

## CONSTITUTIONAL LANGUAGE

*33 percent of the receipts shall be deposited in the outdoor heritage fund and may be spent only to restore, protect, and enhance wetlands, prairies, forests, and habitat for fish, game and wildlife. The dedicated money under this section must supplement traditional sources of funding for these purposes and may not be used as a substitute. Land acquired by fee with money deposited in the outdoor heritage fund under this section must be open to the public taking of fish and game during the open season unless otherwise provided by law.*

### PROPOSAL, CRITERIA QUESTIONS, POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVE QUESTIONS, OBSERVATIONS

#### KEY TO TYPE COLOR

**Black** – current proposal language

**Red** – current scoring criteria language (put in place by appropriate questions but should probably be reordered to be in the order of the proposal questions)

**Blue** – alternative suggestions and questions

**Green** – general observations

**Strikeout** – things I felt we could just eliminate.

- Abstract
- Design and Scope of Work

**CRITERIA QUESTION #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.

- How does the proposal address habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species, and list targeted species?

**ALTERNATIVE QUESTION** – Explain how the proposal addresses habitat protection, restoration or enhancement for threatened or endangered species conservation? *(this avoids the targeted species issue which is not helpful as we are all smart enough to know that wetlands, grasslands, forests are good for many species and don't need rote answers. There is no way to rank the importance of one habitat type over another generally so lets not try and do that in our scoring criteria)*

**CRITERIA QUESTION #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. *(I would eliminate this question)*

- What is the degree of timing/opportunistic urgency and why it is necessary to spend public money for this work as soon as possible?

ALTERNATIVE QUESTION – What are the elements of this proposal that are critical from a timing perspective that cannot be put off until a future time?

CRITERIA QUESTION #8 - Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.

- Describe how the proposal uses science-based targeting that leverages or expands corridors and complexes, reduces fragmentation or protects areas identified in the MN County Biological Survey:

CRITERIA QUESTION #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.

ALTERNATIVE QUESTION – Describe how the proposal expands corridors and complexes.

ALTERNATIVE CRITERIA QUESTION – Proposal will leverage or expand corridors or complexes and/or address habitat fragmentation.

- Which two sections of the Minnesota Statewide Conservation and Preservation Plan are most applicable to this project?
- ~~Which two other plans are addressed in this proposal?~~
- ~~Describe how your program will advance the indicators identified in the plans selected:~~

CRITERIA QUESTION #5 - Proposal identifies indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support. *(I recommend eliminating this)*

ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVE QUESTION – Explain how this proposal will help address climate change and its effects on habitat and the species that utilize the protected or restored/enhanced habitat this proposal targets.

NEW CRITERIA QUESTION #5 – Proposals outcomes will help address climate resilience in a meaningful way.

- Which LSOHC section priorities are addressed in this proposal?
- Describe how your program will produce and demonstrate a significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or outcomes for fish, game, and wildlife as indicated in the LSOHC priorities:

ALTERNATIVE QUESTION - Describe how this project program will produce and demonstrate a significant and permanent conservation legacy and/or outcomes and if not a permanent outcome, why it is important to undertake at this time.

CRITERIA QUESTION #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.

ALTERNATIVE CRITERIA QUESTION - Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and/or permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife. *(just added /or)*

- What other fund may contribute to this proposal?
- Does this proposal include leveraged funding?
- Explain the leverage:

ALTERNATIVE QUESTION (to all three above) – Does this proposal anticipate having other funders? Please identify them and the amount of either firm or anticipated funding.

CRITERIA QUESTION #9 - Proposal includes leverage in funds or other effort to supplement any OHF appropriation

ALTERNATIVE CRITERIA QUESTION – Proposal includes leverage.

- Per MS 97A.056, Subd. 24, Please explain whether the request is supplanting or is a substitution for any previous funding that was not from a legacy fund and was used for the same purpose.
- Non-OHF Appropriations (table)

COMMENT – not sure why this is important

- How will you sustain and/or maintain this work after the Outdoor Heritage Funds are expended?

ALTERNATIVE QUESTION (1 of 2)– In the case of acquisitions (both fee and easement), who will the ultimate holder of the conservation property be? How will they sustain and/or maintain this property over time and with what funds?

ALTERNATIVE QUESTION (2 of 2) – In the case of restoration/enhancement work, who will maintain this and where will the funds come from to do this work?

- Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes (table)

CRITERIA QUESTION #6 - Performance measures are clearly identified, and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.

CRITERIA QUESTION #7 - Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time

- ~~Identify indicator species and associated quantities this habitat will typically support:~~
- How will the program directly involve, engage, and benefit BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, People of Color) and diverse communities:

COMMENT – This is not something we can really score. Important but is it appropriate and actionable?

#### Activity Details

- Requirements
  - If funded, this proposal will meet all applicable criteria set forth in MS 97A.056?
  - Will county board or other local government approval be formally sought prior to acquisition, per 97A.056 subd 13(j)?
    - Describe any measures to inform local governments of land acquisition under their jurisdiction:
  - Is the land you plan to acquire (fee title) free of any other permanent protection?
  - Will restoration and enhancement work follow best management practices including MS 84.973 Pollinator Habitat Program?
  - Is the restoration and enhancement activity on permanently protected land per 97A.056, Subd 13(f), tribal lands, and/or public waters per MS 103G.005, Subd. 15?
    - ~~Where does the activity take place?~~
- Land Use
  - Will there be planting of any crop on OHF land purchased or restored in this program?
    - Explain what will be planted:

ADDED QUESTION – Will neonicotinoid products be used in the planting or restoration process and if so, why?

- Is this land currently open for hunting and fishing?
- Will the land be open for hunting and fishing after completion?
  - Describe any variation from the State of Minnesota regulations:
- Are there currently trails or roads on any of the proposed acquisitions? If yes, please describe.

- Will new trails or roads be developed or improved as a result of the OHF acquisition? *If yes, please describe.*
- Will the land that you acquire (fee or easement) be restored or enhanced within this proposal's funding and availability?
- Other OHF Appropriation Awards
  - Have you received OHF dollars in the past through LSOHC? (table)

ADDITION – Add percentages to “spent to date”, not sure what the “reported in AP” and “realized to date” are, change “affected” to “accomplished,” and add percentage to the “affected to date”

Timeline (table)

COMMENT – Seems like the timeline and the “Actions to Maintain Project Outcomes” could be combined.

**CRITERIA QUESTION #7 - DUPLICATION**

Budget (table)

- Amount of Request:
- Amount of Leverage: **MODIFY TO INCLUDE TWO CATEGORIES**
  - Committed
  - Anticipated
- Leverage as a percent of the Request: 6.01%
  - Committed
  - Anticipated
- DSS + Personnel:
- As a % of the total request:
- Easement Stewardship:
- As a % of the Easement Acquisition:
- Describe and explain leverage source and confirmation of funds:

**CRITERIA QUESTION #10 - Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.**

- Does this proposal have the ability to be scalable?
- If the project received 70% of the requested funding
  - Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?

- Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?
- If the project received 50% of the requested funding
  - Describe how the scaling would affect acres/activities and if not proportionately reduced, why?
  - Describe how personnel and DSS expenses would be adjusted and if not proportionately reduced, why?

COMMENT – Because we rarely provide 70% funding, perhaps we should change the percentages to 50% and 30%

- Personnel
  - Has funding for these positions been requested in the past?
    - Please explain the overlap of past and future staffing and position levels previously received and how that is coordinated over multiple years?

COMMENT – I don't feel our question really gets answers that are meaningful. A table that asks for individual people funded in each FY allocation and in this proposal that would show who is funded for how long by each allocation would be very helpful. Then the other questions on this could be eliminated.

- Contracts
  - What is included in the contracts line?

ADDITION – Professional services. What is included in the professional services line?

- Fee Acquisition
  - What is the anticipated number of fee title acquisition transactions?
- Travel
  - Does the amount in the travel line include equipment/vehicle rental?
  - Explain the amount in the travel line outside of traditional travel costs of mileage, food, and lodging

REWORDING – Identify in specific dollars the amount in the travel line outside of traditional travel costs of mileage, food and lodging.

- I understand and agree that lodging, meals, and mileage must comply with the current MMB Commissioner Plan:

- Direct Support Services
  - How did you determine which portions of the Direct Support Services of your shared support services is direct to this program?
  
- Other Equipment/Tools
  - Give examples of the types of Equipment and Tools that will be purchased?

REWORDING – Identify equipment and tools that will be purchased and approximate amounts required for these items.

- Federal Funds
  - Do you anticipate federal funds as a match for this program?

ADDITION – Is there any additional information you care to share about this proposal not covered by other questions?

COMMENT – We need to discuss this. I know that when federal funds are in the mix, the appropriation goes on longer but I cannot remember why and if we have any say in this. And if I don't know, then I am guessing others don't either.

#### Output Tables

- Outcomes

#### Parcels

- Sign-up Criteria?
  
- Explain the process used to identify, prioritize, and select the parcels on your list:

Restore/Enhance Parcels (table)

Protect Parcels (table)

#### Parcel Map

INTERESTING OBSERVATION - The scoring process is based on the number of members to recommend funding for a proposal. However, when a council member claims a conflict of interest, it gives the appearance of a lower rank for that proposal. Proposals should be ranked by the % of eligible members that recommended funding a proposal rather than by the raw number of members that recommend funding.

INTERESTING OBSERVATION – DNR appraisal process is challenging – perhaps we should have DNR leadership come in an explain how they are trying to address this.

ADDITIONAL CRITERIA QUESTION – Is the proposal reasonable in its size (full score) or inflated in an attempt to overcome the possibility of receiving less than the entire amount?