

Napa County

1195 THIRD STREET
SUITE 310
NAPA, CA 94559



Agenda - Final

Monday, April 27, 2026

2:00 PM

Board of Supervisors Chambers

Napa County Wildlife Conservation Commission

Members

Charles Burton, Chair

Kimberly Richard

Molly Moran Williams

Leslie Lew

Greg Matsumoto

Alex Pader, Vice Chair

Ina Pisani

Xuexin (Allen) Xie

How to Watch or Listen to the Napa County Wildlife Conservation Commission Meetings

The Napa County Wildlife Conservation Commission will meet pursuant to the annually adopted meeting calendar available at the following link: <https://www.countyofnapa.org/2342/Calendar>

The WCC realizes that not all County residents have the same ways to stay engaged, so several alternatives are offered. Remote Zoom participation for members of the public is provided for convenience only. In the event that the Zoom connection malfunctions for any reason, the WCC reserves the right to conduct the meeting without remote access.

Please watch or listen to the WCC meeting in one of the following ways:

1. Attend in-person at the Board of Supervisors Chambers, 1195 Third Street, Napa Suite 305.
2. Watch on Zoom using the attendee link: <https://countyofnapa.zoom.us/j/87073670597>. Make sure the browser is up-to-date.
3. Listen on Zoom by calling 1-669-900-6833 (Meeting ID: 870 7367 0597).

If you are unable to attend the meeting in person and wish to submit a general public comment or a comment on a specific agenda item, please do the following:

1. Email your comment to wildlife@countyofnapa.org 24 hours in advance of the meeting to ensure that your comment will be shared with all members of the WCC.
2. Use the Zoom attendee link <https://countyofnapa.zoom.us/j/87073670597>. Make sure the browser is up-to-date. When the Chair calls for the item on which you wish to speak, click “raise hand”. Please limit your remarks to three minutes.
3. Call the Zoom phone number: 1-669-900-6833 (Meeting ID: 870 7367 0597). When the Chair calls for the item on which you wish to speak, press *9 to raise hand. Please limit your remarks to three minutes.
Please note that phone numbers in their entirety will be visible online while speakers are speaking

The above-identified measures meet all legal requirements for participation and public comment, including those imposed by the Ralph M. Brown Act and Executive Order N-08-21.

For more information, please contact the Wildlife Conservation Commission Staff at 707-253-4417 or email wildlife@countyofnapa.org.

Requests for disability-related modifications or accommodations, aids or services, including assistive listening devices and interpreters, may be made to Commission staff representative Pamela Arifian at (707) 259-5934 or by email at pamela.arifian@countyofnapa.org no less than 72 hours prior to the meeting date. All materials relating to an agenda item which are provided to a majority or all of the members of the Commission by Commission members, staff or the public within 72 hours of but prior to the meeting will be available for public inspection, at the time of such distribution, in the office of the Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department, 1195 Third Street, 2nd. Floor, Napa, California 94559, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:45 p.m., except for County holidays. Materials distributed to a majority or all of the members of the Commission at the meeting will be available for public inspection at the public meeting if prepared by the members of the Commission or Commission staff and after the public meeting if prepared by some other person. Availability of materials related to agenda items for public inspection does not include materials which are exempt from public disclosure under Government Code sections 6253.5, 6254, 6254.3, 6254.7, 6254.15, 6254.16, or 6254.22.

In this time period, anyone may comment to the Commission regarding any subject over which the Commission has jurisdiction, or request consideration to place an item on a future Agenda. No comments will be allowed involving any subject matter that is scheduled for discussion as part of this Agenda. Individuals will be limited to a three-minute presentation. No action will be taken by the Commission as a result of any item presented at this time.

You may submit public comment for any item that appears on the agenda or general public comment for any item or issue that does not appear on the agenda, as follows: Please provide your name and the agenda item on which you are commenting. Via Email – send your comment to the following email address: wildlife@countyofnapa.org. Emails received will not be read aloud but will still become part of the public record. All comments will be taken up in the order received.

1. **Call to Order (Chair)**
2. **Roll Call (Staff)**
3. **Pledge of Allegiance (Chair)**
4. **Public Comment and Recommendations (Chair)**
5. **Approval Of Minutes**
 - A. Review and approve Meeting Minutes from February 23, 2026. [26-965](#)
Attachments: [2-23-26 Draft Meeting Minutes](#)
6. **Agenda Review (Staff)**
7. **Consideration and Action on Agenda Items**
 - A. Commissioners report on the progress of their assigned grant projects for the 2025-26 Grant Cycle. [26-983](#)
 - B. Review and accept results from a survey of past grant recipients on their perspectives of grant award process. [26-982](#)
Attachments: [Agenda Item 7B Attachment - Survey ADA](#)
 - C. Receive a report on historic grant funding and comparative process information to inform discernment on potential improvements to the grant awards decision-making process. [26-936](#)
Attachments: [Agenda Item 7C Attachment - Tables](#)
[Agenda Item 7C Attachment 2 - Other County Commission Criteria](#)
[Commissioner Allen Xie Draft Grant Criteria and Rubric](#)
[Sonoma County Ag Open Space MGP Evaluation-Matrix](#)
8. **Director or Designee Report**
9. **Commissioner Comments/ Reports**
10. **Future Agenda Items**
11. **Adjournment**

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE AGENDA FOR THE ABOVE STATED MEETING WAS POSTED AT A LOCATION FREELY ACCESSIBLE TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AT THE NAPA COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING, 1195 THIRD STREET, NAPA, CALIFORNIA ON APRIL 16, 2026 BY 10:30 AM. A HARDCOPY SIGNED VERSION OF THE CERTIFICATE IS ON FILE WITH THE COMMITTEE CLERK AND AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION
AIME RAMOS (by e-signature)
Aime Ramos, Clerk of the Commission



Napa County
Board Agenda Letter

1195 THIRD STREET
SUITE 310
NAPA, CA 94559
www.napacounty.gov
Main: (707) 253-4580

Napa County Wildlife Conservation Commission **Agenda Date:** 4/27/2026

File ID #: 26-965

TO: Napa County Wildlife Conservation Commission
FROM: Dana Morrison, Secretary to the Wildlife Conservation Commission
REPORT BY: Pam Arifian, Planner III
SUBJECT: Approval of Minutes from February 23, 2026

RECOMMENDATION

Review and approve Meeting Minutes from February 23, 2026.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Review and approve Meeting Minutes from February 23, 2026.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: Not a “project” pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) State CEQA Guidelines Section 15378.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

Review and approve Meeting Minutes from February 23, 2026.



Napa County Wildlife Conservation Commission Meeting Minutes

Date: Monday, February 23, 2026

Time: 2:00 PM

Location: Board of Supervisors Chambers
1195 Third Street, Third Floor

1. Call to Order

The meeting commenced at 2:02 PM.

2. Roll Call

Commission Members Present:

- Charles Burton (Chair)
- Kimberly Richard
- Molly Moran Williams
- Leslie Lew
- Alex Pader (Vice Chair)
- Ina Pisani
- Xuexin (Allen) Xie

Commission Members Absent:

- Greg Matsumoto

County Staff Present:

- Dana Morrison, Supervising Planner (Secretary to the Commission)
 - Pam Arifian, Planner III
 - Daniel Zador, Planner II
 - Laura Anderson, County Counsel
 - Aime Ramos, Meeting Clerk
-

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. Public Comment

No public comments were received.

5. Approval of Minutes

Item: Approval of minutes from August 25, 2025, regular meeting.

Motion: Made by Commissioner Richard seconded by Commissioner Lew.

Vote Result: Motion carried (6–1–1)

- **Yes:** Burton, Richard, Lew, Pader, Pisani, Xie
- **Abstain:** Moran Williams
- **Absent:** Matsumoto

6. Agenda Review

Dana Morrison provided an overview of the meeting agenda

7. Consideration and Action on Agenda Items

7A. Election of Officers (Chair and Vice Chair)

Pam Arifian presented the item.

Vice Chair Election:

- Motion made by Commissioner Richard to appoint Alex Pader as Vice Chair for 2026
- Seconded by Commissioner Xie

Vote Result: Motion carried (7–0–1)

- **Yes:** Burton, Richard, Lew, Pader, Pisani, Xie, Moran Williams
- **Absent:** Matsumoto

Chair Election:

- Motion made by Commissioner Richard for Charles Burton to remain Chair for 2026
- Seconded by Commissioner Pader

Vote Result: Motion carried (7–0–1)

- **Yes:** Burton, Richard, Lew, Pader, Pisani, Xie, Moran Williams
 - **Absent:** Matsumoto
-

7B. Review and Adoption of 2026 Meeting Calendar

Dana Morrison presented the item.

Motion: Made by Commissioner Pader to adopt the revised 2026 meeting calendar, seconded by Chair Burton.

Vote Result: Motion carried (7–0–1)

- **Yes:** Burton, Richard, Lew, Pader, Pisani, Xie, Moran Williams
 - **Absent:** Matsumoto
-

7C. Grant Evaluation Process Improvements

Pam Arifian presented the item and facilitated discussion.

Commissioner Xie also provided a presentation and contributed to the discussion.

Motion:

Chair Burton moved to direct staff to provide additional information on historic grant funding and on how selection criteria in Solano, Alameda, and Contra Costa counties influence the distribution and allocation of funds.

Seconded by Commissioner Lew.

Vote Result: Motion carried (7–0–1)

- **Yes:** Burton, Richard, Lew, Pader, Pisani, Xie, Moran Williams
 - **Absent:** Matsumoto
-

8. Director or Designee Report

Dana Morrison reported the following:

- On April 14, the Watershed Information Council will present to the Board of Supervisors regarding its reformation.

- A BDR Community Workshop (in-person) will be held on Thursday, March 19, from 10:30 AM to 12:30 PM at Schmidt Hall in Yountville.
 - A BDR Community Workshop (virtual) will be held on Monday, March 23, from 4:30 PM to 6:30 PM.
-

9. Commissioner Comments and Reports

Chair Burton discussed the possibility of holding officer elections every other year instead of annually. This change would require an amendment to the Commission Bylaws.

10. Future Agenda Items

- A special meeting will be scheduled for May 2026.
 - Progress reports on the grants awarded will be presented at the April meeting.
-

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:34 PM.

12. Signature

Aime Ramos, Meeting Clerk



Napa County

Board Agenda Letter

1195 THIRD STREET
SUITE 310
NAPA, CA 94559
www.napacounty.gov
Main: (707) 253-4580

Napa County Wildlife Conservation Commission **Agenda Date:** 4/27/2026

File ID #: 26-983

TO: Napa County Wildlife Conservation Commission
FROM: Dana Morrison, Secretary to the Wildlife Conservation Commission
REPORT BY: Pam Arifian, Planner III
SUBJECT: 2025-26 Grant Award Monitoring Reports

RECOMMENDATION

Commissioners report on the progress of their assigned grant projects for the 2025-26 Grant Cycle.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Commissioners report on the progress of their assigned grant projects for the 2025-26 Grant Cycle.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: Not a “project” under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) State CEQA Guidelines Section 15378.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

Commissioners report to group on progress on the 2025-26 grant awards as assigned below:

Napa-Solano Audubon Society: Commissioner Burton

International Bird Rescue: Commissioner Burton

Land Trust of Napa County: Commissioners Lew and Richard

North Bay Bear Collaborative: Commissioners Lew and Richard

American Canyon Community and Parks Foundation: Commissioner Matsumoto

Institute for Conservation Advocacy Research Education: Commissioners Matsumoto and Xie

Carolyn Parr Nature Center: Commissioner Pader

School Garden Doctor: Commissioner Pisani

Napa County Resource Conservation District: Commissioner Richard

University of California Cooperative Extension: Commissioner Richard

Napa Wildlife Rescue: Commissioners Xie and Williams



Napa County

Board Agenda Letter

1195 THIRD STREET
SUITE 310
NAPA, CA 94559
www.napacounty.gov
Main: (707) 253-4580

Napa County Wildlife Conservation Commission **Agenda Date:** 4/27/2026

File ID #: 26-982

TO: Napa County Wildlife Conservation Commission
FROM: Dana Morrison, Secretary to the Wildlife Conservation Commission
REPORT BY: Pam Arifian, Planner III
SUBJECT: **Process Improvements: Survey Responses**

RECOMMENDATION

Review and accept results from a survey of past grant recipients on their perspectives of grant award process.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Review and accept results from a survey of past grant recipients on their perspectives of grant award process.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: Not a “project” under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15378.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

Following direction from the WCC at the February 23, 2026 meeting, Staff created a brief survey and distributed to recent grant award recipients (21 contacts from 12 different organizations). Following a two-week response period (March 24, 2026 to April 8, 2026), Staff received eight (8) to nine (9) anonymous responses from past recipients. The responses are summarized below; please refer to Attachment 7B to read complete responses.

Question 1. “How satisfied are you with the grant application and decision-making process?”

Responses (9):

- 44% “satisfied”

- 33% “dissatisfied”
- 11% “very satisfied”
- 11% “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied”

Question 2. “What specific improvements could be made to the grant selection process to make it more efficient?”

Responses (8):

- Emphasis on providing maximum grant amounts available or likely to be funded (3 responses)
- Emphasis on not having applicants present for discussion of merits (2 responses)
- Emphasis on creating a clear, structured and measurable scoring rubric (2 responses)
- Suggestion that Commissioners scores applications ahead of public meeting (1 response)
- Additional suggestions regarding clarity about allowable expenses, and acknowledgement that some costs are necessary if not “glamorous”

Question 3. “What improvements could be made to provide more clarity regarding the structure of the grant or decision process?”

Responses (8):

- Emphasis on the existing biases, vague priorities, and arbitrary decisions, with suggestions for more structured system for rating or scoring applications (5 responses).

Question 4. “Do you feel the time allotted for in-person presentations is adequate? Would you like more time? Or do you prefer to let the application materials speak for themselves and not provide a presentation?”

Responses (8):

- Presentations are valuable (5 responses)
- Presentations unnecessary or too big a lift (4 responses)
- Presentation time limit is adequate (3 responses)
- Presentation time limit is too short (3 responses)
- Support for being able to answer questions (4 responses)

Question 5. “Are there any other general comments, concerns, or kudos related to the Napa County WCC

grant program?”

Responses (8):

- Appreciation for support (5 responses)
- Appreciation for community of applicants and commissioners (2 responses)
- Reporting requirements are appropriate
- Grateful for soliciting feedback (2 responses)
- Suggestion to have presentations be part of reporting (2 responses)

Attachment to Staff Report (Agenda Item 7B)

Survey Responses from Past Grant Award Recipients

Background:

Following direction from the WCC, Staff created and distributed a brief survey (through surveymonkey.com to recent grant award recipients (21 contacts from 12 organizations). Following a two-week response period (March 24, 2026 to April 8, 2026), Staff received eight (8) to nine (9) anonymous responses. Complete responses are provided below:

Question 1. “What specific improvements could be made to the grant selection process to make it more efficient?”

Responses (9):

44% “satisfied”

33% “dissatisfied”

11% “very satisfied”

11% “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied”

Question 2. “What specific improvements could be made to the grant selection process to make it more efficient?”

Responses (8):

1. “The Committee always does a great job discussing projects and asking questions to each applicant during the selection meeting each year. Since it seems there are a large number of applicants in recent years, as well as more requests for funding than there are funds available to be awarded, I wonder if it would save time to

calculate the funding amounts that are likely available for all of the grant applicants prior to the meeting (such as: all applicants' budgets are scaled down equally by 10% if the overall amount requested is 10% over the amount of funding available for the year), or to come up with some possible scenarios for amounts to be awarded prior to the meeting, so that the math is already done ahead of time? Of course, the Committee may decide to fully fund some of the grants but not others, so I see where this might not be helpful. Is it possible for the Committee to discuss each grant prior to the selection meeting date so that they have questions ready ahead of time, and have some time to discuss prior to the meeting with the applicants? That might also make the selection process more efficient as well if that step is possible.”

2. “I would suggest a cap/limit to the amount that any one organization can be awarded to provide a more equitable distribution of funds, and prevent large requests from taking a major percentage of the available funding.”
3. “Clarifying amount of funding available to applicants in advance and providing maximum fundable amount for each proposal. For example, organizations can apply for up to \$10,000. If all qualifying applications are meant to get funded, then state that up front, and indicate the minimum amount each entity . Clear, structured, and measurable scoring rubric (with standard point system) to eliminate personal biases of commissioners. Each commissioner should score the applications based on the application’s adherence to application criteria that is clearly stated. Rubric could be based on each section of the application (Needs Assessment, Clear Statement of Benefit Relative to Goals of the Commission, Budget Detail, Attachments) Application template needs to have a maximum page or word count to give sense of level of effort expected of applicants. Reviewers could score their applications ahead of the hearing meeting and present the summary of scores beforehand.”
4. “Additional clarity/guidance about the maximum grant amounts available or likely to be funded, and about allowable expenses (whether personnel costs are fundable); also, an acknowledgement that some costs are necessary but not always "glamorous" such as insurance”
5. “It would be more comfortable if commissioners discussed the grant applications in private rather than during the meeting when applicants are present.”
6. “streamline the process with Less paperwork”
7. “Open discussion about the merits of each grant in the public is uncomfortable for the applicants and makes it seem like certain commissioners have "favorites"”

because they are personally involved with the specific group. Presentations about the projects seems like a big lift. No other grants have this requirement. Sitting in the room and waiting to hear how is being funded and how much they are being funded for is not a positive experience, especially since many of us are partners in each others programs. Perhaps have the discussion about who gets how much in private to save time.”

8. “There should be a weighting system whereas money is allocated based on which applications best meet the grant criteria. The guidelines have specific criteria, yet there does not seem to be much consideration given to them by the Commissioners.”

Question 3: “What improvements could be made to provide mor clarity regarding the structure of the grant or decision process?”

Responses (8):

1. “It has all seemed pretty clear, I can't think of any helpful improvements at the moment.”
2. “I would recommend a more structured assessment system for determining the funding granted to requests based on specific criteria such as educational value to the community, habitat preservation, etc. as was suggested by the student representative on the Commission last year. It seems that sometimes grants are awarded based on the personal lobbying of individual Commission members.”
3. “The Commission needs more consistency in objective decision making. The current process allows for bias, based on personal opinion or preferred outcome, not clear criteria. There seems to be preference towards projects who seek more funding than smaller projects, and wildlife rescue. Larger project proposals historically garner larger awards – particularly when across the board budget cuts are proposed by the commission, unequally impacting smaller proposals. The greater the ask typically results in a larger award. Environmental education proposals are additionally burdened beyond other applications with the requirement of at least one (1) letter of support from a school board member, principal, teacher, whereas other proposals do not require this. Commissioners should be provided with more structure for their conversation so that it focuses on

the merits of the application as opposed to their individual experience with the organization. Commission could prepare their budget allocations in advance. Budget determinations and changes are decided in the moment during the application hearing, resulting in significant changes to projects and applications. A 30% or 50% change in budget dramatically alters the project, and the work that went in to forming the project and it's potential outcomes and adherence to commission priorities.”

4. “Stronger acknowledgement/codifying of linkages between committee criteria and program features/descriptions/application. I've seen times where despite clearly strong fit/linkage a proposal gets cut for seemingly arbitrary reasons”
5. “Application process is straightforward and easy to understand.”
6. “Giving more examples of past projects and approved grants.”
7. “A matrix for how the grants are scored would really help. Everything is very vague so we don't really understand what your real priorities are.”
8. “The application could be rated on a scale (1-5) for each of the criteria. The grant applications with the highest points should receive a higher percentage of funding than the grant applications with lower points. The Commissioners could rate them as a group or individually.”

Question 4: “Do you feel the time allotted for in-person presentations is adequate? Would you like more time? Or do you prefer to let the application materials speak for themselves and not provide a presentation?”

Responses (8):

1. “I think the allotted presentation time is adequate, especially for the number of applicants that typically participate each year. I think it could also be fine to let application materials speak for themselves, but if that was the case, it would be nice to still be able to answer questions in person.”
2. “Yes, I would definitely like more time. 3 minutes is hardly sufficient to convey the benefit of the grant for our organization.”
3. “We would prefer to let the application materials speak for themselves. If the Commission would like to see photos of the work, we encourage them to add this to

the criteria for the grant application. Developing an in-person presentation can be a very time-intensive process, even for short presentations. Additionally, applicants are encouraged to be present for the entire public hearing, and be prepared to defend and alter their project in the moment based upon feedback by the Commissioners. Applicants who have experience with the process have seen the Commission tend to provide applicants with a percent of their request are prepared to respond to the possibility of adjusting their budget. In contrast, new or less resourced applicants may not be aware of this last-minute change. Lastly, the presentation process may lead to the perception of competition among applicants.”

4. “We very much like and appreciate being able to make a short presentation (virtual and/or in-person), and be available to answer questions and provide additional context, based on Commissioner questions”
5. “Time is adequate but are repetitive to the application. Suggest having representative on site to answer questions from the board if needed but not to include presentations.”
6. “Its plenty of time.”
7. “There is not enough time, but I also don't think the applicants should do a presentation at all. The full grant request should be enough. If the commission has clarifying questions, they should be sent directly to the applicants and we can answer them accordingly.”
8. “More time would be appreciated for a presentation.”

Question 5: “Are there any other general comments, concerns, or kudos related to the Napa County WCC grant program?”

Responses (8):

1. “We really appreciate all of the support that the WCC has provided over the years, and are grateful for the opportunity to apply for funding from you all towards our ongoing stewardship projects! It is always inspiring to see the group of people who make up the WCC and the time and care they spend helping this community in this way!”

Napa County Wildlife Conservation Commission

April 27, 2026 Special Meeting

2. “We all greatly appreciate the funding received to support our organizations' activities.”
3. “We greatly appreciate the annual funding provided by the Commission, and the fact that awards are determined by community members. The reporting requirements are appropriate and not overly time consuming or burdensome to the projects relative to the size of the award. We have enjoyed providing Commissioners with tours of our grant-funded projects. We are very grateful that you are soliciting this feedback to improve the process and outcome of this granting procedure. Alternatively, the Commission could invite applicants to share a summary of their accomplishments from the past year to showcase how the funds were utilized for wildlife benefit. Commissioners have demonstrated preference towards applications which propose the funding of equipment or materials as opposed to labor-based projects. For example, if an applicant is proposing the purchase of an aviary or an ATV, commissioners are less willing to reduce the applicant's proposed budget, because the perception is that equipment could not be purchased with partial funding. Subsequently, projects which require staff time are more readily reduced based on the discretion of the commissioners.”
4. “The virtual component/attendance is really helpful for us, and overall we think the Napa County process is a good one; as evidenced by the intention to strive to make it even better.”
5. “Thank you WCC, we are grateful for your support of these important programs!”
6. “Thank you for all your support over the years!”
7. “If the commission wants presentations, perhaps they could be part of the grant report, after the fact. That way the commission knows what the funding helped create. All of the applicants have very worthy projects and it is a bit hurtful to sit through debate about the value of each one. The commission is wonderfully generous in its funding, but the process could be tightened up.”
8. “Everyone is thanked for giving their time.”



Napa County

Board Agenda Letter

1195 THIRD STREET
SUITE 310
NAPA, CA 94559
www.napacounty.gov
Main: (707) 253-4580

Napa County Wildlife Conservation Commission **Agenda Date:** 4/27/2026

File ID #: 26-936

TO: Napa County Wildlife Conservation Commission
FROM: Dana Morrison, Secretary to Commission
REPORT BY: Pam Arifian, Planner III
SUBJECT: Process Improvements: Past Grant Funding Data & Comparative Processes

RECOMMENDATION

Receive a report on historic grant funding and comparative process information to inform discernment on potential improvements to the grant awards decision-making process.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Receive a report on historic grant funding and comparative process information to inform discernment on potential improvements to the grant awards decision-making process.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: Not a "project" under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) State CEQA Guidelines Section 15378.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

At the February 23, 2026 Special Meeting of the Wildlife Conservation Commission (WCC), the Commission requested multiple data points to inform and support the development of improvements to the decision-making process for the annual grant award. The Commission also requested more information on the process for other County Commissions administering a California Department of Fish and Wildlife Fish and Wildlife Propagation Fund grant program.

Following and attached are data regarding categories of funding and percentage of award categories over the most recent 5- and 10-year datasets, as well as information regarding repeat grant recipients and funding of staff positions, which has been provided below and in the attached documents, in addition to the information about process from other Counties. Following this information, there are ideas proposed for consideration that

address issues and ideas encompassed in past discussion, current feedback and historic funding information.

Grant Funding History

Following WCC recommendations, the County has provided grant funding to a total of 36 different organizations over the past 24 years, with an average of six to seven grant applicants / recipients per year. The WCC recommended a total of \$1,136,535 in funding since 2002, with an annual average of \$47,356 awarded for programs and organizations doing work in one of the following categories: Environmental Education, Wildlife - Direct Care, Habitat Restoration, Wildlife - Research, and Miscellaneous (includes equipment for CDFW enforcement).

Funding By Category

Table 1 (attached) details funding history in five- and ten-year data sets of average annual funding by category, including the average number of applicants by category over the five- and ten-year datasets.

Average Annual Funding and Number of Applications by Category: 5 years (2021-2025)

- Education: \$33,352 (57% of total awards); 4.6 average annual applications.
- Restoration: \$11,267 (19% of total awards); 1.2 average annual applications.
- Wildlife - Direct Care: \$9,580 (17% of total awards); 2 average annual applications.
- Research: \$3,812 (7% of total awards); 0.8 average annual applications.
- Miscellaneous: \$4,376 was awarded in 2022 and rolled over in 2023 for CDWF outboard motor, but CDFW could not receive the funds, therefore never funded and not included here. 0.2 average annual applications.

Average Annual Funding by Category: 10 years (2016-2025)

- Education: \$27,418 (52% of total awards); 3.8 average annual applications.
- Restoration: \$11,070 (21% of total awards); 1.1 average annual applications.
- Wildlife - Direct Care: \$9,657 (18% of total awards); 1.6 average annual applications.
- Research: \$4,084 (8% of total awards); 0.8 average annual applications.
- Miscellaneous: \$5,000 (1% of total awards) - One (1) grant to CDFW for enforcement equipment. 0.2 average annual applications.

Repeat Grant Award Recipients

At the February 23, 2026 WCC meeting, the Commission requested information regarding WCC grant awards recipients that have repeatedly received funding over the years. Table 2 (attached) provides information on repeat recipients, including how many awards were received, the total award amounts and in what categories, all of which is summarized below.

- Land Trust of Napa County: 21 times since 2003 (\$186,679) (Restoration, Education)
- Napa County Resource Conservation District: 21 times since 2005 (\$208,956) (Education, Restoration)
- Napa Wildlife Rescue: 19 times since 2003 (\$148,815) (Education, Wildlife - Direct Care)
- Napa-Solano Audubon Society: 12 times since 2013 (\$78,024) (Education)
- Institute for Conservation Advocacy Research: 10 times since 2007 (\$49,800) (Research, Education)
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife: applied 10 times since 2002, but last successful funded project was 2019 (equipment for enforcement) (\$50,219) (Miscellaneous)
- International Bird Rescue: 7 times since 2019 (\$31,650) (Wildlife - Direct Care)
- American Canyon Community and Parks Foundation: 3 times since 2023 (\$35,011) (Education)
- Carolyn Parr Nature Center: 3 times since 2005 (10,691) (Education, Restoration)

Staff Salary Funding

At the February 23, 2026, WCC meeting, the Commission requested information regarding WCC grant awards that support staff salaries, including how many “career” staff (regular salaried position) vs. “program” staff (short-term or project-based) and at what total amounts have been awarded to each type.

The WCC has funded an approximate total of \$311,787 in support of staff salaries since 2002, including career positions at the organization for time spent on specific programs (for example, Napa County Resource Conservation District staff time on specific, short-term education programming), or to career positions (for example, in the case of Napa Wildlife Rescue, to facilitate the consistent educational programs and wildlife rehabilitation that is foundational to the mission). The WCC has granted a total of \$365,615 to these organizations in the same time period, resulting in 85% of funding granted towards staff salaries. Table 3 (attached, and as summarized below) provides details on past recipients that received awards in support of staff salaries, including what percentage of the total requests were for salaries, and whether the support was for “career” staff or “program” staff.

- Napa County Resource Conservation District (RCD) has received an approximate total of \$95,705 from WCC grants towards salaried staff since 2007, with an average of \$7,362 per year over 13 years. The funding supported career staff salary for their time spent on specific program implementation including Youth Stewardship Council and Monarch Habitat project, as examples. RCD has received WCC grants 21 times since 2003, with a total of \$208,956 for Education, Research and Restoration.

- Napa Wildlife Rescue (NWR) has received an approximate total of \$75,996 from WCC grants towards salaried staff since 2018, with an average of \$12,666 per year over six years. The funding has supported a percentage of full-time staff salary for a position that is built into the operations (Environmental Education Coordinator and Wildlife Rehabilitation Technician). NWR has received WCC grants 19 times since 2003, with a total of \$148,815 for Education and Wildlife - Direct Care.
- Napa-Solano Audubon Society (NSAS) has received an approximate total of \$75,448 from WCC grants since 2015, with an average of \$7,549 per year over ten years. The funding has supported a percentage of part-time staff and/or interns who are facilitating Audubon programs. NSAS has received WCC grants 12 times since 2013, with a total of \$78,024 for Education.
- Institute for Conservation Research and Education (ICARE) has received an approximate total of \$39,936 from WCC grants since 2007, with an average of \$3,994 per year over ten years. The awards supported ICARE staff/consultants for work on the specified projects. ICARE has received WCC grants ten (10) times since 2007, with a total of \$49,800 for Restoration, Research and Education.
- American Canyon Community & Parks Foundation (ACCPF) has received an approximate total of \$24,662 from WCC grants since 2023, with an average of \$8,221 per year over three years. The funding supported salaried staff for work on the specified programs (Watershed Protectors/Explorers). ACCPF has received WCC grants three (3) times since 2023, with a total of \$35,011 for Education.

FWPF Award Processes from Other Counties

Staff conducted a review of what was publicly available from the equivalent Fish & Wildlife Propagation Fund Commissions/Committees of 30 counties in California regarding grant award criteria, scoring or other information about the decision-making process. Based on the limited available information, the following models / processes are presented for comparative analysis.

- Alameda County Fish and Game Commission
 - Either one \$30,000 grant for habitat restoration, or
 - One to two grants of up to \$10,000 and five to eight grants of up to \$5,000
- Solano County Fish & Wildlife Committee (Refer to Attachment)
 - Grant evaluation scoresheet with following criteria:
 - Clarity of Proposal
 - Sustainability

- Goals and Evaluation
- Project Financing
- Committee of three (3) make recommendations for funding to Parks & Recreation Commission.
- Contra Costa County Fish & Wildlife Committee
 - No scoresheet; rather, at the first meeting, the Committee gives each project a plus (+), minus (-) or question mark (?) to indicate a recommendation for full or no funding or if there is a need for more information.
 - At second meeting, Committee reviews new information and makes final recommendations for Board of Supervisors.
 - The Committee tries to fairly recommend projects throughout the county (by region).
- Mendocino County Fish and Game Commission (Refer to Attachment)
 - Application Assessment Criteria:
 - Meets CDFG Code 13101
 - Work proposed is feasible
 - Work benefits the local ecology
 - Work benefits local communities
 - Applicant(s) work(s) well and cooperatively with related agencies
 - Proposed activities represent the “best use” of limited funds
 - Application Assessment Criteria includes Ways to Measure It and Ranking (-5 through 5) with descriptions for how to rank.
 - Scoring Sheet includes space for additional comment for qualitative analysis in addition to the criteria scores.

Some Ideas for Improving the Grant Award Process

1. Two-Meeting Award Process

- In first meeting, review applications, hear presentations (optional), ask questions of applicants.
- In second meeting, review any new information as applicable, and deliberate on funding recommendations. Applicants may attend that meeting as it is a public hearing, but they would not be called upon for new information.

2. Set Caps for Grant Awards by Category

- Based on average annual awards by category over most recent (five) 5 years (and assumption of consistent awards fund of \$75,000 per year):
 - Education 53% (\$40,000 cap)
 - Four (4) grants of \$10,000 each, or
 - Five (5) grants of \$8,000 each
 - Wildlife 21% (\$16,000 cap)
 - Includes direct care and enforcement, miscellaneous
 - Two (2) grants of \$8,000, or
 - Three (3) grants of \$5,300
 - Restoration 17% (\$13,000 cap)
 - One (1) grant of \$13,000, or
 - Two (2) grants of \$6,500
 - Research 8% (\$3,000 cap) or
 - One (1) grant of \$3,000

3. Set Caps for Grant Awards Based on Award Level

- “Large”: \$10,001 to \$15,000
 - On average over last five years, there were four (4) applications requesting a “large” grant. On average, the WCC awarded two (2) “large” grants each year.
 - 1-2 “large” grants per year
- “Medium”: \$5,001 to \$10,000
 - On average over last five years, there were two (2) applications requesting a “medium” grant. On average, the WCC awarded four (4) “medium” grants each year.
 - 3-4 “medium” grants per year
- “Small”: \$5,000 or less
 - On average over last five years, there was one (1) application requesting a “small” grant per year. On average, the WCC awarded two (2) “small” grants each year.
 - 1-2 “small” grants per year

4. Consider Adopting Assessment Criteria

- Adapt and adopt criteria and rubric from Mendocino County FWC to inform Commission funding recommendations.

Attachment to Staff Report (Agenda Item 7C) – Tables

Table 1: Average Annual Funding by Category over 5-years (2021-2025) and 10-years (2016-2025)

Category	Average Annual Funding over 5 years (2021-25)	Average Percentage of Total Annual Awards (2021-25)	Average Number of Applicants (5 years (2021-25))	Average Annual Funding over 10 years (2016-25)	Average Percentage of Total Annual Awards (2016-2025)	Average Number of Applicants (10 years (2016-25))
Education	\$33,352	57%	4.6	\$27,418	52%	3.8
Wildlife-Direct Care	\$9,580	17%	2	\$9,657	18%	1.6
Restoration	\$11,267	19%	1.2	\$11,107	21%	1.1
Research	\$3,812	7%	0.8	\$4,084	8%	0.8
Miscellaneous	\$0	0%	0.2	\$500	1%	0.2

Napa County Wildlife Conservation Commission

April 27, 2026 Special Meeting

Table 2: Repeat WCC Grant Award Recipients

Organization	Total Number of Awards	Total Awards Received	Award Category	Notes
Land Trust of Napa County (LTNC)	21	\$189,679	Restoration, Education	Since 2003
Napa Wildlife Rescue (NWR)	19	\$148,815	Education, Wildlife-Direct Care	Since 2003
Napa-Solano Audubon Society (NSAS)	12	\$78,024	Education	Since 2013
Institute for Conservation Advocacy Research Education (ICARE)	10	\$49,800	Research, Education	Since 2007
California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)	10	\$50,219	Miscellaneous	Since 2002, but last successfully funded project was 2019.
International Bird Rescue (IBR)	7	\$31,650	Wildlife-Direct Care	Since 2019
American Canyon Community & Parks Foundation (ACCPF)	3	\$35,011	Education	Since 2023
Carolyn Parr Nature Center	3	\$10,691	Education, Restoration	Since 2005

Table 3: Grant Awards Supporting Staff Salaries

Organization	No. of Years Awarded for Salary	Total Funds Request for Salary	Total Funds Award for Salary	Percent (%) of Request Awarded	Average Awarded Funds for Salary per year	“Career” (C) or “Program” (P) Staff Salary Support
Napa County Resource Conservation District (RCD)	13 times since 2007	\$116,162	\$95,705	70%	\$7,362	C & P – Supported career staff for time on specific program
Napa Wildlife Rescue (NWR)	Six (6) times since 2018	\$102,998	\$75,996	74%	\$12,666	C - Supported percentage of full-time staff salary for Environmental Education Coordinator / Lead Wildlife Rehabilitation Technician
Napa-Solano Audubon (NSAS)	Ten (10) times since 2015	\$87,662	\$75,488	86%	\$7,549	C & P - Supported percentage of part-time staff and/or interns facilitating programs
Institute for Conservation Research and Education (ICARE)	Ten (10) times since 2007	\$47,886	39,936	80%	\$3,994	C & P – Supported career staff for time on specific program
American Canyon Community & Parks Foundation (ACCPF)	Three (3) times since 2023	\$36,700	\$24,662	69%	\$8,221	C & P – Supported career staff for time on specific program (Watershed Protectors/Explorer)

Napa County Wildlife Conservation Commission

April 27, 2026 Special Meeting

Table 4: Grant Requests and Awards by Funding Levels (up to \$5,000; \$5,001 to \$10,000; \$10,001 and above)

Grant Cycle	No. of Requests \$10,001+	No. of Awards \$10,001+	No. of Requests \$5,001-\$10,000	No. of Awards \$5,001-\$10,000	No. of Requests up to \$5,000	No. of Awards up to \$5,000
2025-26	7	1	4	6	0	4
2024-25	4	3	1	2	1	1
2023-24	4	2	2	4	2	2
2022-23	3	3	1	1	2	2
2021-22	2	1	3	4	1	1
Total – 5 yr	20	10	11	17	6	10
Average	4	2	2	3	1	2
Median	4	2	2	4	1	2
2020-21	2	0	2	4	1	2
2019-20	3	1	3	3	2	4
2018-19	3	3	1	1	0	0
2017-18	1	1	3	3	2	1
2016-17	3	3	2	2	1	1
Total – 10 yr	32	18	22	30	12	18
Average	3	2	2	3	1	2
Median	3	2	2	3	1	2



Fish and Wildlife Propagation Fund (FWPF) Fiscal Year 2024/2025 Application Materials

Your grant application will be used to evaluate funding requests made to the Solano County Park and Recreation Commission in conformance with Section 13100 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code. Fish and Game Code Section 13100 et seq. regulates the expenditures of funds collected from fines and forfeitures in Solano County (see list, Appendix A), for the protection, conservation, propagation and preservation of fish and wildlife, under the direction of the County Board of Supervisors.

Maximum grant request is \$2,500.00. No matching funds are required. Eligible entities that may receive award of grant funds include units of government, including special districts organized under federal, state or local laws, accredited educational institutions and private non-profit organizations with current 501(c)(3) status. Applications will be scored using the criteria in Appendix B. Grantees will be required to sign a grant agreement with Solano County, and to incur project expenses and apply for reimbursement from Solano County. Recipients will be required to demonstrate that their proposal meets the requirements of any and all regulatory agencies and that the cost for any CEQA or permit costs related to the proposal shall be borne by the applicant from sources other than grant award monies. Please fill out one application per project. One un-bound original of the application must be received by **close of business (5:00 p.m.) on Monday, October 7, 2024** at the address shown below. Faxed or emailed applications will not be accepted.

APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

EACH PROJECT APPLICATION MUST INCLUDE THESE 5 ITEMS OR IT WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED:

- 1. COMPLETED AND SIGNED "GRANT APPLICATION FORM" (SEE BELOW)**
- 2. RESPONSES TO THE 4 "PROJECT QUESTIONS" (SEE BELOW) – 2 page maximum response.**
- 3. COMPLETED AND SIGNED "PROPOSED PROJECT BUDGET" FORM (SEE BELOW)**
- 4. A ONE-PAGE DETAILED PROJECT BUDGET (SEE "INSTRUCTIONS" BELOW)**
- 5. A ONE-PAGE PROJECT SITE MAP ON 8-1/2" X 11" SIZE PAPER**

Submit one, un-bound original of the full application, by close of business **(5:00 p.m.) Monday, October 7, 2024** to the following address (faxed or e-mailed applications will not be accepted):

**Solano County Parks and Recreation Division
c/o Chris Drake, Parks Services Manager
675 Texas Street, Suite 5500, Fairfield, CA 94533
(Office is open from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm)**

EVALUATION PROCESS

Applicants may make an optional, brief project presentation (approximately 5 min.) to the Parks and Recreation Commission at the meeting of Thursday, September 12, 2024 at 10:00AM. Applications will be evaluated and ranked using the criteria on the scoring sheet in Appendix B. The evaluation committee will consist of one subject matter expert in fish and wildlife issues and two Commissioners. This committee will present its results, and the Commission will make a recommendation regarding the award of grant funds, at the meeting of the Park and Recreation Commission on Thursday, November 14, 2024 Commission meetings begin at 10:00AM, at the Solano County Administration Center, 675 Texas Street, Fairfield, first floor Room 1600 (in the lobby). The Commission's award recommendations are subject to approval by the Solano County Board of Supervisors (tentatively scheduled for December 2024).

For additional information or assistance, contact: Chris Drake, Parks Services Manager at (707) 784-6765.



GRANT APPLICATION FORM

TYPE OF PROJECT - (Fill in <u>Project Type</u> and <u>Letter of Applicable Code Subsection</u> , using list in Appendix A).	
This is a _____ project, eligible under Fish and Game Code Section 13103- _____.	
GRANT APPLICANT (Organization, address, zip code)	Grant Request Amount (maximum \$2,500): \$ _____ Plus Other (non-grant) funds to be used: \$ _____ Equals TOTAL PROJECT COST: \$ _____
PROJECT NAME and ADDRESS (or NEAREST CITY)	ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER (APN), <u>OR</u> PROPERTY NAME WITH ACREAGE (if multiple sites, list on separate sheet)
GRANT APPLICANT'S AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE:	
Name (typed or printed) and Title	Email Address Phone
PERSON WITH DAY-TO-DAY RESPONSIBILITIES FOR PROJECT:	
Name (typed or printed) and Title	Email Address Phone
GRANT SCOPE: (Brief description of items of work to be completed with grant funds.)	
LAND TENURE: Land tenure is: _____ acres (total), including: <i>(fill in appropriate blanks below)</i>	
_____ # Acres owned in fee simple by applicant, or co-owned by applicant.	
_____ # Acres available under lease until year _____ from _____ <i>(landowner name)</i>	
_____ Project site(s) will be utilized by specific agreement with, and full knowledge of land owner(s)*	
* (If multiple sites, list all confirmed or prospective sites for your program on a separate sheet and identify by parcel number, or by providing parcel acreage with property name.)	

I CERTIFY THAT:

- I am authorized on behalf of the above-named Grant Applicant to conduct all negotiations and execute and submit all documents, including but not limited to, this application and any agreements, amendments, payment requests and so on, necessary for project completion; and
- Information contained in this project application form, including assertions of land tenure and all required attachments, is accurate; and
- All necessary CEQA and other environmental compliance requirements, and all applicable state, federal and local regulatory permits (e.g., building/grading permits if applicable), have been met/obtained for the project, or will be met/obtained (with non-grant funds) prior to initiating the project; and
- I have read and understand the important information and assurances in the application materials.

SIGNED _____	DATE _____
_____ Grant Applicant's Authorized Representative	



PROJECT QUESTIONS

Instructions: Respond to the 4 questions here or attach written response. 2-page maximum

1. Provide a description of the project, who will be involved, and what you plan to achieve.

2. Describe how this project furthers the propagation and conservation of fish and wildlife.

3. Please provide objective, measurable goals the Project will seek to achieve, and identify the measurement criteria your organization will use to evaluate success.

4. If the proposed project is for the one-time expenditure of funds please explain how the benefits from the project will be sustained and funded over a multi-year period of time.



PROPOSED PROJECT BUDGET

BUDGET GUIDELINES

Maximum grant request is \$2,500.00. No matching funds are required. It is the intent of the Solano County Park and Recreation Commission to ensure that grant funds under its authority are expended to the maximum public benefit. It is also the policy of the Solano County Board of Supervisors that all grants or contracts for services be performance-based. Accordingly, grant funds will be available for payment by reimbursement. Grantees will be required to incur project expenses and apply to Solano County for reimbursement.

DETAILED PROJECT BUDGET - INSTRUCTIONS

Please attach a Detailed Project Budget (one page) identifying 4 categories of expenditures – 1.) Salaries and Benefits, 2.) Services and Supplies, 3.) Equipment, 4.) Other Expenses. Note: permit, CEQA and food costs are not eligible expenses, and no more than 10% of grant amount may be used for planning/design costs.

PROJECT BUDGET SUMMARY

Using your Detailed Project Budget, fill in a summary of your project budget information here, and sign below.

Grant Applicant: _____ Project Name: _____
(Organization)

Total Project Budget: \$ _____

Grant Funds Requested (\$2,500 max.): \$ _____

SIGNATURE

Signature of Authorized Representative

Title

Date

California Fish & Game Code 13103 (a)-(m)

13103. Expenditures from the fish and wildlife propagation fund of any county may be made only for the following purposes (references to "Department" here, are the California Department of Fish and Wildlife*):

(a) Public education relating to the scientific principles of fish and wildlife conservation, consisting of supervised formal instruction carried out pursuant to a planned curriculum and aids to education such as literature, audio and video recordings, training models, and nature study facilities.

(b) Temporary emergency treatment and care of injured or orphaned wildlife.

(c) Temporary treatment and care of wildlife confiscated by the department as evidence.

(d) Breeding, raising, purchasing, or releasing fish or wildlife which are to be released upon approval of the department pursuant to Sections 6400 and 6401 onto land or into waters of local, state, or federal agencies or onto land or into waters open to the public.

(e) Improvement of fish and wildlife habitat, including, but not limited to, construction of fish screens, weirs, and ladders; drainage or other watershed improvements; gravel and rock removal or placement; construction of irrigation and water distribution systems; earthwork and grading; fencing; planting trees and other vegetation management; and removal of barriers to the migration of fish and wildlife.

(f) Construction, maintenance, and operation of public hatchery facilities.

(g) Purchase and maintain materials, supplies, or equipment for either the department's ownership and use or the department's use in the normal performance of the department's responsibilities.

(h) Predator control actions for the benefit of fish or wildlife following certification in writing by the department that the proposed actions will significantly benefit a particular wildlife species.

(i) Scientific fish and wildlife research conducted by institutions of higher learning, qualified researchers, or governmental agencies, if approved by the department.

(j) Reasonable administrative costs, excluding the costs of audits required by Section 13104, for secretarial service, travel, and postage by the county fish and wildlife commission when authorized by the county board of supervisors. For purposes of this subdivision, "reasonable cost" means an amount which does not exceed 15 percent of the average amount received by the fund during the previous three-year period, or ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) annually, whichever is greater, excluding any funds carried over from a previous fiscal year.

(k) Contributions to a secret witness program for the purpose of facilitating enforcement of this code and regulations adopted pursuant to this code.

(l) Costs incurred by the district attorney or city attorney in investigating and prosecuting civil and criminal actions for violations of this code, as approved by the department.

(m) Other expenditures, approved by the department, for the purpose of protecting, conserving, propagating, and preserving fish and wildlife.

** Formerly California Department of Fish and Game*

Evaluation Scoring Sheet for Applications for Fish and Wildlife Propagation Fund Grants

Applicant and Project Name:		
EVALUATION CRITERIA	MAXIMUM POINTS	SCORE
CLARITY OF PROPOSAL	50	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Proposal clearly identifies how the project meets the intent of the applicable sections of the California Fish and Game Code Section 13103. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant demonstrates the ability to undertake and complete the work effort, including identifying and obtaining any necessary permits from regulatory authorities (with separate funding). <input type="checkbox"/> Approach for accomplishing Proposed Project is reasonable and incorporates demonstrated best practices and industry standards, where applicable. 		
SUSTAINABILITY	20	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant demonstrates that the results of the project will be sustained over time. <input type="checkbox"/> The project utilizes materials and implementation approaches that provide benefits beyond the immediate project. 		
GOALS AND EVALUATION	20	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The Proposal clearly establishes measurable goals/objectives. <input type="checkbox"/> The evaluation criteria measures both the completion of the project (e.g., goal reached or proposed quantities were provided), as well as criteria and time frame to evaluate the success of the project against the stated goals/objectives. 		
PROJECT FINANCING	10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Project budget is of sufficient detail to enable evaluator to determine whether Applicant can realistically carry out the proposal. <input type="checkbox"/> Budgeted expenditures are within the industry norm for similar activities. <input type="checkbox"/> Post-project funding has been identified to sustain the project. 		
TOTAL	100	



**Mendocino County Fish & Game Commission
Grant Guidelines and Review Process
Mendocino County Fish and Wildlife Propagation Fund**

The California Fish and Game Code Section 13100 establishes the county fish and wildlife propagation fund to be expended for the protection, conservation, propagation, and preservation of fish and wildlife, under the direction of the Board of Supervisors (BOS), pursuant to the Fish and Game Code. Funds are received through various fines. The BOS established the Fish and Game Commission (Commission) to advise and make recommendations to the BOS on the expenditure of funds that benefit fish and wildlife in Mendocino County. As the grant funds provided under this Code constitute public funds, the Commission has produced these guidelines to provide information to the public related to how the Commission maintains and distributes these funds.

General Guidelines

Applications may be submitted via email to pbscommissions@mendocinocounty.gov with the subject line “Fish and Game Commission Propagation Fund Grant Application” or in person to the Fish and Game Commission c/o Mendocino County Planning & Building Services.

Applications must be complete, provide all requested information, and be submitted ahead of the deadline. This includes applicant’s Taxpayer I.D. number, project timeline, project budget, maps and photos, and at least one letter of support for the proposed project.

Applicants are encouraged to attend a Commission meeting to present their application.

Administrative costs of projects may not exceed 10% of total costs.

A final project report is required within 60 days of project completion, outlining the project’s difficulties and failures, along with the success. The report should describe methods, activities, and outcomes, and should include photographs. Receipts and invoices must also be included in final report.

Qualifying Projects

California Fish and Game Code Section 13103 defines allowable uses for the Propagation Fund. In order to be considered, project activities must be limited to one of the following:

- (a) Public education relating to the scientific principles of fish and wildlife conservation, consisting of supervised formal instruction carried out pursuant to a planned curriculum and aids to education such as literature, audio and video recordings, training models, and nature study facilities.
- (b) Temporary emergency treatment and care of injured or orphaned wildlife.
- (c) Temporary treatment and care of wildlife confiscated by the department as evidence.

- (d) Breeding, raising, purchasing, or releasing fish or wildlife that are to be released upon approval of the department pursuant to Sections 6400 and 6401 onto land or into waters of local, state, or federal agencies or onto land or into waters open to the public.
- (e) Improvement of fish and wildlife habitat, including, but not limited to, construction of fish screens, weirs, and ladders; drainage or other watershed improvements; gravel and rock removal or placement; construction of irrigation and water distribution systems; earthwork and grading; fencing; planting trees and other vegetation management; and removal of barriers to the migration of fish and wildlife.
- (f) Construction, maintenance, and operation of public hatchery facilities.
- (g) Purchase and maintain materials, supplies, or equipment for either the department's ownership and use or the department's use in the normal performance of the department's responsibilities.
- (h) Predator control actions for the benefit of fish or wildlife following certification in writing by the department that the proposed actions will significantly benefit a particular wildlife species.
- (i) Scientific fish and wildlife research conducted by institutions of higher learning, qualified researchers, or governmental agencies, if approved by the department.
- (j) Reasonable administrative costs, excluding the costs of audits required by Section 13104, for secretarial service, travel, and postage by the county fish and wildlife commission when authorized by the county board of supervisors. For purposes of this subdivision, "reasonable cost" means an amount that does not exceed 15 percent of the average amount received by the fund during the previous three-year period, or ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) annually, whichever is greater, excluding any funds carried over from a previous fiscal year.
- (k) Contributions to a secret witness program for the purpose of facilitating enforcement of this code and regulations adopted pursuant to this code.
- (l) Costs incurred by the district attorney or city attorney in investigating and prosecuting civil and criminal actions for violations of this code, as approved by the department.
- (m) Costs incurred by a county counsel in investigating and prosecuting an action for civil penalties, injunctive relief, or civil penalties and injunctive relief pursuant to Section 5650.1 resulting from unlicensed cannabis cultivation.

Applications must identify which use their application qualifies under.

Grant Application Review Process

The Commission will try to fairly allocate resources between fish, game and/or wildlife habitat restoration, artificial propagation, and fish, game and/or wildlife education projects.

Review criteria will include: (1) compliance with Fish and Game Code Section 13103; (2) project feasibility; (3) ecological benefits; (4) community benefits; (5) cooperative relationships; and (6) effective use of funds.

Applications that are not in compliance with all requirements will be notified in writing, and those proposals will be removed from funding considerations.



**Mendocino County Fish & Game Commission
Grant Application
Mendocino County Fish and Wildlife Propagation Fund**

Please fill out the following application and attach any supporting documentation, including one required letter of recommendation. For questions or additional information, please call the Fish and Game Commission at (707) 234-6094, or email the Commission at pbscommissions@mendocinocounty.gov

Note: Planning and Building policy changes may impact funding disbursement schedule

Applicant:

Project Title:

Fish and Game Code Section 13103 Category:

Estimated Start Date:

Estimated Completion Date:

Taxpayer ID Number:

Mailing Address:

City, State, Zip Code:

Contact Person:

Telephone Number:

Funding Amount Request:

Please provide detailed answers to the following questions:

- 1. Applicant Background – Tell us about your organization. Has your group applied for Mendocino County Fish and Wildlife Propagation Fund Grants in the past? Describe previous work by your group related to this resource protection effort.**

2. Project Background – Provide project description, map and location (if on a stream, provide name of the stream, tributary, and basin). Please attach relevant maps and pictures.

3. Project Description – Project description, what work would be done with grant funding.

4. Objectives – What is the purpose of this project? Please indicate how this project will enhance fish, wildlife, youth, educational, restoration, and/or enforcement activities within Mendocino County.

5. Project Procedure – Explain in detail your approach and plan of action. This should include organizational framework, project timing on use of funds, and a logical sequence of events that will ensure the completion of the project.

- 6. Budget Information – Outline the entire project budget, including a list of services and supplies, equipment (note whether it will be purchased or rented), and other funds, in-kind services, donations, etc. applied for the project. If preferred, a spreadsheet may be attached with budget information.**

Reminder: copies of invoices should be kept and submitted with final project report, due within 60 days of project completion.

Criteria for Assessing Grant Applications to the Mendocino County Fish & Game Commission (Version 1.0 – June 2013)

	CRITERIA	WAY 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 mentioned; 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 survivorship	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 building, and/or income generation	<p>0 = activities do not contribute positively to local communities</p> <p>1 = activities indirectly contribute positively to local communities</p> <p>2 = activities have a potential, but unclear direct positive impact</p> <p>3 = activities have a clear and direct positive short-term impact</p> <p>4 = activities have a clear and direct positive short-term and long-term impact</p>
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 a 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 the “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 name below:

Mendocino County Fish and Game Commission
Ranking of Proposals Submitted for Fiscal Year 25/26 Grant Cycle

	PROPOSAL TITLE	CRITERIA						Score	additional comments (qualitative analysis of the proposal)
		1	2	3	4	5	6		
1									
2									
3									
4									
5									
5									

**GRANT APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS
NAPA COUNTY WILDLIFE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
(DRAFT BY ALLEN XIE)**

Section 1: Selection Process Comparison

Step	Old Process	New Process	Reason for change
Review Panel	WCC members review applications	Add 1 educator, 1 ecologist if necessary	More opinion from experts
Evaluation Criteria	General priorities without a rubric	Adopt a weighted scoring rubric based on 5 categories: Impact, Education, Equity, Feasibility, Collaboration	Provide transparent scoring guide
Scoring Format	Informal discussion-based decisions	Use a 1-5 scale per criterion with the clear definitions and total weighted score	Reduce bias, standardizes decisions, enables justification.
Final Decision	Based on collective agreement	Based on top scores, followed by short pitch/interview for finalists if needed	Allows a deeper understanding of proposals
Feedback for applicants	No formal feedback	All applicants receive written feedback on strengths and areas for improvement	Encourage growth, and future participation.

Section 2: Grant Award Criteria Comparison

Category	Old criteria	New Criteria	Reason for Change
Legal Basis	Must align with Fish and Game Code § 13103	Still must comply with § 13103, but must show measurable ecological or educational outcomes	Shifts focus from just legality to demonstrate impact, making results more trackable
Wildlife Focus	Projects that generally benefit wildlife	Prioritize projects with clear benefit to native species, critical habitats, or biodiversity hotspots	Focuses funding on scientifically urgent and locally relevant conservation needs
Education Projects	Environmental education programs broadly accepted	Curriculum-aligned programs and field trips with defined learning outcomes and assessment methods	Encourages educational accountability and deeper impacts in schools and communities
Budget Justification	Budget required, basic explanation	Must provide a detailed, itemized budget, showing cost-effectiveness and funding breakdown	Enhances financial transparency and ensures responsible use of funds
Community Benefit	Community benefit vaguely mentioned	Must describe who benefits, like students, volunteers and how they are engaged	Promote equity, inclusion, and public engagement
Innovation	Not addressed	Prioritize innovative, scalable, or replicable models	Supports new ideas and increases the chance for success beyond one-time use

Sample scoring guide

Scoring scale

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

Evaluation Categories:

1.Conservation Impact (Weight: 40%)

Does the project benefit native species or critical habitats?
Are the expected outcomes clear, measurable, and supported by data?

2.Education Value (Weight: 25%)

Is the program aligned with school standards or environmental literacy goals?
Are learning outcomes defined and is there a plan for assessment

3.Community Engagement & Equity (Weight: 15%)

Does the project engage the public, especially underrepresented communities?
Are volunteers, students, or local organizations meaningfully involved?

4.Feasibility & Accountability (Weight: 10%)

Is the budget clear, itemized, and reasonable?
Are there realistic timelines, responsibilities, and success metrics?

5.Collaboration & Matching Support (Weight 10%)

Are partnerships with other groups or agencies involved
Does the project include matching funds or in-kind support?

Criteria	Weight (%)	Score (1-5)	Weighted Score	Justification
Conservation Impact	40			
Educational Value	25			
Community Engagement & Equity	15			
Feasibility & Accountability	10			
Collaboration & Matching Support	10			

Total Score (out of 100)

Example : Next Page

Project Example: “Habitat Heroes: Student-Led Restoration in Napa Foothills”

A local nonprofit partners with a middle school to restore native plant species in a degraded foothill zone, involving 100+ students over one year.

Scoring Table

Criteria	Weight (%)	Score (1–5)	Weighted Score	Justification
Conservation Impact	40%	5	40	Targets native species with a well-researched habitat plan. Uses baseline biodiversity data and outlines measurable ecological outcomes.
Educational Value	25%	4	20	Strong curriculum tie-ins and leadership by science teachers. Some assessment methods could be more detailed.
Community Engagement & Equity	15%	4	6	Includes diverse student body and outreach to parents. Could improve on accessibility and language inclusivity.
Feasibility & Accountability	10%	5	5	Detailed timeline, milestones, and budget. Clear roles for all partners.
Collaboration & Matching Support	10%	3	3	Includes school and land trust but lacks outside funding or major in-kind support.

Total Score: 74 / 100

**APPENDIX A-5
ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA**

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS: *must meet all criteria below to be considered eligible for*

Qualifications	Yes/No
1. Eligible Applicant: Public agency or 501(c)3 nonprofit.	
A. If nonprofit: submittal of :	
1) Evidence of qualification under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Service Code,	
2) Articles of Incorporation	
2. Eligible Project Category: Acquisition and/or Improvement	
Acquisition project applicants provides information on the status of the following:	
A. Negotiations with seller (purchase and sales agreement or letter of intent)	
B. Appraisal status (complete = most competitive, or letter of valuation)	
C. Required approvals, permits, CEQA, ADA, etc. Please list and status.	
D. Visual Design. Can be Conceptual Visual Design	
Improvement project applicants provides information on the status of the following:	
A. Site Ownership or Control	
B. Visual design (e.g.conceptual restoration plans, construction plans, design)	
C. Public outreach/comment on design	
D. Required approvals, permits, CEQA, ADA, etc.	
3. Project Match: Statement of 50 % Match Commitment	
Variances will be considered if match presents a significant organizational hardship	
4. Authorization: letter/resolution from governing body	
Applicant acknowledges and states ability to carry out project as presented, project is consistent with pertinent general plan and zoning, and applicant will be compliant with all stated MGP Guideline and agreement conditions.	
5. Location: Within 0.5 miles of established Urban Growth Boundary or Urban Service Area. (If not, provides information to describe what community the project will serve and how.)	
6. Long-term management, maintenance, and compliance (30 + years)	
7. Fiscal Solvency (see fiscal screen)	
8. Completed Pre-application	
ELIGIBLE APPLICATION? Y/N	

APPENDIX A-5 EVALUATION MATRIX

1. MGP PROGRAM INTENT

Extent to which project aligns with **Ag + Open Space Expenditure Plan** and *Vital Lands Initiative* .

a. INTENT - Creation and Improvement of Community Open Space: 20 points possible.		
	Meets Criterion?	Points
Acquisition and Improvement of land for public open space for agriculture, recreation, and/or natural resource restoration. 20 points		
Acquisition of land for public open space for agriculture, recreation, and/or natural resource restoration. 15 points		
Improvement of land for public open space for agriculture, recreation, and/or natural resource restoration. 10 points		
SUBTOTAL		0
b. INTENT - Additional Authorizing Language Priority alignment. 20 points possible, 2 points each.		
	Meets Criterion?	Points
Links communities to open space via trails or other open space adjacency connections. Preference is given to projects that include regional trail connections.		
Implements restoration techniques to restore or enhance natural and native habitats.		
Constructs outdoor public community gathering space in a natural setting. Preference is given to projects where no community gathering space currently exists.		
Develops new, outdoor, nature-based, recreational opportunities. Preference is given to projects that are located where no such recreation opportunities currently exist.		
Constructs amenities to provide opportunities for public education about the natural world and agriculture.		

Protects and/or improves open space in fire- and/or flood-impacted community		
Protects and/or improves climate resilience Project conserves an area vulnerable to climate change; or builds resilience to the impacts of climate change (e.g., mitigates urban heat island effect, helps reduce flood or fire risk, increases water storage capacity, promotes local food security, protects or increases native biodiversity)		
Protects, creates, or enhances public access to the Russian River, Pacific Ocean or other waterways.		
Protects native plant and/or animal species.		
Protects farmland that provides urban greenspace and access to locally grown ag and provides opportunities to experience food and/or fiber production.		
SUBTOTAL		0
PROGRAM INTENT TOTAL		0

2. NEED:
Extent to which project fulfills well-identified and high-priority community needs within project geographic area.
10 points possible, 2.5 points each.

	Meets Criterion?	Points Applied
Project has documented community-based support (e.g. including: letters of support, design charette, public workshop, rallies, events)		
Identified public sector support in or furthers policies of at least <u>one</u> adopted plan or document.		
Community (census tract level) where MGP funding has not been awarded in the last three MGP cycles		
Parks Gap Analysis - Project is in area lacking publicly-accessible open space, as identified by the Sonoma County <i>Parks Gap Analysis</i> .		
NEED: TOTAL		10.0

3. COUNTY STRATEGIC PRIORITIES
Extent to which project is aligned with County strategic equity and climate justice priorities. *20 points max, 5 points each.*

	Meets Criterion?	Points Applied

Environmentally Vulnerable Community. Projects is in SB535 Disadvantaged Communities - <i>CalEPA CalEnviro Screen 4.0</i> top 25% census tracts in Sonoma County with high rates of pollution and low income populations, including tribal communities.		
Portrait of Sonoma County - Priority Community - Project is in identified community census tract that ranks below the county average Human Development Index score (6.19).		
Economically Disadvantaged Community - Project is in community census area where median household income is equal or less than 80% of Sonoma County Median Income.		
Climate Resiliency Target Area Project is in identified climate resilience target area.		
COUNTY STRATEGIC PRIORITIES: TOTAL		0

4. PLANNING & DESIGN

Extent to which project is aligned with MGP design goals
10 points max, 2 points each.

	Meets Criterion?	Points Applied
Demonstrated understanding of process for implementation including permitting requirements (state, federal, and local agency), CEQA, ADA.		
Design shows no more than 25% of project is covered by structures, impervious surfaces, and/or hardscape.		
Demonstrated understanding of potential impediments to project completion and explanation/s of how they will be addressed.		
Accessible to the City and/or community where it is located via public transport, public roads, bike and/or pedestrian routes.		
Design includes incorporation of natural elements in design (e.g. grassy areas, trees, vegetation).		
PLANNING & DESIGN : TOTAL		0

5. READINESS application shows ability to successfully launch, complete and sustain the project
20 Points possible.

a. Project Tasks/Schedule/Budget
5 points each, 15 points possible.

Meets Criterion?	Points Applied

Tasks align with eligible activities, and reflect needed workflow to complete project		
Schedule is timely and informed by necessary project development steps		
Budget is reasonable to complete the proposed project, expenses and match are eligible costs, and match is stated clearly		
SUBTOTAL		0

b. Project Sustainability

5 points possible

Meets Criterion?	Points Applied

Applicant clearly demonstrates how they will successfully manage and fund long-term operations and maintenance.

SUBTOTAL		0
-----------------	--	---

c. Project Funding

0 points possible

Meets Criterion?	Points Applied
NA	

Is partial funding an option?
(No points, just y/n for evaluation).

READINESS: TOTAL		0
-------------------------	--	---

TOTAL SCORE		10
--------------------	--	-----------

