

Evaluation Criteria for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program

Below are my questions and concerns for information provided on the evaluation criteria form:

#	Project Type	Project Title	Grant Request	Match Total	Project Cost
2013-14	G13-04-02-R01	Restoration (Baldy Mesa)	1,105,422	388,611	1,494,033
2014-15	G14-04-02-R01	Restoration (NO Projects)	664,152	694,425	1,358,577
2013-14	G13-04-02-S01	Education & Safety	96,281	304,907	401,188
2014-15	G14-04-02-S01	Education & Safety	85,514	275,230	360,744
2013-14	TOTAL for BOTH	Rest + Ed & Sfty	1,201,703	693,518	1,895,221
2014-15	TOTAL for BOTH	Rest + Ed & Sfty	749,666	969,655	1,719,321

5. For Applicant's OHV grant Projects which reached the end of the Project performance period within the last two years, the percentage of all Projects closed out in accordance with Program regulations:

Restoarion (their mis-spelling): G08-04-02-R01; Grant Period 7/1/09 - 6/30/12 & G09-04-02-R01; Grant Period 8/11/10 - 8/10/13 **Safety & Ed**: G10-04-02-S01; Grant Period: 7/13/11 - 7/12/12 & G11-04-02-S01; Grant Period 7/13/12 - 7/12/13

It was filled in as 100% of deliverable accomplished yet I've personally been in these areas lately and have not seen ANYTHING resembling full completion of these projects. This was not address last year and I expect it likely won't be address this year either...WHY?

6. Public input prior to the Preliminary Application - (Page 14 of 17)

b. SCMF staff hosted two publicly noticed meetings with the general public to review the grant process and discuss the proposed project. Meetings were held 1) February 10, 2015; 6pm-8pm at the Forest Service Supervisors Office in San Bernardino and 2) February 11, 2015; 7pm-9pm at Sizzler Restaurant in Corona, CA.

The so-called "public meeting" was ONLY announced via their SBNFA-OHV "PRIVATE" bulletin board which is NOT made available to the general public. Only their members of this PRIVATE CLUB can access this site and has been this way since early 2011. Further, the Sizzler Restaurant management INSISTS that ALL attendees MUST purchase a meal when entering into the restaurant to attend this so-called 'public meeting". A more tolerable venue must be considered.

11. OHV Education – Education materials available onsite:

b. SCMF's OHV program provides multiple hands on and formal class trainings. Hands on training includes: ASI and MSF certification, RUV, radio, 1st aid and CPR, and land navigation classes. Classroom training includes: rules and regulations and On the Right Trail. Classes are offered monthly and vary in duration from 4-8 hour. SCMF leads educational/interpretive rides. Outreach: we attend dealerships, industry trade shows and host kiosks where we distribute printed materials including; maps, brochures, and educational CD's and DVD's. The program contacts over 10,000 individuals annually providing educational messages through means listed above. Advertising: PSA's and e-newsletters

are distributed monthly with educational messages. Social Media: we utilize SCMF's Facebook and twitter accounts for education and safety messages and have over 2,400 followers.

This 'training' is ONLY made available to their "PRIVATE CLUB" members and not to the general public for which true education is actually intended to reach. Also, you need to take into consideration that they have lowered their On the Right Trail presentations from 24 in 2011 to 15 in 2012 and NOW from a mere 6 in 2013 to ZERO in 2014? What happened?

d. ATV Safety Institute and/or Motorcycle Safety Foundation approved training courses are provided to the public:

This is NOT OPEN TO THE PUBLIC by any means and they should not be given a point. You have to a member of the volunteer program or a forest service employee.

Restoration Grant - Not in support of this Grant

1.) Staff: They claim 100% of Projects closed out (10 points). Now, why are they asking for another 2 positions at \$55,000+ each for THREE YEARS within a ONE YEAR GRANT totaling \$165,000+? An "OHV Patrol Volunteer Coordinator – I can possibly understand one (1) position which is applied for within the Education & Safety Grant but why three (3)? Within their own submission list, the element of 'recruiting...and monitoring volunteers" is mentioned. This very element is supposed to be handled by the Volunteer Coordinator – a position they apply for grant funding for within their Safety & Education Grant to the tune of \$49,610 a year (up from \$48,000 last year) PLUS a "PART TIME" Program Assistant "Intern" for 15 hours a week to the tune of \$12,000 a year PLUS... \$10,350 in personal vehicle fuel expenses. Could this turn out to be "double dipping"? Maybe a contingency plan should one of the other two positions are not funded. If so, it should be disallowed.

They brag so heavily about the work of the OHV Volunteers AND of the Adopt-A-Trail Program so why not utilize them? Maybe it's about money once again. Bottom line, it appears they are spending too much money on employees

Safety and Education Grant - Not in support of this Grant

Based on only 1.5 million dollars available for the entire state, this Grant applicant is asking for just under 10% of the available funds. The available funds need to be shared more evenly throughout all the Grant applicants. Below are my recommendations for this Grant applicant.

Staff: OHV Program Coordinator position should be for a total of 30 hours per week. Why would the tax payers allow for the funding of \$49,610 (up from \$48,000 last year) for a position that's main objective is "recruiting" new volunteers for this "CLUB"? In 2012, this applicant proposed 24 ORT presentations. Then in 2013, they have decreased by half. In 2014, it had been cut again to a mere six (6). Now, for 2015, I don't see ANY ORT presentations listed yet they are asking for more money for less deliverables. This is not a sound business practice and proper use of funds. Looks a lot like more money for less work to me.

Material and Supplies: In the categories of Brochures and Signs, they seem redundant. There are printing costs associated with each category and it should be a bundled request not separated. They are asking for more money than is actually needed, \$25,000 (up from \$20,000 last year) seems excessive for printing needs for one year. In 2012, they were granted \$8,000 minus the match and seemed to do just fine. They are more than doubling the costs of two years

ago... this seems suspicious. Especially in today's world of technology, they can put these materials on line and people can chose to print for themselves.

Equipment Use Expenses:

Other – Mileage Reimbursement – It seems that the amount being requested can be reduced to approximately \$3000... Not the proposed \$10,350 as they claim. How about they use a monthly stipend of \$100 per month for travel as this would require the employee to keep track of his/her mileage and receipts for gas. (The volunteers do not receive reimbursement or a stipend for their gas/mileage). Also, they have access to Forest Service vehicles to travel from the office which would reduce they amount they are requesting.

Equipment Purchase - Other: In 2013, the SCMF asked for \$18,000 to fund a Mobile Education Kiosk – that was \$18,000 for a branding message. They received this and I have only ever seen this vehicle at ONE (1) trade show, the Sand Sports Super Show and NOT ANY OTHERS. This appears to be yet another “recruitment tool” and a waste of tax payer’s money.

Other – Trade Show Fees – They claim that funds (\$2,400 they are requesting) go towards exhibiter fees for the Off-Road Expo in Pomona, CA & the Intl Motorcycle Show in Long Beach, CA. SCMF further claims this as an increase to cover space for their large mobile education exhibit created with OHMVR funds two years ago. This group also claims they were unable to bring it to these events due to lack of funding last year (and the year prior). When they were at the Off Road Expo, they were openly & actively “RECRUITING” new volunteers from the attending public. They continue to do this at ALL shows they attend. Why are public funds being utilized by a “private club” for the purpose of recruitment?

Other – Indirect Costs – Listed by SCMF as the indirect rate of Administrative Costs that include salaries, rents, supplies and communication. When we’re talking about \$11,154, why would this request so vague and ambiguous?

For an education and safety grant there is not much being asked for on either point; education or safety. This is a fluff piece grant and the money should be used to further educate the public on safety. **[Drew A]**
