

Wildlife Conservation Board
Wildlife Corridor and Fish Passage Program
2021 Public Solicitation Notice





Wildlife Conservation Board

Wildlife Corridor and Fish Passage Program

Proposal Solicitation Notice

The Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB) is seeking to award up to \$30,000,000 for high quality wildlife corridor and fish passage projects that result in enduring benefits. This 2021 Proposal Solicitation Notice (PSN) allows for the following project types:

- Projects to construct, repair, modify, or remove transportation infrastructure or water resources infrastructure improving passage for wildlife or fish.
- Projects that restore or enhance wildlife mobility or fish passage across barriers whose impacts on migration have been increased by drought conditions.

This document provides general eligibility information as well as priorities, pertinent dates, scoring criteria, and important documents specific to the 2021 grant cycle. Potential applicants are strongly encouraged to read the [WCB Proposition 68 Guidelines](#) (Guidelines), this PSN, and any associated documents prior to deciding to submit a proposal.

It is recommended that applicants use, at a minimum, the following technical guidance documents and sources before submitting a proposal: WCB Strategic Plan, State Wildlife Action Plan, California Department of Water Resource's Disadvantaged Community Mapping Tool, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife's Areas of Conservation Emphasis. Links to these can be found in the Guidelines for this program.

PROJECT REQUIREMENTS

Entities eligible to submit grant proposals in response to this PSN include nonprofit organizations and State, Federal, or local government agencies.

PROGRAM PRIORITIES AND SOLICITATION FOCUS

Program Priorities

The Wildlife Corridor and Fish Passage Program (Program) supports the following priorities:

Implementation

Grants may provide for projects that restore or enhance ecosystems that result in enduring direct and measurable improvements in the ability of fish or wildlife to move between habitat areas.

Planning

Planning grants may further efforts that identify processes that lead to the successful implementation of future wildlife corridor and fish passage projects. These efforts may provide direct guidance for future restoration and enhancement projects, implementation strategies, or project specific activities such as preliminary design and environmental review. Planning grants are intended to support the development of projects that are likely to qualify for future implementation funding.

2021 PSN Focus

WCB is seeking projects that restore or enhance habitat in wildlife migration corridors or that remove impediments to fish passage. Examples of project types and their priority are identified below. All projects must provide for improved fish or wildlife mobility, and further the objectives of [California Drought, Water, Parks, Climate, Coastal Protection and Outdoor Access for All Fund of 2018 \(Proposition 68\)](#), [Public Resources Code Section 80132\(e\)\(1\)](#). These examples should not be viewed as an exhaustive list of eligible project types and projects that are not Priority 1 or Priority 2 will still be considered.

Priority 1 projects:

- Construction of wildlife overcrossings and undercrossings in areas where wildlife mortality due to traffic interactions imperil a sensitive species.
- Restoration or enhancement of natural habitats that provide a visual screen in wildlife corridors for migrating wildlife species that are sensitive to human presence or to direct wildlife away from roadways and toward existing migration corridors.
- Removal of instream impediments to fish passage such as weirs, check dams or other water supply and flood control infrastructure.
- Installation of fish friendly culverts, fish ladders, bypass channels or other measures that allow migratory fish to go under, around or over passage barriers.
- Planning projects that provide designs and environmental review for future restoration projects at sites that are listed on either of CDFW's 2020 Wildlife Movement Priority Barrier List or 2019 Fish Passage Priority List.

Priority 2 projects:

- Installation of fencing or other measures that will direct wildlife away from roadways and toward existing migration corridors.
- Planning projects that provide designs and environmental review for future wildlife corridor and fish passage restoration projects at sites that are **not** listed on either of CDFW's 2020 Wildlife Movement Priority Barrier List or 2019 Fish Passage Priority List.

TIMELINES AND SCORING

Deadlines

Any project funded by the 2021 PSN must be completed and funds expended before March 31, 2026.

All applicants must submit a Pre-application and, only if requested to do so, a full application. Pre-applications must be submitted using the online [Pre-application Form](#) by **5:00 PM Pacific Standard Time on October 5, 2021**. A link to this form can also be found on WCB's Proposition 68 Program page <https://wcb.ca.gov/Grants/Funding#87619-prop-68>.

Only plain text may be entered in the Pre-application Form and applicants are unable to save progress or edit responses after submission. If an applicant would like to revise or resubmit a Pre-application before the submission deadline, that applicant should e-mail WCB at WCBcorridors@wildlife.ca.gov. Appendix A includes a preview of the Pre-application Form to help applicants prepare responses in advance.

In addition to the required Pre-application Form, applicants may submit optional attachments (e.g., maps, labeled photos, design drawings). To submit optional attachments, applicants must e-mail one combined PDF document not to exceed five pages to WCB at WCBcorridors@wildlife.ca.gov no later than the Pre-

application submission deadline. WCB will not accept zip files as e-mail attachments; e-mails with zip file attachments are filtered automatically and do not reach WCB. The e-mail subject line must contain “2021 Wildlife Corridor and Fish Passage Program Pre-App” and the Project Title as submitted with the online Pre-application Form. The main text of the e-mail message should list the optional documents provided.

WCB staff will evaluate Pre-applications and contact applicants to provide direction as to whether or not the proposal addresses the objectives of the Program, provide direction as to the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the Pre-application, identify any ineligible costs, and request a full proposal if appropriate.

WCB will only request Full Applications from applicants selected after Pre-application review. Invited applicants must submit Full Applications by **5:00 PM Pacific Standard Time on November 19, 2021** using the Full Application Form and Budget Worksheets referenced under the “Guidelines, Forms, and Templates” section, below.

Full Applications must be submitted via e-mail to WCBcorridors@wildlife.ca.gov with “2021 Wildlife Corridor and Fish Passage Program Application” and the Project Title in the subject line. Incomplete applications will not be scored or evaluated for funding. The Guidelines describe the general evaluation process. Review and evaluation processes specific to this PSN are described in additional detail, below.

WCB holds a minimum of four meetings annually (typically February, May, August, and November) where the board may consider awarding funds for proposed projects. The February 2022 board meeting is likely the first opportunity where WCB may award funds under this PSN. WCB staff anticipate that November 2022 will be the last board meeting where WCB will consider awarding funds under this 2021 PSN

Table 1: Grant Cycle Timeline for 2021

| Schedule | Milestone / Activity |
|-------------------------------|--|
| September 7, 2021 | Release solicitation and application |
| October 5, 2021, at 5:00 pm | Submit pre-application to WCB |
| October 22, 2021 | Request full applications from successful pre-applicants |
| November 19, 2021, at 5:00 pm | Complete project proposals due to WCB |
| December 17, 2021 | Technical review completed |
| February 2022 | Potential Board Meeting for first project presentation |

Evaluation Criteria

Please review the [Guidelines](#) for the general Program evaluation process. All information requested in this PSN is mandatory unless otherwise indicated. Failure to complete all required application components will make the proposal incomplete. Incomplete proposals may not be scored or considered for funding. The specific evaluation scoring method and evaluation of the full applications for the 2021 cycle is provided below.

WCB will conduct an administrative review to determine if applications were completed as required. All information requested in this PSN must be provided and in the required formats. Applications that are determined to be ineligible or incomplete may not be considered for funding. Administrative review criteria include:

- Applications submitted by required deadlines
- Project meets eligibility requirements

- Pre-application completed per PSN instructions
- Full Application (upon invitation) completed per PSN instructions
- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents are current and complete or will be completed no less than 15 days prior to Board meeting where funding approval may be considered
- **Project will be completed and funds expended before March 31, 2026.**

All Full Applications that satisfy WCB’s administrative review will be evaluated and scored by technical reviewers based upon the scoring guide and evaluation criteria listed in Appendix B. When scoring is complete, WCB will compose preliminary funding recommendations based on:

- Final score by technical reviewers
- Alignment with Guidelines and PSN priorities
- Distribution of funds among geographies, applicants, etc.
- Availability of funds
- Coordination with other agencies implementing complementary programs

PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

By submitting an application, project proponent agrees to and understands all requirements and responsibilities as outlined in Sections 5.0 Project Approval and Implementation and Section 6.0 General Program Requirements of the [Guidelines](#). Additional requirements are outlined below.

Environmental Compliance and Permitting

Activities funded under the Program must be in compliance with applicable State, tribal and Federal environmental laws and regulations, including the CEQA, NEPA, and other environmental permitting requirements. Several local, State, tribal and federal agencies may have permitting or other approval authority over projects that are eligible for grant funding. The applicant is responsible for obtaining all permits necessary to carry out the proposed work.

Applicants must identify the project’s expected permitting requirements, state what permits have been obtained or the process through which the permits will be obtained and describe the anticipated timeframe for obtaining each permit. Projects that are undertaken to meet mitigation obligations, or projects that are under an enforcement action by a regulatory agency, will not be considered for funding.

Proposals for projects that are subject to CEQA and NEPA must identify the State and federal lead agencies and provide documentation that the agency or agencies have accepted the role. CEQA/NEPA compliance must be complete 15 days before Board approval. If CEQA/NEPA compliance for a proposed project is not complete at time of proposal submission, WCB will determine the likelihood of CEQA/NEPA completion by the anticipated WCB Board date based upon the applicant’s schedule for and progress toward completion. Applicants must provide environmental documents and lead agency compliance, such as Environmental Impact Reports and a Notice of Determination, upon request.

Project Monitoring and Reporting

Habitat restoration project proposals are required to include a monitoring and reporting plan that explains specifically how improvements to fish and wildlife passage will be measured or quantified and how project success will be evaluated and reported. Planning projects proposing to conduct baseline monitoring may include development of a monitoring plan as a task in the scope of work, or if the proposed monitoring approach is known, it should be described in the Monitoring and Reporting Plan portion of the application.

Performance of planning projects will be evaluated based on completion of project deliverables per the grant agreement. The specific terms and conditions for monitoring and reporting, including performance measures, may be negotiated prior to grant execution, to ensure appropriate measures have been identified and to assist with consistency of nomenclature, units, and measurements.

The scope of the Monitoring and Reporting Plan will vary depending on the nature of the project; however, each plan shall include:

- Project-specific performance measures that are clearly linked to project objectives and have quantitative and clearly defined targets, at least some of which must be feasible to meet within one to two years post-implementation. Performance measures can be placed into two broad categories.
 - Output performance measures track whether on-the-ground activities were completed successfully and evaluate factors that may be influencing ecosystem outcomes (e.g., number of acres protected or restored, types and numbers of land management practices developed and implemented).
 - Outcome performance measures evaluate direct ecosystem responses to project activities (e.g., responses by target wildlife populations and responses in ecosystem function).
- Identify opportunities to extend the monitoring activities beyond the term of the grant (e.g., by using standardized, readily replicated monitoring and evaluation processes; leveraging on-going monitoring programs; and building partnerships capable of attracting funding from multiple sources over time).
- A plan for reporting monitoring results and progress toward performance measures.
- Annual monitoring reports will be required for the life of the project and some reported project information may be publicly available on the WCB website.

Data Management

Environmental data collected under this grant program must be made visible, accessible, and independently understandable to general users in a timely manner, except where limited by law, regulation, policy or security requirements. Where applicable, each proposal must include a description of how data and other information generated by the project will be handled, stored, and shared. Applicants should account for the resources necessary to implement data management activities in the project budget. Projects generating environmental data must include data management activities that support incorporation of those data into statewide data systems (e.g., [California Environmental Data Exchange Network](#) [CEDEN]), where applicable.

Unless otherwise stipulated, all data collected and/or created through WCB grant funds shall be required as a deliverable and will become the property of WCB. A condition of final payment shall include the delivery of all related data. Geospatial data must be delivered in an [ESRI](#)-useable format where applicable and documented with metadata in accordance with the [CDFW Minimum Data Standards](#).

Long-term Management and Maintenance

Applicants proposing habitat restoration projects shall outline 25-year management and maintenance plans for the project as part of their grant proposal. The outline shall include a discussion of the actions that will be taken if it is determined that the project objectives are not being met, including the responsible party and source(s) of funding for completing the remedial measures. This adaptive management approach provides a structured process that allows for taking action under uncertain conditions based on the best available science, establishing an explicit objective, monitoring and evaluating outcomes, and re-evaluating and adjusting decisions as more information is learned. Properties restored or enhanced, and facilities

constructed or enhanced with funds provided by WCB shall be operated, used, and maintained consistent with the purposes of the grant and in accordance with the long-term management plan for the project.

Land Tenure/Site Control

Applicants for projects conducting on-the-ground work must submit documentation showing that they have adequate tenure to, and site control of, the properties to be improved or restored for at least 25 years.

Proof of adequate land tenure includes, but is not necessarily limited to:

- Fee title ownership
- An easement or license agreement
- Other agreement between the applicant and the fee title owner, or the owner of an easement in the property, sufficient to give the applicant adequate site control for the purposes of the project and long-term management
- For projects involving multiple landowners, all landowners or an appointed designee must provide written permission to complete the project
- For most grants to non-profit organizations for project implementation and construction, WCB will require an agreement sufficient to protect the public interest. That agreement shall be recorded in the county in which the real property is located. This document is typically a Notice of Unrecorded Grant Agreement, or NOUGA.

When an applicant does not have tenure at the time of proposal submission, but intends to establish tenure via an agreement that will be signed prior to grant execution, the applicant must submit a template copy of the proposed agreement, memorandum of understanding (MOU), or permission form at the time of proposal submission. Once a project has been awarded, the applicant must submit documentation of land tenure before a complete grant agreement can be executed.

WCB and its representatives shall have the right to access the project site at least once every 12 months from the start date of the grant for the life of the project. WCB shall provide advance notice to Grantee and landowners prior to accessing the project site.

Financial Criteria

Budget

A budget using the format shown in the 2021 Wildlife Corridor and Fish Passage Project Budget Worksheets (budget worksheets) must be submitted with the application. This budget must show WCB grant money split into project task categories. The budget must also include any other funds, including in-kind services, the applicant intends to use as cost share.

Cost Share

Cost share is the portion of the project cost not funded by the awarding agency (WCB) and is provided by the applicant and/or other sources (e.g., private companies, nonprofit organizations, public agencies, and/or other entities). A list of all cost share sources must be detailed in the budget worksheets. Proposals with higher proportions of secured cost share contribution towards total project cost will receive higher scores during the proposal evaluation process. Proposals providing cost share in the form of cash or other resources (in-kind services) for the support of the project must specify the source and

dollar amount of all proposed cost share. Points will be awarded to proposals that are responsive to the scoring criteria, where cost share is:

- Used to support the proposed project;
- Spent between grant award and end of the proposed WCB funded project term; and
- Secured prior to application submission

Where applicable, cost share agreements or funding assurances will be required prior to grant execution. Applicant must also indicate if any cost share is being used as match for other grants or entities and whether they intend to leverage other State funds as match, if awarded.

Advance Funds

WCB may provide advance funds (Advance) for planning and implementation projects that serve Disadvantaged Communities. After grant execution, grantee may request a single advance of up to 25% of the grant award. Grantee must submit the Advance Funds Request before submitting any disbursement requests under the grant agreement. Grantee shall report use of Advance through the disbursement request process (i.e., modified Disbursement Template) and WCB shall disburse the remainder of the grant award in arrears.

Incidental Costs

Incidental costs (alternatively known as Administrative Costs, Indirect Costs or Administrative Overhead) rates are limited to 20 percent of the total direct WCB award to the grantee, minus subcontractor and equipment costs. Any amount over 20 percent will not be funded but may be used as cost share. Indirect costs include but are not limited to: workers compensation insurance, utilities, office space rental, phone, and copying which is directly related to completion of the proposed project. Costs for subcontractors and purchase of equipment cannot be included in the calculation of indirect costs in the overall project budget. The applicant must explain the methodology used to determine the rate and provide detailed calculations in support of the indirect cost rate. Please refer to the 2021 Wildlife Corridor and Fish Passage Project Budget Worksheets.

Ineligible Costs

The following are costs that are ineligible for reimbursement through an awarded grant:

- All costs incurred outside of the grant agreement term;
- All costs related to the preparation and submission of the grant proposal;
- Travel costs not specifically identified in the grant budget;
- Out of state travel without prior written authorization from WCB;
- Appraisal, title, or escrow costs;
- Student tuition and/or registration fees; and
- Purchase of electronics or other equipment not specifically identified in the grant agreement.

Special Considerations

Serving Disadvantaged Communities

The major funding source of this PSN is Proposition 68, the California Drought, Water, Parks, Climate, Coastal Protection, and Outdoor Access for All Act of 2018. Proposition 68 requires that at least 20

percent of the chapter funds available be allocated for projects serving severely disadvantaged communities. Proposition 68 defines a severely disadvantaged community as “a community with a median household income less than 60 percent of the statewide average.” The Department of Water Resources has developed the [Disadvantaged Communities Mapping Tool](#) that shows the location and boundaries of disadvantaged communities in the State. The interactive map allows users to overlay the following three US Census geographies as separate data layers:

- Census Place
- Census Tract
- Census Block Group

Applicants should use the following two-step process to evaluate whether their proposed project will benefit one or more disadvantaged communities. Projects that benefit a severely disadvantaged community will be given extra points.

Step 1 – Determine whether a majority (50% +) of the proposed project area is located within a severely disadvantaged community. For interactive maps of disadvantaged communities, refer to the Disadvantaged Communities Mapping Tool. The applicant may use data at the census place, census tract, or census block group geography levels to determine whether the project is located within a severely disadvantaged community, based on the geography that is the most representative for that community.

Step 2 – Determine whether the proposed project will provide benefits to a severely disadvantaged community. If the proposed project meets one or more of the following criteria, it will be deemed to provide benefits to a severely disadvantaged community.

- Project preserves, restores, or enhances a site that allows public access, enhances public recreational opportunities (e.g., fishing, hiking, biking, bird watching), and is within 1 mile of a severely disadvantaged community;
- Project significantly reduces flood risk to one or more severely disadvantaged communities;
- Project reduces exposure to local environmental contaminants (e.g., water quality contaminants) within a severely disadvantaged community;
- Project includes recruitment, agreements, policies, or other approaches that are consistent with federal and state law and result in at least 25% of project work hours performed by residents of a severely disadvantaged community; or
- Project includes recruitment, agreements, policies, or other approaches that are consistent with federal and state law and result in at least 10% of project work hours performed by residents of a severely disadvantaged community participating in job training programs which lead to industry-recognized credentials or certifications

[California Conservation Corps/California Association of Local Conservation Corps Services](#)

A project whose application includes the use of services of the California Conservation Corps (CCC) or certified community conservation corps, as defined in Section 14507.5 of the Public Resources Code, will be given preference for receipt of a grant. Prior to submission of proposals, it is encouraged that applicants first consult with the CCC and the California Association of Local Conservation Corps (CALCC), collectively referred to as “the Corps,” as to the feasibility of using their services to implement projects. The CCC is a state agency with local operations throughout the state, and CALCC is the representative for certified local conservation corps. While this is not a requirement of the PSN, applicants are encouraged to use the services of the Corps and those that do will be given extra points.

The CCC has developed a [Corps Consultation Review Document](#) to help determine whether it is feasible for CCC or CALCC to provide services for the proposed project.

Connectivity Potential of Project Site Location

For wildlife corridor projects:

Projects that address the barriers listed on CDFW's 2020 Wildlife Movement Barrier Priorities list will be awarded the highest connectivity score possible in this PSN. This dataset represents barriers to terrestrial wildlife movement in California that are high priority for remediation, as identified by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) in March 2020. CDFW divides the state into six administrative Regions. CDFW staff in each Region identified linear segments of infrastructure that currently present barriers to wildlife populations in their jurisdiction. In doing so, the Regions used all available empirical information in their possession, including existing connectivity and road crossing studies, collared-animal movement data, roadkill observations, and professional expertise. The dataset represents the ten highest priority barriers identified in each region.

For more information on the 2020 Wildlife Movement Barrier Priorities list, visit [CDFW's BIOS website](#) at:

<https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/bios/?bookmark=6272>

For wildlife corridor projects not on CDFW's priority list, the connectivity score will be determined by the project area's score in CDFW's Areas of Conservation Emphasis (ACE) Terrestrial Connectivity dataset. This list summarizes information on terrestrial connectivity; including the presence of mapped corridors or linkages and the juxtaposition to large, contiguous, natural areas. This dataset was developed to support conservation planning efforts by allowing user to spatially evaluate the relative contribution of an area to terrestrial connectivity based on the results of statewide, regional, and other connectivity analyses.

The ACE connectivity ranks were developed to provide a broad overview of connectivity across the state using the best available connectivity information for each region of the state. The scoring system was designed to bring together connectivity information at multiple scales, giving each hexagon an ACE Connectivity Rank of 1-5 based on locations of large, unfragmented habitat areas; linkages and corridors; and landscape intactness.

For more information on how ACE scores are generated, visit [CDFW's ACE website](#) at:

<https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/Analysis/Ace#523731772-connectivity>

For fish passage projects:

Projects that address the barriers listed on [CDFW's 2019 Fish Passage Priorities List](#) (which can be found in Appendix C of this document) will be awarded the highest connectivity score possible in this PSN. The following criteria were considered in the creation of this list: 1) high likelihood to improve migration for anadromous species; 2) availability of recent fish and habitat data; 3) willing partners and land access; 4) known political support at a local, state or national level; 5) if the site is a barrier to a federal recovery plan "core" population; 6) if the watercourse is an eco-regional significant watershed; 7) if the Department is committed to monitoring before, during and after any barrier improvement project is undertaken; and 8) if the site is considered a keystone barrier.

For fish passage projects not on CDFW's priority list, the next highest connectivity score will go to projects that address barriers explicitly mentioned in State or Federal recovery plans.

PROPOSAL GUIDELINES, FORMS, AND TEMPLATES

Requirements as identified in the [Wildlife Conservation Board Proposition 68 Guidelines](#) below are mandatory unless stated otherwise. Applicants must use the forms referenced below to apply or the application may be deemed incomplete and ineligible for funding. Links to these forms can also be found on WCB's Proposition 68 Program page <https://wcb.ca.gov/Grants/Funding#87619-prop-68>.

- [2021 Wildlife Conservation and Fish Passage Program – Pre-application](#) (must be completed **by 5:00 PM Pacific Standard Time on October 5, 2021** using the online [Pre-application Form](#))
- [2021 Wildlife Conservation and Fish Passage Program – Full Application](#)
- [2021 Wildlife Conservation and Fish Passage Program – Full Application Budget Worksheets:](#)
 - A. Applicant Budget
 - B. Budget Justification
 - C. Cost Share

For questions regarding this PSN or the WCB Wildlife Corridor and Fish Passage Program, please contact WCB's Wildlife Corridor and Fish Passage Program at WCBcorridors@wildlife.ca.gov.

Appendix A

Preview of Pre-application Form

Note that the numbering of the questions in the online Pre-application may vary from the numbering shown in this Appendix because some questions are conditional (e.g., do not apply in all cases).

1. Project Title
2. Organization Name
3. Organization Type
 - State government
 - Federal government
 - Local government
 - Nonprofit organization
4. Contact Person - full name
5. Contact Person - phone number
6. Contact Person - e-mail address
7. Project Type
 - Planning
 - Implementation
8. Status of project environmental review per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
 - For implementation projects only.*
 - Project is exempt under CEQA
 - Project requires a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report
 - For projects supported by an MND or EIR: a Notice of Determination is required at least two weeks in advance of a WCB meeting for the Board to consider approving the grant award at that meeting.*
9. Briefly explain why the project is exempt under CEQA and provide the number for the project class exemption.
 - For implementation projects that are exempt under CEQA.*
10. Specify the environmental review document, lead CEQA agency, and clearinghouse number or anticipated filing date.
 - For implementation projects that require a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report*
11. Landowner Type
 - For implementation projects only.*
 - State government
 - Local government
 - Federal government
 - Native American Tribe

- Nonprofit organization
- Private landowner

12. Landowner Name

For implementation projects only.

13. Parcel APN number(s)

For implementation projects only.

14. Describe any protections or restrictions affecting the project (e.g., carbon offset projects, conservation easements, etc.).

For implementation projects only.

15. Project Summary (4,000 character limit).

Briefly describe:

- *Problem or need and how the project will provide a solution, including anticipated results (e.g., restored habitat types and acreages, deliverables, etc.).*
- *How the project advances WCB's objectives for the Program, as described in the PSN.*
- *Whether/how this project relates to other conservation work in the vicinity.*

16. Habitat Type

For wildlife corridor projects only

17. Habitat Acreage

For wildlife corridor projects only

18. Are there any barriers to anadromy downstream of the proposed barrier removal?

For fish passage projects only

19. Spawning habitat made available by barrier removal

For fish passage projects only

- Amount of quality spawning habitat made directly available by barrier removal
- If no quality spawning habitat is made directly available by the project, how many upstream barriers must be removed before quality spawning habitat is reached?

20. How does the project help to mitigate impacts to wildlife mobility or fish passage from current or potential future droughts?

21. Total project cost

Round up to nearest \$1,000

22. Amount requested from WCB

Round up to nearest \$1,000.

23. Amount of non-WCB funds secured

Round up to nearest \$1,000.

24. Start Date

(m/d/yyyy)

25. End Date

(m/d/yyyy)

26. Briefly describe project location

e.g., current/former land uses, distance to nearest city, etc.

27. Latitude for approximate center of project area

Provide in decimal degrees (e.g., 38.583344).

28. Longitude for approximate center of project area

Provide in decimal degrees (e.g., -121.505838).

29. County(ies) overlapping project area.

You may select multiple counties if applicable.

30. CDFW Regions overlapping project area (<https://wildlife.ca.gov/regions>).

You may select multiple Regions, if applicable.

31. Do you plan to upload any optional documents (e.g., maps, labeled photos, design drawings) for WCB to consider as part of this Pre-application?

See PSN instructions regarding e-mail transmittal of optional documents.

- Yes
- No
- Maybe

Appendix B

Scoring

All complete and eligible proposals will be evaluated and scored by technical reviewers in accordance with the scoring criteria documented in Appendix B. Technical reviewers may make narrative comments that support their scores.

Each criterion will be scored by technical reviewers and assigned a point value between zero and five based on the extent to which the proposal addresses the criteria. Each score will then be multiplied by the applicable weighting factor to calculate the criterion score. A total score for the proposal will be generated by averaging the scores from each of the reviewers. Unless otherwise described in the table below, standard scoring criteria are applied, and points are assigned as follows:

- A score of 5 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale.
- A score of 4 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed but is supported by less thorough documentation or less sufficient rationale.
- A score of 3 points will be awarded where the criterion is less than fully addressed and is supported by less thorough documentation or less sufficient rationale.
- A score of 2 points will be awarded where the criterion is marginally addressed, or the documentation or rationale is incomplete or insufficient.
- A score of 1 point will be awarded where the criterion is minimally addressed, or no documentation or rationale is presented.
- A score of 0 points will be awarded where the criterion is not addressed.

Categories with special scoring criteria are identified within the table below.

When scoring is complete, a preliminary funding recommendation will be generated that takes into account the following considerations:

- Technical review scores and comments;
- Program purposes and goals;
- Balance/distribution of funds by: a) geographic area, b) project type, or c) type of institutions;
- Availability of funds; and
- Results of coordination and consultation with partner agencies implementing other relevant granting programs (e.g., Proposition 1).

Evaluation Criteria

| Category | Criteria | Weight Factor | Max. Points | Max. Score |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------|-------------|------------|
| Purpose and Background | The extent to which a project aligns with at least one of the priorities stated in this PSN, contributes to the goals of Proposition 68, and promotes and implements the WCB's Strategic Plan. Scoring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A score of 5 points will be awarded for a Priority 1 project where the criterion is fully addressed and | 4 | 5 | 20 |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|----|
| | <p>supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A score of 4 points will be awarded for a Priority 1 project where the criterion is fully addressed but is supported by less thorough documentation or less sufficient rationale. • A score of 3 points will be awarded for a Priority 2 project where the criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. • A score of 2 points will be awarded for a Priority 2 project where the criterion is fully addressed but is supported by less thorough documentation or less sufficient rationale. • A score of 1 point will be awarded for a Non-Priority project that meets the criteria of the solicitation and where the criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. | | | |
| Approach and Feasibility | <p>The extent to which a proposal narrative is sufficiently detailed to clearly show that the approach is well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project, and adequately described to assure methods and technologies are appropriate and understood. Scoring: standard scoring criteria</p> | 3 | 5 | 15 |
| Project Outcomes – Diversity and Significance of the Benefits | <p>The extent to which a project provides multiple tangible benefits, including improvements in climate change resilience, and the proposal provides sufficient analysis and documentation to demonstrate significance and a high likelihood that the benefits will be realized. Scoring: standard scoring criteria</p> | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Long Term Management and Maintenance | <p>The extent to which a project will deliver enduring sustainable benefits, as defined in the Guidelines. Scoring: standard scoring criteria</p> | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Monitoring and Reporting | <p>The extent to which a proposal demonstrates a clear and reasonable approach to monitoring project benefits, contains a reasonable baseline report, identifies performance measures, and utilizes and integrates with existing efforts. Scoring: standard scoring criteria</p> | 1 | 5 | 5 |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Project Team Qualifications | <p>The extent to which a proposal demonstrates that the project team, and any partnership as appropriate, has the appropriate experience, facilities/equipment, and capacity to successfully perform the proposed tasks.</p> <p>Scoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant team that demonstrates an appropriate level of expertise and, where applicable, successful completion of previously funded grants will receive 4 to 5 points. • Applicant team that lacks some expertise, has had some problems with successful completion of previously funded grants, or some key subcontractors are not named, or named subcontractors are not appropriate for work, will receive 2 to 3 points • Proposals in which the project team with very limited expertise and experience and/or has had many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, or no key subcontractors are named, will receive 0 to 1 point | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| Schedule and Deliverables | <p>The extent to which a proposal demonstrates a logical sequence and timing of project tasks, with reasonable milestones and appropriate deliverables consistent with a fund liquidation deadline of March 31, 2025, and that aligns with the tasks in the project narrative. The extent to which the proposal demonstrates the means by which data and other information generated by the project will be handled, stored, and made publicly available.</p> <p>Scoring: standard scoring criteria</p> | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| Project Readiness | <p>The extent to which a proposal demonstrates that access to the property, environmental compliance, permitting, planning, engineering design or other necessary preparations for the project as a whole are sufficient for prompt project implementation.</p> <p>Scoring: standard scoring criteria</p> | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| Budget | <p>The extent to which a proposed budget and justification are appropriate to the work proposed, cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs, and are consistent with the tasks shown in the project narrative and schedule.</p> <p>Scoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals for which the budget is detailed, accurate, and considered reasonable will receive 5 points. • Proposals for which the budget appears reasonable, contains moderate detail, inaccuracies or unspecified lump sums of up to 20 percent of the total budget will receive 3 to 4 points. • Proposals for which the budget lacks sufficient detail, and includes; many inaccuracies, unspecified lump | 1 | 5 | 5 |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| | <p>sums of 20 to 50 percent of the total budget, or inappropriate costs will receive 1 to 2 points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals for which the budget lacks sufficient detail, is inaccurate, contains unspecified lump sums exceeding 50 percent of the total budget, or is not cost effective will receive a score of zero. | | | |
| Cost Share | <p>The extent to which a project provides secured Federal, State, private, or local cost share. All fund sources must be identified. Scoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-Program cost share of >40% will receive 5 points Non-Program cost share of 31-40% will receive 4 points Non-Program cost share of 21-30% will receive 3 points Non-Program cost share of 11-20% will receive 2 points Non-Program cost share of 1-10% will receive 1 point Non-Program cost share of 0% will receive a score of zero. | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| Serving Disadvantaged Communities | <p>Project benefits to severely disadvantaged communities per California Department of Water Resources guidance (https://gis.water.ca.gov/app/dacs/).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projects that provide direct benefits to a severely disadvantaged community will receive 2 points If the majority of the project area is located within a severely disadvantaged community, the project will receive an additional 1 point | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| CCC/CALCC Services | Score one point for projects that utilize Corp services. | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Community Access | <p>The extent to which the project will improve or expand community access to the project area through implementation of the following elements (1 point per element present in project proposal, 4 points maximum)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public stakeholder engagement programs Technical assistance for community access planning Facilities that maximize safe and equitable physical admittance to natural or cultural resources Community education Recreational amenities | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Connectivity Potential of Project Site Location | <p>For Wildlife Corridor projects:</p> <p>One to five points based on either the project addressing a barrier on CDFW's 2020 Wildlife Movement Barrier Priorities list or the project location's connectivity score in the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's (CDFW) Areas of Conservation Emphasis (ACE) Terrestrial Connectivity dataset. Scoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A project addressing a barrier on CDFW's 2020 Wildlife Movement Barrier Priorities list will receive 5 points | 5 | 1 | 5 |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A project with an ACE terrestrial connectivity score of 5 will receive 3 points • A project with an ACE terrestrial connectivity score of 4 will receive 2 points • A project with an ACE terrestrial connectivity score of 3 will receive 1 point <p>For Fish Passage projects: A project that addresses a fish passage barrier on either CDFW's 2019 Fish Passage Priorities List (see Appendix C) will receive 5 points.</p> <p>A project that addresses a barrier explicitly mentioned in a State or Federal recovery plan will receive 3 points</p> | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

APPENDIX C

California Department of Fish and Wildlife 2019 Fish Passage Priorities List

| County | Site Name | Water Body | PAD ID |
|--------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| Del Norte | Rowdy Weir | Rowdy Creek | 721887 |
| Mendocino | Baechtel Creek City of Willits Waste Water Treatment Concrete Weir | Baechtel Creek | 764902 |
| Mendocino | Cedar Creek Hatchery Weir | Cedar Creek | 737364 |
| Mendocino | Pudding Creek Dam | Pudding Creek | 715065 |
| Mendocino | South Fork Noyo Water Intake Pump | South Fork Noyo River | 758253 |
| Shasta | North Fork Battle Creek Boulder Cluster Fish Passage | Battle Creek | 65176, 765178 |
| Shasta and Tehama | Battle Creek Restoration Project Dams (Shasta and Tehama) | North and South Fork Battle Creek | 720158, 735086, 730481, 720137, 735082, 720189, 735081, 735083 |
| Tehama | Deer Creek Stanford Vina Dam Fish Ladders | Deer Creek | 704279 |
| Tehama | Mill Creek Fish Passage Project - Upper Dam | Mill Creek | 704275 |
| Tehama | Mill Creek Fish Passage Project - Ward Dam | Mill Creek | 704276 |
| Butte | Five Mile Dam | Big Chico Creek | 704194 |
| Butte | One Mile Dam | Big Chico Creek | 704198 |
| Placer | Hemphill Dam | Auburn Ravine | 737315 |
| Placer | Sewer Pipe Crossing | Dry Creek | 717236 |
| San Joaquin | Bellota Weir | Mormon Slough | 703864 |
| San Joaquin | Hosie Low Flow Road Crossing | Mormon Slough | 735119 |
| Sutter | Weir #1 Sutter Bypass | Butte Creek | 703959 |
| Sutter | Sunset Pumps Diversion Dam | Feather River | 717632 |
| Sutter | Tisdale Weir | Sacramento River | 720308 |
| Yolo | Fremont Weir | Sacramento River | 704343 |
| Marin | Highway 1 Culvert | John West Fork | 706059 |
| Marin | Larsen Creek Culvert/Ladder (Sir Francis Drake Boulevard Culvert) | Larsen Creek | 707315 |
| Marin | Highway 1 Culverts | McCurdy and North McCurdy Creeks | 706078, 706079 |
| Marin | Roy's Pools | San Geronimo Creek | 735661 |
| Napa | Bothe State Park Culverts | Ritchie Creek | 735060 |
| Napa | Highway 29 Culvert | Ritchie Creek | 705459 |
| San Mateo | Adobe Road Crossing | San Pedro Creek | 713787 |
| San Mateo | Capistrano Road Crossing | San Pedro Creek | 713785 |
| Sonoma | Adobe Creek Road | Adobe Creek | 730620 |
| Sonoma | Lancel Creek | Lancel Creek | 712089 |
| Fresno | Mendota Dam | San Joaquin River | 718840 |
| Madera | Sack Dam | San Joaquin River | 704635 |

| | | | |
|------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|
| Merced | Merced River Cowell Agreement Diverters (CAD) Wingdams | Merced River | 703263, 737075, 37068-737070, 704924, 737065 |
| Monterey | Los Padres Dam | Carmel River | 718842 |
| San Luis Obispo | Dairy Creek at Hwy 1 | Dairy Creek | 700037 |
| San Luis Obispo | Marre Weir | San Luis Obispo Creek | 700056 |
| San Luis Obispo | San Luis Obispo Creek Hwy 1 above Cuesta Park | San Luis Obispo Creek | 700058 |
| San Luis Obispo | San Luis Obispo Creek Hwy 1 Rocky Ramp Stagecoach Road | San Luis Obispo Creek | 700061 |
| San Luis Obispo | San Luisito Creek Adobe Road Culvert | San Luisito Creek | 700065 |
| San Luis Obispo | San Luisito Creek Hwy 1 Culvert with 5ft. Drop Structure | San Luisito Creek | 700066 |
| Santa Barbara | Hwy 192 Box Culvert | Mission Creek | 706538 |
| Santa Barbara | Mission Canyon Road Bridge | Mission Creek | 706537 |
| Santa Barbara | Casa Dorinda Channel | Montecito Creek | 707372 |
| Santa Barbara | Lower Montecito Creek Channel | Montecito Creek | 707371 |
| Santa Barbara | Diversion Dam and Two Arizona Crossings | San Jose Creek | 706285, 764927, 706286 |
| Santa Barbara | Hollister Road Bridge | San Jose Creek | 700090 |
| Ventura | Wheeler Gorge Campground Crossing | Bear Creek | 707652 |
| Ventura | Hwy 126 Bridge | Hopper Creek | 713878 |
| Ventura | Matilija Dam | Matilija Creek | 719058 |
| Ventura | Lower Wheeler Gorge Campground Crossing | North Fork Matilija Creek | 707666 |