

## USFS Stanislaus

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.
- #8b – Narrative does not support “5 to 19 times per year”. Only onsite education efforts are eligible for credit.
- #8d – Narrative does not support “4-17 times per year”. It is unclear if the MSF training is being conducted.
- #9 – Applicant to verify response.
- #14 – Narrative does not support “Has engaged in collaborative processes with agencies ...” and “Has established an OHV Commission or stakeholder group...”. Also, the narrative does not support “Has created a special fund to set aside funding to sustain OHV Recreation”.

Ground Operations – Stanislaus NF	G11-02-19-G01
<b>Project Description</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comment.</li> </ul>	
<b>Project Cost Estimate</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff – SCA OHV Volunteers – Need to identify how this position relates to the project.</li> <li>• Materials/Supplies – Other Gates – Need to identify how these gates relate to the project.</li> <li>• Equipment Use Expense – Trail Crew Use – Need further details on this item and how it relates to the project.</li> <li>• Equipment Purchase – Generator – Need further details on this item and how it relates to the project.</li> </ul>	

Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• #4 – Narrative does not support the response. Need to identify the dates of the meetings and conference calls.</li> <li>• #5 – Narrative does not support the response. Need to identify how each partner will participate in the project.</li> <li>• #8 – Narrative does not support a “Yes” response.</li> </ul>	

Development – Mi-Wok North District	G11-02-19-D01
-------------------------------------	---------------

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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comment.</li> </ul>
---

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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff – “District Ranger (Planning)” and “District PS PA (Planning)” appear to be Indirect Costs – provide more detail.</li> <li>• Materials / Supplies – “Signs” (e.g., fiberglass trail marker post with decals) are not related to the project.</li> <li>• Materials / Supplies – “Signs” (e.g., mid size caution sign approx.. 18X24 inch) are not related to the project.</li> <li>• Materials / Supplies – “Printing of letters/documents” and “Postage” are indirect costs.</li> <li>• Equipment Use Expenses – Clarify rate and UOM for “Mileage (Truck)”.</li> <li>• Equipment Use Expenses – For “ATV Use”, cannot claim FOR for equipment purchased with OHV Trust Funds.</li> </ul>
--

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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• #3 – “Mountain Bikes” do not qualify as OHV use.</li> <li>• #5 – Signs and posts would not qualify as 50% of the construction materials. Also, items identified as native materials ((e.g. rocks, logs) from adjacent areas do not qualify as recycled content.</li> <li>• #8 – The trails being rerouted is the “facility being improved and would not provide improvement to facilities for non-motorized recreation.”</li> <li>• #9 – Date(s) not provided for checked items. Identify interested parties and stakeholders.</li> <li>• #11 – Narrative does not adequately explain the primary funding source for future operational costs.</li> </ul>
--

Development – Groveland Reynolds	G11-02-19-D02
----------------------------------	---------------

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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comment.</li> </ul>
---

<b>Project Cost Estimate</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff – “District Ranger” and “District PS PAL” appear to be Indirect Costs – provide more detail.</li> <li>• Contracts – “Rock Boulder Barriers” and “K-Rail Barrier” were not included in the project description – provide more detail.</li> </ul>	
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• #3 – Narrative does not support the items checked. Construction of a connector trail and loading ramps would not provide for diversified OHV use. It appears the area already provides for OHV use for those items checked. Additionally, “Mountain Bikes” to not qualify for OHV use.</li> <li>• #5 – Signs and posts would not qualify as 50% of the construction materials. Also, items identified as native materials (e.g. rocks, logs) from adjacent areas do not qualify as recycled content.</li> <li>• #6 – Narrative does not support response.</li> <li>• #8 – The connector trail and loading ramp are the “facility” being improved and would not provide improvement to facilities for non-motorized recreation.</li> <li>• #9 – Date(s) not provided for checked items. Identify interested parties and stakeholders.</li> <li>• #11 – Narrative does not adequately explain the primary funding source for future operational costs.</li> </ul>	

Restoration – Mi-Wok North District OHV	G11-02-19-R01
<b>Project Description</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• F – Not applicable. This section only applies for scientific and cultural studies.</li> </ul>	
<b>Project Cost Estimate</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff – “Other-Management/Admin Staff (Planning and Implementation)” appear to be Indirect Costs. Explain role of “Other-Management/Admin Staff (Planning and Implementation)” and how it directly relates to the project.</li> <li>• Staff – “OHV/Rec Volunteers” Explain role of “OHV/Rec Volunteers” and how it directly relates to the project.</li> <li>• Staff – “Other-District Ranger” appears to be an Indirect Cost. Explain role of “Other-District Ranger” and how it directly relates to the project.</li> <li>• Other – “Other- Printing” is an Indirect Cost.</li> <li>• Other – “Other- Postage” is an Indirect Cost.</li> </ul>	

Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• #2 – Narrative does not support checked items “Sensitive areas” and “Other special-status species”. Regarding “Sensitive areas” and “Other special-status species”, species identified in narrative should correspond with the number indicated for each response.</li> <li>• #7 – Narrative does not support the response. Applicant needs to identify meeting dates, interested parties and stakeholders.</li> <li>• #10 – Narrative does not support response.</li> <li>• #11 – Project description does not identify the size of sensitive habitats to be restored by the project.</li> </ul>	

Restoration – Calaveras Big Chunk OHV	G11-02-19-R02
Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comment</li> </ul>	
Project Cost Estimate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff – “Other-Management/Admin Staff (Planning)” appears to be Indirect Costs. Explain role of “Other-Management/Admin Staff (Planning)” and how it directly relates to the project.</li> <li>• Staff – “OHV Rec Volunteers” Explain role of “OHV/Rec Volunteers” and how it directly relates to the project.</li> <li>• Staff – “Other-District Ranger” appears to be an Indirect Cost. Explain role of “Other-District Ranger” and how it directly relates to the project.</li> </ul>	
Evaluation Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• #7 – Narrative does not support the response. Applicant should identify meeting dates and stakeholders.</li> <li>• #9 – Not applicable. Project is not a scientific or cultural study.</li> <li>• #10 – Narrative does not support response.</li> <li>• #11 – Project description does not identify the size of sensitive habitats to be restored by the project.</li> </ul>	

Restoration – Summit Long Valley OHV	G11-02-19-R04
Project Description	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A – Applicant should clarify project is for restoration planning only; reference to future implementation activities is confusing.</li> </ul>	

**Project Cost Estimate**

- Staff – “Other-Management/Admin Staff (Planning)” appears to be Indirect Costs. Explain role of “Other-Management/Admin Staff (Planning)” and how it directly relates to the project.
- Staff – “Other-District Ranger” appears to be an Indirect Cost. Explain role of “Other-District Ranger” and how it directly relates to the project.

**Evaluation Criteria**

- #7 – Narrative does not support the response. Applicant needs to identify meeting dates, interested parties and stakeholders.
- #9 – Not applicable. Project is not a scientific or cultural study.
- #10 – Narrative does not support response.
- #11 – Response is not applicable. Project is restoration planning; no sensitive area will be restored

<b>Restoration – Groveland Ferretti OHV</b>	<b>G11-02-19-R05</b>
---	----------------------

**Project Description**

- A – Applicant needs to clarify “clean-up days” are specific to restoration project, otherwise may be considered Ground Operations activities and deemed ineligible. Are the clean-up days in Restoration areas?

**Project Cost Estimate**

- Staff – “Other-Management/Admin Staff (Planning)” appears to be Indirect Costs. Explain role of “Other-Management/Admin Staff (Planning)” and how it directly relates to the project.
- Staff – “Other-District Ranger” appears to be an Indirect Cost. Explain role of “Other-District Ranger” and how it directly relates to the project.
- Staff – “OHV Trail Dozer Crew” not addressed in project description. Explain role of “OHV Trail Dozer Crew” and how it directly relates to the project.
- Equipment Use Expenses – “Other-OHV Trail Dozer use” not addressed in project description. Explain role of “Other-OHV Trail Dozer use” and how it directly relates to the project.

**Evaluation Criteria**

- #2 – Narrative does not to support checked item “Other special-status species”. “Other special-status species” needs to be identified in narrative and correspond with the number indicated for response.
- #7 – Narrative does not support the response. Applicant needs to identify meeting dates, interested parties and stakeholders.
- #9 – Not applicable. Project is not a scientific or cultural study.
- #10 – Narrative does not support response.
- #11 – Applicant needs to verify size of sensitive habitats to be restored by the project.