

BLM – Barstow Field Office

Comments submitted by the OHV Division to individual grant applicants should in no way be construed as a guarantee of successful results for the applicant within the competitive grants process or a commitment of funding. Additionally, the lack of comments by the OHV Division to any specific applicant does not ensure successful results for the applicant within the competitive grant process or a commitment of funding.

Please note: If multiple proposed projects are requesting funding for the same deliverable, and multiple projects are successful, only one project will receive funding for the deliverable.

General Evaluation Criteria

- #1c – The data for the “OHV Visitation (visitor days)” should be that from the BLM’s Recreation Management Information System (RMIS)
- #2 – Applicant may want to consider checking the item where “At least 50% of the staging areas include support facilities...”.
- #4 – The Division has processed payment requests for prior years’ cooperative agreements funded during period the 10/1/2007 – 9/30/2008.
- #12a – Applicant may want to expand response to indicate/explain the systematic methodology for evaluating soil conditions.

El Mirage OHV Ground Operations

G08-01-XX-G01

Project Description

- A – Law Enforcement activities are not applicable for a Ground Operations Project type.

Project Cost Estimate

- Staff – Not clear if “Recreation Planner” will work 100% this project.
- Staff – “Volunteer Coordinator” mentioned in project description as part of project, but not identified in cost estimate. Various “Volunteer” staff identified - applicant may want to provide further detail for clarification of how volunteers will be utilized in this project.
- Materials / Supplies – Cost for “Toilet paper, case” appears excessive.
- Equipment Use Expenses – “Pickup truck” “Qty” appears excessive.
- Equipment Use Expenses – Including a “Note” providing the type of expense would be helpful (e.g., routine maintenance or rental) to clarify how these items are utilized as part of this project. “Rate” amount appears the same for different equipment.
- Unit of Measure (UOM) missing from several line items.

Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #2 – Consider “Loss of OHV Opportunity”. • #6 – Explanation appears cut-off/incomplete and does not respond to all items checked (e.g., “re-routing trails..”, “Providing sanitary facilities”, and “Protecting cultural sites”). • #7 – “...trail maps...” and “Construction materials in visitor center” do not appear to be part of this project. • #8 – Response/explanation should be in response to this project. 	

Dumont Dunes OHV Ground Operations	G08-01-XX-G02
------------------------------------	---------------

Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A – Law enforcement activities are not applicable for a Ground Operations Project type 	

Project Cost Estimate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff – “Park Ranger” and “Ranger” are identified, however, if these staff are performing enforcement activities, this would not be applicable for this project. Applicant may want to provide details of the activities this staff will perform for this project. Staff – “Maintenance Worker” and Volunteer Maintenance Worker” are indicated at two different rates. Applicant may want to clarify the difference. • Equipment Use Expenses – Including a “Note” providing the type of expense would be helpful (e.g., routine maintenance or rental) to clarify how these items are utilized as part of this project. • Unit of Measure (UOM) missing from several line items. 	

Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #2 – Consider “Loss of OHV Opportunity”. • #3 – Portions of the explanation provided does not appear to address the items checked and how they will sustain OHV Opportunity relevant to this project. • #6 – “Re-routing trails...” does not appear to be a part of this project. • #7 – “...trail maps...” and “Recycled asphalt” do not appear to be part of this project. • #8 – Response/explanation should be in response to this project. 	

Law Enforcement Barstow	G08-01-XX-L01
Needs Assessment	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Item 3 – Applicant does not appear to provide details regarding the frequency of patrols. 	
Law Enforcement Certification	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments 	
Project Cost Estimate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff – Applicant may want to describe how "Resources Staff", "Recreation Staff", "Management Staff", and "Administrative Staff" will be utilized in the project. Equipment Use Expense – "Vehicle Replacement" appears to be an "Equipment Purchase". Applicant may want to provide more detail regarding this item. Equipment Purchase – Applicant may want to provide more detail regarding how the items listed in this category will be utilized in this project. 	

El Mirage Twin Hills Planning	G08-01-XX-P01
Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments 	
Project Cost Estimate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff – Not clear how "Volunteer" will be utilized in this project. 	
Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments 	

Dumont Protective Barrier Restoration	G08-01-XX-R01
Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments 	

Project Cost Estimate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff – Not clear how “Laborer, volunteer”, “Education Volunteer”, and “Law Enforcement Ranger” will be utilized in this project. • Staff – “archeologist” mentioned in Project Description, but not listed in Project Cost Estimate. • Contracts – Not clear how “Restoration Crew” will be utilized in this project. • Materials / Supplies – “Fencing Cable”, verify “21” is the appropriate “Qty”. • Equipment Use Expenses – Applicant may want to clarify “Implement bit replacement” being listed twice with two different rates. • Equipment Purchases – Not clear how “Bobcat type skid w/attach” will be utilized in this project. • Administrative Costs – Unit of Measure (UOM) missing from line item.
Evaluation Criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #4 – Applicant indicates the project is to construct protective vehicle barriers and does not mention on the ground restoration activities, however checked “Use of native plants and materials” and “Identification of alternate OHV routes to ensure that OHV activities will not reoccur in restored area”. Also, explanation indicates “This project includes new kiosk...”, however this is not mentioned in the Project Description. • #6 – The applicant’s response does not address future operational costs.

Rattlesnake Protective Barrier Restoration	G08-01-XX-R02
Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G – Applicant may want to delete first paragraph. 	
Project Cost Estimate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contracts – Not clear how “Restoration Crew” will be utilized in this project. • Unit of Measure (UOM) missing from several line items. 	
Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #3 – The applicant’s responses is not supported in the Project Description • #4 – Explanation does not appear to support “Site monitoring to prevent additional damage”. Applicant indicates the project is to construct protective vehicle barriers and does not mention on the ground restoration activities, however checked “Use of native plants and materials”. Also, explanation indicates “This project includes new site info panels...”, however this is not mentioned in the Project Description. 	

Afton Canyon Restoration	G08-01-XX-R03
Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • F – Since this project does not involve scientific and cultural studies, a response is not required. 	
Project Cost Estimate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contracts – Not clear how “Restoration Crew” will be utilized in this project. • Materials / Supplies – Applicant may want to clarify “Misc”. • Equipment Use Expenses – Unit of Measure (UOM) missing from line item. 	
Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #2 – The items checked require the entry of a number. Explanation provided does not appear to support the items checked. • #4 – “Identification of alternate OHV routes to ensure that OHV activities will not reoccur in restored area” does not appear to be supported in the explanation provided. • #6 – The reference document does not appear appropriate. • #7 – Explanation does not appear to support the item checked. • #9 – Since this project does not appear to include scientific and cultural studies, a response to this item would not be appropriate. • #10 – Explanation does not appear to support response. 	

Juniper Flats Restoration	G08-01-XX-R04
Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant may want to provide additional details regarding the restoration activities. • B – The response does not appear to address the item. • C – The response does not appear to address the size of the project site. • E – Since this project does not involve planning for Restoration a response is not required. • F – Since this project does not involve scientific and cultural studies a response is not required. 	
Project Cost Estimate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff – Not clear how “Volunteer Patrol” will be utilized in this project. • Contracts – Not clear how “Restoration Crew” will be utilized in this project. • Materials / Supplies – Not clear how “Barrier Materials” will be utilized in this project. • Unit of Measure (UOM) missing from several line items. 	

Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #2 – Applicant may want to identify the “Archeological and historical resources” in the explanation. • #4 – Explanations does not appear to support the item checked. 	

Barstow OHV Education & Safety	G08-01-XX-S01
--------------------------------	---------------

Project Description	
---------------------	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments 	
---	--

Project Cost Estimate	
-----------------------	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff – “Park Ranger” and “Ranger” are identified, however, if these staff are performing enforcement activities, this would not be applicable for this project. Applicant may want to provide details of the activities this staff will perform for this project. • Staff – Not clear how “Volunteer Planning Committee” will be utilized in this project. • Staff – “ATV Safety Instructor” not clear if this is applicant’s staff - appears to be to for training. If so, this item should be listed under the “Other” category. Additionally, costs for this item appear to be excessive. • Materials / Supplies – Project Description indicates “update 6 existing kiosks”, however, a “Qty” of 15 “Kiosk Panels” are listed. • Equipment Uses Expenses – Not clear how “Heavy Equipment” will be utilized in this project. • Equipment Uses Expenses – “Vehicle Operations and Maintenance” is listed twice, but with different rates and units of measure. Further details would help to clarify these differences. • Unit of Measure (UOM) missing from several line items. 	
---	--

Evaluation Criteria	
---------------------	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #5 – “Land Sailor” does not appear to be a type of OHV Recreation. • Applicant responded to “Safety” criteria, but project appears to be an “Education” project and should respond to the “Education” criteria. 	
--	--

El Mirage Lake Road Development	G08-01-XX-D01
---------------------------------	---------------

Project Description	
---------------------	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A – Contains cut-off/incomplete sentence. • B – Contains cut-off/incomplete sentences. • C – The response does not provide the size of this project. • E – Second paragraph appear to fit more appropriately under item A. 	
---	--

Project Cost Estimate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff - Unit of Measure (UOM) missing from one line item.
Evaluation Criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #5 – Applicant may want to identify the recycled material(s) in explanation. • #6 – Explanation provided does not address this project. • #11 – Previous year’s documents not appropriate for future operational costs. • #13 – The project does not indicate "sanitary facilities" will be developed.

Barstow OHV Ground Operations	G08-01-XX-G03
Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A – The response appears to be a duplicate of the proposed “El Mirage OHV Ground Operations” project. • B – The response appears to be a duplicate of proposed “El Mirage OHV Ground Operations” project. • C – The response appears to be a duplicate of proposed “El Mirage OHV Ground Operations” project. 	
Project Cost Estimate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff – “Park Ranger” and “Ranger” are identified, however, if these staff are performing enforcement activities, this would not be applicable for this project. Applicant may want to provide details of the activities this staff will perform for this project. 	
Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #7 – The project does not indicate that “Barrier materials...” or “...trail maps...” will be utilized in this project. 	