

Environment and Natural Resources Trust Fund Request for Proposal (RFP) Evaluation Criteria

ADDITIONAL EXPLANATION OF EVALUATION CRITERIA

All Environment and Natural Resources Trust Fund proposals should strive to maximize efficiency and return on investment for the proposed expenditures. Additionally, the following criteria, as applicable, will be considered in evaluating proposals:

1. **FUNDING PRIORITIES:** Responds to RFP funding priorities articulated and adopted by the LCCMR.
 - How directly does proposal respond to RFP priorities?
2. **MULTIPLE BENEFITS:** Delivers multiple benefits to Minnesota's environment and natural resources.
 - Would proposed project deliver multiple benefits impacting multiple resources? Would impacts and benefits cross resources or have any crossover effects on other resources? Does proposal line up with multiple funding priorities?
3. **OUTCOMES:** Identifies clear objectives likely to result in measurable, demonstrated, and meaningful outcomes.
 - Are objectives and outcomes clearly articulated? Are objectives and outcomes feasible? Is proposed project well thought out and planned? Would outcomes provide worthy return on investment? Are outcomes/benefits capable of being evaluated?
4. **KNOWLEDGE BASE:** Contributes to the knowledge base or disseminates information that will benefit other efforts.
 - Would proposed project contribute information that is necessary or useful to environment and natural resources efforts? Would it make information more accessible to people that could be aided by using/having the information? Would it increase knowledge amongst a group (e.g., the public) in a way that could impact effectiveness or efficiency of related efforts?
5. **EXTENT OF IMPACTS:** Results in broad, long-term impacts of statewide, regional, or local significance.
 - How far into the future would benefits extend? How far-reaching and how fairly would outcomes and benefits of proposed project be distributed throughout the state?
6. **INNOVATION:** Employs or demonstrates innovative approaches to more effectively and efficiently solve specific environment and natural resources issues.
 - Does proposed project offer something new/innovative/outside-the-box? Could proposed project expand/build upon/improve current standards and practices? Is there potential for a "breakthrough" or to learn something important and unknown?
7. **SCIENTIFIC/TECHNICAL BASIS:** Reflects current scientific and technical knowledge, standards, and best practices.
 - Is proposed project in line with most current knowledge in the field it is proposing to work in? Does proposed project demonstrate knowledge of current scientific and technical understandings? Does project hold up to expert/peer scrutiny?
8. **URGENCY:** Addresses an issue for which immediate future action is urgent and critical to avoid undesirable consequences.
 - How urgent is the issue the proposed project aims to address? Is time of the essence? How serious or irreversible are the consequences of a failure to act now?
9. **CAPACITY AND READINESS:** Demonstrates capacity and readiness for efforts to be managed and completed in timely, accountable, and effective manner.
 - Does organization or project manager appear capable of carrying out what they propose to do? Does the proposed project seem ready to go? Do proposers seem "ready, willing, and able" to carry out the project as proposed? For example, have construction projects considered permitting needs? Have land acquisition projects conducted any pre-acquisition work that is consistent with DNR land acquisition procedures?
10. **LEVERAGE:** Leverages collaborative partnerships and additional efforts, resources, and non-state dollars.
 - Are there partners involved and are the right partners involved? Are there additional non-state dollars or significant in-kind services being brought to the table? Would funding of project generate match dollars? Would match dollars be non-state?