

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Suzanne Baird													
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is 120 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 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).		
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	Max points: 10		
PA01	Martin County WMA Acquisition - Phase 9	7	6	8	7	5	7	6	7	6	2	8	8	77	The proposal talks about restoration but no outcomes for restoration are listed.
PA02	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase XI	8	7	8	7	9	9	8	7	9	3	7	7	89	
PA03	RIM Grassland Reserve - Phase VI	9	8	9	9	8	6	7	6	8	2	7	6	85	\$8M for 1260 acres of easements seems high.There is a conflict between the abstract and the Scope of work in the acreage to be enrolled (1260 and 980).
PA04	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase XI	9	8	9	9	8	6	8	7	8	2	7	6	87	Large amount of funding requested for easements
PA05	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XVII	7	7	8	9	9	9	8	7	9	4	8	8	93	
PA06	MN Prairie Recovery Program - Phase XIV	10	10	10	10	8	7	8	9	8	1	9	9	99	
PA07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase XV	9	9	10	8	8	8	8	9	8	2	8	7	94	
PA08	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase XVII	7	7	8	9	7	7	7	7	8	1	6	8	82	
PRE01	Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands - Phase VIII	10	10	8	8	7	9	7	6	8	1	8	7	89	
PRE02	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase V	9	8	9	7	3	8	8	8	9	3	7	7	86	
FA01	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase III	8	7	9	8	8	10	8	8	8	2	9	8	93	
FA02	Itasca County Memorial Forest Project	9	9	9	10	9	8	8	7	10	1	9	10	99	
FA03	Protecting Critical Habitat in Northeastern Minnesota while Balancing Sustainable Public Land Use and Permanent Public Access Through a Community Land Trust Model	6	6	8	9	6	7	6	7	7	7	6	8	83	The proposal and budget do not agree. Propoasal talks about easements but no funding is set aside for easement purchase in the budget
FA04	Hardwood Hills Habitat Conservation Program - Phase 2	9	9	8	7	8	9	8	9	8	4	8	8	95	
FA05	Camp Ripley Sentienl Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase XIII	10	8	8	9	8	7	8	8	8	5	8	7	94	
FA06	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase X	8	7	8	9	8	7	8	6	8	4	8	8	89	
FRE01	DNR Statewide Forest Enhancment and Restoration - Phase V	7	9	8	7	7	8	8	8	8	0	9	8	87	
FRE02	Carver County Lake Minnewashta Regional Park Management Unit 1 Old Field Restoration	9	9	9	9	8	9	8	8	8	0	10	9	96	
WA01	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase X	8	9	7	8	8	9	9	9	9	4	7	7	94	
WA02	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	9	9	9	9	9	9	8	7	9	4	7	8	97	The proposal talks about acquisition and restoration but the output tables do not provide any outputs for restoration.
WA03	RIM Wetlands - Restoring the Most Productive Habitat in Minnesota	6	6	8	7	7	7	8	8	8	0	7	6	78	Very confusing - acquiring or restoring - not clear. Seems duplicative of PA04 - maybe should be combined into one proposal.2
WA04	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XVII	8	8	7	7	9	8	8	7	9	5	7	7	90	The amount of funding from this project for restoration seems low as compared to the amount for fee title acquisition. May want to do a little more restoration.
WRE01	East Park WMA / Nelson Slough	6	6	7	7	6	7	7	7	8	8	7	8	77	The proposal lack specifics - it talks about the water control structure but that is not what the funding request is for. Lack of clarity on the length of dike to be able to determine if the budget request is appropriate.

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Suzanne Baird													
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is 120 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 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).		
WRE02	Living Shallow Lakes and Wetlands Enhancment and Restoration Initiative - Phase XI	8	9	9	7	8	8	8	7	9	3	8	7	91	
WRE03	Big Swamp North - Peatland Restoration Project	9	10	9	7	8	8	8	9	9	0	10	10	97	Restoration of a large peat complex is a high priority
WRE04	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements - Phase XVII	9	9	8	7	7	8	8	6	8	0	8	7	85	
HA01	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	9	10	9	8	8	7	9	8	8	2	8	7	93	
HA02	Spring Road Conservation Project	7	8	9	8	8	7	8	5	7	10	8	9	94	
HA03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase X	9	8	9	8	9	8	8	9	8	3	7	6	92	
HA04	Integrating Habitat and Clean Water - Phase III	6	7	8	6	7	7	8	7	9	0	7	6	78	
HA05	2025 St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase VI	9	9	9	8	7	8	8	8	8	3	7	7	91	
HA06	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase IX	8	7	7	8	10	8	8	9	9	1	7	6	88	
HA07	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase XIII	9	9	8	8	8	9	8	8	7	3	8	7	92	
HA08	Protecting Coldwater Fisheries on Minnesota's North Shore - Phase III	7	7	8	7	6	7	8	8	7	4	8	8	85	
HA09	Metro Big Rivers - Phase XV	9	10	8	7	8	8	8	6	9	4	8	7	92	
HA10	Minnesota River Watershed Habitat Conservation Program	9	9	9	8	9	8	8	8	8	3	8	8	95	
HA11	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase XIV	7	9	9	8	8	9	7	8	7	1	8	9	90	
HA12	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance - Phase IV	8	8	8	6	8	7	9	6	9	3	8	8	88	
HA13	Shakopee Creek: Headwaters Restored; Species and Land Protected	6	6	5	6	8	7	5	8	6	0	7	7	71	The proposal talks about protection but does not explain how this protection will be achieved. Talks about partnerships but no evidence of partners. Would like to the investment of partners upfront for this project. Poorly explained.
HA14	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements - Phase IV	9	10	8	9	8	8	9	7	8	0	9	9	94	
HA15	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase XI	9	9	8	7	8	8	8	6	8	3	8	7	89	
HRE01	Minnesota Statewide Trout Habitat Enhancement - Phase II	7	9	7	9	9	9	9	9	7	5	8	8	96	
HRE02	Restoring and Enhancing Minnesota's Important Bird Areas - Phase IV	9	9	9	8	8	9	9	8	9	3	8	7	96	
HRE03	Fall River Restoration	9	9	7	6	9	7	9	6	9	8	9	9	97	
HRE04	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement - Phase VIII	10	9	9	7	9	7	9	8	8	10	7	6	99	
HRE05	Lake Nokomis Shoreline Enhancements for Turtles and Pollinators - Phase III	8	9	7	6	8	8	8	9	8	4	9	10	94	
HRE06	Moose Habitat Collaborative, NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement - Phase V	8	6	8	6	8	8	7	8	7	2	9	9	86	Proposal is somewhat vague on the specifics of what is proposed. Not clear what the enhancements that will be used. Still have spent a small proportion of funds from 2023.

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:	Suzanne Baird														
Due Date:	Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.														
Maximum score per request is 120 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 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).		
HRE07	Rum River Corridor Fish and Wildlife Habitat Enhancement - Phase III	7	8	9	7	8	8	8	6	8	4	9	9	91	Proposal is a little short on details of the enhancements in the detailed proposal section.
O1	Contract Management													0	
O2	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2025													0	
O3	DNR Core Functions in Partner-led OHF Land Acquisitions													0	
O4	DNR Roving Crew - Phase 3													0	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program Ph. 17 Statewide and Metro Habitat													0	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		John Burkel													
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
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	Max points: 10		
PA01	Martin County WMA Acquisition - Phase 9	10	10	6	6	7	10	7	9	7	4	6	6	88	Personnel - 4.24% Leverage- 4.01%
PA02	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase XI	10	10	5	5	9	10	9	8	9	4	7	5	91	Personnel - 3.14% Leverage - 7.03% -
PA03	RIM Grassland Reserve - Phase VI	10	10	7	7	8	10	8	9	8	1	6	3	87	Personnel - 4.76% Leverage - 0.00% -
PA04	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase XI	10	10	5	5	7	10	7	8	7	1	7	3	80	Personnel - 3.63% Leverage - 0.00% -
PA05	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XVII	10	10	5	5	7	10	7	8	7	7	7	3	86	Personnel - 3.7% Leverage - 15.59% -
PA06	MN Prairie Recovery Program - Phase XIV	10	10	5	5	9	10	9	7	7	2	2	4	80	Maintaining anonymity of parcels is an important consideration for the organization in order to protect landowner privacy rights and to maintain the integrity of good faith negotiations. .
PA07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase XV	10	10	5	5	8	10	8	9	8	4	5	6	88	Personnel - 13.1 % of request
PA08	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase XVII	10	10	5	5	7	10	7	9	7	1	7	5	83	Personnel - 2.57% Leverage - 0.00% -
PRE01	Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands - Phase VIII	10	10	6	6	8	10	8	9	8	4	8	7	94	Personnel - 5.14% Leverage - 2.93%
PRE02	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase V	10	10	7	7	9	10	9	8	9	8	5	6	98	Personnel - 8.01% Leverage- 8.7%
FA01	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase III	10	10	7	7	8	10	8	9	8	4	3	4	88	Personnel - 14,51% Leverage - 3.41%
FA02	Itasca County Memorial Forest Project	10	10	10	10	7	10	7	9	7	3	5	6	94	Personnel - 2.65% Leverage - 1.37%
FA03	Protecting Critical Habitat in Northeastern Minnesota while Balancing Sustainable Public Land Use and Permanent Public Access Through a Community Land Trust Model	10	10	10	10	8	10	8	7	8	10	7	9	107	Personnel - 6.17% Leverage - 40.72%
FA04	Hardwood Hills Habitat Conservation Program - Phase 2	10	10	9	9	9	10	9	9	9	6	4	5	99	Personnel - 8.96% Leverage - 10.2%
FA05	Camp Ripley Sentienl Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase XIII	10	10	5	5	9	10	9	9	9	10	7	9	102	Personnel - 5.74% Leverage - 21.83%
FA06	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase X	10	10	5	5	8	10	8	9	8	9	10	9	101	Personnel - .63% Leverage - 14.48%
FRE01	DNR Statewide Forest Enhancment and Restoration - Phase V	10	10	7	7	8	10	8	8	8	1	5	3	85	Personnel - 2.54% Leverage - 0
FRE02	Carver County Lake Minnewashta Regional Park Management Unit 1 Old Field Restoration	10	10	10	10	7	10	7	9	7	1	10	9	100	Personnel - .32% Leverage - 0
WA01	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase X	10	10	5	5	9	10	9	9	9	9	6	7	98	Personnel - 6.52 Leverage - 14.34%
WA02	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	10	10	5	5	9	10	9	8	9	6	4	5	90	Personnel - 7.08% Leverage - 10.01%
WA03	RIM Wetlands - Restoring the Most Productive Habitat in Minnesota	10	10	10	10	8	10	8	9	8	1	6	6	96	Personnel - 6.68% Leverage - 0
WA04	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XVII	10	10	5	5	9	10	9	9	9	10	6	8	100	Personnel - 3.35% Leverage - 23.82%

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		John Burkel													
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
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	Max points: 10		
WRE01	East Park WMA / Nelson Slough	10	10	9	9	9	10	9	8	9	10	10	10	113	Personnel - 0.00% Leverage - 60.86%
WRE02	Living Shallow Lakes and Wetlands Enhancment and Restoration Initiative - Phase XI	10	10	5	5	9	10	9	7	9	7	3	5	89	Personnel - 14.32% Leverage - 9.02%
WRE03	Big Swamp North - Peatland Restoration Project	10	10	10	10	9	10	9	9	9	1	10	7	104	Personnel - 0% Leverage - 0%
WRE04	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements - Phase XVII	10	10	5	5	8	10	8	9	8	1	1	1	76	Personnel - 19.41% Leverage - 0%
HA01	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	10	10	5	5	7	10	7	9	7	2	4	4	80	Personnel - 9.38% Leverage - 3.19%
HA02	Spring Road Conservation Project	10	10	10	10	8	10	8	9	8	10	10	10	113	Personnel - 0% Leverage - 92.53%
HA03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase X	10	10	5	5	8	10	8	8	8	6	1	5	84	Personnel - 20.14% Leverage - 6.82 %
HA04	Integrating Habitat and Clean Water - Phase III	10	10	8	8	9	10	9	9	9	1	8	6	97	Personnel - 4.44% Leverage - 0
HA05	2025 St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase VI	10	10	7	7	7	10	7	9	7	2	4	8	88	Personnel - 8.89% Leverage - 7.64% +
HA06	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase IX	10	10	6	6	9	10	9	9	9	1	4	8	91	Personnel - 7.78% Leverage - 1.13% +
HA07	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase XIII	10	10	5	5	9	10	9	8	9	6	1	3	85	Personnel - 16.21% Leverage - 6.22% -
HA08	Protecting Coldwater Fisheries on Minnesota's North Shore - Phase III	10	10	7	7	8	10	8	7	8	9	4	4	92	Personnel - 8.43% Leverage - 15.49% -
HA09	Metro Big Rivers - Phase XV	10	10	5	5	8	10	8	9	8	7	3	5	88	Personnel - 10.15% Leverage - 10.31%
HA10	Minnesota River Watershed Habitat Conservation Program	10	10	10	10	9	10	9	9	9	6	3	5	100	Personnel - 11.92% Leverage - 6.91%
HA11	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase XIV	10	10	5	5	8	10	8	8	8	2	7	7	88	Personnel - 1.85% Leverage - 2.77% +
HA12	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance - Phase IV	10	10	7	7	7	10	7	7	7	7	5	6	90	Personnel - 6.77% Leverage - 9.84%
HA13	Shakopee Creek: Headwaters Restored; Species and Land Protected	10	10	10	10	8	10	8	8	8	1	4	8	95	Personnel - 7.96% Leverage - 0.0% +
HA14	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements - Phase IV	10	10	6	6	9	10	9	8	9	1	9	4	91	Personnel - .24% Leverage - 0% -
HA15	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase XI	10	10	5	5	8	10	8	8	8	7	4	4	87	Personnel - 7.99% Leverage - 9.79% -
HRE01	Minnesota Statewide Trout Habitat Enhancement - Phase II	10	10	9	9	7	10	7	8	7	10	3	7	97	Personnel - 11.02% Leverage - 20.59%
HRE02	Restoring and Enhancing Minnesota's Important Bird Areas - Phase IV	10	10	6	6	8	10	8	8	8	7	1	5	87	Personnel - 18.31% Leverage - 9.94%
HRE03	Fall River Restoration	10	10	10	10	9	10	9	9	9	10	10	10	116	Personnel - 0.0% Leverage - 62.79% +++

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		John Burkel													
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
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	Max points: 10		
HRE04	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement - Phase VIII	5	10	6	6	9	10	9	9	9	10	1	0	84	Personnel - 18.64% Leverage - 106.25% ???
HRE05	Lake Nokomis Shoreline Enhancements for Turtles and Pollinators - Phase III	10	10	8	8	8	10	8	8	8	10	10	10	108	Personnel - 0.0% Leverage - 19.84% ++
HRE06	Moose Habitat Collaborative, NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement - Phase V	10	10	7	7	8	10	8	9	8	3	4	8	92	Personnel - 9.15% Leverage - 3.81% +
HRE07	Rum River Corridor Fish and Wildlife Habitat Enhancement - Phase III	10	10	8	8	8	10	8	9	8	9	1	6	95	Personnel - 17.83% Leverage - 11.05%
O1	Contract Management	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	10	1	10	10	110	Personnel - 0.0% Leverage 0.0%
O2	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2025	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	8	10	1	1	10	100	Personnel - 88% Leverage - 0.0%
O3	DNR Core Functions in Partner-led OHF Land Acquisitions	10	10	5	5	10	10	10	9	10	3	2	10	94	Personnel - 14.79% Leverage - 3.3%
O4	DNR Roving Crew - Phase 3	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	8	10	1	1	10	100	Personnel - 75.76% Leverage - 0.0%
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program Ph. 17 Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	8	10	7	7	10	112	Personnel - 3.44% Leverage - 9.6% +

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Dudley Edmondson													
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
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	Max points: 10		
PA01	Martin County WMA Acquisition - Phase 9	10	10	10	7	7	7	8	7	8	6	7	8	95	
PA02	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase XI	7	8	8	7	8	8	7	7	7	7	7	7	88	
PA03	RIM Grassland Reserve - Phase VI	9	8	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	9	7	9	103	
PA04	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase XI	7	8	7	5	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	7	84	
PA05	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XVII	7	8	7	5	8	7	7	7	8	7	7	7	85	
PA06	MN Prairie Recovery Program - Phase XIV	8	9	8	8	9	8	9	8	8	8	8	8	99	
PA07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase XV	8	9	9	8	8	8	9	9	8	9	8	8	101	
PA08	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase XVII	8	9	8	9	8	8	8	8	9	9	9	9	102	
PRE01	Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands - Phase VIII	8	8	8	8	8	9	9	9	8	8	8	8	99	
PRE02	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase V	8	8	8	9	9	9	8	9	9	7	8	8	100	
FA01	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase III	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	9	9	8	8	103	
FA02	Itasca County Memorial Forest Project	9	8	7	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	9	96	
FA03	Protecting Critical Habitat in Northeastern Minnesota while Balancing Sustainable Public Land Use and Permanent Public Access Through a Community Land Trust Model	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	7	9	9	106	
FA04	Hardwood Hills Habitat Conservation Program - Phase 2	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	96	
FA05	Camp Ripley Sentienl Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase XIII	8	8	7	7	7	7	7	8	8	8	8	7	90	
FA06	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase X	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	8	8	9	9	103	
FRE01	DNR Statewide Forest Enhancment and Restoration - Phase V	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	9	8	8	8	104	
FRE02	Carver County Lake Minnewashta Regional Park Management Unit 1 Old Field Restoration	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	108	
WA01	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase X	8	8	8	8	8	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	97	
WA02	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	8	8	8	7	8	8	9	9	8	7	8	8	96	
WA03	RIM Wetlands - Restoring the Most Productive Habitat in Minnesota	8	8	9	9	8	9	8	8	9	6	8	8	98	
WA04	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XVII	8	8	8	8	7	8	8	8	7	7	8	8	93	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Dudley Edmondson													
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
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	Max points: 10		
WRE01	East Park WMA / Nelson Slough	8	8	8	9	8	8	8	9	9	9	9	8	101	
WRE02	Living Shallow Lakes and Wetlands Enhancment and Restoration Initiative - Phase XI	8	8	8	8	9	9	9	8	8	8	9	8	100	
WRE03	Big Swamp North - Peatland Restoration Project	8	9	8	8	8	8	9	8	8	6	8	9	97	
WRE04	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements - Phase XVII	9	8	8	8	9	8	9	8	8	6	8	8	97	
HA01	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	9	9	8	8	9	9	8	9	8	6	8	8	99	
HA02	Spring Road Conservation Project	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	8	10	9	9	107	
HA03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase X	8	8	9	9	9	9	8	8	9	8	8	8	101	
HA04	Integrating Habitat and Clean Water - Phase III	8	8	8	8	9	9	8	9	9	8	8	8	100	
HA05	2025 St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase VI	8	8	8	8	8	8	9	9	9	9	8	8	100	
HA06	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase IX	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	108	
HA07	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase XIII	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	101	
HA08	Protecting Coldwater Fisheries on Minnesota's North Shore - Phase III	9	8	8	9	9	9	8	9	9	9	9	9	105	
HA09	Metro Big Rivers - Phase XV	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	9	9	9	9	9	105	
HA10	Minnesota River Watershed Habitat Conservation Program	9	8	9	8	8	8	9	8	8	8	8	8	99	
HA11	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase XIV	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	96	
HA12	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance - Phase IV	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	108	
HA13	Shakopee Creek: Headwaters Restored; Species and Land Protected	8	8	8	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	9	9	97	
HA14	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements - Phase IV	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	8	107	
HA15	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase XI	8	8	8	8	8	8	9	8	8	8	8	8	97	
HRE01	Minnesota Statewide Trout Habitat Enhancement - Phase II	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	9	9	107	
HRE02	Restoring and Enhancing Minnesota's Important Bird Areas - Phase IV	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	108	
HRE03	Fall River Restoration	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	107	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Dudley Edmondson														
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.														
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes	
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	Max points: 10			
HRE04	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement - Phase VIII	9	9	9	8	9	9	8	9	9	9	8	9	105		
HRE05	Lake Nokomis Shoreline Enhancements for Turtles and Pollinators - Phase III	10	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	10	9	10	10	111		
HRE06	Moose Habitat Collaborative, NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement - Phase V	9	10	9	10	9	9	9	9	10	9	9	9	111		
HRE07	Rum River Corridor Fish and Wildlife Habitat Enhancement - Phase III	9	8	8	9	9	8	8	9	9	9	8	8	102		
O1	Contract Management	9	9	9	9	8	9	8	8	9	9	8	9	104		
O2	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2025	9	9	9	8	9	9	8	9	9	9	9	9	106		
O3	DNR Core Functions in Partner-led OHF Land Acquisitions	8	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	9	9	9	9	106		
O4	DNR Roving Crew - Phase 3	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	96		
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program Ph. 17 Statewide and Metro Habitat	8	9	8	9	8	9	9	9	8	9	8	9	103		

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Kristin Eggerling													
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
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	Max points: 10		
PA01	Martin County WMA Acquisition - Phase 9	10	10	8	8	9	10	10	8	8	4	8	8	101	
PA02	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase XI	10	10	8	8	9	10	10	8	10	7	8	8	106	
PA03	RIM Grassland Reserve - Phase VI	10	10	10	9	9	10	10	8	9	0	8	8	101	no leverage
PA04	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase XI	10	10	10	8	9	10	10	8	8	0	8	8	99	no leverage
PA05	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XVII	9	10	8	8	9	10	10	8	9	10	8	8	107	
PA06	MN Prairie Recovery Program - Phase XIV	10	10	10	10	9	10	10	8	9	2	8	8	104	
PA07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase XV	9	10	10	10	9	10	10	8	9	4	8	8	105	
PA08	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase XVII	10	10	10	10	9	10	10	8	8	0	8	8	101	no leverage
PRE01	Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands - Phase VIII	10	10	10	9	8	10	9	8	8	3	8	8	101	
PRE02	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase V	9	10	10	10	10	9	10	8	9	9	8	8	110	
FA01	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase III	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	8	8	3	8	8	105	
FA02	Itasca County Memorial Forest Project	10	10	10	10	10	9	10	8	9	1	8	8	103	not scalable
FA03	Protecting Critical Habitat in Northeastern Minnesota while Balancing Sustainable Public Land Use and Permanent Public Access Through a Community Land Trust Model	9	9	9	10	8	8	9	8	9	10	8	8	105	
FA04	Hardwood Hills Habitat Conservation Program - Phase 2	10	10	10	10	9	10	10	8	9	10	8	8	112	
FA05	Camp Ripley Sentienl Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase XIII	10	10	10	8	8	9	10	8	9	10	8	8	108	
FA06	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase X	10	10	9	10	10	9	10	8	9	10	8	8	111	
FRE01	DNR Statewide Forest Enhancment and Restoration - Phase V	8	10	10	8	8	10	10	8	8	0	8	8	96	no leverage
FRE02	Carver County Lake Minnewashta Regional Park Management Unit 1 Old Field Restoration	10	10	10	9	9	10	10	8	10	0	8	8	102	no leverage
WA01	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase X	10	10	10	9	9	10	10	8	9	10	8	8	111	\$10,951,142 remaining funds
WA02	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	10	10	10	9	9	10	10	8	10	10	8	8	112	
WA03	RIM Wetlands - Restoring the Most Productive Habitat in Minnesota	10	10	10	10	9	10	10	8	10	0	8	8	103	
WA04	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XVII	8	9	9	8	9	10	10	8	10	10	8	8	107	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Kristin Eggerling													
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
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	Max points: 10		
WRE01	East Park WMA / Nelson Slough	8	10	10	8	8	9	10	8	9	10	8	8	106	not scalable
WRE02	Living Shallow Lakes and Wetlands Enhancment and Restoration Initiative - Phase XI	10	10	9	8	9	9	10	8	10	9	8	8	108	
WRE03	Big Swamp North - Peatland Restoration Project	10	9	9	8	8	8	10	8	9	0	8	8	95	90% unspent
WRE04	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements - Phase XVII	9	9	10	8	10	10	10	8	8	0	8	8	98	\$9M remaining, 38.5% spent
HA01	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	10	10	10	8	8	10	10	8	9	3	8	8	102	
HA02	Spring Road Conservation Project	10	10	10	10	10	9	10	8	9	10	8	8	112	
HA03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase X	10	9	10	9	10	10	10	8	10	7	8	8	109	
HA04	Integrating Habitat and Clean Water - Phase III	7	8	10	9	8	10	10	8	9	0	8	8	95	
HA05	2025 St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase VI	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	8	10	8	8	8	112	
HA06	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase IX	9	9	10	8	9	10	10	8	10	1	8	8	100	
HA07	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase XIII	10	10	10	10	9	10	10	8	10	6	8	8	109	
HA08	Protecting Coldwater Fisheries on Minnesota's North Shore - Phase III	10	10	10	10	9	10	10	8	10	10	8	8	113	
HA09	Metro Big Rivers - Phase XV	10	10	10	10	9	10	10	8	10	10	8	8	113	
HA10	Minnesota River Watershed Habitat Conservation Program	10	10	10	9	9	9	10	8	9	7	7	7	105	
HA11	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase XIV	10	10	10	9	8	9	10	8	9	3	8	8	102	
HA12	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance - Phase IV	10	10	10	10	9	9	10	8	9	10	8	8	111	
HA13	Shakopee Creek: Headwaters Restored; Species and Land Protected	8	8	8	8	8	10	10	8	8	0	8	8	92	not scalable
HA14	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements - Phase IV	8	8	8	8	8	9	10	8	10	0	8	8	93	
HA15	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase XI	9	10	10	9	8	9	10	8	10	10	8	8	109	
HRE01	Minnesota Statewide Trout Habitat Enhancement - Phase II	8	8	10	9	8	9	10	8	8	10	8	8	104	
HRE02	Restoring and Enhancing Minnesota's Important Bird Areas - Phase IV	9	10	10	9	8	9	10	8	8	10	8	8	107	
HRE03	Fall River Restoration	8	8	10	8	8	8	10	8	9	10	8	8	103	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Kristin Eggerling														
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.														
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes	
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	Max points: 10			
HRE04	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement - Phase VIII	8	8	10	8	9	10	10	8	8	10	8	8	105		
HRE05	Lake Nokomis Shoreline Enhancements for Turtles and Pollinators - Phase III	9	10	10	9	9	9	10	8	8	10	8	8	108	not scalable	
HRE06	Moose Habitat Collaborative, NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement - Phase V	9	9	10	8	9	9	10	8	9	4	8	8	101		
HRE07	Rum River Corridor Fish and Wildlife Habitat Enhancement - Phase III	8	9	8	8	8	9	9	8	8	10	8	8	101		
O1	Contract Management	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	8	8	42		
O2	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2025	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	23		
O3	DNR Core Functions in Partner-led OHF Land Acquisitions	10	10	8	8	0	8	10	8	9	3	8	8	90		
O4	DNR Roving Crew - Phase 3	9	10	10	8	9	10	10	8	8	0	8	8	98		
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program Ph. 17 Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120		

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Name:		David Hartwell													
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is 120 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 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
		1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).		
PA01	Martin County WMA Acquisition - Phase 9	8	8	8	6	8	7	7	6	5	0	8	7	78	How do you insure cooperators do not use Neonicotoid seeds or pesticides?
PA02	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase XI	8	8	8	6	8	7	7	8	5	4	8	4	81	Significant 2022 funds (and 32% of 2020 funds) remaining unspent. How do you insure cooperators do not use Neonicotoid seeds or pesticides?
PA03	RIM Grassland Reserve - Phase VI	8	8	8	7	8	7	7	6	7	0	8	4	78	Significant funds from 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023 remain unspent. How do you insure cooperators do not use Neonicotoid seeds or pesticides?
PA04	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase XI	8	8	8	6	8	7	7	6	7	0	8	4	77	How do you insure cooperators do not use Neonicotoid seeds or pesticides?
PA05	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XVII	8	8	8	7	8	8	8	6	6	0	8	5	80	2021 and 2022 funds appropriated are almost totally unspent. Why the need for more now?
PA06	MN Prairie Recovery Program - Phase XIV	8	8	8	6	8	8	7	6	5	0	8	5	77	How do you insure cooperators do not use Neonicotoid seeds or pesticides?
PA07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase XV	9	9	10	8	9	8	9	7	8	0	8	5	90	How do you insure cooperators do not use Neonicotoid seeds or pesticides?
PA08	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase XVII	8	8	8	7	8	8	8	7	8	0	8	5	83	How do you insure cooperators do not use Neonicotoid seeds or pesticides? Restoration is included in acquisition budget? 2021 and 2022 funds are hardly spent.
PRE01	Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands - Phase VIII	7	6	7	6	8	7	7	7	7	0	8	5	75	Past funds have hardly been spent.
PRE02	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase V	8	8	8	7	9	8	8	7	9	4	8	6	90	
FA01	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase III	8	8	7	7	9	8	8	7	7	0	9	8	86	Is it really logical to remove ash before it is infected - why not just plant under it and let the trees decompose? \$45K for easement stewardship is the highest I have ever seen - seems especially high for forest property. Concern that 2022 appropriation is not significantly spent.
FA02	Itasca County Memorial Forest Project	10	10	6	9	7	7	8	6	8	0	10	10	91	
FA03	Protecting Critical Habitat in NE MN Through a Community Land Trust Model	5	5	6	6	8	6	5	5	4	3	5	7	65	The proposal talks about conservation easements but the budget is for fee acquisition. Does not make sense that this property will have PILT liability. Is the homestead on the 10 acres to be acquired with leveraged funds. What is then the appraised value of the property proposed to be acquired with LSOHC funds? It appears that the only building sites are near the County Road and the southern portion of property is inaccessible due to the swamp. Makes me wonder what the value of the property really is?
FA04	Hardwood Hills Habitat Conservation Program - Phase 2	10	9	9	7	10	8	10	9	9	4	10	9	104	% spent to date for 2023 funds is concerning.
FA05	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase XIII	8	8	8	7	8	7	10	8	10	3	10	8	95	Leverage does not seem appropriate when LSOHC is being asked to support the National Guard's turf through this program
FA06	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase X	10	9	10	8	10	7	10	10	10	6	10	8	108	Will leverage be scaled if project does not receive full funding?
FRE01	DNR Statewide Forest Enhancement and Restoration - Phase V	8	8	8	5	5	6	6	8	6	0	9	7	76	Timber harvesting is mentioned but there is no revenue from this activity to support the ongoing management needs identified in this project which seems wrong. Why is this work not done by roving crews? How would Arts and Cultural Heritage funds be involved?

FRE02	Carver Co. Lake Minnewashta Regional Park Mgt Unit 1 Old Field Restoration	6	7	6	5	5	5	5	4	4	0	4	5	56	All ash trees are going to die. No need to survey. Invasives like buckthorn will invade with or without tree canopy. 2029 and beyond maintenance will require more than survey. Will they remove invasives or just know they are there and not commit to long term management? Contracts answer does not match budget (\$809k vs \$605 in budget. Price per acre seems very high.. Species list seems mostly speculative.
WA01	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase X	8	8	7	8	9	9	8	7	8	6	8	7	93	How do you insure cooperators do not use Neonicotoid seeds or pesticides?
WA02	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	8	8	8	8	8	8	9	7	8	6	8	6	92	Funding from 2020 forward has good availability.
WA03	RIM Wetlands - Restoring the Most Productive Habitat in Minnesota	8	8	8	8	8	7	8	7	7	0	8	5	82	How do you insure cooperators do not use Neonicotoid seeds or pesticides?
WA04	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XVII	8	8	8	8	10	8	8	7	9	10	7	7	98	How many easement violations on LSOHC funded projects? How have they been addressed and how many have been litigated by the Attorney General's office?
WRE01	East Park WMA / Nelson Slough	7	7	6	4	4	4	5	6	7	10	8	8	76	How do you insure cooperators do not use Neonicotoid seeds or pesticides?
WRE02	Living Shallow Lakes and Wetlands Enhancement and Restoration Initiative - Phase XI	8	8	8	8	10	8	8	7	8	4	10	7	94	Flood control project more than habitat one. Water level control is a factor for nesting birds but not so much for migratory ones.
WRE03	Big Swamp North - Peatland Restoration Project	7	7	6	5	6	6	8	7	8	0	8	7	75	LSOHC funds to pay for legal process to abandon ditches (this does not seem like shovel ready but a long process that has LSOHC funds tied up for years before any work is done). Legal abandoning might be necessary as part of a project but is not restoration. construction estimated in 2030 for funds in this request. It is not near shovel ready. Why not just plug ditches rather than fill them in? Request wants funds to reduce breakout flows over a county road which is a road and not a habitat project. 2020 appropriation is 10% spent and there is a new 2024 appropriation just approved totaling \$5M.
WRE04	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements - Phase XVII	7	8	7	7	8	7	8	6	6	0	8	4	76	How long does spraying cattails last before the seed bank replenishes them? \$9M left from prior appropriations from 2019 on. What is the current need? Why is funding 2 wetland specialists not supplanting as this seems to be just permanent staff?
HA01	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	8	7	7	7	8	8	8	7	7	0	7	5	79	How do you insure cooperators do not use Neonicotoid seeds or pesticides?
HA02	Spring Road Conservation Project	10	10	6	8	8	7	7	7	9	10	8	8	98	Lots of prior appropriations left to be spent.
HA03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase X	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	4	7	5	87	How do you insure cooperators do not use Neonicotoid seeds or pesticides?
HA04	Integrating Habitat and Clean Water - Phase III	8	7	7	6	8	6	6	6	7	0	7	5	73	How do you insure cooperators do not use Neonicotoid seeds or pesticides?
HA05	2025 St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase VI	8	8	9	7	9	8	8	6	7	4	8	6	88	Explain why such a high percentage of funds from 2021 (and 2023) not yet spent. How do you insure cooperators do not use Neonicotoid seeds or pesticides?
HA06	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase IX	8	7	7	8	8	6	6	6	8	0	8	7	79	"generally there would be no net gain of trails" does not provide much comfort about future use. Defining no net gain or no net gain more than 5% would be far better.
HA07	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase XIII	9	8	10	8	9	8	9	9	8	4	8	6	96	How do you insure cooperators do not use Neonicotoid seeds or pesticides during the restoration period? Backlog of previous appropriations not spent?
HA08	Protecting Coldwater Fisheries on Minnesota's North Shore - Phase III	9	9	8	8	9	7	9	8	8	8	8	7	98	8% of 2022 funds spent?
HA09	Metro Big Rivers - Phase XV	8	8	7	7	7	8	7	8	8	4	8	6	86	How do you insure cooperators do not use Neonicotoid seeds or pesticides during the restoration period
HA10	Minnesota River Watershed Habitat Conservation Program	9	9	8	8	8	8	8	7	7	6	9	9	96	Restoration on WMA's? Why is the roving crew not doing that? If I read this correctly, work is proposed on BWSR easements - but, they are all done with the restoration up front and the landowner responsible for it after that. So we are being asked to take responsibility for what landowners have committed by contract to doing. Not a good idea. How do you insure cooperators do not use Neonicotoid seeds or pesticides during the restoration period
HA11	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase XIV	7	7	7	7	7	5	8	6	7	0	8	8	77	Why is only 57% of 2020 and 36% of 2022 funds utilized?
HA12	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance - Phase IV	8	10	9	7	9	8	9	8	9	4	8	6	95	
HA13	Shakopee Creek: Headwaters Restored; Species and Land Protected	7	6	6	5	7	7	4	5	4	0	9	7	67	Not scalable? What local stakeholders, conservation organizations and community groups are involved in this proposal? Landowners are "excited" to participate to avoid additional cost but they are not contributing to this. Why? It does not appear that there is permanent protection of the land to be restored which is against state law as the public waters does not include the banks of the stream.

HA14	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements - Phase IV	10	10	6	6	8	8	8	8	7	0	8	10	89	
HA15	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase XI	9	10	8	8	9	10	10	8	9	4	8	7	100	funds left from prior appropriations seem high.
HRE01	Minnesota Statewide Trout Habitat Enhancement - Phase II	8	8	7	6	6	7	8	7	8	10	8	6	89	Don't find reasons 7 & 8 compelling - just give us money and we ill find a way to spend it.
HRE02	Restoring and Enhancing Minnesota's Important Bird Areas - Phase IV	8	8	8	7	9	8	7	7	6	4	8	8	88	2022 - only 15% spent.
HRE03	Fall River Restoration	10	10	7	7	8	8	9	10	10	10	10	10	109	
HRE04	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement - Phase VIII	10	10	9	10	10	7	8	8	8	10	8	8	106	significant match which is great - Infrastructure bill which is time limited. 2022 funds are hardly spent (18%)
HRE05	Lake Nokomis Shoreline Enhancements for Turtles and Pollinators - Phase III	7	7	6	5	6	5	6	7	6	8	8	7	78	Lake of the Isles has "naturalized" and a good part is just high vegetation that is full of intended species and probably impassable to turtles. What is the maintenance plan for the long term? Why would Nokomis be different than Isles? Nothing spent on 2023. A big disappointment as the money could be in the ground somewhere else.
HRE06	Moose Habitat Collaborative, NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement - Phase V	7	6	8	6	6	7	7	6	7	0	8	6	74	What is the role of timber harvest in this? Do moose move to timbered or recently timbered areas or only stay in their established range? Previous funds have not yet been spent (2121 - 65% - \$1.2M of \$1.8M, 2023 - 0%). Why more money now? Why is the RGS the lead in a moose project? Do they have special knowledge that makes them the best manager?
HRE07	Rum River Corridor Fish and Wildlife Habitat Enhancement - Phase III	8	8	7	7	9	10	8	7	8	6	10	10	98	Lots of prior appropriations not spent.
O1	Contract Management													0	What is grants management doing to reduce burden on land acquisition by partners?
O2	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2025													0	Looking for specific recommendations for improvement - not genral ized reports that do not highlight problems and failures.
O3	DNR Core Functions in Partner-led OHF Land Acquisitions													0	Can some of these functions be done directly by partners faster and at least as efficiently? Fund this once all proposals are allocated to.
O4	DNR Roving Crew - Phase 3	10	10	10	8	8	8	10	8	7	0	10	7	96	No 2023 funds spent yet? Equipment seems low.
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program Ph. 17 Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	10	8	7	8	8	8	8	7	4	10	10	98	is the \$4M from proposers that have not received funds before realistic?

Leverage	
0-5%	0
6-10%	4
11-15%	6
16-20%	8
21-25%	10

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Senator Foug Hawj													
Due Date: Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.															
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
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	Max points: 10		
PA01	Martin County WMA Acquisition - Phase 9	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	86	
PA02	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase XI	7	7	7	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	8	83	
PA03	RIM Grassland Reserve - Phase VI	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	8	85	
PA04	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase XI	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	8	85	
PA05	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XVII	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	8	85	
PA06	MN Prairie Recovery Program - Phase XIV	7	7	6	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	6	7	82	
PA07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase XV	7	7	6	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	6	7	82	
PA08	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase XVII	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	8	87	
PRE01	Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands - Phase VIII	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	8	85	
PRE02	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase V	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	6	84	
FA01	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase III	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	8	85	
FA02	Itasca County Memorial Forest Project	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	86	
FA03	Protecting Critical Habitat in Northeastern Minnesota while Balancing Sustainable Public Land Use and Permanent Public Access Through a Community Land Trust Model	7	7	7	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	9	8	86	
FA04	Hardwood Hills Habitat Conservation Program - Phase 2	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	8	85	
FA05	Camp Ripley Sentienl Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase XIII	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	8	85	
FA06	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase X	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	6	8	84	
FRE01	DNR Statewide Forest Enhancment and Restoration - Phase V	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	6	8	84	
FRE02	Carver County Lake Minnewashta Regional Park Management Unit 1 Old Field Restoration	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	86	
WA01	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase X	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	6	8	84	
WA02	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	6	84	
WA03	RIM Wetlands - Restoring the Most Productive Habitat in Minnesota	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	6	8	84	
WA04	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XVII	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	8	85	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Senator Foung Hawj													
Due Date: Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.															
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
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	Max points: 10		
WRE01	East Park WMA / Nelson Slough	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	86	
WRE02	Living Shallow Lakes and Wetlands Enhancment and Restoration Initiative - Phase XI	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	6	84	
WRE03	Big Swamp North - Peatland Restoration Project	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	86	
WRE04	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements - Phase XVII	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	6	8	84	
HA01	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	6	8	84	
HA02	Spring Road Conservation Project	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	86	
HA03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase X	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	8	85	
HA04	Integrating Habitat and Clean Water - Phase III	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	6	8	84	
HA05	2025 St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase VI	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	8	85	
HA06	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase IX	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	6	8	84	
HA07	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase XIII	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	8	85	
HA08	Protecting Coldwater Fisheries on Minnesota's North Shore - Phase III	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	8	85	
HA09	Metro Big Rivers - Phase XV	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	5	7	82	
HA10	Minnesota River Watershed Habitat Conservation Program	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	8	85	
HA11	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase XIV	7	7	7	5	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	85	
HA12	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance - Phase IV	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	6	8	84	
HA13	Shakopee Creek: Headwaters Restored; Species and Land Protected	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	86	
HA14	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements - Phase IV	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	6	8	84	
HA15	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase XI	7	7	7	5	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	85	
HRE01	Minnesota Statewide Trout Habitat Enhancement - Phase II	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	86	
HRE02	Restoring and Enhancing Minnesota's Important Bird Areas - Phase IV	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	86	
HRE03	Fall River Restoration	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	86	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Senator Foung Hawj														
Due Date: Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.																
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes	
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	Max points: 10			
HRE04	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement - Phase VIII	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	6	85		
HRE05	Lake Nokomis Shoreline Enhancements for Turtles and Pollinators - Phase III	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	86		
HRE06	Moose Habitat Collaborative, NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement - Phase V	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	86		
HRE07	Rum River Corridor Fish and Wildlife Habitat Enhancement - Phase III	7	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	86		
O1	Contract Management	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	8	87		
O2	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2025	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	8	87		
O3	DNR Core Functions in Partner-led OHF Land Acquisitions	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	8	87		
O4	DNR Roving Crew - Phase 3	7	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	6	85		
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program Ph. 17 Statewide and Metro Habitat	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	9	97		

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:	Mark Holsten
--------------	--------------

Due Date: **Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.**
Maximum score per request is **120** 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
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	Max points: 10		
PA01	Martin County WMA Acquisition - Phase 9	7	8	8	7	8	7	8	7	8	1	7	7	83	
PA02	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase XI	8	8	8	8	8	9	8	8	8	6	8	6	93	Federal WPA's - 190 acers. State WMa's - 80
PA03	RIM Grassland Reserve - Phase VI	9	8	9	8	8	8	7	8	8	0	8	8	89	
PA04	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase XI	9	8	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	0	8	8	90	
PA05	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XVII	9	9	9	8	9	8	8	9	9	9	8	8	103	
PA06	MN Prairie Recovery Program - Phase XIV	9	9	8	8	9	8	8	9	9	1	8	8	94	how do you prioritize which acers to keep vs tranfer to state/feds. Carryforward a little high
PA07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase XV	9	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	3	8	8	93	
PA08	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase XVII	9	9	9	7	8	8	8	8	8	0	8	8	90	
PRE01	Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands - Phase VIII	9	9	8	8	8	8	9	8	8	3	8	8	94	
PRE02	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase V	9	9	9	8	9	8	8	8	8	7	8	8	99	is the bennefit to using USFWS easements over RIM the match or something else?
FA01	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase III	9	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	3	8	8	93	
FA02	Itasca County Memorial Forest Project	9	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	1	7	8	89	
FA03	Protecting Critical Habitat in Northeastern Minnesota while Balancing Sustainable Public Land Use and Permanent Public Access Through a Community Land Trust Model	8	8	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	10	7	7	89	project belongs in CPL
FA04	Hardwood Hills Habitat Conservation Program - Phase 2	9	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	98	
FA05	Camp Ripley Sentienl Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase XIII	9	8	8	7	8	8	8	8	8	10	8	8	98	
FA06	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase X	9	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	9	8	8	99	
FRE01	DNR Statewide Forest Enhancment and Restoration - Phase V	9	8	8	7	8	8	8	8	8	0	8	8	88	
FRE02	Carver County Lake Minnewashta Regional Park Management Unit 1 Old Field Restoration	9	8	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	0	8	8	85	project belongs on CPL
WA01	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase X	9	9	8	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	8	8	104	
WA02	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	9	9	8	9	9	9	9	9	8	6	8	8	101	
WA03	RIM Wetlands - Restoring the Most Productive Habitat in Minnesota	9	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	0	8	8	90	
WA04	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XVII	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	8	9	10	8	9	106	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:	Mark Holsten
--------------	--------------

Due Date: **Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.**
Maximum score per request is **120** 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
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	Max points: 10		
WRE01	East Park WMA / Nelson Slough	9	8	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	10	7	8	97	
WRE02	Living Shallow Lakes and Wetlands Enhancment and Restoration Initiative - Phase XI	9	9	8	8	9	8	9	8	8	7	8	8	99	
WRE03	Big Swamp North - Peatland Restoration Project	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	0	7	7	87	
WRE04	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements - Phase XVII	9	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	9	0	8	8	91	
HA01	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	9	9	9	8	9	8	9	8	8	2	7	8	94	
HA02	Spring Road Conservation Project	9	8	7	7	8	7	7	8	8	10	7	8	94	
HA03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase X	9	9	8	7	8	8	9	8	8	3	8	7	92	
HA04	Integrating Habitat and Clean Water - Phase III	9	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	3	7	8	92	
HA05	2025 St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase VI	9	9	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	1	8	8	90	
HA06	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase IX	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	1	7	8	89	
HA07	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase XIII	9	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	3	7	7	91	
HA08	Protecting Coldwater Fisheries on Minnesota's North Shore - Phase III	9	9	8	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	97	
HA09	Metro Big Rivers - Phase XV	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	5	7	8	93	
HA10	Minnesota River Watershed Habitat Conservation Program	9	8	8	9	9	9	8	8	8	3	7	8	94	
HA11	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase XIV	9	9	8	9	8	9	9	9	8	7	8	8	101	
HA12	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance - Phase IV	9	9	8	9	8	9	9	8	9	7	8	8	101	
HA13	Shakopee Creek: Headwaters Restored; Species and Land Protected	9	8	8	8	8	7	8	8	7	1	7	8	87	
HA14	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements - Phase IV	9	9	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	0	8	8	91	
HA15	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase XI	9	8	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	6	8	8	94	
HRE01	Minnesota Statewide Trout Habitat Enhancement - Phase II	9	8	8	7	8	8	7	8	7	10	8	7	95	
HRE02	Restoring and Enhancing Minnesota's Important Bird Areas - Phase IV	9	9	8	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	99	
HRE03	Fall River Restoration	9	8	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	10	7	8	91	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Mark Holsten													
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
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	Max points: 10		
HRE04	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement - Phase VIII	9	8	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	0	7	7	86	
HRE05	Lake Nokomis Shoreline Enhancements for Turtles and Pollinators - Phase III	8	8	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	10	7	7	89	
HRE06	Moose Habitat Collaborative, NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement - Phase V	9	9	8	9	8	9	8	8	8	3	8	8	95	
HRE07	Rum River Corridor Fish and Wildlife Habitat Enhancement - Phase III	9	9	9	8	8	9	8	8	8	7	8	8	99	
O1	Contract Management	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	0	9	9	99	
O2	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2025	9	8	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	0	7	7	80	
O3	DNR Core Functions in Partner-led OHF Land Acquisitions	9	8	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	0	7	7	80	
O4	DNR Roving Crew - Phase 3	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	0	9	9	99	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program Ph. 17 Statewide and Metro Habitat	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	0	9	9	99	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Sen. Lang													
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
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	Max points: 10		
PA01	Martin County WMA Acquisition - Phase 9	7	7	7	6	7	8	8	7	7	4	8	7	83	
PA02	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase XI	8	8	8	7	7	6	7	8	8	7	7	6	87	
PA03	RIM Grassland Reserve - Phase VI	6	6	6	7	6	5	7	6	7	0	6	5	67	
PA04	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase XI	8	7	6	6	6	7	7	6	7	0	6	5	71	
PA05	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XVII	7	8	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	10	7	6	90	
PA06	MN Prairie Recovery Program - Phase XIV	6	7	6	6	6	6	5	6	6	2	8	6	70	
PA07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase XV	6	7	6	7	6	6	6	6	6	4	8	6	74	
PA08	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase XVII	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	8	0	8	8	87	
PRE01	Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands - Phase VIII	8	8	8	7	7	8	8	7	8	3	8	7	87	
PRE02	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase V	8	8	8	8	7	8	8	7	8	9	8	8	95	
FA01	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase III	7	8	6	6	7	7	8	6	6	4	8	8	81	
FA02	Itasca County Memorial Forest Project	8	8	7	8	8	8	8	7	8	9	8	8	95	
FA03	Protecting Critical Habitat in Northeastern Minnesota while Balancing Sustainable Public Land Use and Permanent Public Access Through a Community Land Trust Model	7	7	2	2	2	2	4	5	4	10	6	7	58	
FA04	Hardwood Hills Habitat Conservation Program - Phase 2	8	8	7	6	7	6	7	7	8	10	8	7	89	
FA05	Camp Ripley Sentienl Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase XIII	8	8	8	8	7	7	8	7	8	10	8	8	95	
FA06	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase X	7	7	7	6	8	7	6	7	8	10	6	6	85	
FRE01	DNR Statewide Forest Enhancment and Restoration - Phase V	7	8	7	6	7	6	6	8	7	0	7	7	76	
FRE02	Carver County Lake Minnewashta Regional Park Management Unit 1 Old Field Restoration	8	8	8	8	7	7	8	7	8	5	8	7	89	
WA01	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase X	7	6	6	6	7	6	7	8	7	10	6	6	82	
WA02	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	8	8	7	7	8	8	7	8	7	10	8	7	93	
WA03	RIM Wetlands - Restoring the Most Productive Habitat in Minnesota	7	7	6	6	7	7	8	6	8	0	7	6	75	
WA04	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XVII	7	8	7	7	7	8	8	7	8	10	8	8	93	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Sen. Lang													
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
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	Max points: 10		
WRE01	East Park WMA / Nelson Slough	8	8	8	8	7	8	8	7	7	10	8	7	94	
WRE02	Living Shallow Lakes and Wetlands Enhancment and Restoration Initiative - Phase XI	8	8	7	8	7	7	8	8	7	9	8	7	92	
WRE03	Big Swamp North - Peatland Restoration Project	8	8	8	9	8	7	7	7	6	5	8	8	89	
WRE04	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements - Phase XVII	6	6	7	7	6	5	7	7	8	0	8	7	74	
HA01	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	7	7	6	6	7	7	7	8	8	3	8	7	81	
HA02	Spring Road Conservation Project	8	7	4	4	4	6	7	6	7	10	4	3	70	
HA03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase X	6	6	6	7	6	7	7	6	7	7	7	7	79	
HA04	Integrating Habitat and Clean Water - Phase III	6	5	6	5	8	6	7	7	8	0	5	7	70	
HA05	2025 St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase VI	8	7	6	7	7	7	6	7	6	9	8	6	84	
HA06	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase IX	8	7	6	7	6	6	7	7	6	1	8	7	76	
HA07	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase XIII	6	6	6	6	7	6	7	7	6	6	7	6	76	
HA08	Protecting Coldwater Fisheries on Minnesota's North Shore - Phase III	6	6	6	6	6	7	7	6	6	0	5	8	69	
HA09	Metro Big Rivers - Phase XV	6	6	7	6	7	6	6	7	7	10	6	7	81	
HA10	Minnesota River Watershed Habitat Conservation Program	8	7	7	7	6	7	7	7	7	0	7	8	78	
HA11	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase XIV	7	6	7	6	7	6	6	8	7	3	7	7	77	
HA12	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance - Phase IV	7	6	6	5	6	6	7	7	6	10	6	7	79	
HA13	Shakopee Creek: Headwaters Restored; Species and Land Protected	9	9	7	8	7	8	8	8	8	5	8	8	93	
HA14	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements - Phase IV	7	8	6	8	7	6	7	7	7	0	7	7	77	
HA15	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase XI	7	7	7	7	8	6	7	8	7	10	7	7	88	
HRE01	Minnesota Statewide Trout Habitat Enhancement - Phase II	8	6	7	8	7	6	6	7	6	10	6	6	83	
HRE02	Restoring and Enhancing Minnesota's Important Bird Areas - Phase IV	8	7	6	6	7	7	7	6	8	10	7	7	86	
HRE03	Fall River Restoration	7	7	8	6	7	7	8	7	7	10	7	6	87	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Sen. Lang														
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.														
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes	
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	Max points: 10			
HRE04	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement - Phase VIII	7	6	6	7	7	8	6	7	6	10	8	6	84		
HRE05	Lake Nokomis Shoreline Enhancements for Turtles and Pollinators - Phase III	6	7	7	6	7	7	6	6	7	10	6	7	82		
HRE06	Moose Habitat Collaborative, NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement - Phase V	7	7	6	8	6	6	7	7	6	4	6	7	77		
HRE07	Rum River Corridor Fish and Wildlife Habitat Enhancement - Phase III	8	7	7	8	7	7	7	8	8	10	8	7	92		
O1	Contract Management	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120		
O2	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2025	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120		
O3	DNR Core Functions in Partner-led OHF Land Acquisitions	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120		
O4	DNR Roving Crew - Phase 3	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120		
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program Ph. 17 Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120		

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Rep. Lillie													
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
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	Max points: 10		
PA01	Martin County WMA Acquisition - Phase 9	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	I'm wanting to hear from all these groups...Will not be giving full funding though...
PA02	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase XI	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	During discussions I would like to hear how groups are ensuring projects
PA03	RIM Grassland Reserve - Phase VI	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	will responds to climate changes ...Also I would like to hear how groups are
PA04	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase XI	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	encouraging and using community volunteers and involving kids as can
PA05	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XVII	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	in projects.
PA06	MN Prairie Recovery Program - Phase XIV	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
PA07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase XV	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
PA08	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase XVII	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
PRE01	Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands - Phase VIII	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
PRE02	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase V	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
FA01	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase III	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
FA02	Itasca County Memorial Forest Project	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
FA03	Protecting Critical Habitat in Northeastern Minnesota while Balancing Sustainable Public Land Use and Permanent Public Access Through a Community Land Trust Model	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
FA04	Hardwood Hills Habitat Conservation Program - Phase 2	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
FA05	Camp Ripley Sentienl Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase XIII	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
FA06	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase X	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
FRE01	DNR Statewide Forest Enhancment and Restoration - Phase V	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
FRE02	Carver County Lake Minnewashta Regional Park Management Unit 1 Old Field Restoration	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
WA01	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase X	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
WA02	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
WA03	RIM Wetlands - Restoring the Most Productive Habitat in Minnesota	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
WA04	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XVII	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Rep. Lillie													
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
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	Max points: 10		
WRE01	East Park WMA / Nelson Slough	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
WRE02	Living Shallow Lakes and Wetlands Enhancment and Restoration Initiative - Phase XI	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
WRE03	Big Swamp North - Peatland Restoration Project	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
WRE04	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements - Phase XVII													0	Understand there is much unspent funds...Would prefer money goes into field now
HA01	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
HA02	Spring Road Conservation Project	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
HA03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase X	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
HA04	Integrating Habitat and Clean Water - Phase III	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
HA05	2025 St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase VI	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
HA06	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase IX	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
HA07	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase XIII	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
HA08	Protecting Coldwater Fisheries on Minnesota's North Shore - Phase III	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
HA09	Metro Big Rivers - Phase XV	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
HA10	Minnesota River Watershed Habitat Conservation Program	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
HA11	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase XIV	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
HA12	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance - Phase IV	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
HA13	Shakopee Creek: Headwaters Restored; Species and Land Protected	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
HA14	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements - Phase IV	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
HA15	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase XI	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
HRE01	Minnesota Statewide Trout Habitat Enhancement - Phase II	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
HRE02	Restoring and Enhancing Minnesota's Important Bird Areas - Phase IV	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
HRE03	Fall River Restoration	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Rep. Lillie													
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
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	Max points: 10		
HRE04	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement - Phase VIII	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
HRE05	Lake Nokomis Shoreline Enhancements for Turtles and Pollinators - Phase III	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
HRE06	Moose Habitat Collaborative, NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement - Phase V	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
HRE07	Rum River Corridor Fish and Wildlife Habitat Enhancement - Phase III	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
O1	Contract Management	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
O2	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2025	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
O3	DNR Core Functions in Partner-led OHF Land Acquisitions	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
O4	DNR Roving Crew - Phase 3	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program Ph. 17 Statewide and Metro Habitat	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Tom Saxhaug													
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
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	Max points: 10		
PA01	Martin County WMA Acquisition - Phase 9	5	5	5	3	3	5	5	3	5	3	5	5	52	
PA02	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase XI	5	3	3	5	5	5	5	3	5	3	5	5	52	
PA03	RIM Grassland Reserve - Phase VI	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	58	
PA04	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase XI	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	0	5	50	
PA05	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XVII	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	54	
PA06	MN Prairie Recovery Program - Phase XIV	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	58	
PA07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase XV	5	5	7	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	62	
PA08	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase XVII	3	3	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	49	
PRE01	Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands - Phase VIII	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	3	5	3	5	5	48	
PRE02	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase V	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	56	
FA01	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase III	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	56	
FA02	Itasca County Memorial Forest Project	7	5	5	7	5	5	7	5	5	5	5	7	68	
FA03	Protecting Critical Habitat in Northeastern Minnesota while Balancing Sustainable Public Land Use and Permanent Public Access Through a Community Land Trust Model	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	58	CPL?
FA04	Hardwood Hills Habitat Conservation Program - Phase 2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	58	
FA05	Camp Ripley Sentienl Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase XIII	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	60	
FA06	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase X	7	5	7	5	7	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	66	
FRE01	DNR Statewide Forest Enhancment and Restoration - Phase V	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	58	
FRE02	Carver County Lake Minnewashta Regional Park Management Unit 1 Old Field Restoration	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	55	CPL?
WA01	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase X	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	7	5	62	
WA02	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	60	
WA03	RIM Wetlands - Restoring the Most Productive Habitat in Minnesota	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	58	
WA04	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XVII	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	56	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Tom Saxhaug													
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
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	Max points: 10		
WRE01	East Park WMA / Nelson Slough	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	7	5	5	62	
WRE02	Living Shallow Lakes and Wetlands Enhancment and Restoration Initiative - Phase XI	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	58	
WRE03	Big Swamp North - Peatland Restoration Project	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	55	
WRE04	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements - Phase XVII	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	55	
HA01	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	54	
HA02	Spring Road Conservation Project	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	7	5	5	62	
HA03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase X	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	60	
HA04	Integrating Habitat and Clean Water - Phase III	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	53	
HA05	2025 St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase VI	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	58	
HA06	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase IX	5	7	5	5	5	5	5	5	7	3	5	5	62	
HA07	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase XIII	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	55	
HA08	Protecting Coldwater Fisheries on Minnesota's North Shore - Phase III	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	60	
HA09	Metro Big Rivers - Phase XV	7	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	62	
HA10	Minnesota River Watershed Habitat Conservation Program	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	58	
HA11	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase XIV	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	58	
HA12	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance - Phase IV	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	58	
HA13	Shakopee Creek: Headwaters Restored; Species and Land Protected	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	56	
HA14	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements - Phase IV	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	55	
HA15	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase XI	5	7	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	57	
HRE01	Minnesota Statewide Trout Habitat Enhancement - Phase II	7	7	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	64	
HRE02	Restoring and Enhancing Minnesota's Important Bird Areas - Phase IV	7	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	62	
HRE03	Fall River Restoration	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	7	5	5	62	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Tom Saxhaug														
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.														
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes	
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	Max points: 10			
HRE04	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement - Phase VIII	7	5	5	5	5	7	5	5	5	5	5	5	64		
HRE05	Lake Nokomis Shoreline Enhancements for Turtles and Pollinators - Phase III	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	60	CPL?	
HRE06	Moose Habitat Collaborative, NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement - Phase V	7	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	57		
HRE07	Rum River Corridor Fish and Wildlife Habitat Enhancement - Phase III	7	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	62		
O1	Contract Management	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	60		
O2	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2025	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	60		
O3	DNR Core Functions in Partner-led OHF Land Acquisitions	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	60		
O4	DNR Roving Crew - Phase 3	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	84		
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program Ph. 17 Statewide and Metro Habitat	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	84		

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name: Enter Name Here																
Due Date: Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.																
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes	
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	Max points: 10			
PA01	Martin County WMA Acquisition - Phase 9	5	3	8	5	5	5	8	3	6	2	5	5	60	SPENT ALMOST \$10 MILLION TO RESTORE 2,000 ACRES??? HAVE ALMOST \$6 MILLION UNSPENT???	
PA02	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase XI	5	3	5	5	5	3	5	5	8	3	5	3	55	NEARLY \$13 MILLION LEFT TO SPEND. TIME TO TAKE A BREAK...	
PA03	RIM Grassland Reserve - Phase VI	8	5	5	5	3	5	3	3	5	0	5	3	50	\$8 million to protect in easement 1,260 acres???	
PA04	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase XI	8	8	5	3	3	5	5	3	8	0	5	3	56	Almost \$14 million left unspent?? Time totake a break!!	
PA05	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XVII	8	8	5	3	8	8	8	5	8	8	5	5	79		
PA06	MN Prairie Recovery Program - Phase XIV	8	5	5	3	3	5	5	5	3	3	5	5	55		
PA07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase XV	8	8	8	5	5	5	3	3	8	3	5	5	66	Morethan \$12 million left to be spent????	
PA08	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase XVII	8	8	5	5	8	5	3	3	8	0	5	5	63		
PRE01	Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands - Phase VIII	8	5	8	3	8	5	5	3	5	3	5	5	63		
PRE02	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase V	8	8	5	3	8	5	5	3	5	8	5	5	68		
FA01	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase III	5	5	8	5	3	5	5	3	5	3	5	5	57		
FA02	Itasca County Memorial Forest Project	8	8	5	5	8	5	5	5	8	3	5	5	70		
FA03	Protecting Critical Habitat in Northeastern Minnesota while Balancing Sustainable Public Land Use and Permanent Public Access Through a Community Land Trust Model	3	3	3	3	5	3	5	3	5	5	5	5	48	VERY CONFUSING PROPOSAL	
FA04	Hardwood Hills Habitat Conservation Program - Phase 2	5	5	3	3	5	8	5	3	8	5	5	5	60		
FA05	Camp Ripley Sentient Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase XIII	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	8	5	5	49	RECEIVED \$11 MILLION IN FIVE YEARS FOR EASEMENTS, NOT ONE ACRE OPEN TO PUBLIC	
FA06	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase X	8	5	5	3	5	5	5	3	8	5	5	5	62		
WRE01	DNR Statewide Forest Enhancement and Restoration - Phase V	8	5	5	5	3	5	8	3	5	0	5	5	57		
WRE02	Carver County Lake Minnewashta Regional Park Management Unit 1 Old Field Restoration	8	5	8	5	5	5	5	3	8	0	5	5	62		
WA01	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase X	8	5	5	5	8	5	8	3	8	5	5	5	70		
WA02	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	8	8	8	5	5	8	8	5	8	5	5	5	78		
WA03	RIM Wetlands - Restoring the Most Productive Habitat in Minnesota	8	8	8	5	5	8	8	5	8	0	5	5	73		
WA04	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XVII	8	8	8	5	5	8	8	5	8	8	5	5	81		
WRE01	East Park WMA / Nelson Slough	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	5	8	10	5	5	89		
WRE02	Living Shallow Lakes and Wetlands Enhancement and Restoration Initiative - Phase XI	8	8	5	5	8	8	8	5	8	5	5	5	78	PERSONNEL COSTS HIGH. ALMOST \$2 MILLION??	
WRE03	Big Swamp North - Peatland Restoration Project	8	8	5	8	8	8	8	5	8	0	5	5	76	HAVEN'T SPENT MUCH OF 2020 GRANT OF \$3 MILLION?	
WRE04	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements - Phase XVII	8	8	5	5	8	8	8	5	5	0	5	5	70		
HA01	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	5	5	5	5	5	8	5	5	5	3	5	5	61		
HA02	Spring Road Conservation Project	8	8	8	8	8	5	5	5	8	10	5	5	83		
HA03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase X	5	8	5	5	8	5	8	5	5	5	5	5	69		
HA04	Integrating Habitat and Clean Water - Phase III	5	5	8	5	8	8	5	5	8	0	5	5	67		
HA05	2025 St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase VI	8	8	8	5	8	5	5	5	8	3	5	5	73		
HA06	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase IX	8	8	5	5	8	5	8	5	8	3	5	5	73		
HA07	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase XIII	8	8	5	5	8	5	5	5	8	3	5	5	70		
HA08	Protecting Coldwater Fisheries on Minnesota's North Shore - Phase III	5	5	8	5	8	5	5	5	8	5	5	5	69		
HA09	Metro Big Rivers - Phase XV	8	8	5	5	8	5	8	5	8	5	5	5	75		

HA10	Minnesota River Watershed Habitat Conservation Program	5	5	5	5	8	5	8	5	8	5	5	5	69	
HA11	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase XIV	8	8	8	5	8	8	8	5	5	3	5	5	76	
HA12	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance - Phase IV	8	8	5	5	8	8	8	5	5	3	5	5	73	
HA13	Shakopee Creek: Headwaters Restored; Species and Land Protected	8	8	5	8	8	5	8	5	5	0	5	5	70	
HA14	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements - Phase IV	8	8	5	5	8	8	8	5	8	0	5	5	73	
HA15	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase XI	8	5	8	5	5	8	8	5	8	0	5	5	70	HOW IS THIS PROPOSAL DIFFERENT FROM HA 1277?
HRE01	Minnesota Statewide Trout Habitat Enhancement - Phase II	8	8	8	5	8	8	8	5	5	5	5	5	78	
HRE02	Restoring and Enhancing Minnesota's Important Bird Areas - Phase IV	5	5	8	5	8	8	5	3	5	5	5	5	67	
HRE03	Fall River Restoration	8	5	8	5	8	8	5	3	5	10	5	5	75	
HRE04	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement - Phase VIII	8	8	8	5	8	8	8	5	8	10	5	5	86	
HRE05	Lake Nokomis Shoreline Enhancements for Turtles and Pollinators - Phase III	8	8	5	5	8	5	5	5	8	8	5	5	75	
HRE06	Moose Habitat Collaborative, NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement - Phase V	5	5	8	5	8	8	5	5	8	3	5	5	70	
HRE07	Rum River Corridor Fish and Wildlife Habitat Enhancement - Phase III	8	8	5	5	8	8	8	5	5	5	5	5	75	
O1	Contract Management													0	FULL AMOUNT
O2	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2025													0	FULL AMOUNT
O3	DNR Core Functions in Partner-led OHF Land Acquisitions													0	FULL AMOUNT
O4	DNR Roving Crew - Phase 3	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	0	5	5	82	WHAT TASKS FOR ROVING CREWS ARE FORBIDDEN?
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program Ph. 17 Statewide and Metro Habitat													0	RECOMMEND \$10 TO \$15 MILLION FOR CPL

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Jamie Swenson													
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
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	Max points: 10		
PA01	Martin County WMA Acquisition - Phase 9	8	8	7	5	7	6	7	7	7	6	6	9	83	
PA02	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase XI	8	8	9	9	8	6	9	6	7	6	7	6	89	
PA03	RIM Grassland Reserve - Phase VI	8	8	8	8	8	6	8	8	8	0	7	7	84	
PA04	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase XI	8	8	8	7	7	6	8	8	8	0	6	7	81	
PA05	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XVII	10	10	9	6	9	6	9	9	7	8	8	6	97	
PA06	MN Prairie Recovery Program - Phase XIV	8	9	9	6	9	6	9	9	8	5	8	7	93	
PA07	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge - Phase XV	8	8	7	5	8	6	8	8	7	6	8	7	86	
PA08	DNR WMA and SNA Acquisition - Phase XVII	9	9	9	5	9	6	9	7	7	0	8	7	85	
PRE01	Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands - Phase VIII	9	9	8	7	8	6	8	7	8	5	9	8	92	
PRE02	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program - Phase V	9	9	9	8	10	6	9	8	10	7	8	7	100	
FA01	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project - Phase III	8	7	8	6	7	6	6	6	6	5	7	7	79	
FA02	Itasca County Memorial Forest Project	9	9	5	6	8	6	6	7	9	5	8	8	86	
FA03	Protecting Critical Habitat in Northeastern Minnesota while Balancing Sustainable Public Land Use and Permanent Public Access Through a Community Land Trust Model	6	6	4	4	5	6	5	6	7	8	7	7	71	
FA04	Hardwood Hills Habitat Conservation Program - Phase 2	7	7	5	6	7	6	5	5	8	2	6	6	70	
FA05	Camp Ripley Sentienl Landscape ACUB Protection Program - Phase XIII	7	7	7	7	8	6	8	7	8	8	6	8	87	
FA06	Minnesota Forests for the Future - Phase X	7	7	7	6	7	6	7	7	8	7	6	5	80	
FRE01	DNR Statewide Forest Enhancment and Restoration - Phase V	5	5	10	6	7	6	8	7	6	0	7	6	73	
FRE02	Carver County Lake Minnewashta Regional Park Management Unit 1 Old Field Restoration	5	5	2	2	3	6	2	2	4	0	4	2	37	
WA01	Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase X	7	7	8	7	8	6	7	8	7	6	6	6	83	
WA02	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	9	9	9	8	10	6	10	7	8	7	7	7	97	
WA03	RIM Wetlands - Restoring the Most Productive Habitat in Minnesota	8	8	8	7	8	6	8	8	9	0	7	7	84	
WA04	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XVII	7	7	8	8	10	6	9	8	8	8	7	6	92	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Jamie Swenson													
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.													
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes
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	Max points: 10		
WRE01	East Park WMA / Nelson Slough	8	8	6	6	5	6	6	5	5	9	5	6	75	
WRE02	Living Shallow Lakes and Wetlands Enhancment and Restoration Initiative - Phase XI	9	9	9	7	9	6	9	9	8	6	7	6	94	
WRE03	Big Swamp North - Peatland Restoration Project	7	7	6	6	5	6	6	6	6	0	7	6	68	
WRE04	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements - Phase XVII	7	7	7	6	6	6	7	6	6	0	7	5	70	
HA01	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - Phase XIV	8	7	7	5	9	6	7	7	7	4	4	4	75	
HA02	Spring Road Conservation Project	7	7	6	7	6	6	7	6	5	9	5	4	75	
HA03	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Conservation - Phase X	9	9	9	9	9	6	8	9	8	5	6	7	94	
HA04	Integrating Habitat and Clean Water - Phase III	5	6	6	6	7	6	7	6	8	0	8	7	72	
HA05	2025 St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration - Phase VI	7	7	7	5	8	6	7	6	8	4	7	5	77	
HA06	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project - Phase IX	8	8	8	5	8	6	8	7	8	2	7	5	80	
HA07	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration - Phase XIII	8	8	8	5	8	6	8	8	8	4	6	6	83	
HA08	Protecting Coldwater Fisheries on Minnesota's North Shore - Phase III	7	7	6	8	5	6	7	8	7	1	6	6	74	
HA09	Metro Big Rivers - Phase XV	8	8	7	6	8	6	7	7	7	5	6	4	79	
HA10	Minnesota River Watershed Habitat Conservation Program	5	7	9	7	6	6	5	7	6	5	4	4	71	
HA11	Shell Rock River Watershed Habitat Restoration Program - Phase XIV	8	8	8	3	9	6	10	8	8	5	4	6	83	
HA12	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance - Phase IV	8	8	8	7	8	6	5	7	8	4	6	5	80	
HA13	Shakopee Creek: Headwaters Restored; Species and Land Protected	8	8	6	6	6	6	6	7	6	0	8	8	75	
HA14	DNR Trout Stream Conservation Easements - Phase IV	7	7	7	7	7	6	7	5	8	0	7	7	75	
HA15	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - Phase XI	9	9	10	8	10	6	10	8	9	4	7	5	95	
HRE01	Minnesota Statewide Trout Habitat Enhancement - Phase II	5	5	8	6	7	6	8	7	6	6	7	7	78	
HRE02	Restoring and Enhancing Minnesota's Important Bird Areas - Phase IV	7	7	8	6	7	6	8	7	9	5	7	7	84	
HRE03	Fall River Restoration	6	7	5	6	6	6	6	6	7	8	7	7	77	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2025 / FY 2026

Member Name:		Jamie Swenson														
Due Date:		Wednesday, July 17, 2024 by 4 p.m.														
Maximum score per request is 120 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 provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	7. 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.	8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes. .	9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10. Proposal includes leverage.	11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	Total Score (out of 120 possible points)	Comments / Notes	
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	Max points: 10			
HRE04	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement - Phase VIII	7	7	8	7	7	6	7	7	6	10	7	6	85		
HRE05	Lake Nokomis Shoreline Enhancements for Turtles and Pollinators - Phase III	8	8	4	7	6	6	6	6	6	4	5	8	74		
HRE06	Moose Habitat Collaborative, NE MN Forest Habitat Enhancement - Phase V	9	8	10	9	8	6	9	8	7	4	8	5	91		
HRE07	Rum River Corridor Fish and Wildlife Habitat Enhancement - Phase III	9	9	7	5	8	6	8	8	7	5	8	7	87		
O1	Contract Management	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0		
O2	Restoration Evaluations - ML 2025	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0		
O3	DNR Core Functions in Partner-led OHF Land Acquisitions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0		
O4	DNR Roving Crew - Phase 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0		
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program Ph. 17 Statewide and Metro Habitat	9	9	9	9	9	6	10	8	9	6	9	10	103		