

Wildlife Conservation Board

Wildlife Corridor and Fish Passage Program

2019 Public Solicitation Notice





Wildlife Conservation Board

Wildlife Corridor and Fish Passage Program

Proposal Solicitation Notice

The Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB) is seeking high quality grant proposals for wildlife corridor and fish passage projects that result in enduring benefits. This 2019 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.

This document provides general eligibility information as well as priorities, pertinent dates, scoring criteria, and important documents specific to the 2019 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 Strategic Emphasis 3.0. 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.

2019 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 wildlife corridor and fish passage restoration projects with significant implementation funding secured.

Priority 2 projects:

- Installation of fencing or other measures that will direct wildlife away from roadways and toward existing migration corridors.
- Installation of fish screens on priority unscreened diversions and the repair or replacement of existing substandard screens.
- Planning projects that provide designs and environmental review for future wildlife corridor and fish passage restoration projects without significant implementation funding secured.

TIMELINES AND SCORING

Deadlines

All applicants must submit a pre-application and, only if requested to do so, a full application. Pre-applications must be submitted by 5:00 PM Pacific Standard Time on April 26, 2019. 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-proposal, identify any ineligible costs, and request a full proposal if appropriate.

In order to be considered for funding, applicants must submit a complete proposal, using the documents listed below, by 5:00 PM Pacific Standard Time on June 14, 2019. Project proposals and pre-applications must be submitted to WCBcorridors@wildlife.ca.gov with *2019 Wildlife Corridor and Fish Passage Grant Proposal* in the subject line. 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 will not be scored or considered for funding. Projects funded must be completed and funds expended before March 31, 2024.

Table 1: Grant Cycle Timeline for 2019

Schedule	Milestone / Activity
April 2, 2019	Release solicitation and application
April 26, 2019 at 5:00 pm	Submit pre-application to WCB
May 17, 2019	Request full applications from successful pre-applicants
June 14, 2019 at 5:00 pm	Complete project proposals due to WCB
July 26, 2019	Technical review completed
November 23, 2019	Potential Board Meeting for first project presentation

Evaluation Criteria

Please review the [Guidelines](#) for the general Program evaluation process. The specific evaluation scoring method and evaluation of the full applications for the 2019 cycle is provided below.

An administrative review will determine if the full application is complete and meets all the requirements for technical review. This review will use a “Yes/No” scoring method based on the criteria presented in Table 2. Proposals which receive a “No” for one or more of the Table 2 criteria will be considered incomplete and may not be considered for funding under this PSN.

Table 2: Administrative Review Evaluation Criteria

Administrative Criteria
Applicant submitted a pre-proposal.
All proposal components have been completed in the required formats.
Every question has been answered. N/A is appropriate where a question is not applicable.
Applicant contact information, including person authorized to sign grant agreement, is included.
Applicant is an eligible entity.
Application is signed.
Full proposal was received by the deadline.
Proposal represents an eligible project type.
CEQA documents are current and complete or will be complete 15 days prior to being presented to the Board for final funding approval.

Scoring

All complete and eligible proposals will be evaluated and scored by technical reviewers in accordance with the scoring criteria documented in Table 3. 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 Table 3 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 Table 3 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).

Table 3: Evaluation Criteria

Category	Criteria	Weight Factor	Max. Points	Max. Score
Technical Review				
Purpose and Background	<p>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.</p> <p>Scoring:</p> <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 supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. • 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. 	4	5	20

Category	Criteria	Weight Factor	Max. Points	Max. Score
Purpose and Background (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 	1	5	5

Category	Criteria	Weight Factor	Max. Points	Max. Score
Project Management				
Project Team Qualifications (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 			
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, 2024, 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 sums of 20 to 50 percent of the total budget, or inappropriate costs will receive 1 to 2 points. 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. 	1	5	5

Category	Criteria	Weight Factor	Max. Points	Max. Score
Cost Share	The extent to which a project provides secured Federal, State, private, or local cost share. All fund sources must be identified. Scoring: 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
Special Considerations				
Serving Disadvantaged Communities	The extent to which a project falls within and/or provides direct, meaningful, and assured benefits to one or more economically disadvantaged community, per California Department of Water Resources guidance (https://gis.water.ca.gov/app/dacs/). Scoring: Projects that provide direct benefits to a disadvantaged community will receive 3 points.	1	3	3
	Projects that are located within a disadvantaged community will receive 2 points.	1	2	2
CCC/CALCC Services	Score one point for projects that utilize Corp services.	3	1	3
Community Access	The extent to which the project will improve or expand community access to the project area through engagement programs, technical assistance, or facilities that maximize safe and equitable physical admittance, to natural or cultural resources, community education, or recreational amenities.	2	1	2
Connectivity Potential of Project Site Location	For wildlife corridor projects: One to five points based on the project location's connectivity score in the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's (CDFW) Areas of Conservation Emphasis (ACE) Terrestrial Connectivity dataset. For fish Passage removal projects: A full five points will be awarded for a project that addresses a high priority fish passage barrier (refer to the CDFW's 2018 Fish Passage Priorities List) or high priority water diversion (refer to the CDFW's 2018 Priority Water Diversions for Screening).	1	5	5
Maximum Score Total = 100				

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 and technical assistance 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 2019 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.

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 2019 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.

Projects that solely involve planning, acquisition, or scientific studies without field work or baseline studies should not consult with the Corps as they do not provide these services.

Connectivity Potential of Project Site Location

For wildlife corridor projects:

The CDFW Areas of Conservation Emphasis (ACE) Terrestrial Connectivity dataset 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](https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/Analysis/Ace#523731772-connectivity) at:

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

For fish passage projects:

High priority fish passage barriers are determined by CDFW's 2018 Fish Passage Priorities List, and high priority water diversions as determined by CDFW's 2018 Priority Water Diversions For Screening. Both lists can be found in Appendix A of this document.

PROPOSAL GUIDELINES, FORMS, AND TEMPLATES

Requirements as identified in the Guidelines below are mandatory unless stated otherwise. Applicants must use the templates provided below for application submittal or the application will be deemed incomplete and ineligible for funding.

[2019 Wildlife Conservation Board Proposition 68 Guidelines](#)

[2019 Wildlife Corridor and Fish Passage Project Pre-Application Template](#)

[2019 Wildlife Corridor and Fish Passage Project Application](#)

[2019 Wildlife Corridor and Fish Passage Project Budget Worksheets: A\) Applicant Budget, B\) Budget Justification, and 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

California Department of Fish and Wildlife 2018 Fish Passage Priorities List

Site Name	Waterbody	CDFW Region
Rowdy Weir	Rowdy Creek	1
Cedar Creek Hatchery Weir	Cedar Creek	1
Deer Creek Stanford Vina Dam Fish Ladders	Deer Creek	1
South Fork Noyo Water Intake Pump	South Fork Noyo River	1
Mill Creek Fish Passage Project - Upper Dam	Mill Creek	1
Pudding Creek Dam	Pudding Creek	1
Baechtel Creek City of Willits Waste Water Treatment concrete weir	Baechtel Creek	1
Battle Creek Restoration Project Dams	Battle Creek	1
Antelope Creek Edwards Diversion	Antelope Creek	1
Gulch Creek	Gulch Creek	1
Fremont Weir	Sacramento River	2
Bellota Weir	Morman Slough	2
Weir #1 Sutter Bypass	Butte Creek	2
Central California Traction Railroad Bridge	Stockton Diverting Canal	2
Sunset Pumps Diversion Dam	Feather River	2
Tisdale Weir	Sacramento River	2
Hosie Low Flow Road Crossing	Morman Slough	2
One Mile Dam	Big Chico Creek	2
Five Mile Dam	Big Chico Creek	2
Sewer Pipe Crossing	Dry Creek	2
Roy's Pools	San Geronimo Creek	3
BART Weir	Alameda Creek	3
Middle Rubber Dam (RD1)	Alameda Creek	3
Larsen Creek Culvert/Ladder (Sir Francis Drake Boulevard Culvert)	Larsen Creek	3
Porter Creek #2	Porter Creek	3
Mill Creek Falls	Mill Creek	3
Wallace Creek	Wallace Creek	3
Highway 1 Culvert	John West Fork	3
Adobe Road Crossing	San Pedro Creek	3
Capistrano Road Crossing	San Pedro Creek	3

Marre Weir	San Luis Obispo Creek	4
Mendota Dam	San Joaquin River	4
Sack Dam	San Joaquin River	4
Dairy Creek at Hwy 1	Dairy Creek	4
San Luis Obispo Creek Hwy 1 above Cuesta Park	San Luis Obispo Creek	4
San Luis Obispo Creek Hwy 1 Rocky Ramp Stagecoach Road	San Luis Obispo Creek	4
San Luisito Creek Adobe Road Culvert	San Luisito Creek	4
San Luisito Creek Hwy 1 Culvert with 5ft. Drop Structure	San Luisito Creek	4
Merced River Cowell Agreement Diverters (CAD) Wingdams	Merced River	4
Arizona Crossing on private property	Big Sur River	4
Hwy 192 Box Culvert	Mission Creek	5
Mission Canyon Road Bridge	Mission Creek	5
Casa Dorinda Channel	Montecito Creek	5
Lower Montecito Creek Channel	Montecito Creek	5
Diversion Dam and Two Arizona Crossings	San Jose Creek	5
Hollister Road Bridge	San Jose Creek	5
Wheeler Gorge Campground Crossing	Bear Creek	5
Hwy 126 Bridge	Hopper Creek	5
Matilija Dam	Matilija Creek	5
Lower Wheeler Gorge Campground Crossing	North Fork Matilija Creek	5

California Department of Fish and Wildlife 2018 Priority Water Diversions For Screening

Site Name	Waterbody	CDFW Region
Upper Dam	Mill Creek	1
Antelope Creek/Edwards Dam/Los Molinos	Antelope Creek	1
MWCD	Parks Creek	1
Diversion 43	French Creek	1
SVRIC Main Diversion Dam	Deer Creek	1
DCID Dam	Deer Creek	1
ACID Diversion Churn Creek Bottom Diversion @ Bonnyview	Sacramento River	1
Paynes Creek Bend ID Diversion	Paynes Creek	1

Cone Kimball Dam - Deer Creek	Deer Creek	1
Little (North) Cow Creek: Cook and Butcher Diversion	Cow Creek	1
RD 2035/WDCWA Joint Intake & Fish Screen	Sacramento River	2
Butte Creek Diversion 55	Butte Creek	2
Sunset Pumps Diversion Dam	Feather River	2
Bellota Weir	Calaveras River	2
Meridian Farms Meridian/Drexler	Sacramento River	2
Yuba Brophy (South Diversion)	Yuba River	2
M & T Ranch	Sacramento River	2
Natomas Elkhorn	Sacramento River	2
Natomas Riverside	Sacramento River	2
Grizzly Island Wildlife Area	Montezuma Slough	3
Shinn Pond Diversions	Alameda Creek	3
Iron Horse Vineyards	Green Valley Creek	3
Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area	South Pump Yolo Bypass	3
Grizzly Island Wildlife Area	Joice Island	3
Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area	Duck Club #1 Yolo Bypass	3
Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area	Pump #55 Yolo Bypass	3
Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area	#29 Low Lift Yolo Bypass	3
Napa Sonoma Marsh	Mud/Napa Slough	3
Napa Sonoma Marsh	Napa River Unit	3
Cuneo Diversion	Merced River	4
Mendota Pool	San Joaquin River	4
Arroyo Canal	San Joaquin River	4
West Stanislaus ID	Stanislaus River	4
Cowell #2	Merced River	4
Canavero Diversion	Merced River	4
Oakdale Rec Ponds RM 40.2	Stanislaus River	4
Diversion RM 40.25	Stanislaus River	4
Diversion RM 4.059	Stanislaus River	4
Diversion RM 40.251	Stanislaus River	4
Robles Fishway Screens	Ventura River	5
Mountain View Golf Course	Santa Clara River	5

Lower Piru Creek (PMWC)	Piru Creek	5
Foster Park Surface Diversion	Ventura River	5
Trabuco Creek Diversion	Trabuco Creek	5
Lower Piru Creek Diversion (United Water)	Piru Creek	5
Harvey Diversion	Santa Paula Creek	5
Romero Creek Diversion	Romero Creek	5
Fillmore Diversion	Sespe Creek	5
Escondido Creek Diversion	San Luis Rey River	5