

ACTION PROGRAM

State And Local Government Priorities For Outdoor Recreation Projects Funded By The Land & Water Conservation Fund

FFY 1991-1992 Apportionments

**Supplement To
Minnesota's Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan
1990-1994**

**State of Minnesota
September 17, 1990**

**Prepared By
Minnesota Departments of Natural Resources and
Trade & Economic Development**

GV
191.42
.M6
M56
1990
suppl.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY
645 State Office Building
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55155

PREFACE

Minnesota's Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Planning (SCORP) process is a continuous three-part planning process, which is conducted in accordance with provisions of the Federal Land & Water Conservation Fund (L&WCF) Act of 1965 (P.L. 88-578). This process is characterized by the preparation of an 1) Assessment & Policy Plan, 2) Action Program, and 3) Open Project Selection Process documents.

First, the Assessment & Policy Plan assesses the supply of and demand for outdoor recreation opportunities throughout Minnesota, as well as the key social, economic and environmental variables which affect outdoor recreation. This assessment leads to the identification of issues and the development of recommended actions needed to move recreation interests forward in Minnesota over a five-year period. It is intended to serve as a guide for both public and private sector outdoor recreation providers in meeting future recreation needs.

Next, the Action Program identifies specific land acquisition and facility development needs and L&WCF funding priorities on a biennial basis. It helps guide the investment of federal L&WCF dollars to those state and local acquisition and development projects that address outdoor recreation issues and priorities identified in the Assessment & Policy Plan. Funding priorities established in the Action Program, however, do not necessarily reflect the entirety of Minnesota's outdoor recreation funding needs - only those eligible for Land & Water Conservation Fund support.

Finally, the Open Project Selection Process serves as a formal and objective method of selecting and evaluating specific outdoor recreation projects proposed for L&WCF funding. The OPSP includes a priority ranking system which awards points to grant applications based on how well they address priorities established in the Action Program. L&WCF grants are available only to state and local units of government, and competition for funds is typically very intense.

All three planning documents are jointly produced by the Minnesota Departments of Natural Resources and Trade & Economic Development. Copies of each are available through the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources in c/o Office of Planning, Box 10, 500 Lafayette Road, St. Paul, MN 55155-4010.

Summary of State and Local Government Priorities For Outdoor Recreation Projects Funded By the Land & Water Conservation Fund For FFY 1991-1992

Introduction

The provision of outdoor recreation is a substantial and challenging task facing all sectors of our society. Outdoor recreation involves a complex set of problems, issues and opportunities related to many aspects of public policy. Among the many difficult issues facing Minnesota recreation providers are the following, which were identified during Minnesota's 1990 Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Planning (SCORP) process:

Natural Resource Protection and Management
Land Acquisition
Recreation Facility Development, Redevelopment and Rehabilitation
Recreation Programming and Visitor Services, and
Maintenance and Operations of Existing Outdoor Recreation Facilities.

Key objectives designed to address each SCORP issue area are listed below according to their priority for statewide and local government action.

These issues and objectives provide the focus for SCORP Action Planning and serve as the basis for allocating Minnesota's Land and Water Conservation Fund (L&WCF) apportionment for FFY 1991-'92 to eligible outdoor recreation projects. Biennial recreation priorities will be reviewed and revised for use during the subsequent FFY 1993-1994 L&WCF funding cycle. Formal amendments will be filed, as necessary, to reflect any interim shifts in priority or emphasis.

Differences in state and local government recreation priorities stem from the different roles and responsibilities that each assumes in providing public outdoor recreation. The State of Minnesota provides a broad range of recreation programs, facilities and services in response to demands from a diverse national clientele. State agencies must also assume basic responsibility for protecting and managing Minnesota's environment and natural resources, and for regulating and enforcing aspects of resource use and development in the public interest.

In contrast, local and municipal governments provide a variety of recreation facilities uniquely tailored to local needs and community priorities. State agencies are often called upon to provide financial support and technical assistance in the planning, design and development of recreation programs and facilities that best meet local recreation needs. Close state and local government cooperation helps ensure that local recreation developments complement the state's overall outdoor recreation system.

Issue: Natural Resource Protection and Management

Background

Each year more and more Minnesotans are fishing, hunting, camping, hiking, viewing nature or just enjoying the outdoors. Meanwhile, the state's lakes and streams, forests, and fish and wildlife habitats are being threatened in many areas by rapidly growing land use pressures. Urban, suburban and rural development is taking its toll, as is the drainage of wetlands, the clearing of wooded areas, lakeshore and streambank erosion, and the overuse of sensitive natural areas. This dilemma is causing growing concern among those who recognize the vital links between man and nature.

Growing, changing recreational demands often focus on Minnesota's most sensitive natural resources, such as the state's prime lakes, wetlands, shorelands, vanishing urban open space, and on increasingly crowded waterways. User conflicts have intensified, and new and emerging demands, in many cases, conflict with established uses of public lands.

L&WCF FUNDING PRIORITIES FOR 1991-1992

Objective

Acquire and protect wetlands, shorelands and floodplains of special ecological or recreational significance.

**State
Agencies**

High

**Local
Governments**

High

Develop additional recreation opportunities along Minnesota roadways, parkways and trails, and in areas of scenic or historic interest.

Medium

Medium

Protect, restore and manage Minnesota's remaining native prairie landscape.

Medium

Medium

Provide environmental learning and nature study opportunities.

Medium

Medium

Issue: Public Land Acquisition

Background

The changing face of outdoor recreation mirrors the growing social, economic and cultural diversity of Minnesotans. It calls for renewed emphasis on public land acquisition and the development of new and different outdoor recreation facilities. The 1990's may well prove to be the last opportunity to preserve many of the state's truly outstanding recreational resources, particularly those in close proximity to fast-growing urban and rural population centers where facilities are in short supply and land values are rapidly escalating.

Since the Program began in 1965, competition for Federal Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) dollars has become increasingly intense. Over the period 1985-1989, less than \$4

million in LWCF funding was available to fund over \$67 million in grant requests - an average of less than \$.06 for each dollar requested. Despite steadily decreasing annual apportionments, however, federal LWCF cost-share funds continue to provide the major source of acquisition and development funding for many local park and recreation programs.

Reduced funding, and funding instability, limits opportunities to protect and enhance Minnesota's outdoor recreation estate. Continued federal funding is needed to challenge and leverage state, local and private investment in Minnesota's outdoor recreation system.

L&WCF FUNDING PRIORITIES FOR 1991-1992

<u>Objective</u>	<u>State Agencies</u>	<u>Local Governments</u>
Acquire land and scenic easements along recreational rivers, trails, lakes and streams.	Medium	High
Acquire open space, especially in urban or rural areas experiencing rapid population growth and development.	High	High
Acquire lands for public hunting, fishing, nature study and wildlife observation.	Medium	Low
Acquire land containing critical habitat, rare biotic communities, and endangered species habitat.	High	Low
Acquire abandoned railroad rights-of-way to create or expand trail recreation opportunities, and to link existing trail segments.	High	Low
Acquire private inholdings within public recreation areas.	Medium	Low
Acquire lands providing linkages to existing trails and parks.	Low	High
Acquire lands in areas of recreational land shortages.	Low	High

Issue: Recreation Facility Development, Redevelopment and Rehabilitation

Background

Use of Minnesota's outdoor recreation resources has grown substantially in recent years - by as much as 30% at some facilities. Along with increased numbers of visits, Minnesotans are seeking more diverse settings in which to pursue both traditional and non-traditional recreational activities. Increasingly, recreation providers must accommodate activities such as recreational vehicle camping, off-road vehicle use, skate-skiing, mountain biking, use of personal watercraft, and long-distance hiking, biking, snowmobiling and cross-country skiing.

Trends creating demands for innovative recreation programs and facilities include greater public interest in health and fitness, improved recreation technology, the rise in dual-income households, and a rapidly growing number of special interest groups who seek a wider range of recreation services and facilities. On the other hand, there are also more single-parent families and others with special needs who often lack the time, money, mobility or the outdoor experience to make use of traditional recreation facilities.

Other trends shaping Minnesota's outdoor recreation market include the rapid aging of the state's population, and a gradual move towards greater urbanization in many areas. Recreation researchers expect twenty-first century Minnesotans to recreate more often, but for shorter periods and closer to home. They will seek less strenuous forms of recreation, in close proximity to other leisure time opportunities and amenities. Minnesota's 1989 Recreation Facility Adequacy Poll summarizes public opinion regarding the relative importance of and the need for different types of outdoor recreation facilities.

L&WCF FUNDING PRIORITIES FOR 1991-1992

<u>Objective</u>	<u>State Agencies</u>	<u>Local Governments</u>
Address recreation facility shortages in identified areas.	High	Low
Develop year round, multi-purpose facilities that are both durable and flexible in their use.	Medium	Medium
Ensure access to outdoor recreation facilities by removing physical barriers and providing appropriate visitor information.	High	High
Address the needs of urban residents for nearby recreation facilities.	Medium	High

Issue: Outdoor Recreation Programming and Visitor Services

Background

In our increasingly urban society, many Minnesotans are becoming further and further removed from their natural, ecological surroundings. Consequently, many lack even a basic understanding of environmental concepts, outdoor and life skills, or the ethical behavior and values associated with natural resource conservation.

Education is increasingly recognized as the key to protecting and preserving Minnesota's environment and natural resources over the long term. Incorporating environmental education concepts into elementary and secondary school curriculum materials, emphasizing the inter-relationships between contemporary environmental issues, helps students to better understand how their actions affect environmental quality. Awareness of critical resource issues can lead to strong, active, visible and vocal support for resource conservation programs.

Interpretive programs provide first-hand experience with natural and cultural resources, leading to a deeper awareness and concern for the stewardship of those resources. Interpretive learning provides a valuable framework for understanding the facts and concepts taught in our schools. However, because the results of interpretive programs are often difficult to measure, funding support for these programs has been inconsistent. Unlike statutorily authorized responsibilities, there is no comprehensive state or federal mandate requiring public recreation providers to offer interpretive services.

Building public awareness of resource issues is critical to the protection of Minnesota's natural and cultural heritage. The ability to manage controversial issues and to secure public cooperation hinges upon providing Minnesotans of all ages with timely, factual and balanced views on current issues.

L&WCF FUNDING PRIORITIES FOR 1991-1992

<u>Objective</u>	<u>State Agencies</u>	<u>Local Governments</u>
Develop interpretive opportunities at public outdoor recreation sites.	High	Medium

Issue: Maintenance and Operations of Existing Outdoor Recreation Facilities

Background

Minnesotans have made substantial investments over the past 25 years in developing one of the finest outdoor recreation systems in the nation. Unfortunately, many state and local outdoor recreation facilities are rapidly deteriorating due to their age, increased use and vandalism. In recent years, funding for facility repair and preventative maintenance has been insufficient to reverse this disturbing trend.

Maintenance and operations funding for units of the state's outdoor recreation system has remained relatively constant during the 1980's, despite the eroding effects of inflation, salary increases, cuts in base-level funding, increased operating expenses, and costs resulting from growing visitor use and new facility construction. As a result, visitor safety and satisfaction are jeopardized, and public services have been reduced.

Long-neglected maintenance and operations needs have reached a critical point. A 1989 series of status reports on Minnesota's State Parks, for example, identified more than \$55 million in capital budget needs for land acquisition and resource management projects, as well as for major repair, rehabilitation and replacement of existing State Park facilities.

An ongoing program of facility rehabilitation and repair is essential to protect past investments in outdoor recreation facilities, and to minimize new facility development costs to taxpayers. Dollars spent for routine maintenance and rehabilitation can save major redevelopment costs later on, and can ensure full and extended use of existing facilities. The development of

minimum facility maintenance and service standards among public recreation providers would assist in early identification of unmet management needs.

L&WCF FUNDING PRIORITIES FOR 1991-1992

Objective

Minimize facility maintenance costs by designing and constructing low-maintenance facilities.

Focus maintenance and replacement efforts on those facilities which do not meet current standards.

**State
Agencies** **Local
Governments**

Medium

High

High

Low

OPEN PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

**FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION PROJECTS
FUNDED BY THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND**

FROM THE 1991-1992 APPORTIONMENT

STATE OF MINNESOTA

September 17, 1990

**Prepared by:
Minnesota Departments of Natural Resources and
Trade & Economic Development**

PREFACE

Minnesota's Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Planning (SCORP) process is a continuous three-part planning process, which is conducted in accordance with provisions of the Federal Land & Water Conservation Fund (L&WCF) Act of 1965 (P.L. 88-578). This process is characterized by the preparation of an 1) Assessment & Policy Plan, 2) Action Program, and 3) Open Project Selection Process documents.

First, the Assessment & Policy Plan assess the supply of and demand for outdoor recreation opportunities throughout Minnesota, as well as the key social, economic and environmental variables that affect outdoor recreation. This assessment leads to the identification of issues and the development of recommended actions needed to move recreation interests forward in Minnesota over a five-year period. It is intended to serve as a guide for both public and private sector recreation providers in meeting future recreation needs.

Next, the Action Program identifies specific land acquisition and facility development needs and L&WCF funding priorities on a biennial basis. It helps guide the investment of federal L&WCF dollars to those state and local projects that address outdoor recreation issues and priorities identified in the Assessment & Policy Plan. Funding priorities established in the Action Program, however, do not necessarily reflect the entirety of Minnesota's outdoor recreation funding needs - only those eligible for Land & Water Conservation Fund support.

Finally, the Open Project Selection Process serves as a formal and objective method of selecting and evaluating specific outdoor recreation projects proposed for L&WCF funding. The OPSP includes a priority ranking system which awards points to grant applications based on how well they address priorities established in the Action Program. L&WCF grants are available only to state and local units of government, and competition is typically very intense.

All three planning documents are jointly produced by the Minnesota Departments of Natural Resources and Trade & Economic Development. Copies of each are available by contacting the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources in c/o Office of Planning, Box 10, 500 Lafayette Road, St. Paul, MN 55155-4010.

INTRODUCTION

The *Open Project Selection Process* (OPSP) is a set of procedures designed to provide equal opportunity for all eligible project sponsors, and to ensure that all Minnesotans participate in the benefits of the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund (L&WCF) Grant Program. The purpose of this document is to explain how L&WCF Grant Funds are made available to Minnesota, how project grants are awarded to state agencies and local units of government, and how the state will ensure that the requirements of the L&WCF Grant Program will be met.

The OPSP has four components: a recurring funding cycle, a public notification process, a program for assisting potential sponsors in formulating grant proposals, and a priority ranking system used to select those projects which will receive grant awards. Minnesota divides its annual apportionment from the L&WCF evenly between local and statewide sponsors.

Two state agencies in Minnesota are responsible for administering the L&WCF Grants Program: the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and the Department of Trade & Economic Development (DTED). DNR administers statewide projects sponsored by state agencies and DTED administers local projects sponsored by local units of government. Because state and local projects often differ in terms of their scope and in the type of facilities they provide, the two administering agencies (DNR and DTED) use different versions of the OPSP components to better serve the needs of their clients. Both versions are explained in this document.

RECURRING FUNDING CYCLE

Both state and local project proposals are received, evaluated and selected on an annual cycle. Sometime after October 1st of each year, the annual apportionment from the L&WCF is made available to Minnesota. Because apportionments are made by Congressional appropriation, the amount of the apportionment and its effective date vary from year to year.

Each year, the DNR requests project proposals from state sponsors by January 15th, or upon notification of federal appropriation of its annual L&WCF apportionment, whichever is later. The evaluation and selection process is usually completed within four weeks. Projects selected for funding are then submitted to the National Park Service for additional review and final approval. Once the project is approved and funded, acquisition or development activities can begin - usually by late Spring. Projects must be completed within five years from the date of approval.

The annual cycle for local projects begins in September of each year when DTED begins sending applications to townships, cities, and counties for project proposals to be considered for funding the following year. DTED notifies all local units annually as to the availability of L&WCF grant applications. Completed applications are due September 1st. The evaluation, ranking and selection of local government projects is usually completed within 90 days. Those local projects selected to receive L&WCF assistance are then submitted for federal review and approval. Local sponsors can usually begin acquisition or development activities during the following spring or summer.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

The DNR informs eligible project sponsors of L&WCF funding availability by sending notification letters. DTED, on the other hand, uses an extensive notification process to reach the many potential local sponsors. A notice of the availability of L&WCF applications is mailed directly to every Minnesota city, county and township each year. In addition, official notice is published in the State Register, the official publication of the State of Minnesota. Application booklets are also provided upon request.

DTED staff are charged with making the initial determination as to the basic eligibility of proposed projects. If eligible, applicants are invited to meet with DTED staff to discuss project details, and to complete additional application forms. Program manuals are also distributed to applicants which provide additional information on the following:

- a description of the L&WCF Program and its eligibility requirements,
- a detailed description of the application process, the project review and ranking process,
- the name, address and phone number of persons to contact for assistance in completing the L&WCF grant application,
- a description of the annual funding cycle, including key deadlines, and
- a set of detailed application instructions, including examples of required attachments and other documentation.

PROGRAM ASSISTANCE

The Department of Natural Resources employs a full-time grant coordinator who is available to assist statewide sponsors in preparing their proposals and with other matters necessary for their participation in the L&WCF program. Potential sponsors rely on this coordinator to explain the Open Project Selection Process, interpret grant program requirements, and act as a day-to-day liaison with representatives of the National Park Service.

After initial project evaluation and selection, DTED staff conduct a grant application workshop to inform local project sponsors of steps necessary to obtain needed permits, to conduct any required archeological surveys, to arrange for appraisals, or to complete any other prerequisites to final grant approval. Direct one-on-one assistance is available throughout the funding cycle to help sponsors prepare and submit their proposals.

PRIORITY RANKING SYSTEM

Statewide projects submitted to DNR are ranked using the Statewide Project Priority Ranking System (Exhibit A). L&WCF funds from the 1991 apportionment, for example, will be obligated to projects in rank order until funds are exhausted. No project will receive funding unless all higher ranked projects have been funded. Ongoing statewide projects which have received L&WCF funds in previous years

must also compete in the ranking process if additional funding is requested to complete a project or to cover unexpected cost overruns.

Local projects submitted to DTED are ranked using the Local Project Priority Ranking System (Exhibit B). This system differs somewhat from the Statewide Ranking System (Exhibit A) in that different Action Program priority levels are reflected in the ranking criteria, and a specific list of recreation facilities considered most relevant to local government needs (See Part III(c) of the ranking sheet) is given special consideration. Only one of the facilities listed is required to receive ranking points. This allows smaller communities, or communities proposing smaller scale projects, an equal opportunity to compete for funding.

Finally, L&WCF funds are obligated to projects in rank order until funds are exhausted. State grant funds are obligated in rank order to the remaining projects. No cost overrun amendment will be approved. Consequently, development costs which exceed the total programmed project cost will be the sole responsibility of the local government sponsor.

PUBLIC REVIEW

This Open Project Selection Process has been reviewed by the National Park Service and by DNR's Outdoor Recreation Planning Advisory Committee (ORPAC). The ORPAC advisory group is composed of representatives of federal, state, county, city, and local units of government, private sector recreation interests, and representatives of various special needs groups (e.g., racial and ethnic minorities, disabled individuals, low income persons). In addition, the public at-large was invited to review and comment on the OPSP during a 45-day review period which was announced in a statewide press release issued by the DNR on June 1, 1990.

EXHIBIT A
PRIORITY RANKING SYSTEM: STATEWIDE PROJECTS
1991 & 1992 FUNDING CYCLES

APPLICATION FORM - Statewide Projects

Application # _____ Project Title _____

Sponsor _____ Project location (county) _____

Total cost \$ _____ Federal share \$ _____ Sponsor share \$ _____

Project description:

Acres to be acquired _____

Acquire protected wetlands? (Y/N) _____

Acquire threatened inholding? (Y/N) _____

Narrative description of opportunities provided

SCORING SHEET – Statewide Projects

Application # _____ Project Title _____

Project Eligibility

Does this project meet the eligibility and evaluation criteria outlined in Chapters 640 and 660 of the LWCF Grants Manual? Y / N (If no, reject application)

<u>Project Scoring:</u> (circle points to be awarded)	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Pts</u>
Acquire and protect wetlands, shorelands and floodplains of special ecological or recreational significance.	HI	10
Develop additional recreation opportunities along Minnesota roadways, parkways and trails, and in areas of scenic or historic interest.	Med	5
Protect, restore and manage Minnesota's remaining native prairie landscape.	Med	5
Provide environmental learning and nature study opportunities.	Med	5
Acquire land and scenic easements along recreational rivers, trails, lakes and streams.	Med	5
Acquire open space, especially in urban or rural areas experiencing rapid population growth and development.	HI	10
Acquire lands for public hunting, fishing, nature study and wildlife observation.	Med	5
Acquire land containing critical habitat, rare biotic communities, and endangered species habitat.	HI	10
Acquire abandoned railroad rights-of-way to create or expand trail recreation opportunities, and to link existing trail segments.	HI	10
Acquire private inholdings within public recreation areas.	Med	5
Develop year round, multi-purpose facilities that are both durable and flexible in their use.	Med	5
Ensure access to outdoor recreation facilities by removing physical barriers and providing appropriate visitor information.	HI	10
Address the needs of urban residents for nearby recreation facilities.	Med	5
Develop interpretive opportunities at public outdoor recreation sites.	HI	10
Minimize facility maintenance costs by designing and constructing low maintenance facilities.	Med	5
Focus maintenance and replacement efforts on those facilities that do not meet current standards.	HI	10
Address recreation facility shortages. (Award points from attached sheet).....		_____
Total Points		_____

FACILITY RANKING

(Statewide Projects)

Circle points for each facility provided by this project.

<u>FACILITY</u>	<u>% NEED MORE*</u>	<u>POINTS AWARDED</u>
Paved shoulders for bikes	61.6	12
Wildlife & nature observation	50.5	10
Walking paths	49.1	10
Bicycle paths & trails	48.6	10
Swimming beaches	43.3	8
Flower gardens	40.2	8
Hiking trails	37.8	8
Nature & history interpretation	37.1	8
Lake accesses	36.5	8
XC ski trails	35.8	8
Natural park areas	35.7	8
Swimming pools	35.5	8
Shore fishing areas	34.7	6
River & stream access	32.5	6
Campgrounds	32.4	6
Skating & hockey rinks	29.4	6
Picnic grounds	26.1	6
Horseback trails	23.8	4
Waterfowl hunting areas	22.2	4
Downhill ski areas	21.0	4
Snowmobile trails	20.8	4
Athletic fields	20.7	4
Basketball courts	17.7	4
Upland game hunting areas	17.7	4
Big game hunting areas	17.4	4
Tennis courts	17.1	4
Playgrounds	16.5	4
Shooting ranges	15.4	4
Golf courses	14.6	2
ATV trails & areas	14.6	2
Scuba diving areas	12.7	2
4WD trails & areas	10.2	2
Field dog training areas	8.8	2
<hr/>		
Total points (Insert on Scoring Sheet)		_____

1105. 110
 or sensitive natural
 the vital links

Derived from: Outdoor Recreation Facility Adequacy Survey, MN Dept. of Natural Resources, Office of Planning, April, 1989. A telephone poll of 2,400 Minnesota households to gauge the public's perception of the adequacy of outdoor recreation facilities available to their households.

* Percent of Minnesota households that requested more of facility.

EXHIBIT B
PRIORITY RANKING SYSTEM: LOCAL PROJECTS
1991 & 1992 FUNDING CYCLES

PROJECT RANKING SHEET

FEDERAL LAND & WATER CONSERVATION (LAWCON)/STATE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT GRANTS
Fiscal Year 1991

Aop # _____ Local Unit _____ County _____

Subject Name _____ Total Cost _____

Region # _____ Proposed Acquisition _____ Acres _____

Facilities to be Developed _____

Previous Grant Awards to Applicant:

Date Grant Awarded

Funding Source

1.	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____

Inspection Date: _____ Project Officer _____

APPLICATION PREREQUISITES

In order to be considered for funding, a "Yes" answer must apply to each of the following questions:

YES NO N/A

Satisfactory progress has been made on active grants.

Previous outdoor recreation grant awards to the local sponsor have been satisfactorily closed and/or properly managed.

Existing park facilities administered by the local sponsor appear to be adequately maintained.

The local sponsor presently owns or plans to acquire the land proposed for development.

If acquisition, the applicant has demonstrated a commitment to developing proposed recreation facilities within three years.

The applicant has demonstrated a commitment to operating and maintaining the proposed outdoor recreation site and facilities for public use and enjoyment into perpetuity.

The proposed development or redevelopment will comply with federal and state handicapped accessibility design standards.

For athletic field projects, the applicant has provided adequate justification for any proposed athletic facilities that do not meet regulation size standards.

I. Design Considerations (40 point maximum)

Section I Points _____

A. Design Sensitivity Toward Physical Limitations and Natural Amenities on the Site

1. Topography (enter %)

flat _____ undulating _____ hilly _____ steep (ravined) _____

Is design compatible with the existing topography? _____

Scale 0 1 2 3 4 List Problems _____

2. Vegetation (enter %)

agriculture _____ forest _____ developed park _____ wetland _____ other _____

Is design compatible with existing vegetation? _____

Scale 0 1 2 3 4 List Problems _____

3. Do there appear to be problems with drainage or erosion?
Scale 0 1 2 3 4 List Problems _____
 4. Does design make good use of the available space without crowding?
Scale 0 1 2 3 4 List Problems _____
 5. Are proposed facilities located so as to complement, rather than conflict with each other? Scale 0 1 2 3 4 List Problems _____
- B. Does the design minimize conflicts with adjacent land uses? Scale 0 1 2 3 4
If no, list problems _____
- C. Are there major environmental intrusions on the site that could limit recreation development or use and/or diminish aesthetic values of the area? Yes No
List intrusions _____
If yes, will design successfully mitigate those intrusions?
Scale -4 -3 -2 -1 0 (subtract) _____
- D. Design Standards and Characteristics:
1. Are facilities designed consistent with generally-accepted engineering and architectural design standards?
Scale 0 1 2 3 4 _____
 2. Does the design minimize any potential risk to the health and safety of users?
Scale 0 1 2 3 4 _____
 3. Does the design reflect a sensitivity to a proper balance between active recreation use and resource protection, given the characteristics of the site and proposed use?
Scale 0 1 2 3 4 _____
 4. Does the design include proposed facilities that would be durable and require a low level of maintenance?
Scale 0 1 2 3 4 _____

II. Commitment to Project (12 point maximum)

Section II Points _____

- A. Does the sponsor have an active parks and recreation organization? Yes (4 pts) No (0) _____
- B. Has the sponsor developed projected maintenance and operations costs for the proposed facilities? Yes (4 pts) No (0) _____
- C. Does the sponsor have a separate, specific source of funds for acquiring park land or generating operation and development funds? Yes (4 pts) No (0) _____

III. SCORP Acquisition and Development Priorities (72 point maximum)

Section III Points _____

- A. Would the proposed project be located in an area where the population growth statewide average? Yes (5 pts) No (0) _____

B. Acquisition, Development, Redevelopment, and Rehabilitation Priorities

1. High Priority Acquisition (five points each)

- ☐ acquisition of wetlands, shorelands and floodplains
- ☐ acquisition of open spaces in urban or rural areas experiencing rapid population growth and development
- ☐ acquisition of lands providing linkages to existing trails and parks
- ☐ acquisition of lands in areas of recreational land shortages

2. Medium Priority Acquisition (two points each)

- ☐ acquisition of native prairie lands or lands to be used for prairie restoration
- ☐ acquisition of areas for environmental learning and nature study
- ☐ acquisition of lands that would provide recreational opportunities along Minnesota roadways and parkways and in areas of scenic or historic interest.

3. High Priority Development/Redevelopment/Rehabilitation (five points each)

- ☐ compatible D/R/R of a floodplain, shoreland and wetland area
- ☐ D/R/R of outdoor recreation facilities in areas within ½ hour drive of urban residents
- ☐ removal of physical barriers to handicapped persons in existing outdoor recreation areas and facilities

4. Medium Priority D/R/R (two points each)

- ☐ D/R/R of facilities that would allow for year-round use of the park
- ☐ D/R/R of facilities that are flexible in their use
- ☐ D/R/R of environmental learning facilities

C. Eligible Project List

One or more of the following facilities must be included in the proposed project. Check all that apply and award 20 points if one or more of these facilities are included in the proposal.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Natural park areas | <input type="checkbox"/> Nature study/observation areas |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Picnic grounds | <input type="checkbox"/> Swimming beaches |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lake accesses | <input type="checkbox"/> River/stream accesses |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biking trails | <input type="checkbox"/> Campgrounds |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hiking trails | <input type="checkbox"/> Baseball/softball fields |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Football/soccer fields | <input type="checkbox"/> Skating/hockey rinks |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fishing piers/shore fishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Cross-country ski trails |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tennis courts | <input type="checkbox"/> Basketball/hard courts |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Horseback riding trails | |

TOTAL POINTS _____

Summary of Rater's Overall Impression of the Proposed Project and Additional Comments:
