

**LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND
SCORING CRITERIA UPDATE SUMMARY
FOR THE 2020 GRANT CYCLE**



The following information on pages 1 to 2 represents a high-level summary of the scoring criteria review that took place through the Grants Management Section of the Department of Natural Resources from February through August of 2019. Page 3 provides a comparison of the current weighted categories in place for the 2019 application cycle with the revised weighted categories for the 2020 application cycle. Finally, the specific scoring criteria that will be implemented in the 2020 application cycle can be found on pages 4 through 6 & can be compared to the current score sheets in [chapter 5 of the 2019 application guidelines booklet](#).

What –

Review of the scoring criteria, categorical weights & language across recreation grant programs:

- Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund
- Land & Water Conservation Fund
- Recreation Passport

Why -

- Confirmation that the scoring criteria continues to support the original intent & objectives of each program
- Ensure clarity & consistent language that overlap the three programs
- Stratification of scoring criteria sections that overlap the three programs
- Individual programs have had scoring changes over time, but never holistically across the three programs at the same time

When –

- Engagement process from February through August 2019
- Provided a draft to the National Park Service in October
- Looking to make changes for the 2020 application cycle
- Time needed in fall of 2019 to update materials & MiRecGrants (online grant system)

Who –

Staff & stakeholders included:

- Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund Board
- Michigan Recreation & Parks Association
- Michigan United Conservation Clubs
- Michigan Trails & Greenways Alliance
- Heart of the Lakes
- Divisional DNR staff
- National Park Service

How –

Initial staff analysis included:

- Revisit the original intent language in the founding legislation
- Evaluation of 2016 through 2018 scope categories
- Evaluation of 2018 application categories
- Analysis of 2019 customer survey
- Side by side analysis of category weights
- Side by side comparison of category language
- Initial recommendations for categories increasing, decreasing or remaining the same

How –

Stakeholder engagement schedule included:

- April, initial thoughts based upon experience
- May, feedback & suggestions from April's presentation
- June, incorporation of May's feedback

How –

Changes focused on:

- Adjustments in scores, weights & language
- Alignment of scores, weights & language
- Shifting of some scoring categories to application requirements
- Identifying new core criteria categories
- Streamlining of application & scoring materials

Land Water Conservation Fund Weighted Scoring Criteria Comparison



<i>DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION</i>				
Scoring Criteria Category	Current Pts. for 2019	Current Weight% for 2019	Revised Weight% for 2020	Revised Pts for 2020
NEED FOR PROJECT	70	17.95%	12.50%	50
SITE QUALITY	120	30.77%	20.00%	80
APPLICANT COMPLIANCE	60	15.38%	18.75%	75
FINANCIAL NEEDS OF THE APPLICANT	40	10.26%	12.50%	50
QUALITY OF OVERALL PARK DESIGN	50	12.82%	17.50%	70
ENTRANCE FEES	0	0.00%	7.50%	30
UNIVERSAL DESIGN	30	7.69%	11.25%	45
PROJECT FACILITIES/SCOPE ITEMS	20	5.13%	0.00%	0
TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS FOR DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION SCORING	390	100.00%	100.00%	400

APPLICANT HISTORY (grouped category)
SITE QUALITY (grouped category)

LWCF APPLICATION SCORING CRITERIA

1. NEED FOR PROJECT	
A. PROPOSED MAINTENANCE	
i. Within the provided maintenance plan and associated materials, the applicant has demonstrated that a combination of long-term dedicated funding (millage, operation & maintenance budget, etc.), existing and permanent fulltime operational staff, multi-year contracts, or a formal endowment exists which relates to continual and on-going care of the proposed improvements.	20
ii. Within the provided maintenance plan and associated materials, the applicant has demonstrated at a minimum that one of the following is in place: long-term dedicated funding (millage, operation & maintenance budget, etc.), existing and permanent full-time operational staff, multi-year contracts, or a formal endowment exists which relates to the continual and on-going care of the proposed improvements.	10
iii. Only a maintenance plan was provided with no or limited additional details ensuring that the continual and on-going care of the proposed improvements are in place.	0
PROPOSED MAINTENANCE POINTS (i or ii or iii)	
B. Public Support and Opposition: The application/recreation plan demonstrates that the proposed project is widely supported in the community/region. Also, there is minimal public opposition to the proposed project or applicant is working to address the concerns. Opposition based primarily on the desire to keep the public from the state's natural resources will not be considered. Documentation of support was provided.	30
Maximum Possible Points A + B	50
2. SITE QUALITY	
A. PARK VISIBILITY	
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.	20
ii. There is some difficulty in recognizing that the location is a public park, or the location is somewhat difficult to locate.	10
iii. Site is difficult to locate and is difficult to recognize as a public park.	0
PARK VISIBILITY POINTS (i or ii or iii)	
B. EASE OF ACCESS	
i. Ability to get to the site in multiple ways besides an automobile, such as: sidewalks, trail, or public transportation	20
ii. Ability to get to the site in an additional way besides an automobile.	10
iii. Site can only be accessed by an automobile.	0
EASE OF ACCESS POINTS (i or ii or iii)	
C. SUSTAINABLE DESIGN	
i. Significant proposed sustainable design systems or features	20
ii. Some proposed sustainable design systems or features	10
iii. No proposed sustainable design features	0
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN POINTS (i or ii or iii)	
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.	20
Maximum Possible Points A + B + C + D	80
3. APPLICANT COMPLIANCE	
A. Applicant has not received a development grant from the recreation grant program in the past 10 years (MNRTF, LWCF, Recreation Passport).	35
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.	20
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
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 signage requirements. Also, the applicant has complied with Department procedures while completing grant-assisted projects (acquisition and development) awarded in the past 6 years. Points are awarded if the applicant has never received a grant. Compliance issues considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA execution (60 days) • PSB and Contractors (180 days) • Progress reports (every 180 days) • Final reimbursement (90 days after the end of the project period) • Recognition plaques are in place at previously grant-assisted sites • Conversions or other significant changes in use at grant-assisted sites • Post-completion reports 	25
E. Applicant has a formal recreation department/DNR division or parks committee.	15
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).	-40
Maximum Possible Points (A or B or C) + D + E + F	75
4. FINANCIAL NEED OF THE APPLICANT	
A. Lowest one-third median household income	50
B. Middle one-third median household income	25
C. Upper one-third median household income	0
Maximum Possible Points A or B or C	50
5. QUALITY OF THE OVERALL PARK DESIGN	
A. Site Plan: Site is compatible with its intended purpose and the site plan is clear and understandable.	35
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, and the recreation and support facilities do not negatively impact each other.	35
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 or the	20

impact facilities will have on each other.	
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 or the impact facilities will have on each other.	0
Maximum Possible Points A + (B or C or D)	70
6. ENTRANCE FEES	
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.	30
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	30
7. UNIVERSAL ACCESS DESIGN	
A. The applicant obtained a design 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 Principles 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.	30
C. A majority of the project is designed using the Principles of Universal Design. These criteria apply for scope items where ADA standards and guidelines apply.	20
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 a majority of the scope items do not exceed the Principles of Universal Design.	0
Maximum Possible Points A + (B or C or D or E)	45
TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS	400