Name: Jamie Becker-Finn Date: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m. Email to becky.enfield@lsohc.leg.mn Maximum score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest.* Criteria 1 Proposal abstract I2 Proposal provides a clear and addresses priority science-based 4. Proposal succinct overview of actions and addresses habitats targeting that that have significant the proposal outcomes of one o everages or activity, outputs, more of the xpands corridors value for wildlife 5. Proposal 6. Performance 10. Proposed and outcomes. species of greatest identifies indicator ecological sections and complexes, measures are budget is and is likely to clearly identified 9. Proposal includes appropriate to Proposal is clearly reduces conservation need, species and everage in funds or accomplish the written and produce and fragmentation or and/or threatened associated and have a specific 7. Proposal adequately emonstrate rotects areas or endangered uantities this plan for measuring outcomes will be Degree of timing/ other effort to outcomes describe significant and dentified in the MN species, and lists habitat will typically and evaluating addresses: Who, naintained over opportunistic supplement any n the scope of County Biological targeted species. Total Score What, Where, permanent OHF appropriation. work. support. outcomes. irgency. ID# **Program Title** Max points: 10 Out of 100 PA01 DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase XIII Phase 13, fee acquisition PA02 Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program, Phase 13, Pheasants Forever, asking for almost \$14m Phase XIII PA03 MN Prairie Recovery Program, Phase XI TNC, Phase 11 PA04 Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, TNC, Phase 12 Phase XII PA05 Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Phase 10, CAnnon River Watershed, TPL, Great River Greening Restoration Program, Phase X PA06 Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection, Phase VIII Phase 8, DNR RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Phase IX Phase 9, BWSR PA08 Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Phase 7, Prairie Chicken Society, PF Southern Red River Valley, Phase VII PA09 Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Phase 3. DU and PF Easement Program, Phase III PA10 Martin County WMA Acquisition, Phase V Phase 5. Fox Lake. Conservation Fund PA11 RIM Grassland Reserve, Phase III Phase 3, BWSR PRE01 DNR Grassland, Phase XIII (with Roving Crew) PRE01 DNR Grassland, Phase XIII PRE02 Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands, Phase V PREO Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation, Phase VII Great River Greening, NWTF, MLT, TNC FA01 TNC, blufflands Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration, 10.0 8.0 10.0 SE Forest 10.0 Phase IX FA02 Minnesota Forests for the Future, Phase VIII N&SE Forest DNR 10.0 10.0 10.0 FA03 Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB, Phase IX Morrison County SWCD, easement only, not open to public 8.0 7.0 FRE01 DNR Forest Enhancement DNR FRE02 Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Audubon Phase IV FRE03 Moose Habitat Collaborative, Phase IV - NE MN Forest Ruffed Grouse Society Habitat Enhancement Pheasants Forever, Phase 13 WA01 | Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase XIII WA02 Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration DU Program, Phase X WA03 RIM Wetlands, Phase X BWSR WA04 | Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program hase VI WA05 Wild Rice Shoreland Protection, Phase VII BWSR

Name: Jamie Becker-Finn Date: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m. Email to becky.enfield@lsohc.leg.mn Maximum score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest.* Criteria 1 Proposal abstract I2 Proposal provides a clear and addresses priority science-based 4. Proposal succinct overview of actions and addresses habitats targeting that that have significant the proposal outcomes of one o everages or activity, outputs, nore of the xpands corridors value for wildlife 5. Proposal 6. Performance 10. Proposed and outcomes. identifies indicator cological sections and complexes, species of greatest measures are oudget is and is likely to clearly identified 9. Proposal includes appropriate to Proposal is clearly reduces conservation need, species and everage in funds or accomplish the written and produce and fragmentation or and/or threatened associated and have a specific 7. Proposal adequately emonstrate rotects areas or endangered uantities this plan for measuring outcomes will be Degree of timing/ other effort to outcomes describe significant and dentified in the MN species, and lists addresses: Who, nabitat will typically and evaluating naintained over pportunistic supplement any n the scope of What, Where, County Biological targeted species. OHF appropriation. work. **Total Score** permanent support. outcomes. rgency. Comments ID# **Program Title** Max points: 10 10 10 Out of 100 10 10 10 10 10 10 WRE0 Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Phase 13, statewide 10 10 10 10 10 8 7 5 8 85 all Enhancements, Phase XIII (with Roving Habitat Crew) WREO Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Phase 13, statewide 10 9 10 10 10 8 7 7 5 84 8 Enhancements, Phase XIII (without Roving Habitat WREO Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Phase 7, Ducks Unlimited 10 10 10 7 10 6 7 4 7 78 prairie potho 7 Restoration Initiative, Phase VII HA01 St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and St Croix River Association, MN Land Trust, Trust for Public Land. Carlos Avery, Bayport WMAs. 10 10 10 8 10 7 7 7 85 letro/No. Fores 8 Restoration, Phase II HA02 Metro Big Rivers, Phase XI 10 10 10 7 10 90 10 8 8 8 Metro FIRST REQUEST, BWSR, Buffalo-Red River Watershed District, Wilkin SWCD HA03 Lower Otter Tail River Corridor Habitat Restoration -85 Prairie 10 9 10 10 7 7 10 7 7 8 Request 1 HA04 Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Northern Waters Land Trust, MLT - tullibee in deep cold water lakes in Cass County 91 orthern Forest 10 10 10 9 10 9 8 9 8 8 Minnesota Lakes. Phase VII TPL. BWSR. 8 SWCDs HA05 Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project, Phase 10 10 10 9 10 9 9 10 7 9 93 est/prairie trar HA06 Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological FIRST REQUEST, easements only, MLT ,Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance, NE part of state (Cass to Cook to rthern Forest Carlton) 10 10 10 8 10 7 7 10 9 89 Significance HA07 Rinarian Habitat Protection in the Kettle and Snake Pine County SWCD, sturgeon 10 10 10 9 10 7 84 orthern Forest 8 5 8 River Watersheds HA08 MNDNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements DNR, easement only, 11 miles trout stream, NE and SE rivers 10 10 10 7 10 8 10 7 9 **N&SE Forest** HA09 Targeted RIM Easement and Acquisition to the Parcel Crow Wing SWCD 10 93 orthern Forest 10 10 10 10 8 9 10 7 9 Level Pine and Leech Watersheds, Phase II HA10 Urban Woods and Prairies Initiative Moorhead, MN Audubon 10 10 10 7 10 8 9 9 9 91 Prairie Land Acquisition HRE01 Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Phase 13, leverage was all listed as expected (not confirmed) 10 9 10 7 10 7 6 5 6 8 78 Forest/metro Enhancement and Restoration, Phase XIII HRE02 DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, Phase 4, \$3.2m committed as leverage 10 10 10 10 8 7 10 10 8 90 statewide Phase IV HRE03 St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Phase VIII Phase 8, 10 7 10 10 7 10 8 7 8 7 84 orthern fore HRE04 Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program, Phase X Phase 10, Freeborn County 10 10 10 7 10 8 7 7 8 83 Prairie HRE05 Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation, Phase VI Phase 6, Lake & St Louis Counties 10 10 10 7 10 8 8 6 8 8 85 rthern for HRE06 Southeast Wetland Restoration, Phase II 10 10 10 9 82 Prairie Phase 2, Mankato. Like that its near a population center HRE07 Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection & 10 10 10 10 10 8 8 89 Prairie/forest Restoration, Phase II Phase 3, Douglas/Pope/Stearns/Todd, MLT, Pheasants Forever, TNC HRE08 Klondike Clean Water Retention Project, Phase I 10 10 10 7 10 8 6 10 8 86 Forest/prairie Phase 1. Kittson County HRE09 Targeted Culvert Replacement to Enhance Fish Passage 10 10 10 7 7 6 5 7 76 orthern fores First ask, Lake County, brook trout O1 DNR Roving Crews 10 83 10 10 8 10 8 6 7 5 9 statewide Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase 10 10 10 8 10 10 9 10 10 95 statewide KIII: Statewide and Metro Habitat

	:: Jamie Becker-Finn			,	,								
	: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m. Email to I	ecky.enfield@ls	ohc.leg.mn										
	num score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total S			a conflict of interest.*									
		4. Donor 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1	12. Daniel	12. Non-anni		Crit	eria						
		Proposal abstract	'	3. Proposal uses									
		provides a clear and		science-based	4. Proposal								
		succinct overview of			addresses habitats								
			outcomes of one or	-	that have significant								
		activity, outputs,	more of the			'	6. Performance				10. Proposed		
			ecological sections				measures are				budget is		
		Proposal is clearly	and is likely to		conservation need,	I .	clearly identified,			9. Proposal includes			
		written and	produce and				and have a specific			leverage in funds or	·		
		' '	demonstrate	· ·	or endangered	1 '		outcomes will be	8. Degree of timing/		outcomes described		
		addresses: Who,	significant and	identified in the MN	• •	habitat will typically	-	maintained over			in the scope of		
	I		permanent	County Biological			outcomes.	time.		OHF appropriation.		Total Score	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
02	Contract Management 2021											400	
												100	Fully fund
О3	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2021												
												100	Cully friend
													Fully fund

Name	: Kristin Eggerling											
Due Date	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.											
Maximum sc	ore per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fie	ld if not evaluating a pro	oposal due to a conflict o	of interest.*								
						Crit	eria					
		provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and	ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent	leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or	value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need,	5. Proposal identifies					10. Proposed budget	
		adequately addresses: Who,	conservation legacy and/or habitat		and/or threatened or endangered species,	associated quantities		outcomes will be			is appropriate to accomplish the	
		What, Where, When,	outcomes for fish,	County Biological	and lists targeted	this habitat will	measuring and	maintained over	opportunistic	supplement any OHF	outcomes described	Total
		Why, and How.	game and wildlife.				evaluating outcomes.		urgency.		in the scope of work.	Score Comments Out of
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100
PA01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase XIII	9	9	8	9	9	8	8	9	0	8	77
PA02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program, Phase XIII	9	9	8	9	9	8	8	9	9	7	85
PA03	MN Prairie Recovery Program, Phase XI	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	10	7	8	88
PA04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase XII	9	9	10	9	9	8	9	10	7	8	88
PA05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase X	9	9	8	9	9	8	8	10	7	8	85
PA06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection, Phase VIII	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	10	0	9	80
PA07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Phase IX	9	9	9	8	9	9	9	10	0	7	79
PA08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley, Phase VII	9	9	9	8	9	9	9	9	8	8	87
PA09	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program, Phase III	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	10	8	8	87
PA10	Martin County WMA Acquisition, Phase V	7	8	7	8	9	8	8	8	0	7	70
PA11	RIM Grassland Reserve, Phase III	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	0	8	79
PRE01a	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII (with Roving Crew)	8	9	9	9	9	8	8	10	0	8	78
PRE01b	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII	8	9	9	9	9	8	8	10	0	8	78
PRE02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands, Phase V	9	9	9	9	9	8	7	8	7	8	83
PRE03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation, Phase VII	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	9	8	8	86
FA01	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration, Phase IX	9	9.0	9.0	8.0	8.0	8	8	8	7	8	82

Name	: Kristin Eggerling												
	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
Maximum sco	ore per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fie	eld if not evaluating a pro	oposal due to a conflict	of interest.*									
			T	T	T	Cri	teria		T				T
		the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When,	ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish,	identified in the MN County Biological	value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted	indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will	measuring and	outcomes will be maintained over	opportunistic	leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF		Total	
ID#	Program Title	Why, and How. Max points: 10	game and wildlife. 10	Survey.	species.	typically support.	evaluating outcomes.	10	urgency.	appropriation.	in the scope of work.	Out of 100	Comments
FA02	Minnesota Forests for the Future, Phase VIII	8	9.0	9.0	9	9.0	8	8	8	6	8	82	
FA03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB, Phase IX	9	9.0	9	8	7.0	8	8	8	0	7	73	
FRE01	DNR Forest Enhancement	7	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	0	8	75	
FRE02	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase IV	8	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	7	8	86	
FRE03	Moose Habitat Collaborative, Phase IV - NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement	9	8	9	9	9	8	8	8	6	8	82	
WA01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase XIII	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	10	7	88	

	Muistin Faggading		0	- ,								
	Kristin Eggerling											
	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m. ore per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fie	old if not evaluating a pr	conocal due to a conflict (of interest *								
IVIAXIIIIUIII 3C	ore per request is 100 points. Effer COI in the Total score he	id if flot evaluating a pr	oposar due to a commet (or interest.		Crit	eria					
		Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity,	ecological sections and is likely to produce and	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands								
		outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When Why, and How.	conservation legacy and/or habitat	corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	and/or threatened or	associated quantities this habitat will	identified, and have a specific plan for	outcomes will be maintained over			10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100
WA02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program, Phase X	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	9	7	8	85
WA03	RIM Wetlands, Phase X	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	10	0	7	78
WA04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase VI	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	8	8	85
WA05	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection, Phase VII	9	8	8	9	9	8	8	8	0	8	75
WRE01a	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (with Roving Habitat Crew)	9	9	8	9	8	8	8	7	0	8	74
WRE01b	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (without Roving Habitat Crew)	9	9	8	9	8	8	8	7	0	8	74
WRE02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative, Phase VII	9	9	8	9	8	8	9	7	7	7	81
HA01	St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration, Phase II	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	7	8	86
HA02	Metro Big Rivers, Phase XI	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	9	8	88
HA03	Lower Otter Tail River Corridor Habitat Restoration - Request 1	9	9	8	9	9	8	9	9	8	8	86
HA04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes, Phase VII	9	9	9	9	8	8	9	9	7	8	85
HA05	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project, Phase V	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	6	7	84
HA06	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	8	8	87
HA07	Riparian Habitat Protection in the Kettle and Snake River Watersheds	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	0	8	79
HA08	MNDNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	9	9	9	8	8	8	9	8	0	8	76
HA09	Targeted RIM Easement and Acquisition to the Parcel Level Pine and Leech Watersheds, Phase II	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	0	8	80

Lessaru	-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Propo	osai Evaluation	Scoring Sheet	- IVIL 2021 / FY	2022								
Name	:: Kristin Eggerling												
Due Date:	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
	ore per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fie	eld if not evaluating a pr	oposal due to a conflict	of interest.*									
			1	T	1	Crit	teria		T	1			T
		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.	ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat	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.	value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or			outcomes will be maintained over	8. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	leverage in funds or other effort to	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
HA10	Urban Woods and Prairies Initiative Moorhead, MN Land Acquisition	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	9	8	88	
HRE01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase XIII	8	9	9	9	8	8	9	8	8	8	84	
HRE02	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, Phase IV	9	9	9	9	8	7	8	8	10	8	85	
HRE03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Phase VIII	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	8	7	8	85	
HRE04	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program, Phase X	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	8	7	7	84	
HRE05	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation, Phase VI	8	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	7	8	85	
HRE06	Southeast Wetland Restoration, Phase II	8	8	9	9	0	8	9	8	9	7	75	
HRE07	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection & Restoration, Phase II	10	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	7	8	88	
HRE08	Klondike Clean Water Retention Project, Phase I	9	9	9	9	8	8	9	8	10	8	87	
HRE09	Targeted Culvert Replacement to Enhance Fish Passage	9	9	9	9	8	8	9	8	6	8	83	
01	DNR Roving Crews	8	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	0	8	79	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase XIII: Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	91	
O2	Contract Management 2021	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	0	10	82	
О3	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2021							2				- 04	

Name: k	Kristin Eggerling											
	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.											
Maximum score	e per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fiel	ld if not evaluating a pro	posal due to a conflict of	of interest.*								
						Crit	eria					
			2. Proposal									
			addresses priority									
			actions and									
			outcomes of one or									
		1. Proposal abstract		3. Proposal uses								
		provides a clear and			4. Proposal							
		succinct overview of	"		addresses habitats							
		the proposal activity,	1	leverages or expands								
			I'		value for wildlife							
					species of greatest		6. Performance					
		is clearly written and	~			5. Proposal identifies				9. Proposal includes	10 Proposed hudget	
		•	I'	"		indicator species and		7 Proposal		leverage in funds or		
				identified in the MN			-	outcomes will be	8. Degree of timing/		accomplish the	
			1					maintained over				Total
		What, Where, When,	game and wildlife.	, ,					1	supplement any OHF		
		Why, and How.	garrie ariu Wildlife.	Survey.	species.	typically support.	evaluating outcomes.	ume.	urgency.	appropriation.	in the scope of work.	Score Comments Out of
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100
			1	l		l			L	l		100

Name	e: Rep. Dan Fabian											
Due Date	: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.											
Maximum so	ore per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fie	ld if not evaluating a pr	oposal due to a conflict	of interest.*								
				I		Crit	eria		T			
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who,	ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and		value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities	identified, and have a	7. Proposal outcomes will be		leverage in funds or	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the	
		What, Where, When,	1 '	County Biological				maintained over	opportunistic	supplement any OHF		Total
		Why, and How.	game and wildlife.	Survey.			evaluating outcomes.	time.	urgency.		in the scope of work.	Score Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100
PA01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase XIII	9	9	8	9	9	6	7	5	4	6	72
PA02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program, Phase XIII	9	8	8	8	9	7	7	6	4	6	72
PA03	MN Prairie Recovery Program, Phase XI	9	8	8	9	8	7	8	6	6	7	76
PA04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase XII	9	8	8	9	9	7	8	6	4	6	74
PA05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase X	9	9	8	9	9	5	7	7	6	7	76
PA06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection, Phase VIII	9	9	8	9	9	7	7	6	4	7	75
PA07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Phase IX	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	4	8	81
PA08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley, Phase VII	9	9	8	9	8	8	8	7	5	7	78
PA09	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program, Phase III	9	9	8	8	9	8	8	6	6	7	78
PA10	Martin County WMA Acquisition, Phase V	9	9	8	9	9	8	8	9	2	8	79
PA11	RIM Grassland Reserve, Phase III	9	9	8	8	8	7	7	6	2	8	72
PRE01a	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII (with Roving Crew)	9	10	9	9	9	8	8	9	6	8	85
PRE01b	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII	9	10	9	9	9	8	7	6	3	8	78
PRE02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands, Phase V	9	8	8	8	8	7	7	6	5	8	74
PRE03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation, Phase VII	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	6	8	83
FA01	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration, Phase IX	9	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	7	7	6	7	8	80

Name	: Rep. Dan Fabian												
Due Date	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
Maximum sc	ore per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fie	eld if not evaluating a pro	oposal due to a conflict	of interest.*									
			T	T		Cri	teria	Т	Т	Т	1		
													1
		the proposal activity, outputs, and	ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat		value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or		1	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over	8. Degree of timing/opportunistic	leverage in funds or	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described	Total	
		Why, and How.	game and wildlife.	Survey.	species.	typically support.	evaluating outcomes.	time.	urgency.	appropriation.	in the scope of work.		Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
FA02	Minnesota Forests for the Future, Phase VIII	9	8.0	8.0	7	8.0	7	7	4	3	7	68	
FA03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB, Phase IX	9	9.0	9	9	9.0	7	8	7	5	5	77	
FRE01	DNR Forest Enhancement	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	6	3	5	75	
FRE02	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase IV	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	7	6	6	81	
FRE03	Moose Habitat Collaborative, Phase IV - NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	8	3	8	81	
WA01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase XIII	9	9	9	9	9	8	7	6	8	7	81	

Lessard	-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Propo T	Sai Evaluation	Scoring Sheet	- IVIL 2021 / FY	2022								
Name	Rep. Dan Fabian												
	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
Maximum sc	ore per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fie	eld if not evaluating a pro	oposal due to a conflict	of interest.*		Cuit	eria					<u> </u>	
						Crit	eria			1			
		Proposal abstract	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or	3. Proposal uses									
		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.	ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat	science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas	value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species,	associated quantities this habitat will	identified, and have a specific plan for	outcomes will be maintained over		9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	is appropriate to accomplish the		Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	l
WA02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program, Phase X	9	9	9	9	9	7	7	6	4	6	75	
WA03	RIM Wetlands, Phase X	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	4	7	80	
WA04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase VI	9	9	9	9	9	7	8	6	7	7	80	
WA05	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection, Phase VII	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	7	4	8	80	
WRE01a	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (with Roving Habitat Crew)	9	10	9	9	9	8	8	9	6	8	85	
WRE01b	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (without Roving Habitat Crew)	9	9	9	9	9	8	7	6	3	8	77	
WRE02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative, Phase VII	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	7	6	7	81	
HA01	St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration, Phase II	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	6	7	8	82	
HA02	Metro Big Rivers, Phase XI	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	6	7	7	81	
HA03	Lower Otter Tail River Corridor Habitat Restoration - Request 1	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	8	7	8	85	
HA04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes, Phase VII	9	9	8	9	9	8	8	7	6	7	80	
HA05	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project, Phase V	9	9	9	9	9	7	8	6	6	7	79	
HA06	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance	9	9	9	8	9	8	7	6	7	7	79	
HA07	Riparian Habitat Protection in the Kettle and Snake River Watersheds	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	5	8	82	
HA08	MNDNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	9	9	9	9	9	7	8	6	4	8	78	
HA09	Targeted RIM Easement and Acquisition to the Parcel Level Pine and Leech Watersheds, Phase II	10	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	5	8	83	

Name: Rep. Dan Fabian Due Date: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m. Maximum score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest.* Criteria 2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or 1. Proposal abstract more of the 3. Proposal uses provides a clear and ecological sections science-based 4. Proposal succinct overview of and is likely to targeting that addresses habitats the proposal activity, produce and leverages or expands that have significant outputs, and demonstrate corridors and value for wildlife outcomes. Proposal significant and species of greatest 6. Performance complexes, reduces is clearly written and permanent fragmentation or conservation need, 5. Proposal identifies | measures are clearly 9. Proposal includes 10. Proposed budget adequately conservation legacy protects areas and/or threatened or indicator species and lidentified, and have a 7. Proposal leverage in funds or is appropriate to addresses: Who, and/or habitat identified in the MN endangered species, associated quantities specific plan for outcomes will be 8. Degree of timing/ other effort to accomplish the County Biological What, Where, When, outcomes for fish, this habitat will supplement any OHF outcomes described and lists targeted measuring and maintained over opportunistic Total Why, and How. game and wildlife. species. typically support. evaluating outcomes. time. appropriation. in the scope of work. Score Comments Survey. urgency. Out of ID# **Program Title** Max points: 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 100 HA10 Urban Woods and Prairies Initiative Moorhead, MN Land 9 9 9 7 7 82 9 8 7 Acquisition HRE01 Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat 9 9 9 8 8 8 7 6 81 Enhancement and Restoration, Phase XIII HRE02 DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, 9 9 9 7 8 6 8 81 HRE03 St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Phase VIII 9 8 9 9 9 9 8 8 8 6 83 HRE04 Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program, Phase X 84 9 9 9 9 8 9 6 8 9 8 HRE05 Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation, Phase VI 9 9 9 9 7 7 7 7 8 9 81 HRE06 Southeast Wetland Restoration, Phase II 8 9 7 6 6 9 8 7 75 HRE07 Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection & Restoration, 9 7 HRE08 Klondike Clean Water Retention Project, Phase I 10 HRE09 Targeted Culvert Replacement to Enhance Fish Passage 9 9 8 7 7 3 77 01 **DNR Roving Crews** 9 9 9 9 9 9 89 Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase XIII: 10 10 88 Statewide and Metro Habitat 02 Contract Management 2021 0 Restoration Evaluations - ML 2021 0

Name	Rep. Dan Fabian											
Due Date:	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.											
Maximum sc	ore per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fiel	ld if not evaluating a pro	posal due to a conflict o	of interest.*								
						Crit	eria					
			2. Proposal									
			addresses priority									
			actions and									
			outcomes of one or									
		1. Proposal abstract	more of the	3. Proposal uses								
		provides a clear and		science-based	4. Proposal							
		succinct overview of	"	targeting that	addresses habitats							
		the proposal activity,	produce and	leverages or expands	that have significant							
		1 ' '			value for wildlife							
		outcomes. Proposal	significant and	complexes, reduces	species of greatest		6. Performance					
		is clearly written and	permanent	fragmentation or	conservation need,	5. Proposal identifies	measures are clearly			9. Proposal includes	10. Proposed budget	
		adequately	conservation legacy	protects areas	and/or threatened or	indicator species and	identified, and have a	7. Proposal		leverage in funds or	is appropriate to	
		addresses: Who,	· ·	identified in the MN				outcomes will be	8. Degree of timing/	1 -	accomplish the	
		What, Where, When,		County Biological				maintained over	opportunistic		outcomes described	Total
		Why, and How.		Survey.			evaluating outcomes.		urgency.	appropriation.	in the scope of work.	Score Comments
10#			Ĭ				_			1	·	Out of
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100

Name:	David Hartwell												
Due	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
Maximun	score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score	" field if not evaluating	g a proposal due to a cor	flict of interest.*									
			T	Π		Criteria	1		T	I			T
		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.	other effort	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
PA01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase XIII	10	10	5	10	5	5	8	5	0	8	66	Given the current decline in agricultural land prices, what method is used to determine value? What is in the professional services line item?
PA02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program, Phase XIII	10	10	8	10	5	5	8	5	2	10	73	
PA03	MN Prairie Recovery Program, Phase XI	10	10	10	10	5	6	9	5	1	9	75	Personnel line needs clarification. It appears that staf (biologists and protection specialists) have full time jobs - is that really necessary? What keeps the biologists busy in the winter? SSA finally makes sense:)
PANA	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase XII	10	10	10	10	5	6	8	5	1	8	73	
PA05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase X	10	10	10	8	5	6	8	5	1	8	71	
	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection, Phase VIII	10	10	10	10	8	7	10	7	0	8	80	
PA07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Phase IX	10	10	10	10	7	6	9	9	0	7	78	No output in terms of acres for the restoration
PA08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley, Phase VII	10	10	10	10	7	5	7	5	2	7	73	is wind development a threat? Have there been studies done that verify that? Contracts line shows \$1135000 for restoration but outputs show 30 acres and \$30K. Something is amiss.
PA09	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program, Phase III	10	10	10	10	8	7	9	8	2	8	82	Is DU holding easements? If so, what is USFW and what is DU holding. How determined? How will price of DU easements be determined? No stewardship dollars

Name:	David Hartwell												
Due	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
	score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score	" field if not evaluating	g a proposal due to a cor	nflict of interest.*									
			1	,	1	Criteria				T	1		
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	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.	habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation	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/opportunisti c urgency.	other effort	the outcomes described in the scope of	Total Score	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
PA10	Martin County WMA Acquisition, Phase V	10	10	8	7	7	6	7	7	0	5	67	no cost for restoration that is mentioned in proposal. It seems to be imbedded in the acquisition cost which us unfortunate as it becomes invisible and there is no way to understand the cost of each component.
PA11	RIM Grassland Reserve, Phase III	10	10	10	8	7	7	8	8	0	7	75	
PRE01a	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII (with Roving Crew)	10	10	10	10	8	6	5	7	0	8	74	
PRE01b	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII	10	10	10	10	8	6	5	7	0	8	74	
PRE02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands, Phase V	10	10	10	10	6	6	5	7	1	6	71	This seems to replicate the DNR roving crews other than the conservation grazing. It is basically a contract management proposal. Perhaps just fund the conservation grazing part?
PRE03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation, Phase VII	8	10	8	10	10	8	8	8	2	5	77	not sure what each partners specific role will be and why they are necessary to get this work done. Would like more info on exactly how the rare plant rescue works and success rates. This actually feels like separate proposals jammed together for a reason I cannot understand.
FA01	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration, Phase IX	10	10	10	10	10	8	8	8	1	8	83	What makes TNC ownership appropriate?
FA02	Minnesota Forests for the Future, Phase VIII	10	10	10	10	8	8	7	6	1	8	78	
	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB, Phase IX	10	8	7	7	6	6	7	5	0	9	65	This seems more like a subsidy to the military than a conservation project. They want habitat funds to keep development from encroaching on the camp rather than to protect habitat. And they don't even promise any match.

Name:	David Hartwell												
Due	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
	n score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score	e" field if not evaluating	g a proposal due to a con	flict of interest.*									
						Criteria							1
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	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.	have a specific	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	other effort	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score	
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
FREO1	DNR Forest Enhancement	10	6	4	7	10	5	5	5	0	7	59	How is climate change going to be addressed by this proposal? Is this proposal not just another roving crew under a different name? I have wondered for some time how this clearing enhances natural processes. What happened before European settlement to these forests - and were they unhealthy then? Staffing for fire specialists when fire is not part of the proposal and all the funds go to contractors?
FRE02	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase IV											COI	
FRE03	Moose Habitat Collaborative, Phase IV - NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement	7	8	6	8	8	6	7	6	1	7	64	Why is the Ruffed Grouse Society the lead in a moose habitat proposal?
WA01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase XIII	10	10	10	8	8	7	8	7	6	9	83	

Name:	David Hartwell												
Due	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
Maximun	n score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score	" field if not evaluating	g a proposal due to a con	nflict of interest.*									
						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.	addresses priority	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.	habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation	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/opportunisticurgency.		10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
WA02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program, Phase X	10	10	8	7	8	7	8	7	1	8	74	
WA03	RIM Wetlands, Phase X	10	10	8	7	8	6	7	8	0	7	71	
WA04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase VI	10	10	10	8	8	7	8	7	2	8	78	very low easement cost per acre
WA05	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection, Phase VII	10	10	9	10	9	8	7	6	0	8	77	very low easement cost per acre
WRE01a	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (with Roving Habitat Crew)	8	10	8	10	8	7	7	6	0	6	70	Professional services???
WRE01b	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (without Roving Habitat Crew)	8	10	8	10	8	7	7	6	0	6	70	Professional services???
WRE02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative, Phase VII	10	10	9	8	9	7	7	7	1	8	76	
HA01	St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration, Phase II	10	10	10	10	8	8	7	7	1	8	79	
	Metro Big Rivers, Phase XI	10	8	8	10	8	7	7	6	3	7	74	why the large cost differential between fee with PILT and without? Washing plants to remove soil runs counter to what I know about successful transplanting. Often it is the microbes in the soil that a plant is dependent on and removing the soil will significantly decrease the success and vibrancy of the plant.
HA03	Lower Otter Tail River Corridor Habitat Restoration - Request 1	8	10	8	8	7	7	7	7	2	7	71	What is the long term goal in terms of acres and \$ for them? Same question for the restoration. Project will not be done until 2029? Program management personnel line is larger than the easement processing which does not make sense.
HA04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes, Phase VII	10	10	10	8	8	7	10	8	1	7	79	what is the professional services line for?

Name:	David Hartwell												
Due	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
	score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score	" field if not evaluating	g a proposal due to a cor	flict of interest.*									
						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.	other effort	the outcomes described in the scope of	Total Score	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
HA05	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project, Phase V	10	8	10	8	7	7	8	7	1	7	73	a smaller target area seems more reasonable
HAUG	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance	10	10	10	10	8	7	9	8	2	7	81	
$I H\Delta\Omega / I$	Riparian Habitat Protection in the Kettle and Snake River Watersheds	10	8	8	10	7	7	5	7	0	8	70	
HA08	MNDNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	6	5	5	7	5	5	6	6	0	10	55	11 miles of stream with 211 acres means a very small strip along the stream. Real protection of the stream would be deeper. This feels more like a fishing access than a habitat project.
HANG	Targeted RIM Easement and Acquisition to the Parcel Level Pine and Leech Watersheds, Phase II	7	7	7	7	8	5	6	6	0	7	60	Not excited with roads used for recreational access
$H\Delta 10$	Urban Woods and Prairies Initiative Moorhead, MN Land Acquisition											соі	
HULLI	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase XIII	7	7	6	5	8	7	6	5	2	6	59	Staffing seems very high to just manage contracts
HREOL	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, Phase IV	10	10	10	7	8	7	10	6	5	8	81	
	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Phase VIII	10	10	6	8	8	8	10	7	1	7	75	
	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program, Phase X	8	8	7	7	8	6	7	6	1	6	64	what are the professional services?
	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation, Phase VI	8	7	7	7	7	7	7	5	1	8	64	
HRE06	Southeast Wetland Restoration, Phase II	7	7	6	6	7	6	8	5	3	6	61	Very high restoration cost
HREO/	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection & Restoration, Phase II	8	9	10	8	8	6	8	7	1	7	72	
	Klondike Clean Water Retention Project, Phase I	8	7	7	6	7	6	6	5	10	8	1	More flood control than habitat. We are funding removal of dams so it is confusing that we would fund creation of them.
HRE09	Targeted Culvert Replacement to Enhance Fish Passage	7	7	5	6	5	8	8	5	1	5	57	flood control? Why no match from owners of roads?

Name:	David Hartwell												
Due	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
	n score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score	" field if not evaluating	g a proposal due to a cor	nflict of interest.*									
						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.	habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	have a specific	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	other effort	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
01	DNR Roving Crews	10	10	8	10	9	8	6	9	0	8	78	please provide spreadsheet showing existing roving crew funding ar how this would fit with that
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase XIII: Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	8	8	8	7	8	8	7	2	9	75	CPL coordinator - is there not funding for this in prior years covering the next two?
02	Contract Management 2021											0	
03	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2021											0	

	me: Mark Holsten	136		t - ML 2021 / F	Villa Control		of the state of	A COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE OWNER.			
	te: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.							all to			
	score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score"	field if not evaluating a P	roposal due to a conflict	of interest.*							
		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.	ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat	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.	value for Wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted	S. Proposal identifie	identified, and have a	outcomes will be maintained over	8. Degree of timing/ opportunists urgency.	leverage in funds or other effort to	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope ofwork.
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10 Out of
.01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase XIII	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	18	6 ?	64
02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program, Phase XIII	8	8	8	8	9	g	B	8	10	75
0.3	MN Prairie Recovery Program, Phase XI	8	10	10	10	0	8	R	10.	6	80
04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase XII	8	Co	10	10	10	8	4	10	5	79
05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase X	8	8	8	8	8	0	8	5	3	64
16	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection, Phase VIII	8	10	10	10	10	83	B	10	0	74
7	RiM Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Phase IX	8	10	w	10	10	28	(A)	10	0	74
В	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley, Phase VII	8	10	10	10	10	8	i i	8	10	82
9	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program, Phase III	8	10	10	10	10	2	B	10	10	84
9	Martin County WMA Acquisition, Phase V	78	60	R	w	10	A		7	0	(6)
-41	RIM Grassland Reserve, Phase III	88	10	10	10	10		Q AL	10	0	74
11a	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII (with Roving Crew)	5	5	80	5	10	5	Š	5	D	50
16	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII	1 - U. 1 -		7	TO BE TO ST					0	
2	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands, Phase V	8	8	10	10	10	8	5	5	7	71
	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation, Phase VII	X	8	10	10	10	3	8	6	10	78
	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration, Phase IX	*	4	8	10	10	8	62.	17	6	71

Lessard-Sains Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022 Name: Mark Holsten Due Date: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m. Maximum score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest." 2. Proposal addresses priority actionsand outcomes of one or 1. Proposal abstract more of the 3. Proposal uses provides a dear and ecological sections science-based . Proposal uccinct overview of and is likely to targeting that addresses habitats leverages or expands that have significant the proposal activity. produce and corridors and alue for wildlife outputs, and significant and complexes, reduces utcomes, Proposal species of greatest Performance is clearly written and permanent ragmentation or conservation need, 5. Proposal identifies | measures are clearly 9. Proposal includes 10. Proposed budget adequately conservation legacy protects areas and/or threatened or indicator species and identified, and have a 7. Proposal leverage in funds or is appropriate to addresses: Who and/or habitat other effort to identified in the MN endangered species, associated quantities specific plan for outcomes will be 8. Degree of timing/ accomplish the What, Where, When, outcomes for fish, County Biological and lists targeted this habitat will maintained over opportunistic supplement any OHF outcomes described measuring and Total Why, and How. game and wildlife. evaluating outcomes. urgency. in the scope of work. ID# Max points: 10 10 **Program Title** 10 10 FA02 Minnesota Forests for the Future, Phase VIII FA03 Camp RiplevSentinelLandscape ACUB, Phase IX 8 60 10 FREO1 DNR Forest Enhancement 8 0 6 10 0 FREO2 Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase 0/ Agustin (0 5 Moose Habitat Collaborative, Phase IV - NE MN Forest Š 61 Habitat Enhancement 0 Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, WA01 10 9 8 10 10 Phase XIII Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration 8 8 10 CI (08 10 Program, Phase X RIM Wetlands, Phase X 8 10 10 (0 10 (0 WA04 Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, 8 76 10 6 10 6 Wild Rice Shoreland Protection, Phase VII 9 63 9 6 10 WRE01a Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, 100 Phase XIII (with Roving Habitat Crew) Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, 0 0 Phase XIII (without Roving Habitat Crew) WRE02 Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration 8 Itiative, Phase VII HA01 St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration, 68 Phase II HA02 Metro Big Rivers, Phase XI 61 10 0 6 6 Lower Otter Tail River Corridor Habitat Restoration -70 Request 1

Lessa	rd-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Prop	oosal Evaluatio	n Scoring Sheet	t - ML 2021 / F	Y 2022					The same	Assert &		de la companya della
Na	me: Mark Holsten		STATE OF				and a second						
Due Da Maximun	ate: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m. n score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score"	field if not evaluating a p	roposal due to a conflict	of interest.*			The same of the sa	The last of the la					The second secon
						Crit	eria						
		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.	ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat	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.	value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need,	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.		7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over	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	omments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	HERON THE PROPERTY.
HA04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes, Phase VII	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	8	8		71	
HA05	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project, Phase V	3	8	9	8	8	8	6	7	2		62	
1A06	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance	78	16	8	8	8	8	6	9	10		68	
IAD7	Riparian Habitat Protection in the Kettle and Snake River Watersheds	8	10	8	8	8	8	6	6	0		58	
80Al	MNDNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	8	6	8	6	8	6	60	6	0		48	
HA09	Targeted RIM Easement and Acquisition to the Parcel Level Pine and Leech Watersheds, Phase II	3	8	8	8	8	8,	7	6	0		61	
HA10	Urban Woods and Prairies Initiative Moorhead, MN Land Acquisition	8	4	6	8	6	8	7	6	10		64	
HREO1	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase XIII	8	7	4,	8	6	8	Ý	6	10		60	
IREO2	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, Phase IV	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	6	10		70	
IRE03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Phase VIII	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	8		11	
IREO4	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program, Phase X	8	8	(0	8	6	8	8	6	5		63	
IREO5	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation, Phase VI	8,	6	(0	1	8	8	6	la	5		57	
REO6	Southeast Wetland Restoration, Phase II	8	5	5	5,	6	6	8	6	10		59	
REO7	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection & Restoration, Phase II	8	10	8	8	8	8	7	6	19		カン	
REO8	Klondike Clean Water Retention Project, Phase I	8	8	8	8	6	8	8	7	10		72	
E09	Targeted Culvert Replacement to Enhance Fish Passage	Do	6	9	6	6	6	8	6	2		53	

	core per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score"	field if not evaluating a p	roposal due to a conflict	of interest,*									
			Marie —		7	Cri	teria	1 10 11	N. C. SEL	1		- 1	
		is clearly written and adequately	ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat	leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN	value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted	indicator species and	specific plan for	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	other effort to supplement any OHF	is appropriate to accomplish the	Total Score	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of	
	DNR Roving Crews	4	10	8	10	8	8	1000	8	8	0	68	
3	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase XIII: Statewide and Metro Habitat		10			U	O	(0				GO	
9	Contract Management 2021											1	Branch Branch
	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2021											1	

LANG

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022 Sen Andrew Due Date: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m. Maximum score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest." Criteria 2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or 1. Proposal abstract more of the 3. Proposal uses provides a clear and . Proposal succinct overview of targeting that addresses habitats leverages or expands that have significant the proposal activity, produce and outputs, and demonstrate corridors and value for wildlife outcomes. Proposal significant and complexes reduces species of greatest is clearly written and permanent 9. Proposal includes 10. Proposed budget fragmentation or conservation need, 5. Proposal identifies measures are clearly adequately and/or threatened or indicator species and identified, and have a outcomes we endangered species, associated quantities specific plan for outcomes we verage in funds or is appropriate to conservation legacy rotects areas addresses Who, and/or habitat identified in the MN outcomes will be 8 Degree of timing/ other effort to accomplish the What, Where, When, County Biological and lists targeted this habitat will measuring and maintained over opportunistic supplement any OHF outcomes described Total in the scope of work. Score hy, and How. game and wildlife. appropriation. Survey. typically support. species. evaluating outcome urgency. ID# Program Title Max points: 10 10 10 10 PA01 DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase XIII 0 PA02 Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program, 6 6 Phase XIII 6 PA03 MN Prairie Recovery Program, Phase XI 4 6 6 6 PA04 Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase 8 7 8 6 PA05 Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and 8 8 ષ્ટ 8. Restoration Program, Phase X PA06 Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection, Phase VIII 0 6 6 6 6 PA07 RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Phase IX 9 8 8 0 6 80A9 Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the 9 9 00 Southern Red River Valley, Phase VII PA09 Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement 8 8 9 8 Program, Phase III PA10 Martin County WMA Acquisition, Phase V 9 0 9 9 10 390 DES + B PA11 RIM Grassland Reserve, Phase III 9 9 9 9 0 PRE01a DNR Grassland, Phase XIII (with Roving Crew) 58 32% DSS? 0 DNR Grassland, Phase XIII PREO1b 58 0 6 6 9 PRE02 Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands, Phase V 9 8 80 19 %. 05) 8 6 8 Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation, Phase VII PRE03 9 9 8 8 B 75 Hunting? FA01 Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration, Phase IX 8 0 5 8 5

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022 Name: Sen. Andrew Lang Due Date: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m. Maximum score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest." Criteria 2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or 1. Proposal abstract more of the . Proposal uses provides a clear and ecological sections 4. Proposal cience-based succinct overview of addresses habitats and is likely to targeting that the proposal activity, produce and that have significant leverages or expands outputs, and value for wildlife demonstrate corridors and outcomes Proposal significant and complexes, reduces species of greatest 9. Proposal includes 10. Proposed budget 5. Proposal identifies measures are clearly is clearly written and fragmentation or conservation need everage in funds or is appropriate to indicator species and identified, and have a adequately otects areas and/or threatened o ccomplish the outcomes will be associated quantities specific plan for entified in the MN endangered species, supplement any OHF outcomes described maintained over outcomes for fish, County Biological and lists targeted this habitat will measuring and in the scope of work. Score urgency. appropriation. typically support. evaluating outcome game and wildlife. species. Survey. Vhy, and How. Out of 10 10 10 ID# Program Title 10 100 Max points: 10 FA02 Minnesota Forests for the Future, Phase VIII 7 7 8 9 9 81 8 FA03 Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB, Phase IX 9 8 9 8 9 9 70 FRE01 **DNR Forest Enhancement** 8 Heatha 68 Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase FRE02 7 8 8 7 76 Moose Habitat Collaborative, Phase IV - NE MN Forest 8 FRE03 9 9 Habitat Enhancement Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, 8 WA01 9 Phase XIII Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration 7 WA02 9 9 4 Program, Phase X مام RIM Wetlands, Phase X 8 0 8 WA03 7 8 7 4 7 Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, 9 7 6 WA04 8 Phase VI 7 WA05 Wild Rice Shoreland Protection, Phase VII 9 8 0 8 2 7 Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, \$2 0 hunting WRE01a 7 E 8 6 8 7 8 Phase XIII (with Roving Habitat Crew) Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, WRE01b 6 6 Phase XIII (without Roving Habitat Crew) Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration WRE02 3 9 8 Initiative, Phase VII St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration, HA01 8 8 3 Phase II 373 Acres 60 HA02 Metro Big Rivers, Phase XI 5 8 5 6 6 06 6 87 Lower Otter Tail River Corridor Habitat Restoration -9 8 9 9 HA03 9 9 8 9 Request 1

Name	Sen. Andrew Lang		Scoring Sheet	- IVIL 2021 / F	1 2022							-	
Due Date:	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 n m										-		
Maximum so	ore per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fi	eld if not evaluating a pr	oposal due to a conflict	of interest.*									
						Cr	teria	T	_	T	T	-	T
		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.	and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat	3. Proposal uses complete the terms of the t	d. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant' value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.		6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	outcomes will be maintained over	2. 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	
1D#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
HA04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes, Phase VII	8	7	8	7	7	8	7	7	4	7_	70	
HA05	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project, Phase V	8	7	8	بح	7	7	8	8	4	8	13	
HA06	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance	8	8	8	8	9	9	ઇ	8	6		80	
HA07	Riparian Habitat Protection in the Kettle and Snake River Watersheds	9	9	9	8	9	е	7_	7	6		80	
HA08	MNDNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	9	7	7	8	7	7	7	6	0	8	66	
HA09	Targeted RIM Easement and Acquisition to the Parcel Level Pine and Leech Watersheds, Phase II	9	9	8	9	8	8	8	8	6	8	81	
HA10	Urban Woods and Prairies Initiative Moorhead, MN Land Acquisition	8	9	9	2	7	4	8	6	9	8	78	Good loverage
HRE01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase XIII	9	9	9	9	9	3	9	8	7	8	85	
HRE02	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, Phase IV	8	8	7	8	6	7	7	8	9	9	76	Good leverage
HRE03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Phase VIII	9	8	7	7	7	6	6	7	4	7	69	
HREO4	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program, Phase X	9	9	9	9	9	Ö	8	8	7	8	83	
HREO5	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation, Phase VI	7	5	5	6	フ	7	5	5	3	7	83 57	42 1000
HREO6	Southeast Wetland Restoration, Phase II	7	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	0	6	42	Bad Source Leverge
HREO7	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection & Restoration, Phase II	8	8	9	9	6	Ť	8	6	8	8	77:	thentry
HREO8	Klondike Clean Water Retention Project, Phase I	9	9	q	9	8	8	9	8	10	9	88	J
HREO9	Targeted Culvert Replacement to Enhance Fish Passage	9	9	8	8	8	7	В	6	4	8	75	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022 Sen. Andrew Lang Due Date: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.

Maximum score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest." 2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or 1. Proposal abstract more of the . Proposal uses provides a clear and ecological section succinct overview of and is likely to addresses habitats the proposal activity, pr everages or expands that have significant orridors and value for wildlife significant and complexes, reduces species of greatest is clearly written and permanent 9. Proposal includes 10. Proposed budge 5. Proposal identifies measures are clearly fragmentation or conservation need. is appropriate to indicator species and identified, and have a 7. Proposal protects areas and/or threatened of addresses: Who accomplish the utcomes will be 8. Degree of timing dentified in the MN endangered species, associated quantitle specific plan for What, Where, Wh utcomes described opportunistic outcomes for fish, ounty Biological and lists targeted this habitat will measuring and in the scope of work. typically support ID# **Program Title** Max points: 10 10 10 10 **DNR Roving Crews** 10 Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase XIII: 100 Statewide and Metro Habitat 10. Contract Management 2021 100 10 Restoration Evaluations - ML 2021 10 Assume these will be taken separately.

6 3

43 - 52

Name	: Denny McNamara												
Due Date	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
Maximum so	ore per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fie	ld if not evaluating a pro	oposal due to a conflict	of interest.*								1	
						Crit	eria	<u> </u>					
			2. Proposal										
			addresses priority actions and										
			outcomes of one or										
		1. Proposal abstract		3. Proposal uses									
		provides a clear and	ecological sections		4. Proposal								
		succinct overview of			addresses habitats								
		the proposal activity,		leverages or expands	that have significant value for wildlife								
		outputs, and outcomes. Proposal	demonstrate		species of greatest		6. Performance						
		is clearly written and			conservation need,	5. Proposal identifies	measures are clearly			9. Proposal includes	10. Proposed budget		
		adequately	conservation legacy	protects areas	and/or threatened or	indicator species and	identified, and have a			leverage in funds or	is appropriate to		
			and/or habitat			associated quantities		outcomes will be	8. Degree of timing/		accomplish the		
		What, Where, When, Why, and How.	outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.		and lists targeted species.	this habitat will typically support.	measuring and evaluating outcomes.	maintained over		supplement any OHF appropriation.	outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of	Comments
PA01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase XIII	iviax points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100	
		9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	6	9	87	
PA02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program, Phase XIII	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	89	
PA03	MN Prairie Recovery Program, Phase XI	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	8	9	8	87	
PA04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase XII	9	7	9	9	7	8	9	8	9	9	84	
PA05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase X	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	90	
PA06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection, Phase VIII	9	10	9	10	9	9	9	9	8	9	91	
PA07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Phase IX	9	10	10	9	9	10	8	10	8	9	92	
PA08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley, Phase VII	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	80	8
PA09	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program, Phase III	8	9	8	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	82	
PA10	Martin County WMA Acquisition, Phase V	8	9	8	9	8	9	8	8	8	9	84	
PA11	RIM Grassland Reserve, Phase III	9	10	10	9	9	10	8	10	8	9	92	
PRE01a	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII (with Roving Crew)	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	9	8	10	96	
PRE01b	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	9	8	10	96	
PRE02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands, Phase V	9	9	9	10	9	9	9	9	9	9	91	
PRE03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation, Phase VII	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	80	
FA01	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration, Phase IX	8	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8	8	8	8	8	80	

	e: Denny McNamara		8										-
	·												
	:: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m. core per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fie	eld if not evaluating a pro	onosal due to a conflict o	of interest.*									
	sore per request is 100 pointer that the rotal source in	and it not craited ing a pro-	sposal due to a commer			Crit	teria						
			2. Proposal addresses priority										
			actions and outcomes of one or										
		Proposal abstract	more of the	3. Proposal uses									
			ecological sections		4. Proposal								
			and is likely to	targeting that	addresses habitats								1
		the proposal activity,		leverages or expands									
		outputs, and	demonstrate		value for wildlife		C D. (
		outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and	significant and		species of greatest conservation need,	5. Proposal identifies	6. Performance			9. Proposal includes	10 Proposed hudget		
		adequately					identified, and have a	7. Proposal		1 '	is appropriate to		
		addresses: Who,	and/or habitat	identified in the MN		associated quantities		outcomes will be	8. Degree of timing/		accomplish the		
		What, Where, When,	1	County Biological	and lists targeted			maintained over	opportunistic	supplement any OHF	outcomes described	Total	
	1	Why, and How.	game and wildlife.	Survey.	species.	typically support.	evaluating outcomes.	time.	urgency.	appropriation.	in the scope of work.		Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
FA02	Minnesota Forests for the Future, Phase VIII	8	9.0	9.0	9	8.0	9	8	8	8	8	84	
FA03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB, Phase IX	8	9.0	9	9	8.0	9	9	8	8	8	85	
FRE01	DNR Forest Enhancement	9	8	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	9	88	
FRE02	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase IV	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	90	
FRE03	Moose Habitat Collaborative, Phase IV - NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement	8	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	79	
WA01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase XIII	9	10	9	10	9	9	10	10	8	9	93	

Name	: Denny McNamara												
	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
Maximum sc	ore per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fie	ld if not evaluating a pro	oposal due to a conflict	of interest.*		Crit	eria						
			2. Proposal addresses priority										
		provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately	ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat	leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN	value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or	indicator species and	specific plan for	outcomes will be maintained over	8. Degree of timing/opportunistic		10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
WA02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program, Phase X	9	10	9	10	9	9	9	9	8	9	91	
WA03	RIM Wetlands, Phase X	9	10	10	9	9	9	9	10	8	9	92	
WA04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase VI	9	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	9	89	
WA05	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection, Phase VII	8	8	9	8	8	9	9	9	8	9	85	
WRE01a	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (with Roving Habitat Crew)	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	8	9	96	
WRE01b	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (without Roving Habitat Crew)	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	8	9	96	
WRE02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative, Phase VII	10	10	10	10	9	10	10	9	8	9	95	
HA01	St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration, Phase II	8	9	9	8	8	9	8	9	8	9	85	
HA02	Metro Big Rivers, Phase XI Lower Otter Tail River Corridor Habitat Restoration -	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	8	8	80	
HA04	Request 1 Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	90	
	Minnesota Lakes, Phase VII Miss Headwaters	8	8	9	9	8	8	9	9	8	9	85	
HA05		8	9	8	8	7	8	8	7	8	8	79	
HA06	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance	9	9	8	9	8	8	8	7	8	8	82	
HA07	Riparian Habitat Protection in the Kettle and Snake River Watersheds	8	8	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	79	
HA08	MNDNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	9	10	9	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	90	
HA09	Targeted RIM Easement and Acquisition to the Parcel Level Pine and Leech Watersheds, Phase II	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	90	

Name:	Denny McNamara												
Due Date:	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
Maximum sco	re per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fie	ld if not evaluating a pro	oposal due to a conflict o	of interest.*									
			1	1	Т	Crit	teria	T	T	Т			Г
			Proposal addresses priority actions and										
		provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and	and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and	targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need,	5. Proposal identifies	6. Performance measures are clearly			9. Proposal includes	10. Proposed budget		
		adequately	conservation legacy			indicator species and					is appropriate to		1
			and/or habitat		endangered species,	associated quantities		outcomes will be	8. Degree of timing/		accomplish the	l	1
		What, Where, When,			and lists targeted			maintained over	1	supplement any OHF		Total	Commonts
		Why, and How.	game and wildlife.		species.	typically support.	evaluating outcomes.		urgency.		in the scope of work.	Out of	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100	
HA10	Urban Woods and Prairies Initiative Moorhead, MN Land Acquisition	8	9	8	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	82	
HRE01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase XIII	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	8	10	9	90	
	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, Phase IV	10	10	9	10	9	9	9	10	9	9	94	
HRE03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Phase VIII	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	89	
HRE04	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program, Phase X	8	9	8	8	9	9	8	9	8	9	85	
HRE05	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation, Phase VI	7	8	8	8	8	7	8	8	8	8	78	
HREO6	Southeast Wetland Restoration, Phase II	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	8	7	7	71	
HRE07	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection & Restoration, Phase II	8	9	8	9	8	8	8	9	8	9	84	
HRE08	Klondike Clean Water Retention Project, Phase I	9	10	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	91	
HRE09	Targeted Culvert Replacement to Enhance Fish Passage	8	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	87	
01	DNR Roving Crews	10	10	10	10	9	9	9	10	9	10	96	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase XIII: Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	8	10	91	
02	Contract Management 2021											0	
O3	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2021											0	

Name:	Name: Denny McNamara													
	Date: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum sco	Maximum score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest.*													
	Criteria													
			2. Proposal											
			addresses priority											
			actions and											
			outcomes of one or											
		1. Proposal abstract	more of the	3. Proposal uses										
		provides a clear and		science-based	4. Proposal									
		succinct overview of	_	targeting that	addresses habitats									
		the proposal activity,	produce and	leverages or expands	that have significant									
		outputs, and	demonstrate	corridors and	value for wildlife									
		outcomes. Proposal	significant and	complexes, reduces	species of greatest		6. Performance							
		is clearly written and	permanent	fragmentation or	conservation need,	5. Proposal identifies	measures are clearly			9. Proposal includes	10. Proposed budget			
		adequately	conservation legacy	protects areas	and/or threatened or	indicator species and	identified, and have a	7. Proposal		leverage in funds or	is appropriate to			
		addresses: Who,	and/or habitat	identified in the MN	endangered species,	associated quantities	specific plan for	outcomes will be	8. Degree of timing/	other effort to	accomplish the			
		What, Where, When,	outcomes for fish,	County Biological	and lists targeted	this habitat will	measuring and	maintained over	opportunistic	supplement any OHF	outcomes described	Total		
		Why, and How.	game and wildlife.	Survey.	species.	typically support.	evaluating outcomes.	time.	urgency.	appropriation.	in the scope of work.	Score	Comments	
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of		
15#	Flogialli fille	IVIAN POIITS. 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100		

Name	Name: Ashley Peters											
Due Date	Due Date: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.											
Maximum sc	Maximum score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest.* Criteria											
			1			Crit	eria		T			
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and	ecological sections and is likely to , produce and demonstrate significant and permanent	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or	value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need,	5. Proposal identifies					10. Proposed budget	
		adequately addresses: Who,	conservation legacy and/or habitat		and/or threatened or endangered species,	indicator species and associated quantities		7. Proposal outcomes will be	8. Degree of timing/		is appropriate to accomplish the	
		What, Where, When	, outcomes for fish,	County Biological	and lists targeted	this habitat will	measuring and	maintained over	opportunistic	supplement any OHF	outcomes described	Total
-		Why, and How.	game and wildlife.	Survey.			evaluating outcomes.		urgency.		in the scope of work.	Score Comments Out of
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100
PA01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase XIII	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	6	3	8	73
PA02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program, Phase XIII	8	8	8	7	8	8	8	5	10	8	78
PA03	MN Prairie Recovery Program, Phase XI	8	8	8	8	8	6	8	7	6	6	73
PA04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase XII	8	7	8	8	6	8	7	5	5	6	68
PA05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase X	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	5	5	8	74
PA06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection, Phase VIII	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	7	0	7	69
PA07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Phase IX	8	8	8	7	8	8	7	6	0	7	67
PA08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley, Phase VII	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	5	10	7	77
PA09	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program, Phase III	8	8	8	8	8	7	7	7	10	8	79
PA10	Martin County WMA Acquisition, Phase V	6	8	6	7	8	7	6	6	0	5	59
PA11	RIM Grassland Reserve, Phase III	8	8	8	8	8	7	7	5	0	6	65
PRE01a	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII (with Roving Crew)	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	5	0	8	68
PRE01b	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	5	0	8	68
PRE02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands, Phase V	8	7	7	7	8	8	8	5	6	8	72
PRE03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation, Phase VII	8	7	8	8	7	8	7	8	10	6	77
FA01	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration, Phase IX	8	8	8.0	8.0	8.0	8	7	6	5	6	72

Lessard Sains Oddaoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - WE 2021 / 11 2022													
Name	Name: Ashley Peters												
Due Date	Due Date: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
	Maximum score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest.*												
			•			Cri	teria						
			2. Proposal										
			addresses priority										
			actions and										
			outcomes of one or										
			more of the	3. Proposal uses									
		provides a clear and succinct overview of	_	science-based targeting that	4. Proposal addresses habitats								
		the proposal activity,		leverages or expands									
		outputs, and	demonstrate	corridors and	value for wildlife								
			significant and	complexes, reduces	species of greatest		6. Performance						
		is clearly written and		fragmentation or	conservation need,	5. Proposal identifies	measures are clearly			9. Proposal includes	10. Proposed budget		
		adequately	conservation legacy	protects areas	and/or threatened or	indicator species and	identified, and have a	7. Proposal		leverage in funds or	is appropriate to		
		addresses: Who,	and/or habitat	identified in the MN			specific plan for	outcomes will be	8. Degree of timing/	other effort to	accomplish the		
		What, Where, When,		, ,		this habitat will		maintained over	opportunistic	'' /	outcomes described	Total	
		Why, and How.	game and wildlife.	Survey.	species.	typically support.	evaluating outcomes.	time.	urgency.	appropriation.	in the scope of work.		Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
FA02	Minnesota Forests for the Future, Phase VIII	8	8	8.0	8	8.0	8	7	6	2	7	70	
FA03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB, Phase IX	8	8.0	8	8	5.0	6	7	6	2	8	66	
FRE01	DNR Forest Enhancement	7	6	8	6	8	8	7	6	2	7	65	
FRE02	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase IV	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	Х	0	COI
FRE03	Moose Habitat Collaborative, Phase IV - NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement	8	7	8	8	8	8	8	6	4	6	71	
WA01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase XIII	8	6	8	8	8	8	7	5	10	6	74	

Name	Name: Ashley Peters											
	Due Date: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.											
	Maximum score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest.*											
			T		1	Crit	eria	T	T	T	I	
			2. Proposal									
			addresses priority									
			actions and									
		Proposal abstract	outcomes of one or more of the	3. Proposal uses								
		provides a clear and		science-based	4. Proposal							
		succinct overview of			addresses habitats							
		the proposal activity,		leverages or expands								
		outputs, and	demonstrate	corridors and	value for wildlife		C Dorformoneo					
		outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and	significant and	complexes, reduces fragmentation or	species of greatest conservation need,	5. Proposal identifies	6. Performance measures are clearly			9. Proposal includes	10. Proposed budget	
		adequately	conservation legacy	protects areas		indicator species and		7. Proposal			is appropriate to	
		addresses: Who,	and/or habitat			associated quantities		outcomes will be		other effort to	accomplish the	
		What, Where, When,		County Biological				maintained over	opportunistic	supplement any OHF		Total
		Why, and How.	game and wildlife.	Survey.			evaluating outcomes.	i			in the scope of work.	Score Comments Out of
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100
WA02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program, Phase X	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	8	4	6	73
WA03	RIM Wetlands, Phase X	8	8	8	8	8	6	7	6	2	6	67
WA04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase VI	8	8	8	5	8	8	8	6	10	7	76
WA05	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection, Phase VII	8	8	8	8	8	6	8	6	2	6	68
WRE01a	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (with Roving Habitat Crew)	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	0	7	70
WRE01b	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (without Roving Habitat Crew)	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	0	7	70
WRE02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative, Phase VII	8	7	8	8	8	8	7	6	9	6	75
HA01	St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration, Phase II	8	6	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	78
HA02	Metro Big Rivers, Phase XI	8	7	7	6	8	8	8	6	10	7	75
HA03	Lower Otter Tail River Corridor Habitat Restoration - Request 1	6	6	7	6	8	7	7	6	10	7	70
HA04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes, Phase VII	8	7	8	8	8	8	7	8	8	6	76
HA05	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project, Phase V	8	7	8	8	8	8	7	6	3	6	69
HA06	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance	8	7	8	7	8	6	7	7	10	6	74
HA07	Riparian Habitat Protection in the Kettle and Snake River Watersheds	8	7	8	8	8	8	7	8	0	6	68
HA08	MNDNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	8	7	7	6	8	8	6	7	0	5	62
HA09	Targeted RIM Easement and Acquisition to the Parcel Level Pine and Leech Watersheds, Phase II	7	8	8	8	8	7	7	7	0	6	66

Name: Ashley Peters Due Date: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m. Maximum score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest.* Criteria 2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or 1. Proposal abstract more of the 3. Proposal uses provides a clear and ecological sections science-based 4. Proposal succinct overview of and is likely to targeting that addresses habitats the proposal activity, produce and leverages or expands that have significant outputs, and demonstrate corridors and value for wildlife outcomes. Proposal significant and species of greatest 6. Performance complexes, reduces is clearly written and permanent fragmentation or conservation need, 5. Proposal identifies | measures are clearly 9. Proposal includes 10. Proposed budget adequately conservation legacy protects areas and/or threatened or indicator species and lidentified, and have a 7. Proposal leverage in funds or is appropriate to addresses: Who, and/or habitat identified in the MN endangered species, associated quantities specific plan for outcomes will be 8. Degree of timing/ other effort to accomplish the County Biological What, Where, When, outcomes for fish, this habitat will supplement any OHF outcomes described and lists targeted measuring and maintained over opportunistic Total Why, and How. game and wildlife. species. typically support. evaluating outcomes. time. appropriation. in the scope of work. Score Comments Survey. urgency. Out of ID# **Program Title** Max points: 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 100 HA10 Urban Woods and Prairies Initiative Moorhead, MN Land Χ Χ Χ Х 0 Χ Χ Χ Χ Χ Acquisition HRE01 Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat 6 6 6 8 8 7 7 10 6 71 Enhancement and Restoration, Phase XIII HRE02 DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, 7 5 7 7 5 10 5 69 HRE03 St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Phase VIII 7 7 72 8 8 8 7 5 8 6 HRE04 Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program, Phase X 7 71 8 7 7 6 6 6 8 8 HRE05 Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation, Phase VI 7 8 6 6 7 7 6 9 7 71 8 HRE06 Southeast Wetland Restoration, Phase II 7 7 3 6 6 6 6 6 HRE07 Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection & Restoration, 8 8 8 8 8 7 7 9 7 HRE08 Klondike Clean Water Retention Project, Phase I 77 8 7 8 7 6 10 8 7 HRE09 Targeted Culvert Replacement to Enhance Fish Passage 7 8 4 6 8 6 6 5 60 3 01 **DNR Roving Crews** 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 0 72 Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase XIII: 8 8 8 Statewide and Metro Habitat 02 Contract Management 2021 0 Restoration Evaluations - ML 2021 0

Name	: Ashley Peters											
Due Date:	: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.											
Maximum sc	ore per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fiel	d if not evaluating a pro	oposal due to a conflict o	of interest.*								
						Crit	eria					
			2. Proposal									
			addresses priority									
			actions and									
			outcomes of one or									
		1. Proposal abstract	more of the	3. Proposal uses								
		provides a clear and	1	science-based	4. Proposal							
		succinct overview of	"		addresses habitats							
		the proposal activity,	1	leverages or expands								
			1.		value for wildlife							
		' '		1	species of greatest		6. Performance					
		is clearly written and	~	1 '	ļ ·	5. Proposal identifies				9. Proposal includes	10. Proposed budget	
		•	l'	"	·	indicator species and	,	7. Proposal		1		
		addresses: Who,		identified in the MN				outcomes will be	8. Degree of timing/		accomplish the	
		What, Where, When,	'	County Biological				maintained over	opportunistic		outcomes described	Total
		Why, and How.	1	Survey.	l ~		evaluating outcomes.		urgency.	appropriation.	in the scope of work.	
		•					_	i		1	·	Out of
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100

Lessard-	Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Propo	sal Evaluation	Scoring Sheet	- ML 2021 / FY	2022								
Name:	Tom Saxhaug												
Due Date:	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m. re per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field	d if not avaluating a pr	anasal dua to a conflict o	finterert *									
IVIAXIIIIUIII SCO	re per request is 100 points. Enter COT in the Total score Tien	u ii not evaluating a pro	oposai due to a commet o	i interest.		Crit	eria						
			Proposal addresses priority actions and										
		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.	outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to , produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat	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.	value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need,	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	leverage in funds or other effort to	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
PA01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase XIII	5	5	8	8	5	5	5	5	8	8	62	
PA02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program, Phase XIII	5	5	5	5	5	5	8	5	5	8	56	
PA03	MN Prairie Recovery Program, Phase XI	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	48	
PA04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase XII	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	48	
PA05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase X	3	3	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	44	
PA06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection, Phase VIII	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	48	
PA07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Phase IX	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	50	
PA08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley, Phase VII	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	50	
PA09	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program, Phase III	5	5	8	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	53	
PA10	Martin County WMA Acquisition, Phase V	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	3	5	46	
PA11	RIM Grassland Reserve, Phase III	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	45	
PRE01a	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII (with Roving Crew)	5	8	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	51	
PRE01b	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	48	
PRE02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands, Phase V	8	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	8	5	56	
PRE03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation, Phase VII	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	8	5	53	
FA01	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration, Phase IX	8	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5	5	5	8	5	56	
FA02	Minnesota Forests for the Future, Phase VIII	8	5.0	8.0	5	8.0	5	8	5	5	8	65	
FA03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB, Phase IX	8	5.0	5	5	5.0	5	8	8	5	8	62	
FRE01	DNR Forest Enhancement	8	5	5	5	5	5	8	8	5	8	62	
FRE02	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase IV	5	5	8	5	8	5	5	8	5	8	62	

Lessard-	Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Propo	sal Evaluation	Scoring Sheet	- ML 2021 / FY	2022								
Name:	Tom Saxhaug												
	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
Maximum sco	re per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field	d if not evaluating a pro	posal due to a conflict of	interest.*		Crit	eria						
		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.	ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat	County Biological Survey.	value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need,	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat with sabitat with the shight and the same ship to the same shi	a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.		leverage in funds or			Comments
FRE03	Program Title Moose Habitat Collaborative, Phase IV - NE MN Forest	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
FREUS	Habitat Enhancement	5	5	8	5	8	5	5	8	6	8	63	
WA01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase XIII	5	5	5	8	8	5	5	5	8	8	62	
WA02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program, Phase X	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	50	
WA03	RIM Wetlands, Phase X	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	46	
WA04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase VI	3	5	8	3	5	5	5	5	8	5	52	
WA05	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection, Phase VII	8	8	5	8	5	5	5	5	3	8	60	
WRE01a	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (with Roving Habitat Crew)	5	8	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	51	
WRE01b	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (without Roving Habitat Crew)	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	48	
WRE02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative, Phase VII	5	8	5	5	5	5	5	5	8	8	59	
HA01	St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration, Phase II	8	8	8	5	5	5	8	8	8	8	71	
HA02	Metro Big Rivers, Phase XI	8	8	5	5	5	5	5	5	8	8	62	
HA03	Lower Otter Tail River Corridor Habitat Restoration - Request 1	5	5	5	8	5	5	8	5	5	5	56	
HA04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes, Phase VII	8	5	5	8	5	5	8	5	5	5	59	
HA05	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project, Phase V	8	8	8	5	5	8	8	8	5	8	71	
HA06	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance	8	5	5	8	5	8	5	5	8	8	65	
HA07	Riparian Habitat Protection in the Kettle and Snake River Watersheds	8	8	5	8	8	5	5	5	5	8	65	
HA08	MNDNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	8	5	5	5	8	5	5	5	3	5	54	
HA09	Targeted RIM Easement and Acquisition to the Parcel Level Pine and Leech Watersheds, Phase II	8	8	8	8	5	5	8	8	3	5	66	
HA10	Urban Woods and Prairies Initiative Moorhead, MN Land Acquisition	8	5	5	8	5	5	8	8	8	5	65	
HRE01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase XIII	8	5	5	8	5	5	5	5	5	8	59	

Lessard	d-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Propo	osal Evaluation	Scoring Sheet	- ML 2021 / FY	1 2022								
Nam	e: Tom Saxhaug												
Due Date	: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
	core per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fie	eld if not evaluating a pr	oposal due to a conflict of	interest.*									
				ı	1	Cri	teria	1		ı	T		
		Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written an adequately addresses: Who, what Where Whore Whore Proposal is the provided prop	ecological sections and is likely to , produce and demonstrate significant and d permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat	corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN	endangered species,	indicator species and associated quantities	measuring and	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over	8. Degree of timing/	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to	is appropriate to accomplish the		
		What, Where, Wher Why, and How.	game and wildlife.	County Biological	and lists targeted	this habitat will	evaluating	maintained over time.	opportunistic	supplement any OHF	outcomes described in the scope of work.		Comments
		Max points: 10	game and whome.	Survey.	species.	typically support.	outcomes.	unie.	urgency.	appropriation.		Out of 100	
ID# HRE02	Program Title	iviax points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	1	10	10	10	Out of 100	
HKEU2	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, Phase IV	8	5	8	5	5	8	5	5	8	8	65	
HRE03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Phase VIII	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	80	
HRE04	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program, Phase X	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	8	5	53	
HRE05	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation, Phase VI	5	5	5	5	5	5	8	5	8	5	56	
HRE06	Southeast Wetland Restoration, Phase II	5	5	5	5	5	5	8	5	8	5	56	
HRE07	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection & Restoration, Phase II	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	8	8	5	56	
HRE08	Klondike Clean Water Retention Project, Phase I	3	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	8	8	52	
HRE09	Targeted Culvert Replacement to Enhance Fish Passage	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	50	
01	DNR Roving Crews	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100	Need to be fully funded
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase XIII: Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100	Need to be fully funded
02	Contract Management 2021	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100	Need to be fully funded
03	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2021	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100	Need to be fully funded

Name	: Ron Schara											
	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.											
Maximum so	ore per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fiel	ld if not evaluating a pro	oposal due to a conflict of	of interest.*		Cuit	eria					
						Crit	eria					
			2. Proposal									
			addresses priority actions and									
		Proposal abstract	outcomes of one or more of the	3. Proposal uses								
				science-based targeting that	4. Proposal addresses habitats							
		the proposal activity,	produce and	leverages or expands	that have significant							
		outputs, and outcomes. Proposal	demonstrate significant and		value for wildlife species of greatest		6. Performance					
		is clearly written and adequately	permanent conservation legacy			5. Proposal identifies indicator species and		7. Proposal			10. Proposed budget is appropriate to	
		addresses: Who,	and/or habitat	identified in the MN	endangered species,	associated quantities	specific plan for	outcomes will be	8. Degree of timing/	other effort to	accomplish the	
		What, Where, When, Why, and How.	outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	County Biological Survey.			measuring and evaluating outcomes.	maintained over	opportunistic urgency.	supplement any OHF appropriation.	outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of
PA01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase XIII	8	8	8	6	6	6	8	6	5	8	100 69
PA02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program, Phase XIII	8	8	8	8	6	6	8	6	10	9	77
PA03	MN Prairie Recovery Program, Phase XI	8	8	8	6	6	6	8	6	3	8	67
PA04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase XII	8	8	8	6	6	6	8	6	3	8	67
PA05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase X	8	6	6	6	6	6	8	6	3	8	63
PA06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection, Phase VIII	8	6	6	6	6	6	8	6	0	5	57
PA07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Phase IX	8	6	6	6	6	5	8	6	0	8	59
PA08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley, Phase VII	8	6	6	6	8	6	6	6	5	8	65
PA09	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program, Phase III	8	8	8	6	8	6	6	6	8	8	72
PA10	Martin County WMA Acquisition, Phase V	8	8	6	8	8	6	6	6	0	8	64
PA11	RIM Grassland Reserve, Phase III	8	8	6	8	8	6	6	6	0	8	64
PRE01a	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII (with Roving Crew)	8	8	6	8	8	6	6	6	0	8	64
PRE01b	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII	8	8	6	8	8	6	6	6	0	8	64
PRE02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands, Phase V	8	8	8	8	8	6	6	6	0	8	66
PRE03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation, Phase VII	8	8	8	8	8	6	6	6	8	8	74
FA01	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration, Phase IX	8	6.0	6.0	8.0	8.0	6	6	6	3	8	65

HA03

Request 1

Lower Otter Tail River Corridor Habitat Restoration -

Lessard	-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Propo	sal Evaluation	Scoring Sheet	- ML 2021 / FY	2022								
Name	Ron Schara												
Due Date:	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
Maximum sco	ore per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fie	eld if not evaluating a pro	oposal due to a conflict	of interest.*									
				T	Ι	Crit	teria	Ι	T		1		
	1	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.	demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	County Biological Survey.	value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	measuring and evaluating outcomes.	outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	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	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100	
FA02	Minnesota Forests for the Future, Phase VIII	8	5.0	5.0	5	5.0	5	7	5	0	5	50	
FA03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB, Phase IX	5	5.0	5	3	3.0	5	5	5	0	5	41	can't see public value; return on investment??
FRE01	DNR Forest Enhancement	8	5	6	5	3	5	5	5	0	5	47	
FRE02	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase IV	8	6	8	5	3	5	5	5	3	8	56	
FRE03	Moose Habitat Collaborative, Phase IV - NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement	8	5	6	8	5	5	5	5	3	8	58	
WA01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase XIII	8	8	8	8	5	5	5	5	10	8	70	
WA02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program, Phase X	8	8	8	8	5	5	3	5	5	8	63	
WA03	RIM Wetlands, Phase X	8	5	8	5	5	5	5	5	0	8	54	
WA04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase VI	8	8	8	5	5	5	8	5	0	8	60	
WA05	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection, Phase VII	8	5	8	5	5	5	8	5	0	8	57	
WRE01a	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (with Roving Habitat Crew)	8	8	9	9	8	6	6	6	0	8	68	
WRE01b	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (without Roving Habitat Crew)	8	8	9	9	8	6	6	6	0	8	68	
WRE02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative, Phase VII	9	9	9	9	8	6	6	6	0	8	70	
HA01	St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration, Phase II	9	9	7	5	5	6	8	6	5	8	68	
HA02	Metro Big Rivers, Phase XI	6	6	6	5	5	6	8	6	5	8	61	confusing plan/ parks and more parks?
11402	Lower Ottor Tail Diver Carrider Hebitat Destaration		1	1	1		1						

	Par School		0	- ,								
	Ron Schara											
	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m. ore per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fie	old if not ovaluating a pr	ranasal dua ta a sanflist d	of interest *								
IVIAXIIIIUIII SC	ore per request is 100 points. Enter COT in the Total score he	eld if flot evaluating a pr	roposal due to a conflict (or interest.		Crit	teria					
		1. Proposal abstract		3. Proposal uses								
		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.	and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat	science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted	indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will		outcomes will be maintained over			10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100
HA04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes, Phase VII	9	8	8	9	7	6	8	6	3	8	72
HA05	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project, Phase V	9	9	8	9	8	7	8	6	3	8	more leverage???
HA06	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance	7	9	8	6	7	6	8	6	5	8	70
HA07	Riparian Habitat Protection in the Kettle and Snake River Watersheds	7	8	8	8	7	6	8	6	0	8	66
HA08	MNDNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	7	9	7	6	6	6	8	6	0	8	habitat or access??
HA09	Targeted RIM Easement and Acquisition to the Parcel Level Pine and Leech Watersheds, Phase II	7	7	7	6	6	6	8	6	0	8	61
HA10	Urban Woods and Prairies Initiative Moorhead, MN Land Acquisition	5	5	5	5	3	5	8	3	3	5	this a park?
HRE01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase XIII	8	7	7	8	7	6	8	6	8	8	design issues solved, settled??
HRE02	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, Phase IV	8	8	8	6	6	8	8	6	10	8	76
HRE03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Phase VIII	8	6	8	6	6	6	8	6	5	8	67
HRE04	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program, Phase X	8	7	8	7	6	6	8	6	3	8	more leverage???
HRE05	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation, Phase VI	8	8	6	8	6	6	8	6	5	8	69
HRE06	Southeast Wetland Restoration, Phase II	5	5	6	8	6	6	8	6	7	8	65 is this
HRE07	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection & Restoration, Phase II	8	6	8	8	7	6	8	6	7	8	72
HRE08	Klondike Clean Water Retention Project, Phase I	8	7	8	8	8	6	8	8	10	8	79
HRE09	Targeted Culvert Replacement to Enhance Fish Passage	8	6	6	8	8	6	8	6	3	8	67

Name	Ron Schara												
Due Date:	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
	ore per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fie	eld if not evaluating a pr	oposal due to a conflict o	of interest.*									
						Cri	teria						
			2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or										
			and is likely to produce and demonstrate	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest		6. Performance						
		is clearly written and			1	5. Proposal identifies	measures are clearly			9. Proposal includes	10. Proposed budget		
		adequately		protects areas	and/or threatened or	indicator species and	identified, and have a	7. Proposal		leverage in funds or			
				identified in the MN			specific plan for	outcomes will be	8. Degree of timing/	other effort to	accomplish the		
		What, Where, When,		County Biological			measuring and	maintained over			F outcomes described	Total	
		Why, and How.	game and wildlife.	Survey.	species.	typically support.	evaluating outcomes.	time.	urgency.	appropriation.	in the scope of work.		Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
01	DNR Roving Crews	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	80	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase XIII: Statewide and Metro Habitat											0	
02	Contract Management 2021											0	
03	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2021											0	

Jamie Sw	/enson				Criteria								
ID#	Program Title	Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How. Max points: 10	outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	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. 10	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 outcome s will be	1 ~	9. Proposal includes leverage in e funds or othe / effort to in supplement any OHF appropriation	outcomes described in the scope of	Total Score Out of	Comments
PA01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase XIII	max points: 10	10	10	1	10		1		1	1 20	100	Q1: The Proposal's Need cites the counties with less than 2% public ownership and the Prairie Plan. Support the
1701	DIVIN WIVIA and SIVA Acquisition, I hase Am	9	9	9	9	9	7	7	5	0	8	72	acquisitions where this is true - southern MN counties. This does not include Chsago or Crow Wing according to the state land ownership maps or Prairie Core Areas in the Prairie Plan. Q2: From the proposal, why have the total acres has been lower in the last three yrs compared to previous, especially when the appropriations have gone up? Q3: Why no leverage compared to previous years?
PA02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program, Phase XIII	10	9	9	9	9	9	7	6	8	8	84	
PA03	MN Prairie Recovery Program, Phase XI	8	9	9	9	9	9	8	6	5	8	80	Q: Mentions the project is scalable with a proportional reduction in on-the-ground accomplishments. Current fund request is split for protection vs enhancement/restoration. Historically funds have been split, but ML18 & ML19 show more funds allocated to "Enhance" vs "Protect" - will more funding go towards R&E like the last few years or go back to the historical proportional split?
PA04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase XII	8	8	8	7	10	8	7	5	4	8	73	
PA05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase X	8	8	9	7	8	8	7	5	4	8	72	
PA06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection, Phase VIII	9	9	8	8	8	6	7	7	0	6	68	Q: Why doesn't the proposal include county locations? Parcel list references map, nothing provided.
PA07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Phase IX	8	8	7	8	9	8	8	7	0	6	69	Q: Previous funding had match/timing urgency. Does that urgency still exist for RIM? Explain in greater detail the changes in allocation within the proposal from previous phases regarding funding riparian buffers in support of the Buffer Law and instead expanding into larger, non-buffer areas. Percent funding allocated to Buffers vs Non-Buffer? Does the "Enhances MN Buffer Law" expand funding for buffers on waters not required to have a buffer in the Buffer Law (ie. Private Ditch), or non-buffer areas?
PA08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley, Phase VII	8	9	8	9	9	9	8	9	7	8	84	Q: Has anyone, or is it possible, to analyzed data and created a map for breeding prairie grouse similar to the USFWS "thundermap" for mallards to identify habitat needs?
PA09	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program, Phase III	9	9	10	9	9	8	10	8	6	8	86	Appreciate the public-private partnership innovation since so much land in the prairie area is private. Great and innovative way to preserve habitat and maintain outcomes over time. A WIN-WIN-WIN Q: Is the leverage a percent match or lump sum regardless of funding amount?
PA10	Martin County WMA Acquisition, Phase V	7	7	7	7	8	7	7	5	0	6	61	Q: What is the percent of expired CRP contracts that don't re-enroll that this proposal is looking to capture?
PA11	RIM Grassland Reserve, Phase III	8	7	8	7	8	8	8	8	0	6	68	Q: Previous funding had match/timing urgency. Does that urgency still exist for RIM?
PRE01a	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII (with Roving Crew)	7	7	7	8	9	6	7	6	0	8	65	Q1: Previous funding from Game & Fish, Dedicated Accounts (Duck Stamp, Pheasant Stamp, etc, and Heritage Enhancement Acct. What percentage of this funding request is supplanting? Q2: Explain in greater detail how, "this request is part of a larger effortmultiple partners worked together to submit a State Acre For Wildlife Enhancement to FSA to boost CRP acres in MN." What percent of public grasslands are being grazed? Public-private partnership opportunity? BLM Model?

Jamie Sw	/enson				Criteria								
		Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outputs, and 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.	corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have	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 outcome s will be		9. Proposal includes leverage in e funds or othe (fort to in supplement any OHF appropriation	outcomes described in the scope of	Total Score	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of	
PRE01b	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII (without roving crew)	7	7	7	8	9	6	7	6	0	8	65	Q1: Program, output table of acres and parcels are the same with and without the roving crew. Difficult to understand the program leftover as a stand-alone proposal if roving crews are funded in a separate proposal. Why fund this proposal if funding the O1 proposal?
PRE02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands, Phase V	9	8	8	8	9	7	8	7	5	9	78	
PRE03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation, Phase VII	9	8	9	10	9	7	6	7	4	7		Great explanation of how this proposal is tied to other funds. Q: What portion of the proposal cover the ACD's Rare Plant Rescue Program? If funded by LCCMR, what's the plan for this proposal?
FA01	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration, Phase IX	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	5	1	6	69	Q: The proposal mentions federal funds as a match, but lists this as "leverage" and doesn't include federal match amounts in the table. Is this a typo or are there federal funds as a leverage also?
FA02	Minnesota Forests for the Future, Phase VIII	7	7	7	7	8	7	8	6	1	6	64	Q: Previous funding came from the Wild Turkey Federation and Minnesota Deer Hunters. Why no leverage from these partners? This proposal is very broad. Easier to see value and "move the needle" if focused on specific outcomes, ie. permanent
FA03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB, Phase IX	9	8	8	7	8	7	8	7	8	7	77	Q: Similar to previous proposals, this proposal indicates DOD leverage from the REPI program, but doesn't provide a leverage amount. Confirm this proposal also includes the DOD leverage similar to previous proposals.
FRE01	DNR Forest Enhancement	6	8	7	10	8	7	6	6	0	7	65	Q: Previous funding from Game & Fish, Dedicated Accounts, Heritage Enhancement. What percent of this proposal is supplanting?
FRE02	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase IV	6	6	5	5	6	7	6	3	6	3	53	Q1: Table shows 3,445 acres, but measure of success/outcome is 1,000 acres. What is the measurement of success for the other 2,445 acres? Q2: What is the assumed survival rate of tree plantings to achieve 4.5 ft height?
FRE03	Moose Habitat Collaborative, Phase IV - NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement	9	9	8	10	8	8	7	9	4	8	80	Q: Scientific approach to target areas: Proposal mentions focus on the "moose range." With such a steep decline in known moose population, is there data to focus on known moose populations and target these specific areas for habitat enhancements, or no?
WA01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase XIII	7	9	10	8	9	8	8	8	9	8	84	

Jamie Sw	vencon				Criteria								
ID# WA02	Program Title Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection &	1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How. Max points: 10	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.	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. 10	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 outcome s will be maintain ed over time. 10	of timing opportur stic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in end funds or other funds or other feffort to all supplement any OHF appropriation	outcomes described in the scope of		Comments Q: Are we seeing an increase in urgency due to increased ag drainage activity in the last decade?
	Restoration Program, Phase X	9	10	10	9	9	/	8	8	4	8	82	
WA03	RIM Wetlands, Phase X	7	7	8	8	8	8	8	7	0	3	64	Q: Previous funding had match/timing urgency. Does that urgency still exist for RIM?
WA04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase VI	7	8	8	8	9	8	8	8	1	8		Q: With this proposal being an easement acquisition program, are there working land components part of the "comprehensive management plans" that are developed for the easement areas?
WA05	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection, Phase VII	9	9	8	9	9	8	9	9	0	8	78	
WRE01a	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (with Roving Habitat	7	7	7	7	8	7	7	7	0	7		Q: how much is allocated to the ten wetland enhancement projects on 2,170 acres and how much on the other nine projects?
WRE01b	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (without Roving	7	7	7	7	8	7	7	7	0	7	64	
WRE02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative, Phase VII	9	9	9	9	9	9	8	7	6	8	83	
HA01	St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration, Phase II	8	6	8	7	7	6	9	5	1	8	65	
HA02	Metro Big Rivers, Phase XI	8	7	8	7	7	7	7	5	5	4	65	
HA03	Lower Otter Tail River Corridor Habitat Restoration - Request 1	9	9	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	81	Q: The DNR's HRE02 project includes the Otter Tail River dam removal. How does this align with this project?
HA04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes, Phase VII	9	10	10	10	7	9	9	9	4	7	84	
HA05	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project, Phase V	8	8	8	9	6	7	8	5	4	8	71	

Jamie Sw	renson				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.	corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN	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. Performanc measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcome s will be	of timin	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or othe g/ effort to ni supplement any OHF	outcomes described in the scope of	Total Score	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of	
HA06	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance	9	5	8	8	8	7	8	7	1	6	67	Q1: In discussing the state's lake priorities, the proposal mentions "a major gap in protection exists" and that this program "addresses the noted protection gap" can you elaborate what plans/reports identify this gap? Q2: Does this program replace the Critical Shorelands Program? Is this a phased project? Elaborate on what is considered success of this program. Q3: 10% of 407 lakes is 40 lakes. No counties or parcel information included with the proposal. Only a map of the previous Critical Shorelands Program area footprint. Elaborate on location information to determine overlap with wild rice and cisco/tullibee programs.
HA07	Riparian Habitat Protection in the Kettle and Snake River Watersheds	7	7	8	8	7	8	8	8	0	7	68	
HA08	MNDNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	7	7	7	7	5	5	8	7	0	7	60	Q: Where are project partners and leverage?
HA09	Targeted RIM Easement and Acquisition to the Parcel Level Pine and Leech Watersheds, Phase	9	8	9	8	8	9	8	8	0	8	75	
HA10	Urban Woods and Prairies Initiative Moorhead, MN Land Acquisition	8	5	4	4	6	8	8	9	9	8		Q1: There are three phases of the project over a 5-year establishment period. Will there be future proposals or is this the only proposal to LSOHC for the acquisition component? Will the remainder be funded by CPL only? Q2: Elaborate on how this is scalable. Q3: What is all included in professional service line?
HRE01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase	7	9	9	9	4	7	8	7	6	5	71	
HRE02	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, Phase IV	7	8	7	8	7	8	6	7	9	7	74	Q: How does this proposal and HA03 align?
HRE03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Phase VIII	6	8	8	8	7	7	8	8	5	6	71	Q: Does this proposal include Mud Lake E and W or both? Supporting map shows Mud Lake East resto already underway?
HRE04	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program, Phase X	7	6	7	7	7	7	8	5	5	7	66	
HRE05	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation, Phase VI	5	8	8	9	8	8	7	5	4	7	69	
HRE06	Southeast Wetland Restoration, Phase II	6	5	6	6	5	5	7	4	8	2		Q1: What percent of this project and personnel costs are supplanting from City's stormwater program? Q2: Where are project partners to support urgency and importance in region for this one city stormwater project?
HRE07	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection & Restoration, Phase II	8	7	7	7	8	7	7	5	4	7	67	

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.	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.	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 outcome s will be maintain ed over time.	of timing opportun stic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in e funds or other / effort to ni supplement any OHF appropriation	outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score Out of	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100	
HRE08	Klondike Clean Water Retention Project, Phase I	8	8	7	7	6	6	7	9	10	8	76	
HRE09	Targeted Culvert Replacement to Enhance Fish Passage	8	7	7	7	5	5	8	4	4	8	63	
01	DNR Roving Crews	8	9	7	8	7	5	7	8	0	9	68	One proposal for roving crew restoration work make sense, whether the acres are prairie, wetland, or forest resto or enhancement can be tracked on the reporting side. Also a return of future/unspent funds from previous years, to be recommended for reappropriation. Lets simplify this for everyone. Q1: in total, how many roving crew FTE have been funded for FY 2022 and beyond from previous funding OHF? other sources? Q2: Clearly explain the pricing and resource difference between the five proposals to clarify the math: Roving Crew costs: PRE01a is 6 FTE for 5 years for \$2,467,500 (ave 82,250/FTE/yr). 21.5k ac PE WRE01a is 2 FTE for 5 years for \$701,000 (ave \$70,100/FTE/yr) 2.5k ac WE Combined: 8 FTE for 5 years for \$3,168,500 (ave \$79,213/FTE/yr), 24k acres total (ave \$132/ac) Difference between PRE01a & b: \$4,005,100. Difference between WRE01a & b: \$1,104,000. Total: \$5,109,100 However; OH-1 is 34 FTE for 2 years for \$5,549,000 (ave \$81,603/FTE/yr). 9k ac WE, 4k ac PR+39,600ac PE, 3.5k ac FE, 56.1k acres total. (ave \$99/ac) Q3: If OH-1 simply pulls out the roving crews from the other two proposals, why wouldn't the OH-1 proposal equal 8 FTE for 5 yrs for \$3,168,500? Why an extra 25 FTE over only 2 yrs of funding? Q4: If OH-1 isn't funded and PRE01a & WRE01a is funded instead, then what is the current and future funding source for the other 25 FTE for 2022+?
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase XIII: Statewide and Metro Habitat	9	10	9	9	8	8	9	9	6	9	86	
O2	Contract Management 2021	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	
O3	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2021	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	

Jamie Swenson			Criteria										
				3. Proposal uses									
		1. Proposal abstract	2. Proposal addresses	science-based	4. Proposal addresses						10. Proposed		
		provides a clear and	priority actions and	targeting that	habitats that have	5. Proposal	6. Performance				budget is		
		succinct overview of	outcomes of one or more of	leverages or expands	significant value for	identifies	measures are			9. Proposal	appropriate		
		the proposal activity,	the ecological sections and	corridors and	wildlife species of	indicator	clearly	7.		includes	to		
		outputs, and	is likely to produce and	complexes, reduces	greatest conservation	species and	identified, and	Proposal		leverage in	accomplish		
		outcomes. Proposal is	demonstrate significant and	fragmentation or	need, and/or	associated	have a specific	outcome	8. Degree	funds or other	the		
		clearly written and	permanent conservation	protects areas	threatened or	quantities	plan for	s will be	of timing/	effort to	outcomes		
		adequately addresses:	legacy and/or habitat	identified in the MN	endangered species,	this habitat	measuring and	maintain	opportun	supplement	described in		
		Who, What, Where,	outcomes for fish, game and	County Biological	and lists targeted	will typically	evaluating	ed over	stic	any OHF	the scope of	Total	
		When, Why, and How.	wildlife.	Survey.	species.	support.	outcomes.	time.	urgency.	appropriation.	work.		Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of	

	Name: Senator David Temassoni											
	Name: Senator David Tomassoni											
	Due Date: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m. Maximum score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest.*											
Maximum sc	ore per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fie	eld if not evaluating a pr	roposal due to a conflict (of interest.*		Crit	eria					
		Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of	ecological sections	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that	4. Proposal addresses habitats							
	1	the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When Why, and How.	produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	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.	identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	in the scope of work.	Total Score Comments Out of
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100
PA01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase XIII	7	8	8	8	6	6	6	6	4	5	64
PA02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program, Phase XIII	7	7	6	6	7	7	6	6	4	5	61
PA03	MN Prairie Recovery Program, Phase XI	7	6	7	7	7	8	7	6	3	5	63
PA04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase XII	7	8	7	7	6	6	7	6	4	5	63
PA05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase X	6	7	6	6	7	6	7	6	5	4	
PA06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection, Phase VIII	6	5	7	5	5	6	5	5	0	5	49
PA07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Phase IX	6	7	6	6	5	6	5	5	0	5	51
PA08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley, Phase VII	6	6	6	5	6	6	5	6	7	5	58
PA09	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program, Phase III	9	8	9	8	7	7	8	7	6	5	74
PA10	Martin County WMA Acquisition, Phase V	6	7	6	7	6	6	7	7	0	5	57
PA11	RIM Grassland Reserve, Phase III	6	7	8	7	6	6	6	7	0	5	58
PRE01a	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII (with Roving Crew)	7	7	8	7	7	7	6	6	0	5	60
PRE01b	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII	6	6	7	6	6	6	7	6	0	5	55
PRE02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands, Phase V	6	6	6	7	7	6	6	6	2	5	57
PRE03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation, Phase VII	6	6	7	7	6	7	7	6	1	5	58
FA01	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration, Phase IX	6	6.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	6	6	7	1	5	53

Name	e: Senator David Tomassoni												
	:: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
Maximum s	core per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fie	ld if not evaluating a pro	oposal due to a conflict	of interest.*								_	
				T		Cri	teria 						T
		provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When,	produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish,	complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological	value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted	indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will	measuring and	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over	8. Degree of timing/opportunistic	other effort to supplement any OHF	is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described	Total	
ID#	Program Title	Why, and How. Max points: 10	game and wildlife. 10	Survey.	species.	typically support.	evaluating outcomes. 10	10	urgency.	appropriation.	in the scope of work.	Score Out of 100	Comments
FA02	Minnesota Forests for the Future, Phase VIII	8	7.0	8.0	7	7.0	8	8	7	2	7	69	
FA03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB, Phase IX	6	6.0	7	6	6.0	6	6	6	0	5	54	
FRE01	DNR Forest Enhancement	8	8	7	8	8	7	7	8	0	7	68	
FRE02	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase IV	8	9	8	7	7	8	7	8	2	5	69	
FRE03	Moose Habitat Collaborative, Phase IV - NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement	8	8	7	7	8	7	7	8	3	7	70	
WA01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase XIII	6	7	7	6	7	6	5	7	6	6	63	

Targeted RIM Easement and Acquisition to the Parcel

Level Pine and Leech Watersheds, Phase II

Lessard	essard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022												
Name	:: Senator David Tomassoni												
	: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
Maximum sc	ore per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fie	eld if not evaluating a pr	oposal due to a conflict	of interest.*		Cri	teria						
			ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat	corridors and	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.			7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over	8. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.		10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
WA02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program, Phase X	8	9	8	7	8	8	7	8	4	7	74	
WA03	RIM Wetlands, Phase X	6	6	7	6	7	6	7	7	0	7	59	
WA04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase VI	6	6	7	6	7	6	7	7	4	6	62	
WA05	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection, Phase VII	6	7	6	6	6	7	6	7	0	5	56	
WRE01a	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (with Roving Habitat Crew)	6	6	5	6	6	6	5	6	0	5	51	
WRE01b	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (without Roving Habitat Crew)	6	6	5	5	6	7	5	5	0	5	50	
WRE02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative, Phase VII	8	8	9	7	8	7	8	8	3	7	73	
HA01	St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration, Phase II	6	6	7	6	6		6	5	4	5	51	
HA02	Metro Big Rivers, Phase XI	6	7	6	7	7	6	7	5	6	5	62	
HA03	Lower Otter Tail River Corridor Habitat Restoration - Request 1	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	4	7	67	
HA04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes, Phase VII	6	6	7	6	6	7	6	6	3	6	59	
HA05	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project, Phase V	6	6	7	6	6	6	7	7	3	6	60	
HA06	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	5	7	68	
HA07	Riparian Habitat Protection in the Kettle and Snake River Watersheds	6	7	6	6	6	5	5	6	0	5	52	
HA08	MNDNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	7	7	7	7	7	5	6	6	0	5	57	
		1	T -			1	T .		T	T .	T		

0

55

Name: Senator David Tomassoni

Due Date: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.

Maximum score per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest.* Criteria 2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or 1. Proposal abstract more of the 3. Proposal uses provides a clear and ecological sections science-based 4. Proposal succinct overview of and is likely to addresses habitats targeting that leverages or expands that have significant the proposal activity, produce and outputs, and demonstrate corridors and value for wildlife significant and species of greatest 6. Performance outcomes. Proposal complexes, reduces is clearly written and permanent fragmentation or conservation need, 5. Proposal identifies | measures are clearly 9. Proposal includes 10. Proposed budget adequately conservation legacy protects areas and/or threatened or indicator species and lidentified, and have a 7. Proposal leverage in funds or is appropriate to addresses: Who, and/or habitat identified in the MN endangered species, associated quantities specific plan for outcomes will be 8. Degree of timing/ other effort to accomplish the County Biological What, Where, When, outcomes for fish, this habitat will supplement any OHF outcomes described and lists targeted measuring and maintained over opportunistic Total Why, and How. game and wildlife. species. typically support. evaluating outcomes. time. appropriation. in the scope of work. Score Comments Survey. urgency. Out of ID# **Program Title** Max points: 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 100 HA10 Urban Woods and Prairies Initiative Moorhead, MN Land 4 5 5 5 5 2 5 45 4 5 Acquisition HRE01 Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 7 6 61 Enhancement and Restoration, Phase XIII HRE02 DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, 7 6 7 7 6 9 6 69 HRE03 St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Phase VIII 7 6 6 6 6 7 6 3 6 59 HRE04 Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program, Phase X 7 60 6 7 6 6 6 7 3 6 HRE05 Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation, Phase VI 6 6 7 6 6 7 6 4 5 6 HRE06 Southeast Wetland Restoration, Phase II 6 7 6 5 6 7 6 7 5 61 HRE07 Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection & Restoration, 6 6 7 HRE08 Klondike Clean Water Retention Project, Phase I 71 10 HRE09 Targeted Culvert Replacement to Enhance Fish Passage 7 6 6 7 2 5 59 01 **DNR Roving Crews** 6 6 0 54 Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase XIII: Statewide and Metro Habitat 02 Contract Management 2021 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 0 10 90 Restoration Evaluations - ML 2021 90 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 0

Name	ame: Senator David Tomassoni												
	e Date: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
Maximum sco	re per request is 100 points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" fiel	d if not evaluating a pro	oposal due to a conflict o	of interest.*									
						Crit	eria						
			2. Proposal										
			addresses priority										
			actions and										
			outcomes of one or										
		1. Proposal abstract	more of the	3. Proposal uses									
		provides a clear and	ecological sections	science-based	4. Proposal								
		succinct overview of	"	1	addresses habitats								
		the proposal activity,	1	leverages or expands	that have significant								
					value for wildlife								
		outcomes. Proposal			species of greatest		6. Performance						
		is clearly written and	"	l '	ļ.	5. Proposal identifies	measures are clearly			9. Proposal includes	10. Proposed budget		
		adequately	1	_	and/or threatened or	indicator species and	identified, and have a	7. Proposal		leverage in funds or	is appropriate to		
		addresses: Who,		identified in the MN				outcomes will be	8. Degree of timing/		accomplish the		
		What, Where, When,	1 '	County Biological				maintained over	J 0		outcomes described	Total	
			1	, ,	1		evaluating outcomes.			appropriation.	in the scope of work.	Score Comments	
15.1		· ·			'			1	T .	1	† ·	Out of	
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100	