



# LCCMR 2024 Strategic Planning: LCCMR Goals and Strategies

June 26, 2024



# Strategic Planning Focus

---



- Communications and Outreach
- Proposal Solicitation, Review, and Recommendation Process

# Current Process

---



	<b>Approximate Timing</b>
RFP Approval by Commission	December (Year 0)
RFP Issued	January (Year 1)
Draft Proposal Consultation (Optional)	January – March (Year 1)
RFP Close/Proposals Submitted	March (Year 1)
Staff Evaluation and Scoring	April (Year 1)
Member Evaluation and Selection for Presentation	May/June (Year 1)
Proposal Presentations	June (Year 1)
Member Recommendation for Funding	July/August (Year 1)
Peer Review, Draft Work Plan Development, Legislative Bill Drafted, Commission Approval of Legislative Bill	August – December (Year 1)
Legislative Consideration of Bill	January – May (Year 2)
Work Plan Approval by Commission	June (Year 2)
Projects Begin	July (Year 2)

# RFP Outreach Efforts

---



- Initial announcement that includes press release, emails to listservs, social media, etc.
- Targeted outreach after release to stakeholders, partners, interested parties, and others.
- Ongoing announcements via social media, weekly updates, and more.
- Presentations, webinars, etc., when possible.

# Current LCCMR Evaluation Criteria

---



- **Funding Priorities:** Responds to RFP funding priorities.
- **Multiple Benefits:** Delivers multiple benefits to Minnesota's environment and natural resources.
- **Outcomes:** Identifies clear objectives likely to result in measurable, demonstrated, and meaningful outcomes.
- **Knowledge Base:** Contributes to the knowledge base or disseminates information that will benefit other efforts.
- **Extent of Impact:** Results in broad, long-term impacts of statewide, regional, or local significance.
- **Innovation:** Employs or demonstrates innovative approaches to more effectively and efficiently solve specific environment and natural resources issues.
- **Scientific/Technical Basis:** Reflects current scientific and technical knowledge, standards, and best practices.
- **Urgency:** Addresses an issue for which immediate future action is urgent and critical to avoid undesirable consequences.
- **Capacity and Readiness:** Demonstrates capacity and readiness for efforts to be managed and completed in timely, accountable, and effective manner.
- **Leverage:** Leverages collaborative partnerships and additional efforts, resources, and non-state funds.

# How did the subject matter experts feel about the LCCMR process?



	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Average
LCCMR staff are helpful and easy to work with.	49%	36%	13%	2%	0%	<b>1.68</b>
The LCCMR does a good job in notifying potential applicants that funding is available.	41%	35%	15%	8%	1%	<b>1.92</b>
It is clear what projects are eligible for funding from the ENRTF.	26%	53%	13%	6%	1%	<b>2.03</b>
Completing and submitting a proposal to the LCCMR is reasonably simple and straightforward.	28%	46%	16%	8%	2%	<b>2.09</b>
Once funded, project reporting requirements are clear and straightforward.	26%	42%	26%	5%	1%	<b>2.14</b>
The LCCMR's process from proposal submission to fund availability is timely and efficient.	17%	42%	22%	15%	5%	<b>2.5</b>
The LCCMR process for recommending funding from the ENRTF is fair and transparent.	10%	30%	37%	15%	7%	<b>2.78</b>
It is clear how the LCCMR evaluates and selects projects to recommend for funding.	10%	33%	30%	21%	6%	<b>2.8</b>

# The LCCMR does a good job in notifying potential applicants that funding is available.



	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Average
<b>Applied for Funds</b>						
Yes	46%	35%	11%	7%	1%	<b>1.82</b>
No	8%	38%	42%	13%	0%	<b>2.58</b>
<b>Received Funds</b>						
Yes	52%	34%	10%	3%	1%	<b>1.67</b>
No	18%	34%	25%	21%	2%	<b>2.55</b>
<b>Affiliation</b>						
Academic	57%	30%	7%	5%	1%	<b>1.64</b>
Local Government	43%	40%	11%	6%	0%	<b>1.80</b>
State Government	37%	41%	20%	2%	0%	<b>1.88</b>
Non-Profit	31%	35%	18%	12%	3%	<b>2.22</b>

# It is clear what projects are eligible for funding from the ENRTF.



	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Average
<b>Applied for Funds</b>						
Yes	29%	54%	11%	5%	1%	<b>1.96</b>
No	9%	48%	22%	17%	4%	<b>2.61</b>
<b>Received Funds</b>						
Yes	32%	54%	9%	4%	1%	<b>1.87</b>
No	13%	49%	20%	15%	4%	<b>2.47</b>
<b>Affiliation</b>						
Academic	35%	49%	10%	6%	0%	<b>1.87</b>
Local Government	37%	43%	11%	9%	0%	<b>1.91</b>
State Government	20%	59%	17%	5%	0%	<b>2.07</b>
Non-Profit	17%	60%	12%	6%	5%	<b>2.22</b>



# Completing and submitting a proposal to the LCCMR is reasonably simple and straightforward.



	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Average
<b>Applied for Funds</b>						
Yes	31%	46%	14%	8%	2%	<b>2.04</b>
No	11%	53%	26%	11%	0%	<b>2.37</b>
<b>Received Funds</b>						
Yes	35%	46%	11%	8%	1%	<b>1.95</b>
No	15%	45%	26%	9%	4%	<b>2.42</b>
<b>Affiliation</b>						
Academic	48%	42%	4%	5%	1%	<b>1.69</b>
Local Government	29%	37%	23%	9%	3%	<b>2.20</b>
Non-Profit	11%	54%	30%	3%	2%	<b>2.30</b>
State Government	20%	48%	10%	20%	3%	<b>2.38</b>

# It is clear how the LCCMR evaluates and selects projects to recommend for funding.



	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Average
<b>Applied for Funds</b>						
Yes	11%	32%	30%	21%	6%	<b>2.80</b>
No	0%	42%	37%	21%	0%	<b>2.79</b>
<b>Received Funds</b>						
Yes	12%	31%	31%	20%	6%	<b>2.77</b>
No	6%	37%	27%	25%	6%	<b>2.88</b>
<b>Affiliation</b>						
Local Government	17%	34%	23%	23%	3%	<b>2.60</b>
State Government	5%	41%	39%	12%	2%	<b>2.66</b>
Non-Profit	6%	32%	34%	23%	5%	<b>2.87</b>
Academic	13%	29%	26%	24%	9%	<b>2.88</b>

# The LCCMR process for recommending funding from the ENRTF is fair and transparent.



	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Average
<b>Applied for Funds</b>						
Yes	10%	31%	35%	16%	8%	<b>2.80</b>
No	11%	26%	58%	5%	0%	<b>2.58</b>
<b>Received Funds</b>						
Yes	12%	30%	36%	14%	8%	<b>2.75</b>
No	6%	29%	37%	22%	6%	<b>2.92</b>
<b>Affiliation</b>						
State Government	10%	41%	33%	10%	5%	<b>2.58</b>
Local Government	17%	26%	34%	23%	0%	<b>2.62</b>
Academic	12%	31%	31%	14%	12%	<b>2.82</b>
Non-Profit	5%	27%	46%	16%	6%	<b>2.92</b>

# LCCMR staff are helpful and easy to work with.



	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Average
<b>Applied for Funds</b>						
Yes	51%	35%	11%	3%	0%	<b>1.65</b>
No	40%	40%	20%	0%	0%	<b>1.8</b>
<b>Received Funds</b>						
Yes	57%	34%	7%	2%	0%	<b>1.54</b>
No	37%	39%	20%	4%	0%	<b>1.9</b>
<b>Affiliation</b>						
Academic	58%	34%	7%	1%	0%	<b>1.51</b>
Local Government	56%	26%	15%	3%	0%	<b>1.65</b>
State Government	49%	35%	14%	3%	0%	<b>1.7</b>
Non-Profit	35%	47%	17%	2%	0%	<b>1.85</b>

# The LCCMR's process from proposal submission to fund availability is timely and efficient.



	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Average
<b>Applied for Funds</b>						
Yes	17%	43%	19%	16%	6%	<b>2.49</b>
No	13%	25%	56%	6%	0%	<b>2.56</b>
<b>Received Funds</b>						
Yes	19%	44%	17%	15%	4%	<b>2.41</b>
No	11%	31%	36%	13%	9%	<b>2.78</b>
<b>Affiliation</b>						
Local Government	21%	52%	21%	0%	6%	<b>2.18</b>
State Government	16%	53%	21%	11%	0%	<b>2.26</b>
Academic	21%	41%	19%	15%	4%	<b>2.41</b>
Non-Profit	10%	38%	22%	21%	9%	<b>2.79</b>

# Once funded, project reporting requirements are clear and straightforward.



	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Average
<b>Received Funds</b>						
Yes	30%	45%	18%	5%	1%	<b>2.03</b>
<b>Affiliation</b>						
Academic	37%	45%	12%	3%	3%	<b>1.91</b>
Local Government	28%	52%	20%	0%	0%	<b>1.92</b>
State Government	27%	46%	16%	11%	0%	<b>2.11</b>
Non-Profit	12%	36%	46%	6%	0%	<b>2.46</b>

# Where We Are

---



## Completed

- Vision and Mission Statement
- ENRTF Goals

## In Progress:

- ENRTF Strategies
- LCCMR Goals and Strategies

## Upcoming:

- Measurable Outcomes
- 2026 RFP