2024 (G24) Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program Southern California Mountains Foundation's Factual Findings

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

For information regarding the appeal process, see Section 4970.17 of the Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program regulations webpage https://ohv.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=23747

General Evaluation Criteria:

- #1d – OHV Opportunity Ratio. Add 5 points.
- #6 – The Applicant has been responsive. Add 3 points.
- #7c – The Applicant's response does not match the Land Manager's response. Deduct 2 points.

Restoration: G24-04-02-R01

Project Description – Background

- No change.

Project Description – Project Description

- The Applicant addressed the Division's concern about whether the G24 Project activities described in the Application would occur in the same designated Project Areas as their active G23 Project by stating, "Active restoration of these areas will continue to be monitored by SCMF staff after G23 funding is exhausted." Based on the Applicant's response and information in the G24 Application, the Division has determined that there is a duplication of services between the active G23 Project and the proposed G24 Application with the following Project activities: restoration monitoring (excluding fence monitoring/maintenance), volunteer educational patrols, and nursery activities managed by the Applicant. If the G24 Project is awarded, starting January 1, 2025, these duplicative activities will no longer be covered under the G23 Project but will instead be covered by the G24 Project.

Project Description – List of Project Deliverables

- No change.

Project Description – All Others

- No change.

Project Cost Estimate

- No change.

Evaluation Criteria

- #7 – The narrative does not support the selections. The Applicant did not provide the platform used for the virtual meetings. In addition, the Applicant did not clarify whether the stakeholder meeting was separate from the public meeting and did not provide the dates of other stakeholder meetings. Deduct 2 points.

Restoration: G24-04-02-R02

Project Description – Background

- No change.

Project Description – Project Description

- No change.

Project Description – List of Project Deliverables

- The Applicant is reminded that no second phase Project deliverables/activities can be funded until CEQA and/or NEPA (first phase of Project) conclusions result in a decision to proceed with the second phase Project Deliverables and the OHMVR Division gives prior approval.

Project Description – All Others

- No change.

Project Cost Estimate

- Materials / Supplies #5 "Powertool Maintenance" – Power tools are not considered Equipment in this Program. The Applicant must move maintenance of power tools to the Indirect Costs category. Deduct $1,000 from Grant (could not move the cost to the Indirect Costs category as the Project is over the allowable 15% maximum indirect amount).

- Indirect Costs #1 "–Indirect administrative costs" – The Applicant has now exceeded the 15% maximum allowable. Deduct $150 from Grant. The revised total for this line item is now Grant $153,795 and match $0.

  Revised Totals:
  Grant Request: $1,179,097
  Match: $243,326
  Total Project Costs: $1,422,423

Evaluation Criteria

- #2 – The Applicant received points for "Bodies of Water" and "Soils–Potential for Mass Wasting." The Applicant did not specify the number (e.g., 1, 2, 3) of "Sensitive Areas," "T&E Listed Species," and "Other Special–Status" items; instead, they listed names in the boxes to the far right of the selections. Since numbers (only) were not identified, the Applicant did not receive any points for these selections. Deduct 0 points.
- #3 – The narrative does not support the selection. The reference document supporting the Project is a "draft" and not a finalized/approved reference document. Deduct 4 points.
- #4 – The Project Description section does not support the selection of "Identification of alternative OHV routes...". The Applicant did not provide additional details in the Project Description to support the selection. Deduct 2 points.
- #5 – The narrative does not support the selection. The plan should be publicly reviewed and adopted by the preliminary Application deadline. Deduct 5 points.
- #7 – The narrative does not support the selections. The Applicant did not provide the virtual platform of the public and stakeholder meetings. In addition, the Applicant did not identify the stakeholders who participated in the meeting and clarify how stakeholders are stakeholders to the Project. Deduct 2 points.
- #8 – The narrative does not support the selection. The Applicant did not clarify which USFS organization is a partner on the Project. In addition, it is unclear if Project Heal the Land will actively participate in the Project as they "offered" to help, which is not a guarantee they will participate. Deduct 2 points.