

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2027 / FY 2028

Member Name:		Suzanne Baird												
Due Date:		Friday, July 17, 2026 by 4 p.m. Email to tom.rebman@isohc.mn.gov												
Maximum score per request is 110 points. Scores should be whole numbers, no decimals. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest.*														
		Criteria												
		1. Proposal “Abstract” and “Design & Scope of Work” summaries are both clearly written and adequately address the Who, What, When, Where, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for fish, game, and wildlife, and/or threatened or endangered species.	3. The timing of this proposal is important and urgent.	4. Proposal will improve or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	5. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes and is likely to produce significant permanent conservation legacy and/or beneficial habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	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. Proposal includes leverage.	9. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	10. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	11. Proposal provides public access, use, or benefit.	Total Score (out of 110 possible points)	Comments / Questions
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10		
PA01	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XIX	10	9	7	9	9	7	9	3	9	9	10	91	
PA02	Acquisition and restoration of terrace wetland complex with potential fen characteristic	8	8	7	6	7	9	7	6	3	3	3	67	What NGO will own and manage?? Excessive amount of funding going toward staffing compared to actual project work. Over 50% -
PA03	DNR Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection-Phase IX	9	9	9	8	9	7	9	0	9	9	10	88	Previous OHF Appropriations - Yes, but no information on any pas appropriations still open - question is left blank.
PA04	DNR WMA & SNA Acquisition, Phase XIV	9	9	8	8	9	8	8	6	9	8	10	92	
PA05	Great Prairie Lakes and Wetlands Restoration Initiative	9	7	8	9	7	6	9	3	9	9	10	86	
PA06	Lower Sioux Prairie and Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Project	10	8	8	9	6	7	8	3	9	9	10	87	
PA07	Martin County WMA Acquisition Phase 11	7	8	7	9	8	5	8	3	8	6	10	79	
PA08	Minnesota Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (MN CREP)	10	8	7	8	5	7	9	9	8	8	10	89	Previous OHF Appropriations - Yes, but no information on any pas appropriations still open - question is left blank.
PA09	Minnesota River Watershed Habitat Conservation Program Phase 2	8	9	8	8	7	7	9	3	8	8	10	85	
PA10	MN Prairie Recovery Program	10	9	8	8	8	10	8	3	8	7	10	89	Personnel costs are a little high.
PA11	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase XIII	8	8	7	9	9	7	9	3	9	8	10	87	
PA12	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase XIII	6	9	9	8	6	7	8	0	10	10	10	83	
PA13	Western Minnesota Prairie and Wetland Protection Program	9	9	6	8	8	7	9	3	8	8	9	84	
PRE01	Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands - Phase X	10	7	10	8	9	5	7	3	8	9	10	86	
PRE02	Restoring Minnesota's Prairie Pothole Ecosystem - Phase 1	9	9	7	9	9	9	8	6	8	8	10	92	
FA01	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program Phase 14	8	9	8	8	8	7	8	0	8	9	10	83	
FA02	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project Phase 11	9	8	8	9	7	8	8	0	8	8	10	83	
FA03	MN Forests of the Future Phase XI South East Blufflands to Northern Forests Protection	9	8	9	7	7	6	8	3	8	7	10	82	
FA04	Pine and Leech Watershed Phase IV Forest Habitat Protection	7	9	9	7	8	9	9	0	8	9	10	85	
FRE01	DNR Statewide Forest Enhancement-Phase 7	9	7	6	6	7	7	7	0	7	9	10	75	Travel costs seem high - This includes vehicle rental but no explanation of for what.
FRE02	Enhancing Black Ash Forests for Resilience and Habitat	8	9	9	8	9	7	7	3	7	8	10	85	Personnel costs are a little high.
FRE03	Metro Forests for Minnesota Wildlife and Communities	8	8	7	6	8	9	8	3	7	9	10	83	Personnel costs are a little high.
FRE04	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project	9	9	8	8	6	10	7	3	7	7	10	84	Personnel costs are very high. These costs get higher with each year
WA01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XIX	9	8	8	8	8	7	9	6	9	6	10	88	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2027 / FY 2028

Member Name:		Suzanne Baird												
Due Date:		Friday, July 17, 2026 by 4 p.m. Email to tom.rebman@lsohc.mn.gov												
Maximum score per request is 110 points. Scores should be whole numbers, no decimals. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest.*														
		Criteria											Total Score (out of 110 possible points)	Comments / Questions
		1. Proposal “Abstract” and “Design & Scope of Work” summaries are both clearly written and adequately address the Who, What, When, Where, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for fish, game, and wildlife, and/or threatened or endangered species.	3. The timing of this proposal is important and urgent.	4. Proposal will improve or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	5. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes and is likely to produce significant permanent conservation legacy and/or beneficial habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	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. Proposal includes leverage.	9. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	10. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	11. Proposal provides public access, use, or benefit.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10		
WA02	RIM Wetlands - Restoring the most productive habitat in Minnesota	8	8	8	6	8	7	8	0	8	8	10	79	
WA03	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program	8	9	9	9	8	6	8	3	8	6	10	84	
WRE01	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program	8	9	7	8	9	8	9	3	7	6	10	84	Very high percentage of personnel costs!!! This seems to increase each year.
WRE02	DNR Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements Phase 19	8	8	6	7	8	6	8	0	7	4	10	72	Personnel cost are a little high.
WRE03	DNR Statewide control and reduction of invasive Phragmites Phase I	7	7	9	8	8	9	8	6	10	10	10	92	
WRE04	Living Shallow Lakes and Wetlands Enhancement & Restoration Initiative	8	9	8	8	8	6	8	3	8	8	10	84	high personel costs
WRE05	Mud River Enhancement Phase II	9	9	9	8	7	7	8	6	9	9	10	91	
WRE06	Otter and Campbell Lakes Habitat Enhancement and Restoration Phase 1	8	7	8	7	7	7	8	3	8	9	10	82	Would like more information on the project will address ongoing sedimentation once you have removed the sediment from the lake.
HA01	2027 Riparian Habitat Protection In the kettle and Snake River Watersheds	7	9	8	8	8	9	8	0	8	9	10	84	
HA02	2027 St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Phase 8	7	8	8	6	8	8	8	3	7	7	10	80	
HA03	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - 16	8	8	9	9	8	8	8	3	8	6	10	85	
HA04	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration Phase IX	8	8	5	6	8	6	7	6	8	8	10	80	
HA05	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - ML2027	9	8	9	8	8	8	9	3	9	9	10	90	
HA06	Metro Big Rivers Phase 17	9	8	7	8	8	6	8	3	8	7	10	82	If the restoration and enhancement is being contracted out why such a high amount for supplies/equipment/tools???
HA07	Protecting Minnesota’s Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance - Phase 6	8	9	7	9	8	8	8	3	8	8	10	86	Question - Who will eventually own - Federal is listed but no Federa; designation is listed - explain who the Federal ownership will be.
HA08	RIM Priority Habitat	7	8	8	7	8	7	8	0	8	9	10	80	
HA09	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration Phase 15	8	8	6	9	8	8	8	3	8	7	10	83	
HA10	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Phase X	8	8	8	7	7	6	7	0	8	9	10	78	
HRE01	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Enhancement and Restoration - Phase 11	7	8	7	6	7	8	7	3	7	8	10	78	Very high personnel costs
HRE02	Beaver Creek Habitat Restoration	9	7	9	8	8	9	8	3	9	9	10	89	
HRE03	Daylighting Phalen Creek - Phase 2	8	8	6	8	7	9	7	3	8	8	10	82	
HRE04	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Phase 10	7	7	7	8	7	8	8	3	7	7	10	79	The abstract mentions 2 feasibility studies but the design and scope of work does not go into any detail. Should OHF be funding studies??? Aslo funding a lot of staff positions.
HRE05	DNR Fish Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Phase 1	8	8	8	7	7	8	7	3	7	7	10	80	high personel costs
HRE06	DNR Irish Creek Watershed Enhancement, Phase 1	9	7	8	8	8	6	9	0	7	8	10	80	high personel costs

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2027 / FY 2028

Member Name:		Suzanne Baird												
Due Date:		Friday, July 17, 2026 by 4 p.m. Email to tom.rebman@isohc.mn.gov												
Maximum score per request is 110 points. Scores should be whole numbers, no decimals. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest.*														
		Criteria												
		1. Proposal “Abstract” and “Design & Scope of Work” summaries are both clearly written and adequately address the Who, What, When, Where, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for fish, game, and wildlife, and/or threatened or endangered species.	3. The timing of this proposal is important and urgent.	4. Proposal will improve or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	5. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes and is likely to produce significant permanent conservation legacy and/or beneficial habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	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. Proposal includes leverage.	9. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	10. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	11. Proposal provides public access, use, or benefit.	Total Score (out of 110 possible points)	Comments / Questions
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10		
HRE07	DNR Roving Crew 4	9	9	8	8	7	8	8	0	9	9	10	85	
HRE08	Enhancing Agate Bay's Coastal Wetland Habitat along the Lake Superior Shore in Lake County, Minnesota	9	9	8	8	8	9	8	6	9	9	10	93	Question boardwalk and trail construction with OHF??
HRE09	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation Project-PH VIII	8	7	9	9	8	7	9	3	9	9	10	88	
HRE10	Little Cannon River Stream Habitat Restoration - Construction Phase	9	8	7	9	8	8	8	3	9	9	10	88	
HRE11	Minnesota Marine Art Museum LSCOHC Proposal	5	5	5	3	5	7	6	9	7	8	6	66	????
HRE12	Minnesota Statewide Trout Habitat Enhancement & Protection - Construction	6	7	6	8	8	7	8	3	7	9	10	79	Is \$4.5M enough to do 12 projects??
HRE13	Protection and Resiliency in the Rainy River Headwaters	9	5	7	8	7	7	8	9	7	8	10	85	
HRE14	Restoring priority habitats for Hennepin County's sensitive wildlife	9	9	8	6	8	8	8	6	7	8	10	87	Very high personnel costs
HRE15	Swift Coulee Channel Restoration/ Enhancement - Phase 2	7	8	6	9	8	6	8	6	8	9	10	85	
HRE16	Tamarac River Enhancement Project - Phase 1	9	9	8	9	9	7	8	3	9	9	10	90	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program ML27/FY28	10	10	9	8	9	9	9	3	10	10	10	97	
O1	2027 Contract Management	10	10	8	10	8	10	8	0	10	10	10	94	
O2	2027 Restoration Evaluations - ML 2027	10	8	10	8	8	8	9	0	9	9	10	89	
O3	DNR Core Functions in Partner-led OHF Acquisitions	8	8	4	7	8	5	8	6	7	7	10	78	