

MURRAY-HAYDEN 2002 PUBLIC COMMENTS
ALL SITES COMBINED

TOPIC	VENUE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
General	Oakland	Murray-Hayden, RZH and Urban Parks - propensity to allocate more dollars to urban areas.	No change - statute determines the eligibility of the areas
	LA	I like the way the guides are outlined.	Thank you!
	LA	Emphasis on quality of project management, more so than last time.	Thank you!
	LA	I appreciate the fact that we do not need to include term progress rates and school drop out.	Thank you!
	Email 5/22	"I want to express my appreciation for all the staff I worked with in the last round. They were sincere, helpful, and very professional"	Thank you!
Neighborhood Service Area	Letter 5/27	Neighborhood Service Area definition "directly limits the quality and scope of the projects that get funded"	The Procedural Guide has been modified.
	Letter 5/27	The one-mile limitation of the Neighborhood Service Area unnecessarily limits review and scoring for projects with significant positive impacts for larger areas.	The Procedural Guide has been modified.
	Letter 5/27	Recommends "Neighborhood Service Area" definition be "the neighborhood to be served by the proposed project"	The Procedural Guide has been modified.
	Letter 5/27	The "Neighborhood Service Area" definition, in combination with the evaluation criteria, would eliminate regional projects from consideration.	No change - per Statute, the program focus is on immediate proximity
General Information	San Diego	The section discussing adaptive re-use should expand on the adaptive use of existing buildings vs. new construction.	The Procedural Guide has been modified.
Program Description	Sacramento	Redevelopment should be included in definitions and in section 3. It is confusing because you have several grant programs going at the same time with multiple definitions.	No change - clarification can be provided by the Project Officer.
	LA	Add a sentence or two addressing letters of support, stating they are not required or scored to the guide.	The section was modified - applicants may include letters of support, but they are not required, nor are they part of the scoring criteria.
	Letter 5/27	Recommends "funding maximum waived on a case by case basis" based on "special justification" which might include: 1. Number of youth served, 2. Leveraging of resources, 3. Uniqueness of project, 4. Other criteria established by the state.	No change - present cap allows for maximum number of projects to be funded.
	Email 5/27	Would like guide to "assure applicants that equitable funding consideration will be given to highly ranked applicants throughout the State"	No change - applications will be ranked according to responses to "Project Selection Criteria".
CEQA	San Diego	Clarification that the State Clearinghouse no longer issues written comments.	No change - the State Clearinghouse advised that responses to Environmental Impact Reports, Initial Studies, and Negative Declarations were still issued.
	San Diego	Change language in the procedural guide that website printout would be an adequate documentation.	No change - the State Clearinghouse advised that they still issue responses to Environmental Impact Reports, Initial Studies, and Negative Declarations.
	San Diego	CEQA compliance should include a determination of categorical exemption as a way to comply with this requirement.	No change - categorical exemption already is included as a way to comply.
	Email 5/22	Categorical exemption categories should be defined in RFP.	No change - the categories are already defined in CEQA regulations.

MURRAY-HAYDEN 2002 PUBLIC COMMENTS
ALL SITES COMBINED

TOPIC	VENUE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Criteria - General	San Diego	Point values have changed on most criteria.	No change - the point values for the criteria were based upon prior administrative experience and current comments.
	LA	Criteria is confusing, as they are missing headings.	No change - the headings were removed to improve continuity.
Criteria # 1	Email 5/27	Add statement "the safety and accessibility of the park and open space land need to be considered"	No change - this issue is addressed in Criteria #4 and #7
	Email 5/27	Add questions regarding whether land is "fully usable and accessible by youth", and if there are "safety or hazard concerns", and "extent of adult supervision or oversight present in this park and open space..."	No change - these issues are addressed in Criteria #4 and #7
	Email 5/22	There is no accurate way to determine the acreage of parks in Neighborhood Service Area (NSA).	No change - applicants should check with their local city or county parks and recreation department for the acreage.
Criteria # 2	Email 5/22	2000 poverty data is not available by NSA and census tracts do not reflect the NSA area. Free and Reduced Lunch program should be enough to provide comparative data	No change - the criteria asks for either "free and reduced price lunch" statistics or US census tracts statistics within the Neighborhood Service Area (NSA).
	Email 5/22	Everyone should be using the same Free and Reduced Lunch Data from the same source, e.g. 2002, 2001	The section was modified.
Criteria # 4	LA	This criteria is redundant, because the criteria preceding this one repeats what was asked previously. Some cities may not be able to adequately document statistics - that doesn't mean that children are not at risk.	No change - the criteria is broadly framed to allow applicants to provide narrative and stats as appropriate.
	Email 5/22	Revise the questions re: duplication of services - because there may be one or more agencies providing the same service does not mean there is a services duplication.	No change - applicants can provide written justification of need for additional similar services.
Criteria #5	LA	Should provide definition of "neighborhood service area resident".	No change - lack of adequate justification for the change.
Criteria # 6	Email 5/22	The emphasis on neighborhood input is not appropriate. Neighbors often do not want youth in their neighborhood, especially if they are recovering from addiction.	No change - the programmatic intent is that the community should be involved in the project planning process to ensure that the project will meet their needs.
Criteria # 8	LA	This criteria should refer to the jurisdictional boundary, rather than immediate proximity.	No change - legislation uses the term "immediate proximity" rather than jurisdiction
Criteria # 9	Email 5/22	Partnerships are not an indicator of anything. Some services require extensive networking (e.g., case management) and others do not (e.g., music instruction).	No change - data from current and prior projects suggest that effective partnerships create an atmosphere for leveraging funds and services.
	LA	This criteria should have a higher point value; it should be worth 25 points.	No change - the criteria were revised based upon previous grant administrative experience and current comments.
	San Diego	Regarding calculations of labor hours, traditionally we use Points of Light as standard. Would like to use Points of Light as standard.	No change - we cannot recommend one method over another.
	Letter 5/26	Support and encourage elimination of matching requirement.	No change - Match is mandated by statute.
Criteria #10	LA	This guide does not provide enough points for agencies that are ready to go.	No change - the criteria were revised based upon previous grant administrative experience and current comments.

MURRAY-HAYDEN 2002 PUBLIC COMMENTS
ALL SITES COMBINED

TOPIC	VENUE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	LA	Project readiness should not be included in the scoring criteria.	No change - the criteria were revised based upon previous grant administrative experience and current comments.