

From: Jacquelyn S. Livingston
Bcc: [LSOHC Members](#)
Subject: Call Ranking Criteria and Member Evaluation Spreadsheet
Date: Monday, June 29, 2015 2:42:00 PM
Attachments: [Call Ranking Criteria FY2017 ML2016 \(June 29.2015\).pdf](#)
[Member Eval SS 6.29.2015.xls](#)

Dear Council members:

Attached are two documents for your use; Call Ranking Criteria and Member Evaluation Spreadsheet.

The Call Ranking Criteria (CRC), adopted by the Council on March 14, 2014, is a summary of the criteria questions, response scale and instructions.

The Member Evaluation Spreadsheet (MES) is your scoring sheet for the proposals. You may use this electronically or manually with a print-out to return your scorings to staff. The CRC and MES are nearly identical to what you used last year for ranking projects. The main difference is the chronology of the questions. This year, the questions have been re-ordered slightly to better correspond with the pages of the proposals. Consequently, we hope that you will find it easier to correspond with information necessary to answer criteria questions and complete the ranking process.

42 proposals were received for the FY2017/ML2016 round of OHF recommendations with requests totaling approximately \$285 million. One proposal "Coldwater Spring Unit Restoration" was immediately referred to the Conservation Partners Legacy program as that request was significantly below the \$400,000 project minimum, asking only \$74,700. This item was reviewed with Council at the March 13 meeting and a letter from Chairman Anderson was subsequently sent to the applicant with referral instructions.

Following is a timeline for development of the Council's recommendations for FY2017/ML2016:

June 23 Council received Packet of FY2017/ML2016 Project Proposals.
June 29 Staff emails Call Ranking Criteria and Member Evaluation Spreadsheet to Council members.
July 16 Council members will return their project rankings to LSOHC staff.
August 11 Council meeting. Members discuss proposals ranking and hearing selections.
Sept 1-3 Council meeting. Members hear testimony from project proposal candidate.
Sept 17 Council members' deadline for allocation selection to staff.
Oct 6 Council meeting. Members review and discuss allocation selection.
Oct 15 Project managers submit draft accomplishment plans for review.
Nov 5 Council meeting. Members review draft bill language.
Dec 3 Council meeting. Members approve draft OHF bill.

This is a draft timeline per Council's approved meeting schedule.

Mark
Mark Wm. Johnson
Executive Director
Lessard Sams Outdoor Heritage Council
651-296-6397
Mark.johnson@lsohc.leg.mn

--

Jacquelyn Livingston
Commission Assistant (Temporary)
Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council
Jacquelyn.Livingston@lsohc.leg.mn
651-284-6430

Members:

This table shows the relationship between the Call criteria and the scoring criteria in the scoring worksheet used by LSOHC members. The last column displays the location in the request form where the applicant will be expected to address the criteria. All criteria in the call have a total of six possible points. A request with a perfect score will have 72 points. Ten criteria are scored 0 to 6. Two criteria are evaluated on a yes – no basis. In one case the yes answer adds six points and a no adds zero points. For the other question using yes – no as the response the listed, compound criteria is divided into four logical subparts. Each subpart is scored yes or no. A yes response awards the request 1.5 points and a no adds zero. If a request is scored yes on all four logical subparts the request receives 6 points.

Staff

#	CURRENT CALL CRITERIA	Phrase on Score Sheet	RESPONSE SCALE and POINTS POSSIBLE	Where do I find the detail to evaluate the Call Criteria in the Application?														
1	Does the proposal address actions and targets of one or more of the ecological sections?	The proposal takes actions aimed at habitat targets in LSOHC ecological sections in a way and with enough effort to move the needle toward the target.	<table border="0"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Completely Disagree</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Neither or neutral</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Completely agree</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> </tr> </table>	Completely Disagree			Neither or neutral			Completely agree	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Information is in the <i>Ecological Planning Regions data</i> found on page 1 Applicants will be asked to select three Council priority actions from among the target regions they have identified and rank them in priority order.
Completely Disagree			Neither or neutral			Completely agree												
0	1	2	3	4	5	6												
2a	Does the proposal address Minnesota habitats that have historical value to fish and wildlife;	The proposal addresses Minnesota habitats with historic value to fish and wildlife	<table border="0"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">No</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1.5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> </tr> </table>	0	No	1.5	Yes	This information is provided in the <i>MN Habitats</i> section where a 200 word text box is provided to explain the various parts to the question. There are explicit instructions to address these four attributes.										
0	No																	
1.5	Yes																	

#	CURRENT CALL CRITERIA	Phrase on Score Sheet	RESPONSE SCALE and POINTS POSSIBLE	Where do I find the detail to evaluate the Call Criteria in the Application?
2b	Does the proposal address wildlife species of greatest conservation need;	The proposal lists the wildlife species of greatest concern addressed.	0 No 1.5 Yes	See above
2c	Does the proposal address Minnesota County Biological Survey data; and/or	The proposal lists the Minnesota County Biological Survey data in the program area.	0 No 1.5 Yes	See above
2d	Does the proposal address rare, threatened and endangered species inventories?	The proposal supports the maintenance and growth of populations of threatened and endangered species.	0 No 1.5 Yes	See above
3	Does the proposal explain the nature of the urgency?	This is a habitat project that should be done as soon as possible.	Completely Disagree Neither or neutral Completely agree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	This information is provided under <i>Nature of Urgency</i> . A 50 word text box is provided. There are explicit instructions to address the urgent need for funding.

#	CURRENT CALL CRITERIA	Phrase on Score Sheet	RESPONSE SCALE and POINTS POSSIBLE	Where do I find the detail to evaluate the Call Criteria in the Application?												
4	Does the proposal use a science-based strategic planning and evaluation model?	The proposal clearly uses a science based planning and evaluation model.	<p style="text-align: center;">Completely Disagree Neither or neutral Completely agree</p> <p style="text-align: center;">0 1 2 3 4 5 6</p>	This information is provided under <i>Planning</i> . A 50 word dropdown box is provided to explain the planning and evaluation model used to support the scope of work. There are explicit instructions to address the planning and evaluation model.												
5	Does the proposal fully describe and quantify in sufficient detail how the requested funding supplements - and does not substitute - customary or usual funding sources?	The proposal does not substitute for traditional funding...	<p style="text-align: center;">Completely Disagree Neither or neutral Completely agree</p> <p style="text-align: center;">0 1 2 3 4 5 6</p>	<p>This information is provided under <i>Accelerates of Supplements Current Efforts</i>. A 200 word text box is provided. An additional chart has been added to the application:</p> <p>Please complete the following table describing the source and amount of non OHF money spent for this work each year:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1388 1008 1923 1229"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1388 1008 1566 1062">Fiscal Year</th> <th data-bbox="1566 1008 1745 1062">Source</th> <th data-bbox="1745 1008 1923 1062">Amount</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1388 1062 1566 1115">2015</td> <td data-bbox="1566 1062 1745 1115"></td> <td data-bbox="1745 1062 1923 1115"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1388 1115 1566 1169">2014</td> <td data-bbox="1566 1115 1745 1169"></td> <td data-bbox="1745 1115 1923 1169"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1388 1169 1566 1229">2013</td> <td data-bbox="1566 1169 1745 1229"></td> <td data-bbox="1745 1169 1923 1229"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Fiscal Year	Source	Amount	2015			2014			2013		
Fiscal Year	Source	Amount														
2015																
2014																
2013																

6	Does the proposal describe how the program’s outcomes will be maintained?	It is clear in the request that there is commitment to maintain the outcomes of this program	<p>Completely Disagree</p> <p>Neither or neutral</p> <p>Completely agree</p> <p>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</p>	<p>This information is provided under <i>Sustainability and Maintenance</i>. A 200 word text box is provided. An additional chart has been added to the application.</p> <p>What maintenance steps will be taken in future years to maintain the outcomes of the OHF investment? Use the listed year as an approximation.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1388 496 1925 670"> <thead> <tr> <th>Fiscal Year</th> <th>Steps 1</th> <th>Step 2</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2018</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2020</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2025</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2035</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Fiscal Year	Steps 1	Step 2	2018			2020			2025			2035		
Fiscal Year	Steps 1	Step 2																	
2018																			
2020																			
2025																			
2035																			
7	Does the proposal meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056 Subdivision 13?	The applicant intends, if funded, to meet the applicable criteria set forth in MN Statutes 97A.056, Subd. 13	<p>0 – No, applicant will not comply</p> <p>6 – Yes, applicant agrees to comply</p>	Information provided under <i>Applicable Criteria</i> . This question is asked by all applicants as a “yes/no” affirmative question. A pop-up window showing Subdivision 13 is provided.															

8	If applicable, does the proposal restore or enhance habitat on permanently protected land, including tribal lands under federal trust arrangements?	The proposed restoration and enhancement is on permanently protected land – protected either by a public entity or federal tribal trust.	<p>Completely Disagree</p> <p>Neither or neutral</p> <p>Completely agree</p>	Information provided under <i>Permanent Protection</i> . Questions about protection status are specific to the activity selected.
			0 1 2 3 4 5 6	
9	Does the proposal clearly identify performance measures, and provide a specific plan for measuring, evaluating and publicly reporting these outcomes over time?	The proposal clearly identifies performance indicators and measurements.	<p>Completely Disagree</p> <p>Neither or neutral</p> <p>Completely agree</p>	This information is provided under <i>Outcomes</i> where applicants can select outcomes based on Section Priorities. There are explicit instructions to address how outcomes will be measured.
			0 1 2 3 4 5 6	
10	Is the proposal likely to produce and demonstrate significant and permanent conservation benefits and/or habitat outcomes?	The proposal will produce clear, significant and enduring habitat outcomes.	<p>Completely Disagree</p> <p>Neither or neutral</p> <p>Completely agree</p>	This information is provided under <i>Outcomes</i> . Applicants determine their top 3 outcomes based on Section Priorities. A 50 word text box is provided to explain measurable goals, import of achieving goals and impact of successful completion of the work. There are explicit instructions to address these items.
			0 1 2 3 4 5 6	

11	<p>Does the proposal clearly describe whether it leverages effort and/or other funds to supplement any OHF appropriation? For example, leverage may include cash, in-kind contributions such as proposal evaluations or planning, or personnel. Local outreach, education, and community engagement may also be considered advantageous.</p>	<p>The proposal identifies leverage, non-state funds and/or in-kind contributions to demonstrate the sponsors are committed to the project's success</p>	<p>Completely Disagree</p> <p>Neither or neutral</p> <p>Completely agree</p> <p>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</p>	<p>This information is provided in the budget spreadsheet as well as a table inserted under <i>Relationship to Other Funds</i> that calculates the percentage of the leverage to the request amount.</p>
12	<p>Is the proposal's budget within the norms of this kind of work or otherwise adequate to accomplish all goals and objectives described?</p>	<p>The proposal's budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.</p>	<p>Completely Disagree</p> <p>Neither or neutral</p> <p>Completely agree</p> <p>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</p>	<p>This information is found under <i>Budget</i> in the total request number and the way the applicant has distributed the money to budget line items. Members are asked to use their experience and sense to assess whether or not the right amount of money has been requested and the money is in the right place. Applicants have provided leverage by line item and members should consider the leverage resource concurrently.</p>

