

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

Member Name:		David Hartwell												
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	7	10	7	10	10	8	8	4	10	8	10	92	How do you define what is the goal of restoration in terms of fully functioning wetlands? What does "permanently protected by PF" mean?
PA02	Acquisition and restoration of terrace wetland complex with potential fen characteristic	6	8	7	7	7	4	6	7	8	7	6	73	"potential calcareous" fen. Is it is or is it not? I am concerned that the proposal is based on the "potential calcareous fen" and "appears to retain meaningful restoration potential." I need to know what we would e investing in to be comfortable recommending funding. Who holds the conservation restrictions and what are they? What is the plan for wetland hydrology and water retention and aquatic habitat complexity once he beavers abandon the site and the dam disappears? I am a bit confused as to the plan for habitat protection/restoration on one hand and agriculture (apparently not just conservation grazing) - please explain how these funds are just focused on habitat and not agriculture. I would find it hard to support the use of Neonics for an period of time on the property. Who specifically will own acquired property (beyond NGO)?
PA03	DNR Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection-Phase IX	9	10	8	9	10	8	9	0	9	9	10	91	Use of Neonics for a transition period is a grave concern.
PA04	DNR WMA & SNA Acquisition, Phase XIV	10	10	8	9	10	8	8	4	8	8	10	93	
PA05	Great Prairie Lakes and Wetlands Restoration Initiative	8	8	7	8	10	8	7	3	8	7	10	84	
PA06	Lower Sioux Prairie and Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Project	9	7	8	8	10	8	9	5	8	8	8	88	Not sure if we should be considering funding fencing. I am not certain what all the language about the open for hunting really means = please explain.
PA07	Martin County WMA Acquisition Phase 11	8	7	7	8	10	8	7	2	8	7	9	81	
PA08	Minnesota Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (MN CREP)	8	8	8	8	10	9	8	10	8	7	10	94	Explain how extensive wetland restoration is under this proposal. What is the cost of permanent protection as a percentage of land value under this proposal. Is there a difference in the value paid for prime agricultural property vs marginal cropland under this proposal? No open appropriations are listed after the yes answer.
PA09	Minnesota River Watershed Habitat Conservation Program Phase 2	8	9	8	8	10	8	7	2	8	8	10	86	Since both MLT and GRG do restoration work (and it is all contracted out), explain why this proposal includes both organization vs just MLT doing both the acquisition and restoration.
PA10	MN Prairie Recovery Program	8	9	8	8	10	7	8	4	6	5	10	83	The enhancement cost per acres is close to double that of the roving crew budget. Why is this a good deal for us to fund?
PA11	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase XIII	7	9	7	8	10	7	7	3	7	6	10	81	What happens if a parcel is not appropriate to transfer to a WMA or WPA? Proposal states prairie chicken habitat should be 320 acres or more but criteria does not list size of complex at all - Why?
PA12	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase XIII	6	8	6	8	10	7	8	0	7	7	10	77	Food plots - now up to 10% (higher than other proposals that are 1-3%) or "will not exceed a maximum acreage depending on the size of the easement." What does this mean? Cost per acre seems high but there is no indication of cost of restoration in proposal.
PA13	Western Minnesota Prairie and Wetland Protection Program	8	8	7	8	10	7	8	3	8	7	10	84	
PRE01	Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands - Phase X	7	8	6	8	10	7	6	3	7	6	10	78	What standard will wetlands be restored to? What control methods are used for cattail? If this work is done on state land, why is PF a better provider than the roving crews?
PRE02	Restoring Minnesota's Prairie Pothole Ecosystem - Phase 1	8	8	7	8	10	7	7	7	8	8	10	88	
FA01	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program Phase 14	7	8	6	8	8	7	8	0	7	6	8	73	Food plots - now up to 10% (higher than other proposals that are 1-3%) or "will not exceed a maximum acreage depending on the size of the easement." What does this mean? Where is the partnership with the National Guard. - no leverage funds at all.
FA02	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project Phase 11	7	8	7	8	8	7	7	0	7	8	10	77	
FA03	MN Forests of the Future Phase XI South East Blufflands to Northern Forests Protection	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	3	8	8	10	85	

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

Member Name:		David Hartwell												
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		
FA04	Pine and Leech Watershed Phase IV Forest Habitat Protection	7	8	7	8	8	7	7	0	8	7	10	77	
FRE01	DNR Statewide Forest Enhancement-Phase 7	7	8	7	7	6	6	5	0	6	7	8	67	Lots of prior year funds available
FRE02	Enhancing Black Ash Forests for Resilience and Habitat	7	6	6	6	7	6	7	4	7	7	8	71	
FRE03	Metro Forests for Minnesota Wildlife and Communities	6	6	5	4	5	5	6	3	6	6	8	60	NO real answer on scaling that lets us understand.
FRE04	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project	7	7	6	7	6	7	6	5	7	7	8	73	
WA01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XIX	8	8	7	9	10	7	7	10	7	5	10	88	
WA02	RIM Wetlands - Restoring the most productive habitat in Minnesota	6	8	6	8	10	7	8	0	7	7	10	77	Food plots - now up to 10% (higher than other proposals that are 1-3%) or "will not exceed a maximum acreage depending on the size of the easement." What does this mean? Cost per acre seems high but there is no indication of cost of restoration in proposal.
WA03	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program	9	8	7	9	10	8	7	4	7	7	10	86	
WRE01	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program	8	8	8	9	10	8	8	4	7	7	10	87	
WRE02	DNR Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements Phase 19	8	8	7	9	10	7	7	0	5	5	10	76	Staff request - 10 people for 2 years who will work on projects that this request funds AND OTHERS and will not be scaled. This feels a lot like last years proposal for just staff. Will only support this if staff is scaled and work to be done by the staff is on projects funded with this proposal.
WRE03	DNR Statewide control and reduction of invasive Phragmites Phase I	8	10	10	10	10	9	8	6	9	10	10	100	Explain what removal entails.
WRE04	Living Shallow Lakes and Wetlands Enhancement & Restoration Initiative	8	8	7	8	10	8	7	4	8	8	10	86	
WRE05	Mud River Enhancement Phase II	7	6	6	7	10	6	6	6	8	9	10	81	What will happen in flood events greater than the 10 year flood. Will that harm the work being done and the refuge? If full funding is not granted, what happens?
WRE06	Otter and Campbell Lakes Habitat Enhancement and Restoration Phase 1	8	7	6	7	8	7	6	3	9	9	10	80	If this work is done, will it not just be a temporary fix as the upstream sediment will continue to fill the lakes? Why should the effort not be directed to fixing the cause of the problem before this work?
HA01	2027 Riparian Habitat Protection In the kettle and Snake River Watersheds	8	7	7	8	7	7	9	0	9	9	10	81	
HA02	2027 St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Phase 8	8	7	7	7	8	8	8	2	8	8	10	81	
HA03	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - 16	7	7	7	8	7	7	7	2	7	6	10	75	Do not understand the \$300K remaining for CRP to do program coordination, administration and outreach on prior appropriations that are for the most part, already spent.
HA04	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration Phase IX	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	10	7	7	10	83	Spending restoration dollars on "soon to be protected" land does not fit our criteria. Eased land is not open to public use as the question indicates - it might. Answer should be changed.
HA05	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - ML2027	8	7	6	8	8	7	8	3	7	4	10	76	50% of funds remain from FY 23 FY24 and virtually all of FY25 (and FY 26). Are additional funds double/triple what has been funded in the last 4 years really necessary at this time?
HA06	Metro Big Rivers Phase 17	7	7	6	8	7	6	7	3	7	4	10	72	FMR using \$ to improve public access (does not seem like a habitat project). MLT's personnel is as much as contracts for restoration. Please explain. MVT is showing \$350K of DSS as a match but no personnel?
HA07	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance - Phase 6	8	7	6	8	8	7	8	3	7	4	10	76	Not sure I understand the difference between this and HA05 other than geography - why 2 proposals? Seems like a lost of unspent funds "moving through acquisition process" (but not committed?)
HA08	RIM Priority Habitat	6	7	7	8	8	7	8	0	7	6	10	74	Part time person doing less than 2 easements a year seems high.

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

Member Name:	David Hartwell													
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												
		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		
HA09	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration Phase 15	8	8	8	9	8	7	7	3	7	7	10	82	
HA10	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Phase X	9	9	8	9	8	8	8	0	8	9	10	86	
HRE01	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Enhancement and Restoration - Phase 11	7	8	7	7	8	7	7	3	7	8	10	79	ACD - 2 full time people for 5 years to oversee \$1.7M in contracts seems excessive. GRG personnel also seem high.
HRE02	Beaver Creek Habitat Restoration	8	8	6	7	8	8	7	0	8	8	10	78	
HRE03	Daylighting Phalen Creek - Phase 2	7	7	7	8	8	7	7	4	7	8	10	80	What is the need for a volunteer coordinator?
HRE04	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Phase 10	8	8	7	9	9	8	8	3	7	7	10	84	
HRE05	DNR Fish Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Phase 1	7	8	6	9	8	8	8	1	7	8	10	80	
HRE06	DNR Irish Creek Watershed Enhancement, Phase 1	7	6	6	7	7	8	8	0	6	7	8	70	Seems quite administratively heavy for what will be mostly contracted work. Is some of this work really just roadwork that the county should be doing?
HRE07	DNR Roving Crew 4	8	9	6	9	9	9	7	0	8	8	10	83	Explain the need for funds one year I advance of need.
HRE08	Enhancing Agate Bay's Coastal Wetland Habitat along the Lake Superior Shore in Lake County, Minnesota	5	5	5	6	5	4	5	0	7	7	7	56	Funds should not be used to improve public access - not habitat work. Pictures show boardwalks. Very high cost per acre for enhancement - apparently just for engineering
HRE09	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation Project-PH VIII	7	6	6	8	8	7	7	3	7	8	10	77	Raise the groundwater table? 15 years of work, how has that effected the trout populations specifically? Need for almost .5FTE for 4 years to oversee contracts seems excessive.
HRE10	Little Cannon River Stream Habitat Restoration - Construction Phase	7	8	6	8	8	8	8	2	7	7	10	79	Need better understanding of timeline. When would construction actually start?
HRE11	Minnesota Marine Art Museum LSCOHC Proposal	5	5	2	3	4	2	2	10	3	1	2	39	This should be disqualified as the land is not permanently protected - just and "intent" to do so. The cost per acres is also excessively high, especially since the request is intended to fix what the applicant did in the past that destroyed habitat.
HRE12	Minnesota Statewide Trout Habitat Enhancement & Protection - Construction	7	8	6	8	8	8	8	2	7	7	10	79	Permit and engineering status? When would construction start?
HRE13	Protection and Resiliency in the Rainy River Headwaters	8	9	7	9	8	8	9	10	8	9	10	95	
HRE14	Restoring priority habitats for Hennepin County's sensitive wildlife	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	6	7	7	10	80	
HRE15	Swift Coulee Channel Restoration/ Enhancement - Phase 2	7	8	7	8	8	7	7	10	7	8	10	87	
HRE16	Tamarac River Enhancement Project - Phase 1	8	7	7	8	9	8	9	5	7	8	10	86	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program ML27/FY28	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	3	8	8	10	85	Budget for staff is exactly the same as prior year - Looks like the same people funded for 2 years. Feels like a doubling up.
O1	2027 Contract Management												0	
O2	2027 Restoration Evaluations - ML 2027												0	
O3	DNR Core Functions in Partner-led OHF Acquisitions												0	