

Urban Park Act of 2001

TOPIC	PAGE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Procedural Matters			
Water Conservation & Facility Re-use	5	There is no credit for water conservation or adaptive re-use of facilities. State calls for encouragement of these items, much the same as matching funds are encouraged but not required. Like to see incentive in guidelines.	Water Conservation language has been deleted. Re-use of Existing Buildings language remains unchanged.
CEQA			
	11	CEQA: State Clearinghouse (SC) no longer sending response. SC only gives a response if there is a negative comment. SC puts notice on its web. Change guide to reflect. Recommend be able to submit web page in lieu of written doc.	Guidelines not changed. The SC continues to send responses on Negative Declarations and EIR's regardless of the type of comment. A SC response is not needed for other types of CEQA documents required by our Department.
Definitions			
	1	Add definition of "At-Risk Youth."	Added to Guidelines.

Urban Park Act of 2001

TOPIC	PAGE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Project Service Area (PSA)		Regional vs. Neighborhood parks	
	13	PSA definition is too limiting, and draft guide does not address regional facilities and their ability to address needs identified in program.	Project Service Area definition has been changed.
		PSA does not accurately reflect the area within a community that benefits from our programs. Suggest an alternative scoring process for special projects serving an entire region.	Project Service Area definition has been changed.
		Area of an Environmental Youth Service Center is likely to be somewhat greater than a one mile radius. Limiting the PSA will reduce the scope and utility and quality pf the service centers that can be funded, and limits the positive benefits for young people in larger areas. Applicants should be allowed to present evidence as to why a project is 'regional.'	Project Service Area definition has been changed.

Urban Park Act of 2001

TOPIC	PAGE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p>PSA OK, but page 14, item 2 implies that regional facilities are eligible to apply. But a regional facility would be disadvantaged in all other scoring areas. Recommend that guide make it clear that regional facilities can apply, and that separate scoring criteria be used to evaluate these projects. Questions should be structured to allow regional apps. to be competitive with all other applicants.</p>	<p>Project Service Area definition has been changed.</p>
Grant Min/Max			
		<p>Department should allow waiver to provide for higher maximums for regional facilities. These waivers should be reviewed by [DPR's] evaluation panel.</p>	<p>Guidelines not changed.</p>
		<p>Grant Minimum Amount: can't do much with 100K. Suggest raise to 250K minimum. The higher the number, the less issues.</p>	<p>Guidelines not changed. Minimum grant amount will remain at \$100,000.</p>
		<p>Difficult for NPOs to qualify (hard to meet land tenure requirements)</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	4	<p>Great job capturing information presented at focus groups.</p>	<p>Thank you!</p>
Master Plan Costs			

Urban Park Act of 2001

TOPIC	PAGE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		Due diligence often requires that a master plan be developed for a park project. Master plan enables our park department to hold public hearings and obtain feedback on what public wants in the way of amenities, prepare accurate cost estimates. Recommend that State allow payment for the development of a master plan.	Master Planning is not allowed in statute. Guideline not changed.
Matching Funds			
		Matching funds are not required, but guidelines lack clarity in this area. Guidelines should clearly show that if financial limitations prohibit match of any kind, applicant can still get full points.	Additional Match language added to guideline on pages 7 and 20.
	20	Not clear if matching funds are required? It is our understanding that match is not required.	PRC 5646: "...department shall assign higher priority...for each of the following criteria satisfied: 5646 (f) "application includes a commitment for a matching contribution."
	20	Matching funds confusing. Add section in guide to clarify whether or not match is required.	Additional Match language added to guideline on pages 7 and 20.

Urban Park Act of 2001

TOPIC	PAGE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		Need General Statement of requirements or statement of advantages to having match.	Additional Match language added to the guideline on pages 7 and 20. Per Legislation, higher priority shall be given to projects that have a committed match.
	7	Suggest putting match language requirements on page 6 or 7-Sect 2.	Additional Match language added to guideline on pages 7 and 20.
Eligible Costs			
		Not clear if planning for new facilities qualifies in this grant program - address whether planning is eligible cost.	Language appears in the eligible cost chart. Specific site planning costs are eligible, however, General Planning is not an eligible cost. All costs must be within the Project Performance Period.
Multiple Applications			
		Clarify if applicants can submit multiple applications.	Guidelines have been clarified.
Rehabilitation			
		Clarify rehabilitation. Need better clarification for taking an existing facility and putting new activity/facility on property (e.g. Athletic field or new athletic complex).	Rehabilitation projects are not eligible. Guideline not changed.

Urban Park Act of 2001

TOPIC	PAGE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		Agree with previous comments - Problem is that some cities are built out and it is difficult to find a NEW facility - some cities in the area - unless you find any houses to tear down, there is no open space.	Noted
		Follow-up on eligibility - a "door was opened" on use. The issue of being built out is not the "best door". The only option is to rehabilitate current facility.	Noted
		Safety becomes an issue in facilities in built out areas.	Noted
Description of Project			
		There is no mention of multi-use or outdoor recreation.	Concepts captured in "Facilities" definition section and Criteria 4,5,6.
Criteria, general comments		Scoring, order of	
		Criteria are not listed in a ranked (ascending) order. List in order of point value.	Noted. The order has not changed.
		Disagree, like it as it is.	Noted. Point value has not changed.

Urban Park Act of 2001

TOPIC	PAGE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Criterion 1		Park Acreage	
		My special district is located in the middle of 3 areas (cities), but we are ineligible to apply. We serve a large population of high-risk youths and seniors.	Noted
	14	10 points for the number of park acreage seems too high of a point value.	Guidelines not changed. Legislation mandates that projects located in areas least served will have higher priority.
		Looking at points per acreage - good item. We fall within category of less than 2 acres per 1,000 residence.	Noted
Criteria 1 & 2			
	13	Under project selection criteria, no mention of "multi-use" or "outdoor education facilities" but reference is made to these in UPA intent. Terms should be added to Criteria 1-2.	The intent is taken in its entirety from PRC 5641 (a) (b) (c) with the addition of language taken from the definitions section of the draft guide. The concepts of "multi-use" or "outdoor education" are captured in definitions "Facilities," "New Urban Park [. . .]," and "Outdoor Learning Opportunities."

Urban Park Act of 2001

TOPIC	PAGE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Criteria 3 & 4		Involving Residents and Meeting Their Needs	
	14-15	Criteria 3-4 carry significant weight (25 out of 100 points). Public participation is extremely important, but can be costly for non-profit orgs. Also, what does DPR view as a "concerted effort"? This activity needs clarification. DPR should also provide a way to determine if an organization has met this requirement.	Guidelines not changed
	14-15	Use of input from neighborhood representatives and key community stakeholders should hold just as much weight as other types of community outreach efforts.	Guidelines not changed
	14-15	Need more emphasis on programs and employment rather than points awarded for public participation	Guidelines not changed

Urban Park Act of 2001

TOPIC	PAGE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Criteria 5 & 6		Outdoor learning opportunities	
		Allowing agencies to count private schools will help meet the program intent. It won't be captured using just public schools in PSA.	Guidelines not changed. Legislation designates public schools only.
		Include some points for other schools (i.e., students in neighborhoods) Many parents sending kids to private schools in neighborhood. Private schools are serving kids from other neighborhoods.	Guideline not changed. Legislation designates public schools only.
	15-16	Guidelines biased against youth and children elements of legislation as programs via CCC and LCCs are given few points (10 maximum from criteria 5-6).	Guidelines not changed
Criterion 7	16	Bubble dots conflict with Criterion 7. The main question asks the applicant to describe <u>how</u> the project will . . ." The first dots asks " . . . How the area is blighted." Better to ask 'why.'	Guidelines not changed.

Urban Park Act of 2001

TOPIC	PAGE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Criterion 9		Joint Use & Project Sustainability	
		Too much emphasis (point value) placed on joint use facilities. More important to have facilities in park poor areas, rather give credit for the number of people or organizations operating it.	Noted
	17	More emphasis should be placed on project sustainability. Criterion 9 should have more points as long term accountability is important.	Guidelines not changed.
Criterion 11		Economic Resources	
	18	What you're looking for as economic resources is still unclear. Economic resources should be added to the definitions. Applicant should state what existing economic resources are available. This requirement should be made more specific.	Guidelines not changed
	18	Need greater clarity about #11. How will the department determine if match is proportional, and, how will a project score if applicant has no match?	The Department shall evaluate the amount of the matching contribution in terms of its proportionality in relation to the economic resources of the applicant. Cited from Section 5646 (f) of the Public Resources Code (PRC). Additional match language added to Guideline on pages 7 and 20.