

Member Name

Jim Cox

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-10. **1=Strongly Disagree through 10=Strongly Agree**

Maximum score per request is **100 points**.

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

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

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservation plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute.	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
PA 01	Grasslands for the Future	6	8	5	5	7	7	9	6	7	7	67	
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Acquisition, Ph. V	8	8	8	8	8	5	8	6	6	8	73	
PA 03	DNR Wildlife Management Area, Scientific and Natural Area, and Native Prairie Bank Easement Program, Ph. V	5	8	8	6	8	5	3	5	6	8	62	
PA 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project, Ph. IV	8	8	8	7	8	6	8	7	8	8	76	
PA 05	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Ph. III	3	5	5	3	5	5	7	5	5	4	47	
PA 06	Green Corridors, Ph. V	7	6	6	6	6	5	5	6	6	7	60	
PA 07	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex, Ph. III	8	8	8	8	8	5	8	8	6	8	75	
PRE 01	DNR Grasslands, Ph. V	8	8	8	9	8	5	3	4	8	8	69	
FA 01	Minnesota Forest for the Future/State Forests, Ph. IV	6	6	6	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	51	
FA 02	Young Forest Conservation	5	6	6	5	5	5	7	6	5	6	56	Questions?
FA 03	The Camp Ripley Partnership: Protecting the Mighty Mississippi, Ph. III	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	50	
FA 04	Preventing Forest Fragmentation and Protecting and Resoring Lake and Stream Habitat in the St. Louis River Watershed	7	6	7	7	6	5	8	8	6	5	65	
FA 05	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership, Ph. IV	7	7	7	7	7	5	6	6	6	5	63	
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County, Ph. IV	7	6	6	5	5	5	7	7	6	5	59	
FRE 01	DNR Accelerated Forest Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Program, Ph. III	3	3	3	5	5	5	3	5	6	5	43	
FRE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative, Ph. II	6	8	7	6	6	5	7	6	5	5	61	
FRE 03	Defending the St. Croix Riverway from the Bittersweet Onslaught	5	5	4	3	3	5	7	6	4	4	46	
WA 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership, Ph. V	7	9	8	6	6	8	6	7	6	6	69	
WA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Production Area Acquisition, Ph. V	9	9	8	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	78	
WA 03	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection Program, Ph. III	8	8	7	7	7	7	6	6	6	6	68	
WA 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Program, Ph. II	7	6	6	6	6	6	7	6	6	6	62	

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservation plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute.	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
WA 05	McGregor Marsh Wetland Protection	8	7	7	7	7	6	4	6	6	6	64	
WA 06	Wetland Habitat Protection Program	8	7	7	7	7	6	6	6	6	6	66	
WRE 01	Accelerated Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement, Ph. V	7	7	7	6	6	6	3	4	5	5	56	
WRE 02	Pelican Lake Enhancement	8	8	8	6	8	7	4	4	6	6	65	
WRE 03	Albert Lea Lake Management and Invasive Species Control Structure	6	5	6	6	6	5	7	7	7	5	60	
WRE 04	Goose Lake Restoration and Carp Exclusion Project	6	5	6	6	6	5	7	7	7	5	60	
HA 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat, Ph. V	7	7	7	6	7	7	4	5	6	6	62	
HA 02	Habitat Protection in Dakota County, Ph. IV	5	5	5	5	5	6	7	6	6	5	55	
HA 03	Root River Protection and Restoration	8	8	8	8	8	6	8	8	6	6	74	
HA 04	Metro Big Rivers, Ph. IV	Conflict	Conflict	Conflict	Conflict	Conflict	Conflict	Conflict	Conflict	Conflict	Conflict	Conflict	
HA 05	Minnesota Landscape Arboretum: Acquisition on Property Surrounding Lake Tamarack	3	3	3	6	5	7	6	6	7	6	52	
HA 06	Critical Shroeland Habitat Protection Program, Ph. II	7	7	7	6	7	6	7	6	6	6	65	
HRE 01	Wildlife Habitat Restoration and Enhancement in Metropolitan Regional Parks System	3	3	3	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	41	
HRE 02	Duluth 2012 Flood: Stream Habitat Restoration Program	2	8	2	2	6	5	5	3	3	6	42	
HRE 03	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership, Ph. III	7	7	7	6	7	5	7	6	6	6	64	
HRE 04	Lake Zumbro Habitat Restoration Project	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	2	2	24	
HRE 05	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Ph. IV	8	8	8	8	8	7	7	8	8	8	78	
HRE 06	Developing a National Destination for Trout Angling Cold Water Enthusiasts	5	5	6	6	6	5	7	7	5	5	57	?
TOTAL												2285	

Do not complete the evaluation criteria for the following funding requests. Indicate if they should be recommended for a hearing.

	Recommend for Hearing (Y or N)	
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Ph. V	Y
X 02	Contract Management	Y
X 03	Restoration Evaluations	Y
X 04	High-Priority Transaction Service Acceleration for LSOHC	Y

Member Name

Scott Rall

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-10. **1=Strongly Disagree through 10=Strongly Agree**

Maximum score per request is **100 points**.

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

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

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservation plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute.	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
PA 01	Grasslands for the Future	5	10	7	3	8	-	7	4	7	3	54	
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Acquisition, Ph. V	8	8	9	9	8	10	9	7	8	8	84	
PA 03	DNR Wildlife Management Area, Scientific and Natural Area, and Native Prairie Bank Easement Program, Ph. V	8	8	8	8	8	-	8	5	8	8	69	
PA 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project, Ph. IV	8	8	8	7	8	10	8	6	7	8	78	
PA 05	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Ph. III	8	9	8	5	5	10	7	6	6	7	71	
PA 06	Green Corridors, Ph. V	8	8	9	9	8	-	5	6	8	8	69	
PA 07	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex, Ph. III	7	7	6	6	7	2	6	8	8	7	64	
PRE 01	DNR Grasslands, Ph. V	8	5	8	8	6	-	-	3	-	6	44	
FA 01	Minnesota Forest for the Future/State Forests, Ph. IV	6	3	6	7	8	3	3	7	7	6	56	
FA 02	Young Forest Conservation	5	5	3	4	4	10	5	4	2	2	44	
FA 03	The Camp Ripley Partnership: Protecting the Mighty Mississippi, Ph. III	6	4	6	6	7	-	4	7	7	6	53	Define long-term lease?
FA 04	Preventing Forest Fragmentation and Protecting and Resoring Lake and Stream Habitat in the St. Louis River Watershed	8	3	7	7	7	10	9	8	3	5	67	How will people find this spot?
FA 05	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership, Ph. IV	8	8	9	9	8	3	7	7	8	8	75	
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County, Ph. IV	5	3	7	7	7	2	7	7	8	7	60	
FRE 01	DNR Accelerated Forest Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Program, Ph. III	3	3	4	5	4	-	3	4	4	5	35	
FRE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative, Ph. II	3	9	5	3	3	7	7	7	3	4	51	
FRE 03	Defending the St. Croix Riverway from the Bittersweet Onslaught	6	5	5	5	5	10	7	7	-	6	56	
WA 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership, Ph. V	9	10	9	9	9	10	9	8	8	10	91	
WA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Production Area Acquisition, Ph. V	10	10	9	9	9	10	9	7	9	9	91	
WA 03	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection Program, Ph. III	8	7	8	7	8	3	5	4	7	7	64	
WA 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Program, Ph. II	6	8	7	6	10	3	8	7	5	5	65	
WA 05	McGregor Marsh Wetland Protection	8	8	10	8	9	-	7	8	3	8	69	Any income to state from cooperavive agreement?
WA 06	Wetland Habitat Protection Program	7	7	8	8	8	10	7	8	7	7	77	

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservation plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute.	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
WRE 01	Accelerated Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement, Ph. V	8	8	7	8	9	2	4	5	2	6	59	
WRE 02	Pelican Lake Enhancement	8	8	8	8	8	1	5	7	2	7	62	
WRE 03	Albert Lea Lake Management and Invasive Species Control Structure	7	3	3	4	3	10	6	8	10	5	59	Will this stop AIS?
WRE 04	Goose Lake Restoration and Carp Exclusion Project	5	2	2	4	1	10	5	5	10	3	47	
HA 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat, Ph. V	5	3	7	7	5	-	3	-	5	2	37	
HA 02	Habitat Protection in Dakota County, Ph. IV	8	5	7	7	7	10	7	7	3	7	68	
HA 03	Root River Protection and Restoration	8	3	7	7	8	2	8	6	7	7	63	
HA 04	Metro Big Rivers, Ph. IV	6	4	6	8	7	10	6	7	3	7	64	
HA 05	Minnesota Landscape Arboretum: Acquisition on Property Surrounding Lake Tamarack	4	-	3	8	3	10	3	3	3	3	40	
HA 06	Critical Shroeland Habitat Protection Program, Ph. II	7	5	3	8	8	10	6	4	6	6	63	
HRE 01	Wildlife Habitat Restoration and Enhancement in Metropolitan Regional Parks System	2	2	3	3	4	3	4	4	2	2	29	
HRE 02	Duluth 2012 Flood: Stream Habitat Restoration Program	3	7	4	3	6	10	4	4	3	4	48	
HRE 03	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership, Ph. III	7	7	7	6	7	10	6	7	7	7	71	
HRE 04	Lake Zumbro Habitat Restoration Project	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	20	
HRE 05	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Ph. IV	9	10	8	8	9	-	8	8	8	8	76	
HRE 06	Developing a National Destination for Trout Angling Cold Water Enthusiasts	2	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	2	4	33	
TOTAL											2326		

Do not complete the evaluation criteria for the following funding requests. Indicate if they should be recommended for a hearing.

	Recommend for Hearing (Y or N)
X 01 Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Ph. V	Y
X 02 Contract Management	Y
X 03 Restoration Evaluations	Y
X 04 High-Priority Transaction Service Acceleration for LSOHC	Y

Member Name

Ryan Bronson

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-10. **1=Strongly Disagree through 10=Strongly Agree**

Maximum score per request is **100 points**.

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

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

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservation plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
PA 01	Grasslands for the Future	9	10	10	8	10	6	9	8	6	8	84	
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Acquisition, Ph. V	10	8	8	8	10	9	9	6	8	8	84	
PA 03	DNR Wildlife Management Area, Scientific and Natural Area, and Native Prairie Bank Easement Program, Ph. V	7	7	8	8	8	2	6	8	8	8	70	
PA 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project, Ph. IV	9	9	9	8	9	10	7	8	8	7	84	
PA 05	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Ph. III	9	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	8	86	
PA 06	Green Corridors, Ph. V	6	6	4	7	4	1	1	4	4	4	41	
PA 07	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex, Ph. III	8	6	8	8	8	2	7	7	8	7	69	
PRE 01	DNR Grasslands, Ph. V	9	9	9	9	9	1	6	9	8	8	77	
FA 01	Minnesota Forest for the Future/State Forests, Ph. IV	9	3	8	8	8	3	4	7	8	8	66	
FA 02	Young Forest Conservation	7	9	9	9	9	9	7	7	4	4	74	
FA 03	The Camp Ripley Partnership: Protecting the Mighty Mississippi, Ph. III	8	7	7	7	7	3	7	7	8	7	68	
FA 04	Preventing Forest Fragmentation and Protecting and Resoring Lake and Stream Habitat in the St. Louis River Watershed	6	5	7	7	7	6	5	5	7	7	62	
FA 05	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership, Ph. IV	10	10	10	10	9	6	8	8	7	8	86	
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County, Ph. IV	8	6	8	8	8	5	7	8	9	8	75	
FRE 01	DNR Accelerated Forest Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Program, Ph. III	8	7	8	8	8	4	6	9	8	7	73	
FRE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative, Ph. II	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	5	6	67	
FRE 03	Defending the St. Croix Riverway from the Bittersweet Onslaught	6	6	6	6	6	8	5	8	6	6	63	
WA 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership, Ph. V	10	8	10	9	9	10	8	8	8	8	88	
WA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Production Area Acquisition, Ph. V	8	7	8	8	8	9	6	6	8	8	76	

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservation plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
WA 03	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection Program, Ph. III	10	10.00	10	10	10	5	8	7	8	8	86	
WA 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Program, Ph. II	9	9.00	9	9	9	6	8	8	8	8	83	
WA 05	McGregor Marsh Wetland Protection	9	9.00	9	9	9	6	9	9	9	8	86	
WA 06	Wetland Habitat Protection Program	8	7	8	8	8	7	8	7	8	8	77	
WRE 01	Acceleratated Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement, Ph. V	10	10	10	10	10	4	7	8	8	8	85	
WRE 02	Pelican Lake Enhancement	10	10	10	10	10	5	8	8	8	8	87	
WRE 03	Albert Lea Lake Management and Invasive Species Control Structure	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	8	8	7	78	
WRE 04	Goose Lake Restoration and Carp Exclusion Project	6	6	6	6	6	8	7	5	5	5	60	
HA 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat, Ph. V	8	7	8	9	9	1	8	8	8	8	74	
HA 02	Habitat Protection in Dakota County, Ph. IV	9	8	9	9	9	9	7	6	7	7	80	
HA 03	Root River Protection and Restoration	8	6	7	7	7	9	7	7	7	7	72	
HA 04	Metro Big Rivers, Ph. IV	8	6	8	8	8	5	7	8	7	7	72	
HA 05	Minnesota Landscape Arboretum: Acquisition on Property Surrounding Lake Tamarack	6	2	4	4	6	9	5	2	3	3	44	
HA 06	Critical Shroeland Habitat Protection Program, Ph. II	8	5	7	8	7	8	7	7	7	7	71	
HRE 01	Wildlife Habitat Restoration and Enhancement in Metropolitan Regional Parks System	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	70	
HRE 02	Duluth 2012 Flood: Stream Habitat Restoration Program	6	7	6	6	7	8	8	5	5	5	63	
HRE 03	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership, Ph. III	7	7	7	7	8	10	7	7	7	7	74	
HRE 04	Lake Zumbro Habitat Restoration Project	7	4	5	5	5	10	9	9	7	7	68	
HRE 05	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Ph. IV	9	7	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	88	
HRE 06	Developing a National Destination for Trout Angling Cold Water Enthusiasts	5	1	2	2	2	2	5	4	4	4	31	
TOTAL												2842	

Do not complete the evaluation criteria for the following funding requests. Indicate if they should be recommended for a hearing.

	Recommend for Hearing (Y or N)	
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Ph. V	y
X 02	Contract Management	y
X 03	Restoration Evaluations	y
X 04	High-Priority Tansaction Service Acceleration for LSOHC	y

Member Name

Wayne Enger

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-10. **1=Strongly Disagree through 10=Strongly Agree**
 Maximum score per request is **100 points**.

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

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

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservation plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
PA 01	Grasslands for the Future	8	7	8	10	10	0	7	8	8	8	74	
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Acquisition, Ph. V	8	8	8	10	10	2	8	9	9	8	80	
PA 03	DNR Wildlife Management Area, Scientific and Natural Area, and Native Prairie Bank Easement Program, Ph. V	8	8	8	10	10	0	7	7	9	8	75	
PA 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project, Ph. IV	9	7	8	10	10	4	9	8	9	8	82	
PA 05	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Ph. III	9	8	8	10	10	10	7	8	8	8	86	
PA 06	Green Corridors, Ph. V	8	8	9	10	10	0	8	7	9	8	77	
PA 07	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex, Ph. III	9	7	9	10	10	1	8	9	9	8	80	
PRE 01	DNR Grasslands, Ph. V	9	7	9	10	10	0	7	7	9	8	76	
FA 01	Minnesota Forest for the Future/State Forests, Ph. IV	8	7	9	10	10	2	7	8	8	8	77	
FA 02	Young Forest Conservation	8	7	8	10	10	4	9	9	8	8	81	
FA 03	The Camp Ripley Partnership: Protecting the Mighty Mississippi, Ph. III	8	9	9	10	10	0	8	8	9	8	79	
FA 04	Preventing Forest Fragmentation and Protecting and Resoring Lake and Stream Habitat in the St. Louis River Watershed	8	9	8	10	10	4	8	9	8	8	82	
FA 05	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership, Ph. IV	8	9	8	10	10	2	8	9	8	8	80	
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County, Ph. IV	8	8	8	10	10	3	8	9	8	8	80	
FRE 01	DNR Accelerated Forest Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Program, Ph. III	8	7	8	10	10	0	7	8	8	8	74	
FRE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative, Ph. II	8	9	8	10	10	3	9	8	8	8	81	
FRE 03	Defending the St. Croix Riverway from the Bittersweet Onslaught	8	7	7	10	10	4	7	8	8	8	77	
WA 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership, Ph. V	8	8	8	10	10	10	7	8	8	8	85	
WA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Production Area Acquisition, Ph. V	8	7	8	10	10	6	7	8	8	8	80	

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservation plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
WA 03	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection Program, Ph. III	8	8	8	10	10	2	7	8	8	8	77	
WA 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Program, Ph. II	8	7	8	10	10	2	8	7	8	8	76	
WA 05	McGregor Marsh Wetland Protection	9	8	8	10	10	0	8	9	9	8	79	
WA 06	Wetland Habitat Protection Program	8	7	8	10	10	4	8	8	8	8	79	
WRE 01	Accelerated Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement, Ph. V	8	7	8	10	10	2	7	8	8	8	76	
WRE 02	Pelican Lake Enhancement	8	8	8	10	10	2	8	8	8	8	78	
WRE 03	Albert Lea Lake Management and Invasive Species Control Structure	8	7	7	10	10	5	8	8	8	8	79	
WRE 04	Goose Lake Restoration and Carp Exclusion Project	8	7	7	10	10	4	8	8	8	8	78	
HA 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat, Ph. V	8	7	7	10	10	0	8	8	8	8	74	
HA 02	Habitat Protection in Dakota County, Ph. IV	8	7	7	10	10	4	8	7	8	7	76	
HA 03	Root River Protection and Restoration	8	7	8	10	10	3	8	8	8	8	78	
HA 04	Metro Big Rivers, Ph. IV	8	8	8	10	10	4	8	8	8	8	80	
HA 05	Minnesota Landscape Arboretum: Acquisition on Property Surrounding Lake Tamarack	8	8	8	10	10	10	9	8	8	8	87	
HA 06	Critical Shoreland Habitat Protection Program, Ph. II	8	8	8	10	10	5	8	8	8	8	81	
HRE 01	Wildlife Habitat Restoration and Enhancement in Metropolitan Regional Parks System	8	8	7	10	10	3	8	8	8	7	77	
HRE 02	Duluth 2012 Flood: Stream Habitat Restoration Program	8	10	8	10	10	5	9	8	8	8	84	
HRE 03	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership, Ph. III	8	7	7	10	10	10	8	8	7	7	82	
HRE 04	Lake Zumbro Habitat Restoration Project	7	6	6	10	10	0	9	8	7	7	70	
HRE 05	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Ph. IV	8	8	8	10	10	0	9	9	8	8	78	
HRE 06	Developing a National Destination for Trout Angling Cold Water Enthusiasts	8	8	8	10	10	3	9	8	8	8	80	
TOTAL												3075	

Do not complete the evaluation criteria for the following funding requests. Indicate if they should be recommended for a hearing.

		Recommend for Hearing (Y or N)
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Ph. V	Y
X 02	Contract Management	Y
X 03	Restoration Evaluations	N
X 04	High-Priority Transaction Service Acceleration for LSOHC	Y

Member Name

David Hartwell

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-10. **1=Strongly Disagree through 10=Strongly Agree**

Maximum score per request is **100 points**.

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

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

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservation plans	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
PA 01	Grasslands for the Future	9	9	10	9	10	1	5	7	6	7	73	
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Acquisition, Ph. V	9	8	10	8	10	2	5	7	7	7	73	
PA 03	DNR Wildlife Management Area, Scientific and Natural Area, and Native Prairie Bank Easement Program, Ph. V	9	10	10	9	10	1	5	7	5	8	74	
PA 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project, Ph. IV	8	7	10	9	10	3	7	7	5	7	73	
PA 05	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Ph. III	9	8	10	8	10	10	9	8	5	6	83	
PA 06	Green Corridors, Ph. V	7	7	10	6	10	1	5	6	2	6	60	
PA 07	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex, Ph. III	8	7	10	8	10	1	8	8	5	6	71	
PRE 01	DNR Grasslands, Ph. V	7	7	10	9	10	1	6	6	1	7	64	
FA 01	Minnesota Forest for the Future/State Forests, Ph. IV	8	8	10	8	10	1	8	7	5	4	69	
FA 02	Young Forest Conservation	6	5	10	8	10	5	8	5	4	5	66	
FA 03	The Camp Ripley Partnership: Protecting the Mighty Mississippi, Ph. III	5	3	7	5	7	1	4	6	5	5	48	
FA 04	Preventing Forest Fragmentation and Protecting and Resoring Lake and Stream Habitat in the St. Louis River Watershed	9	9	10	8	10	5	9	8	8	8	84	
FA 05	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership, Ph. IV	7	7	10	9	10	1	8	8	5	7	72	
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County, Ph. IV	9	7	10	8	10	1	9	8	9	8	79	
FRE 01	DNR Accelerated Forest Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Program, Ph. III	6	4	8	4	10	1	4	4	3	5	49	
FRE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative, Ph. II	5	5	6	6	7	1	6	6	2	4	48	
FRE 03	Defending the St. Croix Riverway from the Bittersweet Onslaught	6	7	7	6	7	3	4	4	2	3	49	
WA 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership, Ph. V	10	9	10	9	10	10	7	8	5	5	83	
WA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Production Area Acquisition, Ph. V	9	7	10	9	10	8	8	8	7	7	83	
WA 03	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection Program, Ph. III	8	8	10	8	10	2	7	7	8	7	75	
WA 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Program, Ph. II	10	8	10	9	10	2	8	7	8	8	80	
WA 05	McGregor Marsh Wetland Protection	10	7	10	8	10	1	8	8	10	8	80	
WA 06	Wetland Habitat Protection Program	10	8	10	8	10	6	8	8	10	8	86	

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservation plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities.	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute.	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
WRE 01	Accelerated Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement, Ph. V	9	6	10	8	10	1	7	8	4	7	70	
WRE 02	Pelican Lake Enhancement	7	5	10	7	10	1	9	8	6	6	69	
WRE 03	Albert Lea Lake Management and Invasive Species Control Structure	7	5	8	5	10	5	8	7	4	5	64	
WRE 04	Goose Lake Restoration and Carp Exclusion Project	7	5	8	5	10	4	7	8	6	6	66	
HA 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat, Ph. V	7	5	10	8	10	1	9	6	5	5	66	
HA 02	Habitat Protection in Dakota County, Ph. IV	9	5	10	9	10	5	10	9	5	7	79	
HA 03	Root River Protection and Restoration	9	7	10	9	10	3	8	7	8	6	77	
HA 04	Metro Big Rivers, Ph. IV	8	8	10	9	10	3	8	7	7	5	75	
HA 05	Minnesota Landscape Arboretum: Acquisition on Property Surrounding Lake Tamarack	5	3	5	4	5	8	8	3	4	2	47	
HA 06	Critical Shroeland Habitat Protection Program, Ph. II	10	6	10	8	10	6	9	8	10	6	83	
HRE 01	Wildlife Habitat Restoration and Enhancement in Metropolitan Regional Parks System	6	5	8	5	9	2	5	4	4	4	52	
HRE 02	Duluth 2012 Flood: Stream Habitat Restoration Program	7	4	6	6	6	3	4	5	2	4	47	
HRE 03	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership, Ph. III	7	5	9	5	9	10	7	7	2	4	65	
HRE 04	Lake Zumbro Habitat Restoration Project	4	2	4	3	3	1	7	5	2	2	33	
HRE 05	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Ph. IV	9	5	10	8	10	1	9	8	7	7	74	
HRE 06	Developing a National Destination for Trout Angling Cold Water Enthusiasts	4	2	5	4	6	1	6	4	4	3	39	
TOTAL											2628		

Do not complete the evaluation criteria for the following funding requests. Indicate if they should be recommended for a hearing.

		Recommend for Hearing (Y or N)	
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Ph. V	Conflict	
X 02	Contract Management	N	I don't think a hearing is necessary - does not mean we should not fund.
X 03	Restoration Evaluations	N	I don't think a hearing is necessary - does not mean we should not fund.
X 04	High-Priority Transaction Service Acceleration for LSOHC	N	I don't think a hearing is necessary - does not mean we should not fund.

Member Name

JANE H. KINGSTON

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-10. **1=Strongly Disagree through 10=Strongly Agree**
 Maximum score per request is **100 points**.
 For those not evaluating a proposal due to a **conflict of interest**, put "COI" in the score box.
 Overall proposal evaluation scores will be averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning	Other Funds	Budget	Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments			
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservation plans.							The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.
PA 01	Grasslands for the Future	9	10	9	8	9	9	8	5	7	7	81	Not open.
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Acquisition, Ph. V	8	8	9	8	9	0	8	4	6	8	68	Progress on past grants?
PA 03	DNR Wildlife Management Area, Scientific and Natural Area, and Native Prairie Bank Easement Program, Ph. V	9	8	9	10	8	3	8	7	6	9	77	Progress on past grants? \$2.85M from LCCMR
PA 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project, Ph. IV	10	9	9	10	10	7	8	8	8	9	88	Good Progress report. How are direct services estimated?
PA 05	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Ph. III	9	8	7	7	6	4	8	4	6	4	63	Not open. Progress on past grants?
PA 06	Green Corridors, Ph. V	8	7	10	8	7	3	10	6	6	8	73	Progress on past grants?
PA 07	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex, Ph. III	9	6	10	8	8	0	8	7	6	0	62	Progress on past grants?
PRE 01	DNR Grasslands, Ph. V	10	6	10	9	10	0	8	10	6	6	75	Open? Direct Services 9% - High.
FA 01	Minnesota Forest for the Future/State Forests, Ph. IV	9	7	10	8	10	3	7	8	7	7	76	Clarification on Progress to date? Need Info on relationship to other funds.
FA 02	Young Forest Conservation	9	7	9	9	9	9	8	9	6	5	80	How are Direct Services calculated?
FA 03	The Camp Ripley Partnership: Protecting the Mighty Mississippi, Ph. III	7	8	6	7	7	0	8	7	6	5	61	Not open. Progress on past grants - need clarification.
FA 04	Preventing Forest Fragmentation and Protecting and Resoring Lake and Stream Habitat in the St. Louis River Watershed	6	6	8	6	7	6	5	4	6	5	59	Res land.
FA 05	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership, Ph. IV	6	6	8	8	8	0	8	10	6	7	67	Progress on past grants?
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County, Ph. IV	6	7	4	4	5	0	8	10	8	4	56	Progress on past grants?
FRE 01	DNR Accelerated Forest Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Program, Ph. III	10	6	10	9	10	0	6	10	5	6	72	Open? Direct Services 9% - High. Progress report on past grants?
FRE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative, Ph. II	10	9	9	8	8	2	10	8	7	5	76	Open? Progress report on past grants?
FRE 03	Defending the St. Croix Riverway from the Bittersweet Onslaught	4	3	4	4	3	6	3	8	3	3	41	Planning, analysis, education. How are Direct Services estimated? \$300K from LCCMR.
WA 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership, Ph. V	10	10	10	10	10	10	8	8	6	8	90	Open? Progress report on past grants? \$3M from LCCMR.
WA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Production Area Acquisition, Ph. V	10	8	10	9	10	0	9	5	6	8	75	Progress on past grants?
WA 03	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection Program, Ph. III	10	10	10	10	10	6	8	5	6	6	81	Progress on past grants?
WA 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Program, Ph. II	10	9	10	9	10	2	8	6	8	7	79	All open? Progress on past grant?
WA 05	McGregor Marsh Wetland Protection	9	8	10	8	9	1	7	8	7	7	74	
WA 06	Wetland Habitat Protection Program	10	8	9	10	10	8	8	8	7	7	85	Not open.

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning		Other Funds		Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance		Outcomes	
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservation plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute.	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.	Total	Member Comments
WRE 01	Accelerated Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement, Ph. V	8	8	10	8	10	6	7	10	6	6	79	Open? High Direct Services - estimated how?
WRE 02	Pelican Lake Enhancement	8	6	9	8	8	5	6	8	6	9	73	Map would help.
WRE 03	Albert Lea Lake Management and Invasive Species Control Structure	8	9	8	7	7	4	6	9	6	9	73	
WRE 04	Goose Lake Restoration and Carp Exclusion Project	8	8	8	7	7	4	6	8	8	8	72	
HA 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat, Ph. V	10	10	10	10	10	0	6	5	7	8	76	Progress on past grants? How are Direct Services estimated?
HA 02	Habitat Protection in Dakota County, Ph. IV	5	4	6	6	6	8	6	6	6	4	57	Progress on past grants?
HA 03	Root River Protection and Restoration	8	7	8	9	9	4	6	8	7	7	73	Half of tracts also included in FA01, as well as PA03. MLT involved.
HA 04	Metro Big Rivers, Ph. IV	10	6	10	8	8	8	8	6	8	6	78	Progress on past grants?
HA 05	Minnesota Landscape Arboretum: Acquisition on Property Surrounding Lake Tamarack	9	5	5	5	5	10	6	1	7	6	59	Fish-yes;Hunt-no. \$2M from LCCMR. Parks & Trails. No PILT.
HA 06	Critical Shroeland Habitat Protection Program, Ph. II	9	5	6	6	5	2	6	8	7	6	60	Not open. Progress on past grants?
HRE 01	Wildlife Habitat Restoration and Enhancement in Metropolitan Regional Parks System	7	4	6	5	5	9	5	6	7	6	60	Not open. Park. \$2M from LCCMR.
HRE 02	Duluth 2012 Flood: Stream Habitat Restoration Program	5	5	5	5	3	8	8	0	5	5	49	Open to fishing only? Problem has been ID'd, but no plan as yet.
HRE 03	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership, Ph. III	6	4	8	5	6	10	7	7	4	5	62	Open? Progress report on past grants?
HRE 04	Lake Zumbro Habitat Restoration Project	8	3	2	2	4	10	7	1	7	6	50	Open? Natural lake?
HRE 05	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Ph. IV	10	6	10	8	10	0	10	1	7	7	69	Progress on past grants?
HRE 06	Developing a National Destination for Trout Angling Cold Water Enthusiasts	3	2	3	2	3	2	7	3	4	4	33	Parks & Trails
TOTAL												2682	

Do not complete the evaluation criteria for the following funding requests. Indicate if they should be recommended for a hearing.

		Recommend for Hearing (Y or N)
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Ph. V	Y
X 02	Contract Management	N
X 03	Restoration Evaluations	Y Very high Direct Services %.
X 04	High-Priority Transaction Service Acceleration for LSOHC	Y

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservation plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
WA 03	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection Program, Ph. III	7	7.00	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	70	
WA 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Program, Ph. II	6	6.00	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	60	
WA 05	McGregor Marsh Wetland Protection	5	5.00	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	50	
WA 06	Wetland Habitat Protection Program	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	50	
WRE 01	Accelerated Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement, Ph. V	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	90	
WRE 02	Pelican Lake Enhancement	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	50	
WRE 03	Albert Lea Lake Management and Invasive Species Control Structure	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	90	
WRE 04	Goose Lake Restoration and Carp Exclusion Project	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	90	
HA 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat, Ph. V	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	90	
HA 02	Habitat Protection in Dakota County, Ph. IV	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	90	
HA 03	Root River Protection and Restoration	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	80	
HA 04	Metro Big Rivers, Ph. IV	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	90	
HA 05	Minnesota Landscape Arboretum: Acquisition on Property Surrounding Lake Tamarack	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	90	
HA 06	Critical Shroeland Habitat Protection Program, Ph. II	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	60	
HRE 01	Wildlife Habitat Restoration and Enhancement in Metropolitan Regional Parks System	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	90	
HRE 02	Duluth 2012 Flood: Stream Habitat Restoration Program	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	90	
HRE 03	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership, Ph. III	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	70	
HRE 04	Lake Zumbro Habitat Restoration Project	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	50	
HRE 05	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Ph. IV	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	80	
HRE 06	Developing a National Destination for Trout Angling Cold Water Enthusiasts	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	80	
TOTAL												2930	

Do not complete the evaluation criteria for the following funding requests. Indicate if they should be recommended for a hearing.

	Recommend for Hearing (Y or N)	
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Ph. V	y
X 02	Contract Management	
X 03	Restoration Evaluations	
X 04	High-Priority Transaction Service Acceleration for LSOHC	

Member Name

Denny McNamara

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-10. **1=Strongly Disagree through 10=Strongly Agree**

Maximum score per request is **100 points**.

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

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

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservation plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute.	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
PA 01	Grasslands for the Future	9	9	9	8	9	9	8	8	7	8	84	
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Acquisition, Ph. V	8	8	8	8	9	6	9	8	7	7	78	
PA 03	DNR Wildlife Management Area, Scientific and Natural Area, and Native Prairie Bank Easement Program, Ph. V	8	8	8	7	9	6	9	7	7	7	76	
PA 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project, Ph. IV	8	9	9	9	9	7	9	7	8	8	83	
PA 05	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Ph. III	10	9	9	10	9	7	9	8	9	8	88	
PA 06	Green Corridors, Ph. V	6	5	4	5	5	5	6	4	4	3	47	
PA 07	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex, Ph. III	6	7	5	5	7	5	7	6	6	5	59	
PRE 01	DNR Grasslands, Ph. V	9	10	9	9	8	7	7	8	8	8	83	
FA 01	Minnesota Forest for the Future/State Forests, Ph. IV	7	6	6	7	6	5	6	6	7	6	62	
FA 02	Young Forest Conservation	4	3	3	3	4	5	4	3	3	4	36	
FA 03	The Camp Ripley Partnership: Protecting the Mighty Mississippi, Ph. III	7	7	8	7	7	5	6	6	7	6	66	
FA 04	Preventing Forest Fragmentation and Protecting and Resoring Lake and Stream Habitat in the St. Louis River Watershed	7	8	8	7	8	6	7	7	7	6	71	
FA 05	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership, Ph. IV	6	6	6	7	5	5	6	5	6	6	58	
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County, Ph. IV	5	5	6	6	5	5	6	6	6	5	55	
FRE 01	DNR Accelerated Forest Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Program, Ph. III	6	7	7	7	7	5	5	5	5	5	59	
FRE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative, Ph. II	8	9	8	5	7	5	5	5	4	4	60	
FRE 03	Defending the St. Croix Riverway from the Bittersweet Onslaught	6	8	7	5	5	6	5	6	5	7	60	
WA 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership, Ph. V	8	7	9	9	9	8	8	8	7	8	81	
WA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Production Area Acquisition, Ph. V	8	7	9	9	9	8	7	8	8	7	80	
WA 03	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection Program, Ph. III	9	9	9	7	8	7	8	8	8	9	82	
WA 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Program, Ph. II	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	5	68	
WA 05	McGregor Marsh Wetland Protection	6	6	7	7	6	6	6	6	6	7	63	

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservations plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute.	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
WA 06	Wetland Habitat Protection Program	5	5	5	5	6	5	6	6	6	5	54	
WRE 01	Acceleratated Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement, Ph. V	7	7	7	7	8	7	7	6	6	5	67	
WRE 02	Pelican Lake Enhancement	8	8	9	8	8	7	7	8	7	7	77	
WRE 03	Albert Lea Lake Management and Invasive Species Control Structure	6	7	6	6	7	8	8	7	7	7	69	
WRE 04	Goose Lake Restoration and Carp Exclusion Project	5	5	5	6	6	8	8	7	7	7	64	
HA 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat, Ph. V	8	9	9	8	9	6	7	7	7	6	76	
HA 02	Habitat Protection in Dakota County, Ph. IV	8	9	9	8	9	8	8	8	8	7	82	
HA 03	Root River Protection and Restoration	6	7	7	6	7	6	7	8	7	6	67	
HA 04	Metro Big Rivers, Ph. IV	8	9	7	8	8	8	7	8	8	7	78	
HA 05	Minnesota Landscape Arboretum: Acquisition on Property Surrounding Lake Tamarack	8	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	80	
HA 06	Critical Shroeland Habitat Protection Program, Ph. II	6	6	6	6	6	5	7	7	7	8	64	
HRE 01	Wildlife Habitat Restoration and Enhancement in Metropolitan Regional Parks System	6	5	6	7	7	5	6	7	7	7	63	
HRE 02	Duluth 2012 Flood: Stream Habitat Restoration Program	5	8	5	4	4	8	7	5	5	4	55	
HRE 03	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership, Ph. III	8	9	8	7	8	9	8	7	7	5	76	
HRE 04	Lake Zumbro Habitat Restoration Project	5	6	5	4	4	6	6	6	5	3	50	
HRE 05	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Ph. IV	8	8	9	9	9	9	8	7	8	8	83	
HRE 06	Developing a National Destination for Trout Angling Cold Water Enthusiasts	4	2	2	2	3	3	5	6	6	2	35	
TOTAL											2639		

Do not complete the evaluation criteria for the following funding requests. Indicate if they should be recommended for a hearing.

	Recommend for Hearing (Y or N)
X 01 Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Ph. V	Y
X 02 Contract Management	Y
X 03 Restoration Evaluations	Y
X 04 High-Priority Tansaction Service Acceleration for LSOHC	Y

Member Name

Les Bensch

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-10. **1=Strongly Disagree through 10=Strongly Agree**

Maximum score per request is **100 points**.

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

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

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservation plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute.	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
PA 01	Grasslands for the Future	10	6	10	10	10	-	10	6	6	9	77	
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Acquisition, Ph. V	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	6	6	8	90	
PA 03	DNR Wildlife Management Area, Scientific and Natural Area, and Native Prairie Bank Easement Program, Ph. V	10	10	10	10	10	-	9	8	2	2	71	
PA 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project, Ph. IV	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	6	6	6	87	
PA 05	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Ph. III	10	8	8	10	8	10	10	5	5	8	82	
PA 06	Green Corridors, Ph. V	10	6	6	6	5	-	6	5	5	5	54	
PA 07	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex, Ph. III	10	8	10	10	8	2	8	8	5	5	74	
PRE 01	DNR Grasslands, Ph. V	8	6	10	10	8	-	2	2	5	5	56	
FA 01	Minnesota Forest for the Future/State Forests, Ph. IV	10	5	8	10	8	4	2	8	5	5	65	
FA 02	Young Forest Conservation	10	6	8	9	8	10	4	7	5	5	72	
FA 03	The Camp Ripley Partnership: Protecting the Mighty Mississippi, Ph. III	10	6	8	8	8	-	5	6	6	4	61	
FA 04	Preventing Forest Fragmentation and Protecting and Resoring Lake and Stream Habitat in the St. Louis River Watershed	10	6	8	8	8	8	6	5	5	5	69	
FA 05	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership, Ph. IV	9	8	8	8	8	7	7	9	5	4	73	
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County, Ph. IV	9	8	8	8	7	6	7	8	4	4	69	
FRE 01	DNR Accelerated Forest Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Program, Ph. III	6	4	4	5	5	6	3	5	4	6	48	
FRE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative, Ph. II	6	6	6	5	5	8	8	8	5	5	62	
FRE 03	Defending the St. Croix Riverway from the Bittersweet Onslaught	2	2	2	-	-	8	5	6	3	2	30	
WA 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership, Ph. V	10	10	9	10	8	10	6	8	8	8	87	
WA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Production Area Acquisition, Ph. V	9	9	9	10	9	10	8	6	8	8	86	
WA 03	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection Program, Ph. III	10	10	9	9	8	4	8	3	4	5	70	
WA 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Program, Ph. II	10	10	8	9	8	6	9	10	8	6	84	
WA 05	McGregor Marsh Wetland Protection	10	10	8	8	8	-	9	9	5	5	72	

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservations plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute.	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
WA 06	Wetland Habitat Protection Program	10	10	8	9	8	8	6	7	5	4	75	
WRE 01	Acceleratated Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement, Ph. V	10	10	8	8	8	2	5	5	5	5	66	
WRE 02	Pelican Lake Enhancement	8	6	6	6	6	3	2	6	6	6	55	
WRE 03	Albert Lea Lake Management and Invasive Species Control Structure	4	5	5	5	5	9	5	5	5	5	53	
WRE 04	Goose Lake Restoration and Carp Exclusion Project	6	4	4	4	5	9	5	5	5	5	52	
HA 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat, Ph. V	9	6	6	7	6	-	6	2	5	4	51	
HA 02	Habitat Protection in Dakota County, Ph. IV	9	8	7	7	5	10	6	3	5	5	65	
HA 03	Root River Protection and Restoration	8	7	8	6	6	7	5	3	4	5	59	
HA 04	Metro Big Rivers, Ph. IV	6	2	5	6	7	8	7	3	4	5	53	
HA 05	Minnesota Landscape Arboretum: Acquisition on Property Surrounding Lake Tamarack	6	3	4	4	3	10	4	2	4	4	44	
HA 06	Critical Shroeland Habitat Protection Program, Ph. II	8	5	5	5	4	8	4	2	5	5	51	
HRE 01	Wildlife Habitat Restoration and Enhancement in Metropolitan Regional Parks System	4	2	4	5	2	4	4	2	4	4	35	
HRE 02	Duluth 2012 Flood: Stream Habitat Restoration Program	2	6	2	2	3	10	2	3	4	5	39	
HRE 03	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership, Ph. III	2	3	2	2	2	10	4	4	5	4	38	
HRE 04	Lake Zumbro Habitat Restoration Project	2	2	2	2	3	-	3	3	4	4	25	
HRE 05	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Ph. IV	9	9	8	8	8	-	6	9	9	9	75	
HRE 06	Developing a National Destination for Trout Angling Cold Water Enthusiasts	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	21	
TOTAL											2396		

Do not complete the evaluation criteria for the following funding requests. Indicate if they should be recommended for a hearing.

	Recommend for Hearing (Y or N)	
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Ph. V	Y
X 02	Contract Management	Y
X 03	Restoration Evaluations	Y
X 04	High-Priority Tansaction Service Acceleration for LSOHC	Y

Member Name

Ron Schara

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-10. **1=Strongly Disagree through 10=Strongly Agree**

Maximum score per request is **100 points**.

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

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

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservation plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute.	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
PA 01	Grasslands for the Future	8	8	8	6	8	7	7	5	8	5	70	
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Acquisition, Ph. V	8	8	8	8	8	6	7	7	8	8	76	
PA 03	DNR Wildlife Management Area, Scientific and Natural Area, and Native Prairie Bank Easement Program, Ph. V	8	6	8	7	8	5	6	5	5	5	63	
PA 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project, Ph. IV	8	8	8	8	8	9	9	5	8	8	79	High Personnel Costs
PA 05	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Ph. III	8	8	8	8	8	9	5	7	8	8	77	See reduced gen fund
PA 06	Green Corridors, Ph. V	8	8	8	8	8	9	8	8	8	8	81	
PA 07	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex, Ph. III	8	6	8	8	8	5	8	9	8	7	75	
PRE 01	DNR Grasslands, Ph. V	8	8	8	8	8	6	7	7	7	8	75	peronnel high?
FA 01	Minnesota Forest for the Future/State Forests, Ph. IV	8	5	6	8	8	6	7	7	8	8	71	
FA 02	Young Forest Conservation	6	5	6	6	7	8	8	6	5	6	63	
FA 03	The Camp Ripley Partnership: Protecting the Mighty Mississippi, Ph. III	6	5	5	5	6	8	8	5	6	6	60	
FA 04	Preventing Forest Fragmentation and Protecting and Resoring Lake and Stream Habitat in the St. Louis River Watershed	6	5	5	4	4	5	5	8	5	5	52	
FA 05	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership, Ph. IV	8	7	8	7	8	8	8	7	5	7	73	
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County, Ph. IV	6	5	6	8	6	8	8	8	7	6	68	
FRE 01	DNR Accelerated Forest Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Program, Ph. III	7	5	6	8	6	5	8	6	8	7	66	high water tests
FRE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative, Ph. II	5	5	7	5	6	5	8	7	6	7	61	
FRE 03	Defending the St. Croix Riverway from the Bittersweet Onslaught	6	7	8	6	7	5	8	8	6	8	69	
WA 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership, Ph. V	8	8	8	8	8	10	8	8	8	8	82	
WA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Production Area Acquisition, Ph. V	8	8	8	8	8	10	8	8	8	8	82	
WA 03	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection Program, Ph. III	8	8	8	8	8	9	8	8	8	8	81	
WA 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Program, Ph. II	8	7	8	8	8	7	8	8	8	8	78	

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservations plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute.	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
WA 05	McGregor Marsh Wetland Protection	8	8	8	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	81	
WA 06	Wetland Habitat Protection Program	8	8	8	9	8	9	8	8	8	8	83	
WRE 01	Acceleratated Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement, Ph. V	9	8	8	9	8	9	8	8	8	8	83	
WRE 02	Pelican Lake Enhancement	6	6	8	5	8	7	8	8	6	8	70	
WRE 03	Albert Lea Lake Management and Invasive Species Control Structure	8	8	8	7	8	6	8	8	8	8	77	
WRE 04	Goose Lake Restoration and Carp Exclusion Project	8	8	8	8	8	7	8	8	8	8	79	
HA 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat, Ph. V	6	6	8	8	8	6	8	7	7	8	72	
HA 02	Habitat Protection in Dakota County, Ph. IV	7	5	8	7	8	5	8	8	8	8	72	
HA 03	Root River Protection and Restoration	8	9	8	8	8	9	8	8	8	8	82	
HA 04	Metro Big Rivers, Ph. IV	8	7	8	8	9	10	8	8	8	8	82	
HA 05	Minnesota Landscape Arboretum: Acquisition on Property Surrounding Lake Tamarack	6	5	6	6	8	10	8	8	8	8	73	
HA 06	Critical Shroeland Habitat Protection Program, Ph. II	6	5	7	8	7	8	8	7	8	8	72	
HRE 01	Wildlife Habitat Restoration and Enhancement in Metropolitan Regional Parks System	5	5	6	5	6	8	8	8	8	8	67	
HRE 02	Duluth 2012 Flood: Stream Habitat Restoration Program	6	7	7	8	7	9	7	8	8	8	75	
HRE 03	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership, Ph. III	8	6	8	8	8	10	7	8	8	8	79	
HRE 04	Lake Zumbro Habitat Restoration Project	8	8	8	8	8	9	7	8	8	8	80	
HRE 05	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Ph. IV	8	6	7	8	8	5	8	8	8	8	74	
HRE 06	Developing a National Destination for Trout Angling Cold Water Enthusiasts	5	5	5	7	5	6	8	8	8	8	65	
TOTAL												2868	

Do not complete the evaluation criteria for the following funding requests. Indicate if they should be recommended for a hearing.

		Recommend for Hearing (Y or N)
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Ph. V	y
X 02	Contract Management	n
X 03	Restoration Evaluations	y
X 04	High-Priority Tansaction Service Acceleration for LSOHC	y

Member Name

Tom Saxhaug

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-10. **1=Strongly Disagree through 10=Strongly Agree**

Maximum score per request is **100 points**.

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

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

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservation plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
PA 01	Grasslands for the Future	10	10	10	10	10	1	5	4	10	10	80	
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Acquisition, Ph. V	2	5	10	10	5	2	5	2	1	1	43	
PA 03	DNR Wildlife Management Area, Scientific and Natural Area, and Native Prairie Bank Easement Program, Ph. V	6	5	10	10	5	1	5	7	1	1	51	
PA 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project, Ph. IV	8	5	10	10	5	4	5	9	10	10	76	
PA 05	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Ph. III	8	5	10	10	5	7	5	3	1	5	59	
PA 06	Green Corridors, Ph. V	3	5	10	10	10	1	5	3	1	5	53	
PA 07	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex, Ph. III	2	10	10	10	10	2	10	4	5	5	68	
PRE 01	DNR Grasslands, Ph. V	8	10	10	10	5	1	5	9	1	10	69	
FA 01	Minnesota Forest for the Future/State Forests, Ph. IV	8	10	10	10	10	2	10	9	10	5	84	
FA 02	Young Forest Conservation	8	5	10	10	5	5	10	9	10	10	82	
FA 03	The Camp Ripley Partnership: Protecting the Mighty Mississippi, Ph. III	8	5	10	10	1	1	10	8	10	10	73	
FA 04	Preventing Forest Fragmentation and Protecting and Resoring Lake and Stream Habitat in the St. Louis River Watershed	10	10	10	10	10	1	10	5	10	10	86	
FA 05	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership, Ph. IV	1	5	10	10	10	2	10	8	1	5	62	
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County, Ph. IV	10	10	10	10	10	2	10	8	10	5	85	
FRE 01	DNR Accelerated Forest Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Program, Ph. III	10	10	10	10	10	1	10	9	1	5	76	
FRE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative, Ph. II	10	7	10	10	10	4	10	9	5	10	85	
FRE 03	Defending the St. Croix Riverway from the Bittersweet Onslaught	5	7	5	10	10	4	10	9	1	1	62	
WA 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership, Ph. V	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	8	10	10	98	

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservations plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
WA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Production Area Acquisition, Ph. V	10	10	10	10	10	8	10	3	10	1	82	
WA 03	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection Program, Ph. III	2	3.00	10	10	10	2	10	1	10	10	68	
WA 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Program, Ph. II	7	3.00	10	10	5	2	10	7	1	10	65	
WA 05	McGregor Marsh Wetland Protection	4	10.00	10	10	10	1	10	8	10	10	83	
WA 06	Wetland Habitat Protection Program	10	3	10	10	10	5	10	7	10	10	85	
WRE 01	Accelerated Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement, Ph. V	10	7	10	10	10	1	10	9	1	1	69	
WRE 02	Pelican Lake Enhancement	10	7	10	10	10	1	5	9	1	10	73	
WRE 03	Albert Lea Lake Management and Invasive Species Control Structure	5	10	5	5	5	6	10	9	10	5	70	
WRE 04	Goose Lake Restoration and Carp Exclusion Project	5	10	5	5	5	5	10	9	5	5	64	
HA 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat, Ph. V	8	3	10	10	10	1	5	8	1	1	57	
HA 02	Habitat Protection in Dakota County, Ph. IV	3	10	10	10	5	6	10	1	10	5	70	
HA 03	Root River Protection and Restoration	7	10	10	10	10	3	10	7	10	10	87	
HA 04	Metro Big Rivers, Ph. IV	4	7	10	10	5	4	10	4	5	1	60	
HA 05	Minnesota Landscape Arboretum: Acquisition on Property Surrounding Lake Tamarack	10	10	10	10	5	10	10	1	10	10	86	
HA 06	Critical Shoreland Habitat Protection Program, Ph. II	10	3	10	10	1	8	10	7	10	5	74	
HRE 01	Wildlife Habitat Restoration and Enhancement in Metropolitan Regional Parks System	10	10	10	10	10	3	10	6	5	5	79	
HRE 02	Duluth 2012 Flood: Stream Habitat Restoration Program	10	10	10	10	10	6	10	1	5	10	82	
HRE 03	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership, Ph. III	10	7	10	10	10	10	10	7	5	1	80	
HRE 04	Lake Zumbro Habitat Restoration Project	10	7	10	10	10	10	10	1	10	10	88	
HRE 05	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Ph. IV	10	9	10	10	10	1	10	1	5	10	76	
HRE 06	Developing a National Destination for Trout Angling Cold Water Enthusiasts	1	1	10	10	1	3	10	1	10	1	48	
TOTAL												2838	

Do not complete the evaluation criteria for the following funding requests. Indicate if they should be recommended for a hearing.

		Recommend for Hearing (Y or N)
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Ph. V	Y
X 02	Contract Management	Y
X 03	Restoration Evaluations	Y
X 04	High-Priority Transaction Service Acceleration for LSOHC	Y

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-10. 1=Strongly Disagree through 10=Strongly Agree

Maximum score per request is 100 points.

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

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

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservation plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
PA 01	Grasslands for the Future	10	6	10	9	10	0	10	7	6	9	77	
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Acquisition, Ph. V	9	9	9	10	9	9	10	6	5	8	84	
PA 03	DNR Wildlife Management Area, Scientific and Natural Area, and Native Prairie Bank Easement Program, Ph. V	10	9	10	10	10	0	9	8	2	2	70	
PA 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project, Ph. IV	10	10	9	9	10	10	8	7	6	6	85	
PA 05	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Ph. III	10	9	9	9	8	10	10	6	5	8	84	
PA 06	Green Corridors, Ph. V	10	5	6	6	5	0	6	5	5	5	53	
PA 07	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex, Ph. III	10	9	9	10	8	3	8	9	5	5	76	
PRE 01	DNR Grasslands, Ph. V	8	6	10	9	9	0	2	2	5	5	56	
FA 01	Minnesota Forest for the Future/State Forests, Ph. IV	10	6	9	9	8	4	2	8	5	5	66	
FA 02	Young Forest Conservation	10	7	7	9	8	10	4	7	5	5	72	
FA 03	The Camp Ripley Partnership: Protecting the Mighty Mississippi, Ph. III	10	7	9	9	9	0	5	6	7	5	67	
FA 04	Preventing Forest Fragmentation and Protecting and Resoring Lake and Stream Habitat in the St. Louis River Watershed	10	6	8	8	8	8	6	5	5	5	69	
FA 05	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership, Ph. IV	9	9	9	8	8	7	8	9	5	5	77	
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County, Ph. IV	8	8	7	7	7	6	6	7	5	4	65	
FRE 01	DNR Accelerated Forest Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Program, Ph. III	5	4	4	5	5	6	7	5	4	6	51	
FRE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative, Ph. II	8	8	7	6	6	9	8	8	6	6	72	
FRE 03	Defending the St. Croix Riverway from the Bittersweet Onslaught	2	3	2	0	1	8	5	6	2	2	31	
WA 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership, Ph. V	10	10	9	9	10	8	6	8	8	9	87	
WA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Production Area Acquisition, Ph. V	9	9	9	10	9	10	8	6	8	7	85	Todd Co Commissioners are in a land purchase discussion with PF/DU. Would like discussion.

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservation plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
WA 03	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection Program, Ph. III	10	9	9	9	8	5	7	3	4	5	69	
WA 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Program, Ph. II	10	10	8	9	8	7	9	10	8	6	85	
WA 05	McGregor Marsh Wetland Protection	10	9	9	8	8	0	9	9	5	6	73	
WA 06	Wetland Habitat Protection Program	10	10	8	9	8	8	5	6	6	5	75	
WRE 01	Acceleratated Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement, Ph. V	10	10	8	8	9	2	6	6	6	6	71	
WRE 02	Pelican Lake Enhancement	8	5	5	5	6	4	2	6	5	6	52	
WRE 03	Albert Lea Lake Management and Invasive Species Control Structure	4	5	6	6	7	9	6	6	5	5	59	
WRE 04	Goose Lake Restoration and Carp Exclusion Project	6	4	4	4	5	9	5	4	6	5	52	
HA 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat, Ph. V	9	5	5	7	6	0	6	3	6	5	52	
HA 02	Habitat Protection in Dakota County, Ph. IV	9	9	7	7	6	10	6	4	5	5	68	
HA 03	Root River Protection and Restoration	8	7	8	6	6	6	7	6	4	4	62	
HA 04	Metro Big Rivers, Ph. IV	6	4	6	5	7	9	7	3	4	6	57	
HA 05	Minnesota Landscape Arboretum: Acquisition on Property Surrounding Lake Tamarack	7	5	7	7	7	10	6	6	5	5	65	With followup, I learned there will be special white tail hunting on property.
HA 06	Critical Shroeland Habitat Protection Program, Ph. II	8	5	5	5	4	8	4	3	5	5	52	
HRE 01	Wildlife Habitat Restoration and Enhancement in Metropolitan Regional Parks System	4	2	3	4	2	4	4	2	5	5	35	
HRE 02	Duluth 2012 Flood: Stream Habitat Restoration Program	3	6	3	3	3	10	2	3	4	5	42	
HRE 03	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership, Ph. III	2	3	2	2	3	10	3	4	4	5	38	
HRE 04	Lake Zumbro Habitat Restoration Project	2	2	2	3	3	0	3	3	4	4	26	
HRE 05	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Ph. IV	10	10	9	8	8	0	7	8	9	9	78	
HRE 06	Developing a National Destination for Trout Angling Cold Water Enthusiasts	2	2	1	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	23	
TOTAL											2461		

Do not complete the evaluation criteria for the following funding requests. Indicate if they should be recommended for a hearing.

	Recommend for Hearing (Y or N)	
X 01	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Ph. V	y
X 02	Contract Management	y
X 03	Restoration Evaluations	y
X 04	High-Priority Tansaction Service Acceleration for LSOHC	y