

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Application Checklist	Add "hand numbered pages ok"	Guide edited to incorporate suggestion.
10/01/09	Bay Area Email	Application Deadline	When do you expect the applications to become available?	OGALS anticipates the earliest possible due date to be May or June 2010, however, the date will depend on the publication of the final guide. Updated timelines and due dates will be posted on our website at www.parks.ca.gov/grants as the information becomes available.
10/08/09	Los Angeles Area Email	Application Deadline	I would urge you to make the deadline for grant applications May 1, 2009. For those agencies with limited resources, it will be very difficult to prepare two significant grant applications with the same March 1 st deadline.	OGALS will not use the same 03/01/10 deadline as the Statewide Park Program. The earliest proposed application date for the Nature Education Program is May or June 2010.
10/09/09	Los Angeles Area Email	Application Deadline	Strongly support a June 2010 deadline (or even later). An April deadline is too close to the Statewide Park Program (SPP) deadline. With limited grant staff and plans to apply for SPP, we would be hard-pressed to meet even a June deadline.	OGALS will not use the same 03/01/10 deadline as the Statewide Park Program. The earliest proposed application date for the Nature Education Program would be May or June 2010. However, the date may be later, and will depend on the date of publication of the final guide.
10/07/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Application Deadline	Both this program and the Statewide Park Program are legislated to serve many of the same communities. Having a due date for applications which is close to the Statewide Park Program creates a barrier for these communities applying for both programs. The grant deadlines need to be adjusted to give several months between deadlines to allow time to successfully complete both sets of applications.	OGALS understands that agencies may plan to apply for both the Statewide Park Program and the Nature Education Facilities Program. The two programs are distinctly different in legislation, purpose, and intent. The deadline for the Statewide Park Program is 03/01/10. At this time the earliest proposed application date for the Nature Education Program is May or June 2010.

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	Application Deadline	Also would like separated deadline, with small staff impacted by budget cuts	See above.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Application Deadline	Any concern about separating the application deadlines from Statewide Park Program. Would prefer May or June deadline for this program.	The final filing date for Nature Education Facility Program applications will be announced at least three months before the application is due. OGALS anticipates the earliest possible due date to be May or June 2010, however, the date will depend on the publication of the final guide. Updated timelines and due dates will be posted on our website at www.parks.ca.gov/grants as the information becomes available.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Application deadline	We do not want to see the deadline pushed back. This grant program is a long time coming. We would like to see a round two in future. Having something to show ASAP to public, is advantage to support for future funding.	Thank you for your comment.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Application Deadline	Instead of February 1 st deadline, would prefer later deadline of April 1. Allows time to complete applications, with holiday time considered, and does not conflict with Statewide Park Program deadlines.	The earliest proposed application date would be May or June 2010.
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	Application due date	Second the suggestions to separate the deadlines. Are there similar requirements in both programs that can be cut and pasted?	Although there are similar administrative requirements, the two Proposition 84 programs are distinctly different in legislation, purpose, intent. The Guides for each program reflect this difference.
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	Application Due Date	Would like deadline for this program separated from Statewide Park Program deadline by at least month	That is our intent.
09/23/09	San Diego Area	Application Due	How will I know the due date for applications	The final filing date for Nature Education

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
	Email	Topic date	for this program?	<p>Facility Program applications will be announced at least three months before the application is due. Currently OGALS anticipates the earliest possible due date to be May or June 2010, however, the date will depend on the publication of the final guide.</p> <p>Updated timelines and due dates will be posted on our website at www.parks.ca.gov/grants as the information becomes available.</p>
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Application form	Is acreage for entire project site or just for building site?	List the acreage for the entire site location.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Application form	Need more space to describe project, especially for larger project with many elements.	The form was edited to allow more room to list the project's features and major support amenities, e.g., botanical garden, restroom, parking lot.
10/01/09	Bay Area Email	Application period	Would like extended final filing date extended a month in order to give 4 months rather than 3 months to applicants to complete the application process. Would prefer February 29 th (instead of proposed 2/1/10).	The final filing date for Nature Education Facility Program applications will be announced at least three months before the application is due.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Application period	Would like six month application period.	<p>Most of the agencies OGALS heard from during the public comment period agreed that an application period of at least three months gave them sufficient time to develop an application.</p> <p>The draft guide currently on the website can be used as a template to begin collecting the required documents and formulating draft responses to the criteria.</p>
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Application period	Would like three months application period. We have been waiting for this grant program	OGALS plans to allow at least three months for the application period.

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
			for a long time.	
09/28/09	Bay Area Letter	AZA Accreditation	Recommend that accreditation by AZA be part of your criteria for considering zoos and aquariums.	Guide was not changed. To include this would requirement would disadvantage new zoos and aquariums.
09/25/09	Central Coast Letter	AZA Accreditation	Strongly recommend that accreditation by AZA be part of your criteria for considering zoos and aquariums.	See above.
09/25/09	Central Coast Email	AZA Accreditation	Strongly recommend that accreditation by AZA be part of your criteria for considering zoos and aquariums.	See above
09/23/09	Central Valley Letter	AZA Accreditation	Strongly recommend that accreditation by AZA be part of your criteria for considering zoos and aquariums.	See above
09/23/09	Sacramento Area Letter	AZA Accreditation	Strongly recommend that criteria include accreditation by AZA zoos and aquariums.	See above.
10/07/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	CEQA	PRC 75063(b) mandates nature education facilities that reach diverse population, the most diverse in our state reside in or near dense areas. Projects in these areas inherently have challenging CEQA and approval processes that take additional time not allowed for in these guidelines.	If CEQA is not complete at the time of application, and the grant is awarded, a CEQA pending contract will be offered. Under this one year contract, up to 10% of the grant award will be available for completion of CEQA. Please see both the NEF Application Guide and the Grant Administration Guide for detailed information about the CEQA pending contract.
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	CEQA Pending Contract	What if not able to complete CEQA, do we need return funds?	No. If you are given a CEQA Pending Contract, and a good faith effort is made to complete CEQA, the related costs for CEQA would be considered allowable.

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	CEQA pending contract	May need to clarify if CEQA is limited by 25% of 10% amount for CEQA pending contract. Seems to conflict with other parts of guide which allow up to 25% grant	The guide has been edited to clarify this point. The CEQA pending contract allows the grantee the use of an initial portion (maximum 10%) of the grant funds for completion of CEQA requirements. If CEQA is completed, and the full grant awarded, remaining eligible CEQA costs can be reimbursed up to the maximum 25% allowed for pre-construction costs.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	CEQA pending contract	Projects on federal land will require NEPA. That may take longer than a year to complete.	If you are awarded, a CEQA pending contract's twelve month performance period begins on the date of grant award announcement. Keeping OGALS informed of your progress or issues is important. If CEQA compliance is not complete within the year long performance period, the grant award may be rescinded.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	CEQA pending contract	I like the CEQA pending contract.	Thank you.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Criteria General	I think you should include a comparison of numbers served. This could be adjusted based on the tiers.	This program is designed to accommodate a wide range of projects both urban and rural. Criteria that focuses on numbers served would be difficult to validate across the spectrum. In addition, it would likely disadvantage new projects.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Criteria General	Criteria should consider scale of impact of project that is a large scale project may reach an audience statewide.	An applicant may want to discuss the impact of a large scale project in support of their response to Criterion #1.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Criteria General	If you consider numbers served: Small cities may have smaller attendance, but reach broader % of population targeted.	An applicant may want to discuss the percentage of population served in support of their response to Criterion #1 and/or discuss the project's reach to special population groups in Criterion #3.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Criteria General	What criteria might include consideration of projected attendance?	See above.

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
10/09/09	Sacramento Area Email	Criteria - general	<p>Criteria should include projects that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus on existing infrastructure or green building technology. 2. Develop sustainable green facilities along with educational programming that can be replicated at other sites. 3. Improve and enhance structural and mechanical systems of first generation green buildings 4. Provide market analysis to demonstrate they are not duplicating services in community. 5. Serve underserved communities, including high poverty rates, limited access to parks and nature education facilities, low educational achievement, and /or significant non-white and immigrant populations. 6. New models of nature education, relevant to highly urban and underserved audiences, effectively engage non-traditional audiences and stakeholder groups are replicable. 7. Part of a network of similar providers to stay connected and do either of the above. 8. Focus on programs that get visitors outdoors, help teach skills and provide tools to enjoy outdoor experience. 9. Linked network of similar outdoor or nature education programs statewide 10. Help public learn about stewardship of native habitat and wildlife species 	<p>Thank you for your comments. As noted below, various criteria encourage the kinds of responses you suggest. In some cases, OGALS has clarified or edited the criteria to incorporate specific suggestions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sustainable design consideration and implementation is the focus of Criterion #5. 2. Scoring for all criteria is based on the specific project to be funded by this grant. Nonetheless an applicant could include a discussion of this type of forward planning in their response to criterion #5. 3. This program will pay for renovation of existing facilities and buildings. Improvements and enhancements related to sustainable design can be discussed within Criterion #5. 4. Applicants may choose to include market analysis as support for their responses to deficiency of similar opportunities in Criterion #1. 5. Criteria #4 provides an opportunity for applicants to address how the proposed project meets the needs of specific groups, including underserved communities with limited access. Applicants may also want to discuss this in their response to Criterion #1. 6. Discussion of new models of nature education relevant to specific audiences can be used in support of various criteria including #1, #2 and #4. 7. Descriptions of partnerships and support

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11. Partnerships between NPOs and local, state or federal public agencies 12. Focused on the restoration of native habitat and work with private landowners to restore habitat on farms and ranches. 13. Provide seed funding to develop projects focused on nature education, stewardship and restoration of native habitat in rural communities lacking nature centers 14. Help public visit area of high natural value home to rare, threatened or endangered species, or outstanding aggregations of birds and other wildlife. 15. Use webcams and other IT tools to extend the reach of nature education programs. 	<p>networks can be used to provide background and depth to the responses to many of the criteria.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8. This grant program will fund both indoor and outdoor capital outlay projects. As appropriate, in response to the criteria, you may include information on the programs that will be supported by the project. 9. See #7 above. 10. Criterion #2 provides an opportunity for applicants to discuss how the project will enable the public to think about stewardship of natural resources. 11. See #7 above 12. The intent of the program is to provide nature education facilities for public use. Although native habitat restoration may be an eligible cost within a larger nature education facility, habitat restoration by itself would not be an eligible project. 13. Criterion #1 allows applicants to discuss the lack of nature education in the community they intend to serve. However, the grant plus any additional funds must be enough to complete the project within the grant performance period of 07/01/09 to 06/30/17. 14. Criterion #1 and #2 encourage the applicant to discuss the unique aspects of the project, and/or the resources to be interpreted. 15. Applicants may want to discuss the use of IT tools within Criterion #2. In addition, Criterion # 4 gives points to projects that

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
				will provide alternate means of access to the project.
10/01/09 Email	Bay Area Email	Criteria – General	Appreciate that attention is given to whether or not a given nature education center/ program already exists. This will create more	Thank you

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
			diversity of environmental education in our communities.	
10/09/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Criteria – General	<p>Other characteristics of proposed projects should be evaluated. In particular, preference should be given to Projects that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feature connections to other public recreational opportunities, such as trail networks or visitor-serving facilities. 2. Will result in multiple benefits, such as increased water quality on strained resources, providing new recreational opportunities and leveraging other resources. 3. Are partnerships between multiple public agencies and/or non-profit organizations. 	<p>Thank you for your comments. As noted below, various criteria encourage the kinds of responses you suggest. In some cases, we have clarified or edited the criteria to incorporate specific suggestions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Although applicants will describe the setting and locale of the project within the project summary, this section is not scored. However, applicants may want to address connections with Criterion #4, Project Access. 2. Applicants should address the projects positive impact on other resources primarily within the context of Criterion #5, Sustainable Design. 3. Descriptions of partnerships and support networks can be used to provide background and depth to the responses to many of the criteria.
10/09/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Criterion #1	<p>1. Need for Nature Education Additional points should be given to projects that are in close proximity to the resources interpreted.</p>	<p>The criteria do not allow additional points for projects based only on close proximity. However, in Criterion #2, Educational Opportunities, an applicant may choose to highlight how the proximity of the resource increases understanding and knowledge of the resource.</p>

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Criterion #1	1 A 3 Need more clarification on what is deficiency of similar opportunities. Within the facility or compared to nearby projects? Encourage language to elaborate different approaches to remedy the deficiency.	We are looking for how this project will fill a gap and have edited the criteria to clarify this. The gap may be addressed in various ways, such as by describing the unique quality or nature of project, the depth of nature education provided, based on geography, as in nothing similar near by, etc.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Criterion #1	How do you show need?	See above.
09/24/09	Sacramento Area Letter	Criterion #1	A.3 We support this criterion and ask that the department consider the type of learning experience available in addition to the subject matter of the nature education. By considering the format as well as the type of available nature education facilities in an area, the department will be able to more accurately determine the adequacy of nature education opportunities in the community.	We have edited the criteria prompts to include this concept.
10/09/09	San Diego Area Email	Criterion #1	The application criteria asks about the applicant's previous success in attracting the target audience but it would be excellent if it also included applicant's success in increasing public understanding and knowledge of resources.	Thank you for your comments. An applicant may want to use their experience in support of various criteria including Criterion #2B and #6B
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	Criterion #2	2 A Clarify if resources, is natural or cultural, or historical. For example, if a children's museum is an eligible project type; would the museum need to focus on the natural environment?	Yes. The eligible project types have been clarified in the Guide.
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	Criterion #2	2 B If don't have experience would I only get zero points	We encourage applicants who lack experience in designing museums and exhibits to work with a design team and/or partner with experience.

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Criterion #2	2 A 4, Confusing that you ask about using a broad range of media experiences, yet eligible costs prohibit payment for media.	Media costs including materials or programs including brochures, audios, videos, films are not capitol expenses and are not eligible under this program. The eligible cost section has been updated to provide clarification on eligible and ineligible costs.
10/09/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Criterion #3	Additional points should be given to applicants that can demonstrate inclusion of the targeted groups in the project development process.	Inclusion of targeted groups in project development will not be separately scored. However, applicants who do use include targeted groups in project planning could discuss their process in support of Criterion #3 Visitor Outreach.
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	Criterion #3	Would a statewide project which draws from a statewide visitor group be given an advantage?	No. All projects will be scored based on their outreach to people who lack access to nature education.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Criterion #3	Broad range of people, should also consider reach of project, beyond local users. That is breadth of impact to larger region or statewide significance of project. Using project to expand the community reach.	If the project will serve a regional audience, you may discuss it within your response to Criterion #3. However, you should also remain in consistent in your responses to other criteria. For example, the lack of access to similar nature education in Criterion #1 should be answered based on the same regional audience's ability to access nature education.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Criterion #3	What if we don't have complete focus yet for nature center?	A project that is not clearly focused would likely be less competitive. Your criteria responses should flow consistently in a direction which allows the reviewer to gain an understanding of the projects intent and purpose. In addition, a project that is less well thought out would be more vulnerable to changes in scope after project after award. Scope changes are strongly discouraged to maintain the integrity of

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
				the competitive grant award process, any subsequent requests to change GRANT SCOPES will be carefully evaluated and must be approved by OGALS in writing.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Criterion #3	If we are a new agency without experience, how will this be scored? We are planning to use partners, can we use their experience?	Yes. This criterion allows you to discuss either your or your partner's experience.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Criterion #3	Is this based on current outreach programs or new ones?	Describe the outreach planned for this specific project
10/09/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Criterion #4	Additional points should be given to projects that feature educational elements that can be accessed when the facility is closed.	Criteria 4C allows extra points for projects that provide alternate means of access to nature education for the public, including but not limited to, outreach programs, online learning, or other educational opportunities.
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	Criterion #4	4A If hours are seasonal how that would be scored.	The guide has been clarified to address this issue.
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	Criterion #4	4D What if you include bike path or walk way into project. Would that be fundable under this program	Yes, it would be an eligible cost, as it provides access to the project. However, the costs are only eligible if the bike path or walkway is within the project property.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Criterion #4	We have seasonal hours do you want the average for the year?	Yes provide information on the days and hours for each season, along with an average weekly total averaged over the entire year.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Criterion #4	4 A Hours of operation, what if they change due to budget issues.	If hours change dramatically, we will want to know your timeline and plan to return to full operation. The grant application and the criteria responses are incorporated by reference into the grant contract.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Criterion #4	4 D Not fair to rural communities, alternate means of transportation may not be available.	Point values will remain the same.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Criterion #4	What about fees or no fees. Will this be scored?	Fees were originally in criteria #4 however they were removed from guide in earlier draft.
09/14/09	Public Hearing	Criterion #4	4. C Wants more points given for alternate	Point values will remain the same.

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
	Sacramento		access.	
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Criterion #4	Does not want more points given for projects with lots of means of access. Would make it more difficult for very rural projects to compete.	Point values will remain the same.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Criterion #4	I don't see fees included. Will they be considered in criterion 7?	Fees were originally in criterion #4. They were removed during program development process. However, you may want to include them in your response to number 7, if they will contribute to the long term maintenance and operation of the project.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Criterion #4	If we have project like a day camp programs, need reservation to attend and may only be open seasonally.	A project must be consistently available to and accessible by the general public.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Criterion #4	Is scoring based on full access to every component of project?	This scoring is based on project availability not necessarily entire facility. For example, public exhibits spaces need to be fully accessible to the public, however, other related areas such as offices, storage and equipment space do not.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Criterion #4	Prejudicial against rural communities from various agencies.	Point values will remain the same.
09/21/09	Greater Los Angeles Area Email	Criterion #5	Question A. 2The web link provided needs to be more specific. The web address given is to the CA Integrated Waste Management Board which is a big website and appears to be about recycling, not sustainable features techniques.	The guide has been edited to show a more direct link to sustainable building information and resources. http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/GreenBuilding/
10/09/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Criterion #5	The Guidelines seem to assume that these "sustainable" features will not be feasible. This entire section needs to be revised so that projects that implement multiple sustainable features are given clear	Proposition 84's goals and intent prompted the inclusion of a criterion for sustainable design in this guide. This criterion was originally drafted with a higher point value and an emphasis on LEED standards. However before public

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
			<p>preference. It is not enough to require applicants to “consider” sustainable design features or techniques, points should be awarded based on whether the project includes these features.</p> <p>The number of points given for Sustainable Design should be increased to emphasize the importance of projects that will implement Proposition 84’s goal to “...reduce contributions to global warming and improve the adaptability of our water and flood control systems...” Increasing the point total will also allow for more differentiation between projects that include sustainable features vs. those that do not. An objective way to evaluate a project’s total sustainability could be inclusion of a LEED checklist with the application.</p>	<p>release the draft guide was reviewed by internal and external focus groups who noted that a single standard, such as LEED would likely unfairly impact applicants who requested the funds for something other than a facility or building, e.g., exhibit structures, signage, marine equipment. Allotting 10% of the total score is appropriate for this criterion.</p>
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Criterion #5	<p>Why are you scoring sustainable design where is it in the bond act. This is 10% of criteria. This will disadvantage projects which may not be able to use sustainable design.</p>	See above
10/09/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Criterion #5	<p>We support the Department’s inclusion of sustainable design requirements for nature education facilities; however, we feel that the 10-point appropriation may cause an unfair advantage for large projects over smaller projects. The opportunities for considering and implementing sustainable features and techniques are limited for small projects (i.e. interpretive exhibits) and may also be limited in long-term wear and tear for outdoor</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. As noted above, we expect to have a broad range of project types and the criteria were written to accommodate this. Our intent was to write criteria that that would not create advantages for any one type of project, either large or small. Our funding tiers were developed to accommodate this same range. Applications will be sorted into the appropriate funding tier for review and scoring allowing applications</p>

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
			displays. To be eligible for this funding, a project must be proven to be available to the public for at least 20 to 30 years, and this may be challenging for many “natural”, recycled or recyclable outdoor interpretive materials. We recommend a weighted point system that mimics the funding tiers, acknowledging the difference in opportunities for incorporating sustainable designs for smaller projects versus larger ones	similar in scope, if not type, to compete against each other. This should help to further smooth the variations between large facilities and buildings and smaller project types.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Criterion #5	Can you interpret sustainable features that are part of site, but not part of this project, and get points under 5B	All criteria responses should be specifically related to the project or project site named in the application.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Criterion #5	How will 5B impact the scoring for smaller scale project that may have limited possibility of using sustainable design techniques?	Our intent is that applicants should consider all possible sustainable design features or techniques and implement as many as possible based on the type of project. The scoring is based on how well you demonstrate this careful consideration and the choices made for implementation.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Criterion #5	If unable to implement any technique or design, would sign stating reason why allow for at least one point under this project?	Scoring will be based on how well the applicant describes careful consideration and implementation of sustainable design features for the PROJECT and/or the PROJECT site.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Criterion #5	May need sustainable defined, or include further clarification on sustainable design features.	For a more detailed discussion of sustainable features and techniques, and for links to a wide variety of resources, see the California Integrated Waste Management Board website at http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/greenbuilding/
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Criterion #5	Positive comments, that variety of projects require a broader approach to including sustainable design or techniques.	Thank you for your comment. The criteria were written to accommodate the wide variety of projects fundable under this grant program.

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Criterion #5	What if consideration and implementation under 5A leads to no sustainable design or technique. In this case, would be unable to receive points under 5B	Point value will remain the same.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Criterion #5	Criterion 5 B. You would not be able to get any points, if you considered but were not able to use any sustainable design techniques.	Point value will remain the same.
10/09/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Criterion #6	The Guidelines should include a template for the timeline and state an assumed date for grant execution. It is highly likely that every applicant will submit a timeline that shows that the project can be completed within the performance period. Therefore, the points in this section should be based more upon experience than on the submitted timeline.	The criterion has been clarified and the point values separated.
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	Criterion #6	Does this apply to grant funded project or entire larger project, e.g., multi-phase projects? We are looking at the first phase only of a three phase project. Sounds like the program is for smaller projects that can be completed entirely with the grant award, not for larger multi phase projects.	Any project funded, even if it is a phase of a larger project, must be complete and open for public use. Funds will liquidate 06/30/17 and will no longer be available when the 8 year grant performance period ends.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Criterion #6	Seems to disadvantage smaller agencies who have not have grants or similar projects.	Applicants can use an outside contractor or manager or partner with experience to complete the project.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Criterion #6	What if we do not have the experience? Have not previously built a project like this?	See above response.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Criterion #6	6B Can we just name projects completed through your office? Can we provide a general list of our team and the types of projects they do.	Reviewers will base their scoring on the information provided by the applicant. Therefore, applicants will need to respond fully with sufficient detail for each criterion. However, if your agency has completed many

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
				capital projects, you may choose to describe only the one(s) most similar in type, scope and/or dollar amount.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Criterion #6	Regarding previous history, what if we have not received grant funds and so have no previous history?	New agencies will be primarily non-profits who will need to supply additional documentation regarding to verify their agencies eligibility.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Criterion #6	What if we worked in partnership with a city?	Respond based on your partnerships on similar types of projects.
10/09/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Criterion #7	Operational Sustainability. In addition to funding and logistics for operations and maintenance, the description of operational sustainability should also include a discussion of the ecologically sustainable practices and procedures incorporated into the project's day-to-day operations. Additional points should be given to projects that can demonstrate this type of sustainability in operations.	The expected range of project types limits our ability to fairly apply a point value to suggestion.
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	Criterion #7	Can you include information on how fees will help to sustain the project?	Guide edited to incorporate suggestion.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Criterion #7	Although we have been in place for five years, we do not have a dedicated funding source	Successful applicants will need to demonstrate that the project has long term viability.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Criterion #7	Should include notation that if unable to sustain, than not considered for funding use	Point value will remain the same.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Criterion #7	Should fees be discussed as contributing to operation and maintenance?	Guide edited to incorporate suggestion.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Criterion #7	Can fees and charges for special events be included as funding source?	Guide edited to incorporate suggestion.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Criterion Instructions	Loves the scoring breakdown.	Thank you.

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
10/09/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Definitions	We strongly recommend the inclusion of urban ecosystems in the definition of nature education. Urban ecosystems are natural ecosystems that are located within or adjacent to an urban environment, and likely impacted by urban influences; however they serve a critical role in providing environmental services to the community, perhaps equal to or more so than outside of an urban area. An example of an urban ecosystem is a "Functioning Community Forest," an urban community where local residents and businesspeople joined together to transform their neighborhood into a sustainable ecosystem that functions like a healthy, natural forest. Creating a Functioning Community Forest involves people engaging with each other to plant and care for trees.	The definition of nature education is broad enough to include urban ecosystems. However, for the project to be eligible it would need to provide nature education and access to the general public.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Definitions	Define fixed equipment	The eligible costs section has been updated to more clearly describe fixed equipment.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Definitions	Define fixed equipment could include issues related to eligible costs for and within exhibitory.	The eligible costs section has been updated to more clearly describe fixed equipment especially as it relates to museum exhibits.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Definitions	Does the nature education definition include projects related to urban ecosystems?	The definition for nature education does not include specific project types. A project related to urban ecosystems may be eligible, if it is a capital outlay project and if it fits the description of eligible projects described in the Guide.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Definitions	Wants clarification on marine definition	Marine is now a defined term and can be found in the definition section of the Guide.

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Definitions	Bay area agrees that marine should include bay	The following definition for marine has been added to the Guide. Marine: of, or relating to, the sea; found in, or living in the sea; an umbrella term for things relating to the ocean, coastal zones, and tidal areas.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Definitions	Add marine definition	See above.
10/03/09	Bay Area Email	Eligible Applicants	The draft guide limits eligible agencies to Public Institutions and Not-for-profit organizations. Will this change in the final guide?	Although the guide is in draft status the eligible agencies (applicants) are limited in the underlying legislation, PRC 75063(b), to non-profit organizations and public institutions.
10/09/09	Los Angeles Area Email	Eligible Applicants	<p>It is crucial that we include federal agencies under the Department of the Interior (notably NPS) among the eligible entities for this program. At the very least those areas where there is a cooperative management agreement between NPS and DPR must be included.</p> <p>Including partnerships with the National Park Service would allow these scant few grant dollars to produce far greater opportunities for Nature Education.</p>	<p>Only eligible agencies can submit applications. An eligible applicant may work with partners, which may include federal agencies. Partners would only be identified as necessary, e.g., for example, a project may be located on federally owned land. In addition, various criteria prompt applicants to describe the role that partners may play in the development, execution and operation and maintenance of the project.</p> <p>In addition if the cooperative management agreement described is a Joint Powers Authority (JPA), the JPA may be considered an eligible applicant.</p>
09/09/09	High Sierra Area Phone	Eligible Applicants	Are federal agencies eligible? Are Native American Tribes eligible? If not, why not.	Statutes did not include federal agencies or Native American tribes as eligible. However, they may partner with an eligible agency as noted above.

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
10/05/09	High Sierra Email	Eligible Applicants	Are federal agencies not eligible for this grant program? I see in the instructions: "Eligible Applicants: Public institutions including..." does not include federal agencies.... but it also does not preclude them.	Federal agencies are not eligible. However, they may partner with an eligible agency.
09/09/09	Lake Tahoe Area	Eligible Applicants	Why aren't federal agencies considered public institutions?	The bond act authorized general obligation bonds to fund projects and expenditures to be repaid from the states General Fund. These funds were intended for this program for state and local agencies and NPO's.
09/25/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Eligible Applicants	The list of eligible institutions should be limited to those specifically identified in Proposition 84 (i.e., natural history museums, aquariums, research facilities and botanical gardens). Recently Legislative Counsel opined that neither the legislature nor the implementing agency can alter the words or intent of a voter approved initiative. The Department does not have the discretion to include otherwise ineligible institutions.	The eligible applicants section has been simplified and clarified.
09/17/09 Email	North Coast Email	Eligible Applicants	Would like to see Native American Tribes as eligible applicants.	Native American Tribes are not eligible. They are not public institutions for the purposes of this program. However, a non-profit group associated with a Native American Tribe would be an eligible applicant if they are incorporated as a non-profit, qualified to do business in California, and qualified under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.
10/07/09	North Coast Bay Area Email	Eligible Applicants	Can federally recognized tribes apply? Tribes have a similar status to 501(c) 3 corporations which means they are tax exempt; have articles of incorporation, mission statements, annual reports and	See above.

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
			audits.	
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	Eligible Applicants	Competing at the same level as a state agency may disadvantage smaller agencies.	The tiered funding structure should help to mitigate any differences between large and small projects.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Eligible Applicants	The bond provision describes types of institutions included in program by providing a list of specific institutional types. Feels that eligible agencies should be limited to types described, or should not be limited or further defined.	Eligible applicants include public institutions as listed in the Guide and non-profit organizations that meet one or more of the following objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combine the study of natural science with preservation, demonstration and education programs that serve diverse populations • Provide collections and programs related to the relationship of Native American cultures to the environment • Conduct marine wildlife conservation research
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Eligible Applicants	Thank you for including botanical garden. We are not often specifically called out.	Botanical gardens are specifically named in the legislation PRC 75063(b)
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Eligible Applicants	Are state agencies eligible?	State agencies that meet all the requirements for the program are eligible.
10/05/09	Sacramento Area Email	Eligible Applicants	If federal agencies are not eligible, can they partner with a non-profit or local agency for this program?	Yes partnerships are acceptable. However, only eligible agencies can submit applications. OGALS first determines that the applicant and the proposed project are eligible. As applicable, an applicant would identify partners where necessary; e.g., for example, a project may be located on federally owned land. In addition, various criteria prompt applicants to describe the role that partners may play in the development, execution and operation and maintenance of the project.
09/09/09	Sacramento Area Email	Eligible Applicants	Are school districts eligible applicants?	They are not eligible under this program.

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
09/15/09	Sacramento Area Phone	Eligible Applicants	Happy to see that federal agencies are not eligible.	Thank you for your comment.
09/24/09	San Diego Area Email	Eligible Applicants JPA	Request that the draft guidelines for the Nature Education Facility be amended to include in the definition of District wording such as “local agencies formed for park purposes pursuant to a joint powers agreement between two or more local entities”. Your definition would appear to be broad, but unfortunately it would eliminate local government agencies known as a Joint Powers Authority. Our Joint Powers Authority was specifically created for park purposes. Recent bond acts (such as Prop 12) included specific wording naming Joint Powers Authorities created for park purposes as eligible applicants.	We have added a definition of joint powers authority to the Guide. A joint powers authority will be considered an eligible applicant if at least one of the members qualifies as an eligible applicant, and subject to review and approval of the underlying joint powers authority agreement.
09/24/09	San Diego Area Email	Eligible Applicants JPA	Request inclusion of Joint Powers Authorities as eligible applicants. Suggest that District definition be expanded to include “local agencies formed for park purposes or pursuant to a joint powers agreement between two or more local entities”.	See above.
10/07/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Eligible Applicants JPA	We recommend that Joint Powers Authorities be specifically called out as eligible applicants.	We added joint powers authorities to the eligible applicants section. A joint powers authority will be considered an eligible applicant if at least one of the members qualifies as an eligible applicant, and subject to review and approval of the underlying joint powers authority agreement. A new section has been added to the application checklist which details the information which needs to be included before a joint powers agreement can

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
				be approved.
10/07/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Eligible Applicants JPA	We recommend that Joint Powers Authorities be specifically called out as eligible applicants.	See above
10/09/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Eligible Applicants JPA	<p>Joint Powers Agencies must be listed as eligible applicants. This can be accomplished by adding the following to the definition of "District" on page 46-47:</p> <p><i>A joint powers agency or entity formed under Division 7 (commencing with Section 6500) of the Government Code.</i></p> <p>If the intent is to limit applicants to entities that have a nexus with parks and recreation, the definition could be expanded as follows:</p> <p><i>A joint powers authority or entity formed under Division 7 (commencing with Section 6500) of the Government Code, where at least one of the parties to the joint powers agreement qualifies as an eligible Applicant.</i></p>	See above
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Eligible Applicants JPA	Would like you to Include Joint Powers Authorities formed for the purposes which fit the program	See above
09/29	San Diego Area Email	Eligible Applicants	Strongly recommend that accreditation by AZA be part of your criteria for considering zoos and aquariums.	Guide was not changed. Including this requirement would disadvantage new zoos and aquariums.
10/09/09	Bay Area Email	Eligible Costs	Criteria 2 education opportunities looks for projects that "use a broad range of media and experiences to convey the messages including graphics, video, audio, interactive computer programs, interpretive programs, hands-on experiences, tours, special events." However, in the listing of eligible and ineligible costs, the guidelines indicate	The eligible costs section has been updated and clarified.

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
			<p>that funding will “not include materials or programs including brochures, audio programs, videos, films.” This is confusing to applicants because one section of the guidelines says that media is encouraged, but those costs are considered ineligible. We strongly urge that this discrepancy be clarified and that new media, technology, video and audio be allowed as eligible costs in the projects. Also need clarification on “capital outlay” costs. You list what you may not include “items for display e.g. collections, specimens, artifacts, animals, fish,” also need to clarify what it does include. I would suggest that you give a clear definition of “all fixed equipment within the exhibit.” Specific examples might include equipment that enables state-of-the-art, engaging environmental exhibits such as: software (video editing, audio editing, video animation programs), LCD monitors and/or projectors attached or inset into a wall, wiring, hardware costs to enable computers, solid state media players for HD video and high quality audio, speakers, amplification systems, media furniture, and control devices that enable media.</p>	
09/29/09	Central Valley Email	Eligible Costs	<p>We want street infrastructure costs listed as eligible costs, including those for curb, gutter, and sidewalks. It looks like street work is considered an ineligible cost under the program. In California, a development project within city boundaries requires the property</p>	<p>Although street work may be part of the development of the project site, the related costs are not eligible under this program.</p>

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
			owner to install curb, gutter, and sidewalk along the frontage of the property being developed. This usually requires dedication of property to the city as well, since future street widths are consistently wider than existing street widths. When curb, gutter and sidewalk are installed at the required street boundary, the street must also be paved out to the new width. By denying eligibility for street costs, this program will limit applications to brownfield sites with existing infrastructure or rural sites with no infrastructure requirements.	
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	Eligible Costs	Exhibits can get old over 20 years	The objects exhibited may change over time. This program will fund the exhibit structures, cases or other elements which house exhibits not the items exhibited. The projects funded must meet land tenure terms based on the amount of the grant requested.
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	Eligible Costs	Can you acquire land using funds from this program?	No acquisition is allowed, these funds are for development projects only.
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	Eligible Costs	Are offsite improvements, for example, sewer and electrical eligible if they bring services to the project?	This is not an eligible cost if the electrical or sewer lines are outside project site boundaries. Eligible costs for improvements related to the funded project, would begin at the point of connection to the site.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Eligible costs	Are costs related to existing staff used in support of the project eligible costs?	Yes if they are directly related to the project and specifically documented as such. For additional information on the required documentation, see the accounting and audit rules for employee services in the Grant Administration Guide for Proposition 84 Programs.
10/01/09	Public Hearing	Eligible costs	Grant management costs	Yes these are eligible, if they are directly

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
	Los Angeles			related to the project.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Eligible Costs	Cost of plant specimens within a botanical garden are similar to collections in museum	Costs related to botanical gardens would be listed as a "feature" within the cost estimate.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Eligible Costs	Infrastructure – electrical, water, etc. Is this covered? Needs to be brought from street to project.	Yes. But only if the improvements/connections are on your property within the boundaries identified as the project site. Therefore costs for infrastructure would begin at the edge of your project site and continue inward toward the project itself.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Eligible costs	Add land surveys to construction costs in section on site preparation, grading, gutting, foundation work.	If land surveys are done after ground breaking, they are considered construction costs.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Eligible costs	Land surveys can be preconstruction, and should be added to design, engineering section.	If a survey is done before ground breaking, it is considered pre-construction cost and subject to the 25% maximum limit.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Eligible costs	When can costs already incurred be paid?	After grant award and after the contract has been fully encumbered. Costs incurred before a contract is fully encumbered are the applicant's own risk.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Eligible Costs	Are native plants eligible costs?	Yes. We pay for landscaping.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Eligible Costs	That which is inside the case could be capital outlay. Need further definitions/clarifications for capital outlay costs related to exhibit costs. Structure of exhibit as opposed to collection exhibit.	The eligible costs section has been updated to clarify costs related to exhibits.
09/21/09	Sacramento Area Email	Eligible Costs	Will funding be available before the groundbreaking to help pay for the CEQA report?	If CEQA is not complete at the time of application, and the grant is awarded, a CEQA pending contract will be offered. Under this one year contract, up to 10% of the grant award will be available for completion of CEQA. Please see both the NEF Application Guide and the Grant Administration Guide for

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
				detailed information about the CEQA pending contract.
09/14/09	Central Valley Email	Eligible Project	Would an observatory be an eligible project?	This would be an eligible project if it includes public access to nature education.
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	Eligible Project	Is improvement, expansion of an existing nature trail an eligible project?	Development includes new construction and renovation.
09/14/09	Central Valley Phone	Eligible Projects	Does not think zoos should be eligible.	PRC §75063 (b) allows grants to non-profit organizations and public institutions that combine the study of natural science with preservation, demonstration and education programs that serve diverse populations. Zoos which meet these criteria are eligible applicants.
09/22/09	16. Central Valley Email	Eligible Projects	Can NEF grant funds be used to acquire land?	Acquisition projects are not eligible under this program.
10/09/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Eligible Projects	The draft guidelines indicate that eligible projects are “the development of nature education facilities, buildings, structures, and exhibit galleries,” that must be “open to the public,” and may be used to “construct facilities that house programs.” We encourage DPR to include office space and facilities that support nature education programs. Successful education and recreation programs are supported by staff. Office space and support facilities are essential components of a successful program.	The eligible projects section has been edited and clarified to provide additional direction on the types of projects allowed under this program. However, funds may also be used for support facilities incorporated within the eligible building or facility if they are considered necessary for its primary function, e.g., restrooms, related offices, storage and equipment space.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Eligible Projects	Is expansion to existing facility that adds staff space which supports the purpose or use of the facility an eligible project?	The proposed project must provide nature education.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Eligible projects	Are outdoor elements eligible projects.	Yes, both indoor and outdoor projects are eligible.

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Eligible Projects	Can we combine renovation of existing facility with building a new facility?	Yes, if they are on the same site and encompass a larger project.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Eligible projects	Do exhibits need to last for 20 years?	The items exhibited may change over time. The time This program will fund the exhibit structures, cases or other elements which house exhibits not the items exhibited. The projects funded must meet the following terms based on the amount of the grant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to \$1,000,000 requires at least 20 years of land tenure. • More than \$1,000,000 requires at least 30 years of land tenure. OGALS will start counting the 20 or 30 year land tenure requirement from the date of appropriation.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Eligible Projects	Do projects have to include a marine element?	No.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Eligible Projects	Does this program favor new building over renovations?	No preference is given in program. Both types of projects are eligible.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Eligible projects	If intention is to limit, than you should allow broad inclusion of project types.	The eligible projects section has been edited and clarified to provide additional direction on the types of projects allowed under this program.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Eligible projects	Like list of examples, includes language,"but not limited to" which allows for broad range of projects.	See above.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Eligible projects	Change language but not limited to, to "such as"	See above.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Eligible Projects	Support no funds for acquisition, LA area property costs could exceed \$5 million	Thank you for your comment. We agree that allowing acquisitions under this program would dilute the funds available for nature education facilities.
10/01/09	Public Hearing	Eligible Projects	Why not include history museums, other	If the museum is a facility or building that

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
	Los Angeles		museums are listed.	<p>provides nature education where the objectives listed below can be met, it would be an eligible project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combine the study of natural science with preservation, demonstration and education programs that serve diverse populations • Provide collections and programs related to the relationship of Native American cultures to the environment
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Eligible Projects	Please confirm that both new buildings and renovations eligible projects.	Yes. Both types of projects are eligible.
10/08/09	Sierra Foothills Email	Funding Cycles	Wants two grant rounds in sequential years, to allow a better applicant pool. Would give more time to facilities that are further behind in the planning process. A single grant round will significantly reduce the number of eligible proposals.	The full amount of funds available for this program was appropriated as of July 1, 2009. Therefore, there is only one grant round for this program.
10/07/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Funding Sources	Communities that need facilities within or near dense diverse populations do not have the resources, particularly in these economic times to develop project funding within the next four to eight months. We recommend that the time frame to have all funds in place should be 4 months after the grant award.	Funding assurances are required at time of application and OGALS expects at least a three month application period from final guide to application due date.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Funding Sources	Can project be fully funded by grant?	Yes.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Funding Sources	What if we have already incurred costs after 07/01/09, for CEQA or other preconstruction costs, would that be included as additional funding source?	Yes. List the source of funds for costs already incurred if the grant alone is not equal to the total project cost.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Funding Sources	What if source of funds is a grant agreement with someone else, and the payments are given on reimbursable basis. Does this count	Yes. You would list the grant source, and the total amount of the grant.

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
			as committed funds?	
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Funding Sources	Why do you allow only a four month period to secure committed funds rather than six?	OGALS expects the competitive review, and action to take about six months. Confirm the viability of projects before the final decision making process begins. OGALS prefers that all funds be committed at the time of application. However, an additional four months for applicants to confirm all sources of funds is built into the guide.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Funding Sources	Hard for large projects to have all funds committed.	If funds are not confirmed, projects may fail. Therefore, OGALS requires that all applicants identify funds that are committed, or will be committed within four months after the application date.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Funding Sources	Should we list force account labor used to complete the project?	Yes. List the force account labor as part of your project costs summary if seeking reimbursement for those costs.
09/24/09	Sacramento Area Letter	Funding Sources	<p>We feel that requiring an applicant to identify all funding sources necessary to complete the project and requiring a commitment date for those funds within four months of the application due date creates an unfair disadvantage for brand new facilities.</p> <p>We suggest one or more of the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An exemption to the “funding source” requirement for projects which propose to build a new facility or significantly expand an existing facility. This could include additional project readiness assurances, such as land agreements, site plans, etc. • An alternative timeline for funding source 	<p>OGALS has much expertise in review of applications and has awarded many grants for new facilities under a variety of different grant programs. Requiring applicants to confirm sources of funds helps to ensure the viability and full completion of awarded projects. Our intent is to award projects that are ready to go and that can be completed before the end of the grant performance period.</p> <p>The initial application review includes confirmation of land tenure either by ownership or through lease or agreement. In addition, criterion #6 requires a detailed timeline and information on the project manager’s experience in building capital projects.</p>

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
			commitment for brand new facilities or significant expansion projects. This could include a fund commitment date a certain number of years after funds are awarded with provisions for required "fundraising progress reports".	
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Funding sources form	Do pledged funds from donors count as committed?	A pledge alone would not be sufficient to ensure that the funds will be available. List only those sources of funds that are committed or that will be committed within four months of the application date.
10/07/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Funding Tier	<p>In favor of raising the cap for the maximum possible awards from \$5 million to \$10 million. DPR could limit applicants applying in the larger bracket to one grant request.</p> <p>Although the guidelines do allow an entity to submit more than one application, for large-scale projects, it's more helpful to be awarded one grant for one larger amount, rather than receive several smaller grants. DPR could limit applicants applying in the larger bracket to one grant request.</p>	The maximum amount of grants in Tier A has been raised to \$7 million. \$2 million has been taken from the reserve funds and added to the estimated funds available in Tier E to accommodate this increased maximum. This reflects comments and suggestions made during our first public review period, without impacting the estimated amount of funds available in Tiers B, C, and D.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Funding Tiers	Raise top amount to \$7 million	See above response.
09/25/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Funding Tiers	\$5 million cap in tier A would narrowly limit funding for larger projects with long-term statewide impact. \$10 million would permit the development of larger projects that can more fully achieve the propositions purposes.	See above response.
10/07/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Funding Tiers	You should increase the top tier to \$7 million. The reserve funds should be reduced to \$4 million and fully defined to make it clear when	The maximum grant in Tier A is now \$7 million. \$2 million was moved from the reserve funds to accommodate this increase. The entire

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
			and how they would be utilized	amount of reserve funds will be dispersed across the tiers to ensure sufficient funds are available to award quality projects statewide.
10/01/09	Bay Area Email	Funding Tiers	Appreciate the flexibility in the tier structure to allow the department to shift funds if more qualified applicants apply in a given tier, in order to accommodate as many applicants as possible.	Thank you. OGALS also feels that the tier structure will help to accommodate a wide range of projects and broaden the number of agencies served.
10/08/09	Los Angeles Area Email	Funding tiers	Fully support the Tier System to distribute funding. Willing to support a fifth tier for small grants between \$25,000 and \$100,000. Would not want to see the cap (for tier A) extended beyond the existing \$5,000,000. Funding tiers provide for a depth and breadth of projects across the State.	Thank you. Based on suggestions and comments received during the public comment period, Tier E was added to allow grant awards from \$25,000 to \$100,000.
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	Funding Tiers	Agree with tiers as they are	Thank you for your comment. However, OGALS has edited the tiers to lower the minimum and raise the maximum grant amounts. Also modified are the rules for submitting projects within the tiers. Applicants are now limited to one project application per project site location.
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	Funding Tiers	Clarify how tiers work.	This section has been edited for clarity.
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	Funding Tiers	For smaller cities, smaller grant amounts could be usable. Would allow smaller cities to get funds for smaller projects without competing against larger agencies. Perhaps \$25,000 or \$50,000 at minimum.	We added a fifth tier to accommodate smaller agencies and smaller projects. Tier E will fund projects from \$25,000 to \$100,000.
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	Funding Tiers	Should not be any higher than \$5 million cap	Although we have raised the Tier A maximum to \$7 million, we did not change the estimated amounts available in Tier B, C, or D. Although this will allow higher awards in Tier A, it will

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
				likely limit the number of grants available in that tier.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Funding Tiers	I was involved in early review of this program. Concerned about raising tier A maximum above \$5 million. Could allow large projects to use up available fund and leave less funds available for smaller projects.	See above response.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Funding tiers	\$5 million is to low for the maximum. Preference would be no cap, but understand that there need to be a breadth of possible projects. But \$10 million cap would be good.	The Tier A maximum has been increased to \$7 million.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Funding Tiers	Agree higher amount at top would be good. Amount estimated for each tier would help to insure that funds are distributed across the board for all size projects.	See above response.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Funding Tiers	Appreciate that you allow multiple projects at one site.	Thank you for your comment. However, the second draft Guide limits applicants to only one project application per site location.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Funding Tiers	Believe description of tier process is good.	Thank you for your comment. Nonetheless, the funding tier section has been edited, clarified and simplified to reflect a lower minimum, a higher maximum and a limit of one project application per site location.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Funding Tiers	Like tiers as they are.	See above response.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Funding Tiers	We like the tier amounts as they are.	See above response.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Funding Tiers	Best projects may turn out to come from same applicant	The rules have been simplified. Only agencies with multiple site locations will be able to submit more than one application.

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Funding Tiers	Clarify if agency submits in multiple tiers that each application would be reviewed separately.	If an agency has only one site location, they can only submit one project application in any tier. If an agency has multiple site locations they can submit one application for each site. Each of those applications will be reviewed based on the amount of funds requested, along with other applications within the same tier.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Funding Tiers	Like what you laid out here allows for a depth and breadth across the state. Fear large agencies would take all funds for only about 10 projects across the state.	Although we have increased the maximum award for Tier A, the estimated amounts available in Tiers B, C, and D remain the same. We added \$2 million to Tier A and the same amount was used to create Tier E. Those funds were moved from the estimated reserve funds.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Funding Tiers	Need to clarify if down scope of project in one tier could also be funded in another tier.	Applicants will no longer be allowed to submit more than one application for any one project site.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Funding Tiers	Need to clarify that grant amount and project amount are not necessarily the same.	The guide has been edited to clarify this point.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Funding Tiers	What about large open space area. Would separate projects within this large project area be eligible within the same tier? What does separately manageable unit mean, my rangers patrol same area. Need this defined or clarified	Applicants will no longer be allowed to submit more than one application for any one project site.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Funding tiers	\$5 million cap is ok for us	Thank you for your comment, however, the Tier A maximum has been increased to \$7 million.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Funding Tiers	If I am building a brand new facility how will the tiers work? For example, if \$5 million would cover entire project. What if apply for \$3 million for smaller section.	Applicants will no longer be allowed to submit more than one application for any one project site. Applicants should submit their grant request based on the amount they need to complete the project.
09/24/09	Public Hearing	Funding Tiers	In support of smaller amount in proposed Tier	The new Tier E will fund projects from \$25,000

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
	Oakland		E.	to \$100,000.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Funding Tiers	Is amount estimated in each tier a goal for each tier?	Yes. However, the funds listed for each tier are estimates only and may change based on the quality and quantity of applications received in each tier. All reserve funds will be dispersed across the tiers as needed to fund projects across the state.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Funding Tiers	Spreadsheet showing tiers graphically may help to clarify tier amounts.	This section has been edited and simplified.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Funding Tiers	What if there are an overwhelming number of applications in one tier. Can you move or add funds to that tier to fund more projects?	Yes. The reserve fund allows us to fund quality projects in every tier, it allows flexibility.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Funding Tiers	Where would funds come from for Tier E?	We lowered the amount of funds reserved to create a \$2 million Tier E.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Funding Tiers	Happy to see tiering, but legislation does not require tiering. So can you go above or below the amount listed? I think it would be good for the department to allow applicants to move from tier to tier. Especially for projects that would need more than \$5 million.	The funding tiers were developed to enable funding and competitive reviews of a broad variety of sizes and types of projects. The second draft limits agencies to one application per project site.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Funding Tiers	How about applications for multiple projects?	Multiple applications will only be allowed for agencies with multiple site locations. No agency can submit more than one application per site location.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Funding Tiers	Like multiple applications, allows agency to apply for various projects at each of their sites.	See above response
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Funding Tiers	We have modest education plans may need less than minimum. \$10,000 or \$25,000 project. Would like to see lower minimum.	The new Tier E will fund projects from \$25,000 to \$100,000.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Funding Tiers	We have projects at two separate facilities; can we submit more than one application?	Yes. Agencies with multiple locations may submit one application for each location.

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Funding Tiers	Why allow agencies to apply in all tiers for same project site? Should limit to one tier choice.	The guide has been edited to reflect this change.
10/09/09	Sacramento Area Email	Funding Tiers	Would like to see majority of funds given to grants with a maximum of \$2 million, and minimum 25% match.	There is no match requirement for this program. Grant amounts from \$25,000 to \$7 million will allow for a broad range of projects across the state.
09/08/09	Tuolumne River Trust	Grant Funding	By planning on two grant rounds in sequential years, we feel that you will have a better applicant pool because more time will be given for those facilities that are further behind in the planning process. A single grant round will significantly reduce the number of eligible proposals.	The entire amount of funds available for this program was appropriated 07/01/09 for a single round of grants.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Grant performance period	Are we currently within the grant performance period?	Yes. The grant performance period began on the date of appropriation, 07/01/09. It will end on 06/30/17.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Grant Performance Period	What if currently incurring costs for an eligible project? If awarded, would the costs be reimbursed?	Yes. If the project is awarded, and the costs are eligible and within the grant performance period which began on July 1, 2009. However, costs would be incurred at agency's own risk.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Grant Performance Period	Can retroactive costs be reimbursed?	Yes. Eligible costs incurred after July 1, 2009 could be reimbursed. However, OGALS cautions applicants not to spend funds based only on the expectation of grant award.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Ineligible costs	How are costs differentiated between media equipment and the materials presented?	The eligible costs section has been updated and clarified to more clearly delineate between eligible and ineligible costs.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Ineligible costs	What about relocation costs, for example, we are thinking about changing the current function. We will relocate museum exhibits to new building and keep old building as gift shop.	Relocation costs, including temporary "swing space" while a project is under construction and moving expenses are not eligible for reimbursement.

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
10/08/09	Bay Area Email	Land Tenure	<p>If an entity secures a 30 year land tenure agreement from a municipality, with an option after 10 years to relocate the project to an alternative site but within the property. For example, a possible application would be to rehabilitate an existing structure and to enhance a botanical garden. The structure that is planned to be rehabilitated would face the potential of being moved to a different site on the property, yet still accessible to the public.</p>	<p>All land tenure agreements will be reviewed to ensure that they meet the terms required for the program and the viability of the project for the requisite time period. Even If an agreement with this option met the requirements, the impact on other application requirements, e.g., CEQA, criteria responses, public access would need to be considered.</p> <p>After the final guide is published, OGALS will provide technical assistance through workshops and by phone and email. During the application period, applicants will have an opportunity to ask for more specific direction about proposed land tenure agreements and other application requirements.</p>
10/09/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Land tenure	<p>The land tenure requirement should be revised to allow for unique situations where the intent of the requirements is met through means other than those specified. In our situation, all land that would be part of the submitted project is in public ownership for perpetuity, and each party agreed to “Contribute staff and resources to planning and operating an interagency visitor center to provide appropriate interpretive information and media...”, and therefore the intent of only funding permanent projects is met.</p>	<p>The land tenure section has been edited to allow agencies with lease agreements that differ from the listed alternatives to submit the agreement along with the land tenure form and a letter describing the circumstances that may prevent meeting the standard requirements. All land tenure agreements are subject to review and approval to ensure that they fulfill the intent of the grant program, ensure the viability of the project and are accessible by the public</p>

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
09/24/09	Bay Area Email	Land Tenure	If a project site isn't owned in fee simple by the applicant, but they have a 10 year land tenure agreement, and they meet the additional requirements laid out in the guidelines, would that make their application less competitive?	See above.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Land Tenure	What if we are in process of buying land at time of application?	Include a letter describing the steps remaining in your land purchase, along with an expected date to complete escrow. You would need to prove you owned the land before a grant could be awarded.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Land Tenure	What if we do not have a signed lease?	Applicants will need to submit a draft lease, land tenure form and letters from both land owner and the applicants agreeing to sign the lease if the grant is awarded.
10/07/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Land Tenure	We recognize that the state should have some form of assurance that a capital project should serve the public for a significant period of time. However, land tenure requirement of the guide should be amended. One option would be to require 20 years of land tenure for all grantees regardless of the amount of the grant requested.	For land not owned by the applicant, approved agreements must meet the terms noted in the guide and include various alternatives. However, OGALS has edited the guide to allow applicants with lease agreements that differ from the listed alternatives to submit the agreement, along with a letter describing the circumstances that may prevent the applicant from meeting the standard requirements.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Match	Is match required?	Match is not required under this program.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Match	In favor of match, it shows commitment on part of agency	There is no match requirement under this program and no preference is given for APPLICANTS who provide matching funds. However, the total grant alone, or grant plus additional committed funds, must be equal to the funds needed to complete the PROJECT

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
				Criteria #7 provides an opportunity for applicants to demonstrate their commitment to the long term operation and maintenance of the project including describing funding and other resources, including partners and volunteers.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Match	Is match required?	No
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Match	Likes no match.	Thank you.
10/06/09	High Sierra Email	NEF Guide	The guidelines were very clear and easy to review, and obviously much thought and effort was put into their creation.	Thank you.
09/23/09	Central Valley Phone	NEF Program	Incredibly pleased with program	Thank you for your comment.
09/02/09	North Coast Area Email	NEF Program	Very excited about the program	Thank you
09/25/09	Desert Phone	NPO Requirements	We are a small Non-profit organization (NPO). We have all the documents you require from NPO's, except for the most recent audit report. However, we do a yearly financial review. We would like you to accept our most recent financial review instead of an audit report.	<p>The Guide has been edited to include language allowing most recent audit or financial review. In addition,, all NPO's must also submit the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verification of 501(C)(3) status • Articles of Incorporation or equivalent legal founding document(s) • Mission statement and/or description of organization's most significant activities • Most recent IRS Form 990, <i>Return of Organization Exempt from Income Tax</i> • Most recent annual report and/or budget
10/09/09	Inland Empire Email	NPO Requirements	The draft guide states that non-profit organizations must provide, among other things Articles of Incorporation. Under Definitions, a non-profit is defined as "a non-profit corporation qualified to do business in	The guide has been edited to allow for articles of Incorporation or equivalent legal founding document(s) to be submitted. All non-profit organizations must meet the definition in the Guide and submit all of the other documents

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
			<p>California, and qualified under Section 501(c) 3 of the Internal Revenue Code".</p> <p>Our institution is founded as a trust, and classified within California as a "charitable trust." Our legal founding document is a trust indenture not articles of incorporation. We request that the item on page 10 be reworded along the lines of "Articles of Incorporation or equivalent legal founding document(s)" to allow for institutions which were not founded using Articles of Incorporation.</p>	required.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	NPO Requirements	Some NPO are not required to have audit	The Guide has been edited to include language allowing most recent audit or financial review.
10/01/09	Bay Area Email	Number of applicants	Do you expect many applicants?	At this time, we did not know how many applications we will receive. However, based on the response to the program so far, OGALS expects applications from a wide range of public institutions and non-profit organizations across the state. The proposed multiple funding tiers are developed to enable funding of a broad variety of sizes and types of projects.
10/08/09	Los Angeles Area Email	Number pages	I believe 15 pages are sufficient for the Project Selection section. Part of the challenge here is to be thorough while being succinct.	Thank you. Based on a wide range of feedback OGALS increased the number of pages to 20.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Number pages	15 pages, double space is not enough space for responses.	The guide has been changed to allow the following: Maximum 20 (8½ x 11") pages, single-sided, double-spaced, with 12-point Arial font.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Number pages	May want to include suggested amount of pages needed for each response (as in SPP	Thank you for your suggestion. A suggested number of pages for each response has been

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
			guide).	included in the Guide. However, applicants should allocate the number of pages for each criterion as needed to fully justify and support the responses. In all cases, applicants should clearly and concisely answer the questions asked and/or prompts provided.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Number pages	Suggest 18 pages based on criteria.	Maximum 20 (8½ x 11") pages, single-sided, double-spaced, with 12-point Arial font.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Number pages	Suggest 20 page maximum.	See above response.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Number pages	Would like to see 25 page limit.	See above response.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Number pages	15 double space pages ok	See above response.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Number pages	15 single space pages ok	See above response.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Number pages	15 single space, double sided	See above response.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Number pages	Do you specify font	See above response
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Number pages	In support of specified font – Arial 12	See above response.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Number pages	Need 20 pages	See above response.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Number pages	Need 25 to 30 double space	See above response.
09/02/09	Los Angeles Area Email	Other Proposition 84 programs	Would the Strategic Growth Council's criteria for Prop 84 funds have any impact on the state parks Prop 84 grant funds, and if so, should the criteria be included in the guidelines?"	PRC 75120-75130 establishes and gives direction to the Strategic Growth Council. It also enacts subdivisions (a) and (c) of PRC 75065 of Proposition 84. It does not impact he two Prop 84 grant programs administered by OGALS. The Statewide Park Program and Nature Education Facilities.

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
10/07/09	North Coast Email	Partnership	Would a partnership be acceptable in executing a project as long as an affiliated non-profit is the lead agency? That is, our agency, departments and/or personnel would be responsible for a portion of the project and provide expertise and support to the eligible NPO.	Yes partnerships are acceptable. However, only eligible agencies can submit applications. OGALS will determine that the applicant and the proposed project are eligible under the program. OGALS will follow with a review of all the necessary documents listed on the application checklist. As applicable, an applicant would identify partners where necessary, e.g., funding sources form, land tenure form, etc. In addition, various criteria prompt applicants to describe the role that partners may play in the development, execution and operation and maintenance of the project.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Photos	If renovation, what kind of photos do you need.	The purpose of the photos is to allow the reviewer to have a better understanding of the project. Therefore, send photos that best illustrate the need for the grant.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Project summary	Does marine cover saline or brackish marshes? How about the bay?	The following definition for marine has been added to the Guide. Marine: of, or relating to, the sea; found in, or living in the sea; an umbrella term for things relating to the ocean, coastal zones, and tidal areas.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Project Summary	More points if you meet all three points for types of institutions. <i>Combine the study of natural science with preservation, demonstration and education programs that serve diverse populations</i> <i>Provide collections and programs related to the relationship of Native American cultures to the environment.</i> <i>Conduct marine wildlife conservation research.</i>	Point values will remain the same.

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Project summary	Should be more emphasis on projects that involve outside. No child left inside, we are considering environmental playground that include geographic history of California.	Neither indoor nor outdoor projects are given preference as both types of projects are eligible under this program.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Project summary	I agree that need more emphasis on outdoor projects	See above.
10/09/09	Los Angeles Area Letter	Resolution	The required language of the Authorizing Resolution includes the following certification: <i>Certifies that said applicant has or will have available...the sufficient funds to complete the project;</i> Please clarify that this only pertains to project funding that exceeds the amount of the grant requested. Therefore, if an application was made for 100% funding (no match), then this certification would not be applicable.	Agencies awarded funds will be allowed to submit reimbursement requests as necessary as costs are incurred. In addition, although advances of up to 50% of the grant award are possible under this program, they are permissive by OGALS. Therefore, applicants need to consider how they will fund the project prior to receiving reimbursement.
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	Resolution	Authorized representative, may need to name designee. Should we add "or designee" to resolution.	It is not necessary. OGALS allows the authorized representative to name a designee if necessary.
09/16/09	Public Hearing Fresno	Resolution	Do you need this specific format?	Yes. It is specific to this program
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Resolution	Will you accept a draft resolution? Can take a long time to get resolution through county process.	Yes. Submit the draft as part of the original application packet, and include an explanation and expected date of approval.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Resolution	What about naming the authorized representative? What if it changes?	Name the designated position not the person's name.
09/14/09	Public Hearing Sacramento	Scope Change Request	Would this include changes due to requirement such as ADA?	Not considered a scope change. Scope change would be changing the intent or final result of project, e.g. from aquarium tanks to landscaping.
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Selection Process	Do you visit sites as part of selection process?	Yes
10/01/09	Public Hearing	Selection	Who is on project selection committee?	Scoring and selection of project applications is

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
	Los Angeles	Process		done by OGALS.
09/24/09	Public Hearing Oakland	Site plan	Need consistent size? 11x17 shows site plan more clearly	Thank you for your comment.
09/21/09	Sacramento Area Email	Source of Additional Funds	Is it true that this grant is to be the final gap funding needed to complete a project, not the first money in? Can't a project be totally funded by the grant?	A project can be totally funded by the grant if the grant request and the estimated project cost are the same. However, if the estimated project cost exceeds the grant requested, all of the other sources of funds needed to complete the project must be identified and committed within four months of the application date.
09/21/09	Sacramento Area Email	Source of Additional Funds	Why is there a 20% retention of grant funds until the project is completed and open to the public? Where can I find more about this in the draft guide?	OGALS policy of a 20% retention of grant funds provides assurance of final review of eligible costs. The final payment is made after: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grantee submits the project completion documents • A Project Officer makes a final site visit to confirm that the project is complete, open and accessible to the public. • The final pay package is reviewed and approved by OGALS. Information on payment request and other grant administration policies can be found in the Draft Grant Administration Guide for the Proposition 84 programs. It is available on our website at www.parks.ca.gov/grants
09/21/09	Sacramento Area Email	Source of Additional Funds	When will funding be awarded at the start of the project? In segments? At the completion?	The grants are expected to be awarded approximately 6 months after the application due date. However, the funds will not be available to the Grantee until a contract is fully encumbered. In addition, the Grantee must submit the required documents for either advances (up to 50% grant maximum) or

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
				reimbursement (up to 80% grant maximum) before final payment. Detailed information, and the required forms are available in the Draft Grant Administration Guide at www.parks.ca.gov/grants
10/01/09	Public Hearing Los Angeles	Sub-leases or agreements	We may initiate contract with concessionaire. Would we need to list that contract?	You may list it as a proposed contract. It does not need to be listed if you are only considering and have not identified a concessionaire.
09/25/09	Central Coast Phone	Technical Assistance	If I don't go to the public hearing will there be other opportunities to learn more about the program?	OGALS will present technical assistance workshops across the state after the final guide is published and the application due date is announced. OGALS expects at least a three month application period from final guide to due application due date. Technical assistance workshops, updated timelines and due dates will be posted at www.parks.ca.gov/grants as the information becomes available.
09/29	North Central California Email	Technical Assistance	Will the technical assistance workshops be pod cast or somehow recorded so that I can get the info without actually being on site?	Thank your for your suggestion. At this time OGALS plans to provide eight workshops across the state. In addition, staff will provide technical assistance by phone and email throughout the application period. Our intention, at all times, is to provide as much assistance as possible to all applicants.
09/24/09	San Diego Area Email	Technical Assistance	I see there are dates set for the Technical assistance for the Statewide Park Program. When will technical assistance workshops be held for this program?	OGALS will present technical assistance workshops across the state after the final guide is published and the application due date is announced. OGALS expects at least a three month application period from final guide to due application due date. Technical assistance workshops, updated

Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS)
 NATURE EDUCATION FACILITIES PROGRAM
 DRAFT GUIDE (09/01/09)
 ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS by TOPIC
 01/01/10

Date	Locale/Venue	Topic	Comments	Response
				timelines and due dates will be posted at www.parks.ca.gov/grants as the information becomes available.
10/03/09	Sacramento Email	Volunteer Labor	We may use of volunteers for construction of a gazebo type facility. Any thoughts on the use of volunteers?	Yes, volunteers may be used for project construction. However, comply with all applicable laws related to the use of volunteers in a publicly funded project. In addition, when responding to criteria, consider what roles volunteers or other partners may have in the development, execution, operation or maintenance of the project. For example, Criterion 7 asks applicants to describe additional resources such as partners or volunteers who will contribute to the long term stability of the project.