

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

Bob Anderson													
		Criteria											
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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	
P A 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase X	9	12	7	8	8	5	7	5	0	3	64	
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase X	7	12	6	7	7	5	7	5	0	3	59	
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VIII	7	11	6	7	6	5	7	5	3	3	60	
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase IX	7	11	6	7	5	5	7	5	4	3	60	
P A 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VIII	10	13	9	14	9	9	9	5	6	5	89	
P A 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection-Phase VII	8	12	8	10	8	5	8	5	4	3	71	
P A 07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VIII	7	11	6	7	5	5	7	5	5	3	61	
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase IV	9	12	9	10	8	7	8	5	4	3	75	
P A 09	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition Phase 2	9	13	9	13	8	9	9	5	3	4	82	
P A 10	Protect and Restore MN IBAs within the Tallgrass Aspen Parklands	6	8	5	7	5	4	6	3	3	3	50	
P A 11	Grassland Conservation Partnership, Phase III	7	11	8	7	6	4	6	2	3	3	57	
P A 12	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase I	7	11	7	7	5	4	4	2	3	3	53	
P A 13	East Fork Des Moines River Wetland and Prairie Restoration	9	13	9	13	8	7	8	5	4	3	79	
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement Ph X	7	8	9	10	7	6	7	4	0	4	62	
P RE 02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands - Phase III	9	12	9	11	8	6	7	5	3	4	74	
F A 02	Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project, Phase II	9	13.0	9.0	13.0	9.0	9	10	5	0	5	82	
F A 03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase VII	9	13.0	8.0	9	9.0	7	10	5	5	5	80	
F A 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration Phase 6	7	11.0	6	7	6.0	4	8	4	3	4	60	
F A 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future	7	11	7	10	7	5	8	5	3	3	66	
F A 06	Protect Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VIII	10	14	9	14	9	9	10	5	5	5	90	
F A 07	State Forest Acquisition, Richard J. Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase V	7	8	7	10	8	7	7	4	3	3	64	
F A 08	Critical Shoreland Habitat Program - Phase V	7	8	5	7	5	4	6	2	3	3	50	
F RE 01	Improving Forest Wildlife Habitat and Forest Health through Increased Species and Structural Diversity	9	12	9	11	7	8	8	2	4	4	74	
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative - Phase III	10	13	9	13	10	8	8	5	4	4	84	
F RE 03	Northern Minnesota Forest Recovery Project	7	9	7	8	8	6	6	3	4	4	62	
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase X	7	8	7	7	7	5	6	3	4	4	58	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program - Phase VII	9	12	9	10	8	8	7	3	2	4	72	
W A 03	RIM Wetlands - Phase IX	9	12	7	9	7	6	7	5	10	5	77	
W A 04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase 3	9	12	6	8	7	6	7	3	5	4	67	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

Bob Anderson													
		Criteria											
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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	
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase 10	8	11	7	7	8	7	7	3	2	4	64	
W RE 02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	10	13	8	13	9	9	9	5	3	5	84	
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	10	13	9	13	10	9	7	5	2	5	83	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Phase 8	9	12	8	13	7	9	8	4	10	5	85	
H A 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase III	10	14	9	14	10	9	10	5	3	5	89	
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes Phase IV	10	13	9	13	8	8	8	3	10	5	87	
H A 05	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	10	14	8	13	8	9	7	5	2	5	81	
H A 06	Metro Wildlife Management Areas	9	12	9	12	9	8	9	5	6	5	84	
H A 07	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration Phase VI	9	12	9	12	9	8	8	5	8	5	85	
H A 08	Hennepin County Habitat Conservation Program, Phase 1	9	12	9	12	8	8	9	5	7	5	84	
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase 10	9	13	9	13	9	8	8	5	8	5	87	
H RE 02	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership (Phase IV) Upper Pool 9 Backwater Enhancement and Floodplain Forest Restoration	9	12	9	13	9	8	10	5	2	5	82	
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Ph. V	8	12	7	12	9	8	8	5	2	4	75	
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation Phase III	8	14	10	14	10	9	10	5	7	5	92	
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VII	9	12	9	12	8	8	10	5	7	5	85	
H RE 06	Lake George Dam and Rum River Erosion	10	14	9	12	7	7	9	5	10	5	88	
H RE 07	Buffalo River Watershed Stream Habitat Program – Phase 1	9	12	8	11	7	8	9	5	10	5	84	
H RE 08	Two Rivers Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement	10	14	9	15	10	9	10	5	6	5	93	
H RE 09	Six Mile Creek-Halsted Bay Habitat Restoration - Phase I	10	14	10	15	10	9	8	5	10	5	96	
H RE 10	Slow the Spread of the Emerald Ash Borer	8	10	7	9	7	6	2	5	4	3	61	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	15	10	14	10	9	10	5	8	5	96	
O1	Contract Management 2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
O2	Restoration Evaluations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

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

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

Julie Blackburn													
		Criteria											
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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	
P A 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase X	10	15	10	15	10	9	10	4	0	5	88	Should the 2002 WMA Acquisition Citizens's Committee Report be updated at some point?
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase X	10	15	10	15	10	8	10	4	3	5	90	
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VIII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	4	5	3	92	
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase IX	10	15	10	15	10	8	10	4	5	4	91	
P A 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VIII	10	15	9	15	10	8	8	4	3	4	86	
P A 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection-Phase VII	9	13	10	15	10	8	10	4	0	4	83	
P A 07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VIII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	4	10	5	99	
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase IV	10	15	10	15	10	8	10	4	1	5	88	
P A 09	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition Phase 2	8	13	9	15	10	8	10	5	0	3	81	
P A 10	Protect and Restore MN IBAs within the Tallgrass Aspen Parklands	10	15	10	15	10	7	10	4	7	4	92	Educational programming should not be funded by LSOHFunds
P A 11	Grassland Conservation Partnership, Phase III	10	13	9	15	9	10	10	4	4	4	88	Seems like a large project area. Might it be more effective to focus on a smaller geographic area?
P A 12	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase I	9	15	10	15	10	9	10	4	5	5	92	
P A 13	East Fork Des Moines River Wetland and Prairie Restoration	10	5	5	8	10	8	10	4	1	5	66	Difficult to support without a larger upland to wetland ratio - should follow BWSR/NRCS practice requirements; Monitoring
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement Ph X	9	12	10	15	10	10	10	3	0	5	84	
P RE 02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands - Phase III	9	12	10	15	10	7	10	3	1	5	82	
F A 02	Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project, Phase II	10	12	10	8	8	8	10	3	1	4	74	
F A 03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase VII	10	12	10	12	10	10	10	4	0	5	83	
F A 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration Phase 6	10	13	8	10	8	8	10	3	5	5	80	What is the weighting of the individual ranking criteria?
F A 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase VI	10	12	8	10	9	9	10	3	5	5	81	
F A 06	Protect Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VIII	10	14	4	12	9	6	10	3	2	5	75	
F A 07	State Forest Acquisition, Richard J. Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase V	6	13	7	12	9	9	10	3	2	5	76	
F A 08	Critical Shoreland Habitat Program - Phase V	10	10	7	12	9	9	10	3	9	5	84	
F RE 01	Improving Forest Wildlife Habitat and Forest Health through Increased Species and Structural Diversity	10	12	8	15	9	9	10	5	0	5	83	
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative - Phase III	10	12	10	15	10	10	6	4	4	5	86	
F RE 03	Northern Minnesota Forest Recovery Project	10	12	10	15	10	6	7	3	10	4	87	
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase X	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	4	10	5	99	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program - Phase VII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	4	1	5	90	
W A 03	RIM Wetlands - Phase IX	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	4	10	5	99	
W A 04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase 3	10	15	8	15	10	8	10	4	8	5	93	What is the weighting of the individual ranking criteria?

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

Julie Blackburn													
		Criteria											
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.	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 expands 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 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.	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
		Max points: 10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	Out of 100	
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase 10	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	4	0	4	88	
W RE 02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	4	2	5	91	Please explain the capital equipment purchase of the portable diesel pump for \$120K
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	1	5	91	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Phase 8	10	12	10	12	10	9	10	3	10	4	90	What is the weighting of the individual ranking criteria?
H A 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase III	7	10	5	12	10	6	10	3	0	3	66	Why does habitat value have so few points on the ranking form?
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase III	9	15	8	15	10	9	10	4	10	4	94	
H A 05	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	10	15	10	15	10	7	10	3	0	5	85	
H A 06	Metro Wildlife Management Areas	7	15	10	15	10	10	10	4	1	5	87	
H A 07	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration Phase VI	10	12	9	15	10	10	10	3	10	5	94	
H A 08	Hennepin County Habitat Conservation Program, Phase 1	10	12	10	15	10	10	10	4	10	5	96	
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase 10	8	15	8	15	10	9	8	3	10	5	91	
H RE 02	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership (Phase IV) Upper Pool 9 Backwater Enhancement and Floodplain Forest Restoration	10	8	10	15	10	10	0	3	0	5	71	
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Ph. V	10	10	8	12	7	9	8	3	0	4	71	
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	7	14	6	15	10	10	8	3	2	3	78	Monitoring costs should not come from LSOHFunds
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VII	8	15	10	15	10	10	10	3	4	5	90	
H RE 06	Lake George Dam and Rum River Erosion	7	7	5	0	0	7	7	3	10	5	51	
H RE 07	Buffalo River Watershed Stream Habitat Program – Phase 1	10	13	10	15	10	8	10	3	10	5	94	What will be the average buffer width on the restored channel?
H RE 08	Two Rivers Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement	10	15	10	15	7	10	10	3	0	5	85	
H RE 09	Six Mile Creek-Halsted Bay Habitat Restoration - Phase I	10	8	10	13	9	10	10	3	10	5	88	Aeration is not a permanent activity; it's an annual practice
H RE 10	Slow the Spread of the Emerald Ash Borer	6	5	8	10	0	5	0	4	2	2	42	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	15	10	10	10	10	10	3	5	5	88	
O1	Contract Management 2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
O2	Restoration Evaluations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

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

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

Rep. Dan Fabian													
		Criteria											
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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	
P A 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase X	7	9	7	10	6	7	4	2	9	2	63	prefer enhancement over acquisition
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase X	8	11	7	11	7	7	8	3	6	3	71	no local approval being sought - prefer enhancement over acquisition. Predator control?
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VIII	7	11	6	10	7	6	6	3	9	1	66	No local approval being sought - prefer enhancement over acquisition. Turned over to Feds.
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase IX	4	10	8	10	7	6	6	3	9	1	64	No local approval.
P A 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VIII	8	11	7	11	6	6	6	3	9	4	71	no local approval
P A 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection-Phase VII	9	12	8	12	8	8	9	2	9	4	81	
P A 07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VIII	9	14	8	14	8	9	9	5	10	5	91	
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase IV	8	11	6	10	6	6	6	2	5	2	62	No local approval. Predator control?
P A 09	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition Phase 2	8	12	8	12	8	9	7	4	8	4	80	Work with Reps of local gov't? No local approval.
P A 10	Protect and Restore MN IBAs within the Tallgrass Aspen Parklands	9	13	8	13	8	9	8	4	9	4	85	
P A 11	Grassland Conservation Partnership, Phase III	8	12	8	12	7	8	7	3	5	3	73	like "working lands easement" idea.
P A 12	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase I	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	like "working lands conservation easement" - predator control?
P A 13	East Fork Des Moines River Wetland and Prairie Restoration	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	5	91	
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement Ph X	7	10	7	12	7	8	8	3	5	3	70	deer habitat?
P RE 02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands - Phase III	7	10	7	12	8	7	7	3	5	3	69	
F A 02	Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project, Phase II	9	14.0	9.0	14.0	7.0	9	8	4	4	5	83	TCF definition of "local gov't approval sought"
F A 03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase VII	9	13.0	9.0	14	9.0	9	9	5	10	5	92	
F A 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration Phase 6	7	10.0	7	12	8.0	6	8	3	7	3	71	no local approval
F A 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase VI	9	13	8	13	8	8	9	3	5	4	80	no local approval
F A 06	Protect Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VIII	9	14	9	13	8	9	9	4	9	5	89	
F A 07	State Forest Acquisition, Richard J. Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase V	9	12	8	13	9	7	6	3	6	3	76	no local approval
F A 08	Critical Shoreland Habitat Program - Phase V	7	11	8	12	8	7	7	3	8	4	75	
F RE 01	Improving Forest Wildlife Habitat and Forest Health through Increased Species and Structural Diversity	8	14	9	13	8	8	8	4	1	4	77	
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative - Phase III	10	15	10	14	9	9	8	5	2	5	87	
F RE 03	Northern Minnesota Forest Recovery Project	8	12	8	13	9	8	8	2	4	3	75	
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - phase X	8	11	8	11	7	7	3	2	4	4	65	no local control. Predator control?
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program - Phase VII	8	12	8	12	8	8	4	4	7	4	75	No local approval. Predator control?
W A 03	RIM Wetlands - Phase IX	9	14	8	13	8	9	8	4	10	5	88	
W A 04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase 3	8	13	8	12	7	8	8	3	8	4	79	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

Rep. Dan Fabian													
		Criteria											
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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	
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase 10	8	13	8	13	8	7	7	4	8	4	80	
W RE 02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	8	13	8	12	8	7	7	4	8	4	79	
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	8	13	8	13	8	8	7	3	8	4	80	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Phase 8	9	13	9	13	9	8	8	4	9	4	86	
H A 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase III	8	12	8	12	8	8	7	3	5	4	75	
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase III	7	11	7	11	7	8	7	3	6	4	71	No local approval
H A 05	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	8	12	8	12	8	8	7	4	6	4	77	
H A 06	Metro Wildlife Management Areas	7	11	7	11	7	8	7	3	2	3	66	
H A 07	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration Phase VI	9	13	8	12	8	8	7	3	8	4	80	
H A 08	Hennepin County Habitat Conservation Program, Phase 1	9	13	8	12	8	8	8	4	8	4	82	
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase 10	7	11	7	11	8	7	7	3	7	4	72	
H RE 02	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership (Phase IV)/ Upper Pool 9 Backwater Enhancement and Floodplain Forest Restoration	9	13	8	12	8	7	8	4	5	4	78	
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Ph. V	9	13	9	14	8	8	8	5	9	5	88	
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	8	12	8	13	9	8	8	4	9	4	83	
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VII	9	13	8	13	9	8	8	4	8	4	84	
H RE 06	Lake George Dam and Rum River Erosion	9	13	9	13	8	9	8	4	9	4	86	
H RE 07	Buffalo River Watershed Stream Habitat Program – Phase 1	9	14	9	13	8	8	8	4	9	5	87	
H RE 08	Two Rivers Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement	9	14	9	14	9	9	8	4	6	5	87	
H RE 09	Six Mile Creek-Halsted Bay Habitat Restoration - Phase I	9	14	9	13	9	7	8	4	8	4	85	
H RE 10	Slow the Spread of the Emerald Ash Borer	9	13	9	13	10	7	5	5	6	4	81	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat	9	13	9	13	9	6	7	4	8	4	82	
O1	Contract Management 2017	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
O2	Restoration Evaluations	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

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

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

David Hartwell													
DBH - Match criteria - 0-5% - 0 points, 5-15% - 2 points, 16-30% - 4 points, 31-49% - 6 points, 50 - 74% - 8 points, 75+ - 10 points GMO?		Criteria										Total Score	Comments
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	Out of 100	
P A 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase X	8	12	8	10	8	8	7	3	0	4	68	parking area development? 1000 acres is maximum given price minimum is \$5000/acre. What is realistic acreage goal? What is the breakout of contracts and professional services - ie - what are services and what is overhead? Where does RIM match go? Native prairie is just 13% of the goal? personnel not scaleable even if work declines? % of acquisition work on native prairie?
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase X	9	12	9	10	8	8	7	3	2	4	72	Why Big Woods as part of this proposal? Parking lots are not "wildlife habitat." Metro planning regions? % of acquisition work on native prairie?
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VIII	8	12	8	10	8	8	8	3	2	4	71	Work in 27 counties for 1000 acres of protection or enhancement/restoration? Does not seem very focused. Why not either hold or transfer strategy for entire project? % of acquisition work on native prairie? Why is Big Woods part of this proposal? How will you sustain this work if future grants from LSOHC are not granted or when the Legacy amendment expires? And why would you need this if you are getting 20% outside donations and putting it into a dedicated stewardship account that "guarantees" your ability to maintain your properties? Seems like 2 proposals. one acquisition and one enhancement/restoration.
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase IX	9	15	10	15	8	8	10	4	2	4	85	Does USFW not have staff to do this project without TNC added staff cost? Why big woods forests in this proposal? This proposal to protect land is at a lower cost per acre than other proposals - why?
P A 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VIII	9	12	8	15	9	9	7	4	0	4	77	Why is Greening doing the restoration work vs local groups? Is there a cost advantage over other groups such as CCM or local vendors?
P A 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection-Phase VII	10	15	10	15	9	8	10	5	0	4	86	Personal costs seem a bit high. How many transactions - or how many average acres per transaction? What % of professional services is restoration?

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

David Hartwell													
		Criteria										Total Score	Comments
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	Out of 100	
P A 07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VIII	8	13	9	13	9	8	10	5	10	4	89	Tiling under easements? What is the total paid (CRP term easements & RIM permanent easements) in % of the fair market value of the property (fee ownership)? Is the federal match new dollars or old CRP dollars (expiring CRP)? Bonding dollars? Or is the entire \$150m the state committed to supposed to come from CWF/OHC funding? Cash Match with federal fund of \$33M???? Did the ETF not fund the SWDC part of CREP? if so, why is that in this budget? if USDA committed \$350M and the State \$150M, then a 4:1 or 5:1 match does not make sense.
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the So. Red River Valley - Phase IV	9	12	8	12	8	7	7	4	0	4	71	Since the goal of this proposal is 320 acre minimum of solid grasslands to support Prairie Chickens, how can it also then support crops and do what is intended (WMA food plots)? Budget for contracted services includes parking lots which are not wildlife habitat.
P A 09	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition Phase 2	9	12	7	12	8	7	7	4	0	4	70	
P A 10	Protect and Restore MN IBAs within the Tallgrass Aspen Parklands	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	0	COI
P A 11	Grassland Conservation Partnership, Phase III	9	14	9	12	9	8	10	4	2	5	82	Why limited food plots on grassland easements? Seems like a high price for an easement on marginal farmland. Cost per acre for easement compared to FMV as a %? What protection will there be from overgrazing?
P A 12	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase I	8	12	10	12	8	7	7	4	2	3	73	what keeps grazing out of wetlands? Cost per acre for easement compared to FMV as a %? Explain Federal Easement Payments that are referenced in the proposal. What protection will there be from overgrazing? OHF dollars should not be used to pay for property with protection already in place - explain how that will not happen. is federal match solid or scaleable if less than full funding is received? confusion on who is holding the easements in the long term and the role of USFWS. No stewardship funds are included but it appears that DU will hold some easements - please explain how that works?

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

David Hartwell													
DBH - Match criteria - 0-5% - 0 points, 5-15% - 2 points, 16-30% - 4 points, 31-49% - 6 points, 50 - 74% - 8 points, 75+ - 10 points GMO?		Criteria										Total Score	Comments
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	Out of 100	
PA 13	East Fork Des Moines River Wetland and Prairie Restoration	5	5	4	5	5	5	8	3	0	3	43	community outreach is not habitat protection. Seems like a flood control project more than a habitat project. Restored land subject to flooding??? Project will go forward with traditional agricultural funding if no OHF are provided but the proposal calls for OHF to fund easement acquisition which would be needed for water storage with traditional funding?
PRE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement Ph X	8	10	5	15	8	5	3	3	0	3	60	5 years of funding from one year of spending seems out of balance. It would be very helpful to see a history of funding for roving crews and the years they cover. No mention of the time for the funding for USFWS burning. Not sure how increases in tiling on private land relate to the proposal to manage state lands as a justification for urgency. Direct support services seems very high at \$600K - a calculator might work for a small project but actual calculation would be more accurate for this type of project. what is more effective per acre - roving crews or contracted services. \$3M for supplies - that is one whale of a lot of seed when the primary project is managing woody vegetation. Not sure where the USFWS comes to play in the budget.
PRE 02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands - Phase III	7	10	5	10	8	7	5	3	0	4	59	How is this different than the DNR proposal to do the same thing? Is 5 years funding really needed - all from one grant cycle?
FA 02	Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project, Phase II	9	12	8	10	6	5	8	4	0	4	66	I assume St. Louis County will sell timber from these parcels. Where will those timber sale dollars go and how will they further conservation? New trails for ATV use is not protecting wildlife habitat.

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

David Hartwell													
DBH - Match criteria - 0-5% - 0 points, 5-15% - 2 points, 16-30% - 4 points, 31-49% - 6 points, 50 - 74% - 8 points, 75+ - 10 points GMO?		Criteria										Total Score	Comments
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	Out of 100	
FA 03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase VII	8	10	7	9	7	7	8	3	1	4	64	Since this is a proposal to buffer Camp Ripley, what assurance do we have of the camp's permanence or if it is repurposed, that it will not be sold for development rendering the investment in buffer not of value? Draining water from aquifers - how is that a wildlife habitat issue? Do we need to revisit the definition of roads and trails since this proposal clearly states that without that, they can offer no assurance of the protection of wildlife habitat from roads or trails. DSS fro TCF of \$19K on salary of \$30k seems high. Budget shows \$412K of leverage but leverage description says no leverage.
FA 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration Phase 6	8	15	8	15	8	8	9	4	2	4	81	Eased or fee open to hunting and fishing after completion? Explain the MLT contract costs which seem high - what % is restoration?.
FA 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase VI	8	12	8	10	7	7	10	4	2	5	73	
FA 06	Protect Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VIII	8	15	7	9	8	8	10	4	0	5	74	provide access to existing properties does not meet my definition of protect for wildlife habitat - preventing fragmentation does.
FA 07	State Forest Acquisition, Richard J. Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase V	8	10	7	10	8	7	10	4	0	4	68	
FA 08	Critical Shoreland Habitat Program - Phase V	10	12	10	15	8	10	8	4	4	5	86	
F RE 01	Improving Forest Wildlife Habitat and Forest Health through Increased Species and Structural Diversity	5	7	5	7	5	4	5	3	0	4	45	How does jack pine management help avoid forest conversion to agriculture? If Mixed hardwood results in younger forests, why are all the oaks old? Is this proposal advocating cutting all the ash now and replanting oak so deal ash forests are not converted to agriculture? I am not connecting the dots on management and avoiding fragmentation.
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative - Phase III	8	8	7	9	8	6	3	3	2	4	58	Does moose use lead to more survivability? Or, will this make a difference? Or, is habitat loss the cause of the moose population decline? Seems like the results are somewhat speculative in nature.
F RE 03	Northern Minnesota Forest Recovery Project	8	8	7	9	8	6	3	3	4	2	58	Seems like the same as the Moose project. Direct Support Services at \$639K and personnel at \$799 vs Moose Project of \$0 DSS and \$65 of personnel. 14,000 Acres vs Moose project of 30,000 acres for the same money.

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

David Hartwell													
		Criteria										Total Score	Comments
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	Out of 100	
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase X	10	12	7	12	8	8	8	4	4	4	77	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program - Phase VII	9	12	10	12	10	8	7	4	0	4	76	Confused by DU purchasing and holding this property but also transferring to DNR. Discussion needed on acquiring land with easements already in place. July 2020 is a long time to wait for notification of matching funds.
W A 03	RIM Wetlands - Phase IX	10	15	10	12	8	7	8	4	10	4	88	does this need to be over 5 years? What is the total paid (CRP term easements & RIM permanent easements) in % of the fair market value of the property (fee ownership)? Is the federal match new dollars or old CRP dollars (expiring CRP)? Bonding dollars? Or is the entire \$150m the state committed to supposed to come from CWF/OHC funding? Cash Match with federal fund of \$33M???? Did the ETF not fund the SWDC part of CREP? if so, why is that in this budget?
W A 04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase 3	8	12	10	12	8	7	8	4	4	4	77	who will actually do the restoration work? What level of restoration will it be to?
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase 10	8	10	7	10	7	7	7	3	0	4	63	can we get a schedule of roving crews, year funded and for how long? Why the need for 4 years of roving crews from one year of funding? What would small wetland mgt be that is different than shallow lakes and why would specialists be needed for them alone? what is the amount of acres to be worked by roving crews vs addressing wetland infrastructure?
W RE 02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	9	12	8	10	10	8	8	4	0	4	73	What work to restore 100 acres of prairie wetlands?
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	8	12	7	10	8	10	8	3	0	3	69	When does funding for existing staff run out? What is the \$750K in enhancement work? If it burning and invasive species control, is it to be done on permanently protected lands? How do mussels move upstream? Seems heavy on personnel and perhaps supplanting.
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Phase 8	8	11	8	10	7	7	9	4	6	4	74	
H A 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase III	8	12	7	10	8	8	8	4	0	4	69	administration)personnel) must be an error - 3 years of 1 FTE does not equal \$20,000 (at least in the US). How many easements will be processed over the 3 years and will it require a .3 person for the entire time?

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

David Hartwell													
DBH - Match criteria - 0-5% - 0 points, 5-15% - 2 points, 16-30% - 4 points, 31-49% - 6 points, 50 - 74% - 8 points, 75+ - 10 points GMO?		Criteria										Total Score	Comments
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	Out of 100	
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic N. Central MN Lakes - Phase III	10	12	9	12	8	8	10	4	4	4	81	No FTE for MLT staff but budget of \$162k?
H A 05	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	7	10	8	5	7	7	8	3	0	4	59	What does this easement program protect that is beyond what is protected by statute? Explain professional services item.
H A 06	Metro Wildlife Management Areas	7	10	8	10	7	7	8	3	0	4	64	How would these acquisitions benefit the local tax base and why would that be of interest to the OHF?
H A 07	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration Phase VI	8	12	7	10	8	8	8	3	6	4	74	"self-funded highest quality natural areas" - if they are self funded, why are you seeing OHC restoration dollars? If partial funding, what would the match be?
H A 08	Hennepin County Habitat Conservation Program, Phase 1	10	12	8	12	7	8	10	4	4	4	79	
H RE 01	MN TU Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase 10	8	12	5	12	9	7	8	3	4	4	72	timeline does not seem to be accurate.
H RE 02	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership (Phase IV)-Upper Pool 9 Backwater Enhancement and Floodplain Forest Restoration	7	8	5	8	7	6	7	2	0	4	54	If it is a priority for the Army Corps, why are they not paying to do it? What happens to the material deposited on top of the reed canary grass when there is a flood?
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Ph. V	10	12	8	10	8	8	8	3	0	4	71	
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	7	10	7	8	7	7	7	2	0	2	57	Proposed fiscal agent does not appear to have any experience in this arena. Can proposed fiscal agent work with reimbursed dollars? \$360K to supervise contractors seems high. So does the \$360 DSS.
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VII	7	9	7	8	7	7	7	3	2	4	61	
H RE 06	Lake George Dam and Rum River Erosion	8	10	5	10	7	8	8	3	4	4	67	
H RE 07	Buffalo River Watershed Stream Habitat Program – Phase 1	8	10	7	8	7	7	7	3	4	4	65	What about the water quality going into the proposed restored area. Will it support wildlife and fish? Will this create the block of 320 acres needed by Prairie Chickens? Funds would not be available until July 2018 if this were funded to the completion dates are wrong.
H RE 08	Two Rivers Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement	8	10	8	9	7	8	8	3	0	4	65	
H RE 09	Six Mile Creek-Halsted Bay Habitat Restoration - Phase I	6	7	6	7	7	6	6	3	6	4	58	seems to be control vs eradication of carp and once funding ends, would carp return? Is leverage of staff positions real?
H RE 10	Slow the Spread of the Emerald Ash Borer	5	5	5	7	7	5	4	3	0	2	43	is work to be done on permanently protected land?
CPL	CPLegacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat	8	12	10	12	5	8	6	4	2	5	72	Criteria does not fit all that well for a regrant program.

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

David Hartwell													
DBH - Match criteria - 0-5% - 0 points, 5-15% - 2 points, 16-30% - 4 points, 31-49% - 6 points, 50 - 74% - 8 points, 75+ - 10 points GMO?		Criteria										Total Score	Comments
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	Out of 100	
O1	Contract Management 2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Fund
O2	Restoration Evaluations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Fund

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

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

JANE H. KINGSTON													
		Criteria											
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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	
P A 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase X	10	13	10	12	9	5	7	4	0	4	74	
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase X	10	13	10	12	9	5	7	4	1	4	75	
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VIII	10	12	10	12	9	7	7	4	2	4	77	Update on Carbon credits?
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase IX	10	12	10	12	9	5	7	4	2	3	74	
P A 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VIII	9	9	10	10	9	5	7	4	1	3	67	All parcels repeaters from last 2 years' appropriations except 7.
P A 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection-Phase VII	10	13	10	11	9	5	7	5	1	3	74	Why 4-year term?
P A 07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VIII	10	12	10	7	9	5	7	5	10	4	79	368 easements accomplished in what time frame (3 years? 5 years?)
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase IV	10	12	10	7	9	6	7	4	1	4	70	
P A 09	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition Phase 2	9	9	10	8	9	5	7	4	0	3	64	High \$/ac. Parcels not prioritized, parcel costs not provided.
P A 10	Protect and Restore MN IBAs within the Tallgrass Aspen Parklands	9	10	9	11	9	8	4	3	3	3	69	
P A 11	Grassland Conservation Partnership, Phase III	9	10	9	10	8	9	8	4	1	3	71	"Northern Forest" ?
P A 12	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase I	9	10	10	11	9	7	7	4	2	3	72	
P A 13	East Fork Des Moines River Wetland and Prairie Restoration	6	4	3	4	6	5	8	1	1	2	40	This is infrastructure/water control/dam project, not habitat. High \$/ac, small footprint.
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement Ph X	9	5	8	10	9	5	7	3	0	3	59	9 parcels listed from last appropriation
P RE 02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands - Phase III	9	5	8	10	9	5	7	3	1	3	60	What is future monitoring frequency?
F A 02	Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project, Phase II	10	10	8	6	8	4	5	3	0	4	58	What new trails? Non-severed minerals rights ONLY and not with mineral potential. Will equal acreage be sold?
F A 03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase VII	9	5	5	5	7	5	7	2	3	3	51	\$\$\$ and NO access
F A 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration Phase 6	10	10	9	9	5	5	7	2	2	3	62	Mammalian & avian indicators not provided. Are contracts with TPL only?
F A 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase VI	10	10	8	9	8	4	7	4	2	4	66	Provide ranking/scoring process worksheet. Annual monitoring? Are all parcels new, not carryover from last year?
F A 06	Protect Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VIII	8	5	5	7	8	5	5	5	1	5	54	Why 8-year Land Commissioner term? Provide classification process and mgmt of tax-forfeit lands.
F A 07	State Forest Acquisition, Richard J. Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase V	9	7	7	7	7	5	7	5	1	4	59	EXCLUDE initial boundary surveys & signage, well/septic closure, building & dump disposal - NOT ELIGIBLE.
F A 08	Critical Shoreland Habitat Program - Phase V	9	9	7	7	8	7	7	5	3	4	66	High \$/ac. Parcel costs missing. ALL but 3 parcels are repeaters from past appropriations. Evaluation/ranking prioritization not provided. Any severed minerals or mineral potential?
F RE 01	Improving Forest Wildlife Habitat and Forest Health through Increased Species and Structural Diversity	7	8	8	10	7	6	5	3	0	3	57	EXCLUDE EAB control. What is expected term of effectiveness?
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative - Phase III	8	8	8	11	8	5	5	3	1	3	60	
F RE 03	Northern Minnesota Forest Recovery Project	8	8	8	11	8	5	5	3	3	3	62	Explain administrative costs & science-based prioritization process.
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase X	10	13	10	10	8	5	7	4	4	4	75	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program - Phase VII	10	12	10	12	9	4	7	4	1	3	72	
W A 03	RIM Wetlands - Phase IX	10	11	10	11	9	5	7	5	10	3	81	Which counties?

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

JANE H. KINGSTON													
		Criteria										Total Score	Comments
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.	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 expands 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 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.	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.		
		Max points: 10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5		
W A 04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase 3	10	10	10	7	8	5	8	4	3	3	68	
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase 10	9	7	9	6	7	4	6	4	0	3	55	Why more cost effective to buy all this equipment vs. contracting? Shakopee Fish Barrier where?
W RE 02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	9	7	9	9	7	5	7	3	1	3	60	
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	7	13	10	12	9	4	5	4	1	3	68	Dozens of repeat parcels from prior appropriation
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Phase 8	8	10	9	3	8	6	7	4	4	3	62	Exclude PARKS. Carver County MVT parcels covered in previous phases.
H A 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase III	9	10	9	9	8	5	7	3	1	3	64	All but 4 identical parcels from previous appropriations. What is the cost per transaction?
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase IIII	9	10	8	5	5	5	6	4	4	4	60	All parcels included in previous appropriation except Hubbard County. Provide prioritization/selection process worksheet. No acres indicated, or parcel costs. Leech Lake much too expensive.
H A 05	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	10	9	8	7	7	8	9	3	0	4	65	Any overlap with TU proposal? Why 0 Personnel cost?
H A 06	Metro Wildlife Management Areas	9	9	8	5	7	7	8	3	0	3	59	
H A 07	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration Phase VI	9	4	3	7	10	7	9	3	4	3	59	Exclude PARKS. This should be Parks & Trails proposal. Cannon River already has program in place - overlap?
H A 08	Hennepin County Habitat Conservation Program, Phase 1	9	4	3	9	9	7	9	3	3	3	59	What is ownership of 6000 acres? Are they included in MN County Biological Survey?
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase 10	10	9	8	5	6	7	7	3	3	4	62	Prioritization/selection worksheet?
H RE 02	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership (Phase IV)-Upper Pool 9 Backwater Enhancement and Floodplain Forest Restoration	8	1	8	8	7	7	0	2	0	3	44	Very high \$/ac and very small footprint. Why 0 Personnel cost? Unless upstream land use improves, this is temporary, not permanent. What is expected term of effectiveness?
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Ph. V	8	9	8	5	6	3	6	3	6	4	58	
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	6	7	7	5	4	2	2	2	1	3	39	Evaluation criteria and priorities should be done first, & by LSSA volunteers - this is research & survey work. Personnel \$\$\$ excessive.
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VII	6	6	7	7	7	5	6	2	1	3	50	How many years of requests/proposals remain?
H RE 06	Lake George Dam and Rum River Erosion	6	2	2	2	0	1	2	1	4	2	22	CoE DAM project, PARKS & Trails, & Clean Water project, NOT habitat. What is cost of fish barrier only? How will it limit zebra mussel spread? Also CPL eligible. No work OTG.
H RE 07	Buffalo River Watershed Stream Habitat Program - Phase 1	9	10	7	4	10	8	8	3	3	4	66	What is total program cost, duration, phases, & breakdown? Why not Clean Water proposal? Low wildlife value.
H RE 08	Two Rivers Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement	9	2	7	8	10	8	8	3	0	4	59	
H RE 09	Six Mile Creek-Halsted Bay Habitat Restoration - Phase I	7	2	4	4	8	7	7	2	5	2	48	CPL candidate. Sources of pollution & land use must be mitigated first. Clean Water project. Where would fish barriers be located? Restoration would be preferable.
H RE 10	Slow the Spread of the Emerald Ash Borer	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	4	17	Unconstitutional - INELIGIBLE. Not permanent, not protection, not restoration/enhancement, not on permanently protected land. OHF not for monitoring, outreach, education, training.
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat	9	7	8	8	5	3	7	3	2	3	55	
O1	Contract Management 2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
O2	Restoration Evaluations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

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

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

Sen. Andrew Lang													
		Criteria											
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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	
P A 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase X	10	13	8	15	9	8	9	4	8	5	89	
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase X	10	14	9	15	10	9	9	5	9	5	95	
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VIII	8	12	9	14	8	7	8	3	7	5	81	
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase IX	8	12	9	14	8	7	8	3	7	5	81	
P A 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VIII	8	12	8	12	7	8	8	3	7	5	78	
P A 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection-Phase VII	8	12	9	14	8	7	8	3	7	5	81	
P A 07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VIII	10	14	9	15	9	9	9	5	9	5	94	
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase IV	10	14	9	15	10	9	9	5	9	5	95	
P A 09	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition Phase 2	10	12	8	15	9	8	9	4	8	5	88	
P A 10	Protect and Restore MN IBAs within the Tallgrass Aspen Parklands	8	11	8	12	8	7	6	3	7	4	74	
P A 11	Grassland Conservation Partnership, Phase III	7	11	7	12	7	7	7	3	6	4	71	
P A 12	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase I	10	14	10	15	10	9	9	4	8	5	94	
P A 13	East Fork Des Moines River Wetland and Prairie Restoration	8	11	9	14	8	7	8	3	7	5	80	
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement Ph X	8	11	9	14	8	7	8	3	7	5	80	
P RE 02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands - Phase III	10	14	9	14	9	9	9	5	9	5	93	
F A 02	Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project, Phase II	8	11.0	8.0	12.0	7.0	7	7	3	6	4	73	
F A 03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase VII	10	15.0	10.0	15	10.0	9	9	5	9	5	97	
F A 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration Phase 6	8	12.0	7	12	8.0	7	7	3	6	4	74	
F A 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase VI	9	12	9	14	8	7	8	3	7	5	82	
F A 06	Protect Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VIII	8	11	8	13	8	7	8	3	7	5	78	
F A 07	State Forest Acquisition, Richard J. Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase V	8	12	9	14	7	7	8	3	7	5	80	
F A 08	Critical Shoreland Habitat Program - Phase V	6	10	7	12	6	6	6	4	5	4	66	
F RE 01	Improving Forest Wildlife Habitat and Forest Health through Increased Species and Structural Diversity	10	13	8	15	8	8	10	3	8	5	88	
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative - Phase III	10	13	9	15	10	9	9	5	9	5	94	
F RE 03	Northern Minnesota Forest Recovery Project	6	9	6	11	7	5	4	4	5	4	61	
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase X	10	15	8	14	10	8	9	5	9	5	93	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program - Phase VII	10	15	10	14	10	7	9	5	9	5	94	
W A 03	RIM Wetlands - Phase IX	10	15	10	15	10	5	10	5	10	5	95	
W A 04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase 3	8	12	9	14	8	6	8	3	7	5	80	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

Sen. Andrew Lang													
		Criteria											
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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	
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase 10	8	12	8	12	7	7	8	3	7	5	77	
W RE 02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	10	13	8	14	9	7	9	4	8	5	87	
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	8	12	7	11	8	7	7	3	6	4	73	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Phase 8	8	9	6	11	7	5	4	4	5	4	63	
H A 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase III	8	10	8	12	7	7	7	3	6	4	72	
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase III	10	14	10	14	10	9	9	4	8	5	93	
H A 05	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	8	10	8	11	7	7	7	3	6	4	71	
H A 06	Metro Wildlife Management Areas	7	8	6	10	7	5	4	4	5	3	59	
H A 07	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration Phase VI	9	11	9	14	8	7	8	3	7	5	81	
H A 08	Hennepin County Habitat Conservation Program, Phase 1	7	8	7	9	6	5	4	4	5	3	58	
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase 10	9	12	8	13	8	7	8	3	7	5	80	
H RE 02	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership (Phase IV); Upper Pool 9 Backwater Enhancement and Floodplain Forest Restoration	8	11	7	12	7	8	7	3	6	4	73	
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Ph. V	8	11	7	12	8	7	6	3	7	4	73	
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	9	13	9	14	9	8	8	5	8	4	87	
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VII	9	10	9	14	8	7	8	3	8	5	81	
H RE 06	Lake George Dam and Rum River Erosion	10	15	9	14	8	9	9	5	9	5	93	
H RE 07	Buffalo River Watershed Stream Habitat Program – Phase 1	9	12	7	14	9	7	9	4	8	5	84	
H RE 08	Two Rivers Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement	9	12	8	15	10	9	9	5	9	5	91	
H RE 09	Six Mile Creek-Halsted Bay Habitat Restoration - Phase I	8	10	6	12	7	7	7	3	6	4	70	
H RE 10	Slow the Spread of the Emerald Ash Borer	6	9	6	11	8	5	4	3	5	5	62	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	13	9	15	10	9	9	5	9	5	94	
O1	Contract Management 2017	10	13	8	14	9	9	10	4	9	5	91	
O2	Restoration Evaluations	9	12	8	15	8	8	10	4	9	5	88	

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

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

Rep. Leon Lillie													
		Criteria											
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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	
P A 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase X	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase X	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VIII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase IX	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
P A 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VIII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
P A 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection-Phase VII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
P A 07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VIII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase IV	9	14	9	13	9	9	9	5	9	4	90	
P A 09	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition Phase 2	9	13	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	5	90	
P A 10	Protect and Restore MN IBAs within the Tallgrass Aspen Parklands	8	12	8	12	8	8	8	4	8	4	80	
P A 11	Grassland Conservation Partnership, Phase III	9	13	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	5	90	
P A 12	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase I	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
P A 13	East Fork Des Moines River Wetland and Prairie Restoration	8	12	8	12	8	8	8	4	8	4	80	
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement Ph X	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
P RE 02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands - Phase III	8	12	8	12	8	8	8	4	8	4	80	
F A 02	Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project, Phase II	8	12	8	12	8	8	8	4	8	4	80	
F A 03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase VII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
F A 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration Phase 6	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
F A 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase VI	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
F A 06	Protect Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VIII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
F A 07	State Forest Acquisition, Richard J. Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase V	9	13	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	5	90	
F A 08	Critical Shoreland Habitat Program - Phase V	8	12	8	12	8	8	8	4	8	4	80	
F RE 01	Improving Forest Wildlife Habitat and Forest Health through Increased Species and Structural Diversity	9	13	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	5	90	
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative - Phase III	9	14	9	13	9	9	9	5	9	4	90	
F RE 03	Northern Minnesota Forest Recovery Project	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase X	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program - Phase VII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
W A 03	RIM Wetlands - Phase IX	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
W A 04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase 3	9	14	9	13	9	9	9	5	9	4	90	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

Rep. Leon Lillie													
		Criteria											
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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	
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase 10	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
W RE 02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Phase 8	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
H A 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase III	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase III	8	12	8	12	8	8	8	4	8	4	80	
H A 05	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
H A 06	Metro Wildlife Management Areas	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
H A 07	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration Phase VI	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
H A 08	Hennepin County Habitat Conservation Program, Phase 1	9	14	9	13	9	9	9	5	9	4	90	
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase 10	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
H RE 02	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership (Phase IV); Upper Pool 9 Backwater Enhancement and Floodplain Forest Restoration	9	14	9	13	9	9	9	5	9	4	90	
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Ph. V	9	13	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	5	90	
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
H RE 06	Lake George Dam and Rum River Erosion	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
H RE 07	Buffalo River Watershed Stream Habitat Program – Phase 1	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
H RE 08	Two Rivers Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
H RE 09	Six Mile Creek-Halsted Bay Habitat Restoration - Phase I	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
H RE 10	Slow the Spread of the Emerald Ash Borer	9	14	9	13	9	9	9	5	9	4	90	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
O1	Contract Management 2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
O2	Restoration Evaluations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

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

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

Denny McNamara													
		Criteria											
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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	
P A 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase X	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	4	4	5	93	
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase X	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	4	6	5	95	
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VIII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	3	6	3	92	If SNA should follow management plan of WMA
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase IX	10	14	10	13	10	10	7	2	6	5	87	
P A 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VIII	10	13	10	15	10	10	8	4	6	4	90	
P A 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection-Phase VII	5	7	10	10	10	10	10	3	4	3	72	
P A 07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VIII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase IV	6	7	10	10	6	7	10	3	4	3	66	
P A 09	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition Phase 2	7	12	10	15	8	8	10	5	4	2	81	
P A 10	Protect and Restore MN IBAs within the Tallgrass Aspen Parklands	8	10	10	12	7	10	7	4	10	5	83	
P A 11	Grassland Conservation Partnership, Phase III	5	12	10	10	10	10	10	5	8	5	85	
P A 12	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase I	5	10	7	10	7	8	7	5	7	2	68	
P A 13	East Fork Des Moines River Wetland and Prairie Restoration	7	5	7	10	8	5	10	3	2	2	59	Should have match for flood control work
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement Ph X	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
P RE 02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands - Phase III	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
F A 02	Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project, Phase II	5	10	5	10	7	10	10	2	7	5	71	
F A 03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase VII	10	10.0	8.0	10	10.0	10	10	5	10	5	88	
F A 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration Phase 6	6	11.0	6	10	6.0	8	10	4	5	3	69	
F A 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase VI	5	7	10	8	5	10	10	3	8	3	69	
F A 06	Protect Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VIII	7	10	10	10	5	5	10	2	4	5	68	
F A 07	State Forest Acquisition, Richard J. Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase V	7	10	8	10	8	10	10	3	3	2	71	
F A 08	Critical Shoreland Habitat Program - Phase V	10	10	10	10	5	10	7	3	5	3	73	
F RE 01	Improving Forest Wildlife Habitat and Forest Health through Increased Species and Structural Diversity	10	15	10	10	10	10	8	5	5	5	88	
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative - Phase III	7	15	8	14	10	10	7	5	5	2	83	
F RE 03	Northern Minnesota Forest Recovery Project	10	15	10	12	10	10	7	5	6	3	88	
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase X	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	5	3	93	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program - Phase VII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	5	4	94	
W A 03	RIM Wetlands - Phase IX	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
W A 04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase 3	10	13	8	13	10	8	7	3	7	3	82	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

Denny McNamara													
		Criteria											
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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	
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase 10	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	3	8	4	95	
W RE 02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	3	8	4	95	
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	5	10	10	10	10	5	10	3	2	5	70	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Phase 8	5	10	10	12	10	5	10	3	8	5	78	
H A 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase III	8	11	10	11	10	5	10	3	4	3	75	
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase III	6	11	10	11	10	5	10	5	7	3	78	
H A 05	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	10	12	10	12	8	7	10	5	5	3	82	
H A 06	Metro Wildlife Management Areas	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	4	4	5	93	
H A 07	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration Phase VI	5	10	7	12	7	7	9	3	7	3	70	
H A 08	Hennepin County Habitat Conservation Program, Phase 1	5	10	7	12	7	7	9	3	7	3	70	
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase 10	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
H RE 02	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership (Phase IV)/ Upper Pool 9 Backwater Enhancement and Floodplain Forest Restoration	8	15	10	15	10	10	5	3	6	3	85	
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Ph. V	7	10	10	12	8	10	10	5	10	3	85	
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	2	12	10	10	10	2	10	5	4	3	68	Who do work? What is the competitive bid process?
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VII	10	11	10	11	7	8	10	5	6	3	81	
H RE 06	Lake George Dam and Rum River Erosion	10	9	5	10	7	3	5	3	5	2	59	Possible CPL project
H RE 07	Buffalo River Watershed Stream Habitat Program – Phase 1	10	12	8	12	10	10	10	3	8	4	87	
H RE 08	Two Rivers Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement	10	12	10	12	10	10	10	3	5	3	85	
H RE 09	Six Mile Creek-Halsted Bay Habitat Restoration - Phase I	10	12	10	12	10	10	10	3	8	3	88	
H RE 10	Slow the Spread of the Emerald Ash Borer	2	8	5	15	10	5	7	5	4	2	63	Proposal lacks specifics, need to hear more
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	12	10	11	7	7	7	5	8	3	80	
O1	Contract Management 2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
O2	Restoration Evaluations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

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

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

RON SCHARA													
		Criteria											
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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	
P A 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase X	8	15	8	12	10	5	5	5	0	5	73	
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase X	8	15	8	12	10	5	5	5	0	5	73	
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VIII	5	15	5	12	10	5	5	5	5	2	69	
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase IX	5	15	8	12	10	5	7	5	5	2	74	
P A 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VIII	5	12	5	10	5	5	5	5	5	3	60	
P A 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection-Phase VII	8	12	8	8	10	5	7	5	0	5	68	
P A 07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VIII	10	15	8	12	10	5	10	5	10	5	90	
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase IV	5	12	8	15	10	5	5	5	0	3	68	
P A 09	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition Phase 2	5	10	8	12	10	5	5	5	0	5	65	
P A 10	Protect and Restore MN IBAs within the Tallgrass Aspen Parklands	3	5	5	12	5	5	5	5	3	5	53	
P A 11	Grassland Conservation Partnership, Phase III	5	10	8	12	5	5	7	5	5	5	67	
P A 12	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase I	8	10	8	12	10	5	5	5	5	5	73	
P A 13	East Fork Des Moines River Wetland and Prairie Restoration	8	12	8	12	10	5	7	5	0	5	72	
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement Ph X	8	10	8	12	10	5	5	3	0	3	64	
P RE 02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands - Phase III	8	12	8	10	10	5	5	3	0	5	66	
F A 02	Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project, Phase II	8	5.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	5	3	3	0	5	40	
F A 03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase VII	5	5.0	3.0	5	3.0	5	3	3	5	5	42	
F A 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration Phase 6	8	12.0	8	10	3.0	5	5	3	5	5	64	
F A 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase VI	8	12	5	10	3	5	5	5	5	5	63	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

RON SCHARA													
		Criteria										Total Score	Comments
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.	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 expands 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 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.	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.		
F A 06	Protect Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VIII	8	10	8	8	3	5	10	3	0	5	60	
F A 07	State Forest Acquisition, Richard J. Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase V	8	5	5	12	5	5	5	3	5	5	58	
F A 08	Critical Shoreland Habitat Program - Phase V	8	12	5	12	3	5	8	5	10	5	73	
F RE 01	Improving Forest Wildlife Habitat and Forest Health through Increased Species and Structural Diversity	5	10	5	12	3	5	5	5	0	5	55	
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative - Phase III	3	8	8	10	5	5	5	5	3	5	57	
F RE 03	Northern Minnesota Forest Recovery Project	3	8	10	10	5	5	5	3	5	3	57	
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase X	5	12	10	12	5	5	8	5	8	5	75	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program - Phase VII	8	12	10	12	8	5	5	5	0	5	70	
W A 03	RIM Wetlands - Phase IX	8	12	8	12	10	5	5	5	10	5	80	
W A 04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase 3	5	10	8	12	10	5	5	5	5	5	70	
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase 10	5	8	8	12	10	3	5	5	0	3	59	
W RE 02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	8	12	8	12	10	5	5	5	3	5	73	
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	5	8	5	8	5	3	5	3	0	3	45	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Phase 8	5	8	5	8	3	3	3	3	5	2	45	
H A 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase III	8	8	5	8	3	3	5	3	0	5	48	
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase IIII	8	10	8	10	5	5	5	5	10	5	71	
H A 05	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	8	10	8	10	5	5	5	5	0	5	61	
H A 06	Metro Wildlife Management Areas	8	10	8	10	5	5	5	5	0	3	59	
H A 07	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration Phase VI	5	8	5	5	5	3	5	3	5	3	47	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

RON SCHARA													
		Criteria											
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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	
H A 08	Hennepin County Habitat Conservation Program, Phase 1	5	8	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	51	
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase 10	8	10	8	10	5	5	5	5	5	5	66	
H RE 02	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership (Phase IV)-Upper Pool 9 Backwater Enhancement and Floodplain Forest Restoration	8	12	5	10	8	5	5	3	0	5	61	
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Ph. V	5	8	5	10	5	5	5	3	0	5	51	
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	8	10	8	10	5	5	5	3	3	5	62	
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VII	8	10	8	10	8	5	5	5	5	5	69	
H RE 06	Lake George Dam and Rum River Erosion	8	12	8	12	8	5	5	5	10	5	78	
H RE 07	Buffalo River Watershed Stream Habitat Program – Phase 1	8	12	8	12	8	5	5	5	10	5	78	
H RE 08	Two Rivers Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement	5	10	8	12	5	5	5	5	0	5	60	
H RE 09	Six Mile Creek-Halsted Bay Habitat Restoration - Phase I	8	12	8	12	8	5	5	5	10	5	78	
H RE 10	Slow the Spread of the Emerald Ash Borer	3	5	5	10	3	3	3	5	0	3	40	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat	NA										100	
O1	Contract Management 2017	NA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	
O2	Restoration Evaluations	NA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		

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

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

Jamie Swenson													
		Criteria											
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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	
P A 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase X	9	14	10	11	9	6	8	3	0	4	74	
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase X	10	14	9	12	9	6	8	5	3	4	80	
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VIII	6	13	9	12	10	7	10	3	5	4	79	
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase IX	6	13	8	12	10	7	8	3	6	3	76	
P A 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VIII	9	14	8	11	8	7	8	3	4	4	76	
P A 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection-Phase VII	6	13	10	15	6	7	10	4	2	4	77	
P A 07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VIII	8	13	7	10	9	8	9	4	8	5	81	
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase IV	8	13	7	15	8	6	8	5	4	5	79	
P A 09	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition Phase 2	8	13	7	13	8	6	8	4	2	5	74	
P A 10	Protect and Restore MN IBAs within the Tallgrass Aspen Parklands	8	13	8	13	9	7	9	3	3	4	77	
P A 11	Grassland Conservation Partnership, Phase III	7	10	8	12	8	7	10	3	6	4	75	
P A 12	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase I	9	13	10	13	9	8	10	4	5	4	85	
P A 13	East Fork Des Moines River Wetland and Prairie Restoration	8	13	8	12	8	5	7	4	5	5	75	
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement Ph X	6	10	6	10	9	6	6	3	1	4	61	
P RE 02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands - Phase III	9	13	7	13	9	6	9	4	3	4	77	
F A 02	Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project, Phase II	8	15	8	12	8	6	10	3	2	5	77	
F A 03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase VII	9	13	8	11	8	7	8	4	5	4	77	
F A 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration Phase 6	8	13	8	12	6	8	7	3	5	4	74	
F A 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase VI	6	13	7	11	7	6	8	3	5	5	71	
F A 06	Protect Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VIII	6	14	8	13	7	7	10	3	5	5	78	
F A 07	State Forest Acquisition, Richard J. Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase V	6	13	7	12	7	8	8	3	3	4	71	
F A 08	Critical Shoreland Habitat Program - Phase V	7	12	7	11	7	7	9	3	5	3	71	
F RE 01	Improving Forest Wildlife Habitat and Forest Health through Increased Species and Structural Diversity	7	12	8	13	7	7	7	3	1	4	69	
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative - Phase III	9	14	8	15	7	7	7	4	5	4	80	
F RE 03	Northern Minnesota Forest Recovery Project	5	12	7	13	7	6	7	3	3	3	66	
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase X	8	15	10	14	9	8	9	4	10	5	92	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program - Phase VII	9	15	10	14	9	7	8	4	5	5	86	
W A 03	RIM Wetlands - Phase IX	8	14	9	14	9	8	9	4	8	3	86	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

Jamie Swenson													
		Criteria											
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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	
W A 04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program Phase 3	5	13	8	13	9	8	8	4	5	4	77	
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase 10	7	13	9	14	8	7	7	5	2	5	77	
W RE 02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	9	14	9	14	10	10	7	5	5	5	88	
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	6	12	5	10	7	6	6	3	3	3	61	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Phase 8	7	12	7	7	7	7	8	2	9	4	70	
H A 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase III	6	12	7	9	7	7	8	3	8	4	71	
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase III	9	11	10	8	7	6	10	3	7	5	76	
H A 05	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	7	13	8	11	8	7	9	3	0	5	71	
H A 06	Metro Wildlife Management Areas	7	13	9	9	6	6	8	2	2	5	67	
H A 07	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration Phase VI	8	12	8	9	10	6	9	2	8	4	76	
H A 08	Hennepin County Habitat Conservation Program, Phase 1	7	12	8	9	10	7	9	2	7	5	76	
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase 10	9	14	9	12	10	9	10	4	9	4	90	
H RE 02	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership (Phase IV) Upper Pool 9 Backwater Enhancement and Floodplain Forest Restoration	7	8	2	5	7	5	5	2	0	2	43	
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Ph. V	9	13	9	13	9	5	8	4	6	4	80	
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	5	14	9	13	8	8	8	3	7	4	79	
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VII	8	10	9	12	10	8	8	3	3	4	75	
H RE 06	Lake George Dam and Rum River Erosion	6	8	5	8	5	6	8	2	3	4	55	
H RE 07	Buffalo River Watershed Stream Habitat Program - Phase 1	9	14	7	12	6	7	6	4	4	4	73	
H RE 08	Two Rivers Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement	8	11	8	13	6	7	9	2	0	3	67	
H RE 09	Six Mile Creek-Halsted Bay Habitat Restoration - Phase I	8	11	8	12	6	9	6	3	6	5	74	
H RE 10	Slow the Spread of the Emerald Ash Borer	3	5	2	2	0	0	0	3	0	2	17	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat	9	8	8	13	7	8	9	3	1	4	70	
O1	Contract Management 2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
O2	Restoration Evaluations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

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

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

Barry Tilley													
		Criteria											
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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	
P A 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase X	10	14	8	15	10	7	8	3	0	5	80	
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase X	10	14	9	15	10	8	8	3	7	5	89	
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VIII	10	14	9	15	10	9	10	3	7	3	90	
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase IX	10	15	9	15	10	8	9	3	8	3	90	
P A 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VIII	10	15	9	15	10	7	9	3	5	3	86	Acres listed on parcel list exceed 370.
P A 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection-Phase VII	10	15	8	15	10	6	9	3	0	3	79	
P A 07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VIII	10	15	9	15	10	8	10	5	10	4	96	
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase IV	10	15	9	15	10	9	9	3	1	4	85	
P A 09	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition Phase 2	10	15	9	15	10	9	10	5	0	4	87	
P A 10	Protect and Restore MN IBAs within the Tallgrass Aspen Parklands	10	15	9	15	10	0	5	0	4	3	71	
P A 11	Grassland Conservation Partnership, Phase III	9	12	8	15	10	8	9	3	3	4	81	
P A 12	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase I	10	15	10	15	10	9	9	4	6	4	92	
P A 13	East Fork Des Moines River Wetland and Prairie Restoration	10	15	8	15	10	9	9	5	1	5	87	
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement Ph X	9	13	8	15	6	8	8	1	0	3	71	
P RE 02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands - Phase III	10	15	10	15	8	8	8	2	2	5	83	
F A 02	Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project, Phase II	10	15.0	9.0	15.0	9.0	8	9	4	0	4	83	Why new trails/roads?
F A 03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase VII	10	15.0	8.0	15	9.0	8	8	1	4	4	82	Why do easment acres cost more than aquistion acres?
F A 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration Phase 6	10	15.0	9	15	8.0	8	8	3	5	4	85	Why no permanate protection for Morrison Co. lands?
F A 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase VI	10	15	9	15	9	8	8	2	5	3	84	
F A 06	Protect Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VIII	10	15	9	15	9	8	8	2	3	5	84	
F A 07	State Forest Acquisition, Richard J. Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase V	10	15	8	15	8	8	8	2	2	5	81	
F A 08	Critical Shoreland Habitat Program - Phase V	10	15	8	15	8	8	8	2	4	4	82	
F RE 01	Improving Forest Wildlife Habitat and Forest Health through Increased Species and Structural Diversity	10	15	8	15	9	7	8	2	0	3	77	
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative - Phase III	10	15	9	15	10	8	8	3	5	5	88	Very low admin costs.
F RE 03	Northern Minnesota Forest Recovery Project	10	15	8	15	10	7	6	2	7	2	82	Very high admin costs.
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase X	10	15	10	15	10	9	8	4	9	5	95	Number of acres left out of outcomes.
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program - Phase VII	10	15	10	15	10	9	8	4	5	5	91	
W A 03	RIM Wetlands - Phase IX	10	15	10	15	10	8	10	5	10	5	98	Why will there be new roads/trails?
W A 04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program Phase 3	10	15	10	15	10	8	9	3	6	3	89	High admin.

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

Barry Tilley													
		Criteria											
		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 leverages or expands 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 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.	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	
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase 10	10	15	10	15	6	6	6	2	0	3	73	What are dataloggers (page 2)? High admin.
W RE 02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	10	15	10	15	10	9	8	3	4	5	89	
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	10	15	10	15	10	8	5	4	2	2	81	High admin. High per acre cost.
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Phase 8	10	15	10	15	6	10	9	5	10	5	95	
H A 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase III	10	15	10	15	6	7	8	2	2	3	78	High per acre acquisition cost.
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase III	10	15	10	15	5	5	7	3	6	3	79	
H A 05	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	10	15	6	15	4	5	5	2	0	2	64	Very low admin. High easement cost.
H A 06	Metro Wildlife Management Areas	10	15	8	15	8	5	6	5	2	5	79	Low admin.
H A 07	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration Phase VI	10	15	10	15	10	8	8	5	10	5	96	Park land?
H A 08	Hennepin County Habitat Conservation Program, Phase 1	10	15	8	15	5	6	6	5	8	5	83	
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase 10	10	15	10	15	6	7	8	5	8	5	89	High per acre enhancement cost.
H RE 02	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership (Phase IV) Upper Pool 9 Backwater Enhancement and Floodplain Forest Restoration	10	15	10	15	9	8	0	3	0	2	72	
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Ph. V	10	15	8	15	6	6	2	4	0	2	68	High per acre restoration cost.
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	10	15	10	15	6	6	2	4	3	4	75	
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VII	10	15	10	15	7	7	3	4	5	4	80	Why no hunting and fishing on one parcel?
H RE 06	Lake George Dam and Rum River Erosion	10	15	8	15	3	2	0	3	5	4	65	
H RE 07	Buffalo River Watershed Stream Habitat Program – Phase 1	10	15	10	15	8	5	5	3	6	4	81	Why do so many parcels not have protection?
H RE 08	Two Rivers Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement	10	15	10	15	8	8	5	0	0	3	74	Why no protection on parcels?
H RE 09	Six Mile Creek-Halsted Bay Habitat Restoration - Phase I	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
H RE 10	Slow the Spread of the Emerald Ash Borer	2	8	0	9	0	0	2	5	0	0	26	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	15	10	10	10	10	10	5	10	5	95	
O1	Contract Management 2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
O2	Restoration Evaluations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

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

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

Sen. David Tomassoni													
		Criteria										Total Score	Comments
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.	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 expands 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 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.	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.		
		Max points: 10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	Out of 100	
P A 01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase X	8	12	8	12	8	8	8	4	8	4	80	
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase X	8	12	8	12	8	8	8	4	8	4	80	
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase VIII	8	12	8	12	8	8	8	4	8	4	80	
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase IX	8	12	8	12	8	8	8	4	8	4	80	
P A 05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Complex - Phase VIII	8	12	8	12	8	8	8	4	8	4	80	
P A 06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection-Phase VII	8	12	8	12	8	8	8	4	8	4	80	
P A 07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase VIII	7.5	11	7.5	12	7.5	7.5	7.5	3.5	7.5	3.5	75	
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase IV	6.5	10	6.5	10	6	6.5	6.5	3	6.5	3.5	65	
P A 09	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition Phase 2	7	11	7	11	7	7	7	3	7	3	70	
P A 10	Protect and Restore MN IBAs within the Tallgrass Aspen Parklands	5	7	5	7	5	5	5	3	5	3	50	
P A 11	Grassland Conservation Partnership, Phase III	6	8	5	8	5.5	5.5	5.5	3.5	4.5	3.5	55	
P A 12	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase I	6	9	6	9	6	6	6	3	6	3	60	
P A 13	East Fork Des Moines River Wetland and Prairie Restoration	6	9	6	9	6	6	6	3	6	3	60	
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement Ph X	6.5	10	6.5	10	6	6.5	6.5	3	6.5	3.5	65	
P RE 02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands - Phase III	6.5	10	6.5	10	6	6.5	6.5	3	6.5	3.5	65	
F A 02	Laurentian Forest - St. Louis County Habitat Project, Phase II	7.5	11.0	7.5	12.0	7.5	7.5	7.5	3.5	7.5	3.5	75	
F A 03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase VII	8	12.0	8.0	12	8.0	8	8	4	8	4	80	
F A 04	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration Phase 6	7.5	11.0	8	12	7.5	7.5	7.5	3.5	7.5	3.5	75	
F A 05	Minnesota Forests for the Future Phase VI	8.5	13	8	13	8.5	8.5	8.5	5	8	4	85	
F A 06	Protect Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County - Phase VIII	7	11	7	11	7	7	7	3	7	3	70	
F A 07	State Forest Acquisition, Richard J. Dorer Memorial Forest - Phase V	7	11	7	11	7	7	7	3	7	3	70	
F A 08	Critical Shoreland Habitat Program - Phase V	6	9	6	9	6	6	6	3	6	3	60	
F RE 01	Improving Forest Wildlife Habitat and Forest Health through Increased Species and Structural Diversity	7.5	11	7.5	12	7.5	7.5	7.5	3.5	7.5	3.5	75	
F RE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative - Phase III	8	12	8	12	8	8	8	4	8	4	80	
F RE 03	Northern Minnesota Forest Recovery Project	8.5	13	8	13	8.5	8.5	8.5	4	8	5	85	
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase X	7.5	11	7.5	12	7.5	7.5	7.5	3.5	7.5	3.5	75	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program - Phase VII	7.5	11	7.5	12	7.5	7.5	7.5	3.5	7.5	3.5	75	
W A 03	RIM Wetlands - Phase IX	7	11	7	11	7	7	7	3	7	3	70	
W A 04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase 3	7.5	11	7.5	12	7.5	7.5	7.5	3.5	7.5	3.5	75	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2018/FY 2019

Sen. David Tomassoni

		Criteria											
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.	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 expands 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 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.	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
		Max points: 10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	Out of 100	
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase 10	8	12	8	12	8	8	8	4	8	4	80	
W RE 02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	8	12	8	12	8	8	8	4	8	4	80	
H A 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	7	11	7	11	7	7	7	3	7	3	70	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers Phase 8	8	12	8	12	8	8	8	4	8	4	80	
H A 03	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase III	7.5	11	7.5	12	7.5	7.5	7.5	3.5	7.5	3.5	75	
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase III	8.5	13	8	13	8.5	8.5	8.5	4	8	5	85	
H A 05	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	7	11	7	11	7	7	7	3	7	3	70	
H A 06	Metro Wildlife Management Areas	7	11	7	11	7	7	7	3	7	3	70	
H A 07	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration Phase VI	8	12	8	12	8	8	8	4	8	4	75	
H A 08	Hennepin County Habitat Conservation Program, Phase 1	7	11	7	11	7	7	7	3	7	3	70	
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase 10	8.5	13	8	13	8.5	8.5	8.5	4	8	4	80	
H RE 02	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership (Phase IV) Upper Pool 9 Backwater Enhancement and Floodplain Forest Restoration	8.5	13	8	13	8.5	9	9	4	8	4	85	
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Ph. V	8.5	13	8	13	9	8.5	8.5	4	9	4	85	
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase III	7	11	7	11	7	7	7	3	7	3	70	
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase VII	7.5	11	7.5	12	7.5	7.5	7.5	3.5	7.5	3	75	
H RE 06	Lake George Dam and Rum River Erosion	7.5	11	7.5	12	7.5	7.5	7.5	3.5	7.5	3	75	
H RE 07	Buffalo River Watershed Stream Habitat Program – Phase 1	9	13.5	9	13.5	9	9	9	4.5	9	4.5	90	
H RE 08	Two Rivers Fish Passage Restoration and Habitat Enhancement	8	12	8	12	8	8	8	4	8	4	75	
H RE 09	Six Mile Creek-Halsted Bay Habitat Restoration - Phase I	7	11	7	11	7	7	7	3	7	3	70	
H RE 10	Slow the Spread of the Emerald Ash Borer	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program - Phase IX: Statewide and Metro Habitat	8.5	13	8	13	8.5	8.5	8.5	4	8	4	80	
O1	Contract Management 2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	x	
O2	Restoration Evaluations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	x	

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