

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council  
ML 2014 / FY 2015 Recommendation Process

Project ID	Project Title	Rep. Hansen Comments	Ron Schara Comments	Susan Olson Comments	Scott Rall Comments	Jane Kingston Comments	David Hartwell Comments	Bob Anderson Comments	Senator Ingebrigtsen
PA-1	DNR Wildlife Management Area and Scientific & Natural Area Acquisition --Phase VI	SNA	high personnel costs?	The acquisition costs are quite high.			Focus seems to be on hunting before habitat in narrative which is backward. Prairie plan should focus on native prairie first and not lands requiring restoration. Proposal indicates restoration but there is no requested funds or leverage indicated for restoration. Answer to open to hunting and fishing question is NO? Seems like a wide area instead of focused effort.	BA-spoke to hunting and then said no hunting	<b>Not open to hunt/fish. Why?</b>
PA-2	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase VI			Conflict of Interest (recent Pheasants Forever affiliation)		High Protect Fee \$/ac	How is this different than PA-1? Hunting and fishing on fee land is part of the deal but the motivation should be habitat protection, not places to hunt and fish. Additions should be the focus, not new areas. With all the expiring CRP, why buy any cropland to retire? New WMAs? Why with all the CRP land shrinkage would we not focus on existing investment enhancement? \$300K in supplies but no restoration. Seems unreasonable. Why fund PF national grants staff?	BA-A little weak on leveraging	
PA-3	Prairie Recovery Project --Phase V	<b>Restore</b>	high personnel costs?	I think this is a great project and at a very reasonable cost.		High % Direct Support Svcs	Are acquisition costs for native prairie lands? What is the long term costs for management and how will they be covered? Cost per acres restored/enhanced seems high.	BA-Good Project!	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council  
ML 2014 / FY 2015 Recommendation Process

Project ID	Project Title	Rep. Hansen Comments	Ron Schara Comments	Susan Olson Comments	Scott Rall Comments	Jane Kingston Comments	David Hartwell Comments	Bob Anderson Comments	Senator Ingebrigtsen
PA-4	Northern Tallgrass Prairie National Wildlife Refuge Land Acquisition -- Phase V			Acquisition and easement costs are on the high side.			0 What is in the contracts budget?	BA-USFWS Science? Federal Ownership?	
PA-5	Cannon River Headwaters Habitat Complex Phase IV			Acquisition and restoration costs are on the high side.			0 Lack of hunting and fishing opportunities is not a habitat focused reason for funding.	BA-Wetlands	
PA-6	Accelerated protection of grassland and prairie habitat with (RIM) and (NPB) easements		high costs per acre?	The easement costs are prohibitively high			0 Combined cost per acre of CRP and then RIM easement - and % of value of land 2 full time easement processors for 3 years? A full time engineer for 3 years?	BA-Land not open to public?	
PA-7	Minnesota Buffers for Wildlife and Water --Phase IV			The easement costs are on the high side.			0 Can we get schedule of how much land per year is rolling out of CRP? And % reenrolling (and for how long the contracts are and what the % of FMV the contract represents)? Why does no one worry about the effect of crop insurance on CRP programs? What is the effect of 200' each side of a ditch/stream on insects, mammals, amphibians, etc? - especially in areas with lots of agricultural inputs. % of FMV? What is 1 GIS person going to do for 3 years working on this?	BA-Land not open High Cost.	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council  
ML 2014 / FY 2015 Recommendation Process

Project ID	Project Title	Rep. Hansen Comments	Ron Schara Comments	Susan Olson Comments	Scott Rall Comments	Jane Kingston Comments	David Hartwell Comments	Bob Anderson Comments	Senator Ingebrigtsen
PA-8	Green Corridor Legacy Program -- Phase V			This was poorly written. It is vague, ambiguous and unclear, and reads like a history lesson and not a grant proposal. They did not explain what they are planning to do with the requested funds. I am also concerned that the maintenance will be a problem given the DNR's existing budget for maintenance of DNR-			0 Tourism and new business concepts are not a desired outcome of habitat funding. Not sure if the priority is native prairie or grasslands. Focus areas are different in narrative to county locations identified. Proposal states funding will go to parking lots. Not sure what contract cost includes.		0
PRE-1	DNR Grassland -- Phase VI	No Grazing No Fence	high personnel costs?	Very cost-efficient project, however, I am concerned that the maintenance will be a problem given the DNR's existing budget for maintenance of DNR-owned lands		Public access? High % Direct Support Svcs. Low \$/ac.	Grassland conversion? Pheasant stamp allocation is not LSOHC business. Prairie Cons. Plan - is this on permanently protected land? Farm bill assistance? NO cost of easement although 4000 acres will be protected at a cost of \$272,400	BA-Farm Bill Partnership?	Enhance

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council  
ML 2014 / FY 2015 Recommendation Process

Project ID	Project Title	Rep. Hansen Comments	Ron Schara Comments	Susan Olson Comments	Scott Rall Comments	Jane Kingston Comments	David Hartwell Comments	Bob Anderson Comments	Senator Ingebrigtsen
PRE-2	Anoka Sandplain Habitat Restoration and Enhancement -- Phase III	No Fence		Many of the projects in this group proposal are very worthy, but the overall score was pulled down by certain projects that weren't explained well and are not (in my opinion) within the scope of the Constitutional Amendment's funding mechanism and should have been submitted to the Parks and Trails fund instead. I would recommend funding on the worthy projects within the LSOHC's scope. The submitting entities should strongly consider separate submissions on future	time line is too long	Public access? Low Enhance \$/ac.	What is the development pressure on the sandplain today. Can it be quantified? Is the use of volunteers to do restoration work cost effective to professional contractors? Long term plan for restoration efforts? Explain herbicide cattail control. 2 acres of "habitat" restored for \$218,000????		0 Enhance
PRE-3	Wirth Park Habitat Enhancements			Although this is a worthy project, it is not (in my opinion) within the scope of the Constitutional Amendment's funding mechanism and should be submitted to the Parks and Trails fund instead. The proposal indicates that they have received P&T funding for related work in the past. Also, I feel the enhancement costs are prohibitively high. That	time line is to long	Miss Flyway more than immediately over River	how to do cattail removal. How to manage reed canary grass long term given the seed bank? Not sure of the plan for permanence of enhancement. Explain the difference between professional services and contracts.		0 Cost very high pr acre/4016.00

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council  
ML 2014 / FY 2015 Recommendation Process

Project ID	Project Title	Rep. Hansen Comments	Ron Schara Comments	Susan Olson Comments	Scott Rall Comments	Jane Kingston Comments	David Hartwell Comments	Bob Anderson Comments	Senator Ingebrigtsen
PRE-4	Crow-Hassan Prairie Complex Restoration and Enhancement			Although this is a worthy project, it is not (in my opinion) within the scope of the Constitutional Amendment's funding mechanism and should be submitted to the Parks and Trails fund instead. That being said, this is a dedicated enhancement and restoration of prairie		Low Enhance \$/ac	Explain cattail and phragmighy removal	0	
PRE-5	Praire and Oak Savanna Restoration along Mississippi and Rum Rivers			This was poorly written and does not explain what work is planned for the subject acres. It appears to be substitute funding for what the entity would be doing anyway. In addition, it is not (in my opinion) within the scope of the Constitutional Amendment's funding mechanism and should be submitted to the Parks and Trails fund instead.		Public access? Describe equip & supplies?		0	Supplies and materials 250K ??
FA-1	Dynamic Forest Conservation			0 The discussion of past accomplishments/future plans is helpful. Reasonable costs for proposed work, but plan for sustainability is vague.	no money for training	"Dynamic" vs. "Young"? Low Restore \$/ac.	what is included in contract costs? 4 year full time position to manage contracts seems high.	0	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council  
ML 2014 / FY 2015 Recommendation Process

Project ID	Project Title	Rep. Hansen Comments	Ron Schara Comments	Susan Olson Comments	Scott Rall Comments	Jane Kingston Comments	David Hartwell Comments	Bob Anderson Comments	Senator Ingebrigtsen
FA-2	Preventing Forest Fragmentation and Protecting and Restoring Lake and Stream Habitat in the St. Louis River Watershed		DNR wolf rules must be required	Well-thought out proposal with excellent maintenance plan. Acquisition costs seem reasonable.	how will residents of the state find this project can it be listed on the state recreation map? Would you consider making this a traditional state owned wma?	Must be permanent, or returned to State. Should have equal access/rules for all. Must be used as deemed by LSOHC.	Is restoration of acquired lands the match?	BA-Funding too much	Const/Required ownership ?
FA-3	Camp Ripley ACUB...Protecting one of the last great places in Minnesota --Phase IV			I feel that the wetland/prairie easements are be more important than the forest easements.			0 Why should we invest to protect the functioning of Camp Ripley - should that not be the federal government/national guard's responsibility? Habitat funds should be about habitat but this proposal seems to promote hunting as a goal. But the project is an easement project with no public access. Why should we support Camp Ripley and their economic impact? How is value of easements determined? is the degradation of value due to noise pollution a factor? With 250 landowners wanting to sign up, something must be amiss in the valuations.	0	
FA-4	Northeastern Minnesota Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitat Partnership --Phase V		high costs per acre?	Conflict of Interest (recent Pheasants Forever affiliation)		Appraisals final? Low Enhance \$/ac.	0	0	
FA-5	Protecting Pinelands Sands Aquifer Forestlands and Aquatic Habitat Phase 1			I feel this is an important project and well-written, but I am concerned that the maintenance will be a problem given the DNR's existing budget for maintenance of DNR-			0 What impact is climate change projected to have on dry pine forest? Are we being asked to recommend a project that would protect the aquifer for agriculture? What are they willing to contribute?	0	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council  
ML 2014 / FY 2015 Recommendation Process

Project ID	Project Title	Rep. Hansen Comments	Ron Schara Comments	Susan Olson Comments	Scott Rall Comments	Jane Kingston Comments	David Hartwell Comments	Bob Anderson Comments	Senator Ingebrigtsen
FA-6	Protect (Acquire) Key Forest Habitat Lands - Cass County Phase V			This is one of the few proposals where I see extreme urgency as a factor due to the potential permanent lost opportunity.		Status of previous yrs' funding?	0	0	
FA-7	State Forest Acquisitions Phase II- RJ Dorer Memorial Hardwoods State Forest Land Asset Project		high costs per acre?	I think this is a great project but am concerned that the acquisition costs are on the high side, and there isn't much information about the current use of the proposed 828 acres to indicate what's being done to it, if anything. The two acres of easement are		0	We are not focused on development of recreational opportunities. Contract cost of \$400,000? For acquisition?	0	
FA-8	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration -- Phase II		high personnel costs?	The acquisition costs are on the high side. The rest of the project seems cost-efficient. I feel the prairie work is more important than the forest work		High % Direct Support Svcs	Public access is not our goal. No visible plan for funding future restoration needs.	0	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council  
ML 2014 / FY 2015 Recommendation Process

Project ID	Project Title	Rep. Hansen Comments	Ron Schara Comments	Susan Olson Comments	Scott Rall Comments	Jane Kingston Comments	David Hartwell Comments	Bob Anderson Comments	Senator Ingebrigtsen
FRE-1	Big Woods Habitat Corridors in Scott County			I have several concerns with this project. The proposal is extremely vague about exactly what restoration and enhancement are going to be performed on the 635 acres. The restoration costs are prohibitively high. The maintenance and sustainability does not seem realistic, given the prior succesful projects were very few acres in comparison to the scope of this project, and the fact that the County hadn't maintained it in the past. Finally, it is not (in my opinion) within the scope of the Constitutional Amendment's funding mechanism and should be submitted to the Parks and Trails fund instead.		Public access? High Restore \$/ac.	Big woods habitat - but doing prairie restoration on cropland? What species would this restoration help? What has changed in the last 10 years to create "exponential degradation" of subject lands? Who do the contracts go to and what will they do specifically?	0	
FRE-2	Floodplain Forest Enhancement - Mississippi River			This project has an extremely high cost for an enhancement project and it doesn't appear to merit the dollars expended per acre. In addition, as stated in the proposal, there will be little ultimate value to the project if it can't be continued throughout the region.		Public access?	0	0	



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council  
ML 2014 / FY 2015 Recommendation Process

Project ID	Project Title	Rep. Hansen Comments	Ron Schara Comments	Susan Olson Comments	Scott Rall Comments	Jane Kingston Comments	David Hartwell Comments	Bob Anderson Comments	Senator Ingebrigtsen
WA-1	RIM-WRP Partnership -- Phase VI			This is a great partnership and a fantastic opportunity to leverage MN dollars with federal dollars.			0 What does leverage pay for? Explain how it reduces cost of preservation for the State? If no farm bill or no leverage, what is plan B to get leverage or does program go away? 2 full time people for 75 easements for 3 years? DU role for \$1M but nothing in budget for restoration/enhancement.	0	
WA-2	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase VI			Conflict of Interest (recent Pheasants Forever affiliation)		High Protect Fee \$/ac	Public hunting is not the rational for these funds - habitat is.	0	
WA-3	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Phase III			Good project with proven track record for success.			0	0	0
WRE-1	Accelerated Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancement -- Phase VI		high personnel costs?	I feel this is an important project and well-written, but I am concerned that the maintenance will be a problem given the DNR's existing budget for maintenance of DNR-		Low Enhance \$/ac	Restoring wetlands is not just a waterfowl issue. Personnel chart is missing	0	
WRE-2	Living Shallow Lakes & Wetlands Initiative -- Phase IV		high personnel costs?	I feel this is an important project and well-written, but I am concerned that the maintenance will be a problem given the DNR's existing budget for maintenance of DNR-owned lands. Also concerned that restoration of the 100 acres is very high in cost, and would like more information about the restoration process		Restore \$/ac	How is this different than WRE-1? Almost 10 times as costly per acre as WRE-1. Why? This work will benefit more than ducks, why is that not highlighted? DU Bio-engineering staff seems high.	0	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council  
ML 2014 / FY 2015 Recommendation Process

Project ID	Project Title	Rep. Hansen Comments	Ron Schara Comments	Susan Olson Comments	Scott Rall Comments	Jane Kingston Comments	David Hartwell Comments	Bob Anderson Comments	Senator Ingebrigtsen
HA-1	MN DNR Aquatic Habitat Program Phase VI			The restoration costs are very reasonable, but the acquisition, easement, and enhancement figures are all prohibitively high. I would like to see more information about what			0	0	
HA-2	Metro Big Rivers --Phase V		park and trail funds needed here, too	Many of the projects in this group proposal are very worthy, but the overall score was pulled down by certain projects that weren't explained well and are not (in my opinion) within the scope of the Constitutional Amendment's funding mechanism and should have been submitted to the Parks and Trails fund instead. I would recommend funding on the worthy projects within the LSOHC's scope. The submitting entities should strongly		Equipment/tools? Low Easement \$/ac.	Wildlife dependent recreation is not a goal of LSOHC. Is GRG's program volunteer dependent and if so, is that more cost effective than using contractors? Budget does not capture total costs of fee acquisition correctly		0
HA-3	Vermillion River WMA Acquisition		why not sell buildings?	The acquisition costs, although a rare opportunity, are prohibitively high. Also, I am concerned that the maintenance will be a problem given the DNR's existing budget for maintenance of DNR-owned lands		What do "contracts" cover? High Protect Fee \$/ac.	Hunting land and fishing opportunities are not the goal - habitat is. No open to hunting and fishing? What is the need for a contract for \$322K for this purchase?		0 15K pr. Acre

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council  
ML 2014 / FY 2015 Recommendation Process

Project ID	Project Title	Rep. Hansen Comments	Ron Schara Comments	Susan Olson Comments	Scott Rall Comments	Jane Kingston Comments	David Hartwell Comments	Bob Anderson Comments	Senator Ingebrigtsen
HA-4	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes			The acquisition costs are prohibitively high. Also, I am concerned that the maintenance will be a problem given the DNR's existing budget for maintenance of DNR-owned lands.		Woods Bay portion preferable. High Protect Fee \$/ac.	Sport fishing is not the goal - habitat protection is.	0	
HA-5	3,500-foot Shoreland Acquisition on the St. Croix River			The acquisition cost, although a rare opportunity, is beyond prohibitively high. In addition, the plan for maintenance reads like they will request grants to fix it after there's a problem, but have no maintenance plan otherwise. Finally, since this entire section of property is adjacent to a state trail, it is not (in my opinion) within the scope of the Constitutional Amendment's funding mechanism and should		Recreational, not habitat. Appraisal status? EXTREMELY High \$/ac.	Recreational opportunities is not LSOHC goal. What is the development threat (by code) Value of trail? Will county issue bonds? Has it issued any since 2006 approval of referendum? Actual cost if over \$300K per acre. This looks to be a recreational project more than habitat.	BA-High cost for 15 acres	160K pr. Acre/with no hunting
HA-6	Habitat Protection/Restoration in Dakota County --Phase V			Good project, well written.		0	0	0	
HA-7	Mustinka River Fish and Wildlife Habitat Corridor Rehabilitation			The acquisition cost, although a rare opportunity, is prohibitively high.		Map needed. Very High Restore \$/ac.	is this all or nothing? Very high cost per mile.	0	
HRE-1	Minnesota Trout Unlimited Coldwater Fish Habitat Enhancement & Restoration -- Phase VI			The enhancement costs are prohibitively high, but I would like to see more information about what is involved.		Map needed. High Enhance \$/ac.	Improving access is not the purpose of these funds.	0	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council  
ML 2014 / FY 2015 Recommendation Process

Project ID	Project Title	Rep. Hansen Comments	Ron Schara Comments	Susan Olson Comments	Scott Rall Comments	Jane Kingston Comments	David Hartwell Comments	Bob Anderson Comments	Senator Ingebrigtsen
HRE-2	St. Louis River Restoration Initiative --Phase II			The restoration costs are prohibitively high, but I would like to see more information about what is involved.		High % Direct Support Svcs. Very High Restore \$/ac.	0	0	
HRE-3	Duluth 2012 Flood: Stream Habitat Restoration Program			The restoration costs are prohibitively high, but I would like to see more information about what is involved.	leverage was received by the city but not dedicated to this project funds went elsewhere can funds be dedicated to streams with the best chance of sustaining natural reproduction verses stocking	"Critical" habitat? Rank in order of best habitat? EXTREMELY High Restore \$/ac. CPL appropriate.	Restoration should be for habitat not recreational purposes. Very expensive per mile - exceeding any other project we have looked at. What is the breakdown between planning and actual restoration work?. What would they do if no leverage was found? Seems to include funds to manage a public process - is this what we want to be involved with?	0	Was Fed disaster \$\$ involved??
HRE-4	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation --Phase II			I gave a lower score on the supplement factor because the proposal indicates they have additional funds available for annual maintenance, and if they have that, they should be contributing to the project. Also, I am concerned that the maintenance will be a problem given the DNR's existing budget for		Equipment=trees stock?	Seems like aggressive beaver trapping would be far cheaper than this aggressive method. .5 project manager for 4 years just to put contracts in place?	0	

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council  
ML 2014 / FY 2015 Recommendation Process

Project ID	Project Title	Rep. Hansen Comments	Ron Schara Comments	Susan Olson Comments	Scott Rall Comments	Jane Kingston Comments	David Hartwell Comments	Bob Anderson Comments	Senator Ingebrigtsen
HRE-5	Wildlife and Fishery Habitat Restoration and Enhancement - Metro Region		duplicate proposals here?	Many of the projects in this group proposal are very worthy, but the overall score was pulled down by certain projects that are not (in my opinion) within the scope of the Constitutional Amendment's funding mechanism and should have been submitted to the Parks and Trails or Clean Water funds instead. I would recommend funding on the worthy projects within the LSOHC's scope. The submitting entities should strongly		All duplicate, CPL-eligible, disparate, & temporary water treatment projects. No unifying vision or overall direction.	should be separate projects as they do not show much linkage. Projects under \$400K should apply for Conservation Partners grants. #8 shows no acreage so understanding cost effectiveness is not possible. #10 seems to be a short term fix that will have to be repeated year after year. Impossible to ascertain sustainability of improvements in the format this is submitted in. Unable to understand supplemental nature of funding as presented. Is "contracts" with outsiders or with implementing agencies?		0
HRE-6	Washington County's Last Best Places		high costs per acre?	I have several concerns with this project. The proposal is extremely vague about the St Pau Baldwin Plains and Moraines subsection, the mosaic, and the St Croix Rover portions. Also, the restoration costs are quite high for the number of acres. The project has significant support, but I'm not sure that building a bridge is necessarily the best use of LSOHC funds.		Map needed	Leverage of support services seems not real leverage.	BA-Project timeline?	
HRE-7	Grey Cloud Slough Habitat Restoration					Substitution. This is a transportation project.	LSOHC purpose is not to provide funds for recreational purposes. The proposal seems light on the biological benefits of this. Why would this be good for wildlife habitat? What will remove the likely vegetative matter that has built up over the last 50 years that would make this a functioning slough?		0

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council  
ML 2014 / FY 2015 Recommendation Process

Project ID	Project Title	Rep. Hansen Comments	Ron Schara Comments	Susan Olson Comments	Scott Rall Comments	Jane Kingston Comments	David Hartwell Comments	Bob Anderson Comments	Senator Ingebrigtsen
HRE-8	Lake Nokomis Habitat Enhancements			I feel that much of this project is more suited for the Clean Water fund due to the water quality issues being discussed in the proposal.		Common carp. CPL possibility.	How do you remove carp for "up to three years"? Or does this mean they will be netted for 3 years instead of rotenone treatment of the lake and restocking of other fish? The real question is if the strategy is long or short term. It appears short term by the description.		0 Carp barrier
HRE-9	Lake Independence Fish Habitat Improvement Project		Clean water fund needs to be involved	I feel that much of this project is more suited for the Clean Water fund due to the water quality issues being discussed in the proposal. Also, the proposal needs more details on the design and scope of work.	feedlot issues need to be completely adressed first	Status of Merz Feedlot lawsuit? Not prudent to waste \$ with ongoing unmitigated pollution. Low Enhance \$/ac. CPL possibility.	carp control or eradication? What is being done to control flows from the feedlot so there is a permanent solution? What is the carp control and how effective would it be? How would this be funded going forward?		0
HRE-10	Northwest Bluffs			The enhancement costs are prohibitively high. Also, it is not (in my opinion) within the scope of the Constitutional Amendment's funding mechanism and should be submitted to the Parks and Trails fund instead. The proposal indicates that they have received P&T funding for related work in the past.		Map needed. Low Restore \$/ac. CPL possibility.	Adjacent development is the partial cause of the dedgradation of the habitat but cannot be fixed.		0 cost pr. Acre high

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council  
ML 2014 / FY 2015 Recommendation Process

Project ID	Project Title	Rep. Hansen Comments	Ron Schara Comments	Susan Olson Comments	Scott Rall Comments	Jane Kingston Comments	David Hartwell Comments	Bob Anderson Comments	Senator Ingebrigtsen
HRE-11	Habitat Enhancement in the Sauk Lake watershed			The enhancement costs are prohibitively high. Also, it is not (in my opinion) within the scope of the Constitutional Amendment's funding mechanism and should be submitted to the Parks and Trails or Clean		Supplies/materials detail? EXTREMELY High Enhance \$/ac.	Very high cost per acre. Would it not be better to just sod in this city lot? Should this not be referred to Conservation Partners?		0 38K pr. Acre cost. Extreme
HAIS-1	A Permanent Program to Sustainably Control AIS While Restoring Ecosystems	protect fish habitat	administrative request only	This project is not (in my opinion) within the scope of the Constitutional Amendment's funding mechanism for any of the Legacy Amendment. The funding of an endowment to hire a person does not directly relate to success in any of the other scored areas, and there are no funds to actually support any projects that might be recommended by such a person. Further, although the strategy is	relies on other grants not even applied for yet to continue this work	Substitution, Research, Endowment	This seems like research funding more than restoration funding. While it lists great leverage, the leveraged funds are already committed (but not to the position as outlined) and really don't count as leverage. Office/workspace remodel seems very high in cost.		0 Creat such a fund const. questionable

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council  
ML 2014 / FY 2015 Recommendation Process

Project ID	Project Title	Rep. Hansen Comments	Ron Schara Comments	Susan Olson Comments	Scott Rall Comments	Jane Kingston Comments	David Hartwell Comments	Bob Anderson Comments	Senator Ingebrigtsen
HAIS-2	Protect Aquatic Habitat from Asian Carp	protect fish habitat		This proposal is requesting funds for some unknown future project that may or may not result in a solution. We are being asked for \$6.5 million with no information on how it will be spent, other than conjecture and hyperbole. Also to the extent that the proposal affects water quality issues, I recommend it be submitted for Clean Water Fund consideration.		Substitution, Temporary, Research, Poorly defined. High % Direct Support Svcs.	The lack of specifics makes this hard to evaluate against other projects. Leverage seems like a stretch since those funds were in place for existing projects that this adds to after the fact.		0
HAIS-3	Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD) Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Management Program	protect fish habitat		I feel that this project is more suited for the Clean Water fund due to the water quality issues being discussed in the proposal.		Substitution, 100% Personnel & Equip, Temporary, Highly localized, Requires ongoing funding	Isn't inventory work really research? Containment of small AIS populations makes some sense if there is the opportunity to eradicate. Is there? Would the inspection program be mandatory or would it be voluntary. What about private property access? Painter Creek project seems like research not restoration. Explain the value of a access improvement at a lake that has significant AIS infestations already vs somewhere else?		0



Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council  
ML 2014 / FY 2015 Recommendation Process

Project ID	Project Title	Rep. Hansen Comments	Ron Schara Comments	Susan Olson Comments	Scott Rall Comments	Jane Kingston Comments	David Hartwell Comments	Bob Anderson Comments	Senator Ingebrigtsen
H AIS-4	Statewide AIS Facilities and Equipment	protect fish habitat; pick one section of the state and start development	both infected and non-infected lakes?; what about private boat accesses:	The cost of this project is prohibitively high, and I feel it is more suited for the Clean Water fund.		"Protect in Fee"-False; Substitution, 100% Personnel & Equip, Temporary, Requires ongoing funding	Proposal shows "protect in fee" but there is no land acquisition being done. Where is legislation to require decontamination rather than depend on good intentions? Watershed districts have the power to create income but the proposal indicates there are no alternatives.		0 If needed, statewide bonding should be considered by admin.
H AIS-5	Invasive Species Net Duplication	Protect fish habitat	Is buying nets appropriate expenditure?	This is an interesting idea, but more information should be provided about the number of eligible fishermen, the cost of the nets, the number of nets likely to be needed per fishermen, and the number of lakes that utilize the technique		Not OHF appropriate	would nets be used exclusively for this purpose?		0 Private business responsibility??