

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

Member Name:	Matt Kucharski													
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		
PA01	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XIX	9	8	7	9	10	7	9	7	6	6	10	88	Strong program, good leverage, money being spent
PA02	Acquisition and restoration of terrace wetland complex with potential fen characteristic	8	9	7	8	9	7	7	9	4	7	5	80	High personnel costs. Why 53%? Questions about jurisdiction/continuity of access. What does "potential" mean here? Good leverage.
PA03	DNR Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection-Phase IX	8	10	7	7	9	7	9	5	7	7	5	81	Contuation of solid program - who is accountable for easment maintenance?
PA04	DNR WMA & SNA Acquisition, Phase XIV	9	9	7	7	9	7	7	7	8	7	10	87	Acquisitions. Decision to designate SNA vs. WMA?
PA05	Great Prairie Lakes and Wetlands Restoration Initiative	9	7	7	9	10	7	7	6	6	6	10	84	Like the program but quesitons about where Iowa comes in. Second-highest cost per acre in category.
PA06	Lower Sioux Prairie and Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Project	9	8	7	8	9	7	7	8	8	7	6	84	On paper looks good. Need to understand how ownership works. Third-highest CPA in category.
PA07	Martin County WMA Acquisition Phase 11	9	8	7	7	10	7	7	5	6	6	10	82	We're on Phase 11 - how many phases? Coordination with other OHF applications? Highest CPA of all HA applications.
PA08	Minnesota Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (MN CREP)	8	8	8	8	9	7	9	9	7	6	5	84	Easements - necessary but not accessible.
PA09	Minnesota River Watershed Habitat Conservation Program Phase 2	8	8	7	8	9	7	7	5	6	5	8	78	Phase 2 - would be good to understand long tail. MN River needs help for sure.
PA10	MN Prairie Recovery Program	8	8	6	8	9	7	7	7	5	5	10	80	Lots of outstanding dollars. How likely is the 300/300/300 acre split? Personnel costs higher on paper due to use of on-staff vs. contractors (OK)
PA11	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase XIII	9	10	7	7	10	7	9	6	7	6	10	88	How likely is the 600/600 acre split? Good spending of funds so far, How many phases?
PA12	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase XIII	8	7	7	8	9	7	9	5	7	7	7	81	Easements necessary -- buffers an efficient/effective use of them. Past money being used.
PA13	Western Minnesota Prairie and Wetland Protection Program	8	8	6	8	9	7	7	6	6	6	8	79	New program? Evaluate against existing programs - overlap? Heavy on easements
PRE01	Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands - Phase X	8	8	7	8	8	7	7	6	7	7	7	80	A little more clarity on where work is being done? Public or easements? Fair amount of money remaining from last year.
PRE02	Restoring Minnesota's Prairie Pothole Ecosystem - Phase 1	8	8	7	8	8	7	7	9	6	6	6	80	New program. Cost per acre quite a bit higher than PRE01. Why? Public access question?
FA01	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program Phase 14	8	8	7	8	9	7	9	5	7	6	7	81	Would like to hear more about monitoring of RIM lands after enhancement. Spend on existing funds? Second highest CPA in category.
FA02	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project Phase 11	8	8	6	8	9	7	9	5	7	6	7	80	Big project, lots of phases. Long tail? REALLY open for public use?
FA03	MN Forests of the Future Phase XI South East Blufflands to Northern Forests Protection	8	8	7	8	9	7	7	6	6	5	7	78	Dollars from previous allocation spent? Says public access but really?
FA04	Pine and Leech Watershed Phase IV Forest Habitat Protection	8	8	7	8	8	7	9	5	7	7	7	81	Decent spend of existing funds, Watershed emphasis in forest habitat. Not loving the answers to public use access question in the FA section. Highest CPA in category.
FRE01	DNR Statewide Forest Enhancement-Phase 7	9	8	7	7	8	7	7	5	7	6	10	81	Lots of acres, smaller percentage spent but tied to public lands.
FRE02	Enhancing Black Ash Forests for Resilience and Habitat	8	9	7	8	8	7	8	7	6	7	8	83	This is interesting. Would like to see the science behind this but very promising program.
FRE03	Metro Forests for Minnesota Wildlife and Communities	9	7	7	7	8	7	7	6	6	7	8	79	Metro program - we don't have many. Good application. Something funky on CPA? \$11K? Others seem lower.
FRE04	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project	9	8	7	8	8	7	7	7	6	6	7	80	Good use of existing dollars - lots of acres.

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

Member Name:	Matt Kucharski													
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		
WA01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XIX	8	8	7	9	9	7	7	9	7	7	10	88	good program, public benefit, high leverage
WA02	RIM Wetlands - Restoring the most productive habitat in Minnesota	8	8	6	7	9	7	9	5	6	6	7	78	Work is on easements - near corridors/public. CPA highest in category - easements? Higher than acquisition in WA03?
WA03	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program	8	8	7	9	9	7	7	7	6	7	10	85	Projects tied to wetlands and watershed. Solid spend of existing dollars.
WRE01	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program	8	8	8	7	8	7	9	7	5	5	6	78	Good partnership, some leverage, big ask, modest spend to date, easements.
WRE02	DNR Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements Phase 19	8	8	8	8	8	7	8	5	7	5	8	80	Ask quite a bit higher than past allocations? Good use of allocated funds. Shallow lakes a priority for sure. Good public benefit.
WRE03	DNR Statewide control and reduction of invasive Phragmites Phase I	8	7	7	8	7	7	7	8	5	7	7	78	Need to learn more on this - small ask but cost per acre really high for enhancement. Per acre cost second-highest in category. Both way above average.
WRE04	Living Shallow Lakes and Wetlands Enhancement & Restoration Initiative	8	8	7	7	8	7	7	7	7	6	7	79	Need to reconcile this with WRE02 -- lower dollars spent - how do these two proposals compare?
WRE05	Mud River Enhancement Phase II	8	7	7	8	8	7	7	8	4	6	7	77	Coming back for phase II? Doesn't look like Phase I money has been tapped??
WRE06	Otter and Campbell Lakes Habitat Enhancement and Restoration Phase 1	8	7	8	8	7	7	7	7	6	6	7	78	New program. Would like to understand more on scalability and surrounding impact. Acre cost really high - check?
HA01	2027 Riparian Habitat Protection In the kettle and Snake River Watersheds	8	8	7	8	9	7	9	5	7	5	7	80	Lots remaining from existing fund? River watershed
HA02	2027 St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Phase 8	9	8	8	8	9	7	8	5	7	6	10	85	Like the work being done on WMAs. Good spend of existing.
HA03	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - 16	9	8	8	8	9	7	8	5	7	6	10	85	Similar to HA 02 and like it for same reasons, different area.
HA04	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration Phase IX	8	7	6	8	9	7	7	9	6	6	7	80	Phase 9 - good spend of previous, metro area. Mostly "Restore" - why in HA?
HA05	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - ML2027	8	9	7	8	9	7	7	6	7	5	10	83	coldwater watersheds, 45% of open funds spent (ok)
HA06	Metro Big Rivers Phase 17	9	8	7	8	9	7	7	6	6	5	9	81	BIG ask, lots of opportunity but also need to scale. CPA highest in category (because metro??) Acquisition so maybe OK.
HA07	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance - Phase 6	8	8	7	8	9	7	7	6	6	5	10	81	Decent leverage, modest spend of existing. Acquisition.
HA08	RIM Priority Habitat	8	8	6	8	9	7	7	5	7	6	7	78	Seems high on CPA for easements? \$13k/acre?
HA09	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration Phase 15	8	8	7	8	9	7	7	5	6	5	8	78	Lower leverage, higher percentage of easement but decent track record.
HA10	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Phase X	8	9	7	7	9	7	7	9	5	7	6	81	Easements, but wild rice=water quality.
HRE01	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Enhancement and Restoration - Phase 11	8	8	7	8	8	7	7	6	5	6	7	77	Personnel costs?
HRE02	Beaver Creek Habitat Restoration	9	9	7	8	8	7	8	5	6	5	7	79	Not a huge budget ask but a lot of ancillary benefit. Wish there was more leverage.
HRE03	Daylighting Phalen Creek - Phase 2	8	8	7	8	8	7	7	7	5	7	7	79	Phase 1 predates me - would be good to learn more about progress. Metro. Will point out CPA is huge, but kind of hard to compare.
HRE04	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Phase 10	8	8	7	8	8	7	8	6	6	5	7	78	Big ask. Where's leverage coming from? Like the buffer/water quality aspect of this - long tail?

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

Member Name:		Matt Kucharski												
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		
HRE05	DNR Fish Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Phase 1	8	8	8	8	7	8	5	5	7	7	7	78	New? I see lots of "phases" in the future on this one. Precedents?
HRE06	DNR Irish Creek Watershed Enhancement, Phase 1	8	8	7	8	8	7	7	5	6	6	7	77	Another Phase I in same category from DNR. Looks worthwhile - are we sunsetting any others?
HRE07	DNR Roving Crew 4	8	8	7	6	7	7	7	5	6	6	9	76	We obviously need this - looks like funded every other year - hard to understand how much is needed/how much has been spent. Should this be treated like Contract Management going forward?
HRE08	Enhancing Agate Bay's Coastal Wetland Habitat along the Lake Superior Shore in Lake County, Minnesota	7	7	6	6	7	6	7	8	5	7	7	73	Smallish ask but would like to understand more about the habitat benefit of this specific project. Sounds like it needs to happen but is it really an OHF thing? Reminds me a little of Delano Crow River project.
HRE09	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation Project-PH VIII	8	8	7	8	8	7	8	6	7	5	7	79	how much shoreline benefits? What happens with the next 10-year flood?
HRE10	Little Cannon River Stream Habitat Restoration - Construction Phase	8	9	6	8	8	7	8	5	6	6	7	78	Gave 500k last year (for evaluation? Engineering?) hasn't been spent. Should we move ahead or wait?
HRE11	Minnesota Marine Art Museum LSCOHC Proposal	7	8	6	4	7	7	7	9	4	5	7	71	Understand the need and appreciate leverage but restores 500 feet of the Mississippi. Best use of funds? Someone should fund this. OHF?
HRE12	Minnesota Statewide Trout Habitat Enhancement & Protection - Construction	8	9	7	8	8	7	8	7	7	8	7	84	9 miles of stream is significant - gave them \$750 last year (startout?) Ready for next part or wait?
HRE13	Protection and Resiliency in the Rainy River Headwaters	8	8	6	8	8	7	7	9	7	6	7	81	Addressing culverts seems to be efficient use of dollars for high impact.
HRE14	Restoring priority habitats for Hennepin County's sensitive wildlife	8	8	6	8	8	7	7	8	5	6	7	78	Good leverage, metro area - not a lot of metro.
HRE15	Swift Coulee Channel Restoration/ Enhancement - Phase 2	8	7	8	8	8	7	7	8	7	6	7	81	good leverage, 6 miles of habitat, spend of existing?
HRE16	Tamarac River Enhancement Project - Phase 1	8	8	6	8	8	7	7	7	5	6	7	77	Ditch remediation (worthwhile). Some leverage. How many phases expected?
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program ML27/FY28	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	77	11m last year. Hoping this is statewide this year.
O1	2027 Contract Management	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	77	Necessary
O2	2027 Restoration Evaluations - ML 2027	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	77	Necessary
O3	DNR Core Functions in Partner-led OHF Acquisitions	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	77	Necessary