

USFS – Plumas National Forest

Comments submitted by the Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation (OHMVR) 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 OHMVR Division to any specific applicant does not ensure successful results for the applicant within the competitive grant process or a commitment of funding.

All final applications will be reviewed by the OHMVR Division. The OHMVR Division may, at its sole discretion, decrease the requested amount and eliminate activities pursuant with regulation Section 4970.07.2 (f)(1-5) and for law enforcement projects, regulation Section 4970.15.3(b)(1-5).

Failure by applicant to respond to any OHMVR Division comment of their preliminary application shall be cause for eliminating that item from the applicant's application.

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

- #2 – Applicant to verify response.
- #4 – Applicant to verify response.
- #5 – Applicant to verify response.
- #9 – Applicant to verify response.
- #11b – Cite a reference document.

Project Description

- Any activities that are eligible under the OHMVR OSV Program are not eligible under the Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program. Please verify these costs and adjust accordingly. Identify the summer OHV trails to be maintained.

Project Cost Estimate

- Staff – District Ranger – This is an Indirect Cost.
- Staff – District PSS – Identify how this position relates to the project.
- Staff – Misc Staff – Separate all positions and identify the rate and quantity for each. In addition, the receptionist is an Indirect Cost.
- Staff – GS-5 (10) – Days appear excessive. Identify how these positions directly relate to the project.
- Staff – GS-4 (3) – Identify how these positions directly relate to the project.
- Staff – WG-8 – Identify how these positions relate to the project.
- Contracts – Other Toilet pumping – No mentioned in the Project Description, provide additional information.
- Contracts – Sweco – Provide further details on this contract and how it relates to the project, e.g. work on specific summer OHV trails, etc.
- Materials/Supplies – Trimble Feather River RD – Provide further details on this item and how it relates to the project. Cost appears excessive and need appears not to be justified considering that there are 12 Trimble devices in inventory already. This item should be moved to the Equipment Purchase section.
- Materials/Supplies – Motorcycle “Mtcn” – Provide further details on this item and how it relates to the project. If this is maintenance, the item should be moved to the Equipment Use Expense section.
- Materials/Supplies – Snowmobile O&M – This item should be moved to the Equipment Use Expense section.
- Materials/Supplies – Snowmobile Fuel – This item should be moved to the Equipment Use Expense section.
- Equipment Use Expense – Identify each vehicle for Beckwourth, Mt. Hough and FRRD.
- Equipment Purchases – Other storage container – Purchase of a large container to also store a boat is not a valid project cost.
- Equipment Purchases – Other pressure washer – Not mentioned in the Project Description. Provide justification.
- Other – “Match needs fixed” – Identify what this item is, provide a breakdown, and explain how it directly relates to the project.

Evaluation Criteria

- #4 – Identify the public and stakeholder meetings and identify the interested parties and stakeholders.
- #6 – “Providing bridges instead of wet crossings where appropriate” and “Re-routing trails to divert ...” are not related to this project.
- #8 – The narrative does not support a “Yes” response.

Ground Operations – Granite Basin/Mt. Hough	G11-02-13-G02
Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment. 	
Project Cost Estimate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff – GS-11– Identify how this position and quantity of hours directly relates to the project. • Staff – Volunteers – Identify how these volunteers relate to the project. • Contracts – Other Contractor – 579 work days and total cost appears excessive for 52.9 miles of trail work, considering 51% match by volunteers. Provide additional detail about the specifics of the contract and how the amount was determined. • Materials/Supplies – Other Tool Match Contractor – Cost appears excessive. Provide further details on this item and how it directly relates to the project. • Materials/Supplies – Tool Match Volunteer – Provide further details on this item and how it directly relates to the project. • Equipment Use Expense – Tool Match Volunteer – Provide further details on this item and how it directly relates to the project. • Equipment Use Expense – Travel Match Volunteer – Provide further details on this item and how it directly relates to the project. • Equipment Use Expense – Other-Govt Mileage – Identify the vehicles to be used. 	
Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #2b – Narrative appears to indicate that trails would be rerouted which conflicts with Project Description section D(2)(a) response. Provide clarification. • #4 – Identify the dates of the meetings and conference calls and need to identify the interested parties and stakeholders. • #5 – Identify how each partner will participate in the project. • #6 – “Providing bridges instead of wet crossings where appropriate” and “Re-routing trails to divert ...” are not related to this project. • #7 – Trail maps are not identified in the project. • #8 – The narrative does not support a “Yes” response. 	

Development – OHV Campground Improvements	G11-02-13-D01
Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm that all proposed SST replacements are directly accessible to OHV users. • Confirm that Silver Lake, Rock Creek, and Rogers Cow campgrounds are directly accessible with OHV's, e.g. that OHV green sticker vehicles are allowed on all the roads. 	
Project Cost Estimate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff – Provide detail of activities for each staff position. • Staff – “Road Crew” is listed twice at two different rates, provide more detail. • Contracts – Other Environmental analysis – Provide clarification that a new NEPA is needed or if the document done three years ago would suffice. • Contracts – Other Topographic site surveys – Provide information as to why there are two surveys required for Rogers Cow Camp. 	
Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #2c – Provide a reference document with a date. • #3 – Narrative does not support the items checked. Installation of SSTs would not provide for diversified OHV use. It appears the area already provides for OHV use for those items checked. • #6 – Narrative does not support the response. • #7 – Project description does not support the response. • #9 – Provide date(s) for “Meeting(s) with stakeholders”. More than one stakeholder must be provided. • #10 – The partner activities do not appear to be directly related to the project. Additionally, volunteers and individuals do not qualify as a partner organization. • #13 – Provide a reference document with a date. 	

Development – Granite Basin/Mt. Hough New Trails	G11-02-13-D02
Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A – Clarify the type of the proposed 30.1 miles of new motorcycle trails, e.g. single track, ATV width, etc. 	
Project Cost Estimate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff – GS-11– Identify how this position and quantity of hours directly relates to the project. • Contracts – Other Contractor – 864 work days and total cost appears excessive for 30.1 miles of new motorcycle trails, considering 51% match by volunteers. Provide additional detail about the specifics of the contract and how the amount was determined. • Materials / Supplies – Other Tools Contractor – Cost appears excessive. Provide further details on this item and how it directly relates to the project. • Materials / Supplies – “Volunteer hand tools” appears high – Provide further details on this item and how it directly relates to the project. • Equipment Use Expenses – Provide details of “Travel Contractor”. Provide further details on this item and how it directly relates to the project. • Equipment Use Expenses – Provide more detail for “Volunteer Travel”. • Equipment Use Expenses – Provide more detail for “FS mileage”. 	
Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #2b – Provide a date of the reference document. • #2c – The project description, as provided, does not support selected response. Also, provide a date of the reference document. • #3 – Project description does not support UTV. Confirm that UTV’s will be able to use the new trails. Provide information on how snowmobiles will be able to see and follow single track trails covered by snow. • #4 – Selection appears to be incorrect as the EA is not completed, thus no publicly reviewed and adopted plan is in place. • #5 – Narrative does not support the response. • #6 – Most items identified in the narrative do not appear to be part of the project. Narrative must address only those items for this project. • #9 – Provide specific dates for “Conference call(s) with interested parties” and “Meeting(s) with stakeholders” selections, identify stakeholders. • #10 – Identify how the partner organizations will participate in the project. • #13 – Provide a date of the reference document. 	

Planning – Dispersed Camping	G11-02-13-P01
Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A – Provide additional information such as the number of campsites to be analyzed, how many in each District, whether or not the campsite access routes be added to the MVUM after analysis, etc. 	
Project Cost Estimate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is not enough information provided in project description relative to the number and size of campsites to determine appropriate Staff costs. • Staff – Provide more detail for “Engineer GS-9”. • Staff – “PSS Staff GS-11” appears to be an Indirect Cost. Identify how this position and quantity of hours directly relates to the project. • Staff – “District Rangers” is an Indirect Cost. 	
Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #2 – Narrative does not support the checked item: “Potential effects of OHV Recreation on adjacent lands”. • #4 – Provide date(s) for the checked items. • #7 – Narrative does not support checked item: “Project supports development of OHV Opportunities in areas that lack legal OHV Opportunity”. • #8 – Narrative and reference document do not support the response. • #10 – Narrative does not support the response. 	

Planning – Janesville/Chilcoot	G11-02-13-P02
Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A – Provide additional information as to whether or not the staging area and access routes will be added to the MVUM. 	
Project Cost Estimate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff – Provide more detail for “Engineering”. • Staff – “GS-11 PSS Officer” appears to be an Indirect Cost – Identify how this position and quantity of hours directly relates to the project. • Staff – Provide more detail for “GS-9 Resource assistant, “Resource Specialist SO”, and “GS-5 OHV Tech”. • Materials / Supplies – Provide more detail for “Misc Supplies to support Program”. • Equipment Use Expenses – Provide more detail for “Field Vehicle”. 	
Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #2 – Clarify narrative in response to checked item: “Potential effects of OHV Recreation on soil conditions”. • #4 – Only one stakeholder is identified. • #6 – Explain how partner organization will be utilized in the project. • #7 – Narrative does not support the checked items: “Project supports development of OHV Opportunities in areas that lack legal OHV Opportunity” and “Project will develop system of designated OHV routes for and existing...”. • #8 – Narrative and reference document do not support the response. • #10 – Narrative does not support the response. 	

Planning – Beckwourth Summer/Winter Recreation Area	G11-02-13-P03
Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any activities that are eligible under the OHMVR OSV Program are not eligible under the Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program. Please verify these costs and adjust accordingly. • A – Funding for non-motorized project activities is not an appropriate activity for the OHV Grants Program. 	
Project Cost Estimate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff – Provide more detail for “Engineer”, “GS-09 Resource assistant”, and “Resource Specialist”. • Staff – “GS-11 PSS Staff Officer” appears to be an Indirect Cost – Identify how this position and quantity of hours directly relates to the project. • Staff – Wildlife Specialist – 80 days of time to look at three proposed staging areas appears excessive. Provide more detail. • Materials / Supplies – Provide more detail for “Misc Supplies to support Program”. • Equipment Use Expenses – Provide more detail for “Field Vehicle”. 	
Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #2 – Narrative appears to conflict with project description which does not support the checked items: “Potential effects of OHV Recreation on soil conditions”, “Potential effects of OHV Recreation on water quality”, “Potential effects of OHV Recreation on other recreation uses”, “Potential impact to relationships...”, and “Trail issues such as traffic...”. • #4 – Narrative does not support “Conference calls”. Also, identify stakeholders and meeting date(s). • #6 – Activities identified to not appear related to the project. • #7 – Project description and narrative does not support the checked items. • #8 – Narrative and reference document do not the support response. • #9 – Narrative does not support the response. • #10 – Narrative does not support the response. 	