

**Comments and responses for Section IV, technical assistance, and V, definitions.
Pages 41-51 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide, and general comments about the program**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
360	Technical Assistance Section Page 41-46	Monterey County Public Hearing	When I read the project selection criteria, I read it first before the technical assistance section.	Noted.
361	Technical Assistance Section Page 41-46	Monterey County Public Hearing	Technical assistance (reference) is mentioned in bold in the project selection criteria. I see it.	Correct.
362	Technical Assistance Section Page 41-46	Monterey County Public Hearing	I want to say thank you for this technical assistance section. It is very helpful.	Noted
363	Technical Assistance Section Page 41-46	Monterey County Public Hearing	"Construction" examples on page 46: put "landscaping" or "habitat restoration".	Change made.
365	Technical Assistance Section Page 41-46	San Diego County Public Hearing	Thumbs-up! This is a new section that you have not had in past- very well done.	Noted.
366	Definition Section Pages 47-51	Fresno County Public hearing	Definition of "Outdoor Learning Opportunity"- put in example of interpretive signs.	Outdoor Learning Opportunity has a new definition. Please see the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide.
367	Definition Section Pages 47-51	Fresno County Public hearing	Definition of New Park- encourage a minimum size for useable park space to qualify as a new park.	No change needed. A Project must result in the creation of a new recreational opportunity, and small new parks can and must have enough

**Comments and responses for Section IV, technical assistance, and V, definitions.
Pages 41-51 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide, and general comments about the program**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
				space to provide a recreational opportunity.
368	Definition Section Pages 47-51	Monterey County Public Hearing	The definitions are very helpful. Instead of small caps, italicize terms to make more obvious.	Defined terms will remain in caps.
369	General Comments About This Grant Program	Kern County Public Hearing	In future, it would be nice to have Central Valley to be identified as grant recipient. Would be nice to have different criteria for central valley because other areas have such population density.	It is possible that the Central Valley will present numerous applications that can be competitive. There are critically underserved communities in the Central Valley.
370	General Comments About This Grant Program	Kern County Public hearing	Make awards in advance of LWCF app deadline. If grant is awarded, this grant can be used as match for LWCF.	Noted.
371	General Comments About This Grant Program	Bay Area Public Hearing	In general- seems very possible that you can get many applications with tight cluster. How will ties be broken? Applications in round 1- do those projects get preference in round two or does everyone start over	Applications received in round two will start over. All applications start with zero points, and then gain points based on the response to each project selection criteria.

**Comments and responses for Section IV, technical assistance, and V, definitions.
Pages 41-51 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide, and general comments about the program**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
372	General Comments About This Grant Program	Bay Area, letter	The Application Package should include data sheets that help justify the expenditure of funds. Our Trail Count helps to document the usage and value of our trail network...we should advocate for all other agencies to prove the value of projects through data collection.	The Project Selection Criteria, including criteria #4 community based planning, #5 Sustainable design, #9 etc. all describe the value of the project. The Grant Scope/Cost Estimate form shows the breakdown of the estimated project costs. Finally, the expenditures of grant funds by grantees will be justified through the grant expenditure form found in the Grant Administration Guide.
373	General Comment About Project Selection Criteria Scoring Categories	San Diego County Area, Letter	A different point value is recommended for applications:- Community based planning- 15 points (participation of community members may be harder to obtain in some areas)- Critical lack of park space (3 acres/1000 residents)- 15 points- Significant Poverty (2000 median income)- 15 points- Sustainable Design (LEED, LID, etc.)- 10 points- Type of project (priority order: new park, expansion of existing park & rehabilitation of existing park)- 15 points- Project needs and benefits (community based)- 10 points- Project accessibility (no/ low fee & ADA)- 10 points- Employment or training opportunities (outdoor learning)- 10 points- Project funding (full funding requirement)- 0 points	A critical lack of park space and significant poverty (2008 incomes, not 2000) has been raised to 36 points. Community based planning has been lowered to 18 points. Various other scoring changes made based on public comments and departmental expertise.

**Comments and responses for Section IV, technical assistance, and V, definitions.
Pages 41-51 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide, and general comments about the program**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
374	General Comment About Project Selection Criteria Scoring Categories	Stanislaus County Area, Letter	We support the point total values associated with the nine individual Criteria as listed in the Draft Guidelines.	Noted
375	General Comment About Project Selection Criteria Scoring Categories	Sacramento County Area, Letter	We support the total values associated with the nine criteria in the Draft Guidelines.	Noted.
376	General Comments About This Grant Program	Shasta County - Redding Public Hearing	Are these criteria guidelines indicative of other programs? Like DWR Household Waste- they are coming up with one guideline for their programs. I noticed there was more environmental in this program compared to others.	No, each grant program will have different criteria, eligible applicants, eligible projects etc based on legislation.
377	General Comments About This Grant Program	Shasta County - Redding Public Hearing	With regards to entire State applying, we are talking thousands of potential applicants.	Cities, counties, park districts, and non profits throughout the state are eligible.
378	General Comments About This Grant Program	Shasta County - Redding Public Hearing	Rural counties like Shasta – little attention is given to the need for parks.Last round of Prop. 40 funded a large percentage that went to urban areas.	Grant funds are administered according to legislation.

**Comments and responses for Section IV, technical assistance, and V, definitions.
Pages 41-51 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide, and general comments about the program**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
379	General Comment about Project Selection Criteria	Greater Sacramento Area - Letter	Regarding the proposed points assigned to the categories of park acreage per 1000 residents, free or reduced lunch ratios, and new parks versus expansion or rehabilitation; we respectfully encourage that the point spread be condensed. This modification should result in a more need and less formula - driven grant process.	Change made to criteria #1-2, where competition now drives the score instead of having set points based on acreage per 1,000 or free/reduced price lunch enrollment. Criteria #9 is designed for applicant to discuss the need for the project.
380	General Comments	Los Angeles Area, Letter	<p>I would also like to take this opportunity to share some general comments about the State's grant process:</p> <p>1.) Consider timing grant program schedules so that they are all annually simultaneous--it is confusing to follow and inefficient to respond to multiple different grant program processes from multiple different agencies of the State. Also, when one State program is considered a match for another State program application, the timing cycles can be difficult to coordinate. By keeping one annual, consistent schedule for all grant program cycles, applicants can more easily follow the procedures and this may encourage the involvement of a more diverse applicant pool and reduce redundant transaction costs.</p> <p>2.) Instead of having multiple different departments/agencies within a municipality submit the same information multiple times to multiple grant contract personnel at different departments within the State for different grant programs, have a one-time, annual submission (with strict deadlines) of all of the</p>	<p>1) Grant program schedules are often driven by circumstances outside the Office of Grants and Local Services' control, such as state or federal legislation, appropriation dates, and other budget issues.</p> <p>2) See previous response above. Each grant program is driven by different state and/or federal legislation, requirements, etc.</p> <p>3) Participants at workshops appreciate question and answer face-to-face interaction.</p> <p>4) Applicants have the option of resubmitting the same application for round two. Applicants also have the option of obtaining</p>

**Comments and responses for Section IV, technical assistance, and V, definitions.
Pages 41-51 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide, and general comments about the program**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
			<p>relevant information that will last for the whole municipality for the whole year--such as proof of insurance information, federal employer ID number, compliance with labor codes, maps showing the locations of special zones within the entity's jurisdiction, the entity's participation in regional water management planning efforts, etc. to establish something like a "pre-qualified applicant" list. (This would avoid a lot of costly redundancy for the State and the applicant.)</p> <p>3.) Additionally, instead of holding multiple workshops on each grant program across the State, the Department of Recreation and Parks or Water Resources (for instance) could hold webinars and multiple LOCAL organizations could host viewing of these (for those that don't have resources/computers, etc.)--such as at the River center in Los Angeles. (This would avoid having multiple people drive long distances and take extra time off of work in going to and from such events and, of course, would reduce the carbon footprint generated by such meetings.)</p> <p>4.) Implement a process that allows local applicants to have their rejected projects automatically resubmitted for the next round of grant consideration (from year-to-year) with only minimal update requirements--without having to completely redo their applications (This would save time and money for the State and the applicant.).</p> <p>5.) Provide special consideration to projects that may have critical cumulative impacts in waterbodies of concern; for instance, allow an applicant to make a case for a project that will result in incremental, but</p>	<p>"strengths and weaknesses" technical assistance after round one, so they can try to improve their application/project for round two.</p> <p>5) The project's ecological benefits can be included in the response to criteria #5-B and criteria #9. The examples in your comment are now included. Please see the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide.</p> <p>6) Program legislation mandates funds for capital projects, not ongoing operation and maintenance.</p> <p>7) Acquisition and clean-up of brownfields is an eligible cost. However, the program requires a fully-useable recreational opportunity resulting from the project. Please see the new February 17, 2009, Application Guide technical assistance section for criteria # 6.</p>

**Comments and responses for Section IV, technical assistance, and V, definitions.
Pages 41-51 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide, and general comments about the program**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
			<p>important steps toward solving problems of Statewide significance--such as reducing the Southern California region's dependence on Bay-Delta/external sources of water, preventing the introduction of large amounts of contamination into the ocean, or reducing the need for drastic sedimentation control measures at ports, etc. (This would foster more holistic thinking, which the State has encouraged through its regional water management planning protocols.)</p> <p>6.) Consider implementing language that makes some funds eligible to pay for River project MAINTENANCE at least for the first couple of years as seed-funding to assist with training and mobilization (requiring applicants to guarantee that these costs would subsequently be borne by the implementing agency after that start-up period).</p> <p>7.) Critically underserved communities often contain a number of brownfield sites, which could be redeveloped into much-needed park resources, but which are not attractive to project proponents because of the cost and complexity associated with investigating and remediating them. Consider allowing a portion of park funds to go toward acquisition and clean-up of brownfields without the same near-term development requirements (as applied to other projects).</p>	

**Comments and responses for Section IV, technical assistance, and V, definitions.
Pages 41-51 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide, and general comments about the program**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
381	General Comment about Project Selection Criteria	Los Angeles Area - Letter	<p>Points Given for each Selection Criteria: The point system should reflect the intent of the enabling legislation, which emphasizes 1) the need for funding parks in communities which lack park space and in lower-income areas and 2) giving priority to communities with significant poverty. In addition, the above comments on the Community Based Planning criteria recommends that only 15 points be given to this criteria. 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, this criteria should be given less weight and reduced to 15 points. We recommend distributing the points as follows: Criteria Points 1 Lack of Park Space 20 2 Significant Poverty 20 3 Type of Project 15 4 Community Based Planning 15 5 Sustainable Design 15 6 Project Costs 0 7 Project Accessibility 5 8 Employment Opportunities 5 9 Project Needs & Benefits 5 TOTAL 100</p>	<p>A critical lack of park space and significant poverty has been raised to 36 points. Community based planning has been lowered to 18 points. We do not believe that the revised version of the community based planning criterion (#4) will be difficult to measure and score.</p>

**Comments and responses for Section IV, technical assistance, and V, definitions.
Pages 41-51 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide, and general comments about the program**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
382	General Comments About This Grant Program	Placer County Area, Email	Proposition 84 was a statewide ballot initiative that was passed by the voters of entire State, not just the heavily urbanized cities. The \$400 million Prop 84 Statewide Park Program appears to be targeted solely at heavily urbanized areas. By its stated intent, the program will award grants on a competitive basis for the creation of new parks and new recreational opportunities in proximity to the most critically underserved communities across California. The rating criteria as currently drafted appears to be skewed towards heavy urban areas and precludes Placer County from being competitive in this program. Facility Services we would have preferred a portion be allocated on a pro-capita basis similar to past Propositions 40 and 12 so all agencies would receive some level of funding for new and much needed projects.	Legislation requires a competitive statewide grant program to fund the most critically underserved rural and urban communities throughout California.
383	General Comments About This Grant Program	Sacramento County Public Hearing	Separate Northern and Southern California funding.	Legislation does not divide the state. This is a competitive statewide grant program to fund the most critically underserved communities throughout California.
384	General Comments About This Grant Program	Los Angeles Area Email	Thanks for traveling around the state and giving us the opportunity to comment on the proposed guidelines. I'm new to this process, and learned a lot.	Noted.
385	General	Los Angeles Area - Letter	We appreciate this opportunity to provide feedback on the guidelines and applaud your community outreach efforts.	Noted.

**Comments and responses for Section IV, technical assistance, and V, definitions.
Pages 41-51 of the December 1, 2008 Application Guide, and general comments about the program**

#	Topic	Venue	Comment	Response
386	General Comments.	Greater Inland Empire Area - Letter	Thank you for your openness and willingness to hear our comments and revise the draft guidelines to more appropriately score rural communities and regional park facilities. We deserve a level playing field in this important park funding initiative. We are anxious to tell you the story of our City, its people and struggles. One of which is an unmet need for recreation facilities. Something as basic as soccer fields and a local soccer program, could have great value in this area. We want to give our youngsters the opportunity to engage in team sports, healthful activity and the lasting positive impact of participation. We believe Proposition 84 can give us this chance.	There are critically underserved rural and urban communities throughout California with insufficient or no park space and significant poverty. Criteria #1-2 will ensure that projects located in such communities will get higher funding priority. Criteria #9 is designed for applicants to discuss the challenges of the community.
387	General Comment about the Program	Los Angeles Area, Letter	I am delighted that this program is moving forward and believe that it will go a long way toward providing equitable natural resource amenities to all Californians, but particularly those who have been historically underserved.	Noted.
388	General Comment about the Program	Inland Empire Public Hearing	We are pleased that the State put this program forward. We are an underserved community.	Noted.