

**MICHIGAN NATURAL RESOURCES TRUST 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 11 & can be compared to the current score sheets in [chapter 4 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
- Looking to make changes for the 2020 application cycle
- Time needed in fall of 2019 to update materials & MiRecGrants (online grant system)
- Potential for later phases (Senate Joint Resolution O ballot issue in 2020)

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

Engagement with the Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund Board included:

- Kickoff presentation & overview of the intended process at the February meeting
- Review of the initial analysis & background information at the April meeting
- Summary of the stakeholder meetings & preliminary recommendations at the June meeting
- Presentation of recommendations at the August meeting

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
- Identifying new MNRTF board priority categories
- Streamlining of application & scoring materials

Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund, Weighted Scoring Criteria Comparison



DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION				
Scoring Criteria Category	Current Pts. for 2019	Current Weight% for 2019	Revised Weight% for 2020	Revised Pts for 2020
NATURAL RESOURCE ACCESS AND CONSERVATION	40	7.69%	12.00%	60
URBAN AREA RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES (PARKS WITHIN URBAN BOUNDARIES AS DEFINED BY THE U.S. CENSUS BUREAU)	40	7.69%	12.00%	60
PRIORITY PROJECT TYPES OF THE MNRTF BOARD	50	9.62%	10.00%	50
APPLICANT MATCH	40	7.69%	9.00%	45
FINANCIAL NEEDS OF THE APPLICANT	40	7.69%	8.00%	40
UNIVERSAL ACCESS DESIGN	30	5.77%	7.00%	35
NEW - QUALITY OF OVERALL PARK DESIGN	0	0.00%	6.00%	30
ENTRANCE FEES	30	5.77%	5.00%	25
Program Compliance	10	1.92%	5.00%	25
Sustainable Design	20	3.85%	5.00%	25
Renovation	20	3.85%	5.00%	25
PROPOSED MAINTENANCE	30	5.77%	4.00%	20
Grant Award History	40	7.69%	4.00%	20
Formal Recreation Department	10	1.92%	2.00%	10
Park Visibility	0	0.00%	2.00%	10
Ease of Access	20	3.85%	2.00%	10
PUBLIC SUPPORT	40	7.69%	2.00%	10
Crime Prevention	20	3.85%	0.00%	0
Programming/Marketing	20	3.85%	0.00%	0
Site Plan	20	3.85%	0.00%	0
TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS FOR DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION SCORING	520	100.00%	100.00%	500

APPLICANT HISTORY (grouped category)
SITE QUALITY (grouped category)
2020 BOARD PRIORITIES
1. Trails
2. Regionally Significant

ACQUISITION APPLICATION				
Scoring Criteria Category	Current Pts. for 2019	Current Weight% for 2019	Revised Weight% for 2020	Revised Pts for 2020
NATURAL RESOURCE ACCESS AND CONSERVATION	80	14.55%	18.00%	90
URBAN AREA RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES (PARKS WITHIN URBAN BOUNDARIES AS DEFINED BY THE U.S. CENSUS BUREAU)	40	7.27%	12.00%	60
PRIORITY PROJECT TYPES OF THE MNRTF BOARD	50	9.09%	10.00%	50
APPLICANT MATCH	60	10.91%	9.00%	45
FINANCIAL NEEDS OF THE APPLICANT	40	7.27%	8.00%	40
Conservation or Green Space Planning	20	3.64%	6.00%	30
ENTRANCE FEES	30	5.45%	5.00%	25
Program Compliance	10	1.82%	5.00%	25
PROPOSED MAINTENANCE	30	5.45%	4.00%	20
Grant Award History	40	7.27%	4.00%	20
Ability to get to site	20	3.64%	4.00%	20
Compatability	20	3.64%	4.00%	20
Purchased fee simple	20	3.64%	3.00%	15
LAND OWNERSHIP	10	1.82%	3.00%	15
Formal Recreation Department	10	1.82%	2.00%	10
PUBLIC SUPPORT	40	7.27%	2.00%	10
MOTORIZED RECREATION USE	10	1.82%	1.00%	5
Programming/Marketing	20	3.64%	0.00%	0
TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS FOR ACQUISITION APPLICATION SCORING	550	100.00%	100.00%	500

APPLICANT HISTORY (grouped category)
SITE QUALITY (grouped category)
2020 BOARD PRIORITIES
1. Trails
2. Regionally Significant
2. Lake & River Public Access
3. Wildlife Habitat & Hunting Access Part A
4. Wildlife Habitat & Hunting Access Part B
5. Wildlife Habitat & Hunting Access Part C

**MICHIGAN NATURAL RESOURCES TRUST FUND
ACQUISITION APPLICATION SCORING CRITERIA
FOR THE 2020 GRANT CYCLE**



1. PUBLIC SUPPORT	
A. 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.	10
Maximum Possible Points	10
2. PROPOSED MAINTENANCE	
A. Within the provided maintenance plan and associated materials, the applicant has demonstrated that a <u>combination of</u> 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
B. Within the provided maintenance plan and associated materials, the applicant has demonstrated at a minimum that <u>one</u> 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
C. Only a maintenance plan was provided with <u>no or limited</u> additional details ensuring that the continual and on-going care of the proposed improvements are in place.	0
Maximum Possible Points (A or B or C)	20
3. SITE QUALITY	
A. Ability to Get to the Site: The park can be directly and safely accessed and is appropriately located for the type of project.	20
B. Compatibility: Site is compatible with its intended purpose. Site is compatible with the proposed site design, if the site is to have developed facilities in the future. Site design is clear and understandable.	20
C. Conservation or Green Space Planning: Proposed project is part of a local or regional plan which focuses on land conservation or green space planning. Documentation has been provided to MNRTF staff.	25
D. Property will be purchased fee simple.	20
Maximum Possible Points (A + B + C + D)	85
4. APPLICANT HISTORY	
A. Applicant has not received an acquisition grant from the recreation grant program in the past 10 years.	20
B. Per capita acquisition grant assistance 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
C. Per capita acquisition grant assistance 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 will be awarded if the applicant has never received a grant. Issues that are considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA execution (60 days) • PSB and contractor approval (180 days) • Progress reports (every 180 days) 	25

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final reimbursement (90 days after the end of the project period) • Recognition plaques are in place at grant-assisted sites • Conversions or other significant changes in use at grant-assisted sites • Post-completion reports 	
E. Applicant has a formal recreation Department/DNR division or parks committee.	10
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
Maximum Possible Points (A or B or C) + D + E + F	55
5. NATURAL RESOURCE ACCESS AND CONSERVATION	
A. The project will effectively implement the priorities identified in Michigan's Wildlife Action Plan to conserve the most imperiled or rare species and community types, or include 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.	70
B. The project will conserve or provide direct access to documented high-quality natural communities or resources, rivers, or lakes which are not listed in criteria A.	50
C. The project will conserve or provide direct access to a commonly found natural resources.	30
D. The acquisition and intended use of the property will provide minimal natural resource conservation or access OR no natural resource values were noted in the application materials.	0
E. Project will provide a good quality hunting, fishing, or wildlife viewing opportunity.	20
Maximum Possible Points (A or B or C or D) + E	90
6. FINANCIAL NEED OF THE APPLICANT	
A. Lowest one-third median household income	40
B. Middle one-third median household income	20
C. Upper one-third median household income	0
*MHI is based on ACS 5-Year Survey.	
Maximum Possible Points (A or B or C)	40
7. URBAN AREA RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES (PARKS WITHIN URBAN BOUNDARIES AS DEFINED BY THE U.S. CENSUS BUREAU)	
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
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
Maximum Possible Points (A or B or C or D)	60

8. APPLICANT MATCH*				
Local Match Percentage*	Top ~2% Median Household Income	Top 1/3 rd MHI	Middle 1/3 rd MHI	Bottom 1/3 rd MHI
0-25%	0	0	0	0
26-29%	0	0	10	15
30-39%	0	10	15	25

40-49%	10	15	25	35
50%+	15	25	35	45
* Only match that is documented and secure is used to score this criterion.				
MAXIMUM POSSIBLE POINTS				45
9. ENTRANCE FEES				
A. No planned entrance fee; OR Site will be readily accessible by methods other than the automobile and there will be no entrance fee when using these alternative methods to get to the park (e.g., public transportation, bicycle, walk-in); OR There will be an entrance fee with partial or complete waiver available and the waiver policy is likely to be effective in bringing people with low incomes into the park.				25
B. There will be an entrance fee with partial or full waiver but effectiveness in bringing people with low incomes into the park is questionable; OR Park entrance fee will be waived, reduced, or by-donation-only on a regular basis for all users.				15
C. There will be an entrance fee with no waiver for low-income users.				0
Maximum Possible Points (A or B or C)				25
10. LAND OWNERSHIP				
A. Project is located in a county that contains 50% or more privately owned land.				15
Maximum Possible Points				15
11. MOTORIZED RECREATION USE				
Maximum Possible Points				5
Maximum Possible Points				5
TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS UNDER CORE ACQUISITION CRITERIA 1-11				450

PRIORITY PROJECT TYPES OF THE MNRTF BOARD – ACQUISITION

Listed are the maximum possible points that may be earned under each priority project type. An application may earn points under only one of the priority project types. Factors used to score applications, and their associated points, will be developed and available for review on the evaluation worksheet.

1. TRAILS	
A. Regional land trail/trailhead or documented or designated (state or federal) water trail: Acquisition of land that will be a trail or trailhead which is documented, promoted, and easily identified (signs).	50
B. Local land trail/trailhead or documented water trail: Acquisition of land for a trail or trailhead which is documented but not as promoted or easily identified as A.	30
C. Project will not acquire property for a trail or trailhead.	0
2. REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT	
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
3. LAKE AND RIVER PUBLIC ACCESS	
A. Acquisition of land (or permanent public access easement) that includes Great Lakes shoreline that is located in a DNR mapped “gap” area where there is a stretch of shoreline greater than 5 miles without public access. The Great Lakes shoreline gap map is available on the DNR website at:	50

https://www.michigan.gov/dnr/0,4570,7-350-79133_85340_85625-373280--,00.html	
B. Acquisition of land (or permanent public access easement) that includes Great Lakes shoreline that is not located in a mapped “gap” area but increases public access to the Great Lakes shoreline, or land (or permanent public access easement) on an inland lake greater than 100 acres in size, or on a navigable river where there is a stretch greater than 5 miles without public access.	30
C. Acquisition of land that does not include Great Lakes shoreline, or access to an inland lake greater than 100 acres in size, or on a navigable river.	0
4. WILDLIFE HABITAT AND HUNTING ACCESS	
A. Winter Deeryard Acquisitions	
i. Acquisition of functioning winter thermal cover (does not require habitat management) within the core a of DNR-identified winter deeryard. Documentation, such as a letter from the DNR or planning document will need to be provided for confirmation of DNR-identified winter deer yard.	50
ii. Acquisition of lowland within a DNR-identified winter deeryard that requires habitat management to become fully functioning winter thermal cover. Documentation, such as a letter from the DNR or planning document will need to be provided for confirmation of DNR-identified winter deer yard.	30
iii. Acquisition of uplands immediately adjacent to a DNR-identified winter deeryard, i.e., land containing habitat that supports deer in the deeryard. Documentation, such as a letter from the DNR or planning document will need to be provided for confirmation of DNR-identified winter deer yard.	10
iv. Acquisition of land that is not a deeryard or does not contain habitat that supports deer in a deeryard.	0
B. Wildlife/Ecological Corridors and Natural Area Buffers	
i. Corridor - The acquisition provides a connection between at least two existing protected properties sufficient for wildlife passage.	50
ii. Buffer - The acquisition provides a complete connection on at least one entire side of an existing protected property and documentation was provided.	
iii. The acquisition provides a connection to at least a portion of an existing protected property significant enough to provide a buffer and documentation was provided.	30
iv. The acquisition does not provide a corridor, buffer, or a significant connection to an existing protected property, or documentation was not provided.	0
C. Hunting Access	
i. The acquisition provides a new dedicated hunting area in a location of the state that has been identified as lacking in hunting opportunity acreage per the DNR's Managed Public Land Strategy. Eligible projects will involve 500 or more acres of land in one of the strategy zones OR, if less than 500 acres, are in a strategy zone and located where it is reasonable to conclude that the area can grow to 500+ acres in the future.	50
ii. The acquisition does not provide a new dedicated hunting area or does not meet eligibility requirements.	0
TOTAL BOARD PRIORITY POINTS	50
TOTAL POSSIBLE CORE + BOARD PRIORITY POINTS	500

**MICHIGAN NATURAL RESOURCES TRUST FUND
DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION SCORING CRITERIA
FOR THE 2020 GRANT CYCLE**



1. PUBLIC SUPPORT		
A. The application/recreation plan demonstrates that the proposed project is widely supported in the community/region and a resolution of support has been approved by the local governing Board. 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.	10	
Maximum Possible Points		10
2. PROPOSED MAINTENANCE		
A. Within the provided maintenance plan and associated materials, the applicant has demonstrated that a <u>combination of</u> 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	
B. Within the provided maintenance plan and associated materials, the applicant has demonstrated at a minimum that <u>one of</u> 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	
C. Only a maintenance plan was provided with <u>no or limited</u> additional details ensuring that the continual and on-going care of the proposed improvements are in place.	0	
Maximum Possible Points (A or B or C)		20
3. 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.	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	
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	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	
EASE OF ACCESS POINTS (i or ii or iii)		
C. SUSTAINABLE DESIGN		
i. Significant proposed sustainable design systems or features.	25	
ii. Some proposed sustainable design systems or features	15	
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	25	

the renovation must represent a majority of the total project cost.	
Maximum Possible Points (A + B + C + D)	70
4. QUALITY OF OVERALL PARK DESIGN	
A. Site Plan: Site is compatible with its intended purpose and the site plan is clear and understandable.	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, and the recreation and support facilities do not negatively impact each other.	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 or the impact facilities will have on each other.	10
D. The application does not clearly describe the proposed, existing, and future facilities at the site or there are strong concerns about the expect 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)	30
5. APPLICANT HISTORY	
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
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 will be awarded if the applicant has never received a grant. Issues that are 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 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.	10
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
Maximum Possible Points (A or B or C) + D + E + F	55
6. NATURAL RESOURCE ACCESS AND CONSERVATION	
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
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
7. FINANCIAL NEED OF THE APPLICANT	
A. Lowest one-third median household income	40
B. Middle one-third median household income	20
C. Upper one-third median household income	0
MHI is based on ACS 5-Year Survey.	
Maximum Possible Points (A or B or C)	40

8. URBAN AREA RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES (PARKS WITHIN URBAN BOUNDARIES AS DEFINED BY THE U.S. CENSUS BUREAU)	
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
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
Maximum Possible Points (A or B or C or D or E)	60

9. APPLICANT MATCH*				
Local Match Percentage*	Top ~2% Median Household Income	Top 1/3 rd MHI	Middle 1/3 rd MHI	Bottom 1/3 rd MHI
0-25%	0	0	0	0
26-29%	0	0	10	15
30-39%	0	10	15	25
40-49%	10	15	25	35
50%+	15	25	35	45

* Only match that is documented and secure is used to score this criterion.	
MAXIMUM POSSIBLE POINTS	45

10. 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.	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 for low-income users.	0
Maximum Possible Points (A or B or C)	25

11. 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.	10
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
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 A + (B or C or D or E)	35
TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS UNDER CORE DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA 1-11	450

PRIORITY PROJECT TYPES OF THE MNRTF BOARD – DEVELOPMENT

Listed are the maximum possible points that may be earned under each priority project type. An application may earn points under only one of the priority project types. Factors used to score applications, and their associated points, will be developed and available for review on the evaluation worksheet.

1. TRAILS	
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
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	
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
Total Board Priority Points	50
TOTAL POSSIBLE CORE + BOARD PRIORITY POINTS	500