

USFS - San Bernardino National Forest

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.

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)(1-4) and for law enforcement projects, regulation Section 4970.15.3(b)(1-5).

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

- #1a – Data period should be the most recent complete 12 month period for which accurate data may be obtained.
- #8b – The narrative does not support response with regard to the number of onsite education efforts for “formal programs, educational talks, school field trips, etc.”.
- #8d – The narrative does not support response with regard to the ‘times per year’ in which the Land Manager offers “ATV Safety Institute and/or Motorcycle Safety Foundation approved training courses are provided to the public”.

Development – Shade Structure Development on SBNF Staging Areas	G10-02-14-D02
Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment. 	
Project Cost Estimate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff – “Recreation Staff Manager” and “Deputy District Ranger-MTRD” appear to be Indirect Costs. 	
Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #2b – Need a reference document. • #2c – Need a reference document. • #3 – Items listed for checked item “Other” (“RV’s and campers”) do not qualify as OHV use. • #6 – Narrative does not support response. • #9 – Narrative does not support response with regard to “...and identify the dates of the meetings or calls. Applicant may want to clarify these date(s).” • #13 – Need reference document. 	

Ground Operations – SBNF	G10-02-14-G01
Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A – “Patrol” activity, as described, is not eligible under a Ground Operations project. This activity would be applicable under a Law Enforcement project or Restoration project. Applicant may want to verify and adjust as necessary. • A – Applicant may want to provide additional information regarding “Cranston work center” upgrades. As described, these activities appear to be appropriate under a Development project. • A – “Archaeology Field School” and “Archaeology Site Steward Program” activities, as described, are not eligible under a Ground Operations project. These activities may be appropriate under a Planning or Education and Safety project. • A – “Barrier Placement on the Front Country District” activity, as described, would not be applicable under a Ground Operations project. This activity would be appropriate under a Restoration project. 	

Project Cost Estimate

- Staff – “Other-OHV Program Manager” appears excessive. Applicant may want to provide additional information.
- Staff – “Other-Project Lead-HMP” is unclear. Applicant may want to provide additional information.
- Staff – “Other-Restoration Biologist” appears related to a Restoration project and would not be eligible under a Ground Operations project.
- Staff – “Other-Archaeologist-Site Steward Program”, “Other-Heritage Program Leader”, “Other-Archaeologist-Field School”, “Other-Heritage Program Leader-Field Scho”, “Other-Biologist/Botanist Field School”, “Other-Volunteer Site Stewards”, and “Other-Volunteer Labor for Field School” do not appear to be Ground Operations activities and would not be eligible.
- Staff – “Other-OHV Volunteers” appears excessive. Applicant may want to provide additional information.
- Staff – Cost for “Other-OHV Patrol”, as described in the Project Description, are not eligible under a Ground Operations project. This cost would be eligible under a Law Enforcement or Restoration project.
- Contracts – “Other-CSUSB Donation for Arch Field Scho” does not appear to be related to Ground Operations activities and would not be eligible.
- Contracts – “Other – Boulder Contract” appears related to a Restoration project and would not be eligible under a Ground Operations project.
- Materials / Supplies – “Fencing Supplies” for Cranston work center appears excessive and, as described in Project Description, appears to be appropriate under a Development project.
- Materials / Supplies – “Other-Light bar for patrol truck”, “Other-Tow Straps for patrol trucks”, “Other-Tow hitch for patrol truck”, “Other-GPS Unit for patrol unit”, “Other-Riding PPE” appear to be for Law Enforcement activities. These costs are not eligible under a Ground Operations project.
- Equipment Use Expenses – “Other-Heritage 4x4” appears excessive and/or unrelated to Ground Operations. Applicant may want to provide additional information.
- Equipment Use Expenses – “Other-Sports Utility-Field School” does not appear to be related to Ground Operations activities and would not be eligible.
- Equipment Purchases – Unclear how “Other-ATV's” and “Other-Utility Trailer” will be utilized in this project. Applicant must ensure purchases are for Ground Operations exclusively or prorate costs. Applicant may want to provide additional information and revise cost estimate as appropriate.
- Equipment Purchases – “Other-Side by Side” appears to be for Law Enforcement activities (“for patrol”). These costs are not eligible under a Ground Operations project.

Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #5 – Narrative should be in response only to Ground Operations activities related to this project. • #6 – Narrative does not support response with regard to “Providing bridges...”. • #7 – Response “Paper used for trail maps...” is not part of this project. • #8 – Narrative does not support response. 	

Planning – Cactus Flats Loop Trail NEPA	G10-02-14-P01
Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment. 	
Project Cost Estimate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment 	
Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #7 – Narrative does not support response with regard to “Project will develop a system of designated OHV routes...”. 	

Planning – Inventoried Roadless Area Restoration	G10-02-14-P02
Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A - D – Activities, as described, are not eligible under a Planning project. These activities would be appropriate under a Restoration project. 	
Project Cost Estimate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See comment under ‘Project Description’. 	
Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See comment under ‘Project Description’. 	

Restoration – Deep Creek and Coxey Meadow	G10-02-14-R03
Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment. 	
Project Cost Estimate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment. 	
Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #2 – Narrative does not support response with regard to “Archeological and historical resources...”. • #4 – Narrative does not support response with regard to “Site monitoring...”. • #7 – Narrative does not support response with regard to “Conference call(s)...”. Applicant may not use the OHMVR Division as public input. • #9 – This item should be blank, this item applies only to scientific and cultural studies. • #10 – Narrative does not support response. • #11 – Applicant may want to verify the response is relative to the size of sensitive habitats which will be restored for this project. 	