

Legislative-Citizen Commission on Minnesota Resources

MEMO: Agenda Item #8 and #10

DATE: June 11, 2025

SUBJECT: Proposal evaluation and recommendation process - Part 2

Summary

At the April 28 LCCMR meeting, the commission agreed on how it wanted staff to present its scores and the commission's approach for Evaluation #1 and the selection of proposals for presentation. Members received proposals for evaluation in early May. Before presentations and the second round of evaluations begin, the commission needs to confirm the remainder of the evaluation and recommendation process it wishes to use for the 2026 RFP cycle.

As a reminder, the evaluation and recommendation process includes the following steps:

1. Staff review all proposals for completeness and eligibility issues and score all proposals.
2. Commission members evaluate all proposals (Evaluation #1).
3. The commission selects proposals for further consideration based on the results from Evaluation #1 (First Cut).
4. Selected proposals present before the commission.
5. Commission members provide additional evaluation (Evaluation #2).
6. The commission selects proposals for recommendation to the Legislature based on the results from Evaluation #2 (Second Cut).

This memo describes in more detail the process from proposal presentations through commission recommendations. Staff request the commission take three actions today as described below.

Action #1: Presentations Format and Timing

The commission needs to confirm – or specify any modifications to – the following plan for presentations.

Presentations will be held via Zoom for presenters to save time, provide flexibility, and make participation easier for proposers. Members would have the option to attend in person or remotely; however, the chair would be in-person. Six members (including the chair) would need to attend in person for the meeting to be hybrid.

To avoid technical issues and reduce transition times, no PowerPoints will be used. Presentations will be 15 minutes each: 5 minutes for presentation and 10 minutes for questions and answers, with discretion to go over this time allotment if needed, especially for proposals requesting over \$1 million. 30-minute lunch breaks will be provided. This would allow for up to 30 presentations per day.

Six days are currently reserved for presentations; the exact timing and schedule of presentations will be determined once we know how many presentations will take place. Last year, 5 presentation days were used.

Legislative-Citizen Commission on Minnesota Resources

Possible modification: For the 2025 RFP cycle, the commission reduced the presentation time to 8 minutes for small projects selected by 6 or more members in Evaluation #1. If members would like to reduce the presentation time for certain proposals, staff would recommend reducing them to 10 minutes: 5 minutes for presentation and 5 minutes for questions and answers.

Sample motion: Member _____ moves to adopt the presentation format and timing as described in the staff memo [optional: , but with reduced presentation times for the following proposals: ...].

Action #2: Evaluation #2 and Compiled Results

Prior to presentations, the commission needs to confirm – or specify any modifications to – the following process and conditions for conducting Evaluation #2 and compiling those results.

For Evaluation #2, each member allocates the available ENRTF dollars to their proposals of choice, using the LCCMR-adopted evaluation criteria. Allocating funds to a proposal indicates that the member is supporting funding for that proposal and the funding level they believe is appropriate for that proposal. When a member has allocated all the funds available, their evaluation is complete. The following conditions apply to Evaluation #2:

1. No more than the requested amount may be allocated to a proposal.
2. Only the full requested amount may be allocated to a proposal in Category G (Small Projects; proposals for \$300,000 or less).
3. Allocations for all other proposals may not be less than \$300,000. That is, no proposal requesting more than \$300,000 may be allocated funds at a level less than \$300,000.
4. There will be a \$50,000 buffer for mistakes made during the allocation process. If the buffer is not needed in the end, the commission may either allocate it to another proposal or it will be allocated to the Emerging Issues Account.
5. Allocations will be rounded to the nearest \$1,000.
6. Members may allocate available ENRTF dollars to the Emerging Issues Account or to Legislative Direction (i.e., ENRTF dollars for the Legislature to solely determine how to appropriate).
7. Members may also leave funds unallocated.
8. The LCCMR administrative budget (if applicable), LCC Legacy Website, and DNR Contract will be included in the recommendations at the requested amount.

Staff compile members' Evaluation #2 results into a report to be used for allocation decisions. The compiled results show the number of members allocating funds to a proposal and the average amount

Legislative-Citizen Commission on Minnesota Resources

allocated *by those allocating funds to that proposal* (note: blanks/non-allocations will not be included in the allocation average calculation). In other words, if a proposal receives a funding allocation from a member, it is considered support for funding by that member. The proposals will be ranked high to low according to the number of members supporting funding. An example of the results from last year's process is attached.

Sample motion: Member _____ moves to adopt the Evaluation #2 and results compilation process as described in the staff memo.

Action #3: Initial Agreement on Recommendations

Prior to presentations, the commission needs to confirm – or specify any modifications to – the following process and conditions for using the results of Evaluation #2 to develop an initial agreement on recommendations.

An initial agreement on a recommendation package will be created by going down the list of compiled Evaluation #2 results, ranked high to low, until the total amount available for appropriation is “spent” based on the average allocation amounts. In the event of funds running out in the middle of a proposal or in the middle of a group of proposals supported by an equal number of members, the cut-off will be handled the same way as at the “selections” step associated with Evaluation #1, where the tied proposals will all be included or all be excluded, whichever results in an initial agreement closest to the total amount available. This may result in an over- or under-allocation.

In the event of an over- or under-allocation resulting from the initial agreement, staff will provide some options for member consideration at the allocations meeting once the results of the initial agreement are available.

Sample motion: Member _____ moves to adopt the process for achieving an initial agreement on recommendations as described in the staff memo.

Attachment