Preliminary Scores - Development Scoresheet

Grant Amount Requested	*$112,500.00*
Match Percentage	*25 %*
Match Amount	*$37,500.00*
Total Project Cost	*$150,000.00*
Preliminary Score	*150*

Core Criteria

1. NEED FOR THE PROJECT

A) **RATIONALE:**	**Maximum Possible Points**	**Preliminary Score**
I. Applicant demonstrates a scarcity of parks and recreation services. Proposed project is at the applicant's only park or recreational facility.	40	
II. Applicant does not demonstrate a general scarcity of parks and recreation services but demonstrates a scarcity of a specific recreation type which will be provided by the project.	20	*20*
III. Applicant does not demonstrate a general scarcity of parks and recreation services and does not demonstrate a scarcity for the specific recreation service type which will be provided by the project.	0	

B) **FINANCIAL NEED OF THE APPLICANT:**

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	*20*

C) **PRIORITY:**

The applicant has submitted only one application or, if the applicant submitted multiple applications, this application is the highest priority.	25	*25*

Maximum Possible Points A + B + C	**105**	*65*

Comments to Applicant:

Only trailhead on the Mike Levine Lakelands Trail in Hamburg Twp.

2. SITE QUALITY

A) **PARK VISBILITY:**

	Maximum Possible Points	Preliminary Score
I. The site is easily recognizable as a public park and is easy to locate or will have adequate directional or identification signage in place.	10	*10*
II. There is some difficulty in recognizing that the location is a public park, or the location is somewhat difficult to locate.	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 an automobile.	0	

C) **SUSTAINABLE DESIGN**

I. A majority of the proposed project is designed with sustainable systems or features, where applicable.	10	
II. Some of the proposed project includes sustainable systems or features, where applicable.	5	*5*
III. 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.	10	*0*
Maximum Possible Points A + B + C + D	**40**	*25*

Comments to Applicant:

D) What is the age of the parking lot and access pathways that are being renovated? *Sustainable design features: bike rack(s), bike repair station*

3. QUALITY OF THE OVERALL PARK DESIGN

A) **SITE PLAN**

	Maximum Possible Points	Preliminary Score
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) **QUALITY OF PROPOSAL**

I. 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.	10	*10*
II. 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.	5	
III. 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	

C) **UNIVERSAL ACCESS DESIGN**

I. 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.	15	*0*
II. 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.	10	
III. The entire project is designed using the Principles of Universal Design. These criteria apply for scope items where ADA standards and guidelines apply.	30	
IV. 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.	20	
V. 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	*10*
VI. ADA standards and guidelines do not apply to the scope items or a majority of the scope items do not exceed the Principals of Universal Design.	0	

Maximum Possible Points A + B + C	**65**	*30*

Comments to Applicant:

B) Outdoor family games need to be permanently affixed to the site to be grant eligible.
C) A project review from a person with a disability in the community, an organization representing people with disabilities or an advocate for persons with disabilities was not provided in the application materials.
For consideration of additional universal design points, please provide answers to the following in the supplemental information:
Will there be a pathway/space around the pavilion? If so, how wide?
How wide will the access pathways be?

4. APPLICANT HISTORY

A) **COMPLIANCE WITH PROGRAM PROCEDURES**	**Maximum Possible Points**	**Preliminary Score**
Compliance with program procedures: The applicant is complying 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. Points will be awarded if the applicant has never received a grant. 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.	10	*10*

B) **MAINTENANCE OF THE SITE**

I. Maintenance plan provided 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*
II. Maintenance plan provided provides insufficient details that demonstrate the continual and on-going care of the proposed improvements.	0	

C) **PAST PER CAPITA GRANT ASSISTANCE:**

I. Applicant has not received a development grant from the recreation grant program in the past 10 years (MNRTF, LWCF, Recreation Passport).	20	
II. 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*

III. 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) **CONVERSIONS**

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).	-25	*0*
Maximum Possible Points A + B + C + D	**50**	*30*

Comments to Applicant:

TOTAL MAXIMUM POINTS POSSIBLE = 250	**TOTAL APPLICATION POINTS**	*150*

General Comments to Applicant: