

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
OPEN PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS  
FOR THE  
LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND PROGRAM



May 1989



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction. . . . .	1
Priority Rating Systems . . . . .	3
Project Selection Procedures. . . . .	7
Recurring Funding Cycle . . . . .	9
Public Notification . . . . .	11
Program Technical Assistance for State and Local Projects . . . . .	11
Affirmative Action. . . . .	13
Advisory Boards . . . . .	14
Public Participation. . . . .	15
Appendix A: Guidelines for Local Distribution of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and Priority Rating System. . . . .	19
Appendix B: Correlation of State Agency LWCF Criteria with 1988 California Outdoor Recreation Plan Issues/Actions . . . . .	49



## INTRODUCTION

Since 1965, the state's annual Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) apportionments have been allocated among state agencies and shared with local units of government. The distribution of funds has been on the basis of the formula contained in Section 5099.12 of the Public Resources Code. Selection of local grants will be made in accordance with the priorities and criteria adopted subsequent to public hearings and codified in Chapter 12, Title 14 of the California Administrative Code.

As a part of the updating of the California Outdoor Recreation Plan (CORP), a new Open Project Selection Process (OPSP) has been developed. The process incorporates criteria and standards that respond to the issues currently facing recreation programs in California and to people's preferences for recreation activities. The issues were identified by the CORP Advisory Committee, consisting of people representing a variety of agencies and organizations involved in different aspects of park and recreation programs in California, and a survey of local park and recreation officials. The recreation activity preferences are based on the findings of a public opinion and activity survey in 1987. The issues and recommended actions to deal with the issues, as well as the public opinion and activity survey (and resulting preferences), were developed as parts of the process of updating the California Outdoor Recreation Plan. Those issues, actions, and survey results have been reported in the 1988 CORP.

The new OPSP, consisting of eight components required by the National Park Service (NPS), is presented in the following sections:

- o Priority Rating Systems**
- o Project Selection Process**
- o Recurring Funding Cycle**
- o Public Notification**
- o Program Assistance**
- o Affirmative Action**
- o Advisory Boards**
- o Public Participation**

## PRIORITY RATING SYSTEMS

Local projects that receive LWCF money are picked by the State Department of Parks and Recreation from among a large number of applicants from all over the state, using criteria and a selection process developed by the department's Planning and Local Assistance Division. Each state agency selects the projects to receive its share of LWCF money, using its own criteria and selection processes. All the criteria used to select any state project are designed to be responsive to the major issues facing park and recreation organizations in California that are identified in the current California Outdoor Recreation Plan. In this way, the state is able to implement a consistent policy, across the board, for the expenditure of these funds. At the same time, fund managers can be assured that there is a clear-cut connection between the criteria used to select LWCF projects and the issues identified in CORP, regardless of the agency primarily involved.

The criteria and the scoring system used to select local projects are the main topics in this document. However, the criteria used by each eligible state agency have also been included, with a matrix demonstrating how well these criteria match the major CORP issues (see Appendix B).

### Local Projects

A priority rating system has been established for local acquisition and development projects to ensure that the selection from among competing projects is fair and equitable, and that projects are funded on their relative merits.

A detailed explanation of this system is included in Appendix A (attached), "Guidelines for Distribution of Local Land and Water Conservation Funds and Priority Rating System." The rating system was developed by the staff of the Local Assistance Section and the Statewide Planning Section of the Planning and Local Assistance Division, State Department of Parks and Recreation. The system has been explained and reviewed at public hearings and has been adopted by the state liaison officer (SLO), who is the director of the State Department of Parks and Recreation. The priority rating for local projects and guidelines for distribution of Land and Water Conservation Funds will be placed in the California Administrative Code, pursuant to Section 5099.10 of the Public Resources Code, and a copy will be sent to each member of the State Legislature.

The priorities and project criteria in the rating system reflect the extent to which project proposals conform to eligibility criteria outlined in the NPS Grants-in-Aid Manual, the need for the project as determined by a local needs analysis, the recreation issues identified by the California Outdoor Recreation Plan Advisory Committee and a survey of local park and recreation officials, and findings of the 1987 public opinion survey conducted for the State Department of Parks and Recreation, which determined latent demand and support for public funding of various outdoor recreation activities.

### State Projects

While 60% of the state's annual allocation of LWCF money is allocated to local projects, 40% is made available to finance projects selected by the following four separate state agencies. Eligible state and local agencies may also

apply for 6% of the apportionment deposited in the State Liaison Officer's Contingency Fund.

#### California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR)

Aside from funds allocated for CORP planning, DPR uses its share of allocated funds (55%) on its major program, the State Park System. The criteria used to select projects for the SPS are designed to stimulate contributions from nonprofit organizations and to facilitate acquisition projects for new units near urban centers, critical additions to existing parks, or inholdings in established parks. Also, these criteria encourage the rehabilitation of deteriorating and outmoded facilities and the development of campsites, picnic sites, and other popular facilities in areas where demand is demonstrably high.

#### Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB)

The Wildlife Conservation Board, which receives 35% of the allotment for state agency projects, centers its activities on acquiring lands and developing facilities suitable for preserving and restoring wildlife habitats, and on opportunities for public recreational use of fish and wildlife resources. Specifically, the board stresses projects such as constructing and rehabilitating fishing piers, developing fishing access sites and boat launching ramps, and providing access to hunting and wildlife areas. WCB projects also offer opportunities for bird watching, nature study, and photography.

## California Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW)

Economics plays a dominant role in the consideration of projects financed by the Department of Boating and Waterways' share of funds, 5%. A high benefit-to-cost ratio is a prominent criterion -- buttressed by low-maintenance design and an expectation of high use. Typical projects provide for boating facilities at reservoirs, lakes, and other bodies of water throughout the state. Included in such projects are launching ramps, boating slips, picnic areas, restrooms, and parking lots.

## California Department of Water Resources (DWR)

The projects funded by DWR from its 5% share are generally used to develop water-oriented recreational facilities, such as launching ramps for boating and fishing, in connection with aqueducts, reservoirs, and other water facilities comprising the State Water Project. Some of the most popular water-oriented recreation facilities are located in units of the State Park System.

California Coastal Conservancy: In addition to the state agencies identified above, which receive 40% of the state's apportionment, the California Coastal Conservancy is eligible to compete for the SLO Contingency Fund.

## Differences in Criteria

The criteria used for project selection by these state agencies differ significantly from the criteria for selecting local projects due to

differences in program and scope of responsibility. These differences preclude using state agency criteria to select local projects, and vice versa.

Although there are differences among the criteria used by each of the state agencies involved in this program, and differences between the criteria used by state agencies, as a group, and those for local agencies, there is a strong common thread between them. All criteria are designed to respond to the major CORP issues. The resulting projects offer the public tremendous variety from which to choose. Altogether, they offer healthy diversity while meeting significant needs in their specific areas.

### PROJECT SELECTION PROCEDURES

#### Local Projects

This process used by the State of California to rank local project applications establishes a priority for proposals to be funded under the LWCF program.

The selection process for local projects begins with receipt of an application, which is immediately acknowledged by a letter from the Federal Grants Section. The application is assigned to a project officer, who determines basic eligibility by checking the proposal against the screening criteria contained in Appendix A. If ineligible, the applicant is notified immediately by a letter from the state liaison officer (SLO), and the project is not considered further.

If the project survives the screening process, the project officer notifies the applicant of any apparent deficiencies in the application, and arranges for an on-site inspection. If the project is subsequently selected for funding, there will be further requirements, such as a project agreement and due dates for submission of construction plans and/or appraisals. The applicant is informed about these requirements during the inspection.

Next, the application is evaluated by the project officer, who assigns a numerical score using the priorities and criteria in the Priority Rating System, discussed in Appendix A.

After all eligible projects are scored, they are listed in priority order and presented to the supervisor of the Federal Grants Section, and the chief of the Division of Planning and Local Assistance. These managers check to assure that the criteria and rating factors have been applied fairly, consistently, and objectively.

The final step in project selection is a detailed briefing to the SLO, who makes the final determination. After this final selection, state legislators whose districts contain approved projects are notified. The SLO sends a letter to the successful and unsuccessful applicants, informing them of the outcome.

Projects selected at the state level are forwarded to the western regional office of NPS for its approval and to obligate the funds.

## State Projects

State agency projects are selected by each participating agency and submitted to the SLO for its share of allocated funds. The Federal Grants Section staff reviews each project to assure that it conforms to the eligibility criteria and priorities in CORP.

Eligible projects are forwarded by the SLO to NPS for funding.

## RECURRING FUNDING CYCLE

California's local LWCF Grants Program is administered on an annual cycle. The cycle begins each year when the secretary of the interior issues the apportionment letter to the governor. This notifies the state of the amount available from LWCF.

## Local Projects

If the state is notified of its annual apportionment in October, the schedule for the local program is:

- October - A public notice is sent to about 700 local jurisdictions in California, informing them that applications for the current fiscal year will be accepted until the deadline - the following February 15.

- Mid-February - Deadline for applications for that fiscal year.
- February - May - Applications are reviewed, analyzed, inspected, evaluated, and ranked by staff.
- Mid-May - After briefing by staff, the SLO selects a list of successful projects for the available funds. All applicants are notified of these decisions.
- Early June - Selected projects are forwarded to the regional office of NPS for approval and fund obligation.

This schedule gives local applicants at least four months, October to February, to prepare a technically complete application. This extended period is necessary to allow enough time to go through the public review process of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Also, the schedule allows the state to submit its selected projects to NPS in time for federal approval and obligation of funds prior to the end of the federal fiscal year, September 30.

### State Projects

The SLO notifies eligible state agencies of their share of the annual allocation of the Land and Water Conservation Fund as soon as the apportionment letter to the governor is received. Applications are then accepted by the department for review and transmittal to NPS.

## PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

### State and Local Projects

Each year since the start of the LWCF Program in 1965, California has notified potential applicants of the program and has encouraged applications to be submitted for available funds.

More than 700 letters are mailed annually to all state agencies, cities, counties, and park and recreation districts that have the authority and responsibility for acquiring and developing park and recreation areas and facilities. These letters announce the application deadline, the amount of funds available, how funds will be distributed, criteria for evaluating and ranking projects, and any changes in the grant program.

The annual deadline is also announced in "California Parks and Recreation," a monthly magazine published by the California Park and Recreation Society with a circulation of approximately 4,500 copies.

### PROGRAM TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

### FOR STATE AND LOCAL PROJECTS

The following program assistance is available on request to all potential applicants, both before and after the submission of applications:

- o DPR federal assistance personnel will answer questions, provide instructions, and offer guidance for obtaining LWCF assistance. Workshops will be offered to assist grant seekers in filing applications or interpreting program requirements.
  
- o The department publishes procedural guides for the LWCF Program that provide potential applicants with all the procedures and forms required to successfully submit, administer, and complete a Land and Water Conservation Fund proposal.

These include: Part I, Application Procedures

Part II, Fiscal Procedures

Instructions for Undertaking an Acquisition Project

Instructions for Undertaking a Development Project

Affirmative Action Requirements Handbook

Title VI, Compliance Handbook

Section 504 Guidelines

- o Since 1964, California has developed six state-funded park and recreation grant programs of its own. The grants from these programs are disseminated to virtually every city, county, and park and recreation district in the state. As a result, state grant program administrators are in frequent contact with every eligible applicant in California. They are familiar with LWCF Program requirements and frequently identify the program as a potential matching source for agencies throughout California.

- o The department's comprehensive mailing list of all eligible applicants is used to distribute brochures, procedural guides, application information, notices of criteria hearings, and other items of interest. Lists are also maintained of special interest groups, professional and community organizations, and others who have expressed an interest in the department's grant programs. These individuals and groups are contacted and invited to participate in the review of any changes in the LWCF Program.

### AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

#### Local Projects

Until 1977, local projects in California were selected largely for their resource values (e.g., scenic areas, beaches, river parks). Such resources are usually located in areas remote from population centers. However, a large majority of California's low-income, minority, and other special populations are concentrated in high-density urban centers. Consequently, the SLO at that time directed staff to replace the resource emphasis with objective criteria, giving preference to projects located in areas close to population concentrations, in low-income areas, and at sites conveniently accessible by public transportation.

The revised California Outdoor Recreation Plan and this Open Project Selection Process are designed to provide a well-balanced funding program by continuing to award points to local projects serving ethnic minorities, the disabled, the

elderly, and the economically disadvantaged, as well as to projects providing access to, or protecting, areas with significant scenic or natural values.

### State Projects

To the extent possible, the State Department of Parks and Recreation, the Department of Boating and Waterways, and the Wildlife Conservation Board all give an "urban emphasis" to their project selection processes. While the legislatively mandated missions of these agencies require them to acknowledge certain resource factors, consideration will be given to projects that are people-oriented as well as resource-oriented.

The Department of Water Resources is the only state agency using LWCF assistance that is, by necessity, almost totally resource-oriented. Its mission dictates development of recreation facilities adjacent to water areas (reservoirs and canals). For obvious geologic, engineering, and economic reasons, recreation use and proximity to population are not major considerations when locating reservoirs or canals. Furthermore, studies and observed practice have shown that recreationists are willing to travel very long distances to use water-oriented recreation facilities in California, especially in southern California.

### ADVISORY BOARDS

While the use of advisory boards is not required, it is encouraged by NPS. During the preparation of the current CORP update, a 15-member advisory

committee played an extremely important role. The committee was composed of representatives from city, county, state, and federal government agencies, the California Park and Recreation Society, and the State Park and Recreation Commission, and educators, private consultants, and suppliers of private recreation facilities.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

### Local Projects

Federal guidelines require that the state's OPSP be subject to public review and comment prior to implementation. This is to assure that the preparation and revision of the project selection processes and priority rating systems are equitable and based on citizen involvement and public participation. In California, public involvement in the preparation of the CORP and the formulation of criteria used in evaluating grant projects is achieved through several methods.

First, every CORP update is assisted by the advice of the special CORP Advisory Committee.

Second, California state law requires the State Department of Parks and Recreation to hold public hearings when adopting or revising project selection criteria. These hearings are open to the public and are generally attended by officials of cities, counties, and districts who represent the public.

Public involvement in the selection of local projects is also attained at the local level. As a minimum, the state requires each application for funds to be accompanied by a resolution from the governing body sponsoring the project. The resolutions are adopted at public meetings where the opportunity for involvement is offered. A project application will receive higher priority for a greater degree of substantiated public participation in the development and approval of the proposal.

Additionally, local projects must conform to the distribution and filing of public notices required under the California Environmental Quality Act. The filing of these notices triggers a 30-day public review period, which must occur before the application can be processed.

### State Projects

Public involvement in the state project selection process varies among agencies.

With the exception of the Wildlife Conservation Board, all state-sponsored LWCF projects must be approved by the California Legislature. Such approval requires a minimum of two public hearings (one for the Senate and one for the Assembly). The legislators, as representatives of the public, are, in effect, providing public participation.

The Wildlife Conservation Board is somewhat more autonomous than the other departments in the Resources Agency because it does not need to seek legislative or Public Works Board approval for all of its projects. The board

consists of three members -- the chairman of the State Fish and Game Commission (a private citizen) and two departmental directors (Fish and Game, and Finance) -- who decide on approval of projects. In addition, three members of each house of the State Legislature meet with the Wildlife Conservation Board to ensure legislative awareness and input.

State Park System projects must comply with the general plan for the park unit. These plans are developed with extensive public involvement, including hearings, survey questionnaires, and public workshops. In addition, each general plan must be approved by the State Park and Recreation Commission, which holds public meetings that must conform to the state's "Open Meeting Act." All notices of commission meetings are announced in advance through news media and are sent to those on a mailing list that includes anyone interested in commission activities. Commission meeting agendas and minutes are also distributed to those on the list.

Projects of the Department of Water Resources and Department of Boating and Waterways must be approved by the Legislature and Public Works Board, which review and approve projects at open meetings. In addition, Water Resources projects are reviewed and discussed at State Water Commission meetings, which are also open to the public. Boating and Waterways projects, developed in units of the State Park System, are subject to review by the State Park and Recreation Commission.

Finally, as with local projects, all state projects must conform to the public notice distribution and filing requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.



APPENDIX A

GUIDELINES FOR LOCAL DISTRIBUTION  
OF THE  
LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND,  
AND  
PRIORITY RATING SYSTEM

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
DEFINITIONS . . . . .	21
AUTHORITY FOR THE PROGRAM . . . . .	23
OVERVIEW OF FUND ALLOCATION . . . . .	23
LOCAL PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA. . . . .	25
SUBMISSION OF ELIGIBLE PROJECTS . . . . .	37
PAYMENT OF FUNDS. . . . .	38
AMENDMENTS TO PROJECTS. . . . .	38
SUGGESTED POINT VALUES. . . . .	39

## Definitions

1. ACT - The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, 78 Stat. 897, authorizing the secretary of the interior to provide financial assistance to the states for outdoor recreation purposes.
  
2. ANNUAL APPORTIONMENT - The amount of funds allocated during any one fiscal year by the secretary of the interior and made available to the State of California under this program.
  
3. APPLICANT - Any public agency or political subdivision of the state eligible for, and applying for, assistance under this program. The only state agencies eligible for a regular apportionment of LWCF money are the California Department of Parks and Recreation, the Wildlife Conservation Board, the Department of Water Resources, and the Department of Boating and Waterways. The California Coastal Conservancy is eligible to compete for the State Liaison Officer Contingency Fund.

Cities, counties, recreation and park districts, and certain special districts whose authority permits the acquisition, development, operation, and maintenance of public parks and recreation areas are all eligible.

The terms "project sponsor" and "applicant" are synonymous.

4. CORP - The California Outdoor Recreation Plan, which includes the state's assessment and policy plan required by the Act.

5. DEPARTMENT - The State Department of Parks and Recreation.
6. FUND - Land and Water Conservation Fund.
7. PROGRAM - The Land and Water Conservation Fund program, under which money is made available through the state liaison officer to state and local agencies for outdoor recreation purposes.
8. PROJECT - The acquisition or development proposal for which matching LWCF grant money is requested. Projects involving phases or stages will be required to compete each year. The funding of the first phase of a phased project will not necessarily ensure future funding of subsequent phases.
9. SERVICE or NPS - The National Park Service of the U.S. Department of the Interior.
10. SERVICE AREA - The geographical area surrounding a park or recreation area from which a majority of the visitors will come.
11. SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA/NORTHERN CALIFORNIA - Southern California includes the following 10 counties: San Luis Obispo, Kern, San Bernardino, Santa Barbara, Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Diego, and Imperial. Northern California includes all of the state's remaining 48 counties.

12. STATE LIAISON OFFICER (SLO) - The director of the State Department of Parks and Recreation, designated by the governor to administer the Land and Water Conservation Fund program for the State of California, and given authority by the State Legislature to serve as the state liaison officer.
13. LATENT DEMAND - A measurement for those recreation activities that people would have probably done more often, or would like to have tried, if good facilities or programs had been available.

#### Authority for the Program

The state and its local governmental agencies and subdivisions have authority to participate in the program provided by Articles 1 through 3, Chapter 1.9, Division 5 (Sections 5099 through 5099.11) of the Public Resources Code, and other provisions of law. Also, the Public Resources Code instructs the director of the State Department of Parks and Recreation to maintain a comprehensive plan for the state's outdoor recreation resources, and it gives the director authority to administer the program. The director is appointed by the governor as the state liaison officer and is authorized to act on all matters that affect the state under the LWCF.

#### Overview of Fund Allocation

California's annual allocation from the Land and Water Conservation Fund is distributed among state and local projects by the state liaison officer (SLO) in accordance with the Public Resources Code. This distribution is made for the following purposes:

- Statewide planning
- SLO Contingency Fund
- State and local agencies for acquisition and development

This distribution takes into consideration applicable National Park Service guidelines, issues, and priorities spelled out in the state's outdoor recreation plan, as well as applicable state legislation and adopted criteria.

The state's annual apportionment of funds will be allocated as follows:

1. The cost of preparing and maintaining the California Outdoor Recreation Plan. These funds are available only to the department.
2. Up to 6% of the apportionment may be deposited in the SLO Contingency Fund.
3. 60% of the balance of the total annual apportionment will be made available to local agencies in accordance with adopted criteria. Of that amount, no more than 60% will go to projects in southern California. The remaining amount will go to projects in northern California.
4. 40% of the balance of the annual apportionment will be divided among state agencies as follows:
  - Department of Parks and Recreation      55%
  - Wildlife Conservation Board                      35%

- Department of Water Resources 5%
- Department of Boating and Waterways 5%

If the state's annual apportionment is reduced below a level deemed impractical by the SLO for a statewide local grants program, the total apportionment may be allocated to the state agencies as shown above.

#### Local Project Selection Criteria

Projects submitted by local agencies will be evaluated by the following screening and ranking criteria:

SCREENING CRITERIA: The first phase of the local project selection process involves the application of screening criteria to determine whether the project is eligible for further consideration. Before a project can be ranked, all of the following conditions must be satisfied:

- (a) The project for which funds are requested must meet the eligibility requirements of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act and the criteria established by the National Park Service, and be consistent with priority needs identified in CORP.
- (b) A substantially complete application must be submitted by the annual date identified for submission of project proposals. This is commonly referred to as the application deadline. A technically complete application, as defined by the department, will receive bonus points.

- (c) The application must have an assured source of eligible matching funds to meet the nonfederal share of the cost of the project by the application deadline.
- (d) The applicant must have adequate tenure to the land to be developed by the deadline (applies to development projects only). Adequate tenure will consist of either fee title without encumbrances that would have an adverse effect on the project, or a fully executed, 25-year lease from a federal agency if its land is being developed. Proposed development projects on land to be leased from a nonfederal agency are not eligible unless the lease includes provisions that adequately safeguard the perpetual use requirement contained in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. Such safeguards must include joint sponsorship of the proposed project, whereby the lessor would assume compliance responsibility for the fund-assisted area in the event of default by the lessee or on expiration of the lease. This means that the lessor must agree to take over the project if the lessee is no longer involved, and that the lessor will not use the land for any other purpose than that for which the grant was made.

RANKING CRITERIA: After a local project has been screened, it is subjected to ranking criteria for the purpose of assigning it a numerical rating. This score consists of the following five components:

1. The extent to which the project meets the Priority Statewide Outdoor Recreation Needs identified in the state's 1988 Assessment and Policy Plan (CORP). This factor accounts for a maximum of 30 points of a project's score.

2. In addition to Priority Statewide Outdoor Recreation Needs, the local need for the project will also be evaluated. This factor has a maximum value of 20 points.
3. Project-Specific Criteria identified in CORP that allow for an objective and consistent comparison of each project with competing projects. These criteria account for 45 points.
4. Bonus Points:
  - o Technically Complete Application

Five points are awarded to technically complete grant requests as of the annual deadline.
5. Tie Breakers (explained below) are used when projects remain tied.

Following is a further description of the five components of the ranking criteria used to evaluate local projects. (Scoring is discussed further under the section "Suggested Point Values" in this appendix.)

1. THE PRIORITY STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION NEEDS

Recreation Activities

A statewide public opinion survey was conducted under the direction of the department to determine the latent demand for 38 different

outdoor recreation activities, ranging from camping to visiting zoos. The survey resulted in a priority statewide ranking of activities from highest to lowest, considering two factors: (1) which activity people would do more of if more and better facilities were available; and, (2) which activities people believe are most worthy of support through government funding.

A description of this survey, its methodology, and findings have been published in a departmental document, "Public Opinions and Attitudes on Outdoor Recreation in California - 1987." The material in that document transforms basic information into a means to evaluate which activities (or facilities for those activities) are more worthy of being provided by public agencies.

#### Multiactivity Facilities

When a grant request proposes to meet more than one priority outdoor recreation need, the priority statewide recreation need will be based on the pro rata value of the statewide priority of each proposed activity in proportion to the cost of developing facilities to provide for each activity. An example of how this is done can be found in the section "Suggested Point Values" in this appendix.

#### Other Facilities

Projects that include grant requests for a recreation activity not listed as a statewide outdoor recreation priority will be categorized under "other" activities and given a score of 10 points.

### Support Facilities

Grant requests involving only support facilities (e.g., restrooms, parking areas, entrance stations, maintenance areas, fencing) that are needed to improve the quality of the recreation experience, or make the project available for visitation, will be considered for funding. However, such facilities deemed to be of considerably lower priority than those projects that provide opportunities for recreation use will be given 50% of the statewide priority rating of the activity it supports or partially supports. Support facilities essential for public access to natural resource areas will, however, receive full credit.

### Acquisition Projects

The department's public opinion survey, a survey of local park and recreation agencies, and the findings of the CORP Advisory Committee all indicate that land acquisition is of lower priority than either the rehabilitation or development of recreation facilities. As a result, except for priority wetlands, the local project evaluation system has been designed to give an acquisition proposal a lower score than a development proposal. Thus, only priority wetlands defined and identified in the Wetlands Element of CORP, and other exceptionally good acquisition proposals, will be truly competitive.

In practice, an acquisition proposal will be evaluated as if it were a development proposal. The applicant must provide sufficient

information on how the land to be acquired will be developed, including a statement of intent from the governing body indicating when development will take place. This aspect of the score will be based on the priority rating of the activities to be offered, but will be reduced by 10% since development is promised rather than actually delivered by this grant application. acquisition of wetlands will not be subject to the 10% reduction.

## 2. LOCAL NEED FOR THE PROJECT

The second set of ranking criteria used to evaluate local grant requests is based on the local need for the project. Such need must be taken into consideration to reflect California's diverse climate, landscape, ethnic composition, culture, population distribution, and density.

The local need for a project should be specifically identified and documented to obtain the highest rating for the project.

In determining the need for the project, the department will consider the following factors (not in priority order):

- o How the project is consistent with the priorities identified in the applicant's current, approved systemwide master plan of park and recreation areas.

- o If the specific project for which funds are requested appears on the master plan.
- o If the applicant has a current, approved master plan for the project site, and the areas and/or activities covered in the grant request are shown on the plan.
- o If the applicant has substantiated the need for the proposed project by a local market-survey needs analysis.

3. PROJECT-SPECIFIC CRITERIA

Project-Specific Criteria are based on the technical requirements of the LWCF Act, the Grants-in-Aid Manual, and the policies of the National Park Service. Also considered are the criteria used in administering the several state-funded grant programs in California for more than 20 years. They are also based partly on the outdoor recreation concerns identified by the CORP Advisory Committee and the actions its members recommend to deal with these concerns, and on the results of the local park and recreation agency survey. This survey was mailed to every local public recreation agency in California to obtain information on their recreation programs, facilities, and sites, as well as the priority of the critical park and recreation issues facing them in the next five years.

Following is a detailed description of the three groups of factors listed under Project-Specific Criteria:

A. Service Area Factors

One of the basic objectives of this program is to invest grant funds in projects that deliver the most recreation benefits to the greatest number of people.

The extent to which a project best meets this objective will be determined by an analysis of the project's service area. The analysis will take into consideration:

1. Population Size and Density - Projects located in service areas with the highest population and population density will be given priority over projects located in service areas with lower population and density.
2. Accessibility - Priority will be given to projects that are readily and safely accessible. This will be judged by proximity to users, accessibility by nonmotorized or public transportation, and the lack of physical barriers that may restrict access.
3. Availability to Special Population Groups - Priority will be given to projects that provide or improve recreational opportunities, either through design or location, for special population groups such as the disabled, ethnic minorities, the elderly, and the poor.

4. Lack of Similar Opportunities - Priority will be given to projects that provide needed recreation opportunities in areas identified as having relatively large differences between the supply and the demand for the opportunities.

B. Project Factors

In addition to assessing the area served by the project and the ability of the project applicant, consideration will also be given to such factors as the urgency for the project, site suitability, the type of project proposed, and the feasibility of the project (its cost-benefit ratio).

1. Urgency - Involves acquisition cases only, when immediate action is critical to save an outdoor recreation opportunity from being lost to the public. Those projects will be given higher priority than those where no immediate action is necessary.
2. Site Suitability - Sites that can be made available and accessible to the public with the least alteration of the site will be given priority over sites that require greater alteration. A local grant request will receive a maximum score in this category if it increases or improves public access to, preserves, or protects an area with outstanding scenic or natural values.

3. Type of Project - For development projects only, higher priority will be given to those that will improve or expand capacity by redeveloping worn-out, obsolete, or unsafe recreation facilities. Points will not be given when such redevelopment is due to negligence or poor maintenance. Projects that are additions to existing areas or recreation facilities, or that involve development of undeveloped areas, will be given a lower priority. Rehabilitation or new development of support facilities will be given lowest priority.
  
4. Cost-Benefit Ratio - Higher priority will be given to projects with the most favorable cost-benefit ratio. Projects whose acquisition or development costs are low in comparison to the increase in recreation use generated by the project will be ranked higher than more costly projects with less increased recreation use.

C. Applicant Factors

High priority will be given to applicants that: (1) can initiate and complete the project expeditiously; (2) can operate and maintain it to acceptable standards; and, (3) have incorporated public participation in local planning and project selection. Factors to be judged are:

1. Use of Previous Grant Funds - Applicants with a very good record of initiating and completing grant projects will be given higher priority over applicants with a history of project delays, amendments, and time extensions.
  
2. Ability to Operate and Maintain Projects - In evaluating an applicant's operational ability, higher priority will be given if there is a designated department or organizational unit responsible full-time for programming, operation, and maintenance of park and recreation areas and facilities, and there is evidence of a commitment to a sound maintenance program.
  
3. Public Involvement - Applicants demonstrating they have actively sought and used public involvement in the planning, funding, and implementation of the project will be given priority over applicants with less public involvement. Acceptable forms of public input include, but are not limited to, public hearings, citizen advisory committee action, park and recreation commission action, planning commission action, budget hearings, city council or county supervisors' action, planning surveys, and recent adoption of a park and recreation plan for the area served by the project.

4. BONUS POINTS - Technically Complete Application

A grant request will be awarded a bonus, worth five points, if the application is technically complete as of the annual deadline. A technically complete application is defined in the department's LWCF Procedural Guide.

5. TIE BREAKERS

The following four-step process will be used when two or more projects receive identical scores after all the components of the ranking criteria have been applied:

- A. Projects submitted from applicants with a per capita amount of LWCF money below the state average will be given priority.
- B. If projects still remain tied, priority will be given to the project that achieves a greater geographical distribution of funds.
- C. If projects are still tied, priority will be given to the applicant with the least recent LWCF grant.
- D. Finally, if ties still remain after applying all of the above, selection will be made on the basis of the project's overall merit. This is a qualitative determination by experienced evaluators, taking into consideration the criteria dealing with project timing, concept, and setting.

## The Final Score

The final numerical rating of an eligible grant request is calculated by combining the points of each of the components of the ranking criteria as follows:

<u>Ranking Criteria</u>	<u>Maximum Points</u>
Priority Statewide Outdoor Recreation Needs	30
Local Need for Project	20
Project-Specific Criteria	45
Bonus Points:	
- Technically complete application	<u>5</u>
Total	100
Tie Breakers	--

Projects are then recommended for funding in the order of their assigned score until the funds allocated for local projects are exhausted.

## Submission of Eligible Projects

Local projects that comply with federal regulations, conform to the priorities of CORP, and receive a priority ranking high enough to be funded within the available funds will be presented to the state liaison officer for funding consideration. On approval by the SLO, the project will be submitted by the state liaison officer to NPS for federal funding.

State agency projects are selected by each participating agency and submitted to the SLO within its share of allocated funds. The staff of the Federal Grants Section reviews each project for conformance with eligibility criteria

and priorities in CORP. Eligible projects are forwarded by the SLO to NPS for funding.

Application Format - The SLO will determine the format and content of applications for assistance. Procedural guides for preparation of applications are available to interested agencies on request.

Submission of Applications - Applications will be submitted to meet deadlines established by the SLO. All eligible state and local agencies will be notified of these deadlines.

#### Payment of Funds

Payment of approved funds under this program will be reimbursed to the applicant based on the terms and conditions of a contract (called the project agreement) between the SLO and the applicant. The project agreement is a separate document from the application. The form of the agreement will be determined by the SLO.

#### Amendments to Projects

Scope Amendments and Cost Overruns - Amendments to previously approved projects to increase the project scope or to extend the project period may be considered if such amendments are fully justified. Amendments for additional funds to increase the scope or cover cost overruns, however, are not eligible, and such costs will be borne by the applicant.

Amendments to decrease the scope of an approved project will be considered only if the eliminated elements of the project will not change the priority rating of the original project.

Cost Underruns and Withdrawn Projects - Federal funds that become available as a result of cost underruns or the withdrawal of approved projects may be used by the state in the year they become available to fund a high-priority project, or they may be carried over and added to the next fiscal-year apportionment and redistributed statewide.

Suggested Point Values\*  
for Local Project Selection Factors

The final score for an eligible local grant project is determined by combining the following components of the ranking criteria:

o	Priority Statewide Outdoor Recreation Needs	Maximum - 30 points
o	Local Need for Project	Maximum - 20 points
o	Project-Specific Criteria	Maximum - 45 points
o	Bonus Points:	
	- Technically complete application	Maximum - 5 points
o	Tie Breakers	--- - ---
		Total 100 points

---

\*The suggested point values are designed as a guide for scoring projects at a given time and may require adjustment from year to year.

## A. PRIORITY STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION NEEDS

This portion of a project's score will be based on the statewide priority of outdoor recreation activities proposed in the grant request. These priorities were established for 38 recreation activities. The information base for this work was a public opinion survey published by the department under the title "Public Opinions and Attitudes on Outdoor Recreation in California - 1987."

The 38 activities were separated into nine priority categories. These categories were established by combining the ratings for latent demand and the support for public funding. The nine priority categories were then assigned point values as shown in the following table:

Recreation Activities Point Assignment Table

	<u>Activities by Priority Categories</u>	<u>Assigned Points</u>
Priority 1	Camping/Developed Campsites Visiting Museums, Zoos Walking Picnicking/Developed Area Attending Cultural Events Beach Activities Bicycling Birdwatching/Nature Study	30
Priority 2	Camping/Backpacking Open Turf/Casual Activity	28
Priority 3	Fishing - Freshwater	26
Priority 4	Swimming - Lakes, Rivers Trail Hiking Swimming Pools Driving for Pleasure	24
Priority 5	No Recreation Activities in this Category	22
Priority 6	No Recreation Activities in this Category	20

	<u>Activities by Priority Categories</u>	<u>Assigned Points</u>
Priority 7	Play Equipment/Tot Lots	18
Priority 8	Attending Sports Events Horseback Riding	16
Priority 9	Jogging/Running Hunting Off-Road Bikes/ATVs Golfing Fishing - Saltwater Target Shooting Off-Road - 4WD Playing Basketball Playing Softball/Baseball Power Boating Other Winter Sports Playing Soccer Playing Tennis Kayaking/Rowboating Downhill Skiing Water Skiing Cross-Country Skiing Sailboating/Wind Surfing Playing Football Surfing	14

### Multiactivity Facilities

Most grant requests involve projects with more than one activity. In those cases, a combined point value is assigned based on each activity's share of the total project cost. The prorated point value for each activity is arrived at by multiplying the percentage share of the activity in the total request by the activity priority points. These prorated points are added to provide the total points assigned to the request.

For example, if a project application is submitted for a matching grant for \$100,000 to develop picnic areas, a swimming pool, and open turf areas, it would receive a score of 26.4 (see example below):

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Estimated Cost</u>	<u>Percent of Total Cost</u>	<u>Points</u>	<u>Prorated Points</u>
Picnicking	\$ 40,000	20	30	6.0
Swimming Pool	100,000	50	24	12.0
Open Turf	<u>60,000</u>	<u>30</u>	28	<u>8.4</u>
Total	\$200,000	100		26.4

### Other Facilities

Projects for a recreation activity not listed as a statewide outdoor recreation priority will be categorized under "other" activities and given a score of 10 points.

### Support Facilities

In addition to grant requests for single- and multiactivity projects, projects involving solely support facilities (i.e., restrooms, parking areas, entrance stations, maintenance areas, fencing) that are needed to improve the quality of the recreation experience will be considered for funding. Since the need for such facilities is deemed to be considerably lower in priority than facilities that provide opportunities for recreation use, they will be given 50% of the priority statewide rating of the activity the project supports or partially supports. Support facilities essential for public access to natural resource areas will, however, receive full credit.

## Acquisition Projects

Three sources of information -- the DPR public opinion survey, the 1987 survey of local park and recreation agencies, and the findings of the CORP Advisory Committee -- all indicate that land acquisition is of lower priority than either rehabilitation or development of recreation facilities. As a result, except for priority wetlands, the project evaluation system has been designed to give an acquisition proposal a somewhat lower score than a comparable development proposal. Thus, only priority wetlands defined and identified in the Wetlands Element of CORP, and other exceptionally good acquisition proposals, will be truly competitive.

In practice, an acquisition proposal will be evaluated as if it were a development proposal. The applicant must provide sufficient information on how the land to be acquired will be developed, and must present a statement of intent from the governing body stating when development will occur. The project will then be evaluated as if it were a development project of the nature promised, except that the total outdoor recreation needs score will be reduced by 10% since the development is promised rather than actually delivered by this grant application. Acquisition of wetlands will not be subject to the 10% reduction.

For example, an acquisition project to acquire 50 acres of land to be dedicated to bicycle trails, open turf areas, tennis courts, and play equipment would receive an initial score of 27.7 points out of 30 and a final reduced score of 24.93, as shown below:

<u>Proposed Activity Upon Development</u>	<u>Number of Acres Proposed for Dev.</u>	<u>Percent of Total Park Area to be Acquired</u>	<u>Points</u>	<u>Prorated Points</u>
Bicycle Trail	5	10	30	3.0
Open Turf Area	43	86	28	24.0
Tennis Courts	1	2	14	.3
Play Equipment	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	18	<u>.4</u>
TOTAL	50	100		27.7

Reduction in score (27.7 points x 90%) = 24.93 points

#### B. LOCAL NEED FOR PROJECT

The score reflecting the local need for the project will depend on how many of the following factors are met by the project:

- o The project is consistent with the priorities identified in the applicant's current, approved, systemwide master plan of park and recreation areas.
- o The specific project appears on the systemwide master plan.
- o The applicant has a current, approved, site-specific master plan for the project site, and the areas and/or activities covered in the grant request are shown on the plan.
- o The need for the project is documented by a local, broad-based, public opinion survey or needs analysis.

Scoring is as follows:

	<u>Points</u>
a. Four factors	20
b. Three factors	15
c. Two factors	10
d. One factor	5
e. None	0

### C. PROJECT-SPECIFIC CRITERIA

Projects will be compared to each other to obtain a score for these criteria, using the subjective judgment of the project officer guided by the factor descriptions in the Open Project Selection Process.

The suggested point ranges for this category are as follows:

	<u>Point Range</u>	<u>Maximum Possible Points</u>
<u>Service Area Factors</u>		16
Population (size and density)	1 - 4	
Accessibility (lack of barriers)	1 - 4	

Availability to Special Population Groups	0 - 5	
Lack of Similar Opportunities	0 - 3	
<u>Project Factors</u>		17
Urgency (acquisition projects only)	1 - 6	
Site Suitability	1 - 6	
Type (rehabilitation vs. new development)	1 - 6	
Cost/Benefit Ratio	1 - 5	
<u>Applicant Factors</u>		12
Use of Previous Grant Funds	0 - 3	
Ability to Operate and Maintain	1 - 4	
Public Involvement	1 - 5	—
SUBTOTAL		45

#### D. BONUS POINTS

Five points are awarded for a technically complete application received by the annual deadline. A technically complete application is defined in the department's LWCF Procedural Guide.

#### E. TIE BREAKERS

The following tie breakers will be used when grant requests remain tied after the four elements of the ranking criteria have been applied:

- o Applicant with a per capita amount of LWCF money below the state average.

- o Project that achieves a greater geographical distribution of funds.
- o Applicant with the least recent LWCF grant.
- o Project's overall merit.

The first part of the book is devoted to a general introduction to the theory of...

...the theory of...

...the theory of...

**APPENDIX B**

**CORRELATION OF STATE AGENCY LWCF CRITERIA  
WITH  
1988 CALIFORNIA OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN  
ISSUES/ACTIONS**

**CORRELATION OF STATE AGENCY LWCF CRITERIA  
WITH 1988 CALIFORNIA OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN ISSUES/ACTIONS**

**TABLE 1**

STATE AGENCY LWCF CRITERIA	1988 CORP ISSUES/ACTIONS*															
	FUNDING			MAINTENANCE			OPEN SPACE			POPULATION CHANGE			PUBLIC SAFETY		LEADERSHIP	
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	A	
<u>DPR - STATE PARK SYSTEM</u>																
-ACQUISITION																
-INHOLDINGS-PROPERTIES WITHIN ESTABLISHED PARKS	●															
-CRITICAL ADDITIONS TO EXISTING UNITS	●						●									
-NEW UNITS NEAR METROPOLITAN AREAS	●									●						
-DEVELOPMENT																
-REHABILITATION OF WORN OR OUTMODDED FACILITIES	●	●	●	●	●	●										
-NEW FACILITIES-CAMPSITES, PICNIC AREAS, ETC.	●						●									
-STIMULATE CONTRIBUTIONS FROM NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS	●															
<u>WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD</u>																
<u>ACQUISITION OF WILDLIFE LANDS SUITABLE FOR RECREATION</u>																
a. ACQUIRE KEY PARCELS THAT OPEN UP ACCESS TO EXISTING PUBLIC AREAS							●									
B. ACQUIRE WILDLIFE HABITAT NEAR URBAN AREAS							●									
c. PAY FAIR MARKET VALUE OR LESS																
<u>DEVELOPMENT OF WILDLIFE-RELATED PUBLIC ACCESS FACILITIES</u>																
a. REQUIRE LOCAL O & M OR MATCHING FUNDS	●						●									
b. REHABILITATE EXISTING STRUCTURES		●							●							
c. DEVELOP FACILITIES NEAR URBAN AREAS										●						
d. DESIGN FOR DISABLED USERS WHERE FEASIBLE													●			

\*For definition of sub-items (A, B & C) see narrative

- Greater correlation with criteria
- Some correlation with criteria

1988 CORP ISSUES/ACTIONS\*

STATE AGENCY LWCF CRITERIA	FUNDING			MAINTENANCE			OPEN SPACE			POPULATION CHANGE			PUBLIC SAFETY		LEADERSHIP	
	A	B		A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	A	
<u>BOATING AND WATERWAYS</u>																
1. EXPECTED HIGH USE																
2. BENEFITS EXCEED COST		●														
3. LOW-MAINTENANCE DESIGN		●														
4. VANDAL PROOF																
5. DISABLED-NEW OR RETROFIT																
6. BETTER SECURITY-LIGHTING PHONE, FENCING																
<u>DWR-STATE WATER PROJECT</u>																
-ACQUISITION OF LAND/OR DEVELOPMENT OF FACILITIES FOR WATER-ASSOCIATED RECREATION																
a. PROVIDE PUBLIC ACCESS	●	●						●					●			
b. PROTECT EXISTING AREAS AND FACILITIES	●			●												

\*For definition of sub-items (A, B & C) see narrative

- Greater correlation with criteria
- Some correlation with criteria

Definition of Sub-Items for Table 1 -  
Correlation of State Agency LWCF Criteria  
with 1988 CORP Issues and Actions

ISSUE 1. FUNDING

- A. Encourage public-private joint ventures and private contributions.
- B. Cost effectiveness -- better cost-benefit ratio.

ISSUE 2. MAINTENANCE

- A. Emphasize better care of existing parks.
- B. Adopt maintenance management plans.
- C. Design for low maintenance.

ISSUE 3. OPEN SPACE

- A. Encourage use of private properties for public recreation.
- B. At the project level, obtain recreational access to floodplains, agricultural lands, military bases, etc., by interagency networking.
- C. Adapt existing facilities to recreation uses.

**ISSUE 4. POPULATION CHANGE**

- A. Systematically monitor user preferences and incorporate this information in decisions to add property or facilities.
- B. Make projects adaptable to changing uses.
- C. Provide recreation opportunities for specific populations.

**ISSUE 5. PUBLIC SAFETY**

- A. Design parks to minimize security problems.
- B. Design vandal-proof facilities.

**ISSUE 6. LEADERSHIP**

- A. Coordinate planning and implementation between public recreation agencies at the program level.

**I-0114G**





OGALS LIBRARY COPY

Please Return

Copy    /