

Conservation Partners Legacy Grants - Online Applications

Jamie Gangaware

Admin

[List Applications](#)

[Summary Spreadsheet](#)

[Log Out](#)

☒ Project Summary ☐ Project Info ☐ Site Info ☐ Budget Info ☐ Review & Approval ☐ Additional Info ☐ Application Submission

Project Summary

Project Name and Contact

Project Name:	Pelican Lake SE MWA - USFWS Wetland Restoration	Project Manager:	Brad Nylin
		Title:	Executive Director
Organization Name:	MN Waterfowl Association	Phone:	952-767-0320
		Email:	brad.nylin@mnwaterfowl.com
Organization Type:	Non-Profit		
Mailing Address 1:	901 First Street North		
Mailing Address 2:			
City:	Hopkins		
State:	MN		
Zip Code:	55343		

Project Location Summary

Primary County:	Wright	Secondary Land
Nearest City:	St. Michael, MN	Ownerships:
Project Site Name:	Pelican Lake SE WPA	
Primary Land Ownership:	Federal	

Project Activity Summary

Primary Activity:	Restoration	Primary Habitat Type:	Wetland
Additional Activities:		Additional Habitats:	Fish, Game or Wildlife Habitat
Total Project Sites:	1		
Total Project Acres:	4		

Project Funding Summary

Total Grant Amount	\$7,000
Requested:	
Total Match Amount	\$1,000
Pledged:	
Additional Funding:	
Total Project Cost:	\$8,000
Estimated Project	2011-08-05
Completion Date:	

Summary

The 510 acre Pelican Lake East WPA is located on Pelican Lake, a designated wildlife lake in eastern Wright County. The south unit of the WPA is crossed by a tileline that drains the cropland to the east, and part of the WPA into Pelican Lake. The proposed project would replace the existing tile with non-perforated tile to maintain the neighbors drainage, and prevent drainage of the wetland proposed to be restored on the WPA. In addition, two earthen dams would be constructed to enhance water holding capacity of the restored wetland basin. This will create additional waterfowl breeding pair habitat next to Pelican Lake.

Problem Statement

Pelican Lake provides waterfowl with a much needed migration and brood water habitat. In recent years, the USFWS, MNDNR and some private landholders have planted grasslands and provided

nesting habitat. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service now owns and manages over 1300 acres around Pelican Lake and the MN Department of Natural Resources Just finished another WMA acquisition bringing its land holding around Pelican Lake to over 500 acres. Most of the Private land around Pelican Lake is cropped and has been drained by tile and ditches into the lake, so there are few small wetlands to provide breeding pair habitat for waterfowl. The USFWS has restored several small wetlands, but more are needed. This project will provide critical breeding pair habitat in great nesting habitat near the open water and food source of Pelican Lake. Another issue pertaining to this project is the tileline. It needs replacement. There are at least three blowouts on the WPA which are safety hazards to the public and create sedimentation in Pelican lake. This year the Litchfield FWS office received a call from the neighbor whose land is drained by this tile stating that he had water standing in his cornfield. He has the right to replace it. It would be good to get this project completed in a way beneficial to wildlife before he decides to do repairs on the old tile.

Project Objectives

Ultimately, this project will result in a 4 acre wetland restoration/enhancement with humans and wildlife benefiting. Resident and migratory wildlife will utilize the new wetland habitat. A limiting factor to breeding waterfowl populations is the limited breeding pair habitat of the area. Additional small wetlands should increase breeding pair numbers. The neighbors will benefit (one will get a new tile for agricultural drainage and another will have a drier basement because of the tile) and the public will benefit from improved hunting and the removal of a safety hazard (the tile blowouts).

Methods

It would be helpful to the reader of this narrative to have a map of the project in hand as a reference. The project will begin with the installation of 1000 feet of 8 inch, non-perforated, plastic tile attached to a 10 foot by 10 inch spiral steel culvert outlet. The new tile will then be attached to the existing tile at a point about 150 feet from the road (attachment at the road, the normal procedure, would cause the wetland directly to the S to rise and make worse the neighbor's basement water problem now alleviated by that 150 feet of tile). This part of the project will be contracted out by lowest bid to a local company who operates a tile machine. The old tile will be removed when the new tile is installed. The next part of the project involves the building of two earthen dikes, each under 300 feet in length and only a few feet high. These will be built using bulldozers. After scraping off the topsoil, the dozers will push up mineral soil from the edges of the basin to build the dikes. After shaping and finishing off the earthwork, the topsoil will be spread on the face of the dike. The last part of this project will be seeding the dikes, tilebreaks and any other disturbances. This part of the project will be completed by the USFWS. The USFWS will be responsible for the long-term monitoring and maintenance of the project.

Project Timeline

Time Frame	Goal
July 2011	Install new tile and remove old tile.
July 2011	Build 2 earthen dams
July 2011	Seed earthen dams and other disturbances

Identify short and long term maintenance and management work required to sustain this project and source(s) of funding

Work needed	Who is responsible	Funding source
Periodic inspection and repair of earthen dams	USFWS	USFWS
Monitor tile functionality	USFWS, Neighbor	USFWS, Neighbor

Conservation Partners Legacy Grants - Online Applications


Jamie Gangaware

Admin

[List Applications](#)


[Summary Spreadsheet](#)


[Log Out](#)


 Project Summary


 Project Info

 Site Info

 Budget Info

 Review & Approval

 Additional Info

 Application Submission

Project Information

Answer each of the following questions in 1000 characters or less; descriptions/definitions are available in the [Criteria and Scoring Table](#).

1. Describe the local support for this project.

The local chapter (Pelican Lake Chapter) of the Minnesota Waterfowl Association and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service supports this project. This plan has been discussed with the landowners that are experiencing flooding to their crop field and basement and each support the project. No opposition is anticipated.

2. Describe the degree of collaboration for this project.

This restoration/enhancement effort will be accomplished through collaboration with the Minnesota Waterfowl Association and the FWS. The MWA will coordinate bidding efforts to hire the contractor to replace the tile and construct the dikes. Two adjacent landowners are supportive of the project as it will resolve drainage issues they are experiencing. The Wright County commissioners have been very supportive of any efforts to improve the conditions for both people and wildlife on Pelican Lake.

3. Describe any urgency associated with this project.

The primary urgency of this project is related to the following issues: 1. The existing tile line is not functioning well and this is resulting in poor drainage to the neighbors field. The neighbor has the right to repair and replace the tile. If he was to do this, it would be more difficult to complete this project as the FWS would need approval from him to manipulate the new tile. He has been informed of this project and fully supports it and has agreed to wait on plans to repair the tile. 2. The current tile blowouts have created holes on the WPA which continue to cave in. These holes are creating two problems. First, these holes are a safety hazard to the public that use the WPA. Several calls have been received from hunters reporting the holes. Second, as the holes erode the soil going into the tile ultimately ends up in Pelican Lake.

4. Discuss if there are multiple benefits resulting from your project, identifying those species, habitats, etc.

There are several benefits to the proposed project including: 1. Additional waterfowl breeding pair habitat will be created by the restored wetland which will increase breeding pair densities of the area. 2. Additional water will be held on the landscape. Pelican Lake has been experiencing very high water levels in recent years and this has resulted in degraded waterfowl and waterbird habitat. Any water held on the land and not allowed to drain into Pelican Lake will be beneficial. 3. There will be reduced siltation and nutrient flow into Pelican Lake. 4. Public use opportunities on the WPA will be improved. 5. The relationship between the Public agencies and the private neighbors will be improved which can open doors for additional opportunities in the future. 6. Generally speaking, the restoration/creation of wetlands will benefit all wetland dependant species in the area.

5. Discuss the habitat benefits resulting from your project.

As a general statement, all wetland dependant species will benefit from this project. Specifically, a limiting factor for waterfowl around Pelican Lake is a lack of small wetlands that provide additional breeding pair habitat. This project will provide excellent breeding pair habitat and therefore increase waterfowl production potential of the Pelican Lake complex. A more indirect impact of the project is the reduction of runoff into Pelican Lake. Pelican Lake in recent years suffers from too much water, phosphorus, and nitrogen. While the restoration of this 4 acre wetland only addresses this issue in a small way, it is another piece in the puzzle to solve the problems in Pelican Lake.

6. Describe how your project is consistent with sound conservation science.

This project results in restoration of a wetland. This provides the following benefits; restoring wetland habitat, flood control, water quality improvement, and ground water recharge. Minnesota has lost 95% of its prairie wetlands to drainage. Every attempt should be made to restore Minnesota's wetlands.

7. Indicate if your project is adjacent to protected lands, describing those lands (ownership, public access, etc.)

The importance of Pelican Lake for wetland dependant wildlife and public use opportunities really came to light about 6 years ago. At that time the USFWS and MNDNR ramped up efforts to protect and restore the lake. Part of this effort included emphasis on land acquisition by the agencies. As of September of 2010 the MNDNR and USFWS are up to 2048 acres of public land purchased within one mile of Pelican Lake. The USFWS owns 1381 acres of WPAs and the MNDNR owns 667 acres of WMAs. Each agency is continuing this effort with several more properties in various stages of land acquisition.

8. Discuss if there is full funding secured for this project and the sources of funding.

Based on recent estimates, the funding requested will accomplish the project. If estimates come in higher than anticipated the project will be completed as the USFWS has the equipment and personnel to construct the proposed dikes.

9. Discuss if CPL Grant funds will supplement or supplant existing funding. Discuss how these CPL funds will impact your organization's current budget.

This project will supplement existing funding. This project will not effect our existing budget, as this will be paid for by our local chapter. Our chapters are in charge of how they spend their habitat funds.

10. Describe public access at project site for hunting and fishing, identifying all open seasons.

The WPA is open to hunting, fishing, and trapping according to state and federal regulations. The primary restrictions to public use on the WPA are that no vehicular use is allowed, nontoxic shot is required, and dogs must be under control at all times except in the course of hunting.

11. Describe the sustainability of your project.

The sustainability of the project is excellent. Once the perforated tile is replaced with non-perforated tile there should be no further issues with the tile. Non-perforated tile rarely fails as it is not susceptible to plugging due to tree roots. The dikes that will be constructed will be low profile with gentle slopes and will not be susceptible to muskrat damage. The habitat around the restored wetland is an excellent seeding of native grass and forbs and easy to burn. The USFWS has this WPA in a rotational burning program.

12. Discuss use of native vegetation (if applicable).

Very little native vegetation will be needed for restoration in this project. The disturbed sites will be small and these will be seeded to a mix of native grasses and forbs similar to the existing vegetation. Wetland vegetation will come on its own. The seed source is still present.

13. Discuss your budget and why it is cost effective.

The work will be placed on bid to local contractors. The best value based on these bids will be selected.

14. Describe your organization's ability to successfully complete this work, including experience in the area of interest and ability to successfully implement the proposed project. Include descriptions of your most recent grant experience and if the expected outcomes were achieved.

The local chapter (Pelican Lake Chapter) and the state office of Minnesota Waterfowl Association has an excellent history of working with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on Pelican Lake. Our organization has assisted with land acquisition, upland restoration, wetland restoration and maintenance of nesting structures on WPAs on Pelican Lake. The Pelican Lake MWA chapter has entered into an "Adopt-A-WPA" agreement with the USFWS which requires us to conduct regular cleanup of the parking lots on WPAs on Pelican Lake. There is an excellent relationship between MWA and FWS on Pelican Lake

issues.

15. Discuss how your project supports landscape level plans. Use additional sources for information if needed or available.

The proposed activity meets management criteria for wetland and wetland dependant wildlife improvement as stated in the Prairie Pothole Joint Venture Plan, Minnesota State Wildlife Action Plan, and Minnesota's Wetlands Conservation Plan.

16. Discuss how your project supports species plans. Use additional sources for information if needed or available.

This project conforms to approved practices in Minnesota's Long-Range Duck Recovery Plan and a Vision for Wildlife and Its Use-Goals and Outcomes 2006-2112. The species that would likely received the greatest benefit would be wetland dependant species especially waterfowl and wading birds.

17. Discuss how your project conforms to the Statewide Conservation and Preservation Plan.

The proposal meets all five Priority Conservation Actions identified for native prairie habitats in the Minnesota River Prairie Subsection. The project enhances and improves our natural resources. Enhanced upland habitat quality will benefit threatened and endangered species, as well as resident wildlife. This project fulfills the Statewide Conservation and Preservation Plans' HR 1 (Protect priority land habitats) and HR 5 (Restore land, wetlands, and wetland-associated watersheds).

18. Discuss how your project conforms to the State Wildlife Action Plan (if applicable).

One hundred and twenty-one Species in Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) are known to occur in this subsection and 34 of them are directly linked to non-forested wetland habitat. This proposal is to restore non-forested wetland habitat which will not only directly benefit species dependant on this habitat but due to the proximity of the wetland to Pelican Lake, many of the species dependant on shallow lake habitat will benefit also.

Conservation Partners Legacy Grants - Online Applications


Jamie Gangaware


Admin

[List Applications](#)


[Summary Spreadsheet](#)

[Log Out](#)


 Project Summary


 Project Info

 **Site Info**

 Budget Info

 Review & Approval

 Additional Info

 Application Submission

Site Information

*you may group your project sites together as long as land ownership, activity and habitat information is the same for the land manager

Land Manager



Name:	Scott S. Glup	Phone:	320-693-2849
Organization:	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Email:	scott_glup@fws.gov
Title:	Project Leader		


Site Information

Land Ownership:	Federal	Acres:	4
Site Name(s):	Pelican Lake East Waterfowl Production Area	Click here to View Site Map	
Activity:	Restoration		
Habitat:	Wetland		



Legend

-  FY2011 CPL Project Site
-  USFWS Waterfowl Production Areas



CPL FY11-082
Pelican Lake SE FWS Wetland Restoration
Minnesota Waterfowl Association
Wright County
LSOHC Metro Urbanizing Area
Planning Section



Conservation Partners Legacy Grants - Online Applications

[Jamie Gangaware](#)[Admin](#)[List Applications](#)[Summary Spreadsheet](#)[Log Out](#)[Project Summary](#)[Project Info](#)[Site Info](#)[Budget Info](#)[Review & Approval](#)[Additional Info](#)[Application Submission](#)

Budget Information

Organization's Fiscal Contact Information

Name:	Brad Nylin	Street Address 1:	901 First Street N.
Title:	Executive Director	Street Address 2:	
Email:	brad.nylin@mnwaterfowl.com	City:	Hopkins
Phone:	952-767-0320	State:	MN
		Zip Code:	55343

Budget Subtotals

Budget Item	Grant	Match	Total		
Personnel					
Contracts	\$7,000	\$1,000	\$8,000		
Fee Acquisition with PILT					
Fee Acquisition without PILT					
Easement Acquisition					
Easement Stewardship				In-kind Total	Cash Total
Travel (in-state)				\$0	\$1,000
Professional Services					
DNR Land Acquisition Cost					
Equipment/Tools/Supplies					
Additional Budget Items					
Total:	\$7,000	\$1,000	\$8,000		

Details

Contracts

Contractor Name	Contracted Work	Amount	Grant/Match	In-kind/Cash
To be determined.	Replace tile and build dikes	\$7,000	Grant	
To be determined.	Replace tile and build dikes.	\$1,000	Match	Cash
Totals	Grant: \$7,000 Match: \$1,000	Total: \$8,000		

Conservation Partners Legacy Grants - Online Applications

Jamie Gangaware

Admin

[List Applications](#)

[Summary Spreadsheet](#)

[Log Out](#)



Project Summary



Project Info



Site Info



Budget Info



Review & Approval



Additional Info



Application Submission

Project Review and Approval

A Project Review and Approval Form must be completed by each Land Manager named within the Site Info tab and Land Managers only need to complete one form for all sites they manage. Submitting this form fulfills the following requirements:

- Provides the results of the Natural Heritage Database Review,
- Allows for technical review of the project by the Land Manager, and
- Verifies that the public agency approves the work to be done (or acquisition) on land they manage.

You, as the applicant, are responsible for meeting with the Land Manager and receiving a completed Project Review and Approval Form. This form must contain an original signature from the Land Manager and you must upload it below as a PDF.

Each project will require at least one Project Review and Approval form. You may attach up to 4 forms on this page, but if you need more room you may attach up to three more on the "Additional Info" tab. If your project is working under 3 Land Managers, you must receive and submit a form from each manager.

No late Project Review and Approval Forms will be accepted. Applications lacking any necessary approval forms will be deemed incomplete and not considered for funding.

Answer the following questions, then attach the form(s)

No **Natural Heritage** elements were found within my project site(s):

Project Review and Approval Forms

Uploaded Form 1

CPL Project Review and Approval Form

REVIEWER INFORMATION:

Land manager/ easement holder name:
Agency:
Title:
Phone:
Email:

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Project Name:
Contact Person:
Organization:
Email:

Please check the appropriate boxes:

- ☒ I have read the application and discussed this proposed project with the above listed Organization Contact Person.
☐ For work on easements, the private landowner has been contacted and has given support and approval for this project.

I have performed a Natural Heritage Database review and found:

- ☒ this project to have no features within one mile.
☐ this project to have features within one mile, but project is not likely to adversely affect those features. I have listed the features below and recommended the following minimization strategy:

- ☐ this project is likely to adversely affect Natural Heritage features. I feel that this project is important and should be forwarded to DNR Ecological Resources staff for further review.

- ☐ I do not have access to the Natural Features database and will forward this completed form to DNR by Friday, August 27th 2010 to CPL Staff at LSCLGrants.DNR@state.mn.us to complete the Natural Heritage Review.

I have discussed what role my office will be expected to have in this project and find that the project, as described will require:

- ☐ minimal or no involvement from my office for completion.
☒ a commitment of involvement by staff that is reasonable and can be accomplished with current staffing levels and workload.
☐ an amount of staff involvement that cannot be committed during the project time period with current staffing levels. Unless additional staffing can be committed from other offices, Divisions or appropriate partners, I feel this project cannot be completed within the project timeline to our desired standards.

- ☒ I have discussed permits and applications that the applicant may be responsible for using the Working on DNR Lands and Working on Public Lands, or Working on Private Lands documents.

CPL Project Review and Approval Form

For Acquisitions Only:

- ☐ This project is for an acquisition to be transferred to a public agency by applicant:
- ☐ I have discussed any required Initial Development (facilities, habitat, etc.) work that is required before the transfer with the applicant.
 - ☐ I have discussed all applicable costs of those developments and what party is responsible for those costs.

Complete the following cost tables (required work to bring to agency standards).

Habitat Development	# Acres	Cost/ Acre	Total	Funding Source	Applicant is responsible for:
Prairie Grassland					Choose
Forest/ Woody Cover					Choose
Wetland					Choose
Totals					

Facility Development	Cost	Funding Source	Applicant is responsible for:
Boundary Survey			Choose
Posting/ Fencing			Choose
Wood Routed Sign			Choose
Access Roads and Trails			Choose
User Facilities, Access, Parking Lots			Choose
Well Sealing/ Site Clean-up			Choose
Total			

Upon final review of this project:

- ☒ I find this project to be consistent with sound conservation science. This work will benefit area fish, game and wildlife by restoring, enhancing or protecting forests, wetlands, prairies and habitat and is consistent with the management or stewardship plan for this land. (APPROVAL)
- ☐ I find that this project does not follow the management or stewardship plan for this land and does not fit within the long range goals for this land at this time on the local level. (DECLINE)
- ☐ I find that this project should be sent up to a higher level within the agency for further review and decision. I have forwarded the Project Planning Form and this Review and Approval Form for further review to:

Name: Scott S. Glup	Phone: 320-693-2849
---------------------	---------------------

☒ By checking this box and signing my name below I certify that I have met with the above applicant and discussed the proposed project and have provided feedback to the applicant. I understand I must provide this document as a PDF with my original signature on it to the applicant to submit a complete application.

Name:

Scott S. Glup

Date:

9-15-2010

Comments:

Conservation Partners Legacy Grants - Online Applications


Jamie Gangaware

Admin

[List Applications](#)


[Summary Spreadsheet](#)

[Log Out](#)

 Project Summary


 Project Info

 Site Info

 Budget Info

 Review & Approval

 **Additional Info**

 Application Submission

Additional Information

List any additional details about your project here. Include your organization's history or charter to receive private contributions for local conservation or habitat projects. This is not required.

Minnesota Waterfowl Association is a 501C-3 organization dedicated to waterfowl. Our mission is: The Minnesota Waterfowl Association is dedicated to the preservation, protection and enhancement of Minnesota's wetlands, related waterfowl habitat, and our hunting heritage". The MWA was started in 1967 by people that were concerned about the declining waterfowl numbers in Minnesota. Since the MWA was started we have been involved with on the ground habitat projects all across the state, to try and make a difference on the landscape. MWA is dedicated to waterfowl conservation and will continue making a difference for the future.

Supplemental Documents

If you / your project does not need to upload any of these documents, you may leave these upload boxes empty.

Upload additional information here, limited to Partner Commitment Letters, Letters of Support, Easement information, etc. You may email easement information only if it exceeds size limit while trying to submit the application; all other supporting documentation must be uploaded. Reference CPL Application # and name when emailing (provided upon application submission) or your email will be returned. Send emails to

LSCPLGrants.DNR@state.mn.us

Conservation Partners Legacy Grants - Online Applications


Jamie Gangaware

Admin

[List Applications](#)


[Summary Spreadsheet](#)

[Log Out](#)


 Project Summary

 Project Info

 Site Info

 Budget Info

 Review & Approval

 Additional Info

 Application Submission

Final Application Submission

This completes your CPL Grant Application. Please take the time to revisit the previous sections and make sure you have entered everything completely and correctly. Once you hit the submit button below, you will not be able to return to this application to make changes.

I certify that I have read the Conservation Partners Legacy Grants Program Request for Proposal, Program Manual and other program documents, and have discussed this project with the appropriate public land manager, or private landowner and easement holder.

I certify I am authorized to apply for and manage these grant and match funds, and the project work by the organization or agency listed below. I certify this organization to have the financial capability to compete this project and that it will comply with all applicable laws and regulations.

I certify that all of the information contained in the application is correct as of the time of the submission. If anything should change, I will contact CPL Grant Staff immediately to make corrections.

I certify that if funded I will give consideration to and make timely written contact to Minnesota Conservation Corps or its successor for consideration of possible use of their services to contract for restoration and enhancement services. I will provide CPL staff a copy of that written contact within 10 days after the execution of my grant, should I be awarded.

I certify that I am aware at least one Project Review and Approval form is required for every application and I must submit all completed forms by uploading them into this application. I have attached one form as necessary for each different Land Manager within my project.

I am aware that by typing my name in the box below, I am applying my signature to this online document.

Signature:

Bradley D. Nylin

Organization / Agency:

**Minnesota Waterfowl
Association**

Title:

Executive Director

Date:

2010-09-16

Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program
FY2011 Technical Review Comments and Scoring, Regional and Divisional Directors Comments

Proj ID	Organization Name	Project Name	Technical Review Committee Scoring Comments		Amount Requested	Score	Technical Review Committee Final Rank	Comments	Regional Comments	Meets Regional Plan?	Rank	Region	Division Director's Comments
82	MN Waterfowl Association	Pelican Lake SE MWA-USFWS Wetland Restoration	Nice map. Good project, in a good project/complex area. Good landowner relationships there too.		\$7,000	152	Curious to know what is expected in results--water level, vegetation. #3 recommended, wetland committee	Critical timing and key parcel to preserving water retention strategies outlined in restoration plan. Low cost to ensure current plan strategies can be implemented. Rank #2/ 12	Y	H	3	Good project, becoming an important complex.	
<div>8)Adjacent to Protected Lands9)Full Funding of Project10)Supplants Existing Funding11)Public Access for Hunting and Fishing12)Sustainability</div>													
		1)Amount of Habitat	2)Local Support	3)Degree of Collaboration	4)Urgency	5)Multiple Benefits	6)Habitat Benefits	7)Sound Conservation Science	8)Adjacent to Protected Lands	9)Full Funding of Project	10)Supplants Existing Funding	11)Public Access for Hunting and Fishing	12)Sustainability
		7.00	6.00	7.00	7.00	6.00	7.00	8.00	8.00	7.00	7.00	8.00	7.00
		6.00	7.00	8.00	6.00	8.00	7.00	8.00	7.00	8.00	8.00	10.00	7.00
		7.00	8.00	8.00	9.00	8.00	8.00	9.00	10.00	8.00	7.00	10.00	7.00
		7.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	9.00	8.00	8.00	10.00	9.00	7.00	10.00	9.00
		-	9.00	9.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	10.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00
AVERAGES	6.75	7.60	8.00	7.60	7.80	7.60	8.20	9.00	8.00	7.40	9.20	7.60	
TOTAL SCORE 152.30													
13)Use of Native Plant Materials		14)Budget and Cost Effectiveness	15)Capacity to Successfully Complete Work		16)Supports Existing Landscape Level Plans		17)Supports Species Plans	18)Conforms to Statewide Conservation and Preservation Plan		19)Conforms to State Wildlife Action Plan			
7.00		8.00	7.00		8.00		7.00	8.00		8.00			

7.00	9.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00
7.00	9.00	8.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00
8.00	9.00	10.00	8.00	9.00	8.00	9.00
5.00	-	10.00	8.00	8.00	10.00	8.00
6.80	8.75	8.60	8.20	8.20	8.60	8.40