

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
201	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Fresno County Public Hearing	Criteria should have minimum size for a new park. Don't want something so small that it is not useable. Require ¾ of an acre or 1 acre as a minimum size for a new park.	No change. New parks may be smaller than 3/4 of an acre and still result in useable recreation.
202	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Fresno County Public Hearing	7 points for a new recreation feature. 4 points for renovation. Renovation allows for "expanded use"- to me it is almost the same thing. The expansion part of a facility's renovation is "new". If you have a water feature- and you add new elements to the water feature- those additions are "new".	No change. In this example, the water feature already existed. So, renovation is an improvement to an existing facility. Technical assistance added: Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009.
203	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Fresno County Public Hearing	If you have a facility that is no longer useable- and you make it useable- clarify if that is a renovation or if you are creating a new recreation feature. (new facility)	Renovation is an improvement to an existing facility. Technical assistance added: Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009.
	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Fresno County Area, Letter	Improvements and/or rehabilitation of existing parks should not rank lower than creating new parks. Neighborhoods that this program is designed to target are usually densely developed and built out, so there is limited to no free space for new parks. This puts neighborhoods that are most in-need at a disadvantage. Leaving an older park in disrepair may	Prop. 84 legislation prioritizes the creation of new parks where none currently exist.

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
			lead to park closure, exacerbating the “park-poor” problem.	
204	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Stanislaus County Area, Letter	We support that preference for funding is given to develop new parks, expand existing parks or create new recreational opportunities or features.	Noted.
205	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Letter	<p>Outside of the two eligibility criteria described above, we believe this to be the most critical to ensuring the program’s success in addressing the need to bring park space to communities in the state.</p> <p>We would like to suggest raising the maximum point value in this category to at least (15) and that you add a new description to ‘Type of Project’ to reflect projects that significantly renovates and resuscitates parks that are not used due to safety, age or other circumstances.</p> <p>In our view, re-landscaping and updating the features of an un-used 40-year old park is de-facto creating a new park and points should be awarded to reflect that. There are countless communities that contain land designated as a park that are currently not being used - particularly in metropolitan areas like Los Angeles and San Francisco. Under the draft Application Guide, renovation of an existing park is grossly under-valued and awarded only 4 points.</p> <p>We agree that the creation of a new park be awarded the highest points, but entire renovation of an existing</p>	Prop. 84 Bond Act legislation gives preference to the creation of a new park 'where none currently exists'. "Where none currently exists" does not equal an existing park. For criteria #3, adding new park space is now given 10 points.

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
			<p>park should be worth at least as much as adding park space to an existing overused park. The new scale could look something like this:            Points: 15 – Creating a new park            12 – Expanding an existing park or substantially renovating an existing park            8 – Create one or more new recreational features            6 – Renovate an existing recreational feature</p>	
206	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Inland Empire Public Hearing	Is the intent to have small neighborhood parks in low income areas? Areas are built out- may have to use eminent domain. I'm not saying that those neighborhoods don't need those parks- but it seems like that is what you are focusing us to.	The creation of new neighborhood parks is a Prop. 84 legislative priority. Grant funds cannot pay for eminent domain. However, if a local agency uses eminent domain to acquire the property, grant funds may be used for development only after the acquisition is complete.
207	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Kern County Public Hearing	This will allow for renovation of old facilities.	Yes.
208	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application	Kern County Public Hearing	Our park will not be open to public before date of appropriation- so it qualifies as a new park.	This is correct. If the creation of the new park is underway, but construction is not complete and park is not yet open to the public.

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
	Guide			
209	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Letter, Tulare County Area	<p>Trailways along narrow strips of land, such as abandoned railways, have been developed by many local agencies to promote alternative transportation with linkages between parks and other significant community facilities. This has been a component of the transportation system enhancements to serve the referenced Porterville disadvantaged neighborhood. However, under the grant guidelines, State Parks may consider the strips of railway lands as being existing developed parks, and thereby deem the lands adjacent to the trailways as being park expansion if developed for new park and recreation purposes.</p> <p>Proposed revision: Existing linear parks developed with pedestrian &amp; bicycle trailways and having widths of less than 200 feet shall not be considered as existing local parks for determining community park acreage or park adjacency.</p>	<p>Other participants in the state want greenways with trails to qualify as new parks. "Existing linear parks with pedestrian and bicycle trails" will be counted for community park acreage or park expansion, because "linear parks" are parks, too. This is now added into the definition of "park".</p>
210	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Orange County Area	<p>Grant funding should be allocated based on geographic area with a specific amount designated for northern California, and a specific amount for southern California. This would eliminate unfair competition between projects located in northern California where there is greater amount of open space versus southern California where there is a lack of open space available for new park projects.</p>	<p>Legislation does not divide the state. This is a competitive statewide grant program to fund the most critically underserved communities throughout California.</p>

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
211	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Los Angeles Public Hearing	I appreciate this effort by your staff. A daunting task. I know there is conflicting elements in legislation. Higher priority for new parks is a worthwhile goal. But in today's economy this is a real challenge for local government to direct maintenance and operation funds for new parks when we struggle to maintain current funds. A new park can become run down in 2-3 years. As long as we are focused on critically underserved communities- they may be well served by creating new recreation opportunities in existing parks. May be better able to serve critically underserved if there is more flexibility in scoring- current criteria #3 urges us to build new parks. Make scoring closer between new parks vs. new features in existing parks, so you don't get agencies all applying for new parks.	Prop. 84 legislation prioritizes the creation of new parks. This program encourages and will fund sustainable design (criteria #5) which will help decrease maintenance costs if designed properly. Community based planning (criteria #4) is designed to instill a sense of ownership, which tends to reduce vandalism. Technical assistance for criteria #3 also provides possible solutions to offset long term operation and maintenance costs for new parks.
212	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Los Angeles Public Hearing	We support the fact that new parks are given priority. Tremendous need for park space in this region- want to support intent of this program to bring new open space in underserved areas.	Noted.

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
213	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Los Angeles County Area, Letter	Type of Project: Requirement for creating a NEW park, park space or recreational feature in a neighborhood. Comment: We agree that this is an important and necessary requirement. New park space is much needed in underserved communities.	Noted.
214	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Los Angeles County Area, Email	<p>“Explain if the project will create a new park in a neighborhood, or expand an existing overused park, or create a new recreational opportunity.”</p> <p>Comment: These categories should not be exclusive. In some instances, a project may meet one or more of the above criteria. For example, a project scope may encompass both the creation of a new park in a neighborhood (A) and also the addition of new park space to expand an existing overused park (B). Applicants should have the opportunity to demonstrate all of the advantages of their project and not be limited in their explanations of the benefits. In addition, the guidelines currently penalize projects that are adjacent to other parks. However, for several reasons, this should not be the case. First, phasing of park project implementation is a common practice due to the intermittent availability of funding. Second, if a park project is part of a larger revitalization effort, a recreational master plan, or a river greenway running through many underserved communities, it is necessarily adjacent to an existing park. These projects fulfill the criteria of creating new parks and are as equally important to complete as an isolated park. These phased or linked types of projects can result in a synergy between varying types of</p>	<p>Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009. Change made to decrease point gap between creating a new park and expanding an existing park, both which add park space. Adding new park space to an existing park is now given 10 points. However, a community with no park is more underserved than one with existing parks or greenways.</p>

**Comments and responses for Section IV.**

**Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
			<p>recreational facilities. Third, if the types of amenities in an existing park do not adequately serve the community's needs, adding a new recreational resource to that park is a quick and cost-effective way to meet that need. Finally, penalizing these projects could prevent important, potentially shovel-ready projects from being as competitive and discourages the creation of an easily accessible network of recreational amenities. The guidelines as written could have the effect of hindering the process of fulfilling a larger vision and providing a park (or a series of parks) for communities who are in dire need of open space. The scoring system should be altered to include projects that overlap categories A, B, and/or C. For example, it is possible that a project will convert two acres of industrial land into a new park (adding much needed open space) but is adjacent to an existing ¼-acre park in an underserved community. The way the guidelines are written, the fact that this example project is adjacent to the small ¼-acre park would cause it to lose points during the grant scoring process even though it will be creating two acres of new park space in an underserved community. Applicants should not be penalized for this attribute. Expanding and adding open space adjacent to existing facilities that people are already aware of, have access to, and value would create synergy and have an immediate effect on the quality of life for the members of the community. In addition, as noted in #3 above, adding a new type of recreational resource to an existing park has value that is not recognized in the draft</p>	

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
			guidelines.	
215	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Los Angeles Public Hearing	<p>Need inclusion of "greenways" in definition of what parks and recreation are. Greenways- application does not look at this.</p> <p>No focus on partnerships. Work together to acquire and develop a site- funding of other sources to maximize impact.</p> <p>Ongoing operation and maintenance – no criteria. Maintenance is important.</p> <p>Cost sharing. No reference.</p> <p>Development in underserved communities that also meets a watershed criteria is important- but priority given to creation of new parks.</p>	<p>Changes made: Please see technical assistance added to the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide. "Greenways" is now mentioned in the technical assistance section for Criteria #3. Partnerships are mentioned in the criteria #4- community based planning. Legislation restricts the additional type of scoring criteria that can be added into the guidelines.</p>
216	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Los Angeles Area, Letter	There is no explicit indication of how a greenway/trail/linear park would be scored.	<p>It would depend on the type of project related to the greenway/trail/linear park.</p> <p>Change made: "Greenways" and "linear parks" are now used as an example for how different project types would score. Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009 - technical assistance section for Criteria #3.</p>

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
217	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Los Angeles Public Hearing	Renovation scores low. Want to see stream daylighting in existing parks score higher. Turn underground drain to natural habitat.	A project that does not result in a new recreational opportunity is ineligible. Turning the stream into natural habitat can fit into the project, but the project must include the creation of a new recreational opportunity. Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009. Technical assistance added to clarify: • If a project in an existing park includes both the creation of a new recreation feature, and the renovation of an existing recreation feature, the project will be scored a maximum of 7 points: The creation of a new recreation feature (7 points) is the higher scoring element.
218	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Monterey County Public Hearing	Criteria #3-B. Define "overused"	We only need minimal evidence such as photos, statistics, or other information showing that the park is overused. No change to #3-B.

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
219	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Bay Area - Oakland Public Hearing	Not much land is available for new parks. Maybe there won't be many new park applications. How about still giving more points for new parks, but not such a point spread compared with new facilities in existing parks.	There may not be many applications for new parks.
220	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Bay Area - Oakland Public Hearing	Points give priority to new parks. We have many opportunities to create facilities in the zoo. In this economic environment, it is challenging to create new park- recommend allocating more points to renovation.	Prop. 84 legislation prioritizes the creation of new parks. There continues to be numerous critically underserved communities throughout California that need new park space.
221	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Bay Area and Sacramento County Area, Letter	Increase the point threshold for projects that will create one or more recreational features and for projects that are a renovation of an existing recreation feature to allow for an expanded use. While the City certainly supports the efforts and goals of the Department of Parks and Recreation in making new parks a priority, we humbly request the Department to reconsider this as the top priority for the following reasons: 1. Requirement for new parks is a worthwhile goal, however with the current economic condition resulting in lack of funding to maintain existing facilities and the reductions in the workforce that so many municipalities are experiencing a new park will degrade prematurely after minimal years of use and could unfortunately become an attractive nuisance. 2. Operational	New parks are not "required". Creating a new recreation feature or renovating an existing recreation feature is an eligible project. Prop. 84 legislation prioritizes the creation of new parks. However, there may not be many applications for new parks. Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009, technical assistance for examples of what some

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
			<p>budgets are declining rapidly across the state. Requiring the applicant to state and certify in the resolution that they will have sufficient funds to maintain may change by the time the funds are awarded. 3. The guidelines need to be inclusive of dense and/or urban cities that don't have the opportunity or land available to build new parks.4. New recreational facilities at existing parks would benefit the critically underserved community described in the guidelines and expand usage as much as a new park and in a more expeditious way.5. In order to promptly and adequately address public safety concerns in the State of California and sustain and increase the quality of life for the underserved residents and keeping pace with our ever changing demographics, a renovation at an existing park or new recreational opportunity at an existing park will help accomplish this goal.</p>	<p>agencies have done to offset maintenance costs (sustainable design, partnerships, "adopt a park program", fundraising events etc).</p>
	<p>Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide</p>	<p>Bay Area, Letter</p>	<p>Give more points to projects that renovate or add new recreation features to existing parks. While we understand that the bond requires you to give highest priority to projects that acquire new park land, we would encourage you to adjust the point allocation so that projects that improve existing parks are valued more than they are in the current draft of the guide. Since the voters approved Proposition 84 in 2006, the economy has declined dramatically and nearly every government in the state has had to make large staff reductions, including to the staff that maintain parks. Our priority as a department is to maintain our existing parks and to make improvements to them, during these difficult economic times</p>	<p>Prop. 84 legislation prioritizes the creation of new parks. However, there may not be many applications for new parks. Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009, technical assistance for examples of what some agencies have done to offset maintenance costs (sustainable design, partnerships, "adopt a park</p>

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
				program", fundraising events etc).
222	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Bay Area - Oakland Public Hearing	Make #3 a 15 point question- same as #1-2.	No change. The criterion remains at 12 points.
223	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Bay Area - Oakland Public Hearing	I get less points for building a brand new facility in a park - vs. adding acreage to an existing park. So if we have an existing park but feel it is not useable- can we say that the project will make it a new park?	No change. An existing park counts as an existing park.
224	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Shasta County - Redding Public Hearing	Where would parkways ("greenways") fit in? where people are jogging etc and use them to connect . Parkway that connect parks with communities are good use of public funds. Parkway in themselves become parks. Award that type of project. Consider it as a "New Park" instead of an "Expansion" that adds to existing parks. Some of these parkways convert blighted areas. For people who previously did not have access (further away from existing park), the parkway becomes a new park. For people near to the existing park, the parkway becomes an extension of the existing park. But I'm ok with the spread. (12 vs. 9)	Creating a new greenway (parkway/greenbelt) would qualify as a new park if it is not adjacent to an existing park. If it is adjacent to an existing park, it's an expansion of that park. Greenway example added into technical assistance section. Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009.

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
225	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Shasta County - Redding Public Hearing	In rural areas, parkways are a good way to provide safety for children to get to park facilities. Nice to consider parkways that connect to existing parks. Have language where it can be considered as either a “New park”, or an expansion of an existing park.	A greenway (parkway/greenbelt) fits within the definition of park, and open space. Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009, including the technical assistance section for criteria #3.
226	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Shasta County - Redding Public Hearing	Add: “Create a New Park or New Parkway” in #3A.	Creating a new greenway (parkway/greenbelt) would qualify as a new park if it is not adjacent to an existing park. If it is adjacent to an existing park, it’s an expansion of that park. Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009, including the technical assistance section for criteria #3, and the definition of “park”
227	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Shasta County - Redding Public Hearing	We’ve been talking about recreational. If park or facilities ties in cultural or educational element- that is OK correct? Tie in existing museum or library – i.e. the museum added with the recreational facility becomes one project.	The museum in the park may be eligible if entrance fees etc. are reasonable (criteria #7) and the application makes a strong case that it will create a new recreational opportunity/benefits the community (criteria #9)

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
228	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Shasta County - Redding Public Hearing	Our city does not want to create new parks- we want to improve existing parks.	Improving an existing park to create a new recreational opportunity is an eligible type of project.
229	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Orange County Area, Letter	We believe that new recreation centers should be given as high a priority as a new park in a city	Prop. 84 legislation prioritizes the creation of new parks. Please see technical assistance for community center projects in the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009.
230	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	San Diego County Public Hearing	This criterion is excellent. Very good.	Noted.
231	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	San Diego County Public Hearing	I understand and respect intent to create new parks, but given current economic decline- we may have a few opportunities to create new parks- but maybe you should bump up points for creating new facilities in existing parks given state of economy. Bump 7 points (new rec feature) to 8 points, and renovation to 5 or 6 points. But I do understand intent of new parks - just make other types more competitive.	Prop. 84 legislation prioritizes the creation of new parks. Please see technical assistance for criteria #3 - new parks - in the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009 .

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
232	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	San Diego Area, Letter	The preference given to new parks is not the most cost effective use of bond monies, as new parks often require land acquisition, which often is expensive. It is less costly to rehab existing parks, which often are in need of monies to maintain trails, kiosks, interpretive panels, build community outreach programs etc.	Prop. 84 legislation prioritizes the creation of new parks.
233	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	San Diego County Public Hearing	Better clarification between 7 and 4 points. If I am renovating an existing facility, but also want to add a new rec feature- do I score 7 or 4?	This example would score 7 points. Technical assistance added to the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009.
234	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	San Diego County, Letter	Guidelines need to clarify what is the amount of "Open Space" of a new park facility required to be; percentage of new park project space, estimated dollar amount spent on the project, etc.	Please see the definition of "Open Space" in the definition section which states that it must be designed specifically for active or passive outdoor recreation. There is no need for a percentage or dollar amount to qualify as long as the space is designed to accommodate active or passive recreation.

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
235	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Lake Tahoe Area Letter	<p>1. Page 28 – If a project includes components of multiple categories, does the higher or lower point value category take precedence with the decision makers?2. Pages 28 and 29 – There are a few instances on these pages where the term “recreational opportunity” is used and should perhaps be replaced with (capitalized) RECREATION OPPORTUNITY as a defined term.3. Page 29 – Could clarification be added about the statements about constructing new recreation features or renovating existing recreation features that are “not located in a park”?</p>	<p>1) Change made: Technical assistance added to the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009 to provide additional clarity about how project types will be scored. 2) Change made. 3) Change made: Technical assistance added to the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009</p>
236	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Lake Tahoe Area Letter	<p>Assigning a point system which emphasizes and favors the creation of “new parks” as opposed to the expansion, or renovation of overused or underutilized existing facilities seems counter productive in the movement to encourage the development of sustainable communities; promoting reuse by revitalizing existing blighted park space or facilities; thus reducing the carbon footprint and leading a positive movement to change the social fabric of underutilized recreation areas. A more equitable point system in this area would allow agencies to be more competitive in the recreational opportunities that we are able to provide in these uncertain economic times.</p>	<p>The creation of new parks where none currently exist is a higher priority of the Prop. 84 Sustainable Communities legislation.</p>

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
237	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Placer County Area, Letter	Facility Services also questions giving a higher priority to new parks versus additions to and/or rehabilitation of overused parks that expand the capacity (such as replacing natural grass with synthetic turf to increase the year round usability). In these economically challenging times, improving or rehabilitating an existing overused park where the infrastructure to support the park is already in place should be a priority versus funding the acquisition and development of new parks (especially if there is no requirement for maintenance funding).	The creation of new parks where none currently exist is a higher priority of the Prop. 84 Sustainable Communities legislation.
	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	San Joaquin County Area, letter	A priority of my department is the major renovation of a dated, deteriorated community center that sees very little use. As a renovation of an existing feature, the city would lose 8 points, although the project will generate new and/or expanded use.	The creation of new parks where none currently exist is a higher priority of the Prop. 84 Sustainable Communities legislation.
238	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Sacramento County Public Hearing	Adding new park space to expand an existing park scores higher than renovating an existing park. Renovation is only 4 points. Our overused park is deteriorated and has no rec opportunity. Such as a playground that is unsafe, and no one comes to the park. I will only get 4 points. Expand definition of "overused" to include deteriorated. Park is no longer relevant to community- but we only get 4 points.	If you create a new recreation feature in your existing park to make it more relevant for the community, the project would score 7 points, not 4 points. Technical assistance for #3 has been added to the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009. The

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
239	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Sacramento County Public Hearing	Add possibility where there is existing park and project will improve park. Some cities- land is not available- so we want to improve existing park.	phrase "or deteriorated" has been added to #3-B. Creating a new recreation feature in an existing park is an eligible project. Regarding the creation of new park in cities: This program can fund acquisition such as acquiring blighted buildings and developing them into parks.
240	Project Selection Criteria #3 Pages 28-29 Application Guide	Sacramento Area, Letter	We support the preference for new parks in under served areas, as well as expansion.	Noted.
241	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Fresno County Public Hearing	#4-A: I request removing "weekends" and say "during non-work hours".	Change made. Please see the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide which now gives points for "weekends or evenings" (non-work hours) to best accommodate schedules of the residents. Previous December 1 draft required three weekend meetings AND two evening meetings.

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
242	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Fresno County Area Email	The City suggests lowering the number of meetings required for maximum points under the Community Based Planning Section. In small cities such as ours, it is very hard to get people to attend meetings.	Change made. Please see the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide which clarifies that creative, cost effective approaches can be used, such as adding onto other community meetings, meeting with students in their classes, partnering with other organizations or finding volunteers to reduce costs and need for staff.
243	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Central Valley Letter	Requirement for new public meetings that involve the public: In the case of the Central Valley there has already been an extensive public outreach effort through State Parks' own Vision process as well as the public involvement in the community-led development of the Lower Tuolumne River Parkway vision in Stanislaus County. These meetings have provided the opportunity for extensive input on what our constituents are seeking, and duplication of this public involvement would potentially take more time away from participants' work and families. Hiring professional facilitators is also likely to be a barrier to participation for low income groups or their advocates. Therefore, please consider counting conclusions from existing planning documents in a similar fashion as those points given for new public meetings.	Change made: Definition of "meetings" is now provided, and clarifies that informal meetings may be used. Please see the definitions section and technical assistance added to the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide. Formal meetings using professional facilitators are not necessary. Change also made to clarify that meetings which occurred back to November 2006 can be counted. However, interested applicants should review the criteria and see if the process used meets the intent of criteria #4.

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
				Otherwise, a process can be used to meet with the residents who live in proximity of the project to fulfill the intent of criteria #4.
	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Fresno County Area, Letter	We are concerned about the emphasis on community-based planning. While it is important to involve people in the community it is often difficult for low-income residents to commit time to this kind of process due to working multiple jobs, school, or other responsibilities. The proposed scoring emphasis predisposes the projects to input from higher-income residents that are more likely to have a family member with time to attend meetings.	Change made to clarify that creative, cost effective approaches can be used, such as adding onto other community meetings, meeting with students in their classes, and other informal methods that are convenient for low income residents.
244	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Inland Empire Public Hearing	I salute the community based planning criteria- it does meet the spirit the State is trying to install.	Noted.
245	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Inland Empire Public Hearing	For regional parks- can points be given for meetings/involving community beyond ½ mile radius.	Emphasis is on involving the residents who live within proximity of the project site.

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
246	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Inland Empire Public Hearing	City I represent does not have enough staff to hold 5 public meetings. This also creates public expectation. (meeting with community for planning)	Change made. Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009 to clarify that creative, cost effective approaches can be used, such as adding onto other community meetings, meeting with students in their classes, partnering with other organizations or finding volunteers to reduce costs and need for staff. Technical assistance also gives advice on how to minimize expectations.
247	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Inland Empire Area, Letter	The City of Farmersville is taking steps to actively involve the community in planning for its sports park We believe in this concept. However the requirements outlined in the draft guidelines (Page 30) to garner maximum points are very prescriptive, costly and unrealistic. During one of the public hearings, Department of Parks and Recreation staff encouraged Cities to “get creative” in conducting the community workshops described. However, no amount of creativity will supply the real world costs of staff time, materials, meeting space and qualified facilitators necessary to involve the community at this level. In fact the City of Farmersville has applied for private foundation funding from The California Endowment in order to involve the community in highly interactive park planning charettes. Dictating some level of community input is reasonable;	In addition to the changes noted above, the guidelines now only require two weekend OR evening meetings. Six months will be given for applicants to prepare their application. Effective, highly used, and safe parks are designed using significant community input.

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
			<p>however, in these economic times, a municipality must be frugal and diligent with staff overtime. Time to develop, publicize and conduct multiple community workshops on nights and weekends is a significant commitment in addition to the time required to develop and write the grant proposal. Also, hosting half a dozen public workshops will raise significant expectations for a grant that may or may not be awarded. We would ask that you restructure the points in this category to recognize a broader range (not just nights and weekends) and lesser number of community based planning efforts.</p>	
	<p>Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide</p>	<p>Inland Empire Area, Letter</p>	<p>The scoring requires significant planning prior to the application being submitted. Assuming that we will not own the property prior to the application deadline, it is almost impossible to embark on the community based planning before owning the property. Planning typically occurs after acquisition of the property to avoid legal issues with the current property owner, environmental issues, and to manage the public's expectation about projects "in the making".</p>	<p>For purpose of a competitive application, where the integrity of a competitive process is at stake, applications that best represent the needs of the community residents, as expressed by the community residents, will be given priority for this criterion. Criteria #4 now defines "design" to mean the preliminary conceptualization of the project and does not require the completion of construction documents. the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009. Technical assistance is</p>

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
				available with ideas on managing public expectation for competitive grant projects.
	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Inland Empire Area, Letter	This criteria assumes that significant planning and design work has been accomplished prior to the grant application being submitted. For our Sports Complex project, we are working with property owners, as well as San Bernardino County, to acquire open space. We believe our grant request will be acquisition and development. Much of the planning process will occur after we acquire the property. If the City embarked on the extensive outreach described, it would create a sense of excitement in the community and a perception that the project will be constructed. This set the local government up for failure if the grant will not be awarded. The City must also exercise care in drafting extensive designs prior to owning the property and completing CEQA.	Criteria #4 now defines "design" to mean the preliminary conceptualization of the project and does not require the completion of construction documents.
	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Inland Empire Area, Letter	The language in the guidelines penalizes the applicant if they do not implement the design ideas of the residents. (criteria #4-C design for safe public use). This can be limiting if the residents do not formulate their own ideas or are not suitable or possible. The resident involvement should not be weighted at a value of 10 points as stated in the guidelines: it is recommended that the total point value be reduced.	It is assumed that infeasible, impractical, or unpopular design ideas will not be implemented. People who live in the community are often more likely to understand the community's needs. Projects designed through significant community input often are more successful, practical, safe, heavily used, and are

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
				a source of community pride. The resident's ideas regarding the park's recreational features, location of those features, park beautification and safety are given the weight they deserve.
248	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Kern County Public Hearing	Give points for partnerships- such as partnering with community based organizations for the community based planning process.	Partnerships are mentioned in the criteria #4 and in the technical assistance section but extra points are not given for partnerships.
249	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Kern County Public Hearing	We were looking for funding sources to develop this new park- we got money for design and CEQA. We were hoping this grant will help us with construction. This takes us back to neighborhood planning for something that was going to serve a bigger need- it seems like we will have to back up and go through community based planning.	This may be the case in order to ensure that the project results from the residents' involvement in the planning and design phase.
250	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Los Angeles Public Hearing	The technical assistance for criteria #4. shows various methods that we can use to invite residents- #4-B asks for # of residents invited- how to document # of residents invited? – such as posting notices at schools, or door-to-door distribution. Technical assistance section should not list method examples where we cannot quantify how many people were reached.	Change made: Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009. Criteria #4-B no longer asks or scores based on # of residents that were invited. No change to the list of possible examples in the technical assistance

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
				section, as they provide ideas on how to reach the residents.
251	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Los Angeles Public Hearing	Can have almost 500,000 people within a half mile radius. Very costly to mail to that many people. #4-A- May not be a church or school- not sufficient room to have meetings in that community. Will be 8 points that we may lose if we can't have meetings in community. Allow way to demonstrate that the location that we used- while not within ½ mile- such as a church or library just outside should count if community goes there.	Changes made based on both comments: the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009. Criteria #4-B no longer asks or scores based on # of residents that were invited. The scoring explanation for criteria #4-A now includes the following language: "or within a convenient distance for residents lacking private transportation."
252	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Los Angeles Public Hearing	Difficult to measure the 50% in 2-B. If there are 500,000 people in a ½ mile area- many may be undocumented. We work with local schools- in very dense communities very difficult to invite so many people.  Methods- "Methods were effective"- Be more specific in terms of how we can show that methods were effective.	Change made - Criteria #4-B no longer asks or scores based on # of residents that were invited.
253	Project Selection	Los Angeles Area Email	There is a critical portion missing from this section: emphasis of actual partnership with local community	Partnerships are encouraged throughout the

**Comments and responses for Section IV.**

**Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
	<p>Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide</p>		<p>based organizations (CBOs). I understand that partnerships are encouraged however there are no actual points attributed for tangible results of those partnerships. Because of the grassroots nature of many CBOs , they often have closer ties to communities. They work on individual and micro levels with communities and residents to provide services and in turn stakeholders at times have an easier time communicating their needs with these organizations. Larger governmental agencies such as cities and counties applicants should be awarded for partnering with CBOs and it should be clearly demonstrated how they will be working with CBOs ie. by providing detailed work plan, percentage of work to be completed by the CBO, etc. – what work will the CBO actually be doing? It is easy to state in an application that an applicant partnered with a CBO by hosting meetings. However this does not illustrate how the CBO was engaged.</p>	<p>guidelines, especially partnerships with community based organizations during the community based planning phase (criteria #4). The entire criteria has a grassroots nature, as it puts emphasis on ensuring that the project was conceptualized by the residents. As revealed through the public comments for this criteria, some agencies typically use a process where they tell communities what they will get after the agencies design the projects. This approach often does not result in projects that best meet the community's needs. The technical assistance section details how such agencies can partner with community based organizations that can get to the grass roots level to ensure that the residents conceptualize the project.</p>

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
254	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Los Angeles Public Hearing	"Broad representation" : Define this. Such as diversity of neighborhood.	Change made- Broad Representation is now defined. Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009.
255	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Los Angeles Public Hearing	<p>Have us show that fliers etc reflect appropriate communication needs for community-such as language. Add- Type of partners involved in collaboration – such as outreach to youth in design of project.</p> <p>I agree that having to document 50%- have more focus on strategy based on involving types of organizations such as community based organizations, churches etc.</p>	<p>Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009. Change made to criteria #2 B to clarify that a broad representation (youth, seniors, and families) must be involved in order to get the most points.</p> <p>Communication/language is now added in the technical assistance section. Criteria #4-B no longer asks or scores based on # of residents (50%) that were invited.</p>

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
256	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Los Angeles Area Email	Issue of: How many meetings were "held". Change to state "held or attended". "Held" means that we would have to initiate and hold all meetings, which would be very expensive and staff time consuming. If we could have the option of holding OR "attending" meetings held by other community groups (PTA, AYSO, homeowner groups,etc.), we could get input from many more people, without straining our extremely limited budget.	Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009.. Change made based on your comment: New draft now states "occurred" instead of "held" to give you the option of adding to meetings held by other community groups and other informal meeting methods, so you could get input from many more residents without straining your budget. Definition of "meeting" is now available. Technical assistance also clarifies that formal public hearings are not required - informal meetings can be used.

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
257	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Los Angeles Area Letter	<p>#4-A: I would caution associating point values with the number of meetings since you may be inadvertently burdening some applicants who can't afford to hold that many meetings--maybe the quality and not the quantity of meetings should be more highly valued--such as evidenced in local endorsements for the project.</p> <p>#4-B: The number of methods used to invite residents should not matter, but the quality of the outcome.</p> <p>#4-C: I would suggest either replacing "include" with "reflect" or inserting "some of the" before "residents" in the following: "For the APPLICATION to be eligible, the proposed PROJECT design must include RESIDENTS' ideas to ensure safe public use."</p>	<p>Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009.</p> <p>#4-A: Definition of "meeting" is now available. Technical assistance also clarifies that formal public hearings are not required - informal meetings can be used.</p> <p>#4-B: Technical assistance added. Seven examples of cost effective ways to score three points are listed for #4-B.</p> <p>#4-C: No change needed. It is assumed that infeasible, impractical, or unpopular ideas will be rejected.</p>

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
258	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Los Angeles Area Letter	<p>Community-based planning is an important component in creating and facilitating community pride and preventing crime through ownership. The community process is an integral part of planning a park but for the purposes of the application, it should not outweigh other important elements such as project readiness, land tenure, etc. that ensure project completion. The scoring process is quantitative, not qualitative and this requirement accounts for one quarter of the overall score (25 points). Above all, the quality of community meetings is the most important aspect to effectively plan a community based park project. More meetings do not necessarily ensure adequate response to a community's concerns. However, we understand that it is very difficult to demonstrate quality of public meetings in an application narrative. Proving that a project reflects feedback received is nearly impossible and merely showing that 15 meetings were held with 50% of the local community does not necessarily prove effectiveness of the meeting. Due to this complexity, our recommendation is to reduce the weight of the points from 25 to 20 points for this section.</p>	<p>Recommendation to reduce the weight has been implemented. Please see the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide</p>

**Comments and responses for Section IV.**

**Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
259	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Los Angeles Area Letter	<p>We agree that community based planning is a very important element of the enabling legislation, however, given the difficulty in measuring and scoring this criteria, we recommend a point system based on a series of steps that we believe will result in applicants completing a very good community planning process. Replace the 4.A and 4.B point systems (the number of meetings and recruitment methods) with the following: Allocate 2 points for providing convincing documentation verifying the completion each of the following steps 1 to 5 (total of 10 points). If the documentation is incomplete or unconvincing, 0 points are given. The goal is to ensure all applicants go through these steps, which we believe will result in excellent community based planning. The following recommendations are taken from the Sustainable Sites Initiative<sup>1</sup> with additions from the Rivers &amp; Mountains Conservancy's Grant Program Guidelines. Steps: 1) Identify project stakeholders and the full range of users for the site. List the primary and secondary user groups. Describe the process by which stakeholders were identified. Describe how site users and stakeholders were identified and recruited to participate. 2) Engage a diverse group of site users and stakeholders early in the design process. Provide a narrative describing opportunities for site users and stakeholders to participate, including how the community was engaged and how communication was provided in the appropriate language and time of day to maximize community involvement. Describe how the participants reflect the demographics of</p>	<p>Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009. Changes were made to criteria #4 A and #4 B. Criteria #4 A gives more flexibility for meetings that can occur during the weekday, evenings, or weekends. However, since some residents work during weekdays, and others work during evenings or weekends, it is important that the applicant use a strategy that accommodates these different realities. Applicants are given optimum flexibility to score the maximum points for five meetings with the residents. A definition for "meeting" has been added to clarify that the type of meeting can be informal such as facilitating a meeting with students in their classroom and adding to a meeting agenda of a neighborhood/community based organization where residents will already be</p>

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
			<p>theneighborhood. Keep the current requirements for 4.A and 4.B, which are to provide the date, time, and location of each meeting and the recruitment method and estimated stakeholders invited and the number attended.3) Provide multiple opportunities for participation, including informal and nontraditional methods. Communicate a range of design alternatives and their associated outcomes using visual representations (e.g., sketches, models, or photo simulations). Document feedback from stakeholders, and outline the needs of various groups.4) The project is significant to one or more local resident groups or non-governmental organizations, as reflected by a partnership role in the project implementation and/or ongoing operations. Provide a letter of support from at least two local resident groups or non-governmental organizations to indicate their role in the project.5) Describe how the stakeholders will continue to be involved in the park development process and in the future, any on-going role such as, as a park advisory committee member, volunteer caretaker, programming provider, etc. Give 5 points for the following: Demonstrate how feedback was incorporated into site design, or illustrate why it was not incorporated. Keep the current 4.C goal language, including the requirement that application include stakeholder's ideas to ensure safe public use. Replace the 4.C points system with the following: Provide copies of the design alternatives and associated outcomes shared with the user groups. Describe and summarize the feedback and needs of</p>	<p>available. Formal public hearings are not required. #4-B: The number of residents that were invited to meetings has been deleted. . Regarding the comment to use the criteria (steps 1-5 in the left column) to replace criteria #4: Based on our experience and the changes to 4-A and B, we do not anticipate difficulty in measuring and scoring this criterion. Scoring "documentation" based on "convincing", "incomplete or unconvincing" would impose a greater load of subjectivity. Step 1: This is accomplished through criteria #4-B. The residents are the stakeholders, and the applicant's response will describe how the residents were reached. Step 2: Due to the emphasis on involving a "broad representation" (now defined) of residents, the combination of criteria #4 A, B, and C will accomplish step 2. Step 3:</p>

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
			<p>stakeholder groups. For each of the major recommendations from stakeholders, describe how the site design reflects stakeholder feedback, or if feedback was not incorporated, describe the reasons.</p>	<p>Technical assistance is now added using a portion of this concept. Step 4: Criteria #4 B and C is designed to fund projects that were conceptualized and designed through a broad representation of community residents, and therefore, the project will be significant to the residents. Step 5: This will not be added into the scoring criteria, and the applicant can implement such long-term operational strategies and partnerships. A similar concept is included as technical assistance, which provides examples of what some agencies have done to offset set long term maintenance costs and increase community involvement: * Partnered with non profits and community based organizations that help maintain the park in exchange for use of the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formed “Adopt a Park” or “Friends of the Park” organizations where local</li> </ul>

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
				<p>residents assist with maintenance duties or fundraising events. Regarding the last paragraph of the comment in the left column: Criteria #4-C will accomplish the same aspects, without requiring applicants to provide "copies of the design alternatives and associated outcomes."</p>
260	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Bay Area and Sacramento County Area, Letter	Letters of support from community groups, neighborhood organizations, and park users should be included in this section for additional points.	Letters of support are not requested and will not be given additional points. Applicants are encouraged to partner with community groups/neighborhood organizations that can engage the residents as intended through criteria #4.
261	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Bay Area - Oakland Public Hearing	Thank you for keeping this open to allow for creativity and different methods.	Noted.

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
262	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Bay Area - Oakland Public Hearing	Inviting them by letter, press release etc. Recent participation of my community meetings. 19 people in 1st, 0 in second, and 5 in 3rd. Weekends are tough for people. If we will get rated on number that attended, will be tough. Better response through email or phone. I appreciate your flexibility in letting us use different approaches- throw away attendance points- we get high turnout for controversy – not for community projects	Change made. Please see the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide which now gives points for "weekends OR evenings" (2 non-working hour meetings) to best accommodate schedules of the residents. Previous December 1 draft required three weekend meetings AND two evening meetings (a total of 5 weekend and evening meetings). Regarding number that attended, you can count the number of participants of informal meetings with students in their classes, adding to other meeting agendas where residents are already present etc. Technical assistance is also available. Please see the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide for ideas to increase participation.
263	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33	Bay Area - Oakland Public Hearing	Community based planning- Usually residents want evening weeknight meetings, and don't want to meet on weekends. Also put more emphasis on how many residents we involve in the meetings.	Changes made to criteria #4 A and #4 B.

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
	Application Guide			
264	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Bay Area - Oakland Public Hearing	When does time start when we can start counting the meetings? Clarify	Scoring explanation for Criteria # 4-A now clarifies that points are given for meetings that occurred between November 2006 (when Prop. 84 was passed) and the application deadline.
265	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Bay Area and Sacramento County Area, Letter	<p>The stipulation of having community meetings on specific days, whether in the evenings or on the weekends, should be removed. Community meetings should be held on whatever days are most convenient for the community.</p> <p>The timeline of when community meetings are held should reflect the specifics and details on a case by case basis. For example, a phased project may have community meetings earlier in the planning segment of the project which could have been two years ago, and the second phase will be under way without the need for major input from the residents due to their input already incorporated.</p>	<p>Change made. Please see the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide which gives points for "weekends OR evenings" (2 non-working hour meetings) to best accommodate schedules of the residents. Previous December 1 draft required three weekend meetings AND two evening meetings (a total of 5 weekend and evening meetings).</p> <p>Change made: Scoring explanation for Criteria # 4-A now clarifies that points are given for meetings that occurred between</p>

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
				November 2006 (when Prop. 84 was passed) and the application deadline.
266	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Bay Area, Letter	The City recommends flexibility to allow an applicant to provide in-depth community-based participation plan as an option to the criteria. The demonstration of community based planning should allow some flexibility for the applicant to involve the project stakeholders and the public where it allows for creative participation methods, rather than only through community meetings. Often, initial design and community input are general. Detailed community input is sought when a project has funds to proceed. The criterion for extensive community input may not be developed yet as project funds are not available.	Applicants are given optimum flexibility to score the maximum points for five meetings with the residents. A definition for "meeting" has been added to clarify that the type of meeting can be informal such as facilitating a meeting with students in their classroom and adding to a meeting agenda of a neighborhood/community based organization where residents will already be available. Formal public hearings are not required. For purpose of a competitive application, where the integrity of a competitive process is at stake, applications that best represent the needs of the community residents, as expressed by the community residents, will be given priority for this criterion.

**Comments and responses for Section IV.**

**Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
267	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Letter	<p>We believe that community-based planning is an essential ingredient in successful projects. Having said that, the draft Application Guide has assigned the highest maximum point value for this section (25), which we think is inappropriate. We suggest that you lower the maximum amount of points awarded for community planning to (15), which will be more consistent with the other sections of this application.</p> <p>A – Number of Meetings – TPL believes quality of meetings is more important to community investment than quantity. We agree you should get more points for more meetings but that the timing and quantity of those meetings should be flexible to the individual community needs - you do what works. We think you should remove the language stipulating meetings be held on weekends and evenings. Many lower income communities may have greatest attendance during the day, as that is when there is childcare available. Daytime meetings with senior citizen groups, students, NGO leaders, parents, etc. are also critical components to garnering resident input. Again, results are what matters. (4) Points.</p> <p>B – In the spirit of being ‘results oriented,’ we think number of residents invited and attended is most important but struggle to understand how you are going to measure that. Assuming that accurate numbers are available, we think it more appropriate to reward a maximum of (8) points for community participation results.</p> <p>C – Park Design – We agree that it is important to include the community’s ideas regarding recreational features, location of those features and park beautification. However we think you should remove language that</p>	<p>Point total for community based planning is reduced to 18. Lack of park space and significant poverty (criteria #1-2 is 36 points) Changes were made to criteria #4 A and #4 B. Criteria #4 A now gives more flexibility for meetings that can occur during the weekday, evenings, or weekends. However, since some residents work during weekdays, and others work during evenings or weekends, it is important that the applicant use a strategy that accommodates these different realities. Applicants are given optimum flexibility to score the maximum points for five meetings with the residents. A definition for "meeting" has been added to clarify that the type of meeting can be informal such as facilitating a meeting with students in their classroom and adding (piggy-backing) to a meeting agenda of a neighborhood/community</p>

**Comments and responses for Section IV.**

**Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
			<p>suggests that the community will have the authority to decide or select those features. Community members should have a voice in that discussion, but ultimately the design and amenities should be the responsibility of the applicant. While it is very important that the community is invested in the design of the park, parks agencies should not be penalized for creating a park that is both responsive to the community but also includes amenities that complement those in other nearby parks. (3) Points</p>	<p>based organization where residents will already be available. Formal public hearings are not required.                      #4-B: The number of residents that were invited to meetings has been deleted. Regarding #4-C, it is the applicant's and the Office of Grants and Local Services' responsibility to fund projects that best meet the needs of the community. People who live in the community are often more likely to understand the community's needs. Projects designed through significant community input often are more successful, practical, safe, heavily used, and are a source of community pride. This does not mean that the residents are to become architects and create blue prints, but it does mean that the community's ideas regarding the park's recreational features, location of those features, park beautification and</p>

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
				safety are given the weight they deserve.
268	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Shasta County - Redding Public Hearing	#4-A. Many critically underserved communities do not have a place to meet within the community.	Change made: The scoring explanation for criteria #4-A now includes the following language: "or within a convenient distance for residents lacking private transportation."
269	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Shasta County - Redding Public Hearing	Would not matter if we have 1 or 50 meetings. No one would show up. I don't like the idea that the more meetings you have, the more points.	Regarding number that "show up", meetings with students in their classes, adding on other meetings where residents are already present count for the attendance. Technical assistance is also available to give ideas for increasing participation.
270	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Shasta County - Redding Public Hearing	Offer refreshments. People will show up.	Noted. Offering food has been a effective incentive for families etc. to participate.
271	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33	Shasta County - Redding Public Hearing	Success of a project that has no support-no community based planning no one shows up- nullifies structure of the question	A project that does not result from this community based planning will not rank high in the competitive scoring criteria.

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
	Application Guide			
272	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Shasta County - Redding Public Hearing	I like your different types of meetings (technical assistance examples). If you go to a PTA meeting, or school classroom etc. how does that work for your invitation (# invited).	Change made: Criteria no longer asks for or scores based on # invited. Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009.
273	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Shasta County - Redding Public Hearing	This puts responsibility in a good way on us. There are many ways that we can meet with the residents. It's a good idea.	Noted.
274	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Sacramento County Public Hearing	We have diverse residents- many don't have trust in government. In the past, we did a lot of community meetings - had child care / multi-lingual etc. Highest need areas are least likely to trust government and come to meetings. P. 31 # of residents that attended. If we can prove we made every effort- take that into consideration- take effort demonstrated more into account, not # of residents that attended.	Key to this comment is "least likely to trust government and come to meetings". Please see the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide technical assistance which lists several methods that may help, such as partnering with community based organizations and community leaders who the residents trust, or adding on to meetings where the

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
				residents will already be present so they don't have to come to you, have meetings with students in their classes etc.
275	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Sacramento County Public Hearing	I agree. Take out # of residents that attended.	Please see the revised criteria #4 in the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009. #4-B gives 1 point for the number of participants and a broad representation.
276	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Sacramento County Public Hearing	I know community based planning for my project was done years ago, maybe 2 or 3. Possibly not well documented.	Clarity added into criteria #4: To receive points, the meetings must occur after November 2006 and before the application deadline.
277	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Sacramento County Public Hearing	Allow meeting to be combined with other agenda.	Yes. The technical assistance includes this method, which is a good cost effective way to involve residents without expecting them to come to you.

**Comments and responses for Section IV.**

**Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
278	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Placer County Area, Email	<p>The community outreach and involvement is another area of concern. While we schedule and attend numerous meetings throughout the County to discuss various projects, the number of residents in attendance doesn't necessarily correlate to the effectiveness of the invitation methods. Rather, the more controversial a project, the more public will be in attendance. In addition, due to concerns over traffic, noise, etc., the neighbors that live adjacent to the park (within ½ mile) often times have different opinions on what amenities should be included in the park (or whether there should be a park at that location) from what the County and/or the larger region may want and/or need. Because of the rural nature of Placer County, to give higher priority to a project that meets the specific needs and desires of fewer residents (within ½ mile) versus a project that meets the needs of a larger area appears to be a questionable. Incorporating the preferred recreation features determined by the residents within ½ mile is also a concern. As mentioned above, due to the rural nature of the Placer County, Facility Services generally encourages parks that support a region larger than a ½ mile radius. In many locations, there may not be many residents (if any) within ½ mile of the park.</p>	<p>Regarding number that attended, you can count the number of participants for informal meetings with students in their classes, adding to other meeting agendas where residents are already present etc. Technical assistance is also available to give ideas for increasing participation. It is important to meet with the residents within proximity of the project site to obtain their ideas and understand their concerns.</p>
279	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application	San Marcos Area, Letter	<p>PRC, Section 5646(d) state that the project applicant has actively involved the public and community-based groups in the selection and planning of the project. The guidelines currently read that only public meetings held within Proximity of the project are taken into consideration. These guidelines should be</p>	<p>Change made: Maximum points for criteria #4-A now includes the following: the meetings occurred in the critically underserved community or within a</p>

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
	Guide		<p>expanded to include all efforts, or portion thereof, towards seeking public input and involvement. These efforts constitute active involvement and there are circumstances where there are no facilities available to hold meetings within the Proximity of the project site. In addition, larger park projects go beyond serving a half mile radius, and therefore community based meetings would need to be held in a more convenient location for all residents that will be served by the proposed project whether it falls in or out of the ½ mile radius of the project site. There are currently 3 points assigned to the methods of inviting residents to public meetings. This section should be assigned at least 5 points because it provides an accurate reflection of the applicant's efforts to contact residents through various media outlets. There are currently 4 points assigned to the number of residents attending public meetings. This section should be reduced from 4 points to 2 points. It's unrealistic for larger park projects to receive over 50% of those benefiting residents to be in attendance. The City makes every effort to involve the public to participate in the planning process, however, meeting attendance varies and is not a good indicator of determining community involvement. Usually, controversial parks that aren't consistent with the needs with the community receive higher public meeting attendance. For this reason, the City recommends reducing the total number of points.</p>	<p>convenient distance for residents lacking private transportation. Change made: #4-B no longer looks at inviting 50% as maximum point value. Regarding number of residents that attended, you can count the number of participants for informal meetings with students in their classes, adding to other meeting agendas where residents are already present etc. Technical assistance is also available to give ideas for increasing participation. Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009, including the technical assistance section.</p>

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
280	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Orange County Area, Letter	We agree with the State's efforts to encourage public participation in the grant project process, but believe that more flexibility should be given for the appropriate time to hold the meetings. Our experience with residents in low income areas has proven that many work weekends, therefore requiring three weekend meetings would disproportionately exclude low income residents from participating.	Change made. Please see the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide which now gives points for "weekends OR evenings" (2 non-working hour meetings) to best accommodate schedules of the residents. Previous December 1 draft required three weekend meetings AND two evening meetings (a total of 5 weekend and evening meetings).
281	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	San Diego County Area, Letter	25 points for community based planning- The success of parks is very much dependent on the involvement of the community. Community input is vital to the creation of parks, in order to truly be a resource created by the community, for the community. Ensure that the community based planning is extensive and recent.	Noted.
282	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	San Diego County Public Hearing	#4 A Five is too many meetings. And how do we as public employees go to out-of-office hours during evenings and weekends? Add more points to #4 B- Outreach to the community. Define "meeting".	"Meeting" is now defined in the definitions section. Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009. Residents do not need to come to you, you can add onto other community meetings. Go to students in their classes etc. Partner or get volunteers to assist

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
283	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	San Diego County Public Hearing	I concur- define "meeting". We went out to community fair. We went to something that was planned by community, instead of having them come to us. We had discussions with the community at the community fair.	with the process. Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009. "Meeting" is now defined in the new draft. Your example is the type of cost effective convenient meeting method that can be used.
284	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	San Diego County Public Hearing	We have an expensive extensive community involvement process- but not on weekends. Say "non-business hours" for #4-A	Change made to give more flexibility between weekends or evenings.
285	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	San Diego County Public Hearing	We propose to community what they will get, and then we get input from the community. We won't know what community thinks until after the application is submitted.  Amenities we will propose to community (related to #4 and #5) won't receive input until after the application is submitted. Define "meetings" and Clarify that the "Meetings" have to occur before the application is submitted.	Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009. "Meetings" is now defined. To receive points, the meetings must occur after November 2006 and before the application deadline. The meetings must occur before the application deadline to ensure that the application represents what the residents need as identified by the residents through the community

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
286	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	San Diego County, Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirement for a complete concept plan prior to application submission and up to 5 community meetings (including 3 having to be on weekends) is excessive and requires substantial staff costs upfront with no guarantee of funding.</li> <li>• Guidance should provide more clarity on public meeting types that qualify; revitalization meetings, community planning group meetings, etc.</li> <li>• 25% of application based on community based planning and an additional 10% based on community based project needs and benefits, seems contrary to the stated intent of the proposition; addressing critical lack of local parks in the State, which carries only 15% weight of the application.</li> </ul>	<p>based planning process.</p> <p>This is not a block grant program. We cannot award grants before the community based planning occurs and before the project is determined.</p> <p>Change made: Criteria no longer gives higher points for 3 weekend and 2 evening meetings. Only two meetings must occur during non-working hours.</p> <p>Change made: "Meetings" is now defined, and clarifies that the type of meeting can be informal such as facilitating a meeting with students in their classroom and adding to a meeting agenda of a neighborhood/community based organization where residents will already be available. So your examples meet the definition of "meetings". Please also see technical assistance in the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009.</p>

**Comments and responses for Section IV.  
Project Selection Criteria # 3 and # 4, pages 28-33 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
287	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	San Diego County Public Hearing	I support community based planning process- As policy, we typically hold workshops in the evenings and on Saturdays, and our staff gets comp time for it. I encourage you to maintain weekend and evening requirement. On another note- add language about timely community involvement- should occur within a particular timeframe to make sure process that may have been used is still relevant to project.	Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009. Points will be given for meetings during non-working hours for residents, but guidelines no longer give points for 3 weekend and 2 evening meetings. Language about timely community involvement has been added. (Meetings that occurred after November 2006 and before the application deadline).
288	Project Selection Criteria #4 Pages 30-33 Application Guide	Stanislaus County Area, Letter	Consider projects that have utilized extensive community input in planning for the project even though the community input may have been completed more than three years ago.	Change made: Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009. Criteria now gives points for meetings that occurred dating back to November 2006.