



Michigan Department of Natural Resources - Grants Management

**MICHIGAN NATURAL RESOURCES TRUST FUND
DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION EVALUATION WORKSHEET
2009 APPLICATION**

This information is provided by authority of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources


App # 09-
Applicant
Reviewer Initials
Score

ELIGIBILITY/SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	YES	NO
A. Does the application meet the following MNRTF eligibility factors?		
1. Proposed project meets the goals of the MNRTF Program		
2. Applicant is a local unit of government (as defined in 1994 PA 451)		
3. Applicant has an approved recreation plan on file with Grants Management		
4. Proposed project meets the goals of the applicant's recreation plan		
5. Applicant has or will have control the property		
6. Applicant provided the public with adequate notice of the public meeting		
7. Applicant's governing body held a public meeting and passed a resolution supporting the application within six months prior to the application deadline		
8. Other (explain):		
Comments:		
Date of letter notifying applicant of possible ineligibility of application:		Response due date:
B. Does the application contain the following required documentation?		
1. Notice of public meeting, meeting minutes, and resolution		
2. Match		
3. Project location map		
4. Site development plan		
5. Boundary map		
6. Floor plans and elevation drawings Structure: _____		
7. Narrative		
8. Documentation of site control		
9. Notice of Intent and correspondence letter		
10. Other (explain):		
Comments:		

Date of letter notifying applicant of missing documentation:

Response due date:

ELIGIBILITY/SIGNIFICANT ISSUES (CONTINUED)		YES	NO
C. Does the application have any of the following significant deficiencies?			
1. Contamination issues that would likely pose safety concerns or prevent the timely completion of the proposed project			
2. The proposed project does not meet ADA accessibility requirements and correction of this would likely add significant cost and/or require major modification to the design			
3. The proposed project has a high per capita cost (over \$50) or one or more scope items seem unnecessarily costly, priced too low, or ineligible			
<p>Total project cost =</p> <p>Applicant's population</p> <p>Other issue:</p> <p>Mitigating factors (check any that apply):</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Threat to the resource is serious, imminent and irreparable;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Proposal would provide the first facility of its kind in service area;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates project area receives or will receive high nonresident use (not included in population service area);</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Site has unique natural features that require more costly development to protect and provide for appropriate use;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Critical project scope items (in particular, resource-based items) are by their very nature expensive and there are no reasonable alternatives;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Small community and project size/cost is as reasonable as it can be to provide the needed recreation opportunities;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Significant additional match (generally 10% over the minimum): Cost per capita, when based on the grant request amount, is less than \$50;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional costs are necessary to make the project universally accessible;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other</p>			
4. Applicant has converted a previously grant-assisted site to a use that is not public outdoor recreation without DNR/MNRTF Board approval			
5. Applicant has a "Resident's Only" policy at any of its parks			
6. It is unlikely that the applicant will be able to begin or complete the proposed project in a timely manner			
7. Other (explain):			
Comments:			
Date of letter notifying applicant of significant deficiencies:		Response due date:	
D. Was documentation received or significant deficiency resolved/adequately addressed by deadline given? Date received:			
Comments:			
APPLICATION STATUS FOLLOWING INITIAL SCREENING (CHECK ONE):			
<input type="checkbox"/> Eligible for further consideration <input type="checkbox"/> Ineligible			

CORE CRITERIA			YES	NO	
1. Need for Project					
 <p>feasible for the Project—The proposed project is consistent with the community/state recreation plan's goals and objectives. The Development Application Evaluation Worksheet for additional facilities of the type proposed. The availability of the proposed type of facility in the region was (as appropriate).</p> <p>2009 APPLICATION</p>	<p>MICHIGAN NATURAL RESOURCES TRUST FUND DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION EVALUATION WORKSHEET 2009 APPLICATION</p>		<p>Applicant's Reviewer Initials</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>0</p>
	<p>Comments: <i>This information is provided by authority of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources</i></p>		<p>Score</p>		
ELIGIBILITY/SIGNIFICANT ISSUES			YES	NO	
<p>A. Does the application meet the following MNRTP eligibility factors?</p>					
<p>1. Collaboration—The plan or application was developed through collaboration* with stakeholders that may include adjacent communities, non-profit organizations, user groups, and other entities as appropriate.</p>			20	0	
<p>2. Applicant must have demonstrated the MNRTP ongoing participation in the planning, operation, and maintenance of the project, with the intent that the collaborating parties would be the anticipated users of the facilities. Financial contribution is not required to demonstrate collaboration.</p>					
<p>3. Applicant has an approved recreation plan on file with Grants Management</p>					
<p>4. Proposed project meets the goals of the applicant's recreation plan</p>			20	0	
<p>5. 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.</p>					
<p>6. Applicant provided the public with adequate notice of the public meeting</p>					
<p>7. Applicant's governing body held a public meeting and passed a resolution supporting the application within six months prior to the application deadline</p>					
<p>Maximum Points Possible = 60</p>			Total Points (A + B + C)		
<p>8. Other (explain):</p>					
<p>Comments:</p>					
<p>Date of letter notifying applicant of possible ineligibility of application:</p>			<p>Response due date:</p>		
<p>B. Does the application contain the following required documentation?</p>					
1. Notice of public meeting, meeting minutes, and resolution					
2. Match					
3. Project location map					
4. Site development plan					
5. Boundary map					
6. Floor plans and elevation drawings Structure: _____					
7. Narrative					
8. Documentation of site control					
9. Notice of Intent and correspondence letter					
10. Other (explain):					
<p>Comments:</p>					
<p>Date of letter notifying applicant of missing documentation:</p>			<p>Response due date:</p>		

ELIGIBILITY/SIGNIFICANT ISSUES (CONTINUED)		YES	NO
C. Does the application have any of the following significant deficiencies?			
1. Contamination issues that would likely pose safety concerns or prevent the timely completion of the proposed project			
2. The proposed project does not meet ADA accessibility requirements and correction of this would likely add significant cost and/or require major modification to the design			
3. The proposed project has a high per capita cost (over \$50) or one or more scope items seem unnecessarily costly, priced too low, or ineligible Total project cost = Applicant's population Other issue: Mitigating factors (check any that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> Threat to the resource is serious, imminent and irreparable; <input type="checkbox"/> Proposal would provide the first facility of its kind in service area; <input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates project area receives or will receive high nonresident use (not included in population service area); <input type="checkbox"/> Site has unique natural features that require more costly development to protect and provide for appropriate use; <input type="checkbox"/> Critical project scope items (in particular, resource-based items) are by their very nature expensive and there are no reasonable alternatives; <input type="checkbox"/> Small community and project size/cost is as reasonable as it can be to provide the needed recreation opportunities; <input type="checkbox"/> Significant additional match (generally 10% over the minimum): Cost per capita, when based on the grant request amount, is less than \$50; <input type="checkbox"/> Additional costs are necessary to make the project universally accessible; <input type="checkbox"/> Other			
4. Applicant has converted a previously grant-assisted site to a use that is not public outdoor recreation without DNR/MNRTF Board approval			
5. Applicant has a "Resident's Only" policy at any of its parks			
6. It is unlikely that the applicant will be able to begin or complete the proposed project in a timely manner			
7. Other (explain):			
Comments:			
Date of letter notifying applicant of significant deficiencies:		Response due date:	
D. Was documentation received or significant deficiency resolved/adequately addressed by deadline given? Date received:			
Comments:			
APPLICATION STATUS FOLLOWING INITIAL SCREENING (CHECK ONE):			
<input type="checkbox"/> Eligible for further consideration <input type="checkbox"/> Ineligible			



CRITERIA

Michigan Department of Natural Resources - Grants Management

For Project

MICHIGAN NATURAL RESOURCES TRUST FUND

App # 09-		
Applicant	YES	NO
Reviewer Initials		
Additional evaluated	20	0

DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION EVALUATION WORKSHEET
2009 Application
 A. ~~The proposed project is consistent with the community state recreation goals and objectives. The proposed project is consistent with the need for additional facilities of the type proposed. The availability of the proposed type of facility in the region was (as appropriate).~~
This information is provided by authority of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources

ELIGIBILITY/SIGNIFICANT ISSUES **YES NO**

A. Does the application meet the following MNRTE eligibility factors?		
B. Collaboration—The plan or application was developed through collaboration* with stakeholders that may include project users, the goals of the MNRTE program, user groups, and other entities as appropriate.		
1. Proposed project meets the goals of the MNRTE program	20	0
* Collaboration must be demonstrated through ongoing participation in the planning, operation, and maintenance of the project with the intended users (as defined in 1994 PA 451).		
2. Applicant's governing body (as defined in 1994 PA 451) would be the anticipated users of the facilities. Financial contribution is not required to demonstrate collaboration.		
Comments: has an approved recreation plan on file with Grants Management		
4. Proposed project meets the goals of the applicant's recreation plan		
C. Public Support—The application/recreation plan demonstrates that the proposed project is widely supported in the community region. Applicant is working to address the concerns. Opposition based primarily on the desire to keep the public from state's natural resources will not be considered.		
5. Applicant has the will have no objection to the proposed project or applicant is working to address the concerns. Opposition based primarily on the desire to keep the public from state's natural resources will not be considered.	20	0
6. Applicant provided the proposed project with adequate notice of the public meeting		
Comments:		
7. Applicant's governing body held a public meeting and passed a resolution supporting the application within six months prior to the application deadline		
8. Other (explain):		
Maximum Points Possible = 60	Total Points (A + B + C)	

Comments:

Date of letter notifying applicant of possible ineligibility of application: **Response due date:**

B. Does the application contain the following required documentation?

1. Notice of public meeting, meeting minutes, and resolution		
2. Match		
3. Project location map		
4. Site development plan		
5. Boundary map		
6. Floor plans and elevation drawings Structure: _____		
7. Narrative		
8. Documentation of site control		
9. Notice of Intent and correspondence letter		
10. Other (explain):		
Comments:		

Date of letter notifying applicant of missing documentation: **Response due date:**

ELIGIBILITY/SIGNIFICANT ISSUES (CONTINUED)		YES	NO
C. Does the application have any of the following significant deficiencies?			
1. Contamination issues that would likely pose safety concerns or prevent the timely completion of the proposed project			
2. The proposed project does not meet ADA accessibility requirements and correction of this would likely add significant cost and/or require major modification to the design			
3. The proposed project has a high per capita cost (over \$50) or one or more scope items seem unnecessarily costly, priced too low, or ineligible Total project cost = Applicant's population Other issue: Mitigating factors (check any that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> Threat to the resource is serious, imminent and irreparable; <input type="checkbox"/> Proposal would provide the first facility of its kind in service area; <input type="checkbox"/> Application demonstrates project area receives or will receive high nonresident use (not included in population service area); <input type="checkbox"/> Site has unique natural features that require more costly development to protect and provide for appropriate use; <input type="checkbox"/> Critical project scope items (in particular, resource-based items) are by their very nature expensive and there are no reasonable alternatives; <input type="checkbox"/> Small community and project size/cost is as reasonable as it can be to provide the needed recreation opportunities; <input type="checkbox"/> Significant additional match (generally 10% over the minimum): Cost per capita, when based on the grant request amount, is less than \$50; <input type="checkbox"/> Additional costs are necessary to make the project universally accessible; <input type="checkbox"/> Other			
4. Applicant has converted a previously grant-assisted site to a use that is not public outdoor recreation without DNR/MNRTF Board approval			
5. Applicant has a "Resident's Only" policy at any of its parks			
6. It is unlikely that the applicant will be able to begin or complete the proposed project in a timely manner			
7. Other (explain):			
Comments:			
Date of letter notifying applicant of significant deficiencies:		Response due date:	
D. Was documentation received or significant deficiency resolved/adequately addressed by deadline given? Date received:			
Comments:			
APPLICATION STATUS FOLLOWING INITIAL SCREENING (CHECK ONE):			
<input type="checkbox"/> Eligible for further consideration <input type="checkbox"/> Ineligible			

CORE CRITERIA		
1. Need for Project	YES	No
A. Rationale for the Project—The proposed project is consistent with the community/state recreation plan's goals and objectives. The proposed project is adequately justified in terms of the need for additional facilities of the type proposed. The availability of the proposed type of facility in the region was evaluated (as appropriate).	20	0
Comments:		
B. Collaboration—The plan or application was developed through collaboration* with stakeholders that may include adjacent communities, non-profit organizations, user groups, and other entities as appropriate. * Collaboration must be demonstrated through ongoing participation in the planning, operation, and maintenance of the project, with the intent that the collaborating parties would be the anticipated users of the facilities. Financial contribution is not required to demonstrate collaboration.	20	0
Comments:		
C. Public Support—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.	20	0
Comments:		
Maximum Points Possible = 60	Total Points (A + B + C)	
2. Site and Project Quality	YES	No
A. Ability to Get to the Site—The amount and type of directional signage is adequate for the type of park. The park site is easily recognized as a public park or outdoor recreation area. The park can be directly and safely accessed and is appropriately located for the type of project. The amount of parking (existing or proposed) is appropriate for the type, location, and expected usage of the project. For urban projects, site is on a public transportation route or is served by a "dial-a-ride" type transportation service for seniors and persons with disabilities.	20	0
Comments:		
B. Compatibility—Site is compatible with its intended purpose and the proposed site design. Site design is clear and understandable.	20	0
Comments:		
C. Renovation--Project involves renovation or redevelopment at an existing park site. Renovation is not needed as a result of inadequate maintenance or design. Park must be at least 20 years old.	20	0
Comments:		

Criterion continued on next page

2. Site and Project Quality (continued)		Yes	No
D. Use of Environmentally Friendly Materials and Innovative Technology		20	0
Examples (check box for those proposed): <input type="checkbox"/> Pervious paving materials <input type="checkbox"/> Non-toxic materials <input type="checkbox"/> Recycling bins on site <input type="checkbox"/> Reduction of energy use <input type="checkbox"/> Landscaping with native plants <input type="checkbox"/> Use of natural renewable resources (solar, geothermal, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Using building materials with high content of post-consumer recycled materials <input type="checkbox"/> Low water toilets or other reduction of water use <input type="checkbox"/> Efficient lighting <input type="checkbox"/> Storm water management <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Comments:		
E. Crime Prevention Measures—Potential crime issues have been addressed.		20	0
Examples (check box for those proposed): <input type="checkbox"/> Layout maximizes visibility of people and parking areas <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate lighting <input type="checkbox"/> Hours of operation clearly posted <input type="checkbox"/> Monitoring of project at appropriate times and locations <input type="checkbox"/> Physical layout clearly defines property lines and distinguishes and separates public and private spaces through landscape plantings, pavement designs, and fencing <input type="checkbox"/> Trails within parks are looped or otherwise minimize deadends <input type="checkbox"/> Trailways clearly indicate public routes and discourage access to private areas	Comments:		
F. Programming/Marketing—The applicant has addressed how they will make the public aware of the project and/or the park/forest/recreation area. If a project would provide universal access, this information must be included.		20	0
Examples (check box for those proposed): <input type="checkbox"/> Booklets/brochures <input type="checkbox"/> Presentations to schools, organizations, clubs, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Radio/television <input type="checkbox"/> Website <input type="checkbox"/> Special events, such as fairs and festivals <input type="checkbox"/> Newspapers/magazines	Comments:		
Maximum Points Possible = 120		Total Points (A + B + C + D + E + F)	

2. Site and Project Quality (continued)		Yes	No
A. Use of Environmentally Friendly Materials (MNRTF, LWCF, Recreation Bond Fund, CMI) received by the applicant in the past 20 years (1988-2008) exceeds the median value awarded to all communities over the past 20 years (excluding withdrawn projects). Examples (check box for those proposed): <input type="checkbox"/> Pervious paving materials <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-toxic materials <input type="checkbox"/> Recycling bins on site <input type="checkbox"/> Reduction of energy use <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Applicant has not received a development grant from the recreation grant program in the past 20 years (MNRTF, LWCF, Recreation Bond Fund, CMI) <input type="checkbox"/> Use of natural renewable resources (solar, geothermal, etc.) Median value: \$21.83 Applicant's per capita development grant assistance:		20	0
Comments: <input type="checkbox"/> Low water toilets or other reduction of water use <input type="checkbox"/> Efficient lighting <input type="checkbox"/> Storm water management		0	---
B. 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 (waived for MNRTF projects until signs are available). Also, the applicant has complied with Department procedures while completing grant-assisted projects (acquisition and development) awarded in the past 6 years. Do not give points if the applicant is in-going conversion, but is working to resolve the conversion. Give points if the applicant has never received a grant.		20	0
Examples (check box for those proposed): <input type="checkbox"/> Layout maximizes visibility of people and parking areas Comments: <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate lighting <input type="checkbox"/> Hours of operation clearly posted			
E. Applicant has not closed, sold, or otherwise transferred use or control of any park or recreation facility for non-public recreation purposes within the past 5 years; OR applicant has closed, sold, or otherwise transferred use or control of any park or recreation facility for non-public recreation purposes within the past 5 years but has provided a compelling reason for the action OR applicant has completed mitigation. Comments: <input type="checkbox"/> Trails within parks are looped or otherwise minimize deadends <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Trailways clearly indicate public routes and discourage access to private areas		10	0
F. Applicant has a formal recreation department/DNR division or parks committee.		10	0
F. Programming/Marketing—The applicant has addressed how they will make the public aware of the project and/or the park/forest/recreation area. If a project would provide universal access, this information must be included.		20	0
Maximum Points Possible = 70 Examples (check box for those proposed):		Total Points (A or B or C) + D + E + F	
4. Natural Resource Based Recreation Opportunities <input type="checkbox"/> Presentations to schools, organizations, clubs, etc. <i>Examples include hunting, nature observation/interpretation, fishing, water access (boating, swimming).</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Radio/television <input type="checkbox"/> Website <input type="checkbox"/> Special events, such as fairs and festivals <input type="checkbox"/> Newspapers/magazines		YES	NO
Maximum Points Possible = 120		Total Points (A + B + C + D + E + F)	

3. Applicant History		YES	No
A. Per capita development grant assistance (MNRTF, LWCF, Recreation Bond Fund, CMI) received by the applicant in the past 20 years (1988-2008) exceeds the median value awarded to all communities over the past 20 years (excluding withdrawn projects).		0	---
B. Per capita development grant assistance (MNRTF, LWCF, Recreation Bond Fund, CMI) received by the applicant in the past 20 years is less than the median value awarded to all communities over the past 20 years (excluding withdrawn projects).		20	---
C. Applicant has not received a development grant from the recreation grant program in the past 20 years (MNRTF, LWCF, Recreation Bond Fund, CMI).		40	---
Median value: \$24.83 Applicant's per capita development grant assistance:			
Development grants received in past 20 years:		Comments:	
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 (waived for MNRTF projects until signs are available). Also, the applicant has complied with Department procedures while completing grant-assisted projects (acquisition and development) awarded in the past 6 years. Do not give points if the applicant has an on-going conversion, but is working to resolve the conversion. Give points if the applicant has never received a grant.		10	0
Comments:			
E. Applicant has not closed, sold, or otherwise transferred use or control of any park or recreation facility for non-public recreation purposes within the past 5 years; OR applicant has closed, sold, or otherwise transferred use or control of any park or recreation facility for non-public recreation purposes within the past 5 years but has provided a compelling reason for the action OR applicant has completed mitigation.		10	0
Comments:			
F. Applicant has a formal recreation department/DNR division or parks committee.		10	0
Comments:			
Maximum Points Possible = 70		Total Points (A or B or C) + D + E + F	
4. Natural Resource Based Recreation Opportunities		YES	No
<i>Examples include hunting, nature observation/interpretation, fishing, water access (boating, swimming).</i>			
A. Project proposes the highest quality natural resource based recreation opportunities OR will provide an opportunity that is rare or nonexistent in the applicant's service area.		40	--
B. Project proposes good quality natural resource based recreation opportunities OR will provide highest quality opportunities that are already present in the applicant's service area.		20	--
C. Project proposes fair quality natural resource based recreation opportunities OR will provide good quality opportunities that are already present in the applicant's service area.		10	--
Comments:			
Maximum Points Possible = 40		Total Points (A or B or C or D)	

5. Financial Need of the Applicant		YES	NO
<i>Grant Coordinator may consider the median household income of the population to be served by the proposed project in lieu of the applicant's MHI.</i>			
A. Upper one-third median household income (greater than \$44, 667)		0	--
B. Middle one-third median household income (\$35,735 - \$44,667)		20	--
C. Lowest one-third median household income (up to \$35,734)		40	--
Applicant's Median Household Income:			
Comments:			
Maximum Points Possible = 40		Total Points (A or B or C)	

6. Urban Area Recreation Opportunities (parks within urban boundaries as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau)		YES	NO
A. Park is within the political boundaries of a core or inner ring city for a Metropolitan Statistical Area.		40	--
B. Park is within the Urbanized Area for a Metropolitan Statistical Area		30	--
C. Park is within the political boundaries of a core city for a Micropolitan Statistical Area		20	--
D. Park is within an Urban Cluster—areas surrounding the core city of a Micropolitan Statistical Area or other, smaller communities defined as Urban Clusters.		10	--
E. Park is not within an Urban Area		0	--
Urban Area in which the project is located:			
Comments:			
Maximum Points Possible = 40		Total Points (A or B or C or D or E)	

7. Applicant Match*				
Local Match Percentage**	Top ~2% MH***	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	5	10
30-39%	0	5	10	20
40-49%	5	10	20	30
50%+	10	20	30	40

* Only match that is documented and secure is used to score this criterion.
** Match percent is adjusted down, for the purpose of scoring this criterion only, when total project cost (not grant amount requested) exceeds \$666,666.
*** Those communities with Median Household Income values greater than \$80,000

Applicant's (adjusted) match percentage:				
Comments:				
Maximum Points Possible = 40			Total Points	

8. Entrance Fees		YES	No
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	--
Comments:			
Maximum Points Possible = 30		Total Points (A or B or C)	
9. Universal Design		YES	No
A. The applicant obtained information on persons with disabilities in their community or the state and gathered comments regarding recreation interests and accessibility needs. The applicant has documented how the ideas/suggestions gathered from the public input process influenced the design of the proposed project.		10	0
Organizations contacted: <input type="checkbox"/> Centers for Independent Living <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/> The Arc <input type="checkbox"/> Little People of America <input type="checkbox"/> Paralyzed veterans <input type="checkbox"/> Agencies for the aging <input type="checkbox"/> Local schools <input type="checkbox"/> Neighborhood groups	Comments:		
9. Universal Design (continued)		YES	No
B. The proposed project demonstrates the incorporation of universal design. Any existing support facilities comply with ADA requirements.		20	0
Comments:			
Maximum Points Possible = 30		Total Points (A + B)	
10. Oil and Gas Impacted Areas		YES	No
A. No wells on state-owned land with leased oil and gas mineral rights		0	--
B. 1-50 wells		10	--
C. 51-300 wells		15	--
D. Over 300 wells		20	--
County in which site will be developed:		Number of wells:	
Maximum Points Possible = 20		Total Points (A or B or C or D)	

Maximum Points Possible for Core Criteria = 490	TOTAL POINTS	
--	---------------------	--

PRIORITY PROJECT TYPES OF THE MNRTF BOARD

An application may earn points under only one of the priority project types.

1. Trails	YES	No
<p>A. Access to destinations: The destination(s) (check box for any that apply):</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. Parks & forests (publicly owned);</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. Great Lakes shoreline;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Population centers;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4. Designated heritage routes;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 5. Protected natural areas (public or private but open to public);</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 6. Other desirable trail destinations (e.g. urban recreation areas);</p> <p>is (are) connected to the proposed trail segment with all significant barriers to accessing destinations by the intended user removed—distance, knowledge of, unsafe road crossings, imperfect site control, etc.</p> <p>B. Project type: The primary result of the proposed project will be the construction of a trail that is part of an existing or planned trail network.</p>	50	--
<p>C. Access to destinations: Destination (1-6 above) is in proximity to the proposed trail segment and connection to destination is somewhat aided, but not all barriers, for the average intended user, to the destination have been removed, or there is a planned, connection as described above.</p> <p>D. Project type: The primary result of the proposed project will be the construction of amenities intended primarily for users of an existing trailway.</p>	30	--
<p>E. Access to destinations: Destination (as defined as 1-6 above) is in proximity to the proposed trail segment, as determined by considering the average intended user for that trail, but the trail does not aid in accessing the destination through signs, or existing pathway connection, or plans to connect the destination to the trail segment are not well developed with reasonable enough assurances to warrant 30 points. Or the destination is accessed by way of an existing trail but the destination is not in the proximity (as determined by consideration of the average intended user) of the trail segment.</p> <p>F. Project type: While the proposed project may include a trail that is or will be part of a trail network and/or amenities for trail users, these will not be the primary result or intention.</p>	10	--
1. Trails (continued)	YES	No
<p>G. Access to destinations: Trail is contained within a park and does not have destination outside of the park or link on both ends to another trail.</p> <p>H. Project type: Project will not provide a trail or trail amenities.</p>	0	--
Comments:		
2. Wildlife/Ecological Corridors and Winter Deeryard Acquisitions		
N/A--Acquisition Applications Only		
3. Urban Areas (parks within the urban boundaries defined by the U.S. Census Bureau)	YES	No
A. Park is within the political boundaries of a core city or inner ring city for a Metropolitan Statistical Area.	50	--
B. Park is within the Urbanized Area for a Metropolitan Statistical Area.	40	--
C. Park is within the political boundaries of a core city for a Micropolitan Statistical Area.	30	--
D. Park is within an Urban Cluster--areas surrounding the core city of a Micropolitan Statistical Area or other, smaller communities defined as Urban Clusters.	20	--
E. Park is not within an Urban Area	0	--

Maximum Points for Priority Project Criteria = 50	Total Points (higher score from 1 or 3)	
Maximum Points Possible = 540	TOTAL APPLICATION POINTS	

Overall Comments: