Preliminary Scores - Development Scoresheet

Grant Amount Requested	*$150,000*
Match Percent	*25%*
Match Amount	*$50,000*
Total Project Cost	*$200,000*
Preliminary Score Development Core Criteria	*335*

1. PUBLIC SUPPORT

	Maximum Possible Points	Preliminary Score
A) The proposed project received multiple support documents by diverse stakeholders in the community. The applicant is addressing any public opposition or concerns. Opposition based primarily on the desire to keep the public from the state's natural resources will not be considered.	10	
B) The proposed project received minimal support documents. The applicant is addressing any public opposition or concerns. Opposition based primarily on the desire to keep the public from the state's natural resources will not be considered.	5	
B) The proposed project received no support documents.	0	*0*
Maximum Possible Points	**10**	*0*

Comments to Applicant:

Please provide multiple letters of support from diverse stakeholders for consideration of points.

2. PROPOSED MAINTENANCE

	Maximum Possible Points	Preliminary Score
A) Maintenance plan demonstrates a sufficient detail of dedicated funding, operational staff, multi-year contracts, or formal endowments which relate to continual and on-going care of the proposed improvements.	10	*10*

B) Maintenance plan provides insufficient details to show that there will be continual and on-going care of the proposed improvements.	0	
Maximum Possible Points (A or B or C)	**10**	*10*

Comments to Applicant:

3. SITE QUALITY

A) **PARK VISIBILITY**

	Maximum Possible Points	**Preliminary Score**
I) Ability to get to the site in multiple ways besides an automobile, such as: sidewalks, trail, public transportation, and/or watercraft	10	*10*
II) The site is moderately recognizable as a public park, or the location needs signage improvements to be more easily recognized.	5	
III) Site is difficult to locate and is difficult to recognize as a public park	0	

B) **EASE OF ACCESS**

I) Ability to get to the site in multiple ways besides an automobile, such as: sidewalks, trail, public transportation, and/or watercraft	10	*10*
II) Ability to get to the site in an additional way besides an automobile	5	
III) Site can only be accessed by automobile	0	

C) **SUSTAINABLE DESIGN**

I) Entire proposed project is designed with sustainable systems or features, where applicable.	25	
II) A majority of the proposed project is designed with sustainable systems or features, where applicable.	20	

III) Some of the proposed project includes sustainable systems or features, where applicable.	15	*15*
IV) None, or an unsubstantial amount, of the proposed project includes sustainable systems or features, where applicable.	0	

D) **RENOVATION**

Renovation or removal and replacement of an existing outdoor facility that is at least 20 years old with the same type of facility OR renovation of a building or structure that is at least 40 years old. The cost of the renovation must represent a majority of the total project cost.	25	*25*
Maximum Possible Points (A + B + C)	**70**	*60*

Comments to Applicant:

Sustainable design features: bike rack, bike repair station

4. SITE PLAN AND PROJECT QUALITY

	Maximum Possible Points	Preliminary Score
A) Site Plan: Site plan shows existing features to remain and all proposed scope items, is compatible with its intended purpose and is clear and understandable.	10	*10*
B) Application clearly describes the proposed and existing facilities at the site. Development is feasible and fully compatible with the size, natural and physical characteristics of the site. Expected traffic flow pattern is safe and convenient, access routes are provided to all facilities, facilities are placed to have the least environmental impact, layout maximizes groundwater infiltration.	20	*20*
C) Application clearly describes the proposed, existing, and future facilities at the site, including clear site plans. However, there are concerns about expected traffic flow, access to facilities, environmental impacts.	10	
D) The application does not clearly describe the proposed, existing, and future facilities at the site or there are strong concerns about the expected traffic flow, access to facilities, environmental impacts.	0	
Maximum Possible Points A + (B or C or D)	**30**	*30*

Comments to Applicant:

5. APPLICANT HISTORY

	Maximum Possible Points	Preliminary Score
A) Applicant has not received a development grant from the recreation grant program in the past 10 years (MNRTF, LWCF, Recreation Passport).	20	

B) Per capita development grant assistance (MNRTF, LWCF, Recreation Passport) received by the applicant in the past 10 years is less than the median value awarded to all communities over the past 10 years.	10	*10*
C) Per capita development grant assistance (MNRTF, LWCF, Recreation Passport) received by the applicant in the past 10 years exceeds the median value awarded to all communities over the past 10 years.	0	
Applicant's per capita development grant assistance in past 10 years:		*$16.46*
D) Compliance with program procedures: The applicant is in compliance with all requirements at park sites that have been acquired or developed with recreation grant assistance in the past, including plaque requirements. Also, the applicant has complied with Department procedures while completing grant-assisted projects in the past 5 years. Issues that are evaluated and considered: • Required DNR reviews of plans, specifications and bid packages prior to advertising • Required DNR reviews of contracts prior to awarding • Submittal of final reimbursements within 90 days after the end of the project period • Documented history of non-responsiveness to open and active existing grants (examples: expired agreements/amendments, annual progress reporting, lack of progress within the 2-year project period) • Performance of long-term grant obligations including post completion self-certification reports and plaque photos	25	*25*
E) Applicant has a formal recreation department, division or parks committee/board.	10	*0*
F) Conversion History: Applicant has a known unresolved conversion of a grant-assisted site to a use that does not qualify as public outdoor recreation (applies to all grant programs).	-50	*0*
Maximum Possible Points (A or B or C) + D + E + F	55	*35*

Comments to Applicant:

6. NATURAL RESOURCE BASED RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES

	Maximum Possible Points	Preliminary Score
A) Project provides direct access to the highest quality natural resource-based recreation opportunities such as Critical Dune Areas, frontage on Great Lakes or their connecting water bodies (Detroit River, St. Mary's River, St. Clair River, or Lake St. Clair), frontage on Designated Natural Rivers, land that is or will become part of a dedicated wilderness, natural area, or Pigeon River Country State Forest.	60	*60*

B) Project provides direct access to good quality natural resource-based recreation opportunities such as inland lakes, rivers, natural communities or resources.	40	
C) Project provides direct access to fair quality natural resource-based recreation opportunities.	20	
D) Project will provide minimal natural resource-based recreation opportunities OR no natural resource values were noted in the application materials.	0	
E) Project will provide supporting amenities and features of the Natural Resources at the site. Support includes trailheads, parking lots, restroom buildings, or interpretation. If supporting A - 30 points, B - 20 points, C - 10 points.	30	
Maximum Possible Points (A or B or C or D or E)	60	*60*

Comments to Applicant:

7. FINANCIAL NEEDS OF THE APPLICANT

	Maximum Possible Points	Preliminary Score
DNR will score this section based on available statewide data and the geographical location of the proposed project using United Way's ALICE (Asset Limited, Income Constrained, Employed) index.	5-40	*5*
Maximum Possible Points (5-40)	40	*5*

Comments to Applicant:

8. URBAN AREA RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES (PARKS WITHIN URBAN BOUNDARIES AS DEFINED BY THE U.S. CENSUS BUREAU)

	Maximum Possible Points	Preliminary Score
A) Park is within the political boundaries of a core or inner ring city for a Metropolitan Statistical Area.	60	
B) Park is within the Urbanized Area for a Metropolitan Statistical Area	45	*45*
C) Park is within the urbanized area for a Micropolitan Statistical Area	30	
D) Park is within an urbanized area which doesn't meet the criteria for a Metropolitan or Micropolitan Statistical Area, or park is within 15 miles from an urbanized area.	15	
E) Park is not within 15 miles of an urbanized area.	0	

Urban Area in which the project is located:	*South Lyon-Howell, MI Urbanized Area*	
Maximum Possible Points (A or B or C or D or E)	60	*45*

Comments to Applicant:

9. APPLICANT MATCH*

Local Match Percentage**	5 ALICE	10 or 15 ALICE	20 or 25 ALICE	30 or 35 ALICE	40 ALICE
0-25%	0	0	0	0	10
26-29%	0	0	10	15	20
30-39%	0	10	15	25	30
40-49%	10	15	25	35	40
50%+	15	25	35	40	45

* Only match that is documented and secure is used to score this criterion.

	Maximum Possible Points	Preliminary Score
Maximum Possible Points	45	*0*

Comments to Applicant:

ALICE score of 5 with a 25% match

10. ENTRANCE FEES

	Maximum Possible Points	Preliminary Score
A) No entrance fees; OR Site is readily accessible by methods other than the automobile (applicant must demonstrate this through site records or other means) and there is no entrance fee when using these alternative methods to get to the park (e.g., public transportation, bicycle, walk-in); OR Entrance fees in place with partial or complete waiver available and applicant can demonstrate that the waiver policy is effective in bringing people with low incomes into the park.	25	*25*

B) Entrance fees in place with partial or full waiver but effectiveness in bringing people with low incomes into the park is questionable; OR Park entrance fees are waived, reduced, or by-donation-only on a regular basis for all users.	15	
C) Entrance fees in place with no waiver.	0	
Maximum Possible Points (A or B or C)	25	*25*

Comments to Applicant:

11. UNIVERSAL ACCESS DESIGN

	Maximum Possible Points	Preliminary Score
A) 1.) Prior to April 1 of the application year, the applicant obtained a project review from a person with a disability in their community, an organization representing people with disabilities or an advocate for persons with disabilities. Documentation of this review was provided.	20	*0*
A) 2.) After April 1, but before October 1 of the application year, the applicant obtained a project review from a person with a disability in their community, an organization representing people with disabilities or an advocate for persons with disabilities. Documentation of this review was provided.	15	
B) The entire project is designed using the Principals of Universal Design with the intent to provide accessible recreation for all users. These criteria apply to scope items where ADA standards and guidelines apply.	25	
C) A majority of the project is designed using the Principals of Universal Design. These criteria apply for scope items where ADA standards and guidelines apply.	15	*15*
D) Some of the project is designed using the Principles of Universal Design. These criteria apply for scope items where ADA standards and guidelines apply.	10	
E) ADA standards and guidelines do not apply to the scope items OR scope items do not exceed ADA standards.	0	
Maximum Possible Points (A1 or A2 + (B or C or D or E))	45	*15*

Comments to Applicant:

No project/design review provided.
Universal design features: 10 ft bridge
Will the bench have a back, armrest and companion seating?

	Maximum Possible Points	Preliminary Score
TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS UNDER CORE DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA 1-11	**450**	*285*

PRIORITY PROJECT TYPES OF THE MNRTF BOARD

1. Trails

	Maximum Possible Points	Preliminary Score
A) Regional land trail/trailhead or documented or designated (state or federal) water trail: Development of a trail or trailhead which is documented, promoted, and easily identified (signs).	50	*50*
B) Local land trail/trailhead or documented water trail: Development of a trail or trailhead which is documented but not as promoted or easily identified as A.	30	
C) Trail amenities: The emphasis and intent of the overall project is focused on supporting amenities for a local or regional trail such as signs, kiosk, pavilions or other trail or trailhead items	10	
D) Trail project does not meet the criteria for A, B, or C	0	

2. REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT

	Maximum Possible Points	Preliminary Score
A) The Department has determined that the project is regionally significant to their prosperity region, the state of Michigan, the Midwest or the country through a combination of their planning processes, diversified partners, and uniqueness and significance of natural resources or recreational opportunities. In addition, the project would provide public natural resource based recreational opportunities that are not otherwise available within a reasonable distance. When viewed in its entirety, the project is likely to significantly affect the quality of life for the regional community and visitors.	50	
B) Project is not regionally significant to the prosperity region, the State of Michigan, the Midwest, or the country.	0	*0*
Maximum Points for Priority Project Criteria = 50 Total Points (highest score from 1 or 2)	50	*50*

Board Priority Comments to Applicant:

Maximum Points Possible = 500	**Total Application Points**	*335*

General Comments to Applicant:

Please see comment in each section and reach out to your regional grant coordinator with any questions.