

2026 (G26) Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program BLM - Arcata Field Office's Factual Findings

The information provided below is the OHMVR Division's Factual Findings for this Applicant. The information provided reflects the OHMVR Division's review and determination of the Applicant's final Application.

General Evaluation Criteria:

- #1d – OHV Opportunity Ratio. Add 4 points.
- #4 – Applicant's expenditure of OHV Grant Funds in FY25 was \$202,560 which is more than 50% of the total OHV program cost. Deduct 1 point.
- #6 – Applicant has been responsive. Add 3 points.
- #11d – Narrative does not support the selection. Applicant did not provide additional information to justify the selection of 4-17 times per year. "Certification courses annually" does not properly quantify the number of training courses provided to the public. Deduct 1 point.

Ground Operations: G26-01-02-G01

Project Description – Background

- No change.

Project Description – Project Description

- No change.

Project Description – List of Project Deliverables

- No change.

Project Description – All Others

- No change.

Project Cost Estimate

- All Staff Line Items – Due to recent federal staffing reductions, it is unclear whether the staffing levels listed in the Project Cost Estimate are accurate. Applicant must confirm that all staff positions listed in this Application are currently filled.
- Staff #1,5-7 – Applicant did not adequately respond to Division comment. The percentage of staff time dedicated to Project Deliverable #1 is unclear. Applicant must clarify within the line item notes what portion of staff time will be specifically dedicated to the maintenance of OHV trails and roads. In addition, Applicant must clarify the total amount of staff time that is dedicated to monitoring or "trail condition assessment".
- Staff #7 "Park Ranger" – Applicant did not clarify how "Collecting visitor use data" is directly related to the Project. Activity is considered indirect; Applicant must move the cost and verbiage related to the activity to the Indirect Cost category. Applicant listed twelve (12) activities. Removing one (1) of the activities reduces the line

item total by 8%. Deduct \$2,048 from Grant and \$512 from match due to being at the 15% allowable for Indirect. If funded, Applicant may elect to move the activities to the Indirect Cost category, provided that sufficient previously listed Indirect costs are removed to remain within the 15% allowable limit.

- Materials / Supplies #5 “Concrete Picnic tables” – Applicant transposed the quantity and rate for this line item. Applicant must review and correct.
- Indirect Costs #1 “Administrative” – Applicant must move utility costs to their own separate line item and provide a clear explanation of how the cost was determined, as it is unclear how an hourly rate of “\$47” was established for utility expenses. In addition, it is unclear why “Paper for printing maps of OHV area” is included in this line item. Applicant must remove the verbiage related to “Paper for printing maps of OHV area” from the line item notes and list it as its own separate line item. In addition, Applicant has now exceeded the 15% maximum allowable. Deduct \$96 from Grant and \$132 from match. Revised total for Indirect costs category is now Grant \$7,404 and match \$10,168.

Revised Totals

Grant Request: \$124,556

Match: \$44,856

Total Project Cost: \$169,412

Evaluation Criteria

- #2 – Narrative does not support the selection of “Loss of OHV Opportunity.” Applicant did not provide a detailed explanation and/or example(s) for the selection. Deduct 1 point.
- #3 – Narrative does not support the selection of “Providing varied levels of riding difficulty.” The Applicant did not provide examples of Project activities being performed that support the selection. Deduct 1 point.
- #4 – Narrative does not support the selection of “The Applicant held a meeting(s), held either in-person or virtual, with multiple distinct stakeholders...”. The stakeholder meeting did not include multiple distinct stakeholders. Deduct 1 point.
- #5 – Project Description and/or Project Cost Estimate sections do not support the selection. Applicant did not provide information in one of these sections on how each organization will actively participate towards the completion of the Project. Deduct 4 points.
- #6 – Project Deliverables do not support the selections of “Providing an alternative to wet crossings where appropriate” and “Re-routing trails to divert away from riparian/wetlands areas” as the Project does not include permanent wet crossings or re-routing of trails. Deduct 2 points.

Restoration: G26-01-02-R01

Project Description – Background

- No change.

Project Description – Project Description

- A reminder for all Restoration Projects: Any activities or costs associated with identifying, evaluating, or initiating restoration at new sites are not eligible in this

Grant cycle. Under CCR §4970.11(f)(1), Restoration Projects must include defined Deliverables tied to a known site, and CCR §4970.09(b)(5) prohibits funding for future or undefined work. Applicants must apply under the Restoration Planning category to develop new sites or return in the next Grant cycle with a fully defined restoration scope and remove all related language and costs. In addition, Law Enforcement patrolling efforts in two different wilderness areas managed by BLM Arcata are listed in the Law Enforcement Project. Applicant must remove all language and costs in the Project.

Project Description – List of Project Deliverables

- #1 – If awarded, Applicant must relocate or remove all non-earth-moving activities (monitoring, signage, barriers, etc.) to the designated Project Deliverable.
- #2 – If awarded, Applicant is reminded to remove all language associated with the wilderness areas.
- #3 – Applicant did not clarify how these activities align with the corresponding Project Deliverable and their associated costs. If awarded, Applicant must remove the deliverable.

Project Description – All Others

- No change.

Project Cost Estimate

- Staff #1 “Staff-Botanist” – The Project Description states that the wetland area will be monitored daily during routine patrols conducted by Law Enforcement, the Park Ranger, and the Outdoor Recreation Planner. Additionally, Project Deliverable #2 does not specify any monitoring or patrol responsibilities for the assigned wetland area in the Project. Removing the unsupported wetland monitoring activity reduces the line item by 20%. Deduct of \$400 from the match. The revised total for this line item now match \$1,600.
- Staff #2 “Outdoor Recreation Planner” – Patrolling in the Wilderness area is part of the Law Enforcement Project. Removing the activities in the Wilderness area reduces the line-item by 30%. Deduct of \$1,500 from the match. The revised total for this line item is match \$3,500.
- Staff #3 “Park Ranger” – Activities occurring within the King Range and Cahto Peak Wilderness are part of the Law Enforcement Project. The Applicant must remove this line item in full. Deduct \$5,000 from the match.
- Staff #4 “Law Enforcement” – Activities occurring within the King Range and Cahto Peak Wilderness are part of the Law Enforcement Project. The Applicant allocates 50% of this position’s time to Wilderness activities. Deduct a total of \$62,500: \$60,000 from the Grant and \$2,500 from the Match. The revised total for this line item is \$60,000 Grant and \$60,000 Match. Furthermore, following an overall deduction, the Applicant no longer meets the required 11% - 25% match range for the Project and must deduct and reclassify \$1,850 from the Grant to Match. The revised total for this line item is now Grant \$58,150 and match \$4,350. Contingent line item. The Samoa Dunes Native Plant Area and Wetland Area are both listed in the Restoration and Law Enforcement Project. If awarded and if a duplication exists, the Applicant must remove the language and any associated costs from this line item.

- Indirect Costs #1 “Administrative Services” – Applicant removed “telephone bills,” but did not remove the associated cost. Applicant lists six (6) activities for this line item. Removing one (1) activity reduces the line-item total by 16.67%. Deduct \$667 match. Revised total for this line item is Grant \$0 and match \$3,333.

Revised Totals

Grant Request: \$103,150

Match: \$12,783

Total Project Cost: \$115,933

Evaluation Criteria

- #2 – Narrative does not support the selections, except “Bodies of water.” The applicant did not identify any archaeological or historical resources listed in either the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places. Additionally, the narrative provided under “Soils” describes Ground Operation activities, which are not eligible under a Restoration Project. Finally, the applicant did not provide adequate information on the type and severity of potential impacts if the Project is not funded for the selection of “Sensitive areas” and “Threatened and Endangered (T&E)” species. Deducts 15 points.
- #4 – The narrative does not support the selections of “Construction of barriers...” and “Use of native plants and materials.” Applicant did not provide sufficient information to demonstrate that these elements would be implemented effectively or would contribute to successful project outcomes. Deduct 4 points.
- #7 – Narrative does not support the selection. Applicant did not identify multiple distinct stakeholders. Deduct 1 point.
- #8 – The Project Description and/or Project Cost Estimate sections do not support the selection. In addition, Applicant did not provide sufficient information describing how the partner organization will contribute to the successful completion of the Project. Deduct 2 points.

Law Enforcement: G26-01-02-L01

Need Assessment

- No change.

Needs Enforcement Certification

- No change.

Project Cost Estimate

- No change.