

Napa County Wildlife Conservation Commission

May 18, 2026 Special Meeting Agenda

Item 7B

Mendocino County Fish & Game Commission Grant Selection Criteria and Evaluation Tool

Source: <https://www.mendocinocounty.gov/departments/planning-building-services/fish-and-game-commission>

No.	Criteria	Ways to Measure It	Ranking
1	Meets Fish & Game Code Sections and Restrictions	Explicit statements in the grant proposal describing which section(s) of the code the activities match up with	0 = no sections mentioned in the application or implied 1 = sections mentioned; but no description provided 2 = sections mentioned; inadequate description provided 3 = sections mentioned with adequate description 4 = sections mentions; description clearly and fully demonstrates all proposed activities match with code.
2	Work proposed is feasible	Methods are clearly outlined and detailed with attached calendar schedule of activities	0 = methods are not mentioned 1 = methods are mentioned; but no details provided 2 = methods are partially and inadequately detailed 3 = methods are adequately detailed but no clear schedule 4 = methods are clearly and fully detailed with calendar schedule
3	Work benefits the local ecology	Proposed activities contribute to improved habitat and/or increased stewardship	0 = activities have no [in]direct positive impact on local ecology 1 = activities have an indirect positive impact on local ecology 2 = activities have a potential, but unclear direct positive impact 3 = activities have a clear and direct positive short-term impact 4 = activities have a clear and direct positive short-term and long-term impact
4	Work benefits local communities	Proposed activities contribute to community education, capacity	0 = activities do not contribute positively to local communities 1 = activities indirectly contribute positively to local communities 2 = activities have a potential, but unclear direct positive impact 3 = activities have a clear and direct positive short-term impact

No.	Criteria	Ways to Measure It	Ranking
		building, and/or income generation	4 = activities have a clear and direct positive short-term and long-term impact
5	Applicant(s) work(s) well and cooperatively with related agencies	Applicant(s) is/are recognized professionally and known for positive collaborative relationships	<p>-5 = applicants have a known, and negative history with local agencies</p> <p>0 = applicants have no known professional recognition, and no known collaborative history with local agencies</p> <p>1 = applicant(s) are recognized professionally for their contributions; but have no known collaborative history with local agencies</p> <p>2 = applicant(s) are recognized professionally and have minimal collaborative history with local agencies</p> <p>3 = applicant(s) are recognized professionally and have positive and longer-term collaborative history with local agencies</p> <p>4 = applicant(s) are recognized professionally and have an excellent and long-term collaborative history with local agencies</p>
6	Proposed activities represent “best use” of limited funds	Proposal demonstrates efficient and effective use of funds	<p>0 = budget is too vague</p> <p>1 = budget is partially detailed</p> <p>2 = budget is clearly detailed, but some categories are questionable</p> <p>3 = budget is clearly detailed and all categories are well-reasoned</p> <p>4 = budget is clearly detailed, all categories are well-reasoned and the applicant(s) is/are leveraging or matching the funds requested</p>

Commissioner Allen Xie’s Proposed Criteria and Rubric

Source: Commissioner Xuexin “Allen” Xie, May 2025

Category	Criteria	Weight (%)	Score (1-5)	Weighted score	Justification
Conservation Impact	Does the project benefit native species or critical habitats? Are the expected outcomes clear, measurable, and supported by data?	40			
Education Impact	Is the program aligned with school standards or environmental literacy goals? Are learning outcomes defined and is there a plan for assessment?	25			
Community Engagement & Equity	Does the project engage the public, especially underrepresented communities? Are volunteers, students, or local organizations meaningfully involved?	15			
Feasibility & Accountability	Is the budget clear, itemized, and reasonable? Are there realistic timelines, responsibilities, and success metrics?	10			
Collaboration & Matching Support	Are partnerships with other groups or agencies involved? Does the project include matching funds or in-kind support?	10			

Scoring Scale:

- 1 = inadequate: does not meet expectations
- 2 = Limited: partially meets expectations
- 3 = Adequate: meets basic expectations
- 4 = Strong: meets expectations with minor improvements needed
- 5 = Excellent: fully meets and exceeds expectations