

2026 (G26) 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.

General Evaluation Criteria:

- #6 – Applicant has been responsive. Add 3 points.
- #11b – Applicant's response does not match the Land Manager's. Deduct 1 point.
- #11d – Narrative does not support the selection. Applicant does not currently provide ASI, MSF, ROVA approved training courses to the public. Deduct 1 point.

Restoration: G26-04-02-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.

Project Description – List of Project Deliverables

- #5 – The narrative provided focuses on education, outreach, and distribution of maps to promote responsible OHV use, which are activities more appropriate for a Ground Operations and/or Education Project. These activities do not align with the requirements of a Restoration Project. Restoration Projects must describe actions that restore, repair, or rehabilitate areas damaged by OHV use. If awarded, Applicant must remove this deliverable and the associated costs.

Project Description – All Others

- No change.

Project Cost Estimate

- Staff #1 "Corpsmembers" – The rate is excessive compared to like Projects. The rate was reduced to \$31 an hour. Deduct a total of \$191,558 from the Grant and \$4,031 from the match. The revised total for this line item is Grant \$326,199 and match \$10,089. Additionally, the OHV education described in Deliverable #5 is not

eligible under this Restoration Project. Applicant lists five (5) activities for this line item and removing one (1) activity results in a 20% reduction. Deduct a total of \$65,240 from the Grant and \$2,018 from the match. The revised line-item is now Grant \$260,959 and match \$8,071.

- Staff #3 "Restoration site coordinator" – The OHV education described in Deliverable #5 is not eligible under this Restoration Project. Applicant indicates that 2% of staff time is allocated to education efforts. Deduct \$11,544 from the Grant. The revised line total is now Grant \$565,656.
- Staff #4 "Volunteer" – The OHV education described in Deliverable #5 is not eligible under this Restoration Project. The applicant lists two (2) activities for this line item: performing restoration tasks and conducting educational efforts. Removing one (1) activity results in a 50% reduction. Deduct \$144,504 from the match. The revised line item is now match \$144,504.
- Staff #5 "Seasonal intern" – The OHV education described in Deliverable #5 is not eligible under this Restoration Project. Applicant lists four (4) activities for this line item and removing one (1) activity results in a 25% reduction. Deduct \$27,840 from the Grant. The revised total for this line item is now Grant \$83,520.
- Indirect Costs#1 "Indirect project costs" – After the deduction made by the Division, the Applicant has exceeded the 15% maximum allowable for Indirect and must deduct \$61,110 from the Grant. The revised line item is now \$168,482. After the deduction made by the Division, the Applicant has exceeded the 15% maximum allowable for Indirect and must deduct \$43,408 from the Grant. Following the deduction of the Indirect Costs, the Applicant no longer meets the required 11%–25% match range for the Project and must deduct and reclassify \$19,625 from the Grant to match. The revised line total for the Indirect category is now Grant \$166,559 and match \$19,625.

Revised Totals

Grant Request: \$1,407,794

Match: \$174,000

Total Project Cost: \$1,581,794

Evaluation Criteria

- #8 – Narrative does not support the selection. The "Yamaha Corporation" does not directly participate in the Project. In addition, Applicant did not list the partners separately. Deduct 3 points.

Restoration: G26-04-02-R02

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. Project Description – List of Project Deliverables.

Project Description – All Others

- (D) The size of the specific Project Area(s) in acres and/or miles – Any boulder-related activities and associated costs proposed within fenced areas are not eligible. If awarded, Applicant must remove all related language and costs.

Project Cost Estimate

- Materials / Supplies #4 "Boulders" – Any boulder activities proposed within fenced areas are not eligible. The applicant must reduce this line item by 50%. Deduct \$22,500 from the Grant. The revised line-item total is now Grant \$22,500.
- Contracts #2 "CVCC Resource Manager" – The rate is excessive compared to like Projects. The rate was reduced to \$65 an hour (30% from CVCC Program Specialist). Deduct \$6,240 from the match. The revised line-item is now match \$15,600.
- Others #1 "Dump Fees" – Applicant removed the "trash dumps" associated with this project; however, the corresponding costs were not reduced. It is also likely that much of the trash accumulated within or adjacent to the site is windblown or originates from the nearby dump station, rather than resulting directly from unauthorized OHV use. Because the origin of the trash is unknown, the costs associated with its removal are not eligible under this project. The applicant lists two items under trash removal. Removing one item results in a 50% reduction in this line item. Deduct \$1,500 from the Grant. The revised line-item total is now Grant \$1,500.
- Indirect Costs #1 "Indirect project costs" – After the deduction made by the Division, the Applicant has exceeded the 15% maximum allowable for Indirect and must deduct \$3,526 from the Grant. The revised line item is now Grant \$117,113.

Revised Totals

Grant Request: \$897,873

Match: \$124,738

Total Project Cost: \$1,022,611

Evaluation Criteria

- #2 – Narrative does not support the selections of "Bodies of water" and "Sensitive areas" as the portion of the White Water River where the Project would occur is several miles and is downstream from the section of the river. Deduct 5 points.
- #8 – Project Description and Project cost estimate do not support the Applicant's partnerships. Deduct 2 points.
- #11 – No sensitive habitat will be restored within the Project Area. Deduct 3 points.