

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
1	General Comment About Guidelines	Fresno Public Hearing	You have done a very good job with these guides.	Thank you.
2	General Comment About Guidelines	Inland Empire Public Hearing	Guide is very helpful.	Thank you.
3	General Comment About Guidelines	Inland Empire Area Email	The Guidelines are clear and well thought out. We appreciate your intention to provide a fair selection process and look forward to working with you and other staff as the process moves forward.	Thank you.
4	General Comment About Guidelines	Kern County Public Hearing	Guide is nicely organized. Very easy to follow.	Thank you.
5	General Comment About Guidelines	Monterey County Public Hearing	I commend your staff. I want to comment how user-friendly the guidelines are. Want to comment that smaller communities may need more technical assistance- request pre-review of applications during technical assistance phase.	Thank you. We plan on providing extensive technical assistance.
6	General Comment About Guidelines	Bay Area - Oakland Public Hearing	I appreciate this process of having input- And guidelines evolved since Prop. 12. These are very clear.	Thank you.
7	General Comment About Guidelines	Sacramento Public Hearing.	I think the guidelines are very clear.	Thank you.

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
8	General Comment About Guidelines	Greater Sacramento Region Email	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the application guide. They were some of the best and most clear guidelines that I have ever read. Almost every question that I had was answered. I look forward to the web-based tools to be available to test.	Thank you.
9	General Comment About Guidelines	San Diego Area, Letter	In general, we think the grant guidelines look good. The guidelines really encourage projects that provide outdoor resources to lower-income areas and on community outreach and involvement.	Noted.
10	General Comment About Guidelines	San Diego Public Hearing	From viewpoint of nonprofit, this entire guide is incredibly accessible and helpful for people who don't have experience and resources. Very easy to use these guidelines.	Thank you.
11	Dividing "Application Guide" from "Grant Admin Guide"	San Diego Public Hearing	Thank you for dividing this into 2 guides. I'm on application side of project, and we have a separate side that works on Grant Admin. It would good to have a similar checklist-telling them what should be included in reimbursement/payment.	Thank you. Regarding the second comment, the "Grant Payments" section in the "Grant Administration Guide" provides charts listing what is required for each type of payment request.
12	Page 2: Application Guide	Los Angeles Public Hearing	Eligible projects- We want to just acquire and preserve open space. Does development have to be a recreation component?	Please see the eligible projects section of the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009. "Acquisition must be combined with development so the project will result in a new recreational opportunity."

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
13	Page 2: Application Guide	Bay Area, Letter	What about acquisition only under Eligible Projects, if other funds are available to develop the park or recreational opportunity.	The development portion must be included in the Grant Scope. Your sources of committed funds may be used for development.
14	Page 2: Application Guide	Los Angeles Area, Letter	<p>About these requirements: Acquisition-only is not eligible. For the project to be eligible for funding, the requested grant must equal the estimated cost needed to complete the project, or, the requested grant plus the total amount of additional committed funds must equal the estimated cost of the project.</p> <p>Comment: This requirement should be altered to be more flexible because it tends to be a "Catch-22" situation. It begs the question, "How can funds to plan a park project be authorized if acquisition funds do not exist?" One cannot exist without the other. Under the draft guidelines, the total cost of the project (acquisition + development) must be requested, but a realistic estimate of development costs cannot take place without significant planning. Yet, this planning usually cannot commence before the parcel is acquired. In order to acquire property and plan a development project on a specific parcel, guaranteed funds must be available. Allowing acquisition-only or two-phase projects to be eligible will create flexibility.</p>	If acquisition-only were allowed there would be no way to ensure that the legislative intent of the Statewide Park Program is met. (AB 31§ 5645 (d)) Technical assistance added to the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide regarding phasing acquisition and development projects.
15	Page 2: Application Guide	Los Angeles Area Email	Consider the following as a type of new park: "Art Peace Park Place"	Noted. New parks that include art - peace elements are eligible.

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
16	Page 2: Application Guide	Fresno County Area Email	Allow for the development of community centers that include a significant youth development and training component, the purpose of which is, in part, to train youth in the development and maintenance of the state's parks, as well as other demand occupations.	See Project Selection Criteria #8, which looks at youth development and training.
17	Page 2, Application Guide.	Letter	Parks are not just amenities, but vital to human health, pollution abatement, increasing property values, reducing crime and other quality of life benefits	Noted.
18	Page 2: Application Guide	Bay Area- Oakland Public Hearing	Please define "New Park".	"New Park" is shown in CAP letters, meaning it is defined in the definitions section in the back of the guide.
19	Page 2: Application Guide	Monterey County Public Hearing	Critically underserved communities- working on project in outskirts of the county- site is contaminated- we will need to mitigate it. Often underserved communities have contaminated sites that need toxic remediation before a new park can be created. Improving a contaminated site should be given more points.	Having contaminated sites in a community can be discussed in criteria #9 (community challenges and project benefits) Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009.
20	Eligible Projects- Page 2 - Application Guide	Monterey County Public Hearing	Clarify that indoor facilities are eligible.	List of Eligible Project "examples" on page 2 include indoor facilities such as community centers, gymnasiums etc. Definition of "park" in the definitions section is also inclusive of "indoor".

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
21	Eligible Projects - Page 2 - Application Guide	Los Angeles County Area Email	<p>The City Project working with diverse allies supports the distribution of park funds to achieve healthy, livable communities for all the people of California. We look forward to working with the California Department of Parks and Recreation to ensure that park funds reach the most park poor and economically poor communities through the proposed guidelines, the implementation of AB 31, and compliance with equal justice laws. This will fulfill the intent of the legislation and meet the needs of the voters who have passed park resource bonds for the past ten years. Park funds should be allocated based on need not greed, Under a standard that targets communities with the greatest need first, need should be measured in terms of park poverty and economic poverty combined. Park poverty is less than three acres of parks per thousand residents, under the draft guidelines. Economic poverty is under \$45,316 median household income, under the draft guidelines. Targeting park poverty and economic poverty combined will help achieve equal justice in access to public resources for the mostunderserved communities, based on race, ethnicity, and income under civil rights and environmentaljustice laws.1 People of color and low income people throughout California disproportionately suffer fromunfair disparities in access to park, school, and health resources, and suffer disproportionately from childobesity and other diseases related to the lack of places for physical activity and healthy eating. Investments in parks and schools in the most</p>	<p>AB 31 requires that a project must be located within close proximity of a critically underserved community. Critically underserved community is defined in AB 31 § 5642 (b). AB 31 § 5646 (a)-(b) gives higher priority to a project in a community with deficient or no park space, and significant poverty. Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009. Project Selection Criteria #1-2 will give this higher ranking priority. Regarding the school joint use issue: A project on school property can be eligible if an eligible applicant has a land tenure agreement with the school district. The guidelines "encourage" partnerships between eligible applicants and local governmental agencies. AB 31 § 5643 (b) states that the Department shall</p>

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
			<p>underserved communities is an important part of any green economic stimulus, public works and infrastructure program. Map 2001 shows the communities that are park poor and economically poor, and are disproportionately populated by people of color, in the hatched red hot spots. Using park poverty alone without economic poverty will not accomplish these important public policy goals of improving the quality of life, health, and environment for the most underserved communities.</p> <p>We support other provisions of the guidelines and AB 31 including multibenefit green space and water projects. AB 31 calls for joint use of schools and parks. The guidelines do not, but must. The Department of Parks and Recreation and the people of California have an important opportunity to define and implement standards for equity to measure progress and hold officials accountable through the guidelines and AB 31 and to achieve equal access to public resources including urban parks for all. See Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and its regulations, California Government Code 11135 and its regulations, and the California statutory definition of environmental justice. Maximizing public access to parks and recreation while ensuring the fair treatment of people of all colors, cultures, and incomes can transform California into a more livable, democratic, and just place to live and raise children. We look forward to working with the Department of Parks and Recreation to meet these goals.</p>	<p>"encourage" joint partnership projects between two or more local governmental agencies, such as school districts, or non profits. However, there is nothing in AB 31 that says joint use projects specifically on school property shall receive higher priority. Joint use of schools with parks is not an eligibility criteria established through § 5645 or a higher priority criteria established through § 5646.</p>

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
22	Eligible Projects - Page 2 - Application Guide	Sacramento Public Hearing.	Include historic properties – museums.	Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009. The list only provides "examples".
23	Eligible Projects - Page 2 - Application Guide	San Diego Public Hearing	Acquisition and development combination- We acquired property from school district – we have debt on acquisition- consider the debt as an eligible acquisition cost.	Acquisition costs incurred before date of appropriation are ineligible.
24	Eligible Projects - Page 2 - Application Guide	San Diego Area - Letter	Instead of saying ...creation of new parks and new recreation opportunities, the type of recreation opportunities should include the words “active and passive” to pertain to recreation opportunities created.	Recreation can be active or passive. Examples of active and passive recreation features are in the eligible projects section. Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009.
25	Eligible Projects - Page 2 - Application Guide	Bay Area, Letter	I would like to see trails listed in the eligible projects list. Trails offer a mode of transportation for underserved communities that are less likely to have access to vehicles.	Non-motorized neighborhood and regional recreational trails are included in the "examples" of recreation features. Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009..

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
26	Eligible Applicants - Page 3 - Application Guide	Bay Area - Oakland Public Hearing	Eligible applicants are examples of local governments- and a school district is a local gov entity.	No change. School districts are not eligible applicants based on legislation. However, an eligible applicant may partner with a school district for a project on school property.
27	Eligible Applicants - Page 3 - Application Guide	Fresno County Area Email	Allow for regional or statewide organizations or consortia to apply for projects serving regional or statewide interests.	Eligible applicants are determined by legislation.
28	Eligible Applicants - Page 3 - Application Guide	San Marcos Area, Letter	Recommend including partnerships between two or more agencies, including, but not limited to, school districts, local governmental agencies and water districts are also encouraged to provide consistency with Section 5643(b) of the Public Resource Code.	No change needed: The Application Guide encourages partnerships between local governmental agencies and non profit organizations. School districts and water districts are examples of local governmental agencies.
29	Eligible Applicants - Page 3 - Application Guide	Sacramento Public Hearing.	School district- change to allow school districts to apply.	Eligible applicants are determined by legislation. An eligible applicant may partner with a school district for a project on school property.

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
30	Eligible Applicants - Page 3 - Application Guide	Los Angeles Area, Letter	Few entities have the ability to maintain park projects over the long-term and this limits the ability of some organizations to become engaged/involved. Since conservancies are uniquely equipped/empowered by the State to handle liability and maintenance of park projects, maybe they should receive lump-sum allocations without having to compete with multi-purpose agencies (likemunicipalities) in the grant process as long as they partner with those agencies in project development and implementation. Certainly most small nonprofit organizations also lack the ability to hold liability and maintenance responsibilities for projects, so they, too, must partner with those who can do this. Projects that include all three of these entities as partners could be rewarded with additional points in their applications.	Legislation requires a competitive process and does not allow for lump-sum allocations to conservancies. Many municipalities and non profits have demonstrated the ability to maintain park projects over the long-term. Criteria #9 has been revised: It now asks the applicant to cite relevant administrative and operational experience or capacity to ensure project completion and long term operation and maintenance of the project for the benefit of the critically underserved community.
31	Eligible Applicants - Page 3 - Application Guide	Orange County Area, Letter	Give points for partnerships- Establishing partnerships can enhance programming, increase participation rates, and maximize the use of facilities after hours.	Partnerships are encouraged for the reasons provided in your comment. The applicant may discuss how partnerships/the project will benefit the community in the response to criteria #9. Please see criteria #9 in the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009.

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
32	Application Deadline - Page 3 - Application Guide	Shasta County -Redding Public Hearing	Clarify when process will begin. (applications due- and grant awards announced.)	We cannot determine this until the Legislature appropriates the funds for this program.
33	Application Deadline - Page 3 - Application Guide	Bay Area - Oakland Public Hearing	It is very difficult to get plans going in 6 months (from time guidelines are final to application deadline) - Also, is there a way to get funds for community based planning before application is submitted? Difficult for us to move forward with acquisition plans-other financial investments - if we don't have funding guarantee (for a competitive program). We need funds for up front planning.	If planning is not complete in time for first round, you can apply for the second round. Planning costs incurred after date of appropriation may be eligible for reimbursement if competitive grant is awarded. Technical assistance section provides low cost methods for community based planning. Please see the new Application Guide dated February 17, 2009. Note the definition of "design". The completion of construction documents are not required at the time of application.
34	Application Deadline - Page 3 - Application Guide	San Marcos Area, Letter	The City recommends limiting the number of applications an eligible applicant can submit. This will allow for an equitable distribution of program funds throughout the State.	Submitting a large number of applications does not guarantee even one grant award.

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
35	Amount of Funds Available - Rounds - Page 3 - Application Guide	Sacramento Public Hearing.	I like the two rounds- if I didn't get in on 1st round, I can get in on 2nd round.	Noted.
36	Amount of Funds Available - Rounds - Page 3 - Application Guide	Monterey County Public Hearing	Many grant programs have good applications in round one that exceed available amount. Some programs move funds from round 2 into round 1 to fund those good projects. I encourage 2 rounds, but have flexibility so you can pull money from 2nd round into the 1st round.	Change made to allow for flexibility. The funds have not yet been appropriated by the Legislature, and we do not know how much will be available per round(s).
37	Amount of Funds Available - Rounds - Page 3 - Application Guide	San Marcos Area, Letter	If there are remaining funds from round one, will it be carried over to round two OR will OGALS offer the applicant on the cut off line to revise project budget? Clarify this in the program guidelines.	Flexibility is needed in the guidelines. The funds have not yet been appropriated by the Legislature, and we do not know how much will be available per round(s).
38	Min-Max Grant Amounts - Page 3 - Application Guide	Fresno Public Hearing	Max grant amount- make it higher- raise to \$10 million.	No change. Because this is a statewide program and there are many critically underserved communities throughout the state, a higher maximum of \$10 million per project instead of \$5 million means that roughly 50% less communities will be served

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
				by this program.
39	Min-Max Grant Amounts - Page 3 - Application Guide	Fresno Public Hearing	I agree. Aquatics complex etc will cost \$8-\$10 million.	Because this is a statewide program and there are many critically underserved communities throughout the state, a higher maximum of \$10 million per project instead of \$5 million means that roughly 50% less communities will be served by this program.
40		Fresno Public Hearing	I also agree that max should be \$8-10 million.	Because this is a statewide program and there are many critically underserved communities throughout the state, a higher maximum of \$10 million per project instead of \$5 million means that roughly 50% less communities will be served by this program.
41	Min-Max Grant Amounts -	Fresno Public Hearing	I also agree that cap should be raised to \$8-10 million. .	Because this is a statewide program and there are many critically underserved

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
	Page 3 - Application Guide			communities throughout the state, a higher maximum of \$10 million per project instead of \$5 million means that roughly 50% less communities will be served by this program.
42	Min-Max Grant Amounts - Page 3 - Application Guide	Fresno Public Hearing	I concur with \$8-\$10 million.	Because this is a statewide program and there are many critically underserved communities throughout the state, a higher maximum of \$10 million per project instead of \$5 million means that roughly 50% less communities will be served by this program.
43	Min-Max Grant Amounts - Page 3 - Application Guide	Fresno County Area Email	The City is against raising the Maximum Grant Amount above \$5,000,000. If the amount is raised to \$10 million as suggested at the hearing in Fresno, only 18 grants would be awarded per cycle. There were 18 potential grantees in the Fresno meeting alone.	Noted.
44	Min-Max Grant Amounts - Page 3 - Application Guide	Fresno County Area Email	Increase the maximum allowable award to \$7.5 million per round (from \$5 million per round). (\$368 million available over 2 rounds)	Because this is a statewide program and there are many critically underserved communities throughout the state, a higher maximum of \$7.5 million per project instead of \$5 million means that roughly 25% less

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
				communities will be served by this program.
45	Min-Max Grant Amounts - Page 3 - Application Guide	Inland Empire Public Hearing	I think \$5 million is appropriate. \$10 million as a max grant award takes away from worthy smaller projects. Page 2: Add to list of eligible projects (such as a golf course, outdoor education facilities such as fishery project) - and add ineligible project examples. Ineligible examples places limits on what we can't do.	Noted.
46	Min-Max Grant Amounts - Page 3 - Application Guide	Inland Empire Public Hearing	Our City wants to develop a New Sports Complex Park - City already owns land- but sports complex will cost \$10 million. A small community center of 10,000 square feet costs \$5 mill. It costs \$750-\$1 million to acquire one acre. For \$5 million to purchase land and develop it- you are talking about a neighborhood park only. \$5 million does not get you far. Back in Prop. 12 and 40 the max was around \$5 million. You may have to double it now if you are aiming to put in sports complexes. Again- for our soccer complex-we own the acres, and cost of a small soccer complex is \$10 mil. (development only)	Because this is a statewide program and there are many critically underserved communities throughout the state, a higher maximum of \$10 million per project instead of \$5 million means that roughly 50% less communities will be served by this program.

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
47	Min-Max Grant Amounts - Page 3 - Application Guide	Monterey County Public Hearing	Massive project we are doing will cost far more than \$5 million when all phases are considered.	Please see the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide - Technical assistance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not include long-term or multi-phased elements that will not be paid for by the requested GRANT plus COMMITTED FUNDS (if any). • For ACQUISITION and DEVELOPMENT combination PROJECTS, the entire acquired property need not be developed. Only a phase that creates a fully-useable recreational opportunity must be completed and made open to the public before the end of the GRANT PERFORMANCE PERIOD.
48	Min-Max Grant Amounts - Page 3 - Application Guide	Monterey County Public Hearing	Allow for agencies to request more than the max amount per agency. For example, joint project by multiple agencies that, when combined, can request more than \$5 mil each for a joint project.	No change. This a "committed funds" issue. Please see the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide - Project Selection Criteria #6 and technical assistance.

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
49	Min-Max Grant Amounts - Page 3 - Application Guide	Bay Area - Oakland Public Hearing	I'd like to see no cap on the maximum grant amount. For a large community center- \$5 million won't get you far.	Because this is a statewide program and there are many critically underserved communities throughout the state, a higher maximum means less communities will be served by this program.
50	Min-Max Grant Amounts - Page 3 - Application Guide	Bay Area - Oakland Public Hearing	If we acquire large parcel for \$4 million, and have \$1 million left- is there a problem if we can only develop portion of parcel that we acquire.	Please see technical assistance added to the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not include long-term or multi-phased elements that will not be paid for by the requested GRANT plus COMMITTED FUNDS (if any). • For ACQUISITION and DEVELOPMENT combination PROJECTS, the entire acquired property need not be developed. Only a phase that creates a fully-useable recreational opportunity must be completed and made open to the public before the end of the GRANT PERFORMANCE PERIOD

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
51	Min-Max Grant Amounts - Page 3 - Application Guide	Letter	<p>\$368 million dollars is not enough money to meet all of the state's need for parks. With that in mind, we strongly encourage DPR to place a very high priority for population numbers in the 'service area' - especially when approving grants that are at or approaching the maximum grant amount available. More specifically, we believe that the higher dollar grants approved must be awarded to projects that can service a very high percentage of residents in the community. With a finite amount of funds available, we believe that state must make sure those dollars are invested in projects that will benefit the most number of individuals and families in the community.</p>	<p>Criteria #4 - Community based planning- will ensure that projects funded by this program result from a broad representation of residents in the critically underserved community, and will therefore benefit diverse needs of the community. Due to the use of the 1/2 mile radius, the projects will be located in close proximity to a critically underserved community, instead of being located miles away from residents of the critically underserved community who may lack private transportation. Change made to criteria #2.B. which looks at the number of families below poverty within the community.</p>
52	Min-Max Grant Amounts - Page 3 - Application Guide	Sacramento Public Hearing.	<p>Max grant amount of \$5 million. I want to know how far \$5 mil goes for a park project. Concerned that \$5 million per grant will eat up \$368 million quickly. I really don't know what \$100,000 or \$5 million will get you, but we want to make sure # of people served is considered.</p>	<p>Maximum remains at \$5 million per grant, which should be sufficient for acquisition and basic park development to create a new park.</p>

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
53	Min-Max Grant Amounts - Page 3 - Application Guide	Sacramento Public Hearing.	Max grant amount. A pool will cost about \$3 million. A basic park renovation is \$800,000.	Noted.
54	Min-Max Grant Amounts - Page 3 - Application Guide	Sacramento Public Hearing.	I want a process that allows unique consideration of projects above \$5 million. Projects may warrant a grant for more than \$5 million.	No change. Because this is a statewide program and there are many critically underserved communities throughout the state, a higher maximum means less communities will be served by this program.
55	Min-Max Grant Amounts - Page 3 - Application Guide	Lake Tahoe Area, Letter	Maximum grant amount of \$5 million: The recreation grant history at the California Tahoe Conservancy attests to the fact that the cost to create new recreation features is high, especially if land acquisition is involved. I am asking your consideration for increasing the five million dollar cap in special circumstances. Enable applicants of large projects to submit distinct components for consideration on separate grant scope/cost estimate sheets. Thus, the State doesn't have to review duplicated application packets, but project proponents of larger projects could justify higher price projects in elements that could be reviewed independently in the grant project or approved as a high cost whole. For example, if a large new community center was one component (that \$5 million might only partially fund) and an amphitheater	No change. Please see technical assistance added to the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not include long-term or multi-phased elements that will not be paid for by the requested GRANT plus COMMITTED FUNDS (if any). • For ACQUISITION and DEVELOPMENT combination PROJECTS, the entire acquired property need not be developed. Only a phase that creates a fully-useable recreational opportunity must be

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
			was another component (eligible for a separate amount under \$5 million), then they could be submitted on separate grant scope/cost estimate sheets under one project application. Projects with components totaling more than \$5 million could be asked to submit a separate justification and/or meet additional criteria –perhaps by meeting not only the neighborhood need criteria found in the current guidelines, but also a community criteria (describing how the larger community will be served by the facility), or for a place like Lake Tahoe, how both the local community and the visiting community will all benefit from the facility.	completed and made open to the public before the end of the GRANT PERFORMANCE PERIOD
56	Min-Max Grant Amounts - Page 3 - Application Guide	Orange County Area	There is no viable existing open space to build a brand new park in the City. The ratio of parkland per 1,000 residents is .9 acres. We truly would like to add new park space, but the cost to acquire, demo, relocate, and construct a new park would cost more than the maximum of \$5,000,000 allowed in the grant.	Noted. Please see the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide – Technical Assistance for criteria #6 which relates to “phasing” a new park project.
57	No Match - Page 3 Application Guide	Inland Empire Public Hearing	Why not have a match as an incentive.	It is not permissible based on legislation. A match requirement can disadvantage economically challenged communities.
58	No Match - Page 3 Application Guide	Monterey County Public Hearing	Put “no match” on bottom of page 3 in bold font.	Change made.

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
59	No Match - Page 3 Application Guide	Bay Area, Letter	Although no match is required, the grant guidelines should explain if a local match will increase chances of securing funds. A local match represents community support for project.	It is not permissible based on legislation.
60	Item 4 - Page 4 - Application Guide	Los Angeles Public Hearing	"Revisions will not be accepted"-might be a good idea to soften the language to allow a revision. Went through other grant process- they allowed some revisions.	We give technical assistance to applicants before and after they submit their applications. We give applicants a second chance to complete any incomplete application packet items, except the Project Selection Criteria response. Unlike our office, many granting entities automatically disqualify incomplete applications and do not give applicants a second chance on any incomplete application items.
61	Item 5 - Page 4 - Application Guide	Bay Area - Oakland Public Hearing	Clarify- will staff make decisions. I recommend citizen board making final decision. Some agencies are not the best- I'm not familiar with California- but maybe a check/balance would work.	Change made to clarify that the Office of Grants and Local Services conducts the reviews. An extensive multi-layered evaluation process will be used.

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
62	Item 5 - Page 4 - Application Guide	Monterey County Public Hearing	Clarify application/competitive review process- Who does it? Look at River Parkways grant program- similar process- application, completeness review where we can complete application- and their core review team does the site visits rather than one project officer.	Change made to clarify that the Office of Grants and Local Services conducts the reviews. An extensive multi-layered evaluation process will be used.
63	Item 7 - Page 4 - Application Guide	Inland Empire Public Hearing	Change definition/use of term of "Contract" to "Grant Agreement". Interpretation that "contract" means contract with contractor- not the "Grant Agreement".	"Contract" is shown in caps, meaning it is defined in the definitions section - which clarifies that the contract is for the grant.
64	Item 9 - Page 4 - Application Guide	San Marcos Area, Letter	What is the grant performance period deadline? Is it the date of when the applicant anticipates the project will be completed or is the date of when funds will be liquidated per PRC, Section 5652.5? The grant performance period deadline should be based upon legislation and not upon the estimated construction completion date, as project schedules can be delayed due to unforeseen circumstances. This statement should be incorporated within the GRANT PERFORMANCE PERIOD description on page 49.	It is the date of when funds will liquidate. The recommended addition to the definition of grant performance period has been added.
65		Inland Empire Public Hearing	We are falling short on a project- due to economy. Need a section where we can ask for scope reduction.	See the scope change section of the Grant Administration Guide.
66	Application Packet Checklist - Page 6	Bay Area - Oakland Public Hearing	Want to be able use PDF file where we can input info into forms electronically.	Forms will be made available on the www.parks.ca.gov/grants web site.

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
67	Application Packet Checklist - Page 6	Shasta County - Redding Public Hearing	Make forms available electronically.	Forms will be made available on the www.parks.ca.gov/grants web site.
68	Application Form - Page 7	Los Angeles Area Email	The formatting on the Application form is not correct - there are lines missing and spacing is incorrect.	Noted. These are draft guidelines and formatting will be modified before they are finalized.
69	Resolution page 9	San Diego County Public Hearing	Clarify: If we are a JPA- do we need resolution from each agency within JPA-	If the JPA is the applicant, the resolution comes from the JPA's governing body. (in all cases, the resolution comes from the applicant's governing body)
70	Resolution page 9	Sacramento Public Hearing.	We use designated position or designee. Will that work (want to include designee)	Yes
71	Resolution page 9	Bay Area, Letter	We should encourage the provision of a resolution as long as the time to prepare the grant is reasonable.	Applicants will have 6 months to prepare the application. An extension after the application deadline can be accommodated for the resolution.
72	Grant Scope/Cost Estimate Form page 10-13 - Application	Inland Empire Public Hearing	I like the flexibility to not have to include minor support amenities.	Noted.

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
	guide			
73	Grant Scope/Cost Estimate Form page 10-13 - Application guide	San Diego County Public hearing	Thank you for the Major Amenities- and not including minor amenities.	Noted.
74	Grant Scope/Cost Estimate Form page 10-13 - Application guide	San Diego County - Letter	Project cost estimates are to list major project amenities, minor project amenities are to be removed from the project scope, but then used to support project reimbursement requests. Is the intent of handling major/minor amenities in this manner to lessen the amount of paperwork from grant recipients and State Parks for minor changes in project scope?	Yes. Using a playground project as an example, the grantee will have the flexibility to construct or not construct minor support amenities such as benches, a sign, and a drinking fountain. The costs of those minor support amenities will be accepted as part of the construction of the new playground. The construction of the new playground is the expected grant scope deliverable for project completion.
75	Funding Sources Form page 14-15	Kern County Public hearing	This form is a valuable tool.	Noted.

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
76	Funding Sources Form page 14-15 and Project Selection Criteria #6	San Diego County Public Hearing	Point system- Points should be given for match or committed funds- With no points given for match or collaboration- it can be confusing that you are asking for committed funds.	Points cannot be given for match or committed funds. Legislation requires that the grant by itself, or any additional committed funds (if needed), must meet all costs to complete the project. Committed funds are only asked for when the grant by itself cannot meet all costs to complete the project.
77	Funding Sources Form page 14-15 and Project Selection Criteria #6	Fresno County Area Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow for funds to be used as one installment of several funding sources that may be needed to complete the project. Remove the requirement that application for these Prop 84 funds can be awarded only if all other funding to complete a project is in place at the time of the Prop 84 application. • In connection with the immediate prior comment, allow applicants to make application to any and all competitive rounds made available under this program in order to complete phases of construction planned. 	Legislation requires that the grant by itself, or any additional committed funds (if needed), must meet all costs to complete the project. Committed funds are only asked for when the grant by itself cannot meet all costs to complete the project. Please see the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide - technical assistance for Project Selection Criteria #6. The technical assistance covers the possibility for phasing projects, as long as a phase will create a new recreational opportunity.

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
78	CEQA Compliance pages 16-18 Application Guide	Inland Empire Public Hearing	CEQA flexibility is very helpful to many of our cities. Keep this in.	Noted.
79	CEQA Compliance pages 16-18 Application Guide	Monterey County Public Hearing	CEQA pending should be 16-18 months for large projects.	No change. Experience has shown that one year from the grant award is sufficient.
80	CEQA Compliance pages 16-18 Application Guide	Monterey County Public Hearing	I concur- a lot of our projects are in coastal zone- CEQA and mitigation takes longer than 12 months.	No change. Experience has shown that one year from the grant award is sufficient.
81	CEQA Compliance pages 16-18 Application Guide	San Diego County Public Hearing	CEQA complete within one year from grant award announcement- recommend that it be from date of grant execution. It takes us almost one year to get contract going for CEQA. Maybe an alternative is "within 18 months" instead of one year" from date of grant award. We cannot move on project until we have an executed agreement. There would still be time for you to recommit funds to another project with 18 months.	No change. Experience has shown that one year from the grant award is sufficient.

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
82	CEQA Compliance pages 16-18 Application Guide	San Diego County Public Hearing	CEQA environmental review can be very expensive- we want to make sure we are covered for the cost.	CEQA costs incurred after the program's date of appropriation can be reimbursed after the grant contract is encumbered. See the flow chart on page _____
83	CEQA Compliance pages 16-18 Application Guide	Lake Tahoe Area, Letter	The bottom text box implies that the CEQA expense can be 25% of the grant amount as a Pre-construction cost. Should this box clarify that CEQA can be up to the full amount of the allowed 25% pre-construction cost (which could include other things)?	It does mention that CEQA can be “up to” the 25% pre-construction cost. Also see the definition of “Pre-Construction” which lists other things.
84	CEQA Compliance pages 16-18 Application Guide	Bay Area, Letter	Want to see CEQA required as part of the grant application. It confirms that the project can be built and shows that a community process has occurred. Getting rid of it increases our competition – ultimately the projects that can’t secure CEQA will drop out, but we may be forgotten amongst the other candidate projects that didn’t make the first cut.	A CEQA Pending contract will be issued for grant funded projects that need CEQA compliance. Since this program prioritizes the creation of new parks resulting from community based planning, some excellent projects may not be CEQA compliant at the time of application.
85	Land Tenure Form page 21 and Land Tenure page 19-20	Bay Area Public Hearing	State law does not allow certain agencies to execute long term agreements.	Please see the land tenure section of the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide which shows the alternate requirement.

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
86	Land Tenure Form page 21 and Land Tenure page 19-20	Bay Area Email	Land tenure terms: The requirement for leases greater than 20, 25 (20 or 30 years) years may be difficult for applicants to obtain. We have been working with the school district for certain projects, but the lease term that the district has agreed upon has been 25 years max. We are looking at adding options for extension, but we'll have to see if it's acceptable by the school district. My concern is that the lease timeframe may limit the application request amount as it is currently written.	Please see the land tenure section of the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide which shows the alternate requirement for cases where the 20 or 30 year requirement cannot be met.
87	Land Tenure Form page 21 and Land Tenure page 19-20	Bay Area, Letter	Land Tenure Documents - Can Letters from the City Real Estate documenting property ownership be added as acceptable documentation? San Francisco has some land that was awarded to us by way of ordinance and does not have the type of support real estate documentation listed in the administrative guide.	Yes, if the letter includes the parcel number and brief history of how the property came into the City's ownership.
88	Land Tenure Form page 21 and Land Tenure page 19-20	Fresno County Public Hearing	Land Tenure Form: For most local agencies, city attorneys draft the agreement.	This form assists attorneys and applicants by detailing what is required in the land tenure agreement.
89	Land Tenure Form page 21.	Fresno County Public Hearing	Looks like a checklist, not a form. Maybe call it Land Tenure Form Checklist or Land Tenure Checklist Form.	The form includes boxes that can be checked off.

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
90	Land Tenure Form page 19-21.	Lake Tahoe Area, letter	1. Pages 19 and 20 – Might the form benefit from having different criteria for Public Land than for Private Land when Land Tenure is discussed? In addition, there may not be long-standing use of the property by the Applicant – it may be a new proposed use. (I’m trying to imagine how the Forest Service would respond if asked for a 30-year agreement.) Perhaps it can be made clear that the land needs to remain available for public use during the tenure period and that if the tenure period is less than the required timeframe, which the underlying public agency agrees to take over maintenance responsibilities if the Applicants land tenure period is not extended to the full term?	Please see the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide land tenure section - alternate 3, which is designed to handle cases such as the Forest Service example.
91	Item 9- Site Plan Page 22	San Diego County Public Hearing	"Concept level" is often much different than the final project- such as site conditions that affect where features can finally be located- utility issues- if the same features will be in project site-is that OK. Example- swimming pool wont fit- but splash park will.	Changing the location of the same features at the site is OK. However, the example of swapping a swimming pool that was awarded a grant, for a splash park, will possibly be a denied scope change request as it may affect the integrity of the competitive process.
92	Item 11- Project Location Map Page 22	Bay Area Email	Project Location Map: Would it be considered to allow applicants to use census tracts as an alternative to the ½ mile radius? The radius makes it difficult to capture census data, although I realize the Guide allows an estimate of the information if partial census tract is captured.	The "California State Parks Community Fact Finder" tool will generate the information so you will not need to capture census tract data.

**Comments and responses for Section I, II, and III,
Pages 1-22 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide.**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
---	-------	-------	---------	----------