

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2019/FY 2020

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 XI	9	11	6	13	6	6	7	3	2	4	67	
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XI	9	11	6	13	6	6	7	3	3	4	68	
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase IX	9	14	9	13	9	7	7	4	5	5	82	
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase X	9	10	6	10	4	4	5	2	7	3	60	
P A 05	Lower Wild Rice Corridor Habitat Restoration - Phase II	10	15	10	14	10	9	10	5	9	5	97	
P A 06	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition - Phase III	10	15	10	14	10	9	10	5	9	5	97	
P A 07	RIM Grasslands Reserve	9	9	6	9	6	3	6	3	2	5	58	
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase V	9	12	7	13	6	4	6	4	2	5	68	
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement - Phase XI	10	14	8	13	6	4	6	4	2	5	72	
P RE 02	Anoka Sand Hill Plain Habitat Restoration - Phase VI	9	11	7	13	7	7	5	3	9	3	74	
P RE 03	Fairmont Chain of Lakes Habitat Restoration - Phase I	10	14	10	14	10	9	10	5	9	5	96	
F A 01	Protecting Stategic Forestlands Near Camp Ripley	10	12	9	12	9	9	10	5	10	5	91	
F A 02	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase VII	9	11	8	13	6	7	7	4	9	5	79	
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase VII	10	14	9	14	8	8	8	5	7	5	88	
F RE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River - Phase III	9	11	8	9	7	4	6	3	3	5	65	
F RE 02	Enhanced Public Land - Open Landscapes	10	14	9	14	9	7	7	4	5	5	84	
F RE 03	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase I	10	14	9	14	8	9	8	5	5	5	87	
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XI	8	11	8	10	7	7	7	3	8	5	74	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase VIII	10	14	9	10	9	7	8	4	7	5	83	
W A 03	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase IV	8	12	8	10	8	7	7	4	8	5	77	
W A 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase VI	10	15	10	14	10	9	10	5	2	5	90	
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase XI	10	14	8	10	8	7	8	5	2	5	77	
W RE 02	Marsh Lake - Phase III	10	15	9	14	10	9	9	5	2	5	88	
W RE 03	Restoration of Non-Native Cattail Dominated Wetlands in Border Waters	10	15	10	14	8	10	9	5	9	5	95	
W RE 04	Big Rice Lake Wild Rice Enhancement	10	15	9	14	9	9	9	5	3	5	88	
H A 01	St. Coix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase I	10	14	9	14	8	9	9	5	7	5	90	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2019/FY 2020

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	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers - Phase IX	9	14	9	14	10	9	9	5	8	5	92	
H A 03	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration - Phase VII	9	13	10	13	8	9	10	4	10	5	91	
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase V	10	14	9	13	8	8	8	3	9	5	87	
H A 05	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration	10	14	8	13	8	8	8	4	9	5	87	
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Colwater Fish Habitat Enhancement - Phase XI	8	11	7	12	7	8	7	4	7	5	76	
H RE 02	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	10	14	10	14	8	8	9	4	8	5	90	
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	10	14	9	14	9	8	10	4	5	5	88	
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase IV	7	10	8	12	7	6	7	3	5	5	70	
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Restoration Program - Phase VIII	9	12	8	12	9	8	8	3	5	5	79	
H RE 06	Pine River Fish Passage Project 2020	10	15	10	13	9	9	9	4	8	5	92	
H RE 07	Sauk River Dam Fish Passage	10	15	10	14	9	9	10	4	8	5	94	
H RE 08	Restoration of Norway Brook connectivity to the Pine River by removal of Norway Lake Dam and replacement with rock-arch rapids	10	15	10	14	9	9	10	4	8	5	94	
H RE 09	Cedar River Habitat Restoration	10	15	10	14	8	9	10	4	9	5	94	
H RE 10	Pig's Eye Lake Island Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	10	14	9	14	8	8	10	4	10	5	92	
H RE 11	Protecting Acquatic Habitats Through Watercraft Cleaning Technology and Community Outreach	7	9	7	12	7	6	6	4	10	5	73	
H RE 12	Restoring the Upper Mississippi River at Lake Pepin - Phase I	6	9	6	10	7	7	7	2	10	5	69	Can \$\$ be spent here?
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program: Statewide and Metro Habitat - Phase XI	10	15	10	14	7	8	10	3	10	4	91	
O1	Contract Management 2019	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
O2	Restoration Evaluations	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	

*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 2019/FY 2020

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 XI	10	13	10	14	9	7	9	4	0	4	80	Will all acquisitions be restored with this project budget? Shouldn't IDP be paid for/covered by the other (partner) projects?
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XI	10	13	10	13	9	9	9	4	7	5	89	Will all acquisitions be restored with this project budget?
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase IX	10	13	10	13	9	6	9	4	9	4	87	
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase X	10	13	10	14	10	9	9	4	9	5	93	
P A 05	Lower Wild Rice Corridor Habitat Restoration - Phase II	10	10	10	12	9	7	9	4	9	5	85	
P A 06	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition - Phase III	6	9	7	13	7	7	9	4	1	2	65	
P A 07	RIM Grasslands Reserve	10	12	9	12	9	8	9	4	0	5	78	
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase V	10	14	10	14	9	7	9	4	1	5	83	
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement - Phase XI	7	14	10	14	9	9	9	3	0	3	78	
P RE 02	Anoka Sand Hill Plain Habitat Restoration - Phase VI	10	13	10	13	9	4	9	3	9	4	84	
P RE 03	Fairmont Chain of Lakes Habitat Restoration - Phase I	5	7	6	7	8	7	4	2	0	3	49	What are the rest of the Phases - long term goal? What's the plan for long-term carp management? Why is there so much excavation? what type of wetlands are created by this - is it a restoration of Type 1? is there enough elevation change or barrier into the wetland to prevent carp from entering in flood conditions?
F A 01	Protecting Statagic Forestlands Near Camp Ripley	7	13	10	14	9	7	5	4	10	3	82	What are the county management plans/intentions for trails? will trails be mapped prior to entering into a purchase agreement?
F A 02	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase VII	7	14	10	14	10	7	9	4	4	3	82	
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase VII	10	13	10	13	10	9	9	3	7	5	89	
F RE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River - Phase III	5	10	10	13	9	9	7	4	5	5	77	
F RE 02	Enhanced Public Land - Open Landscapes	10	12	9	13	8	7	8	3	1	4	75	
F RE 03	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase I	8	10	10	14	9	6	6	3	10	3	79	
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XI	8	14	10	14	10	10	9	4	10	5	94	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase VIII	10	14	10	15	10	10	9	4	1	4	87	
W A 03	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase IV	10	13	10	13	9	9	9	3	9	4	89	Will the new wetland easements be restored/enhanced as part of this project?
W A 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase VI	10	12	10	13	9	10	9	3	0	4	80	
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase XI	8	14	10	13	10	10	9	4	2	3	83	
W RE 02	Marsh Lake - Phase III	5	10	7	13	9	7	6	0	0	0	57	Project completion is before any approved appropriation would even be available. Questions regarding cost overruns, contractor selection, estimated project costs with only 25% completion rate.
W RE 03	Restoration of Non-Native Cattail Dominated Wetlands in Border Waters	7	5	7	13	7	9	0	2	3	3	56	Is the Initiative Foundation match OHF dollars? I am highly skeptical that this is a long-term solution. However, the prohibition to chemical application in "Outstanding Natural Resource Value Waters" is a real conundrum. Due to these considerations, the quality of resource is declining. While this is not the applicants issue to respond to, it seems a like there should be a larger discussion regarding pros/cons and risks/rewards.

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2019/FY 2020

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	
W RE 04	Big Rice Lake Wild Rice Enhancement	8	12	6	12	9	7	7	2	0	4	67	What happens to the equipment? Who owns it and how will it be used after the pickerel weed is under control? Why isn't there any match? Explain the scaling issues regarding likelihood of success transferring small scale projects which have worked to this very large scale project - risks, assurances, gaps in knowledge, etc.?
H A 01	St. Coix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase I	7	12	8	13	9	7	8	3	5	3	75	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers - Phase IX	10	12	7	13	7	7	8	4	10	3	81	
H A 03	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration - Phase VII	10	12	8	11	9	9	7	3	10	4	83	
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase V	10	13	9	12	9	9	8	4	10	4	88	
H A 05	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration	9	12	9	13	9	9	9	4	9	4	87	
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Colwater Fish Habitat Enhancement - Phase XI	7	13	7	12	9	7	8	4	9	4	80	The easements obtained should be restored within this project plan.
H RE 02	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	10	14	8	13	9	9	9	4	5	4	85	Need information on the Phelps Dam project.
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	10	14	7	12	8	7	8	3	1	3	73	
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase IV	7	14	9	13	8	7	8	4	3	3	76	Will each phase be bid out separately? The mention of reduced mobilization costs by continuing with this phase makes me curious as to the bidding process.
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Restoration Program - Phase VIII	10	13	9	14	10	9	10	3	5	4	87	
H RE 06	Pine River Fish Passage Project 2020	10	12	8	13	9	8	9	5	6	5	85	
H RE 07	Sauk River Dam Fish Passage	10	12	7	13	9	9	10	5	9	5	89	
H RE 08	Restoration of Norway Brook connectivity to the Pine River by removal of Norway Lake Dam and replacement with rock-arch rapids	10	11	5	13	7	8	9	5	7	5	80	
H RE 09	Cedar River Habitat Restoration	10	5	5	5	3	5	5	3	10	5	56	There is no mention of any species. There is a lack of clarity to what the habitat improvement ROI is; what is the actual improvement to any species? What's the connection to the watershed, upstream/downstream, and the long-term goal of this area which is a focus for this city. The proposal reads more like a dam improvement/water quality project.
H RE 10	Pig's Eye Lake Island Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	9	8	8	13	9	7	7	4	10	5	80	
H RE 11	Protecting Acquatic Habitats Through Watercraft Cleaning Technology and Community Outreach	5	0	3	9	6	4	0	2	10	0	39	
H RE 12	Restoring the Upper Mississippi River at Lake Pepin - Phase I	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	This project is outside of the state and does not result in protected, enhanced, or restored natural resources in the state.
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program: Statewide and Metro Habitat - Phase XI	10	13	10	14	9	9	7	5	8	4	89	
O1	Contract Management 2019	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
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 2019/FY 2020

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 XI	7	9	7	10	8	4	7	2	1	3	58	
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XI	7	10	7	11	8	5	6	2	2	3	61	
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase IX	6	8	8	11	8	4	6	3	2	3	59	
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase X	6	8	8	11	7	4	6	3	2	3	58	
P A 05	Lower Wild Rice Corridor Habitat Restoration - Phase II	9	13	9	14	9	10	9	4	9	5	91	
P A 06	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition - Phase III	8	11	7	12	8	10	9	3	8	4	80	
P A 07	RIM Grasslands Reserve	9	13	9	13	8	9	9	4	1	5	80	
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase V	7	8	7	9	7	4	7	2	2	3	56	
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement - Phase XI	9	13	8	14	9	7	7	4	1	4	76	
P RE 02	Anoka Sand Hill Plain Habitat Restoration - Phase VI	9	13	8	13	8	8	8	4	3	4	78	
P RE 03	Fairmont Chain of Lakes Habitat Restoration - Phase I	9	13	9	13	9	8	8	5	4	4	82	
F A 01	Protecting Stategic Forestlands Near Camp Ripley	8	10	7	11	9	5	8	3	5	4	70	
F A 02	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase VII	7	9	8	10	8	4	7	3	5	4	65	
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase VII	9	13	8	12	8	5	7	3	6	4	75	
F RE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River - Phase III	9	12	8	11	8	5	7	2	6	4	72	
F RE 02	Enhanced Public Land - Open Landscapes	9	12	8	12	8	6	5	3	3	4	70	
F RE 03	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase I	8	11	8	11	8	6	6	3	7	4	72	
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XI	6	9	6	9	7	4	5	2	2	2	52	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase VIII	8	10	8	10	8	6	7	3	2	4	66	
W A 03	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase IV	8	11	7	10	8	6	7	3	3	4	67	
W A 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase VI	9	13	8	12	8	8	7	4	1	4	74	
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase XI	9	12	8	12	8	9	7	4	1	4	74	
W RE 02	Marsh Lake - Phase III	9	14	9	12	9	9	8	5	1	4	80	
W RE 03	Restoration of Non-Native Cattail Dominated Wetlands in Border Waters	6	10	5	8	6	4	5	1	2	2	49	
W RE 04	Big Rice Lake Wild Rice Enhancement	9	12	9	13	7	8	7	4	2	4	75	
H A 01	St. Coix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase I	8	10	7	10	7	7	7	3	6	4	69	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2019/FY 2020

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	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers - Phase IX	8	10	8	10	8	7	7	3	7	4	72	
H A 03	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration - Phase VII	9	13	8	13	8	9	8	4	8	4	84	
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase V	8	11	7	11	7	8	7	3	7	4	73	
H A 05	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration	8	12	7	12	7	8	8	4	7	4	77	
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Colwater Fish Habitat Enhancement - Phase XI	7	11	6	11	7	6	6	3	5	4	66	
H RE 02	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	8	12	8	11	7	7	7	3	3	4	70	
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	7	12	7	11	7	7	8	4	1	4	68	
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase IV	7	11	7	10	7	7	7	4	4	4	68	
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Restoration Program - Phase VIII	9	12	8	12	8	8	8	4	4	4	77	
H RE 06	Pine River Fish Passage Project 2020	9	12	8	12	7	9	8	4	5	4	78	
H RE 07	Sauk River Dam Fish Passage	9	13	8	12	8	9	8	5	8	4	84	
H RE 08	Restoration of Norway Brook connectivity to the Pine River by removal of Norway Lake Dam and replacement with rock-arch rapids	9	13	8	13	7	9	8	5	8	4	84	
H RE 09	Cedar River Habitat Restoration	9	13	9	13	8	8	8	5	5	4	82	
H RE 10	Pig's Eye Lake Island Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	9	13	9	13	9	8	8	5	10	4	88	
H RE 11	Protecting Acquatic Habitats Through Watercraft Cleaning Technology and Community Outreach	9	12	7	12	8	8	8	4	6	4	78	
H RE 12	Restoring the Upper Mississippi River at Lake Pepin - Phase I	9	13	9	13	9	9	9	5	10	5	91	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program: Statewide and Metro Habitat - Phase XI	10	14	9	13	10	10	10	5	9	5	95	
O1	Contract Management 2019	9	14	9	13	9	9	9	4	9	4	89	
O2	Restoration Evaluations	9	14	9	13	9	9	9	4	9	4	89	

*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 2019/FY 2020

David Hartwell													
		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 XI	10	15	10	15	10	8	8	3	0	1	80	proposal indicates fee protion but written description says "develop" which seems inconsistant in the use of constitutional funds for habitat protection. High personnel, contracts and DSS for a fee purchase proposal.
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XI	10	13	10	12	10	8	8	3	1	4	79	
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase IX	8	13	10	13	10	8	8	3	2	1	76	- DSS at \$600K which seems very high for \$4M of personnel and contracts - Really two proposals and should be broken apart - (acquisition 800 acres) and restoration/enhancement (43,500 acres) - what would the DSS be for each part?
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase X	9	15	10	15	10	8	10	3	2	5	87	
P A 05	Lower Wild Rice Corridor Habitat Restoration - Phase II	9	13	10	12	10	7	10	4	2	4	81	what are the professional services for?
P A 06	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition - Phase III	8	13	10	12	10	7	8	3	1	3	75	
P A 07	RIM Grasslands Reserve	8	13	10	10	10	7	8	3	0	4	73	
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase V	9	13	10	12	10	8	8	3	1	3	77	
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement - Phase XI	8	10	10	12	10	7	5	2	0	3	67	DSS is high - \$600K
P RE 02	Anoka Sand Hill Plain Habitat Restoration - Phase VI	8	10	10	12	10	7	8	3	2	3	73	Describe contract work by each partner
P RE 03	Fairmont Chain of Lakes Habitat Restoration - Phase I	8	12	7	5	10	5	5	1	2	4	59	Educational and Recreational opportunities is not within the constitutional mandate. Very little benefit (# of northern pike) for the dollars spent which is the justification they are making for the project.
F A 01	Protecting Statigic Forestlands Near Camp Ripley	8	12	10	10	10	7	8	4	5	3	77	DNR IDP - \$250K???
F A 02	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase VII	8	13	10	15	10	8	8	3	1	3	79	Contracts by MLT?
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase VII	8	10	10	12	10	7	8	3	2	2	72	Seems like the Forest Legacy coordinator budgt is supplanting
F RE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River - Phase III	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	COI	0	0
F RE 02	Enhanced Public Land - Open Landscapes	7	10	7	10	5	7	7	2	1	5	61	
F RE 03	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase I	7	7	7	10	10	7	5	2	3	3	61	how does climate change tie into the planning for this work? If the goal is to create "viable timber harvests" is this proposal about habitat or economic benefits for timber companies and governmental agencies generating revenue from selling timber on public land? DSS is high.
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XI	10	13	8	15	10	10	10	3	3	5	87	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase VIII	10	13	8	15	10	8	7	3	1	4	79	
W A 03	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase IV	10	13	9	15	10	9	9	3	2	5	85	
W A 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase VI	8	15	10	12	10	8	8	3	0	4	78	are the acreage totals for land or land and water?
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase XI	7	10	7	10	10	7	7	3	0	3	64	Shallow lakes specialists seems like suplanting.
W RE 02	Marsh Lake - Phase III	4	10	5	5	5	5	5	2	0	0	41	Do not understand why a 6 month delay results in such a cost. WE funded this project to be 100% done in prior rounds. Is the contractor not on the hook for getting the work done as bid?
W RE 03	Restoration of Non-Native Cattail Dominated Wetlands in Border Waters	6	10	5	10	10	7	5	2	4	2	61	how is acreage measured. Lakes effected or acres of cattails removed with restoration afterward? How do you plan on dealing with the seed bank of cattails to avoid regrowth? - Excessive personnel and DSS cost.

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2019/FY 2020

[illegible]

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2019/FY 2020

Jane 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 XI	10	13	10	12	9	5	7	4	0	4	74	
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XI	10	13	10	12	9	5	7	4	1	4	75	
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase IX	10	12	10	12	9	7	7	4	2	4	77	
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase X	10	12	10	12	9	5	7	4	2	3	74	Historic & estimated \$/easement?
P A 05	Lower Wild Rice Corridor Habitat Restoration - Phase II	10	12	10	11	9	7	8	3	3	5	78	How many easements? Need map with Reaches A-F. Good stewardship. Historic & estimated \$/easement?
P A 06	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition - Phase III	9	9	10	8	9	5	7	4	0	3	64	Wildlife species? Why 4-yr grant admin? Prioritize parcels. NO on Capital Equip.
P A 07	RIM Grasslands Reserve	10	11	10	12	9	5	8	5	0	3	73	Historic \$/easement? \$336K/easement.
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase V	10	12	10	7	9	6	7	4	1	4	70	
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement - Phase XI	9	5	8	10	9	5	7	3	0	3	59	
P RE 02	Anoka Sand Hill Plain Habitat Restoration - Phase VI	9	7	9	12	9	8	9	4	2	3	72	Historic & estimated \$/easement? Good easement stewardship. Actual Historic leverage?
P RE 03	Fairmont Chain of Lakes Habitat Restoration - Phase I	5	3	1	2	6	1	3	1	0	2	24	Why NOT scalable? Repeat of previous unfunded 2016/ML17/FY19 proposal. Leverage incorrect - should be \$30K max.
F A 01	Protecting Stategic Forestlands Near Camp Ripley	9	5	5	5	7	5	7	2	3	3	51	Why 4 years? Leverage guaranteed?
F A 02	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase VII	10	10	9	9	5	5	7	2	2	3	62	Historic & estimated \$/easement? Actual Historic leverage?
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase VII	10	10	8	9	8	4	7	4	2	4	66	Historic & estimated \$/easement?
F RE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River - Phase III	9	7	9	9	8	5	6	3	1	4	61	Prioritize parcels. Leverage confirmed?
F RE 02	Enhanced Public Land - Open Landscapes	9	7	8	10	8	6	6	4	1	5	64	
F RE 03	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase I	8	8	8	11	8	5	5	3	3	3	62	HIGH supplies/materials/Admin/DSS
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XI	10	13	10	10	8	5	7	4	4	4	75	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase VIII	10	12	10	12	9	4	7	4	1	3	72	
W A 03	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase IV	10	10	10	7	8	5	8	4	3	3	68	Historic & estimated \$/easement?
W A 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase VI	9	12	9	10	8	6	6	4	0	4	68	Historic & estimated \$/easement?
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase XI	9	7	9	6	7	4	6	4	0	3	55	HIGH travel & admin
W RE 02	Marsh Lake - Phase III	10	12	9	8	7	5	7	4	0	4	66	NOT scalable. Why 0 acres - how many impacted?
W RE 03	Restoration of Non-Native Cattail Dominated Wetlands in Border Waters	8	3	3	8	0	4	5	3	5	4	43	HIGH DSS. Not for floating mats.
W RE 04	Big Rice Lake Wild Rice Enhancement	8	3	3	3	5	2	2	1	0	3	30	HIGH travel/admin/equip. Permanent? NO buying equipment to use elsewhere.
H A 01	St. Coix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase I	7	9	8	10	7	8	8	3	1	3	64	What R&E activities? Where? Actual Historic MLT leverage?

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2019/FY 2020

Jane 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	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers - Phase IX	8	10	9	3	8	6	7	4	3	3	61	Historic & estimated \$/easement? 88+ FTEs?
H A 03	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration - Phase VII	9	4	3	7	10	7	9	3	5	3	60	Historic & estimated \$/easement? No park acquisitions.
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase V	9	10	8	5	5	5	6	4	3	4	59	What R&E activities? Where? Actual Historic leverage?
H A 05	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration	8	6	6	7	8	8	9	3	2	4	61	Estimated \$/easement? DNR approval & permit?
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Colwater Fish Habitat Enhancement - Phase XI	10	9	8	5	6	7	7	3	2	4	61	Historic & estimated \$/easement? Actual Historic leverage?
H RE 02	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	8	8	7	5	7	4	5	4	1	3	52	
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	8	9	8	5	6	3	6	3	1	4	53	No targeted species....sturgeon? Actual Historic leverage?
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase IV	6	7	7	5	4	2	2	2	1	3	39	Lower travel & admin than last year, still HIGH. Actual Historic leverage?
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Restoration Program - Phase VIII	6	6	7	7	7	5	6	2	1	3	50	No DNR permit
H RE 06	Pine River Fish Passage Project 2020	9	8	7	10	7	4	6	3	1	3	58	NOT scalable. Only 1 ac impacted? DNR approval & permit? AIS passage?
H RE 07	Sauk River Dam Fish Passage	10	8	5	10	7	1	1	4	2	2	50	NOT scalable. DNR approval & permit? AIS passage? Assuming FUTURE OHF for outcome maintenance, not budgeted here.
H RE 08	Restoration of Norway Brook connectivity to the Pine River by removal of Norway Lake Dam and replacement with rock-arch rapids	10	9	7	5	5	3	2	5	1	3	50	NOT scalable. DNR approval & permit? Dock/sidewalk/rails ineligible. AIS passage?
H RE 09	Cedar River Habitat Restoration	9	2	1	1	0	2	3	1	5	2	26	NOT scalable. HIGH supplies/materials. DNR approval & permit? AIS passage?
H RE 10	Pig's Eye Lake Island Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	9	10	7	10	6	8	8	3	10	4	75	Why NOT scalable? DNR approval & permit? Doesn't make sense until CoE decides on upstream dams.
H RE 11	Protecting Acquatic Habitats Through Watercraft Cleaning Technology and Community Outreach	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	12	130 FTEs? UNCONSTITUTIONAL.
H RE 12	Restoring the Upper Mississippi River at Lake Pepin - Phase I	9	7	4	6	7	3	2	1	5	3	47	100% Construction - should be contracts. Budget correction needed. DNR approval & permit? Where's the WI match? Doesn't make sense until CoE decides on upstream dams.
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program: Statewide and Metro Habitat - Phase XI	9	7	8	8	5	3	7	3	2	3	55	
O1	Contract Management 2019	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
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 2019/FY 2020

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 XI	7	10	8	13	6	7	8	4	7	3	73	PH1 ? ...
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XI	7	13	7	13	8	8	8	3	6	4	77	
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase IX	6	10	6	11	7	7	6	3	6	3	65	
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase X	6	10	6	10	6	6	6	3	7	3	63	Hunting?
P A 05	Lower Wild Rice Corridor Habitat Restoration - Phase II	8	13	8	12	6	8	8	3	8	4	78	Science based? Results at conclus...
P A 06	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition - Phase III	8	13	7	14	8	8	8	4	5	4	79	leverage... group size/backing
P A 07	RIM Grasslands Reserve	6	11	6	11	6	6	6	3	3	3	61	lev/map 11 of 11
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase V	7	13	6	13	8	7	7	3	3	3	70	
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement - Phase XI	7	11	8	11	6	6	6	3	4	3	65	
P RE 02	Anoka Sand Hill Plain Habitat Restoration - Phase VI	7	12	7	10	6	7	6	3	7	4	69	
P RE 03	Fairmont Chain of Lakes Habitat Restoration - Phase I	9	13	6	12	6	8	8	4	8	4	78	Species?
F A 01	Protecting Stategic Forestlands Near Camp Ripley	8	13	8	12	7	8	7	3	10	5	81	
F A 02	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase VII	7	11	6	10	6	6	7	3	5	3	64	
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase VII	7	11	7	12	6	7	7	3	6	3	69	
F RE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River - Phase III	8	13	6	11	8	8	8	4	6	4	76	
F RE 02	Enhanced Public Land - Open Landscapes	8	13	8	13	8	8	8	4	6	4	80	
F RE 03	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase I	7	12	7	12	7	8	7	3	8	4	75	
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XI	8	13	6	13	8	9	8	4	8	4	81	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase VIII	9	13	8	12	8	8	8	4	5	4	79	
W A 03	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase IV	8	12	7	12	7	7	8	4	7	4	76	
W A 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase VI	6	11	6	11	6	7	7	3	2	2	61	
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase XI	6	10	6	10	6	7	8	3	2	3	61	
W RE 02	Marsh Lake - Phase III	9	13	8	14	9	8	9	4	3	4	81	
W RE 03	Restoration of Non-Native Cattail Dominated Wetlands in Border Waters	8	13	8	13	8	9	8	4	5	5	81	national Park? Can they receive state funding? Should they? G
W RE 04	Big Rice Lake Wild Rice Enhancement	8	13	7	13	9	8	8	4	5	4	79	
H A 01	St. Coix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase I	8	12	8	11	9	8	7	4	7	4	78	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2019/FY 2020

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	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers - Phase IX	6	10	6	10	6	5	5	3	7	3	61	
H A 03	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration - Phase VII	7	11	7	8	8	6	6	3	9	3	68	
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase V	9	13	8	13	8	8	7	4	8	4	82	
H A 05	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration	8	14	8	14	8	8	8	4	7	4	83	
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Colwater Fish Habitat Enhancement - Phase XI	7	11	7	12	7	6	6	3	7	4	70	
H RE 02	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	7	10	7	11	6	6	7	2	6	4	66	
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	7	10	6	9	6	6	6	3	5	3	61	
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase IV	6	6	6	12	9	4	4	3	4	2	56	
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Restoration Program - Phase VIII	8	13	8	13	8	7	8	4	6	4	79	
H RE 06	Pine River Fish Passage Project 2020	10	14	9	14	8	8	8	5	6	5	87	
H RE 07	Sauk River Dam Fish Passage	9	14	9	14	8	7	7	5	8	5	86	
H RE 08	Restoration of Norway Brook connectivity to the Pine River by removal of Norway Lake Dam and replacement with rock-arch rapids	10	14	9	14	9	9	8	4	8	5	90	
H RE 09	Cedar River Habitat Restoration	8	13	9	14	8	8	8	4	9	4	85	
H RE 10	Pig's Eye Lake Island Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	8	13	9	13	8	8	8	4	8	5	84	
H RE 11	Protecting Acquatic Habitats Through Watercraft Cleaning Technology and Community Outreach	8	7	6	13	5	3	4	2	6	4	58	
H RE 12	Restoring the Upper Mississippi River at Lake Pepin - Phase I	8	13	8	13	8	8	8	4	10	4	84	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program: Statewide and Metro Habitat - Phase XI	8	13	8	13	8	8	8	4	7	5	82	
O1	Contract Management 2019	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
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 2019/FY 2020

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 XI	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XI	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase IX	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase X	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	
P A 05	Lower Wild Rice Corridor Habitat Restoration - Phase II	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	
P A 06	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition - Phase III	8	13	8	13	8	9	9	4	9	4	85	
P A 07	RIM Grasslands Reserve	8	13	8	13	8	9	9	4	9	4	85	
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase V	8	13	8	13	8	8	8	3	8	3	80	
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement - Phase XI	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	
P RE 02	Anoka Sand Hill Plain Habitat Restoration - Phase VI	8	13	8	13	8	9	9	4	9	4	85	
P RE 03	Fairmont Chain of Lakes Habitat Restoration - Phase I	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	
F A 01	Protecting Stategic Forestlands Near Camp Ripley	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	
F A 02	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase VII	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase VII	8	13	8	13	8	9	9	4	9	4	85	
F RE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River - Phase III	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	
F RE 02	Enhanced Public Land - Open Landscapes	8	13	8	13	8	9	9	4	9	4	85	
F RE 03	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase I	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XI	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase VIII	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	
W A 03	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase IV	8	13	8	13	8	9	9	4	9	4	85	
W A 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase VI	8	13	8	13	8	9	9	4	9	4	85	
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase XI	8	13	8	13	8	9	9	4	9	4	85	
W RE 02	Marsh Lake - Phase III	8	13	8	13	8	9	9	4	9	4	85	
W RE 03	Restoration of Non-Native Cattail Dominated Wetlands in Border Waters	8	13	8	13	8	8	8	3	8	3	80	
W RE 04	Big Rice Lake Wild Rice Enhancement	8	13	8	13	8	9	9	4	9	4	85	
H A 01	St. Coix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase I	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2019/FY 2020

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	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers - Phase IX	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	
H A 03	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration - Phase VII	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase V	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	
H A 05	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration	8	13	8	13	8	8	8	3	8	3	80	
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Colwater Fish Habitat Enhancement - Phase XI	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	
H RE 02	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	8	13	8	13	8	9	9	4	9	4	85	
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	8	13	8	13	8	9	9	4	9	4	85	
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase IV	8	13	8	13	8	9	9	4	9	4	85	
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Restoration Program - Phase VIII	8	13	8	13	8	8	8	3	8	3	80	
H RE 06	Pine River Fish Passage Project 2020	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	
H RE 07	Sauk River Dam Fish Passage	8	13	8	13	8	9	9	4	9	4	85	
H RE 08	Restoration of Norway Brook connectivity to the Pine River by removal of Norway Lake Dam and replacement with rock-arch rapids	8	13	8	13	8	9	9	4	9	4	85	
H RE 09	Cedar River Habitat Restoration	8	13	8	13	8	9	9	4	9	4	85	
H RE 10	Pig's Eye Lake Island Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	
H RE 11	Protecting Acquatic Habitats Through Watercraft Cleaning Technology and Community Outreach	8	13	8	13	8	7	7	2	7	2	75	
H RE 12	Restoring the Upper Mississippi River at Lake Pepin - Phase I	8	13	8	13	8	8	8	3	8	3	80	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program: Statewide and Metro Habitat - Phase XI	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	
O1	Contract Management 2019	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	
O2	Restoration Evaluations	9	14	9	14	9	9	9	4	9	4	90	

*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 2019/FY 2020

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 XI	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	4	5	5	94	
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XI	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	4	7	5	96	
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase IX	10	12	10	15	10	10	10	3	8	3	91	
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase X	10	13	10	12	10	10	7	2	6	5	85	
P A 05	Lower Wild Rice Corridor Habitat Restoration - Phase II	10	12	8	11	10	7	8	3	7	4	80	
P A 06	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition - Phase III	8	13	10	15	9	8	10	5	4	2	84	
P A 07	RIM Grasslands Reserve	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 V	6	7	10	10	6	7	10	3	4	3	66	
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement - Phase XI	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
P RE 02	Anoka Sand Hill Plain Habitat Restoration - Phase VI	7	11	8	12	8	9	7	3	8	3	76	
P RE 03	Fairmont Chain of Lakes Habitat Restoration - Phase I	10	15	10	14	9	9	8	5	8	5	93	
F A 01	Protecting Stategic Forestlands Near Camp Ripley	9	12	7	12	10	10	9	3	10	3	85	
F A 02	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase VII	7	12	8	11	7	8	10	4	6	3	76	
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase VII	8	12	10	11	7	10	10	4	8	4	84	
F RE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River - Phase III	10	13	9	12	10	8	8	5	8	5	88	
F RE 02	Enhanced Public Land - Open Landscapes	10	15	8	13	9	8	8	5	8	5	89	
F RE 03	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase I	10	12	8	13	10	9	8	5	8	5	88	
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XI	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	4	7	4	95	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase VIII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	4	5	5	94	
W A 03	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase IV	10	13	10	13	10	8	9	4	9	4	90	
W A 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase VI	10	13	8	12	9	8	8	3	9	3	83	
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase XI	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
W RE 02	Marsh Lake - Phase III	10	15	8	15	10	7	7	5	10	3	90	
W RE 03	Restoration of Non-Native Cattail Dominated Wetlands in Border Waters	10	12	8	15	10	6	6	3	10	4	84	
W RE 04	Big Rice Lake Wild Rice Enhancement	10	10	7	11	9	7	7	3	4	3	71	
H A 01	St. Coix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase I	10	13	10	12	8	7	8	3	6	3	80	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2019/FY 2020

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	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers - Phase IX	8	10	8	12	10	6	10	3	8	3	78	
H A 03	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration - Phase VII	9	12	8	12	8	8	9	4	7	3	80	
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase V	8	10	9	11	10	6	9	5	7	3	78	
H A 05	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration	8	12	10	11	8	7	7	4	7	3	77	
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Colwater Fish Habitat Enhancement - Phase XI	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
H RE 02	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	10	14	9	15	10	9	9	5	6	3	90	
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	7	10	10	12	8	10	10	5	10	3	85	
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase IV	4	12	9	12	10	3	9	5	5	3	72	
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Restoration Program - Phase VIII	10	11	9	12	7	8	10	5	6	3	81	
H RE 06	Pine River Fish Passage Project 2020	8	13	9	15	10	8	10	5	7	5	90	
H RE 07	Sauk River Dam Fish Passage	7	12	8	15	10	8	9	3	8	3	83	
H RE 08	Restoration of Norway Brook connectivity to the Pine River by removal of Norway Lake Dam and replacement with rock-arch rapids	9	13	9	15	10	8	10	4	6	5	89	
H RE 09	Cedar River Habitat Restoration	9	11	9	13	9	8	9	4	9	4	85	
H RE 10	Pig's Eye Lake Island Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	9	12	9	11	7	8	7	3	10	4	80	
H RE 11	Protecting Acquatic Habitats Through Watercraft Cleaning Technology and Community Outreach	5	10	5	10	5	7	7	5	4	5	63	
H RE 12	Restoring the Upper Mississippi River at Lake Pepin - Phase I	10	13	8	13	8	6	6	5	10	5	84	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program: Statewide and Metro Habitat - Phase XI	10	13	9	13	10	10	10	5	8	4	92	
O1	Contract Management 2019	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
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 2019/FY 2020

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 XI	8	12	8	15	8	8	8	3	0	5	75	PA projects show severe discrepancies in estimated land/ wetland acquisition prices????
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XI	8	12	8	15	8	8	8	3	5	5	80	
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase IX	9	15	10	15	8	8	8	5	7	5	90	
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase X	8	12	10	15	8	8	10	5	7	5	88	
P A 05	Lower Wild Rice Corridor Habitat Restoration - Phase II	9	15	10	12	8	8	10	5	8	5	90	
P A 06	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition - Phase III	8	15	8	15	8	8	8	4	2	5	81	
P A 07	RIM Grasslands Reserve	9	12	10	15	8	8	8	4	0	5	79	
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase V	8	12	8	15	8	8	8	3	2	5	77	
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement - Phase XI	8	10	8	15	8	8	5	3	0	3	68	
P RE 02	Anoka Sand Hill Plain Habitat Restoration - Phase VI	8	10	8	12	8	8	5	3	7	5	74	
P RE 03	Fairmont Chain of Lakes Habitat Restoration - Phase I	8	10	8	10	8	8	5	5	5	5	72	not scalable
F A 01	Protecting Stategic Forestlands Near Camp Ripley	8	10	8	5	5	5	5	3	10	5	64	
F A 02	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase VII	8	12	8	12	8	8	8	3	5	5	77	
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase VII	8	12	8	12	8	5	8	3	7	5	76	
F RE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River - Phase III	8	10	8	10	5	8	3	5	5	5	67	
F RE 02	Enhanced Public Land - Open Landscapes	8	8	8	12	8	5	8	3	2	5	67	
F RE 03	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase I	5	8	5	8	5	3	3	3	8	5	53	
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XI	10	15	8	12	8	5	8	5	10	5	86	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase VIII	10	12	8	12	8	8	8	3	2	5	76	
W A 03	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase IV	10	12	8	12	8	5	8	3	8	5	79	
W A 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase VI	8	12	8	10	8	8	8	3	0	5	70	
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase XI	10	12	8	12	8	5	8	3	0	5	71	
W RE 02	Marsh Lake - Phase III	10	12	10	15	10	8	10	3	0	5	83	
W RE 03	Restoration of Non-Native Cattail Dominated Wetlands in Border Waters	5	5	5	8	5	5	5	3	10	5	56	
W RE 04	Big Rice Lake Wild Rice Enhancement	5	8	8	8	5	5	5	3	0	5	52	
H A 01	St. Coix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase I	5	8	8	8	3	3	5	3	5	5	53	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers - Phase IX	8	10	8	10	3	5	5	3	8	5	65	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2019/FY 2020

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 03	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration - Phase VII	10	12	8	8	8	8	10	3	10	5	82	
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase V	8	12	8	12	8	8	8	3	8	5	80	
H A 05	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration	8	15	8	12	8	8	8	5	8	5	85	
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Colwater Fish Habitat Enhancement - Phase XI	10	15	8	10	8	10	8	3	8	5	85	
H RE 02	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	8	12	8	12	8	8	10	3	5	5	79	
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	8	10	5	10	8	5	8	3	2	5	64	
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase IV	5	10	5	10	5	5	8	5	3	5	61	bulk of project appears to be surveys, etc. and not much actual habitat improving? Or lack of habitat details?
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Restoration Program Phase VIII	8	12	8	12	8	8	5	3	5	5	74	
H RE 06	Pine River Fish Passage Project 2020	8	10	8	12	8	5	8	3	5	5	72	
H RE 07	Sauk River Dam Fish Passage	10	12	8	12	8	8	8	5	8	5	84	
H RE 08	Restoration of Norway Brook connectivity to the Pine River by removal of Norway Lake Dam and replacement with rock-arch rapids	10	10	8	12	8	8	8	5	5	5	79	
H RE 09	Cedar River Habitat Restoration	5	8	8	5	0	5	8	3	10	5	57	Failed to list any fish species aided by this project???
H RE 10	Pig's Eye Lake Island Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	10	10	8	12	8	8	8	5	10	5	84	
H RE 11	Protecting Acquatic Habitats Through Watercraft Cleaning Technology and Community Outreach	5	3	0	10	3	0	3	3	3	5	35	This is not a project that fits Lessard Sams habitat emphasis. Emphasis is on equipment, education, etc. Nothing requires boaters to use decontamination units??
H RE 12	Restoring the Upper Mississippi River at Lake Pepin - Phase I	12	12	8	12	8	5	8	5	10	5	85	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program: Statewide and Metro Habitat - Phase XI											100	
O1	Contract Management 2019	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	
O2	Restoration Evaluations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	

*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 2019/FY 2020

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 XI	9	14	10	11	9	6	8	3	0	4	74	
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XI	10	14	9	12	9	6	8	5	3	4	80	
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase IX	6	13	9	12	10	7	10	3	5	4	79	
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase X	6	13	8	12	10	7	8	3	6	3	76	
P A 05	Lower Wild Rice Corridor Habitat Restoration - Phase II	7	11	7	10	8	8	8	2	8	4	73	
P A 06	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition - Phase III	8	13	7	13	8	6	8	4	2	5	74	
P A 07	RIM Grasslands Reserve	9	11	8	12	9	7	8	3	0	4	71	
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase V	8	13	7	15	8	6	8	5	4	5	79	
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement - Phase XI	6	10	6	10	9	6	6	3	0	4	60	
P RE 02	Anoka Sand Hill Plain Habitat Restoration - Phase VI	9	13	9	13	8	7	5	3	3	4	74	
P RE 03	Fairmont Chain of Lakes Habitat Restoration - Phase I	8	10	7	10	10	6	6	4	4	4	69	
F A 01	Protecting Stategic Forestlands Near Camp Ripley	7	12	7	10	8	7	9	3	5	4	72	
F A 02	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase VII	8	13	8	12	6	8	7	3	5	4	74	
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase VII	6	13	7	11	7	6	8	3	5	5	71	
F RE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River - Phase III	6	8	7	10	7	6	5	0	4	3	56	
F RE 02	Enhanced Public Land - Open Landscapes	9	13	7	11	7	8	5	3	3	4	70	
F RE 03	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase I	5	10	6	13	7	6	7	3	3	3	63	
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XI	8	15	10	14	9	8	9	4	10	5	92	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase VIII	9	15	10	14	9	7	8	4	5	5	86	
W A 03	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase IV	5	13	8	13	9	8	8	4	5	4	77	
W A 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase VI	9	13	8	14	9	8	9	4	0	4	78	
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase XI	7	13	9	14	8	7	7	5	2	5	77	
W RE 02	Marsh Lake - Phase III	8	13	5	13	8	9	8	5	0	3	72	
W RE 03	Restoration of Non-Native Cattail Dominated Wetlands in Border Waters	7	10	7	13	8	9	3	2	5	1	65	
W RE 04	Big Rice Lake Wild Rice Enhancement	6	10	8	13	8	9	3	2	0	2	61	
H A 01	St. Coix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase I	8	10	7	10	5	7	9	3	2	3	64	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2019/FY 2020

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	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers - Phase IX	9	12	7	7	7	7	8	2	9	4	72	
H A 03	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration - Phase VII	8	12	8	9	10	6	9	2	8	4	76	
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase V	9	11	10	8	7	6	10	3	7	5	76	
H A 05	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration	8	8	7	5	9	9	9	3	2	2	62	
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Colwater Fish Habitat Enhancement - Phase XI	9	14	9	12	10	9	10	4	9	4	90	
H RE 02	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	6	12	5	10	7	6	6	3	3	3	61	
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	9	13	9	13	9	5	8	4	6	4	80	
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase IV	5	14	9	13	8	8	8	3	7	4	79	
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Restoration Program - Phase VIII	8	10	9	12	10	8	8	3	3	4	75	
H RE 06	Pine River Fish Passage Project 2020	5	10	5	5	5	5	8	2	2	4	51	
H RE 07	Sauk River Dam Fish Passage	7	10	2	2	3	6	8	2	5	2	47	
H RE 08	Restoration of Norway Brook connectivity to the Pine River by removal of Norway Lake Dam and replacement with rock-arch rapids	7	8	2	3	5	5	8	2	2	3	45	
H RE 09	Cedar River Habitat Restoration	7	7	2	2	2	4	8	2	8	5	47	
H RE 10	Pig's Eye Lake Island Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	8	6	3	3	5	4	5	2	8	4	48	Does this restoration project to increase migratory bird populations (3x indicated in proposal) in this location conflict with FAA & DoD objectives?
H RE 11	Protecting Acquatic Habitats Through Watercraft Cleaning Technology and Community Outreach	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
H RE 12	Restoring the Upper Mississippi River at Lake Pepin - Phase I	5	8	5	10	8	8	2	2	5	5	58	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program: Statewide and Metro Habitat - Phase XI	9	8	8	13	7	8	9	3	1	4	70	
O1	Contract Management 2019	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
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 2019/FY 2020

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 XI	10	15	10	15	10	10	9	5	1	5	90	
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XI	10	15	10	15	10	10	9	5	3	5	92	
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase IX	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	2	5	92	
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase X	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	2	5	92	
P A 05	Lower Wild Rice Corridor Habitat Restoration - Phase II	10	16	10	15	10	10	10	5	3	5	94	
P A 06	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition - Phase III	8	15	8	15	8	5	10	5	1	3	78	Wetland cost high!Park? Wetland cost high.
P A 07	RIM Grasslands Reserve	10	15	10	15	10	8	10	5	0	5	88	
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase V	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	2	5	92	
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement - Phase XI	10	15	10	15	10	10	8	5	0	5	88	
P RE 02	Anoka Sand Hill Plain Habitat Restoration - Phase VI	10	15	10	15	10	9	6	5	3	5	88	
P RE 03	Fairmont Chain of Lakes Habitat Restoration - Phase I	5	8	6	9	6	5	8	3	3	0	53	Park? Hiugh wetland cost
F A 01	Protecting Stategic Forestlands Near Camp Ripley	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
F A 02	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase VII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	6	5	96	
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase VII	10	15	10	15	10	10	8	5	6	5	94	
F RE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River - Phase III	10	15	10	15	8	8	8	5	4	4	87	
F RE 02	Enhanced Public Land - Open Landscapes	10	15	10	12	8	3	5	3	1	3	70	
F RE 03	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase I	10	15	10	15	10	8	6	3	3	3	83	High DDS and personnel.
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XI	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase VIII	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	6	5	96	
W A 03	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase IV	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	8	5	98	
W A 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase VI	10	15	10	15	6	6	10	5	0	3	80	
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase XI	10	15	10	15	8	6	6	4	0	4	78	Narative says \$576,000 form travel, chart says \$100,000
W RE 02	Marsh Lake - Phase III	10	15	10	15	8	6	8	5	10	5	92	
W RE 03	Restoration of Non-Native Cattail Dominated Wetlands in Border Waters	10	15	10	15	7	6	7	5	10	5	90	
W RE 04	Big Rice Lake Wild Rice Enhancement	10	15	10	15	8	6	7	4	0	4	79	
H A 01	St. Coix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase I	10	15	10	15	8	8	8	4	6	4	88	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2019/FY 2020

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	
H A 02	Metro Big Rivers - Phase IX	10	15	10	15	5	8	8	3	8	5	87	
H A 03	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration - Phase VII	10	15	10	15	10	10	9	4	10	5	98	
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase V	10	15	10	15	10	9	9	5	10	4	97	
H A 05	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration	10	15	10	15	10	9	9	5	6	4	93	
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Colwater Fish Habitat Enhancement - Phase XI	10	15	10	15	10	10	9	5	7	4	95	
H RE 02	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	10	15	10	15	10	9	9	5	5	4	92	
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	10	15	10	15	8	8	5	3	2	3	79	
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase IV	10	15	10	15	10	9	10	5	4	4	92	
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Restoration Program - Phase VIII	10	15	10	15	8	9	10	4	3	4	88	Will a public access be built?
H RE 06	Pine River Fish Passage Project 2020	10	15	10	15	8	8	9	4	3	3	85	
H RE 07	Sauk River Dam Fish Passage	6	6	5	6	4	4	4	1	1	1	38	Park?
H RE 08	Restoration of Norway Brook connectivity to the Pine River by removal of Norway Lake Dam and replacement with rock-arch rapids	5	6	5	6	4	4	4	1	1	1	37	Park?
H RE 09	Cedar River Habitat Restoration	5	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	6	1	17	Recreation? Educational?
H RE 10	Pig's Eye Lake Island Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	2	10	5	97	
H RE 11	Protecting Acquatic Habitats Through Watercraft Cleaning Technology and Community Outreach	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	3	14	
H RE 12	Restoring the Upper Mississippi River at Lake Pepin - Phase I	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Come back when you have a project on Minnesota.
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program: Statewide and Metro Habitat - Phase XI	10	15	10	15	10	10	10	5	10	5	100	
O1	Contract Management 2019	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
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 2019/FY 2020

Sen. David Tomassoni													
		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 XI	7	7	6	8	7	8	6	2	0	3	54	
P A 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XI	6	7	7	9	7	7	5	3	1	2	54	
P A 03	MN Prairie Recovery Project - Phase IX	7	8	5	8	6	7	5	2	2	2	52	
P A 04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase X	6	8	6	7	6	7	7	3	2	2	54	
P A 05	Lower Wild Rice Corridor Habitat Restoration - Phase II	7	8	7	9	7	6	4	4	1	3	56	
P A 06	Martin County DNR WMA Acquisition - Phase III	8	9	7	10	8	7	5	3	0	3	60	
P A 07	RIM Grasslands Reserve	8	9	6	8	8	6	5	3	0	3	56	
P A 08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase V	7	10	7	10	8	8	6	4	0	3	63	
P RE 01	DNR Grassland Enhancement - Phase XI	8	8	8	12	8	7	6	5	0	3	65	
P RE 02	Anoka Sand Hill Plain Habitat Restoration - Phase VI	7	10	7	10	7	8	6	4	2	3	64	
P RE 03	Fairmont Chain of Lakes Habitat Restoration - Phase I	7	10	7	10	7	8	6	3	1	2	61	
F A 01	Protecting Stategic Forestlands Near Camp Ripley	7	12	7	10	7	6	6	4	10	3	72	
F A 02	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase VII	7	8	9	10	7	6	7	4	2	3	63	
F A 03	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase VII	8	12	8	12	8	8	7	5	3	3	74	
F RE 01	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River - Phase III	8	10	7	10	7	7	7	5	2	3	66	
F RE 02	Enhanced Public Land - Open Landscapes	7	12	8	12	8	8	8	5	1	3	72	
F RE 03	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase I	7	12	8	10	7	7	7	5	6	3	72	
W A 01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XI	8	12	8	10	8	8	8	5	7	3	77	
W A 02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection Program - Phase VIII	8	10	7	8	8	8	7	4	1	3	64	
W A 03	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase IV	7	10	7	7	7	7	8	4	3	3	63	
W A 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection - Phase VI	9	13	8	12	8	8	8	5	0	3	74	
W RE 01	Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement - Phase XI	7	11	8	7	7	8	7	4	0	3	62	
W RE 02	Marsh Lake - Phase III	7	10	8	7	7	8	7	5	0	3	62	
W RE 03	Restoration of Non-Native Cattail Dominated Wetlands in Border Waters	6	8	6	8	6	7	6	3	10	3	63	
W RE 04	Big Rice Lake Wild Rice Enhancement	9	14	9	13	9	9	9	5	0	3	80	
H A 01	St. Coix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase I	8	8	7	11	8	7	7	3	3	3	65	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2019/FY 2020

Sen. David Tomassoni													
		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 02	Metro Big Rivers - Phase IX	7	9	7	9	7	7	6	3	4	3	62	
H A 03	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration - Phase VII	8	10	8	7	8	8	7	4	9	3	72	
H A 04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase V	8	12	8	9	8	8	7	4	6	3	73	
H A 05	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration	9	12	7	9	8	7	8	4	2	3	69	
H RE 01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Colwater Fish Habitat Enhancement - Phase XI	8	12	9	8	9	8	8	4	3	3	72	
H RE 02	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	7	10	8	7	8	8	7	4	2	3	64	
H RE 03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative - Phase VI	7	10	8	7	8	8	7	4	2	3	64	
H RE 04	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation - Phase IV	9	12	8	12	8	8	9	4	4	5	79	
H RE 05	Shell Rock River Watershed Restoration Program - Phase VIII	9	12	8	12	8	8	9	4	4	4	78	
H RE 06	Pine River Fish Passage Project 2020	9	13	9	13	8	9	9	4	4	4	82	
H RE 07	Sauk River Dam Fish Passage	9	13	9	13	8	9	9	4	5	5	84	
H RE 08	Restoration of Norway Brook connectivity to the Pine River by removal of Norway Lake Dam and replacement with rock-arch rapids	9	13	9	13	8	9	9	4	2	5	81	
H RE 09	Cedar River Habitat Restoration	8	10	7	12	8	7	8	4	7	3	74	
H RE 10	Pig's Eye Lake Island Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	8	12	8	10	7	7	7	3	10	4	76	
H RE 11	Protecting Acquatic Habitats Through Watercraft Cleaning Technology and Community Outreach	9	13	9	13	8	8	8	4	5	4	81	
H RE 12	Restoring the Upper Mississippi River at Lake Pepin - Phase I	9	12	8	12	8	8	8	4	10	4	83	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program: Statewide and Metro Habitat - Phase XI	9	14	9	13	8	9	8	4	4	4	82	
O1	Contract Management 2019	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	
O2	Restoration Evaluations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	

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