

**SCORING TABLE**

CATEGORIES OF QUESTIONS	POINTS = 100
#1. WATERFOWL A. High priority species B. Other priority species C. Other waterfowl	MAXIMUM = 15 0-7 0-5 0-3
#2. WETLAND-ASSOCIATED MIGRATORY BIRDS A. Priority bird species B. Other wetland-associated bird species	MAXIMUM = 15
#3. NORTH AMERICAN GEOGRAPHIC PRIORITY WETLANDS AS RECOGNIZED BY MAJOR MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION PLANS A. National geographic priority wetland areas B. Regionally important wetland areas	MAXIMUM = 15 0-9 0-6
#4. WETLANDS STATUS AND TRENDS A. Decreasing wetlands types B. Stable wetlands types C. Increasing wetlands types D. No trend data types E. Uplands	MAXIMUM = 10 0-10 0-4 0-1 0-1 0-8
#5. LONG-TERM CONSERVATION A. Benefits in perpetuity B. Benefits for 26-99 years C. Benefits for 10-25 years D. Benefits for <10 years E. Significance to long-term conservation	MAXIMUM = 15 0-12 0-8 0-6 0-4 0-3
#6. ENDANGERED SPECIES AND OTHER WETLAND-DEPENDENT FISH AND WILDLIFE A. Federal endangered, threatened or proposed species = 1, 2, >2 species B. State-listed species = ≥1 species C. Other wetland-dependent fish and wildlife = ≥1 species	MAXIMUM = 10 0-3, 0-4, 0-5 0-3 0-2
#7. PARTNERSHIPS A. Ratio of non-Federal match to grant request = ≤ 1:1; >1: < 1.5; 1.5 : < 2; ≥ 2 B. Matching partners contributing 10% of the grant request = 0-1, 2, 3, > 3 C. Partner categories = 1, 2, 3, > 3 D. Important partnership aspects E. Public Access	MAXIMUM = 20 0, 1, 3, 6 0, 1, 2, 3 0, 2, 3, 4 0-5 0-2

Exhibit B  
Working Lands Payment Sheet

Name:  
Contract #  
County: Burleigh

District 4  
Land Use Annual Payment

	Amount/acre	Acres	Total
Conventional/fall tillage	\$0.00	0	\$0.00
Spring Tillage	\$0.50	0	\$0.00
Conservation Tillage	\$0.75	0	\$0.00
Range/Pasture I	\$0.25	0	\$0.00
Range/Pasture II	\$1.50	0	\$0.00
Range/Pasture III	\$2.00	0	\$0.00
CRP/WRP/EWP/WTB	\$5.00	0	\$0.00
Hayland	\$0.25	0	\$0.00
<b>Undisturbed Habitat Annual Payment</b>			
Idled Native Rangeland	\$13.00	0	\$0.00
Existing Habitat	\$13.00	0	\$0.00
Unusable acres/open water > 10 acres/no shoreline habitat	\$0.25	0	\$0.00
Grass establishment/Expired CRP soil class II-III	\$29.00	0	\$0.00
Grass establishment/Expired CRP soil class IV-V	\$20.00	0	\$0.00
Grass establishment/Expired CRP soil class VI-VII	\$10.00	0	\$0.00
<b>Total</b>		0	\$0.00

Annual Enhancement Payments	Amount/acre	Acres	Total
Food Plot	\$0.00	0	\$0.00
Waterfowl Driving Access signs	\$0.50	0	\$0.00
District Priority (Capped at \$500)	\$1.00	0	\$0.00
Idled Alfalfa Hayland (Cap of 40 acres)	\$25.00	0	\$0.00
NDGFD Approved Grazing Plan	\$5.00	0	\$0.00
Cover Crop (ungrazed until April 1 of following year)	\$40.00	0	\$0.00
<b>Upfront/One Time Enhancement Payments</b>			
<i>All below enhancements require 6 year agreement minimum. 100% of cost-shares will be reimbursed for early termination.</i>			
Wetland restoration (Done in conjunction with NRCS/USFWS)	\$50.00	0	\$0.00
Stripper/picker header (small grains and corn/sunflowers)	\$2,000.00	0	\$0.00
Cross fence Costshare (NRCS rate)	\$0.00	0	\$0.00
Grass Seeding Cost share (up to 50%)	\$0.00	0	\$0.00
Habitat Enhancement (interseeding, light discing)	\$30.00	0	\$0.00
Water Tank Development (50% cost-share using NRCS rate)	\$0.00	0	\$0.00
Tree/Shrub block planting	\$60.00	0	\$0.00
Tree/Shrub Cost share (up to 50% on the trees only)	\$0.00	0	\$0.00

Total Annual Payment \$0.00  
Total Upfront/One Time Enhancement Payment (requires 6yr Agreement) \$0.00

\*All payments subject to availability of funding.  
\*Cooperator agrees to above habitat type acreages and payments. If these are not present at annual payment time, payment will be reduced to reflect on-the-ground acreages.

Comments:

X  
Cooperators Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

# NDSU



*"Care for, protect and improve forests and natural resources to enhance the quality of life for future generations."*

## For more information

Larry A. Kotchman  
State Forester  
NDSU-ND FOREST SERVICE  
307 1st Street East  
Bottineau ND 58318-1100

Tel: (701) 228-5422  
[forest@nd.gov](mailto:forest@nd.gov)

[www.ndsu.edu/ndfs](http://www.ndsu.edu/ndfs)

Celebrating  
"100 Years of Forestry"  
1906 - 2006



## ND Outdoor Heritage Fund

# Grant Application Recommendations

The NDSU-North Dakota Forest Service manages a variety of state and federal grant programs. Based on our experience, we offer the following grant application process recommendations for consideration by the North Dakota Outdoor Heritage Fund Advisory Board. An effective grant allocation process may include:

### Competitive Criteria

The competitive component is intended to demonstrate that funds are being spent on projects that address the legislative intent in the Outdoor Heritage Fund. Proposed projects may consider the following key concepts:

- Purpose Statement – Projects should effectively address one or more of the purpose statements described in the North Dakota Outdoor Heritage Fund, Section 54-17.8-03.
- Project Scale – The project scale shall be a function of the most appropriate size associated with the issue or landscape of state or regional importance. Projects may be on any combination of land ownerships.
- Collaboration – Projects should identify partners that have demonstrated a commitment and add value towards project planning and implementation. Collaboration may be qualitative in nature, and the contribution of the partners may be more important than the number of partners involved in the projects.
- Outcomes – Projects should prioritize funding and other resources toward the achievement of outcomes identified below.
  - a) Provide access to private and public lands for sportsmen, including projects that create fish and wildlife habitat and private access for sportsmen;
  - b) Improve, maintain, and restore water quality, soil conditions, plant diversity, animal systems and to support other practices of stewardship to enhance farming and ranching;
  - c) Develop, enhance, conserve and restore wildlife and fish habitat on private and public lands; and
  - d) Conserve natural areas for recreation through the establishment and development of parks and other recreation areas.
- Integrated Delivery – Projects should seek to improve the delivery of public benefits by coordinating with complementary private, state, federal and tribal programs when possible.
- Leverage – Projects should maximize Outdoor Heritage funding by using it to leverage contributions from other entities.
- Influence Positive Change – Projects should include a component of outreach, training, lessons learned or related opportunities such that implementation of the project results in skills and capability that extends beyond the life of the project itself.

September 16, 2013

## **General Guiding Principles & Recommendations for North Dakota's Outdoor Heritage Fund (OHF)**

### *Overarching Goals, Performance Measures & Selection Criteria:*

- Grant funds should clearly address at least one of the four statutory intended purposes:
  - A. Provide access to private and public lands for sportsmen, including projects that create fish and wildlife habitat and provide access for sportsmen;
  - B. Improve, maintain, and restore water quality, soil conditions, plant diversity, animal systems, and to support other practices of stewardship to enhance farming and ranching;
  - C. Develop, enhance, conserve, and restore wildlife and fish habitat on private and public lands; and
  - D. Conserve natural areas for recreation through the establishment and development of parks and other recreation areas.
- Projects should be prioritized, targeted and address our state's greatest conservation needs
- Long-term monitoring and evaluation plan would be desirable to evaluate success and determine return on investments and positive impact to ND's natural resources.
- Projects should maximize ecological and public benefits for the state of ND.
- Funds should be invested in projects that achieve long-term program objectives and develop a network of lands that fulfill the program's mandates.
- Credible and defensible criteria and eligibility guidelines are essential to developing a transparent project selection process.
- Fund recipient entities must enter into grant agreements that make clear how the funds are to be spent, ensure fiscal accountability, tracking, accomplishment timeline, etc.
- Allot sufficient funding for stewardship, land management and reasonable administration costs.
- The OHF Advisory Board and ND Industrial Council should explore options of specific project categories (e.g., clean water, fish and wildlife habitat, conservation cover, public access, parks & recreation, etc.).

### *Commitment to Science-Based Targeted Investments:*

- Proposals should be objectively evaluated and funded based on scientific merit, cost-efficiency, measurable and achievable results and sustainable investments. Several regional and national conservation plans already exist (e.g., State Wildlife Action Plan, PPJV/NGP, NAWMP, etc.), but a visionary statewide OHF strategic plan would help guide future program investments.
- Future recommendation may be to develop a comprehensive and robust ND OHF strategic investment plan to help guide future program investments and implementation.

### *Leverage Resources & Promote Collaboration:*

- Strive to leverage ND OHF funds with other private, local, state and federal sources to help accomplish landscape conservation, long-term resource benefits and maximize return on investment.
- While not a requirement, proposals with matching funds could competitively rank higher than other proposals with lower match ratios.
- Incentivize rather than require min. matching funds – successful programs place a high value on maximizing return on every dollar. Accordingly, many require some minimum level of match as a threshold for funding eligibility. There are some drawbacks to establishing a minimum that need to be evaluated in advance.

- Collaborative proposals by diverse partnerships (e.g., number and different types of partners, e.g., local, state, federal, NGO, tribal, private, etc.) would score more favorably by reviewers and promote greater collaboration among conservation, energy, agriculture and business partners.
- Explore opportunities to link local grants to cooperative land management. Partnerships formed between a state program and local governments, nonprofits and private landowners can allow for productive shared responsibilities for future land management
- Reduce duplication of existing programs and promote new innovative approaches to landscape-scale conservation

*Ensuring Success & Sustainability:*

- Offer assurance that the program is meeting its objectives, and doing a good job communicating these results to ND constituents and legislative leaders (i.e., shareholders).
- Long-term O & M plan, funds and expertise (in addition to OHF funds) would be desirable to ensure long-term project functionality, stewardship and success.

*Reward Innovation:*

- New conservation partnership and innovative approaches should receive a competitive edge to help address ND's resource concerns, challenges and prepare for new ones

*Avoid Political Intervention--Develop Protective Measures:*

- This recommendation will be challenging to implement, but separation among project developers, proposal reviewers, the Advisory Board and Industrial Commission would be desirable to prioritize project selection, avoid conflicts of interest and prevent politically-motivated final funding decisions.
- Popular and successful programs in other states are designed so that the legislature does not approve a list of projects, although the programs' funding is subject to the appropriations process. The selection and prioritization is completely local in states like OH, IA and MA. Their efforts are focused on helping landowners, local governments and nonprofits achieve their resource protection objectives and therefore entrust community leaders with the work of identifying and ranking potential projects.
- Legislators do not have the time to deeply evaluate the pros and cons of each funding proposal and the distribution of money invites trade-offs and partisanship. Leaders involved in writing statutes should do everything in their power to institute protective measures, such as those described above.

*Ensure Citizen Input, Oversight & Accountability:*

- Program oversight, transparency, and leadership are an imperative and key responsibility of a governing body
- The Advisory Board and Industrial Commission has a central role in final project selection and funding approvals
- Appointments to the body should be done with stakeholder participation to reduce the chances of the body being highly-politicized.
- Citizen leaders appointed to the board give it and the program credibility with the public and legislature.

- Provide an avenue for public input (e.g., stakeholder meetings, open public hearings/listening sessions, roundtable forums, etc.) to ensure ND's residents have an important voice in identifying and addressing our state's greatest conservation and recreational needs.

*Create an Effective Governing Body:*

- Ensure that the body is accountable to the public and legislature
- Avoid program funds being diverted to other non-germane programs and funding priorities, like mitigation, permitting or other environmental remediation requirements.
- Give the body sufficient authority to govern the program and make changes to policy and procedures so the program can readily adapt to changing times, resource needs and lessons learned.
- De-politicize the process to maintain high integrity and credibility

*Prioritize Communications & Outreach*

- Ensure citizens, legislators and partners know what the program is doing, why and where investments are being made, etc. A list of approved projects for each funding cycle should be made public to encourage public participation in projects.

*Other general recommendations:*

- Provide adequate time between the RFPs and application deadlines – Potential first-time applicants and/or those with small or no staff need more time to prepare and submit applications.
- Appoint a specific person(s) as the point of contact(s) for proposal developers to submit questions and gain further insight on proposal development guidance.
- Offer Technical Assistance – Provide community and organizational outreach to help train staff or volunteers to produce high quality proposals.
- Consider possible funding tiers (large vs. small grant proposals)– Programs intended to be inclusive, partnering with both small and large organizations, and distributing funds to communities and projects of all sizes can set up tiers or categories so that proposals compete only with others submitted by applicants of their like-type or size.
- Strive for objectivity – A talented, competent presenter or a well-written application featuring nice images and colorful maps can be very convincing. Train reviewers to screen for truly relevant, and base funding decisions on scientific merit and likelihood of success.
- Public access to programs- Funds awarded to a group/org cannot be restricted just to members of that group/org.

# Minnesota Ranking Process

Member Name Jim Cox

Evaluate each section of the Request for Funding on a scale of 1-10. 1=Strongly Disagree through 10=Strongly Agree

Maximum score per request is 100 points.

For those not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest, put "COI" in the score box.

Overall proposal evaluation scores will be averaged using the number of members evaluating that individual proposal.

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservation plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute.	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
PA 01	Grasslands for the Future	6	8	5	5	7	7	9	6	7	7	67	
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Acquisition, Ph. V	8	8	8	8	8	5	8	6	6	8	73	
PA 03	DNR Wildlife Management Area, Scientific and Natural Area, and Native Prairie Bank Easement Program, Ph. V	5	8	8	6	8	5	3	5	6	8	62	
PA 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project, Ph. IV	8	8	8	7	8	6	8	7	8	8	76	
PA 05	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Ph. III	3	5	5	3	5	5	7	5	5	4	47	
PA 06	Green Corridors, Ph. V	7	6	6	6	6	5	5	6	6	7	60	
PA 07	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex, Ph. III	8	8	8	8	8	5	8	8	6	8	75	
PRE 01	DNR Grasslands, Ph. V	8	8	8	9	8	5	3	4	8	8	69	
FA 01	Minnesota Forest for the Future/State Forests, Ph. IV	6	6	6	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	51	
FA 02	Young Forest Conservation	5	6	6	5	5	5	7	6	5	6	56	Questions?
FA 03	The Camp Ripley Partnership: Protecting the Mighty Mississippi, Ph. III	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	50	
FA 04	Preventing Forest Fragmentation and Protecting and Resoring Lake and Stream Habitat in the St. Louis River Watershed	7	6	7	7	6	5	8	8	6	5	65	
FA 05	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership, Ph. IV	7	7	7	7	7	5	6	6	6	5	63	
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County, Ph. IV	7	6	6	5	5	5	7	7	6	5	59	
FRE 01	DNR Accelerated Forest Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Program, Ph. III	3	3	3	5	5	5	3	5	6	5	43	
FRE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative, Ph. II	6	8	7	6	6	5	7	6	5	5	61	
FRE 03	Defending the St. Croix Riverway from the Bittersweet Onslaught	5	5	4	3	3	5	7	6	4	4	46	
WA 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership, Ph. V	7	9	8	6	6	8	6	7	6	6	69	
WA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Production Area Acquisition, Ph. V	9	9	8	8	7	7	7	7	8	8	78	
WA 03	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection Program, Ph. III	8	8	7	7	7	7	6	6	6	6	68	
WA 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Program, Ph. II	7	6	6	6	6	6	7	6	6	6	62	

# Minnesota Ranking Process

Project ID	Project Title	Design and Scope of Work		Planning			Other Funds	Budget		Sustainability and Maintenance	Outcomes	Total	Member Comments
		The strategies are clear, effective, and directly address the problem(s) outlined.	This is an urgent problem needing immediate attention.	If funded, the request will effectively address pertinent MN conservation plans.	The request is fully grounded in conservation science.	The request effectively addresses relevant LSOHC section priorities	The request maximizes leverage with other funding sources.	The budget supplements the organization's traditional funding sources and does not substitute.	The level of funding is reasonable for each component of the budget.	The request has a well-designed plan for sustainability and maintenance.	The stated outcomes provide meaningful evaluative data.		
WA 05	McGregor Marsh Wetland Protection	8	7	7	7	7	6	4	6	6	6	64	
WA 06	Wetland Habitat Protection Program	8	7	7	7	7	6	6	6	6	6	66	
WRE 01	Accelerated Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement, Ph. V	7	7	7	6	6	6	3	4	5	5	56	
WRE 02	Pelican Lake Enhancement	8	8	8	6	8	7	4	4	6	6	65	
WRE 03	Albert Lea Lake Management and Invasive Species Control Structure	6	5	6	6	6	5	7	7	7	5	60	
WRE 04	Goose Lake Restoration and Carp Exclusion Project	6	5	6	6	6	5	7	7	7	5	60	
HA 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat, Ph. V	7	7	7	6	7	7	4	5	6	6	62	
HA 02	Habitat Protection in Dakota County, Ph. IV	5	5	5	5	5	6	7	6	6	5	55	
HA 03	Root River Protection and Restoration	8	8	8	8	8	6	8	8	6	6	74	
HA 04	Metro Big Rivers, Ph. IV	Conflict	Conflict	Conflict	Conflict	Conflict	Conflict	Conflict	Conflict	Conflict	Conflict	Conflict	
HA 05	Minnesota Landscape Arboretum: Acquisition on Property Surrounding Lake Tamarack	3	3	3	6	5	7	6	6	7	6	52	
HA 06	Critical Shroeland Habitat Protection Program, Ph. II	7	7	7	6	7	6	7	6	6	6	65	
HRE 01	Wildlife Habitat Restoration and Enhancement in Metropolitan Regional Parks System	3	3	3	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	41	
HRE 02	Duluth 2012 Flood: Stream Habitat Restoration Program	2	8	2	2	6	5	5	3	3	6	42	
HRE 03	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership, Ph. III	7	7	7	6	7	5	7	6	6	6	64	
HRE 04	Lake Zumbro Habitat Restoration Project	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	2	2	24	
HRE 05	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Ph. IV	8	8	8	8	8	7	7	8	8	8	78	
HRE 06	Developing a National Destination for Trout Angling Cold Water Enthusiasts	5	5	6	6	6	5	7	7	5	5	57 ?	
TOTAL												2285	

Do not complete the evaluation criteria for the following funding requests. Indicate if they should be recommended for a hearing.

	Recommend for Hearing (Y or N)
X 01 Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Ph. V	Y
X 02 Contract Management	Y
X 03 Restoration Evaluations	Y
X 04 High-Priority Transaction Service Acceleration for LSOHC	Y

# Minnesota Ranking Process

## ML 2013 / FY 2014 Allocation Summary Sheet

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	Pre-allocated	Fund Request	James Cox	Scott Hall	Ryan Bronson	Wayne Enger	David Hartwell	Jane Klingston	Rep. Leon Lilje	Rep. Denny McNamara	Leazer Benesch	Ron Schara	Sen. Tom Savhus	Sen. Bill Ingbrigtsen	# selecting \$	TOTAL of all Members
	Administrative Budget	Legislative Coordinating Commission	\$936,000	\$936,000														
O2	Contract Management	DNR	\$175,000	\$175,000														
O3	Restoration Evaluations Program, Phase 3	DNR	\$92,000	\$92,000	45,000													
O1	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program, Phase 5	DNR		\$ 6,028,700	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 6,000,000	COI	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 6,028,700		3,000,000	\$ 4,500,000	10	\$ 44,028,700
O 4	High-Priority Pre-Transaction Service Acceleration for Lessard-Sams Outdoor	MN DNR	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$0	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0		\$50,000	\$0	6	\$ 300,000
FA 01	Minnesota Forest for the Future/State Forests, Ph. IV	DNR - Forestry	\$ 13,085,000	\$ 13,085,000		\$0	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$4,500,000	\$4,000,000	\$7,000,000		\$6,000,000	\$0	\$8,000,000	\$2,000,000	7	\$ 32,500,000
FA 02	Young Forest Conservation	American Bird Conservancy	\$ 4,771,000	\$ 4,771,000	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$1,500,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$3,000,000		\$500,000	\$0	\$2,000,000	\$1,725,000	9	\$ 14,725,000
FA 03	The Camp Ripley Partnership: Protecting the Mighty Mississippi, Ph. III	Morrison SWCD	\$ 3,048,000	\$ 3,048,000		\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$3,048,000	\$1,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$2,000,000	9	\$ 18,048,000
FA 04	Preventing Forest Fragmentation and Protecting and Resoring Lake and	Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa	\$ 2,476,000	\$ 2,476,000	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$1,500,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,000,000		\$2,000,000	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$0	7	\$ 11,500,000
FA 05	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership, Ph. IV	Pheasants Forever, Inc.	\$ 2,100,000	\$ 2,100,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,100,000	\$2,100,000	\$1,500,000	\$0	\$2,000,000	\$1,000,000		\$1,900,000	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$2,100,000	9	\$ 14,700,000
FA 06	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands in Cass County, Ph. IV	Cass County	\$ 1,233,200	\$ 1,233,200	\$1,000,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$1,200,000	\$700,000	\$700,000			\$1,100,000	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$500,000	8	\$ 7,000,000
PRE 02	Minnesota Moose Habitat Collaborative, Ph. II	MN Deer Hunters Assodation	\$ 2,153,200	\$ 2,153,200	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,153,200	\$0	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$800,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,750,000	11	\$ 15,203,200
PA 01	Grasslands for the Future	Board of Water and Soil Resources	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 20,000,000		\$0	\$400,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,000,000		\$4,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$6,500,000	6	\$ 26,900,000
PA 02	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Acquisition, Ph. V	Pheasants Forever, Inc.	\$ 15,000,000	\$ 15,000,000	\$13,000,000	\$15,000,000	\$15,000,000	\$9,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$8,621,300	\$7,500,000	\$8,000,000	\$9,000,000	12	\$ 105,121,300
PA 03	DNR Wildlife Management Area, Scientific and Natural Area, and Native	MN Dept. of Natural Resources	\$ 14,840,300	\$ 14,840,300		\$2,226,000	\$8,100,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$4,000,000	11	\$ 61,326,000
PA 04	Minnesota Prairie Recovery Project, Ph. IV	The Nature Conservancy	\$ 9,122,800	\$ 9,122,800	\$9,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$4,500,000	\$5,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$5,500,000	12	\$ 66,000,000
PA 05	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water, Ph. III	BWSR & Pheasants Forever	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000		\$4,250,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$2,500,000	\$4,000,000	11	\$ 43,750,000
PA 07	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex, Ph. III	The Trust for Public Land	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,225,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$1,250,000	\$1,500,000	\$2,000,000		\$1,900,000	\$2,500,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,250,000	11	\$ 22,125,000
PRE 01	DNR Grasslands, Ph. V	MN DNR	\$ 3,976,300	\$ 3,976,300	\$1,500,000	\$596,445	\$3,900,000	\$3,000,000	\$2,500,000	\$1,800,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	COI	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	11	\$ 25,296,445
WA 01	The RIM-WRP Partnership, Ph. V	Board of Water and Soil Resources	\$ 26,000,000	\$ 26,000,000	\$16,000,000	\$16,500,000	\$400,000	COI	\$22,500,000	\$14,000,000	\$12,000,000	\$26,000,000	COI	\$15,000,000	\$15,000,000	\$11,500,000	10	\$ 148,900,000
WA 02	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Acquisition, Ph. V	Pheasants Forever, Inc.	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$9,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$7,500,000	\$5,000,000	\$4,387,000	\$8,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$7,000,000	12	\$ 84,887,000
WA 03	Shallow Lake and Wetland Protection Program, Ph. III	Ducks Unlimited	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$4,500,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$2,825,200	\$3,000,000	\$3,600,000	\$1,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$4,000,000	12	\$ 43,925,200
WA 04	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Program, Ph. II	Minnesota Board of Water and Soil	\$ 4,926,000	\$ 4,926,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$400,000	\$1,500,000	\$2,000,000	\$3,097,000			\$4,785,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,300,000	10	\$ 20,082,000
WA 05	McGregor Marsh Wetland Protection	MNDNR Wildlife	\$ 2,396,000	\$ 2,396,000	\$2,300,000	\$2,396,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,300,000	\$0	\$0			\$1,900,000	\$2,100,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	8	\$ 14,996,000

# Minnesota Ranking Process

## ML 2013 / FY 2014 Allocation Summary Sheet

Project ID	Project Title	Organization	Pre-allocated	Fund Request	James Cox	Scott Hall	Ryan Bromson	Wayne Enger	David Hartwell	Jane Kingston	Rep. Leon Lillie	Rep. Denny McHarmara	Leszer Bensch	Ron Schara	Sen. Tom Savinang	Sen. Bill Ingebrigtsen	# selecting \$	TOTAL of all Members
WA 06	Wetland Habitat Protection Program	Minnesota Land Trust		\$ 2,170,000	\$2,100,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$1,700,000	\$2,200,000	\$1,500,000		\$1,500,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,170,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,250,000	11	\$ 18,420,000
WRE 01	Accelerated Wetland and Shallow Lake Enhancement, Ph. V	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources		\$ 3,179,000	\$1,000,000	\$476,850	\$3,000,000	\$3,179,000	\$1,500,000	\$2,000,000		\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$3,179,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,000,000	11	\$ 22,334,850
WRE 02	Pelican Lake Enhancement	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources		\$ 2,137,000	\$2,100,000	\$0	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,750,000		\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$1,381,000	\$500,000	\$0	7	\$ 11,731,000
WRE 03	Albert Lea Lake Management and Invasive Species Control Structure	Shell Rock River Watershed District		\$ 1,127,600	\$1,000,000	\$0		\$1,127,600	\$0	\$750,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,100,000	\$250,000	\$1,127,600	\$500,000	\$1,127,600	9	\$ 7,982,800
WRE 04	Goose Lake Restoration and Carp Exclusion Project	Shell Rock River Watershed District		\$ 412,000	\$397,000	\$0		\$412,000	\$400,000	\$0	\$412,000	\$360,000	\$412,000	\$412,000	\$247,000	\$0	8	\$ 3,052,000
HA 01	DNR Aquatic Habitat, Ph. V	MN DNR		\$ 16,895,000	\$4,500,000	\$2,534,250	\$9,600,000	\$6,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$6,500,000	\$8,081,000	\$10,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$3,000,000	12	\$ 65,215,250
HA 02	Habitat Protection in Dakota County, Ph. IV	Dakota County		\$ 4,100,000	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$2,547,000	\$3,000,000	\$4,100,000	\$4,100,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,100,000	\$3,000,000	\$0	10	\$ 28,847,000
HA 03	Root River Protection and Restoration	The Nature Conservancy		\$ 3,774,600	\$2,500,000	\$3,774,600		\$3,700,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,000,000	\$3,250,000	\$1,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$2,127,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,724,400	11	\$ 27,576,000
HA 04	Metro Big Rivers, Ph. IV	MN Valley Trust (Metro Big Rivers)		\$ 2,456,000	COI	\$0	\$400,000	\$2,400,000	\$2,450,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,456,000	\$700,000	\$2,000,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,000,000	\$0	9	\$ 13,906,000
HA 05	Minnesota Landscape Arboretum: Acquisition on Property Surrounding Arboretum	Minnesota Landscape Arboretum		\$ 1,500,000		\$0		\$800,000	\$400,000	\$0	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$500,000	\$-	\$1,500,000	\$750,000	7	\$ 6,950,000
HA 06	Critical Shoreland Habitat Protection Program, Ph. II	Minnesota Land Trust		\$ 1,420,000	\$1,400,000	\$1,420,000		\$0	\$1,400,000	\$600,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$-	\$1,000,000	\$1,420,000	9	\$ 10,240,000
HRE 03	Lower Mississippi River Habitat Partnership, Ph. III	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service		\$ 3,400,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,147,855	\$1,100,000	\$1,500,000	\$500,000	\$1,500,000	\$2,900,000	\$2,800,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,800,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,000,000	12	\$ 21,247,855
HRE 05	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement and	Minnesota Trout Unlimited		\$ 2,900,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,900,000	\$2,847,000	\$2,900,000	\$2,400,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,900,000	\$2,900,000	\$1,500,000	\$2,900,000	12	\$ 30,747,000
<b>Total Spent</b>					\$90,797,000	\$90,797,000	\$90,797,000	\$90,797,000	\$90,797,000	\$90,797,000	\$90,797,000	\$90,797,000	\$90,797,000	\$90,796,600	\$90,797,000	\$90,797,000	12	\$ 1,089,563,600

Request edit access

# North Dakota Outdoor Heritage Fund Grant Application-Review

1. Does the grant application impact one or more than one fund directive?

1 2 3 4

One directive     Meets all four directives

2. Does the project provide additional outdoor recreation opportunities?

0 1 2 3 4

Does not provide additional outdoor recreation      Provides extensive outdoor recreation

3. Does the grant application address a strong conservation need?

0 1 2 3 4

Project does not address conservation      Project addresses a declining habitat

4. Does the grant provide for additional open and free access to land?

0 1 2 3 4

Does not provide new access to lands      Provides extensive free and open access to additional lands

5. Does the grant application include partnerships with other organizations?

0 1 2 3 4

Project does not include partnerships      Partnership with several private and public agencies

6. Does the grant application include matching funds?

0 1 2 3 4

Project does not include any matching funds      Provides for funding match of 50% or more

7. What is the long term sustainability of project?

1 2 3 4

1-5 years     15 years to indefinite

**Submit**

Never submit passwords through Google Forms.

100%: You made it.

Powered by  


This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.  
[Report Abuse-Terms of Service-Additional Terms](#)

**PROPOSED ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS  
FOR OUTDOOR HERITAGE FUND APPLICATIONS**

**Question 1:** How does the proposal contribute to enhanced hunting, water quality, outdoor recreation, or conservation of natural areas for recreation in North Dakota?

**Question 2:** How does the proposal contribute to a public-private partnership?

**Question 3:** How does the proposal support farming and/or ranching while enhancing hunting, water quality, other outdoor recreation, or conservation of natural areas for recreation?

**Question 4:** How does the proposal address the reduction of wildlife habitat and add to the diversity of that habitat?

**Question 5:** How does the proposal address areas of greatest need for hunting, water quality, outdoor related recreation, or parks?

Answer the questions as follows:

1. Answer each question separately.
2. Be as quantitative and qualitative as possible.
3. All five questions must be answered in no more than 5 pages total, including all texts and tables.

**OUTDOOR HERITAGE FUND**

**SCORING TABLE**

CATEGORIES OF QUESTIONS	POINTS=100
<p><b>#1. Enhanced hunting, water quality, outdoor recreation, or parks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Number of wildlife species positively impacted</li> <li>B. Public access</li> <li>C. Water Quality</li> <li>D. Outdoor recreation</li> <li>E. Parks development</li> <li>F. Length of agreement (1-20 years)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 1-5</li> <li>2. 6-10</li> <li>3. 11-15</li> <li>4. 16-20</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Maximum=25</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0-5</li> <li>0-5</li> <li>0-3</li> <li>0-4</li> <li>0-4</li> <li>1</li> <li>2</li> <li>3</li> <li>4</li> </ul>
<p><b>#2. Partnership</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Ratio of non-OHF match to grant request</li> <li>B. Number of matching partners</li> <li>C. Private Partnership</li> <li>D. Public partnership</li> </ul>	<p>Maximum =15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0-5</li> <li>0-2</li> <li>0-4</li> <li>0-4</li> </ul>
<p><b>#3. Farming/Ranching</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Activity that supports farming/ranching while augmenting wildlife habitat or parks development</li> <li>B. Idled or approved managed grazing on native grasslands</li> <li>C. Established grass (e.g., CRP mixture)</li> <li>D. Tree/shrub block planting</li> </ul>	<p>Maximum =20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0-7</li> <li>0-6</li> <li>0-4</li> <li>0-3</li> </ul>
<p><b>#4. Habitat</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Develop new habitat</li> <li>B. Enhance existing habitat</li> <li>C. Private land</li> <li>D. Public land</li> </ul>	<p>Maximum=20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0-8</li> <li>0-6</li> <li>0-3</li> <li>0-3</li> </ul>
<p><b>#5. Location for greatest conservation need</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Declining habitat</li> <li>B. Stable habitat</li> <li>C. Proximity to existing habitat</li> </ul>	<p>Maximum=20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0-8</li> <li>0-5</li> <li>0-7</li> </ul>

**OUTDOOR HERITAGE FUND  
THEORETICAL PROJECT PROPOSAL #1**

This project proposal is located in Stutsman County, ND and consists of wetland restoration in association with planting upland habitat on adjacent ground. All of the wetlands and grassed areas have the support and cooperation of landowners where these activities would occur. The wetland acres restored would consist of a number of types of wetlands from very shallow, seasonal wetlands to more permanent, deeper wetlands. The total acreage affected is 640 acres. The landowners have not agreed to public hunting access on this land but would agree to access for bird watching and other associated activities. The length of the easement on this land would be for 20 years.

Using the assessment questions, they could be answered as follows.

1. This proposal would increase production of waterfowl in the area and the associated uplands would provide nesting and cover opportunity for songbirds, upland birds such as grouse and deer. There would be a water quality component given it's in the James River drainage that is prone to flooding. There would be no direct additional hunting opportunities with this project but the potential for bird watching would be slightly increased.
2. This proposal is a cooperative effort between the private landowners and Wetland Wings, Incorporated, a non-government entity whose mission is to enhance habitat for wetland related birds across the nation.
3. This proposal would transfer the existing farming operation to one of grass. Crop production would cease but grass management would have to occur so there would be some potential benefit for intermittent haying/grazing activities.
4. This project would restore habitat that was originally in the area and the grass seed mixture would be one of grasses and forbs that adds to the diversity of the habitat.
5. This is in an area where little hunting currently occurs since there are few opportunities to do so because of limited wildlife production. There is a need for water quality projects along the James River due to sediment transport and this can be part of the solution. There is no direct benefit to the state parks system.

## POTENTIAL SCORING OF THEORETICAL PROPOSAL #1

- 1A. 4—a number of game and non-game species will benefit.
  - 1B. 1—Only limited public access will occur and no hunting access
  - 1C. 2—Limited water quality benefits associated with the project but will be some.
  - 1D. 2—It appears only bird watching and possibly hiking will benefit but marginal use.
  - 1E. 0-- There are no parks and recreation benefits.
  - 1F. 4-- This is the maximum amount of time for an easement.
- 
- 2A. 2—Although not stated it is a 50% cost share from Wetland Wings
  - 2B. 1—There are only 2 landowners associated with this project.
  - 2C. 3—This is a collaborative effort of Wetland Wings and private landowners
  - 2D. 0—Other than outdoor heritage funds there are no public funds.
- 
- 3A. 2—There is limited support with farming/ranching activities.
  - 3B. 5—There is a plan for managed haying and grazing associated with this.
  - 3C. 4—The seed mixture is applicable.
  - 3D. 0—No tree or shrub plantings are in this project.
- 
- 4A. 5—Development of new habitat is associated with the project.
  - 4B. 0—There is no existing habitat so no enhancement credit.
  - 4C. 3—The entire project is on private land.
  - 4D. 0—There is no public land involved.
- 
- 5A. 6—The project is in an area where loss of CRP and other habitats is rapidly occurring.
  - 5B. 3—Little habitat exists but what remains is relatively stable.
  - 5C. 4—This project lies within 10 miles of an existing wildlife management area.

Total Score=46

**OUTDOOR HERITAGE FUND  
THEORETICAL PROJECT PROPOSAL #2**

This project proposal is located in Morton County, ND and consists of a grazing management system on native grasslands, some minimal wetland development, and support payments for a winter wheat program on agricultural ground that is currently in a sunflower and spring wheat rotation. Multi-row tree belts will be established in the winter wheat area to reduce erosion and provide seasonal habitat for wildlife. This has the support and cooperation of landowners where these activities would occur. The grazing management system would include cross fencing, seasonal grazing and installation of water systems. The wetland development would consist of approximately 10 acres of created wetlands in an area where few occur and would be in association with the winter wheat acreage. The total acreage affected is 2000 acres. The landowners have agreed to public hunting access on this the native grass areas and agricultural acreage once the crops have been removed. It is associated with the State Park system and the owners have agreed to a trail development to connect currently disassociated portions of the park. The proposal includes 5 different landowners, one state agency and one non-governmental entity. The length of the easement on this land would be for 15 years.

Using the assessment questions, they could be answered as follows.

1. This area is close to the Heart River where public access is routinely difficult so offering this amount of acres would contribute substantially to hunting in the area. Water quality benefits would be minimal due to the current nature of the watershed. Managed grazing in association with the offered trail system would allow for an improved natural area for birdwatchers, bikers, hikers and such and an interpretational program.
2. This proposal is a cooperative effort between five private landowners, North Dakota Game and Fish and I Like Hunting, Inc., a non-government entity whose mission is to promote hunting and outdoor recreation in North Dakota.
3. The proposal is a benefit for farming/ranching through the establishment of an improved grazing system and water development, which should increase cattle production to some extent. Concurrently, it will improve habitat for waterfowl through the winter wheat program in association with strategic placement of the created wetlands; will provide improved nesting habitat conditions for numerous upland bird species and improve big game habitat through protection of wooded draws, managed grazing and cross fencing. Establishment of a trail system would allow for other activities to occur.

4. This project will enhance habitat that was currently exists in the area and protection of the native prairie will enhance the diversity. While this isn't an area that has experienced massive loss of habitat it will improve that already in existence.
  
5. This is in an area where hunting currently occurs but public access is difficult. It is adjacent to an existing wildlife management area and would augment the value of the area for wildlife. It would also create a connection between two portions of the park system.

## POTENTIAL SCORING OF THEORETICAL PROPOSAL #2

- 1A. 4—a number of game and non-game species will benefit.
- 1B. 4—Good public access is provided. Less than maximum score was given due to limited or no access in some years due to unharvested crops.
- 1C. 1—Very limited water quality benefits associated with the project.
- 1D. 3—A variety of outdoor use will be available.
- 1E. 2-- There are parks and recreation benefits because of the connecting trail system.
- 1F. 3-- This is the close to the maximum amount of time for an easement.
- 
- 2A. 2—Although not stated it is a 50% cost share from partners.
- 2B. 2—There are 5 landowners, 1 public entity and 1 NGO associated with this project.
- 2C. 3—This is a collaborative effort of I Like to Hunt, Game and Fish, and private landowners
- 2D. 3—There is an equal match from all public and NGO partners.
- 
- 3A. 5—There is good support with farming/ranching activities and improving habitat.
- 3B. 5—There is a plan for managed grazing, water system and cross fencing associated with this.
- 3C. 0—No grass plantings will occur.
- 3D. 2—Some tree or shrub plantings are in this project.
- 
- 4A. 3—Development of new habitat is limited on this project (created wetlands)
- 4B. 6—Existing habitat will be greatly enhanced.
- 4C. 3—The entire project is on private land.
- 4D. 1—There is no public land involved but the proximity to an existing WMA gives increased value.
- 
- 5A. 4—The project is in an area where loss of CRP has occurred but is primarily on existing habitat.
- 5B. 3--Habitat exists and has been relatively stable.
- 5C. 6—This project is adjacent to an existing wildlife management area.

Total Score=65