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Qualifying Criteria

Answered as a Yes/No Question

- Project Scheduling/Timeline
- Geographic Location
- Long-Term Maintenance/Management Plan
Refined Criteria (8.15.2023)

Weighted Criteria (Original)

Scored on a scale (e.g., projects with more considerations for safety receive higher safety score)

- Conservation and Environmental Impact – 20%
- Accessibility – 18%
- Feasibility – 17%
- Equity – 15%
- Long-Term Management and Maintenance – 10%
- Costs and Leveraged Funding – 10%
- Alignment with County Plans/Needs/Other Priorities – 5%
- Safety – 5%
Refined Criteria (9.07.2023)

Qualifying Criteria
Answered as a Yes/No Question

- Project Scheduling/Timeline
- Geographic Location
- Long-Term Maintenance/Management Plan
Refined Criteria (9.07.2023)

Weighted Criteria (Refined)

Scored on a scale (e.g., projects with more considerations for safety receive higher safety score)

- Conservation and Environmental Impact – 20%
- Feasibility – 20%
- Accessibility – 15%
- Equity – 15%
- Long-Term Management and Maintenance – 10%
- Costs and Leveraged Funding – 10%
- Alignment with County Plans/Needs/Other Priorities – 5%
- Safety – 5%
# Weighted Criteria

## Conservation and Environmental Impact – 20%
- Low-impact improvement techniques
- Protection of wildlife habitats, native species, pollinator gardens
- Management of stormwater and runoff
- Tree canopy preservation and restoration
- Contiguous conserved lands / contribution to wildlife corridors
- Area of land conserved
- Ecosystem and bio-diversity
- Protection and restoration of aquatic resources
- Educational opportunities on local wildlife

## Accessibility – 15%
- ADA accessibility
- Proximity to public transportation opportunities
- Proximity to downtown areas / population hubs
- Bathroom facilities and drinking fountains available
- Walkability/Bikeability
- Parking availability
- Accessibility for seniors
- Connectivity to other trail systems, greenways, etc.
# Weighted Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feasibility – 20%</th>
<th>Equity – 15%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner/Stakeholder/Community Support</td>
<td>Directly serves traditionally underserved communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age/Completeness/Availability of Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Proximity to existing or planned low-income and senior housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography, hydrology, other geographic features</td>
<td>Engagement of public in project design/implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of design, land ownership, implementation</td>
<td>Location within traditionally disadvantaged, unincorporated communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for additional structures (e.g., bridges, bathhouses, etc.)</td>
<td>Cultural and historical significance of project site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated time until completion</td>
<td>Inclusion of host communities in project planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consideration and mitigation of potential negative impacts on local community (e.g., gentrification, traffic, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Located in areas with limited access to similar lands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Weighted Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management/Maintenance – 10%</th>
<th>Costs and Leveraged Funding – 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invasive species management</td>
<td>Inclusion of planning-level contingencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash and litter management plans</td>
<td>Ratio of funding leveraged from non-Bond sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for on-site staff, patrols, etc.</td>
<td>Up-to-date project cost estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for trail maintenance, erosion control</td>
<td>Efficient allocation of costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of low-impact maintenance techniques</td>
<td>Is the project fully-funded, including Bond funds?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement in park maintenance</td>
<td>Plan for long-term maintenance/management costs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of experienced land managers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Weighted Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Alignment with County Plans – 5%</strong></th>
<th><strong>Safety – 5%</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with County Comprehensive Plan, Parks &amp; Rec Master Plan, or other strategy</td>
<td>Designed to mitigate potential conflict between different users (e.g., bikes and hikers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with regional/municipal plans</td>
<td>Considerations for crime prevention (e.g., safety patrols, emergency call kiosks, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to regional wildlife conservation approaches</td>
<td>Clear signage for trails and other features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not identified by existing plan but recognized as new county-wide need</td>
<td>Education regarding wildlife encounters and safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areas for shade/rest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of easy-to-use maps / navigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two Tracks:
1) Land Acquisition
2) Park Improvements
NEXT STEPS & TENTATIVE TIMELINE

- SEPTEMBER : Subcommittee Approval of Criteria
- SEPTEMBER/OCTOBER: Criteria Presentations to Board of Commissioners