

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

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 "COL" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict 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,	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	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score		Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100		
PA01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase XIII	10	10	10	10	10	8	9	7	7	9	90		Phase 13, fee acquisition
PA02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program, Phase XIII	10	10	10	7	10	8	9	5	6	6	81		Phase 13, Pheasants Forever, asking for almost \$14m
PA03	MN Prairie Recovery Program, Phase XI	10	10	8	9	10	8	7	5	9	7	83		TNC, Phase 11
PA04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase XII	10	10	8	9	8	8	9	5	8	7	82		TNC, Phase 12
PA05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase X	10	10	10	9	10	8	7	5	6	8	83		Phase 10, Cannon River Watershed, TPL, Great River Greening
PA06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection, Phase VIII	10	10	10	9	10	8	9	7	5	9	87		Phase 8, DNR
PA07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Phase IX	10	10	8	10	10	8	9	6	6	7	84		Phase 9, BWSR
PA08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley, Phase VII	10	10	9	7	10	8	9	5	7	6	81		Phase 7, Prairie Chicken Society, PF
PA09	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program, Phase III	10	10	10	8	10	8	7	7	9	6	85		Phase 3, DU and PF
PA10	Martin County WMA Acquisition, Phase V	10	10	10	7	10	8	9	5	5	5	79		Phase 5, Fox Lake, Conservation Fund
PA11	RIM Grassland Reserve, Phase III	10	10	10	9	10	9	10	9	8	8	93		Phase 3, BWSR
PRE01a	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII (with Roving Crew)	10	10	10	10	10	8	7	7	5	8	85		
PRE01b	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII	10	9	10	10	10	8	7	7	5	8	84		
PRE02	Enhanced Public Land – Grasslands, Phase V	10	10	8	7	10	8	6	7	7	8	81		PF
PRE03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation, Phase VII	10	10	10	9	10	8	9	8	8	8	90		Great River Greening, NWTF, MLT, TNC
FA01	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration, Phase IX	10	10.0	10.0	8.0	10.0	8	9	8	8	6	87	SE Forest	TNC, blufflands
FA02	Minnesota Forests for the Future, Phase VIII	10	10.0	10.0	9	10.0	8	9	7	6	8	87	N&SE Forest	DNR
FA03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB, Phase IX	10	8.0	10	7	7.0	7	9	5	6	6	75		Morrison County SWCD, easement only, not open to public
FRE01	DNR Forest Enhancement	10	10	10	8	10	8	8	8	7	9	88		DNR
FRE02	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase IV	10	10	10	9	10	8	8	8	8	9	90		Audubon
FRE03	Moose Habitat Collaborative, Phase IV - NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement	10	10	10	8	10	7	9	8	8	8	88		Ruffed Grouse Society
WA01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase XIII	10	10	10	7	10	7	8	5	9	5	81		Pheasants Forever, Phase 13
WA02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program, Phase X	10	9	10	8	10	8	9	5	6	6	81		DU
WA03	RIM Wetlands, Phase X	10	10	10	9	10	8	9	9	6	7	88		BWSR
WA04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase VI	10	9	8	7	10	8	7	6	7	7	79		
WA05	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection, Phase VII	10	10	10	10	10	8	8	9	6	9	90		BWSR

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

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 "COL" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict 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,	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	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score		Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100		
WRE01a	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (with Roving Habitat Crew)	10	10	10	10	10	8	7	7	5	8	85	all	Phase 13, statewide
WRE01b	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (without Roving Habitat Crew)	10	9	10	10	10	8	7	7	5	8	84	all	Phase 13, statewide
WRE02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative, Phase VII	10	10	10	7	10	6	7	4	7	7	78	prairie pothole	Phase 7, Ducks Unlimited
HA01	St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration, Phase II	10	10	10	8	10	7	7	8	7	8	85	Metro/No. Forest	St Croix River Association, MN Land Trust, Trust for Public Land. Carlos Avery, Bayport WMAs.
HA02	Metro Big Rivers, Phase XI	10	10	10	8	10	8	7	9	10	8	90	Metro	
HA03	Lower Otter Tail River Corridor Habitat Restoration - Request 1	10	9	10	7	10	7	7	7	10	8	85	Prairie	FIRST REQUEST, BWSR, Buffalo-Red River Watershed District, Wilkin SWCD
HA04	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes, Phase VII	10	10	10	9	10	9	8	9	8	8	91	Northern Forest	Northern Waters Land Trust, MLT - tullibee in deep cold water lakes in Cass County
HA05	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project, Phase V	10	10	10	9	10	9	9	10	7	9	93	rest/prairie transect	TPL, BWSR, 8 SWCDs
HA06	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance	10	10	10	8	10	7	7	8	10	9	89	Northern Forest	FIRST REQUEST, easements only, MLT ,Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance, NE part of state (Cass to Cook to Carlton)
HA07	Riparian Habitat Protection in the Kettle and Snake River Watersheds	10	10	10	9	10	8	7	7	5	8	84	Northern Forest	Pine County SWCD, sturgeon
HA08	MNDNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	10	10	10	7	10	8	10	8	7	9	89	N&SE Forest	DNR, easement only, 11 miles trout stream, NE and SE rivers
HA09	Targeted RIM Easement and Acquisition to the Parcel Level Pine and Leech Watersheds, Phase II	10	10	10	10	10	8	9	10	7	9	93	Northern Forest	Crow Wing SWCD
HA10	Urban Woods and Prairies Initiative Moorhead, MN Land Acquisition	10	10	10	7	10	8	9	9	9	9	91	Prairie	Audubon
HRE01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase XIII	10	9	10	7	10	7	6	5	6	8	78	Forest/metro	Phase 13, leverage was all listed as expected (not confirmed)
HRE02	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, Phase IV	10	10	10	8	10	8	7	7	10	10	90	statewide	Phase 4, \$3.2m committed as leverage
HRE03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Phase VIII	10	10	10	7	10	8	7	7	8	7	84	Northern forest	Phase 8,
HRE04	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program, Phase X	10	10	10	7	10	8	7	6	7	8	83	Prairie	Phase 10, Freeborn County
HRE05	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation, Phase VI	10	10	10	7	10	8	8	6	8	8	85	Northern forest	Phase 6, Lake & St Louis Counties
HRE06	Southeast Wetland Restoration, Phase II	10	10	10	5	5	7	9	8	9	9	82	Prairie	Phase 2, Mankato. Like that its near a population center
HRE07	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection & Restoration, Phase II	10	10	10	10	10	8	8	8	7	8	89	Prairie/forest	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	7	10	8	86	Forest/prairie	Phase 1, Kittson County
HRE09	Targeted Culvert Replacement to Enhance Fish Passage	10	10	10	7	8	7	6	6	5	7	76	Northern forest	First ask, Lake County, brook trout
O1	DNR Roving Crews	10	10	10	8	10	8	6	7	5	9	83	statewide	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase XIII: Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	10	10	8	10	10	9	8	10	10	95	statewide	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

Name:		Jamie Becker-Finn												
Date:		Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m. Email to becky.enfield@isohc.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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where,	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	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score		Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100		
O2	Contract Management 2021											100		Fully fund
O3	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2021											100		Fully fund

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

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

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

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

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

Name: Kristin Eggerling													
Due Date: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is <b>100</b> points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict 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.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	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	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

Name: Kristin Eggerling													
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										Total Score	Comments
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	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	
O1	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	
O3	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2021	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	0	9	81	





Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

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

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

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										Total Score	Comments
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	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 Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

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

## Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

[illegible]

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

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											
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Total Score Out of 100	Comments

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

Name:		David Hartwell											
Due		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											
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	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 staff (biologists and protection specialists) have full time jobs - is that really necessary? What keeps the biologists busy in the winter? SSA finally makes sense :)
PA04	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	
PA06	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....

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

Name:		David Hartwell											
Due		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											
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	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	
FA03	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.

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

Name:		David Hartwell											
Due		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											
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
FRE01	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	



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

Name:		David Hartwell											
Due		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											
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	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	
HA02	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?

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

Name: David Hartwell													
Due	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
Maximum score per request is <b>100</b> points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest.*													
		Criteria										Total Score	Comments
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	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
HA06	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance	10	10	10	10	8	7	9	8	2	7	81	
HA07	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.
HA09	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
HA10	Urban Woods and Prairies Initiative Moorhead, MN Land Acquisition											COI	
HRE01	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
HRE02	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, Phase IV	10	10	10	7	8	7	10	6	5	8	81	
HRE03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Phase VIII	10	10	6	8	8	8	10	7	1	7	75	
HRE04	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program, Phase X	8	8	7	7	8	6	7	6	1	6	64	what are the professional services?
HRE05	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
HRE07	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection & Restoration, Phase II	8	9	10	8	8	6	8	7	1	7	72	
HRE08	Klondike Clean Water Retention Project, Phase I	8	7	7	6	7	6	6	5	10	8	70	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?

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

Name:		David Hartwell											
Due		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											
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
O1	DNR Roving Crews	10	10	8	10	9	8	6	9	0	8	78	please provide spreadsheet showing existing roving crew funding and 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?
O2	Contract Management 2021											0	
O3	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2021											0	

Lessard-Sams 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.

Criteria													
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Total Score	Comments
PA01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase XIII	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	6?		64	
PA02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program, Phase XIII	8	8	8	8	9	8	8	8	10		75	
PA03	MN Prairie Recovery Program, Phase XI	8	10	10	10	10	8	8	10	10		80	
PA04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase XII	8	10	10	10	10	8	8	10	10		79	
PA05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase X	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	5	3		64	
PA06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection, Phase VIII	8	10	10	10	10	8	8	10	0		74	
PA07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Phase IX	8	10	10	10	10	8	8	10	0		74	
PA08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley, Phase VII	8	10	10	10	10	8	8	8	10		82	
PA09	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program, Phase III	8	10	10	10	10	8	8	10	10		84	
PA10	Martin County WMA Acquisition, Phase V	8	10	10	10	10	8	8	7	0		68	
PA11	RIM Grassland Reserve, Phase III	8	10	10	10	10	8	8	10	0		74	
PRE01a	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII (with Roving Crew)	5	5	10	5	10	5	5	5	0		50	
PRE01b	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII									0			
PRE02	Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands, Phase V	8	8	10	10	10	8	5	5	7		71	
PRE03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation, Phase VII	8	8	10	10	10	2	8	6	10		78	
PA01	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration, Phase IX	8	8	8	10	10	8	6?	7	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.

		Criteria										Total Score	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	6	8	8	8	8	4	1		59	
FA03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB, Phase IX	8	8	8	8	8	8	6	6	0		60	
FRE01	DNR Forest Enhancement	8	8	6	8	8	6	6	5	0		55	
FRE02	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase IV	8	4	8	4	8	6	6	6	7		65	Acquisition list?
FRE03	Moose Habitat Collaborative, Phase IV - NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement	8	8	8	8	8	6	6	6	3		61	
WA01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase XIII	10	8	10	10	8	8	8	8	10		81	
WA02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program, Phase X	9	8	10	10	9	8	8	8	4		68	
WA03	RIM Wetlands, Phase X	8	8	8	10	8	10	6	6	0		64	
WA04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase VI	10	8	8	10	8	10	6	6	10		76	
WA05	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection, Phase VII	8	5	9	9	8	9	6	6	0		63	
WRE01a	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (with Roving Habitat Crew)	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	0		64	
WRE01b	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (without Roving Habitat Crew)	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	0		64	
WRE02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative, Phase VII	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	10		74	
HA01	St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration, Phase II	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	8		68	
HA02	Metro Big Rivers, Phase XI	8	8	8	6	6	8	7	6	10		67	
HA03	Lower Otter Tail River Corridor Habitat Restoration - Request 1	8	8	8	8	8	8	6	6	10		70	



Lessard-Sams 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.\*

		Criteria										Total Score Out of 100	Comments
ID#	Program Title	1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		
		Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10		
HAD4	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes, Phase VII	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	8	8		71	
HAD5	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project, Phase V	8	8	9	8	8	8	6	7	2		62	
HAD6	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance	8	6	8	8	8	8	6	6	10		68	
HAD7	Riparian Habitat Protection in the Kettle and Snake River Watersheds	8	6	8	8	8	8	6	6	0		58	
HAD8	MNDNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements	8	6	8	6	8	6	6	6	0		48	
HAD9	Targeted RIM Easement and Acquisition to the Parcel Level Pine and Leech Watersheds, Phase II	8	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	
HRE01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase XIII	8	7	6	8	6	8	7	6	10		60	
HRE02	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, Phase IV	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	6	10		70	
HRE03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Phase VIII	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	8		71	
HRE04	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program, Phase X	8	8	6	8	6	8	8	6	5		63	
HRE05	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation, Phase VI	8	6	6	6	8	8	6	6	5		57	
HRE06	Southeast Wetland Restoration, Phase II	8	5	5	5	6	6	8	6	10		59	
HRE07	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection & Restoration, Phase II	8	10	8	8	8	8	7	6	9		72	
HRE08	Klondike Clean Water Retention Project, Phase I	8	8	8	8	6	8	8	7	10		72	
HRE09	Targeted Culvert Replacement to Enhance Fish Passage	8	6	5	6	6	6	8	6	2		53	

Lessard-Sams 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.

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.

[illegible]

VI

LANG

## 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 "CDI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest.\*

ID#	Program Title	Criteria										Total Score Out of 100	Comments
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		
PA01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase XIII	6	7	7	7	6	7	7	6	0	7	60	Hunting? No
PA02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program, Phase XIII	6	7	7	7	7	6	6	7	6	8	67	Hunting? Yes
PA03	MN Prairie Recovery Program, Phase XI	7	6	6	6	7	7	8	6	4	8	63	12% OSS? It's a tie
PA04	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge, Phase XII	7	7	8	7	8	6	7	4	5	7	66	
PA05	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase X	7	7	8	7	8	8	7	7	8	8	75	
PA06	Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection, Phase VIII	6	6	6	7	6	6	6	5	0	6	54	
PA07	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Phase IX	8	7	8	9	9	7	6	6	0	7	67	
PA08	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley, Phase VII	8	6	8	9	9	8	7	7	7	8	77	
PA09	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program, Phase III	8	8	9	9	9	8	8	7	8	8	82	
PA10	Martin County WMA Acquisition, Phase V	8	8	9	8	9	9	8	7	10	8	84	3% OSS +
PA11	RIM Grassland Reserve, Phase III	7	9	9	9	9	7	7	6	0	6	67	
PRE01a	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII (with Roving Crew)	6	7	6	7	7	6	7	6	0	6	58	32% OSS?
PRE01b	DNR Grassland, Phase XIII	6	7	7	6	6	7	7	6	0	6	58	1
PRE02	Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands, Phase V	8	8	9	9	9	8	8	7	6	8	80	19% OSS
PRE03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation, Phase VII	8	8	9	9	9	8	8	8	6	8	81	
FA01	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration, Phase IX	7	7	8	9	8	7	8	8	5	8	75	Hunting?



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										Total Score Out of 100	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10		
FA02	Minnesota Forests for the Future, Phase VIII	8	8	9	7	9	7	7	7	3	8	73	
FA03	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB, Phase IX	8	9	9	9	9	7	7	7	8	8	81	
FRE01	DNR Forest Enhancement	7	8	8	7	8	7	7	6	4	8	70	
FRE02	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River, Phase IV	7	7	8	8	7	7	6	7	4	7	68	Hunting?
FRE03	Moose Habitat Collaborative, Phase IV - NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement	8	9	9	9	8	7	6	7	5	8	76	
WA01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program, Phase XIII	7	8	7	9	8	7	9	8	9	8	82	
WA02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program, Phase X	8	9	9	9	8	7	9	6	4	8	77	
WA03	RIM Wetlands, Phase X	8	7	7	6	8	7	8	7	0	8	66	
WA04	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program, Phase VI	8	9	9	7	7	6	7	6	4	7	70	
WA05	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection, Phase VII	8	8	7	9	8	7	8	6	0	7	68	
WRE01a	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (with Roving Habitat Crew)	8	8	7	8	7	8	7	6	2	8	69	hunting OSS all
WRE01b	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements, Phase XIII (without Roving Habitat Crew)	7	7	6	7	6	7	6	5	1	7	59	
WRE02	Living Shallow Lake Enhancement & Wetland Restoration Initiative, Phase VII	8	8	9	8	8	7	7	6	3	7	71	leverage #
HA01	St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration, Phase II	7	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	3	8	67	hunting
HA02	Metro Big Rivers, Phase XI	7	6	6	6	5	6	6	5	5	8	60	373 acres
HA03	Lower Otter Tail River Corridor Habitat Restoration - Request 1	8	9	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	8	87	

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											
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	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	8	7	7	8	8	4	8	73	
HA06	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance	8	8	8	8	9	9	8	8	6	8	80	
HA07	Riparian Habitat Protection in the Kettle and Snake River Watersheds	9	9	9	8	9	8	7	7	6	8	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	8	7	6	8	6	9	8	78	Good leverage
HRE01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase XIII	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	8	7	8	85	
HRE02	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, Phase IV	8	8	7	8	6	7	7	8	9	8	76	Good leverage
HRE03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Phase VIII	8	8	7	7	7	6	6	7	6	7	69	
HRE04	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program, Phase X	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	8	7	8	83	
HRE05	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation, Phase VI	7	5	5	6	7	7	5	5	3	7	57	
HRE06	Southeast Wetland Restoration, Phase II	7	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	0	6	42	42 Acres Bad Source Leverage
HRE07	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection & Restoration, Phase II	8	8	9	9	6	7	8	6	8	8	77	+hunting
HRE08	Klondike Clean Water Retention Project, Phase I	9	9	9	9	8	8	9	8	10	9	88	
HRE09	Targeted Culvert Replacement to Enhance Fish Passage	9	9	8	8	8	7	8	6	4	8	75	

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.*														
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Total Score Out of 100	Comments
O1	DNR Roving Crews	10	→										100	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase XII: Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	→										100	
O2	Contract Management 2021	10	→										100	
O3	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2021	10	→										100	

?

Assume these will be taken separately?

3

16

43 - 52

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

Name: Denny McNamara													
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										Total Score	Comments
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
PA01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase XIII	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	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

Name: Denny McNamara													
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 more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Total Score Out of 100	Comments
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	

## Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

[illegible]

## Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

[illegible]





Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

Name: Ashley Peters													
Due Date: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is <b>100</b> points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict 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.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	Comments
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-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

Name: Ashley Peters													
Due Date:	Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.												
Maximum score per request is <b>100</b> points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict 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.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	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	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	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	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

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											
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	Comments
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	



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

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											
			1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Total Score Out of 100	Comments

# Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

Name: <b>Tom Saxhaug</b>													
Due Date: <b>Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.</b>													
Maximum score per request is <b>100</b> points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict 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.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	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 Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

<b>Name: Tom Saxhaug</b>													
<b>Due Date: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.</b>													
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.*													
ID#	Program Title	Criteria										Total Score	Comments
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		
		Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
FRE03	Moose Habitat Collaborative, Phase IV - NE MN Forest 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-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

Name: <b>Tom Saxhaug</b>													
Due Date: <b>Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.</b>													
Maximum score per request is <b>100</b> points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest.*													
ID#	Program Title	Criteria										Total Score	Comments
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		
		Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
HRE02	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	
O1	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
O2	Contract Management 2021	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100	Need to be fully funded
O3	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2021	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100	Need to be fully funded



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

Name: Ron Schara													
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										Total Score	Comments
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
PA01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase XIII	8	8	8	6	6	6	8	6	5	8	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	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

Name: Ron Schara													
Due Date: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is <b>100</b> points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict 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.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	Comments
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?
HA03	Lower Otter Tail River Corridor Habitat Restoration - Request 1	8	8	9	9	8	6	8	6	8	8	78	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

Name: Ron Schara													
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											
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	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	75	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	63	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	47	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	73	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	67	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	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

Name: Ron Schara													
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											
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
O1	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	
O2	Contract Management 2021											0	
O3	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2021											0	

Jamie Swenson		Criteria											
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes s will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/opportunitstic 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 Out of 100	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10		
PA01	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition, Phase XIII	9	9	9	9	9	7	7	5	0	8	72	Q1: The Proposal's Need cites the counties with less than 2% public ownership and the Prairie Plan. Support the 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 effort...multiple 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 Swenson		Criteria											
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/opportunity 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 Out of 100	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10		
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	76	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 wetland forest conservation, permanent riparian lands.
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 Swenson		Criteria											
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/opportunity 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 Out of 100	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10		
WA02	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program, Phase X	9	10	10	9	9	7	8	8	4	8	82	Q: Are we seeing an increase in urgency due to increased ag drainage activity in the last decade?
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	73	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 Crew)	7	7	7	7	8	7	7	7	0	7	64	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 Habitat Crew)	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 Swenson		Criteria											
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcome s will be maintain ed over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportuni stic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	Total Score	Comments
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
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 II	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	69	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 VIII	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	54	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	





[illegible]

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

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

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

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										Total Score	Comments
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
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	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

Name: Senator David Tomassoni													
Due Date: Thursday, July 16, 2020 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is <b>100</b> points. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict 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.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	Comments
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	
HA09	Targeted RIM Easement and Acquisition to the Parcel Level Pine and Leech Watersheds, Phase II	6	6	7	6	6	6	7	6	0	5	55	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

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										Total Score	Comments
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.	10. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Out of 100	
HA10	Urban Woods and Prairies Initiative Moorhead, MN Land Acquisition	5	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	2	5	45	
HRE01	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Phase XIII	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	7	6	61	
HRE02	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, Phase IV	7	7	7	6	7	7	7	6	9	6	69	
HRE03	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative, Phase VIII	6	6	6	7	6	6	7	6	3	6	59	
HRE04	Shell Rock River Habitat Restoration Program, Phase X	6	6	7	7	6	6	6	7	3	6	60	
HRE05	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation, Phase VI	6	6	6	7	6	6	7	6	4	5	59	
HRE06	Southeast Wetland Restoration, Phase II	6	6	7	6	5	6	7	6	7	5	61	
HRE07	Sauk River Watershed Habitat Protection & Restoration, Phase II	6	6	6	6	6	6	7	7	4	5	59	
HRE08	Klondike Clean Water Retention Project, Phase I	7	8	7	6	7	6	7	7	10	6	71	
HRE09	Targeted Culvert Replacement to Enhance Fish Passage	6	7	7	6	6	7	6	7	2	5	59	
O1	DNR Roving Crews	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	0	6	54	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase XIII: Statewide and Metro Habitat	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	2	6	56	
O2	Contract Management 2021	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	0	10	90	
O3	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2021	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	0	10	90	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2021 / FY 2022

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											
			1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	3. Proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey.	4. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and lists targeted species.	5. Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Degree of timing/ opportunistic urgency.	9. Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Total Score Out of 100	Comments