

# 2024 (G24) Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program USFS - Inyo National Forest'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)  
[https://ohv.parks.ca.gov/?page\\_id=23747](https://ohv.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=23747)

---

## **General Evaluation Criteria:**

- #1d – OHV Opportunity Ratio. Add 1 point.
- #6 – The Applicant has been responsive. Add 3 points.
- #7c – The narrative does not support the selection. Information on respect for private property was not included. Deduct 2 points.
- #8b – The narrative does not support the selection. The Applicant did not provide a detailed explanation on the "Recommendations for improvement in species management", "Ongoing survey/inventory of archeological sites", "Biological monitoring that measures changes in populations", "Strategies to respond to changing conditions that affect the survival or reproduction of species", "Recommendations for improvement in species management" and "Strategies to respond to changing conditions that affect the survival or reproduction of species". Deduct 5 points.

## **Ground Operations: G24-02-05-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

- Staff #1 "OHV Techs Qty (2) GS–7 for North Zone" – The Applicant removed "reporting" activities from the line item but did not reduce the line item total. The Applicant listed seven (7) Project activities for this line item. Removing (one) activity reduces the line item by 14%. Deduct \$7,610 from Grant. The revised total for this line item is now Grant \$46,750 and match \$0.
- Staff #2 "OHV Techs Qty (2) GS–7 for South Zone" – Applicant removed "reporting" activities from the line item but did not reduce the line item total. The Applicant listed seven (7) Project activities for this line item. Removing (one) activity reduces the line item by 14%. Deduct \$7,610 from Grant. The revised total for this line item is now Grant \$46,750 and match \$0.
- Staff #3 "OHV Program Manager" – The Applicant added Project activities to the line item in response to Division comment. The added Project activity of "overseeing grant writing" is an ineligible Project expense as it does not relate to the completion of the Project. In addition, the Applicant added the Project activities of "grant management, budgets, equipment maintenance...and staff training" these activities are considered indirect activities as they do not directly relate to the completion of the Project. The Applicant must remove the verbiage for all these activities from the item and the cost associated with them. The Applicant listed seven (7) Project activities for the line item. Removing five (5) activities reduces the line item by 71% Deduct \$19,335 from Grant and \$10,508 from match (could not move the cost to the Indirect Costs category as Project is over the allowable 15% maximum indirect amount). The revised total for this line item is now Grant \$12,189 and match \$0.
- Staff #6 "Hydrologist Tech" – The line item "Quantity" (QTY) increased compared to the previous year's Application. The Applicant did not provide additional details to justify the increase. The Applicant is allowed a 15% increase in QTY from the prior year's Application line item total. Deduct \$18,626 from Grant. The revised total for this line item is now Grant \$7,534 and match \$0.
- Equipment Use Expenses #2 "Fuel for Equipment" – Contingent line item: the Applicant did not respond to Division comment. The Applicant must describe in the notes section how fuel costs were determined (a per-mile charge provided for the methodology would be acceptable).
- Indirect Costs #1 "Agreement Administrative Cost" – The Applicant has now exceeded the 15% maximum allowable. Deduct \$4,306 Grant and \$2,422 match. The revised total for this line item is now Grant \$8,313 and match \$2,578.

Revised Totals:

Grant Request: \$224,239

Match: \$189,740

Total Project Cost: \$413,979

## **Evaluation Criteria**

- #3 – The narrative does not support the selections of "Maintaining trails that provide for multi-use" and "Providing varied levels of riding difficulty". The Applicant did provide examples of Project activities being performed that support the selection. Additionally, the Project Description and/or Project Cost Estimate sections do not support the selection of "Maintaining trail or road tread for single vehicle use". Furthermore, the Division or the public did not provide a comment on "Installing or repairing erosion control features" in order for the Applicant to add the selection making that selection ineligible. Deduct 10 points.
- #4 – The narrative does not support the selections. The Applicant did not state whether the meetings were separate from BLM Bishop's public and stakeholder meetings. Deduct 2 points.
- #5 – The narrative does not support the selection. The Applicant did provide a detailed explanation of how each partner actively participates towards the completion of the Project. Deduct 4 points.
- #6—The narrative does not support the selections of "Protecting water quality" and "Protecting special-status species." The Applicant did not provide example(s) of the activities performed in the Project that support the selections. In addition, the Project Deliverables do not support the selection of "Re-routing trails to divert away from riparian/wetlands areas" as the Project does not include re-routing trails. Deduct 3 points.
- #7 – The Project Description and/or Project Cost Estimate sections do not support the selections of "Erosion control features which use materials with recycled..." and "Paper used for trail maps which includes recycled content" are made with recycled materials. In addition, the selection of "Other products with recycled content" is not eligible as the Applicant already received credit for barrier material in another selection. Deduct 3 points.

## **Restoration: G24-02-05-R01**

### **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

- Staff #1 "OHV Restoration Technicians" – The hourly "Rate" significantly increased by 40% compared to the similar G19 Project. The Applicant did not provide additional details to justify the increase in "Rate". Allow a 20% increase in Rate compared to the G19 Project hourly Rate. New Rate is \$22.38 per hour. Deduct \$23,564 from Grant. The revised total for this line item is now Grant \$139,517 and match \$0.
- Staff #2 "OHV Manager " – The Applicant revised the line item notes to state that this position works "\$11,769 per year for 3 years of restoration grant term" (new line item total of \$35,307). The Applicant did not revise the line item totals to reflect the notes. The new hourly "Rate" is \$39.23. Deduct \$7,399 from Grant and \$2,600 from the match. The revised total for this line item is now Grant \$27,907 and match \$7,400.
- Contracts #1 "ACE Crew" – The Applicant notes, "This contract would only be used if the Forest is not successful in hiring techs." This line item must be removed as it is not essential for completing the Project. If the agency cannot hire staff for the Project, a reallocation request can be submitted to fund the contract. Deduct \$1,000 from Grant.
- Equipment Use Expenses #2 "Equipment Maintenance" – Chainsaws and augers are not considered Equipment in this Program. The Applicant must move maintenance of augers and chainsaws to the Indirect Costs category. The Applicant listed four (4) different items under the line item. Moving two (2) items reduces the line item by 50%. Move \$750 from Grant to the Indirect Costs category Grant. The revised total for this line item is now Grant \$750 and match \$0.

Revised Totals:

Grant Request: \$219,130

Match: \$86,567

Total Project Cost: \$305,697

## Evaluation Criteria

- #2 – The narrative does not support the selection of "archeological and historic resources". The Applicant did not identify at least one archeological and/or historical resource within the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places. Additionally, the narrative does not support the selections of "T&E listed species..." and "Other special-status species" as the Applicant did not explain the type and severity of impacts that might occur if the Project is not funded for these selections. Deduct 10 points.
- #7 – The narrative does not support the selections. The Applicant did not provide the platform used for the virtual meetings. Deduct 2 points.
- #8 – The Applicant added a new partner (Dirt Ninjas) without receiving a public and/or Division comment to add a partner. Deduct 2 points.

- #9 – This question only applies to Restoration Project that are scientific and/or cultural studies. This Project is not a scientific and/or cultural study and is not eligible for this question. Deduct 4 points.