

2026 (G26) Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program City of Needles' 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:

- #5 – First time Applicant. Add 5 points.
- #6 – First time Applicant or past Applicant with no active Grant Projects within the last two years. Add 2 points.
- #7b – Applicant did not provide a detailed explanation to support the selection. Deduct 5 points.
- #7c – Applicant did not provide a detailed explanation to support the selection. Deduct 5 points.
- #10 – Narrative does not support the selection. The question asks if the Applicant and/or land manager conducts, or causes to be conducted sound level testing, not intent to conduct sound testing. Deduct 4 points.
- #11a – Narrative does not support the selection. Applicant does not currently provide free literature to visitors describing safe and responsible OHV recreation practices. In addition, Applicant does not currently have bulletin boards, signs or kiosks at the majority of staging areas, trailheads, or other areas where the public gathers to provide information concerning safe and responsible OHV recreation. Deduct 10 points.
- #11b – Applicant did not provide a detailed explanation to support the selection. Deduct 2 points.

Development: G26-03-22-D01

Project Description – Background

- No change.

Project Description – Project Description

- Applicant is reminded that in the event they come in for future OHV Projects such as Ground Operations, they may only charge time for OHV related activities. Any costs derived from the rodeo such as toilet pumping would not be eligible.
- In addition, Applicant shall clarify which trailhead is being referenced and what trails are available in the surrounding area. Lastly, Applicant must clarify if the signage is specific to OHV.

Project Description – List of Project Deliverables

- #1 - Applicant shall revise the deliverable to include more information related to the Project such as restrooms, trailer parking, signage, etc.
- #3 - Applicant did not respond to the Division comment. The activities listed are not a unique Development deliverable. Applicant must remove this Project deliverable.

- #4 - Applicant added language without receiving a public or Division comment. Applicant shall remove the language to match the preliminary Application.

Project Description – All Others

- “BLM Connection Route” seems unclear. Applicant shall clarify what trails networks provide connectivity to the proposed parking lot and pilot OHV Program.

Project Cost Estimate

- Staff #1 "Project & Grant Administration" – Grant administration appears to be an indirect activity. Approximately 50% of the time should be related to grant administration, which is 100 hours. Applicant shall move the QTY of hours and costs associated to the Indirect Cost category. Move \$19,564 to Indirect match. The revised line item total is now \$19,564 match.
- Staff #2 "Match" – Applicant must move the notes from the Project Cost Estimate summary section into the Project Cost Estimate, creating individual line items for each staff member. Applicant is reminded that they may not increase the QTY of hours or the hourly rate. In addition, the following staff members are duplicative 'Chief Plant Operator' and 'Water Forperson' and the 'Public works director' and the 'Engineering Tech II'. Applicant must deduct of \$9,647 from the match. In addition, the following staff members are completing indirect activities 'Building Permit Tech', 'City Clerk', 'Finance Assistance', and the 'Director of Finance'. Move \$24,676 to Indirect match. Lastly, the notes within the narrative total \$145,706.00; Applicant must reduce the line item to match the notes. Deduct \$37,813 match. Revised line item total is \$111,383 match.
- Contracts #1 "Contract Project Mobilization/SWPPP Plan" – The activities listed within the contract pertaining to this line item are indirect costs. Applicant must move the line item and costs associated to the Indirect Cost category. Move \$116,572 to Indirect Grant. Revised line item \$0.00 Grant.
- Contracts #2 "Contractor Earthwork (Grading/Bioswale)" – Applicant did not respond to Division comment. Applicant must clarify why grading is necessary if the parking lot already exists.
- Materials / Supplies #1 "Signage (Entry, OHMV Kiosk Sign, ADA)" – Applicant did not respond to Division comment. ADA tow away signage is considered an indirect cost. Per quote provided, move \$2,396 to Indirect match. Revised line item total is now \$31,729. In addition, compared to like Projects, the entry signage appears excessive. Applicant must clarify why the proposed signage would be beneficial to an OHV staging area.
- Materials / Supplies #3 "Picnic Benches" – Applicant must revise the methodology to reflect the unit of measure (UOM) and cost per bench.
- Equipment Purchases #1 "Prefabricated Vault Bathroom Kit" – Line item and the cost associated with the line must be moved to the "Other" category.
- Other #2 "City Building Permit Fees" – Applicant did not respond to Division comment. Applicant must clarify what “planning approval of the proposed project” entails, as it is unclear if this Project is ready to be started upon the time of funding.
- Others #3 "City water service installation" – Applicant did not respond to Division comment. Applicant must clarify the need for the water installation (i.e., toilet, sink). In addition, Applicant must clarify if this service is being completed with a contracted company.

- Indirect Costs – Due to deductions, Applicant is now over the 15% allowable maximum Indirect amount. Applicant must deduct \$49,823 from the Indirect Grant. In addition, Applicant now does not meet the minimum 25% match requirement for the Project and must move \$23,140 from the Grant to match.

Revised Totals

Grant Request: \$799,516

Match: \$266,507

Total Project Cost: \$1,066,023

Evaluation Criteria

- #2a – Narrative is not supported. Applicant did not provide a name and date of reference document to support the selection. Deduct 5 points.
- #2b – Narrative is not supported. Applicant did not provide a name and date of reference document to support the selection. Deduct 5 points.
- #2c – Narrative is not supported. Applicant did not provide a name and date of reference document to support the selection. Deduct 10 points.
- #4 – Background and/or Project Description sections and the narrative for each selection do not support the selections. Deduct 4 points.
- #8 – Project does not support the selection. Project better supports 'Project improves support facilities associated with existing OHV Opportunity'. Deduct 1 point.
- #10 – The 'El Garces' meeting is not eligible as it falls outside of the eligible dates. No points deducted.
- #11 – Narrative does not support the selection. Applicant did not provide a detailed explanation for how each partner will actively participate towards the completion of the Project. Deduct 2 points.
- #13 – Narrative does not support the selection. Applicant did not explain what measures have been taken to address offsite impacts relative to this Development Project. Deduct 1 point.