakanda Enhancement Project	10	15	10	15	10	10	6	3	6	4	89	Very low enhancement costs
HRE 07	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	10	15	10	15	10	8	6	3	10	5	92	Parcels purchased in fee are not listed
HRE 08	Fairmont Lakes Foundation Dutch Creek Habitat Restoration	6	10	6	15	8	6	8	3	6	3	71	Very high restoration costs
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	10	10	0	0	10	10	0	8	0	58	Staff FTE's don't make sense.
01	Contract Management 2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
02	Restoration Evaluations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

Elizabeth A	. Wilkens	-											
Maximum score per request is 100 points. "COI" indicates a member is not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest. Overall proposal evaluation scores will be averaged using the number of members evaluating each proposal.													
		Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish,	targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage t/ in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	Out of 100	
PA 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase IX	10	12	9	15	9	9	9	4	3	5	85	
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase	10	10	9	10	8	9	9	4	1	5	75	
		5	10	9	12	9	5	9	4	2	5	70	
PA 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VII Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition - Phase VIII	8	10	9	14	9	9	9	5	1	5	79	
PA 04	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VII	9	10	9	13	9	9	9	4	1	5	78	
	·	10	10	9	14	9	9	9	4	0	5	79	
PA 06 PA 07	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection - Phase III RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VII	3	10	6	12	8	3	9	4	0	2		BWSR needs to define best practice for trails, not LSOHC
	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the	9	10	9	13	9	8	9	4	0	5	76	
PA 08	Southern Red River Valley - Phase IIIPrairie Chicken Habitat	10	10	8	12	9	8	g	4	0	5	75	
PA 09	Martin County/Fox Lake DNR WMA Aquisition - Phase II			, and the second			-	9	•	-			
PRE 01	DNR Grasslands - Phase IX	10	10	8	12	8	5	9	4	0	5	71	
PRE 02	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase V	10	12	9	15	10	10	10	4	1	5	86	
FA 01	Carnelian Creek Conservation Corridor	10	12	10	15	10	5	9	5	5	5	86	
FA 02	Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project	10	10	8	12	10	3	9	4	0	5	71	
FA 03	Camp Ripley ACUB - Phase VII	9	10	6	13	9	10	9	4	0	5	75	
FA 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase V	10	14	10	13	10	5	9	5	1	5	82	
FA 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase V	10	15.0	10.0	14.0	10.0	6	9	5	2	5	86	
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitats in Cass County - Phase VIII	10	10.0	8.0	8	2.0	6	9	3	0	5	61	
FA 07	State Forest Acquisition - Richard J. Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase IV	8	10.0	8	12	8.0	7	9	3	0	5	70	
FA 08	Critical Shoreland Habitat Protection Program - Phase IV	10	10	9	12	10	6	9	4	1	5	76	
FA 09	Bushmen Lake	10	15	9	15	10	6	10	5	4	5	89	
WA 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase	10	12	10	13	10	8	10	3	2	5	83	
WA 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase VI	10	13	10	15	10	10	9	4	0	5	86	
WA 03	RIM Wetlands - Phase VIII	10	14	5	10	9	9	9	4	5	5	80	
WA 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase V	10	15	10	14	10	10	9	4	0	5	87	
WRE 01	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase IX	9	12	5	8	5	2	7	4	0	5	57	
WRE 02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative - Phase V	10	14	9	12	9	10	9	4	0	5	82	
WRE 03	Restoration of Non-native Cattail Dominated Wetlands in Rainy Lake	10	15	12	12	9	10	10	5	6	5	94	
HA 01	MN DNR Aquatic Protection and Enhancement - Phase IX	10	15	10	12	8	10	10	4	0	5	84	
HA 02	Metro Big Rivers - Phase VIII	10	14	10	14	8	10	9	5	3	5	88	
HA 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase II	8	10	8	8	8	5	5	3	0	5	60	
HA 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase III	8	10	10	8	2	2	8	4	0	5	57	
HA 05	Wildlife and Rare Species Habitat	10	15	10	15	10	5	8	5	0	5	83	
			•								•		

			T	1		ı	T			1		
HA 06	Goose Prairie	6	7	7	8	7	0	7	3	0	5	50
HRE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration - IX	10	13	7	10	10	10	9	4	4	2	79
HRE 02	DNR Stream Habitat - Phase II	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	4	0	5	78
HRE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase IV	10	14	10	9	8	10	8	5	5	5	84
HRE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	10	14	9	12	9	8	8	5	1	5	81
	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VI	8	12	8	9	8	7	8	4	0	5	69
HRE 06	Lake Wakanda Enhancement Project	10	15	8	13	10	9	9	5	1	5	85
HRE 07	Wolverton Creek Habitat Restoration	8	12	8	12	9	10	9	4	3	5	80
HRE 08	Fairmont Lakes Foundation Dutch Creek Habitat Restoration	7	10	8	12	8	5	8	5	0	5	68
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat											Hearing requested
01	Contract Management 2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Report?
02	Restoration Evaluations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	- Report?