



2022 S.L. Gimbel Foundation Fund Grant Application

Internal Use Only:
Grant _____

Organization / Agency Information

1) Organization/Agency Name: The Trust for Public Land		
2) Physical Address: 101 Montgomery St., Suite 1000		City/State/Zip San Francisco, CA 94104
3) Mailing Address: PO BOX 399336		City/State/Zip San Francisco, CA 94139
4) CEO or Director: Diane Regas		Title: President and CEO
5) Phone: (415) 495-4014	6) Fax:	7) Email: Diane.Regas@tpl.org
8) Contact Person: Dede Devlin		Title: Institutional Giving Director
9) Phone: (323) 304-8345	10) Fax:	11) Email: Dede.Devlin@tpl.org
12) Web Site Address: Tpl.org		13) Tax ID: 23-7222333

Program / Grant Information

Interest Area: Animal Protection Education Environment Health Human Dignity

14) Program/Project Name: Melrose Elementary School Green Schoolyard		15) Amount of Grant Requested: \$500,000	
16) Total Organization Budget: \$73,588,000	17) Per 990, Percentage of Program Service Expenses (Column B / Column A x 100): 82%	18) Per 990, Percentage of Management & General Expenses Only (Column C / Column A x 100): 9%	19) Per 990, Percentage of Management & General Expenses and Fundraising (Column C+D / Column A x 100): 18%
20) Purpose of Grant Request (one sentence): The Trust for Public Land respectfully requests \$500,000 to transform the asphalt-covered Melrose schoolyard, which serves a disadvantaged community in Oakland, CA, into green space that enhances access to nature, improves health and learning, and benefits both the school and surrounding community.			
21) Program Start Date (Month and Year): July 2021		22) Program End Date (Month and Year): December 2022	
23) Gimbel Grants Received: List Year(s) and Award Amount(s) 2015-\$25,000; 2018-\$251,000			

Signatures

24) Board President / Chair: (Print name and Title) Tom Reeve, Board Chair	Signature: 	Date: 2/7/2022
25) Executive Director/President: (Print name and Title) Diane Regas, CEO	Signature: 	Date: 2/7/2022

2022 S.L. Gimbel Foundation Fund APPLICATION

Narrative

Please provide the following information by answering **ALL** questions (I to IV), **12 Font, One Inch Margins, Times New Roman**. Use the format below (I to IV). **Type the question**. Type your complete answers to the question directly below the question. Please be thorough, clear, specific, and concise.

I. Organization Background

A) What are the history, mission and purpose of your organization?

In 1972, a handful of visionaries founded The Trust for Public Land to pioneer a new type of nonprofit organization, driven by a mission to protect land for people, especially in and around cities. “Nearly 80 percent of the nation’s people live in metropolitan areas, yet only a small percentage of the existing public recreation lands are available to them,” wrote founder Huey Johnson. He called this: “A major flaw in the American dream.” In the decades that followed, The Trust for Public Land expanded its service areas and geographic reach to amplify its impact and meet emerging needs. In the 1990s, the organization grew into a national leader and innovator in developing community-driven city parks. Today, almost half a century later, we proudly stand apart for our land-for-people mission, focus on communities, and nationwide impact.

The Trust for Public Land creates parks and protects land for people, ensuring healthy livable communities for generations to come. We envision an America where all communities can connect to nature, near and far. Our mission is delivered through four initiatives—lands, parks, green schoolyards, and trails—supported by wide-ranging expertise and partnerships. Our commitment to promoting health, advancing equity, and building climate resilience alongside communities drives every decision we make. We believe that if we maximize the opportunities for all people to experience the health benefits of nature, energize the efforts of historically marginalized groups, and improve climate resilience through land protection and park creation, then every community—regardless of zip code—will be stronger, healthier, and more connected.

B) How long has the organization been providing programs and services to the community?

Since 1972, The Trust for Public Land has preserved 3.7 million acres; created 500 parks, playgrounds, or gardens; and developed 2,000 miles of trails. We lead the nation in park advocacy, helping generate \$80 billion for open space through legislation and ballot measure and inspiring 300 hundred mayors to commit to park access improvements. Founded in San Francisco, the Trust for Public Land has been working in Oakland and the San Francisco since the 1970s.

In an effort to return nature to children’s everyday lives, The Trust for Public Land transforms paved schoolyards into verdant campuses and opens them to the public after school. A national leader in the green schoolyard movement, The Trust for Public Land has programs underway in New York, Philadelphia, Dallas, Tacoma, and Oakland. In New York City, the nation’s largest district, we have transformed over 200 schools, enhancing the lives of 400,000 students and 4 million residents, while adding 200 acres of green space to a dense metropolis and capturing almost 20 million gallons of rainwater each year. Found in almost every neighborhood, schoolyards can be a linchpin for promoting environmental appreciation for children and health and resilience for communities nationwide.

Six years ago, The Trust for Public Land formed a partnership with the Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) and Green Schoolyards America to transform barren blacktops into vibrant outdoor environments where students and neighbors can exercise, play, and connect with nature every day.

With more than a hundred schools spread over almost five hundred urban acres, the district has the power to create daily connections to nature for thousands of underserved children and residents. Children in Oakland’s low-income neighborhoods rarely get to experience the joy and wonder of nature because most of its parks lie in the more affluent hillside areas. Schoolyards are among the only open spaces available to these kids, but most OUSD campuses are covered in asphalt, eliminating natural connections while contributing to dangerous heat and air pollution. Our successes to date include drafting a policy that was passed by the school board which lays out the vision, goals, and steps needed for taking the Green Schoolyards program to scale; completing a master plans for five pilots projects; completing two green schoolyard projects; embedding TPL staff in the district to help formulate design guidelines and maintenance practices; raising over \$8.2 million for the program; and advising the district on a bond measure to support the program.

C) What are some of your past organizational accomplishments (last three years)?

From coast to coast, The Trust for Public Land’s work focuses on bringing communities together to reimagine the power of land for people and to change millions of lives in millions of exciting ways—increasing equity, improving health, and building climate resilience. Our proudest mission-delivery accomplishments include the Ackerson Meadow expansion of Yosemite National Park, the protection of Dr. Martin Luther King’s childhood home and the Stonewall Inn, the creation of over 250 green schoolyards in New York City, and the subject matter expertise and contributions by our program directors through research, articles, speaking engagements, and white papers.

In the last three years, key accomplishments include opening our first and second California green schoolyard pilot programs in Oakland, adding 17 miles of protected area to the Pacific Crest Trail in Northern California, playing a critical role in the passage of the Great American Outdoors Act, permanently protecting the trail entrance to the Zion Narrows in Utah, and expanding the Acadia National Park in Maine, among many others. Cumulatively, this represents 38 parks created, 180,000 acres of land protected, 11 green schoolyards converted, and substantial research, advocacy, and community engagement efforts across the county. In California, The Trust for Public Land’s work includes 8 parks created, 40,000 acres protected, and 2 green schoolyards constructed.

D) What are your key programs and activities?

The Trust for Public Land’s core services include:

- *Plan:* We bring a wide range of stakeholders together to identify and prioritize land for parks, trails, and conservation—and chart a course to protect and sustain it.
- *Fund:* We build coalitions to help craft measures and pass legislation to secure funding for conservation and parks.
- *Protect:* From pocket parks to vast backcountry escapes, our real estate experts help partners acquire and safeguard land for the public.
- *Create:* We engage communities in designing and building innovative parks, playgrounds, and trails that foster a strong sense of place and connection to nature.
- *Advocate:* We mobilize support for critical bills and policies to advance the use of public land for societal good.

These services work to support our four initiatives, which are:

- *Lands:* Nationally, we are working to generate more than \$10 billion in funding for land protection and establish 500 protected places for public benefit, deploying innovative tools to advance community conservation goals.
- *Parks:* We are working towards the goal of putting a quality park within a 10-minute walk of five million people who currently lack access by creating new parks or transforming

underutilized parks in the communities of greatest need and by activating local and national partnerships.

- *Schoolyards*: We are growing our schoolyards program to expand park access for nearly 6 million people across the country and open green schoolyards in 20 underserved school districts.
- *Trails*: We will connect more than 3 million people to 1,000 miles of local and national trails and greenways.

E) Describe the communities you serve. Include populations, geographic locations served, and relevant statistics.

Where we live plays a big role in how long, and how well, we live. But walk around any city and it's easy to see: Not all neighborhoods are created equal. Some have expansive parks and trails, bustling businesses, and plenty of welcoming public spaces to host a farmer's market, fair, or community gathering. Others don't. Although the causes of inequity are vast and systemic, the effects are measurable, mappable, and—in many cities—literally concrete. While past decisions have led to stark disparities, the decisions we make today can create a just future for all. The Trust for Public Land is committed to ensuring that everyone in the United States, regardless of race, income, or zip code, enjoys access to the great outdoors. That is why we have set an ambitious goal: to put a quality park within a 10-minute walk, or about a half-mile, of everyone in the United States. We believe that the 10-minute walk is a powerful goal that can improve health, equity, and climate resilience for our most vulnerable communities. Our work in the city of Oakland is pivotal to achieving this goal.

II. Project Information:

A) Statement of Need

1. Specify the community need(s) you want to address and are seeking funds for.

The City of Oakland has been a leader in sustainability and greenhouse gas reduction since the 1990s. Unfortunately, much of the city is highly urbanized, with little tree canopy or open space. Manufacturing and industrial areas within the city provide local employment, but coupled with freeways, can contribute to poor air and water quality, including large expanses of impermeable surfaces which contribute to runoff to local water bodies.

One in five Californians visit public schools daily, and schools often serve as community hubs. Schools also represent one of the largest holders of public land in urban areas. Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) has 120 schools over 400 acres of outdoor space and makes up the daily experience of nearly 50,000 students – including their access to the outdoors on school campuses. Unfortunately, schoolyards typically do not reflect local habitats or serve ecological functions. In reality, in many dense urban cities such as Oakland, schoolyards resemble parking lots – primarily paved, with few to no trees.

Extensive paving creates hot and unwelcoming conditions for Oakland's children while carrying polluted runoff into the region's creeks and ultimately the San Francisco Bay. Combined with a lack of trees and shade, conventional schoolyards not only contribute to urban heat island effects, but can also directly impact the health of vulnerable populations. Asphalt can be up to 68 degrees hotter than ambient air temperature and temperatures can be 50 degrees hotter at a child's head height compared to that of an adult's. Children also respire and absorb pollutants more rapidly than adults. While students in the low-income communities served by OUSD have a need for the growth and discovery that comes from experiencing nature on a daily basis, many of the school sites offer a landscape that falls short. Greening these sites could re-introduce ecological function – including filtering and absorbing rainfall, capturing carbon, and provide shady refuges for children. The confluence of utilizing public land to maximize environmental benefits while improving quality of life for low-income students makes

school grounds a high priority for investment. Investing in green infrastructure on school campuses begins to address environmental impacts in the community and can also improve educational outcomes for underserved children.

Additionally, public school districts collectively own tens of thousands of acres across the country. But as little as 10% of America's schoolyards are open to the public outside of school hours. The Trust for Public Land's analysis shows that America's public school grounds have the potential to solve the problem of park access for at least 19.6 million people—including 5.2 million children—if we redesign schoolyards and open them to the public after hours.

That's why The Trust for Public Land transforms neglected school lots into vibrant parks that proactively drive climate resiliency, support community goals, and serve the entire neighborhood. By executing joint-use agreements, cities and districts can open schoolyards to the public part-time, eliminating disparities in park access. Green, healthy schoolyards maximize health, wellness, and community and environmental benefits while improving learning and quality of life for students and nearby residents. And studies show that spending time in nature can reduce stress, anger, and aggression and boost communication and relationship skills.

The Trust for Public Land (TPL) is working with OUSD, Green Schoolyards America (GSA) and each school community to create a Living Schoolyards Program that addresses the educational, health and ecological opportunities that each school offers. Through the construction of five pilot projects, this grant will enable urban greening site improvements to create outdoor learning environments that offer far-reaching benefits for the students and surrounding communities.

B) Project Description

1. Describe your project. How does your project meet the community need?

The Melrose Green Schoolyard project, one of the five pilot Living Schoolyard projects in Oakland, will allow us to complete a full green schoolyard transformation in partnership with the Oakland Unified School District and Green Schoolyards America. The green infrastructure project will contribute to the health of the school community, the neighborhood and local watersheds. By expanding the urban tree canopy and replacing asphalt with climate-appropriate and native planting on school grounds, the projects will mitigate urban heat islands, enhance air and water quality, and increase habitat. The project will also improve health and academic outcomes for our most vulnerable children and provide opportunities for children and the nearby community to learn about local ecosystems.

The Melrose campus is in East Oakland, in the urbanized Peralta Creek watershed, which drains into San Leandro Bay. The 3.3-acre school site has limited campus green space that is accessible to students during the school day. The mostly asphalt, 3.3-acre 2-8 school serves nearly 500 students in a dual Spanish/English immersion program. Since 2016, we have been working with the school community to re-envision their space and begin renovating it in phases. The community's vision, developed through participatory design, is to replace their vast asphalt expanses with planting areas including native plants and over 40 shade trees, water efficient irrigation system, outdoor sitting areas, vegetated swales, nature play areas, a sports field, renovated basketball courts, a running track a teaching garden, an outdoor classroom, a new entry court, picnic tables and benches, shade structures, a drinking fountain, and an ADA ramp to access the lower yard.

In early 2019 The Trust for Public Land completed the Phase 1 of the project, which included the removal of approx. 4,000 square feet of asphalt, planting of 16 shade trees, and creation of a learning garden, planting areas, seating areas, and vegetated swales. The Trust for Public Land now seeks

additional funding to complete the community’s vision in Phase 2 of the work, with includes removing asphalt and adding more nature exploration areas with planting and shade trees, a new play field, basketball courts and running track, picnic tables and benches, a drinking fountain and one shade structure.

2. What is unique and innovative about this project?

Every green schoolyard TPL creates is designed by the community, for the community. We partner directly with historically marginalized communities, where our impact addresses broader, upstream disparities in community, health, environment, and economic opportunities. When developing projects, we engage the whole community, including those who face barriers to participation.

Through a deep and inclusive participatory design process, students and residents create fun, vibrant play spaces unique to their needs. Students, parents, teachers and community members participate and help lead the schoolyard design: evaluating the site, collecting preferences from school and community users, building models, sketching ideas, and refining design options into a final concept design. Our process supports students as they gain valuable experience with team building, problem-solving, and critical thinking as they design their outdoor spaces.

Our public engagement efforts extend off-campus and into the community, reaching neighbors who will use the new schoolyard parks. Parents, educators, and residents were engaged in developing the design of their local schoolyard.

The Trust for Public Land is working with the Oakland Unified School District and Green Schoolyards America to not only build projects but also to create systemic change by changing policy and processes and ensure that all OUSD campuses will be green by 2030. Melrose Leadership Academy will serve as a showcase and proof of concept to demonstrate that schoolyard greening promotes health and education outcomes, climate resilience, and environmental justice for students and neighbors.

C) Project Goal, Objective, Activities and Expected Outcome

- 1. Note: Objective, Outcome and Evaluation must all be based on the SAME QUANTIFIABLE CRITERIA (for example, “number served, or acres improved”). This quantifiable criteria should refer to the grant amount you are requesting from the Gimbel Foundation only and not the total program.**

State ONE GOAL, ONE OBJECTIVE, ONE OUTCOME. USE NUMBERS AND DO NOT USE PERCENTAGES.

- 2. State ONE project goal. The Goal should be an aspirational statement, a broad statement of purpose for the project.**
- 3. State One Objective.** The Objective should be specific, measurable, verifiable, action-oriented, realistic, and time-specific statement intended to guide your organization’s activities toward achieving the goal. **Specify the activities** you will undertake to meet the objective and number of participants for each activity.
- 4. State One Outcome.** An outcome is the individual, organizational or community-level change that can reasonably occur during the grant period as a result of the proposed activities or services. What is the key anticipated outcome of the project and impact on participants? State in a quantifiable and verifiable term.
- 5. Evaluation:** How will progress towards the objective (per above) be tracked and outcome measured?

Provide specific information on how many individuals will be evaluated (should be the same number as in the objective), how you will collect relevant data and statistics that

meet your objective and validate your expected outcome, in a quantifiable manner, as you describe your evaluation process.

BELOW IS AN EXAMPLE OF GOAL, OBJECTIVE, OUTCOME AND EVALUATION:

Objective, Outcome and Evaluation should align and should be written in a linear format, using actual numbers, and data that are quantifiable and verifiable. Do not use percentages)

STATE THE GOAL, OBJECTIVES, AND OUTCOME

GOAL: House all homeless youth ages 18-24 in Mariposa County who are physically, mentally and legally able to work within 24 hours and help them become sufficient in 90 days.

OBJECTIVE: House up to **145 homeless youth** referred or who contact us within 24 hours.

ACTIVITIES:

1. For each of 145 youth identified, develop a case management file.
2. Create a 90 day sufficiency action plan for each of the 145 youth.
3. Input weekly progress reports for each of the 145 youth.

OUTCOME: We expect to **provide rapid rehousing to over 145 homeless youth** in 2020.

EVALUATION: Using Build Futures' Salesforce data base client management and tracking system, generate reports on the number of clients served and housed. **Track our role in housing 145 youth.** Account for additional successes or lower numbers of youth in the program.

WRITE YOUR RESPONSES HERE AND Use the following format for your goal, objective, respective activities and expected outcome:

GOAL: Develop proof of concept green schoolyard in Oakland where the school can serve as a community resource, enhance individual and community health outcomes, and demonstrate a model for promoting sustainability practices in the broader population.

OBJECTIVE: Complete construction on a green schoolyard at Melrose Elementary that incorporates community input and enhances access to green space for the school's 538 students, as well as 6,183 members of the surrounding community.

ACTIVITIES: Remove approx. 13,000 square feet of pavement, replacing it with new, permeable surfaces, and increase tree canopy using 40 shade trees to provide shade and an area for nature exploration and rest, as well as construct a teaching garden, an outdoor classroom, a natural play area, planted areas, a new entry court, picnic tables and benches, a new grass field, new basketball courts, a running track, three shade structures, and an ADA ramp to access the lower yard. These improvements are based on designs developed through a community engagement process designed to support the school's 538 students, as well as 6,183 members of the surrounding community.

OUTCOME: Increase community access to a vibrant and healthy environment for 538 students and 6,183 individuals within 10 min walk of home. Green schoolyards will connect children with natural processes and promote environmental stewardship, physical health and emotional well-being for students and staff. OUSD's community-use agreements at project schools mean that the wider community also gains access to new green space once green schoolyards projects are complete.

EVALUATION: The Trust for Public Land measures success by how we are improving park equity and access for underserved communities. Our multi-method evaluation process relies on the collection of quantitative and qualitative data using GIS tools, tracking, surveys, interviews, and design calculations in order to better understand the project's success in enhancing community input and access for the 538 students of Melrose Elementary and 6,183 members of the surrounding community. We will conduct a one-year post-occupancy evaluation of the Melrose Elementary Schoolyard site that

includes interviewing and surveying at least 50 members of the school community and 20 local residents living within a 10 minute walk of the site on subjects related to physical activity, use, and sense of safety and security.

D) Timeline

Provide a timeline for implementing the project. The start date and end date should be the same dates on the cover page.

The program start date is:

The program end date is

Include timeframes for specific activities, as appropriate.

Finalize the green schoolyard design	Summer 2021
Complete construction documents	Fall-Winter 2021
Complete secure all necessary permits	Winter 2021 - Spring 2022
Begin construction of Green Schoolyard	Spring 2022
Complete and open Green Schoolyard	Fall 2022

E) Target Population

1. Who will this grant serve?

Melrose is a Spanish/English K-8 school with 538 students: 63% are Latino, 8% are African American, and 17% are Caucasian. Melrose’s student population is 36% English language learners; 7% asthmatic; 43% at or below poverty level; and 60% are eligible for the free lunch program. The local median household income is 69% the SF Bay Area’s median household income. The school’s CalEnviroScreen2.0 rating is 61-70%. The project will serve a large English learner population.

Additionally, a community-use agreement exists between schools in the Living Schoolyards pilot program and the city of Oakland, allowing school facilities to be opened to the public once the projects are completed. As a result, schoolyard conversion to a park-like space will not only benefit the students but also 6,183 members of the surrounding community who live within a 10 minute walk of the school.

2. How many people will be impacted? Provide a breakdown: Number of Children, Youth, Adults, Seniors, Animals.

Children/ Youth – 23.6%/ 1,456

Adults – 61.9%/ 3,830

Seniors – 14.5%/ 896

Animals – unknown number of butterflies, birds, and insets that will benefit from the increased greenery and habitat space

F) Projects in the Community

1. How does this program relate to other existing programs in the community?

The OUSD School Board has outlined a vision that by 2035 all OUSD school grounds will incorporate living schoolyards that support 21st Century education, promote children’s health, well-being and joy and function as ecologically rich community schools that connect children and their neighborhoods to the natural world right outside their classroom door, every day. This vision is laid out in the OUSD *Board Policy on Living Schoolyards* document, which describes the goals, implementation, and management of this vision. The Trust for Public Land is proud to be working along OUSD to achieve this goal. A video documenting the making of the first Oakland green schoolyard at Cesar Chavez elementary can be found here: <https://vimeo.com/442481068>.

2. Who are your community partners (if any)?

Partnerships are a cornerstone of The Trust for Public Land's work. The Trust for Public Land is working with the Oakland Unified School District (OUSD), Green Schoolyards America (GSA), and the Melrose school community to create a green schoolyard program that addresses the educational, health and ecological opportunities most relevant to the site. Other partners include the Active Parent Green Team, which leads approximately four community clean up and build days per year, and Growing Together, which is a community organization working with the OUSD school community to building a culture of garden stewardship.

3. Who else in the community is providing this service or has a similar project?

Across Oakland, a few other partners are also working on schoolyard greening to promote health, environmental, community, and equity benefits. For example, Growing Together is engaged in gardening and stewardship at other schools; FoodCorps (an AmeriCorps program) is helping to develop school gardens; and the OUSD Education Center team is working on supporting schoolyard greening. However, no other organizations are engaged in full green schoolyard renovations in partnership with OUSD.

4. How are you utilizing volunteers?

The Trust for Public Land is focused on incorporating community input and collaboration on the development of our projects. Community volunteers support The Trust for Public Land's work at green schoolyards by volunteering at community planting days, as well as in the creation of community-designed artwork, such as mosaics and murals.

G) Use of Grant Funds

How will you use the grant funds? This answer should align with the specific activities previously outlined in C) Project Goal, Objectives, Activities and Expected Outcomes

Funds from the Gimbel Foundation will be used on hard costs associated with the schoolyard's construction, such as shade trees, drought tolerant/ native plants, a picnic area, a soccer field, drinking fountains and lighting, fencing, and construction consulting for design, permitting, and administration.

III. Project Future

A) Sustainability

Explain how you will support this program after the grant performance period. Include plans for fundraising or increasing financial support designated for the program.

Every green schoolyard we create is designed by the community, for the community. The Trust for Public Land's inclusive approach to participatory design ensures that the communities in which we work are active participants from inception to conclusion. As the Living Schoolyard Program fulfills OUSD's commitment to sustainability, the district has committed time and staffing at both the school site and the administrative levels to this project, with the OUSD Facilities Team, the OUSD Garden Coordinator, and school communities being full partners in design, implementation and maintenance. The Trust for Public Land has also worked to organize stewardship groups of local stakeholders, including garden stewards, science teachers, the community partner Growing Together, who keep the spaces vibrant and safe. Our ultimate goal is to cultivate leaders who go on to champion other neighborhood improvements.

Other strategies to achieve systemic and lasting change in the district include:

- Building pilot projects like Melrose campus to serve as models
- Developing a methodology to assess district and individual school needs and identify and prioritize future projects
- Creating design guidelines, curriculum, and best practices to support implementation and management of green schoolyards

- Supporting partners as they apply for public grants
- Advocating for a state funding measure to support and expand the program statewide

The Trust for Public Land is committed to assisting OUSD with site maintenance. This includes having secured \$35,000 in funding for maintenance and programming, as well as a commitment of \$300,000 over three to five years to support OUSD’s Buildings and Grounds team in maintaining the pilot program school sites.

The Trust for Public Land has a successful record of leveraging public and private funds to support for its projects. Of its annual philanthropy revenues, The Trust for Public Land receives about 55% from individuals and family foundations and about 45% from institutional foundations and corporations. The Trust for Public Land has a well-established record of success in leveraging public and private funds to implement its mission. In fact, every \$1 donated to The Trust for Public Land is leveraged to save \$8 worth of land.

IV. Governance, Executive Leadership and Key Personnel/Staff Qualifications

A) Governance

1. Describe your board of directors and the role it plays in the organization.

The National Board of Directors is the chief governing body of The Trust for Public Land. Directors are primarily responsible for overseeing successful delivery of the mission of the organization. The Board fulfills this responsibility in the following ways:

- Performs its fiduciary duties in accordance with the standard of care set forth in the Bylaws;
- Establishes and oversees sound governance practices and policies that serve to enhance the health and sustainability of the Board and the organization at large;
- Evaluates the CEO’s performance;
- Assesses and approves the annual budget to ensure the fiscal health of the organization and alignment with strategic priorities and long term goals;
- Works with staff leadership to guide strategic vision for near term and long term organizational success and reviews and approves annual strategic priorities;
- Ensures The Trust for Public Land’s strength and position among the nation’s top conservation organizations by contributing individual financial resources and bringing to bear other resources and connections to advance our mission locally and nationwide.

2. What committees exist within your board of directors?

The committees of the Board are: The Board Advancement Committee, The Audit Committee, The Project Review Committee, The Board Affairs Committee, The Transaction Committee, The Board Conservation Committee, The Executive Committee, and The Finance Committee.

3. How does the board of directors make decisions?

The National Board makes decisions by majority vote at board and committee meetings. A quorum is required for the transaction of business of the board. Some actions outlined in the Board’s bylaws do not necessitate a board meeting, in which case, Board members make vote in writing.

B) Management

1. Describe the qualifications of key personnel/staff responsible for the project.

Guillermo Rodriguez is the California State Director for The Trust for Public Land. He brings over 20 years of successful nonprofit, private sector and local government experience to the organization. He is responsible for developing, managing and leading the Trust’s land acquisition, park development and policy activities throughout the state. Before joining The Trust for Public Land, Guillermo worked for

the City and County of San Francisco starting his public service career with Mayor Gavin Newsom where he was responsible for local hiring programs, workforce development and the CityBuild program. Guillermo continued with Mayor Ed Lee as the Policy & Communications Director for the San Francisco Department of the Environment where he was responsible for managing local, state and federal climate and environmental policy. Guillermo remains active with several local and statewide nonprofits including Brightline Defense Project, Chinese for Affirmative Action, Meals on Wheels San Francisco and served on the California Postsecondary Education Commission, Mono Lake Committee, founding director of the Greenlining Institute and Trustee with the California State Parks Foundation.

Alejandra Chiesa directs the Bay Area Parks for People Program at The Trust for Public Land. Her work focuses on advancing green space equity with the goal of improving health, community cohesion and climate resilience. Alejandra has extensive experience working with low income communities of color to plan, design, and build parks and green schoolyards, while developing partnerships and coalitions to advocate for systems change and policies to achieve large and long lasting impacts in green space equity. She has worked extensively with many communities in the Bay Area including San Francisco, Richmond, and Oakland. One of her recent accomplishments includes launching the Oakland Living Schoolyards Initiative, which is transforming asphalt playgrounds into green spaces for students and their communities.

Trudy Garber is a Senior Program Manager with The Trust for Public Land's Bay Area Parks for People Program. She has been managing parks and schoolyards development projects with the organization for the past 11 years. In her role, she manages the coordination of community stakeholders, oversees creation of design and construction documents, and acts as the TPL representative supervising construction. Prior to her work at the Trust for Public Land, Trudy worked for architecture and landscape architecture firms, as well as the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation. Trudy holds a Bachelors in International Affairs from Georgetown University, as well as a Master of Landscape Architecture and Master of City Planning from UC Berkeley.

2. What is the CEO/Executive Director's salary?

The salary of Diane Regas, TPL's President & CEO, is \$498,750.

2022 S.L. Gimbel Foundation APPLICATION

V. Project Budget and Narrative (Do not delete these instructions on your completed form and use this form).

A) **Budget Table:** Provide a detailed line-item budget for your **entire** program by completing the table below. Note that if funded, this is the budget that you will have to refer to in the Evaluation (Final) Report.

A breakdown of specific line item requests and attendant costs should include:

- 1) Line item requests for materials, supplies, equipment and others:
 - a. Identify and list the type of materials, supplies, equipment, etc.
 - b. Specify the unit cost, number of units, and total cost**
 - c. Use a formula/equation as applicable. (i.e. 40 books @ \$100 each = \$4000)
- 2) Line item requests for staff compensation, benefits: **Do not use FTE percentages.**
 - a. Identify the position; for each position request, **specify the hourly rate and the number of hours** (i.e. \$20/hr x 20 hours/week x 20 weeks = \$8,000)
 - b. For benefits, provide the formula and calculation (i.e. \$8,000 x 25% = \$2,000)
- 3) Line items on Salaries/Personnel included in budget (contribution or in-kind) but NOT requested from the Gimbel Foundation must be broken down per number 2) above: Provide rate of pay per hour and number of hours.
- 4) The Gimbel Foundation **does not fund indirect costs.**

Line Item Request	Line Item Explanation	Support From Your Agency	Support From Other Funders	Requested Amount From Gimbel	Line Item Total of Project
Personnel: Project Manager	20 hours a month x 21 months x \$63/hour	\$ -	\$26,460.00	\$ -	\$26,460.00
Consultant: Landscape Architect	Design, construction administration, structural and geotech - \$109k	\$ -	\$109,000.00	\$ -	\$109,000.00
Consultant: Architect	Permitting support & design - ADA accessibility - \$47k	\$ -	\$47,000.00	\$ -	\$47,000.00
Consultant: Cost Estimator	Provide cost estimate for construction - \$12k	\$ -	\$12,000.00	\$ -	\$12,000.00
Construction Estimate	Site Clearing & Demolition	\$ -	\$ -	\$114,000.00	\$114,000.00
Construction Estimate	Landscape	\$ -	\$200,000.00	\$150,000.00	\$350,000.00
Construction Estimate	Asphalt & Fencing	\$ -	\$ -	\$48,000.00	\$48,000.00
Construction Estimate	Soccer Field	\$ -	\$ -	\$121,000.00	\$121,000.00
Construction Estimate	Picnic Area	\$ -	\$109,000.00	\$ -	\$109,000.00
Construction Estimate	Drinking Fountains and Lighting	\$ -	\$66,000.00	\$67,000.00	\$133,000.00
Construction Estimate	Site Clearing & Demolition	\$ -	\$ -	\$114,000.00	\$114,000.00

TOTALS:		\$ -	\$569,460.00	\$ 500,000.00	\$1,069,460.00
----------------	--	------	--------------	---------------	----------------

B) Narrative: The budget narrative is the justification of “how” and/or “why” a line item helps to meet the program deliverables. Provide a description for each line item. Each line item must have a narrative. Explain how the line item relates to the program. If you are requesting funds to pay for staff, list the specific duties of each position. See attached SAMPLE Program Budget and Budget Narrative

1. Personnel: Coordinate with OUSD, Melrose School, State Coastal Conservancy and consultants.
Project Manager Manage the project and consultants. Manage construction contractor when hired.

2. Consultant: Landscape architect designing project, including creation of construction documents,
Landscape assistance with bid package, structural and geotechnical services.
Architect

3. Consultant: Architect assisting with non-landscape items, including ADA accessibility. Assisting with
Architect State permitting requirements.

4. Consultant: Cost Providing a cost estimate of construction based on design plans to confirm project within
Estimator budget as designed.

5. Construction This is the current high level construction estimate to build the project.
Estimate

2022 S.L. Gimbel Foundation APPLICATION

VI. Sources of Funding: Please list your current sources of funding and amounts.

Secured/Awarded

Name of Funder: Foundation, Corporation, Government, Individual Donors, Other (specify)	Amount
California State Coastal Conservancy	\$185,000
Wayne and Gladys Valley Foundation	\$200,000
Individual donors to the Oakland Schoolyards Program	\$184,460

Pending

Name of Funder: Foundation, Corporation, Government, Individual Donors, Other (specify)	Amount	Decision Date

Diversity of Funding Sources: A financially healthy organization should have a diverse mix of funding sources. Complete those categories that apply to your organization using figures from your most recent fiscal year.

Funding Source	Amount	% of Total Revenue	Funding Source	Amount	% of Total Revenue
Contributions	\$37,751,000	24%	Individual Fee	\$7,055,000	5%
Earned Income/Interest	\$12,608,000	8%	Land Value	\$10,777,000	7%
Corp/Foundation Grants	\$45,333,000	29%	Corp/Foundation Fee	\$14,900,000	10%
Government Grants	\$10,459,000	7%	Government Fee	\$15,808,000	10%

Notes: Unaudited for FY21. Operating and Capital combined.

S.L. Gimbel Foundation APPLICATION

VII. Financial Analysis

Agency Name: The Trust for Public Land

Most Current Fiscal Year (Dates): From 7/1/2021 To: 6/30/2022

This section presents an overview of an applicant organization's financial health and will be reviewed along with the grant proposal. Provide all the information requested on your **entire organization**. Include any notes that may explain any extraordinary circumstances. Information should be taken from your most recent 990 and audit. **Double check your figures!**

Form 990, Part IX: Statement of Functional Expenses

1) Transfer the totals for each of the columns, Line 25- Total functional expenses (page 10)

(A) Total Expenses	(B) Program service expenses	(C) Management & general expenses	(D) Fundraising expenses
\$150,943,297	\$124,254,978	\$14,206,398	\$12,481,921

2) Calculate the percentages of Columns B, C, and D, over A (per totals above)

- Program services (B) – A general rule is that at least 75% of total expenses should be used to support programs
- Management & general administration (C) – A general rule is that no more than 15% of total expenses should be used for management & general expenses
- Fundraising (D) – A general rule is that no more than 10% of total expenses should be used for fundraising

(A) Total Expenses	(B) Program service expenses	(C) Management & general expenses	(D) Fundraising expenses
	Columns B / A x 100	Columns C / A x 100	Columns D / A x 100
Must equal 100%	82%	9%	9%

3) Calculate the difference between your CURRENT year budget for management & general expenses and your previous management & general expenses per your 990 (Column C)

Percentage of Organization's <u>Current</u> Total Budget used for Administration	Column C, Management & general expenses per 990 above	Differential
10%	9%	1%

If the differential is above (+) or below (-) **10%**, provide an explanation:

S.L. Gimbel Foundation APPLICATION

Quick Ratio: Measures the level of liquidity and measures only current assets that can be quickly turned to cash. A generally standard Quick Ratio equals 1 or more.

Cash	+ Accounts Receivables	/Current Liabilities	= Quick Ratio
\$145,309,000	\$23,005,000	\$65,974,000	2.55

Excess or Deficit for the Year:

Excess or (Deficit) Most recent fiscal year end	Excess or (Deficit) Prior fiscal year end
\$3,551,000 surplus	\$353,000 surplus

Notes: The Trust for Public Land had surpluses in both of the last two fiscal year's that was used to rebuild reserves following a deficit year in FY19.

VIII. EMAIL TWO PDF files to Gimbel@iegives.org

- A. One PDF file of the following, #1 to #5 B. Second PDF file of the following, #6 & #7**

#1	Completed Grant Application Form (cover sheet, narrative), budget page and budget narrative (see sample) and sources of funding, financial analysis page	#6	A copy of your most recent year-end financial statements (audited if available)
#2	Your current operating budget and the previous year's actual expenses (see sample Budget Comparison)	#7	A copy of your most recent 990. Please make sure that the Form 990 you submit is no more than two (2) years old.
#3	Part IX only of the 990 form, Statement of Functional Expenses (one page). Please make sure that the Form 990 you submit is no more than two (2) years old.		
#4	For past grantees, a copy of your most recent final report.		
#5	A copy of your current 501(c)(3) letter from the IRS		

Trust for Public Land Budget Comparison (OPERATING ONLY)

	Actuals	Budget	Variance
	Most Recently Completed Year	Projections Current Year	
	FY21	FY22	
Income			
Individual Contributions	25,560,878	27,179,000	1,618,123
Corporate Contributions	18,744,644	19,931,000	1,186,357
Foundation Grants	12,496,429	13,288,000	791,571
Government Contributions	42,170	-	(42,170)
Other Earned Income	12,499,037	11,489,000	(1,010,037)
Other Unearned Income	-	-	-
Interest & Dividend Income	1,546,240	1,710,000	163,760
Total Income	70,889,397	73,597,000	2,707,603
Expenditures			
Personnel			
Salary CEO/Executive Director	492,813	498,750	(5,938)
Staff Salary (total)	30,808,112	33,732,250	(2,924,139)
Payroll Taxes	2,435,701	2,682,000	(246,299)
Insurance - Workers' Comp	93,704	96,000	(2,296)
Insurance - Health	3,197,087	3,552,000	(354,913)
Payroll Services	434,060	449,000	(14,940)
Retirement	1,260,928	1,452,000	(191,072)
Total Personnel	38,722,404	42,462,000	(3,739,596)
General Program/Administrative			
Travel & Meetings	328,629	1,808,000	(1,479,371)
Consultants	16,720,706	17,919,000	(1,198,294)
Insurance Expense	296,424	567,000	(270,576)
Rent and Utilities	3,913,538	4,015,000	(101,462)
Equipment	881,436	921,000	(39,564)
Printing, Postage and Supplies	1,523,858	1,349,000	174,858
Interest Expense	467,207	878,000	(410,793)
Transaction Expenses (closing costs, permits, property taxes etc)	845,184	885,000	(39,816)
Grants to Partners	2,752,000	1,923,000	829,000
Miscellaneous	886,410	861,000	25,410
Total General Program/Administrative	28,615,392	31,126,000	(2,510,608)
Total Expenditures	67,337,796	73,588,000	(6,250,204)
Revenue Less Expense	3,551,601	9,000	(3,542,601)

Part IX Statement of Functional Expenses

Section 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) organizations must complete all columns. All other organizations must complete column (A).

Check if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part IX

Do not include amounts reported on lines 6b, 7b, 8b, 9b, and 10b of Part VIII.	(A) Total expenses	(B) Program service expenses	(C) Management and general expenses	(D) Fundraising expenses
1 Grants and other assistance to domestic organizations and domestic governments. See Part IV, line 21	58,256,249.	58,256,249.		
2 Grants and other assistance to domestic individuals. See Part IV, line 22				
3 Grants and other assistance to foreign organizations, foreign governments, and foreign individuals. See Part IV, lines 15 and 16				
4 Benefits paid to or for members				
5 Compensation of current officers, directors, trustees, and key employees	2,587,628.	1,248,961.	812,835.	525,832.
6 Compensation not included above to disqualified persons (as defined under section 4958(f)(1)) and persons described in section 4958(c)(3)(B)				
7 Other salaries and wages	27,223,454.	14,315,639.	6,120,227.	6,787,588.
8 Pension plan accruals and contributions (include section 401(k) and 403(b) employer contributions)	980,970.	514,290.	221,352.	245,328.
9 Other employee benefits	3,515,532.	1,842,431.	797,340.	875,761.
10 Payroll taxes	2,273,698.	1,187,716.	526,994.	558,988.
11 Fees for services (nonemployees):				
a Management				
b Legal	71,014.	47,874.	23,140.	
c Accounting	207,665.		207,665.	
d Lobbying	132,000.	132,000.		
e Professional fundraising services. See Part IV, line 17	960,014.			960,014.
f Investment management fees	379,020.		379,020.	
g Other. (If line 11g amount exceeds 10% of line 25, column (A) amount, list line 11g expenses on Sch O.)	3,425,022.	1,790,212.	1,235,322.	399,488.
12 Advertising and promotion	715,209.	13,155.	666,218.	35,836.
13 Office expenses	2,071,849.	1,018,697.	573,143.	480,009.
14 Information technology	665,001.	207,355.	414,000.	43,646.
15 Royalties				
16 Occupancy	4,120,787.	2,281,089.	896,736.	942,962.
17 Travel	1,086,132.	610,510.	133,555.	342,067.
18 Payments of travel or entertainment expenses for any federal, state, or local public officials				
19 Conferences, conventions, and meetings	221,092.	127,343.	14,910.	78,839.
20 Interest	1,182,900.	1,182,900.		
21 Payments to affiliates				
22 Depreciation, depletion, and amortization	220,394.	34,349.	169,879.	16,166.
23 Insurance	770,377.	402,423.	178,557.	189,397.
24 Other expenses. Itemize expenses not covered above (List miscellaneous expenses on line 24e. If line 24e amount exceeds 10% of line 25, column (A) amount, list line 24e expenses on Schedule O.)				
a DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION	36,301,157.	36,301,157.		
b APPRAISAL SERVICES	808,272.	808,272.		
c LAND SURVEYS	741,869.	741,869.		
d ENV ASSMNT & CLEANUP	664,780.	664,780.		
e All other expenses	1,361,212.	525,707.	835,505.	
25 Total functional expenses. Add lines 1 through 24e	150,943,297.	124,254,978.	14,206,398.	12,481,921.
26 Joint costs. Complete this line only if the organization reported in column (B) joint costs from a combined educational campaign and fundraising solicitation.				

Check here if following SOP 98-2 (ASC 958-720)

INLAND EMPIRE COMMUNITY FOUNDATION
S. L. GIMBEL FOUNDATION FUND

Please complete the form and type your answers directly underneath the questions. Leave one space between numbered questions.

ORGANIZATION INFORMATION

1. Name of your Organization

The Trust for Public Land

2. Grant #

3. Grant Amount:

\$251,000

4. Date Awarded (date on award letter)

September 18, 2018

5. Grant Period (Indicate start date and end date per Grant Agreement)

09/18/2018 – 08/31/2019

6. Location of your Organization (City, State)

Los Angeles, CA

7. Name and Title of person completing evaluation

Dede Devlin, Institutional Giving Director

8. Phone Number

323-304-8345

9. Email Address

dede.devlin@tpl.org

KEY OUTCOMES AND RESULTS

10. Total number of clients served through this grant funding:

A) Per original grant application, what is the estimate number served:

Over 14,000 people.

B) Actual number served:

More than 14,000 people, including 3,000 children.

11. Describe the project's key outcomes and results based on the goals and objectives. (Include the program accomplishments as a result of the Gimbel grant AND for the entire program. Please make the distinction between the Gimbel funded program accomplishments and the total organizational program, as a whole).

Goal:

The Trust for Public Land will build a beautiful, culturally relevant park for the residents of East Hollywood, a park-poor disadvantaged neighborhood in the City of Los Angeles. The park will incorporate the following amenities requested by residents: an entry plaza, a basketball tree, a Fitness Zone, a playground, a tricycle path, and picnic tables. The playground will include different sections for children aged 2-5 and 5-12, and features a farm theme to complement the community garden. Twenty native and drought-resistant trees and 400 shrubs will be planted to create a lush, tranquil space.

Activities:

Supervise construction of Madison Avenue Park, which will begin in June 2018 and will be completed by March 2019, and host a ribbon cutting ceremony for the community when the park is opened. Activities included community engagement, park design and construction management, the purchase and construction of play equipment, creation of community designed artwork, and the planting of trees and shrubs throughout the site.

Objective: In terms of specific quantifiable criteria:

A) Per original grant application:

The Trust for Public Land will build a beautiful, culturally relevant park for the residents of East Hollywood. The park will incorporate the following amenities requested by residents: an entry plaza, a basketball tree, a Fitness Zone, a playground, a tricycle path, and picnic tables. The playground will include different sections for children aged 2-5 and 5-12, and features a farm theme to complement the community garden. Twenty native and drought-resistant trees and 400 shrubs will be planted to create a lush, tranquil space.

B) Actual grant outcome, results, accomplishments:

With the completion of Madison Avenue Park, more than 14,000 people, including 3,000 children, can now access a modern oasis for recreation and socializing within a 10-minute walk from home. The opening celebration's whopping turnout of more than 200 people attests to the local fervor for the park. The park includes the following amenities, which were requested by residents: an entry plaza, a basketball tree, a Fitness Zone, a playground, a tricycle path, and picnic tables. The playground includes different sections for children aged 2-5 and 5-12, and features a farm theme to complement the community garden. The planting of twenty native and drought-resistant trees and 400 shrubs create a lush, tranquil space. Madison Avenue Park's benefits will ripple through the neighborhood as residents strike up friendships, get active and fit, relax and recharge, and connect with nature. On a broader level, the cutting-edge park will help transform Los Angeles into a greener, more climate-resilient city.

12. Describe any challenges/obstacles the organization encountered (if any) in attaining goals and objectives.

A key challenge on this project included building two projects on one site. The property is designed as one parcel. However, after the property was acquired by the City of Los Angeles, The Trust for Public Land collaborated with the LA Community Garden Council to develop a community garden on the rear half of the site. The Trust for Public Land was responsible for developing the public park on the street side of the site. Aside from sharing one lot, these developments were independent in design and construction. The initial stages of construction proved challenging as neither general contractor wanted to have the other's crew walking through their site. It brought up discussions of liability and so forth. Ultimately, the park project needed to wait several weeks to begin which allowed construction of the community garden to get to a point where community garden contractors would no longer need access to the park side of the property.

13. How did you overcome and/or address the challenges and obstacles?

Overcoming the challenge of multiple construction projects on one site required significant discussion and coordination. Ultimately, delaying the start of the park construction was the most straightforward way to avoid any issues on-site. Ultimately, the projects were both completed in a timely fashion, and we enjoyed a jointly held ribbon cutting celebration.

14. Describe any unintended positive outcomes as a result of the efforts supported by this grant.

Funding through the Gimbel Foundation allowed The Trust for Public Land to ensure that the massive shade structure at the park was implemented as originally intended. We knew that by providing a large amount of shade at the park, people would be able to make greater use of the space, even in the hottest months of the year. What we did not know was that the City of Los Angeles would view this shade structure as exemplary for park projects moving forward. They value immediate shade for residents, which this structure provides. While trees may be generally preferable, if there is the budget, as was provided by Gimbel's support, shade structures can provide instant shade on a massively impactful scale.

15. Briefly describe the impact this grant has had on the organization and community served.

By all measures, Madison Avenue Park is a resounding success. The Trust for Public Land's primary measure for the success of its projects is how they increase park access for underserved communities, based on the population living within a 10-minute walk (about half a mile) of them. We use the 10-minute walk as a benchmark because it is a manageable distance for children and seniors.

This project serves a diverse and disadvantaged community who, until now, had zero acres of park space within a half-mile. About 50 percent of residents here are immigrants and 90 percent are renters. Its many children have languished in crowded apartment buildings, isolated and sedentary. This project has created access to a great park for more than 14,000 people, including more than 3,000 children, who live within a 10-minute walk of the site. Fully half of this population qualifies as low-income (earning less than \$35,000 annually).

In addition, The Trust for Public Land measures how its projects address multiple urban challenges. Madison Avenue Park's many benefits are summarized below.

Health Benefits: Amenities like the tractor and grain silo climbers, sandbox, gym equipment, walking loop, and basketball tree support healthy active and passive recreation. Sycamores, elms, black elderberry and other native flora create a shady and idyllic landscape where people can escape the heat, breathe easier, and refresh their minds and spirits.

Community Benefits: By replacing a derelict empty lot with a safe haven for recreation, the park has improved safety and prosperity. Picnic tables, grassy patches, and similar features have brought families and neighbors together by giving them pleasant spots to spend time together.

The park’s vivid mural and mosaics, created with help from local children and youth, continues to generate neighborhood pride. Our inclusive approach to park development has also strengthened community bonds. We convened hundreds of neighbors from all ages and backgrounds to design the park and create its art. Residents got to know one another and worked together to achieve a mutual goal. This solidarity will continue at park cleanups and other events led by a group of local volunteers.

Environmental Benefits: The native trees, shrubs, and grasses provide critical habitat for wildlife and introductions to nature for city kids. These plantings, along with green infrastructure, improve water quality and resilience to drought by cleaning and infiltrating stormwater that would otherwise contribute to contaminated runoff. The art in the park promotes environmental appreciation by celebrating the natural world and nature’s bounty in images and sculptures.

On a practical level, we measure success based on the completion of project activities within its stated timeline. Madison Avenue Park successful by these standards as well, because it was constructed on schedule and within budget.

BUDGET

16. Please provide a budget expenditure report. Also, provide a budget narrative that explains how the funds were utilized, what was purchased, what were the expenses items based upon the original budget submitted and approved. Use the form below and expand as needed:

Line Item	Line item description	Approved amount from TCF (per the submitted budget)	Actual Expenditure
Prof Svc – Other Prof	Other professional services	14,000	17,507
Rubberized Surfacing	Rubberized surfacing installed for safety in playground	17,000	17,000
Trees & Shrubs	Tree and shrubs to be planted in park and in parkway in front of park	61,000	60,234
Play Equipment – grain silo	Grain silo slide feature	60,000	57,942
Concrete pavers	Pavers for the plaza area of park	10,000	13,200
Tree grates	Grates for tree wells to protect trees’ roots	14,000	14,252
Play Equipment – crates	Seating and climbing crates in playground	15,000	19,718
Mosaic supplies for artwork	Supplies for mosaics art pieces in park	15,000	15,000

Sidewalk repairs	Repairs to sidewalk in front of park	15,000	6,148
Stewardship activities	To support park stewardship group	30,000	29,999
TOTAL EXPENSES		251,000	251,000

Budget Narrative:

Professional Services – Other: This includes expenses associated with a labor compliance consultant, who ensured and monitored that all workers on the site were paid the prevailing wage. (This was a condition of our state grant.) It also includes the expenses associated with deputy inspection services (stress testing concrete, etc.) that were required to ensure that the park is constructed according to code.

Rubberized Surfacing: Rubberized surfacing installed for safety in playground

Trees & Shrubs: Tree and shrubs were planted in park and in parkway in front of park

Play Equipment – grain silo: This line item represents the grain silo slide play feature.

Concrete pavers: The pavers line the walkway in the plaza area of the park.

Tree grates: The grates protect the trees’ roots and help ensure their survival.

Play Equipment – crates: The crates provide a climbing feature and a place to sit in the playground.

Mosaic supplies for artwork: Art is a key element of the park design.

Sidewalk repairs: The sidewalk in front of the park was cracked and crumbling and in need of repair to make the park entrance more inviting and safe. The City of Los Angeles required the project to upgrade the sidewalk as part of the development.

Stewardship activities: The Trust for Public Land supports the Madison Avenue stewardship group with community events to ensure the park’s success and community involvement.

SUCCESS STORIES

17. Please tell us ONE success story.

While shopping for a home three years ago, Ivan Gonzales and his wife, Lucera, found good prospect in East Hollywood. They loved the house but were apprehensive about weedy lot next door. Having grown up in a tough part of Los Angeles, ridden with vacant lots, Ivan knew these spaces could be magnets for crime. When they learned that the lot was slated for a park, it

convinced them to buy the house. “We thought the park was the start of a good community,” he said. As Ivan hoped, the park has helped his family assimilate into the neighborhood. Prior to construction, they participated in community workshops hosted by The Trust for Public Land to design the park. In the process, they got to know their neighbors and felt a stronger sense of community. Local children were also invited to help create tiles for the planter mosaic. His six-year-old son, Danny, joined in, painting a bright orange carrot. “He has left his imprint on the park,” Ivan says with pride. Since the park opened this summer, they have deepened their friendships with neighbors while playing and exercising there. As an employee of a transit agency, Ivan appreciates the health benefits of active living and of having a park next door. “We thought it was a great way to reduce screen time for our son,” he said. His son visits the park almost daily, where his favorite activities are riding the tractor and shooting hoops on the basketball tree. The boy has taken to calling the place, “Danny’s Park.” But, his father said, “He’s fine sharing it with other kids.” Meanwhile, Lucera is looking forward to growing vegetables in the garden for healthy meals. Their family was lucky to get one of its plots. “We felt like we won the lottery,” Ivan said.



Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

P.O. Box 2508
Cincinnati OH 45201

In reply refer to: 0248167147
Nov. 07, 2013 LTR 4168C 0
23-7222333 000000 00
00018924
BODC: TE

TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND
101 MONTGOMERY ST STE 900
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104



020668

Employer Identification Number: 23-7222333
Person to Contact: Ms Wittwer
Toll Free Telephone Number: 1-877-829-5500

Dear Taxpayer:

This is in response to your Oct. 29, 2013, request for information regarding your tax-exempt status.

Our records indicate that you were recognized as exempt under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code in a determination letter issued in February 1978.

Our records also indicate that you are not a private foundation within the meaning of section 509(a) of the Code because you are described in section(s) 509(a)(1) and 170(b)(1)(A)(vi).

Donors may deduct contributions to you as provided in section 170 of the Code. Bequests, legacies, devises, transfers, or gifts to you or for your use are deductible for Federal estate and gift tax purposes if they meet the applicable provisions of sections 2055, 2106, and 2522 of the Code.

Please refer to our website www.irs.gov/eo for information regarding filing requirements. Specifically, section 6033(j) of the Code provides that failure to file an annual information return for three consecutive years results in revocation of tax-exempt status as of the filing due date of the third return for organizations required to file. We will publish a list of organizations whose tax-exempt status was revoked under section 6033(j) of the Code on our website beginning in early 2011.

0248167147
Nov. 07, 2013 LTR 4168C 0
23-7222333 000000 00
00018925

TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND
101 MONTGOMERY ST STE 900
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104

If you have any questions, please call us at the telephone number shown in the heading of this letter.

Sincerely yours,

Richard McKee

Richard McKee, Department Manager
Accounts Management Operations