

Delta Working Landscapes

Jeffrey A. Hart

Initial Selection Panel Review

0093

Delta Working Landscapes

Delta Protection Commission

Applicant amount requested: \$1,274,066

Fund This Amount: \$800,000

The proposal lacks a well-defined monitoring program, which would support and explain the rationale for the specific amounts of work to be done in Task 2 (e.g., why 20,000 linear feet of vegetated ditch bank is appropriate), and provide a framework for Task 3 demonstration projects. In particular Task 2 actions and potentially the demonstration projects in Task 3, need to be structured with an experimental design (including controls, replicates) in order to build the data to justify the relative benefit of funding the specified amount of work (such as 20,000 linear feet of vegetated ditch banks) and to measure environmental benefit (such as reduced sediment or pesticide loads). This plan should also serve to justify the amount of funding requested for these tasks, which presently is not well detailed. The panel thinks these tasks could be completed for less. The revised Task 3 need to identify the interview methodology to be used and how it is supported by current social science interview practices. The revised proposal also needs to be consistent in the description of deliverables among the text, the deliverables table, and the budget detail. The panel questioned the feasibility of implementing vegetated ditches in light of current ditch practices (i.e., spud ditches).

Task 2 of the proposal appears to be a continuation of existing projects, but the proposal does not show how the new projects are informed by past work. The selection panel indicated that some of the wildlife-friendly approaches are good, though they could be implemented for less than the amount requested. The Delta festivals may be a good outreach

Initial Selection Panel Review

approach, but may not be an effective strategy to exchange information and ensure that growers adopt practices. It also appears that the festivals are focused beyond the ecosystem and agriculture objectives of this PSP, so the selection panel recommends reducing the ERP contribution to \$44,000. PSP funds can not be used to create a non-profit group, and cost share funds for the festivals should be sought from other sources. The proposal should provide assurances that the applicants will coordinate with the Delta Vision and other planning processes.

Reconsider if Revised

Technical Panel Review

Proposal Name: Delta Working Landscapes

Applicant Organization: Delta Protection Commission

Amount Requested: \$1,274,066

Panel Rating:

Poor - Serious deficiencies.

Panel Summary

The panel commends the proposal's focus on the integration of agricultural and conservation activities in a working landscape. However, the three components of the proposal are disjointed, and the overall proposal does not contain sufficient technical detail, lacked a well-defined adaptive management plan, and did not justify that the funding requested would result in usable, scientifically-supported solutions for Delta farmers.

The panel had fundamental concerns about the lack of a clearly designed and articulated monitoring program and subsequent performance evaluation for the restoration demonstration projects. One of the primary outcomes of the project would be development of demonstration sites, but there was no description, design, measurements, or discussion of how the benefits of this project would inform or assist future restoration projects.

The proposal does not provide the technical panel with confidence that it will capture an understanding of why farmers don't participate in certain practices, and for those that do participate, what specific measured environmental benefits are provided.

While the Panel agreed with the benefits of the social approach, they questioned the usefulness of the public outreach festival. An additional concern voiced by one panel member was that the project contained a survey of farmers to

Technical Panel Review

assess the barriers of adoption of conservation measures with no reference to any literature on the subject. There was also concern regarding the qualifications of those carrying out the landowners interviews.

On the positive side, small restoration efforts, led by respected groups like TNC and Ducks Unlimited can be very effective and valuable. Panel members acknowledge that building rapport and trust with farmers is critically important.

Despite the current proposal's limitations, the Panel believes the overall concept has great potential and therefore recommends that the applicant pursue funding through another proposal that remedies the existing technical deficiencies.

External Technical Review #1

Proposal Number: 0093

Proposal Name: Delta Working Landscapes

Applicant Organization: Delta Protection Commission

Amount Requested: \$1,274,066

Goals

Rating	fair
Comments	<p>Does the proposal describe the problem that the project is designed to address?</p> <p>Yes, but in a general way. It refers to "numerous media accounts describing the pelagic water system at historic low point." I would like to have seen a bit more scientific references about the specific ecological problems in the Delta that the project would address.</p> <p>Does the proposal identify the ecosystem goals (link to ERP goals and objectives / documents) that the project is designed to address?</p> <p>The study focuses on practices rather than on direct ecosystem goals. For example it defines deliverables in terms of linear feet of vegetation planted or the extent of adoption of "wildlife friendly" practices. But the potential impact of the planted vegetation is only discussed generally. "Wildlife friendly" is never defined and there is no discussion of whether or how it would be measured.</p> <p>The agricultural goals?</p>

External Technical Review #1

	<p>Again, goals are measured in terms of practice use, but not practice impact.</p> <p>Are the project's objectives clearly stated? Yes</p> <p>Are the objectives tangible and measurable?</p> <p>One of the project's objectives, change in practices, is tangible and measurable? How change in practices translates into furthering ecosystem goals is also tangible and measurable. However, this is NOT part of the proposal and is harder to do.</p> <p>Does the project describe how it will assist farmers in integrating agricultural activities with ecosystem restoration? It proposes demonstration projects for activities that would be profitable (or at least not profit-reducing) to adopt and proposes cost-sharing for projects that would be more costly to adopt.</p>
--	--

Justification And Conceptual Model

Rating	fair
Comments	<p>Does the proposal present a clear conceptual model that explains the interconnections between the key ecosystem and agricultural system components relating to the action(s) proposed?</p> <p>The basic concepts are explained quite well. Most of the scientific references, however, were 10 years old or more. This discussion was very general and I would have liked to have seen more quantification of how MUCH of an impact the proposed farming practices might have. How much erosion would be presented? How much is wildlife population and diversity enhanced? The project refers to "preliminary data" that is forthcoming, but they don't say where it is forthcoming and what the basic quantitative results are. Some methods are described as "cost-effective" but this is used as a "toss-off" phrase. Usually cost effectiveness is a measure of an environmental benefit</p>

External Technical Review #1

per dollar spent or a level of environmental benefit for a fixed budget. Here the the environmental benefits aren't measured or estimated.

Does the conceptual model clearly explain the hypotheses it is testing?

There is a very large social science literature on barriers to adopting more environmentally farming practices. The proposal cites none of this work. The proposal cites PI "considerable experience . . . to determine why more farmers and land stewards" don't adopt such practices. They do not present any discussion of specific theory, prior studies or findings or empiricial framework to formally assess this issue.

Does the proposal justify the applicant's choice of a pilot, demonstration, or full-scale implementation project?

It seems that the proposal is moving very quickly from data collection to demonstration. One part of the project will study constraints on adopting certain agricultural practices. Another will demonstrate practices, but this pre-supposes that these are viable. It seems you would need to have a lot more information about what works and what doesn't before rushing to demonstrate new pra

Approach

Rating	fair
Comments	<p>Does the proposal clearly describe its approach (including study design and methods, if appropriate)?</p> <p>There are a number of USDA programs that support adoption of the kind of practices that this project would assess or promote. This include EQIP, WHIP, WRP and continuous sign-up for CRP and the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) for California's</p>

External Technical Review #1

North Central Valley. I was surprised that use (or lack of use) of these programs in the study area was not discussed. It seems that federal funds could be used to leverage state activities to a greater extent. For example, EQIP pays cost share for practices of the types the project proposes to pay cost share for. Do these projects not qualify in the local conservation district system for EQIP? If not, why not? Should CALFED pay cost shares for practices that are eligible for federal USDA cost shares? If these practices don't qualify, wouldn't it be more cost-effective (for the state of CA) to work with NRCS to change this?

Are there no lessons from the North Central Valley CREP that are applicable to this study? Are some farmers in the region eligible to participate in CREP?

Is that approach appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Is there a good deal of information about the ecosystem and agricultural system to which the project will contribute (?information richness?)?

The direct interviews of farmers and the results of focus groups would be interesting and would be a nice addition to more quantitative analysis. This kind of qualitative analysis is often lacking in other studies, although the proposal is correct in noting its importance.

Again, the project focuses on practices / technologies not outcomes. There is little information about how changes in practices will translate into ecosystem changes.

Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge of integrating agricultural activities with ecosystem restoration?

There is a large emphasis of demonstration and dissemination relative to actual new information

External Technical Review #1

	<p>collection.</p> <p>Will that information (or approaches) be useful for farmers, cooperating agencies or non-governmental organizations and decision makers?</p> <p>Again, there seems little attention to the potential role of NRCS-administered programs and the CREP (administered by FSA) in project implementation.</p>
--	---

Feasibility

Rating	excellent
Comments	<p>Is the proposed project's approach technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Can the project be completed within reasonably foreseeable constraints (e.g., planting, harvesting, species needs, etc.)? Does the proposal thoroughly address requirements such as environmental compliance and permitting and address contingencies regarding timing of natural or operational conditions?</p> <p>The project appears technically feasible. It seems reasonable to expect that the PIs will deliver what they say they will deliver. They have extensive experience in working with different stakeholders to address requirements and contingencies.</p>

Performance Evaluation

Rating	poor
Comments	<p>Does it explain the criteria it will use to test hypotheses (pre-post comparisons; treatment-control comparisons)? Does the project include a list of project-specific performance measurements (and are they reasonable based on the conceptual model)?</p>

External Technical Review #1

The project would "likely" collect 1) amount of habitat created such as acres created, plant diversity, etc.;

It doesn't say how this will be measured (e.g. pre-post comparison) or how plant diversity would be measured. Other ecosystem effects are relegated to "etc." 2) number of acres of farmland utilizing wildlife friendly techniques;

It is not clear whether they will just catalogue what people are currently doing or trying to estimate changes as a result of project. If it is the latter there is no discussion of what methods they would use to assess this. Also, what does "wildlife friendly" mean? It doesn't appear that there will be any before / after comparison of species numbers or diversity.

3) biological/environmental response such as increased wildlife use, sediment entrapment, reduced pesticide use and movement to waterways; How this will be measured is not discussed

4) farmer responses to altering farming practices to increase environmental values; This presumably are results of interviews / focus group sessions

5) number of participants attending event festivals, including surveys of information successfully disseminated; If this is just a head count or count of information packets distributed, that would be an input not a performance measure. A before-after survey of participant knowledge WOULD BE a performance measure, but it isn't clear that is what is being proposed.

6) establishment of a non-profit organization that would ultimately serve in a leadership role for Delta working landscapes, including festivals; How is this a performance evaluation measure? 7) development of new economic opportunities, through agri-tourism and

External Technical Review #1

	<p>ecotourism This is an objective, but not a performance evaluation measure.</p> <p>8) discovery and implementation of policies and incentive measures that could improve Delta resource values. This is an objective, but not a performance evaluation measure.</p> <p>Is the performance evaluation likely to demonstrate the efficacy of the agricultural management or restoration actions?</p> <p>No. The evaluation will measure practices and inputs, but not the efficacy of those activities.</p>
--	---

Proposed Outcomes

Rating	fair
Comments	<p>Are products of value likely to be generated from the project?</p> <p>Some products, such as qualitative information on practice adoption constraints and ex post performance of the vegetative cover would be of value.</p> <p>Will these products contribute to ecosystem health as well as agriculture? The project does describe how it will measure this.</p> <p>Will products increase the knowledge base relating to the integration of agricultural activities with ecosystem restoration? Yes, somewhat.</p> <p>Can this knowledge be applied in other ecosystems, other crops, or other cropping systems? Yes.</p> <p>Will the project's outcomes be useful to farmers or agencies that manage both</p>

External Technical Review #1

	<p>agricultural systems and ecosystems? Yes, but it would be enhanced with greater collaboration with USDA.</p> <p>How will the reports, information, and data be stored or available in the future for other farmers and agencies that manage both agricultural systems and ecosystems? There is only a sketch description of software to be used for the projec</p>
--	---

Capabilities

Rating	excellent
Comments	<p>What is the track record of the project team in terms of past performance on related projects? Is the project team qualified to effectively implement the proposed project (i.e., does the team have the range of experience and expertise in physical, agricultural, and environmental sciences necessary to carry out the project)? Do they have the capacity (i.e., infrastructure and other support) necessary to accomplish the project?</p> <p>I don't doubt the team has the expertise to carry out what they say they will do?</p>

Cost-Benefits

Rating	fair
Comments	<p>Part 1. The budget for the incentive study is reasonable.</p> <p>Part 2. The cost of installing practices looks in line with cost estimates from other projects in other states.</p> <p>Part 3. I'm not convinced that having multiple festivals is the most cost-effective way do disseminate information.</p>

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating

Rating	fair
Comments	<p>I have no doubt that the PIs will deliver what they promise to deliver. The question is, what will be the ecological impact of their project. They seem very sketchy about this. There is also a quick race from evaluation to demonstration. Gearing up demonstration assumes that you really know what works. If that is the case, why isn't more of this success quantified, documented and published? If it is not the case, why commit to demonstration before you really know what is going on? It was puzzling that the role of USDA conservation programs was entirely lacking.</p> <p>There are no real ecological performance measure in this proposal.</p>

External Technical Review #2

Proposal Number: 0093

Proposal Name: Delta Working Landscapes

Applicant Organization: Delta Protection Commission

Amount Requested: \$1,274,066

Goals

Rating	very good
Comments	The proposal describes and documents very clearly what the ecosystem problems and agricultural opportunities are. The objectives for the first goal of implementing demonstrations are clear and measurable - in terms of completed linear feet of buffers and numbers of farm practices. However, the objectives for the second goal of researching barriers to adoption of farm practices are intangible and not specified. The objectives for the third goal of educational festivals are explained but not measurable, and probably rightly so, since it is a broad and long-term activity.

Justification And Conceptual Model

Rating	good
Comments	The three components are very different. The first, the on-farm demonstrations, clearly presents the scientific rationale for implementing the new practices and how the environment will benefit. However, it assumes that a sufficient number of farmers will volunteer their land and their future maintenance labor in exchange for Hart to design and plant the practice, or to change their tillage or other practices just because they have been encouraged to. The unstated hypothesis is that technical assistance, free implementation, or some (unspecified)

External Technical Review #2

	<p>cost share will cause the change in farmer behavior.</p> <p>The second component, the study of farmer attitudes, promises to study what the barriers are, but its results (after the second year) may not come in time to be used in this project.</p> <p>The third component, festivals, strikes me as a helpful action, but not enough detail is given regarding exactly how it will improve farmer implementation. The goal of creating a new non-profit to take over festivals is stated, but not how to get there.</p>
--	--

Approach

Rating	very good
Comments	<p>The research component of this project is somewhat vague. How many individuals will be surveyed; how will they be identified; how will the questions be structured? An open-ended research approach is not bad, but obtaining quantifiable results seems like an unlikely outcome. On the other hand, the best way to explore farmer attitudes and barriers is to take the time to ask them, and develop recommendations to deal with those barriers. Much depends on the integrity and savvy of the staff involved, The Nature Conservancy here, which I am not able to comment on.</p>

Feasibility

Rating	good
Comments	<p>Compliance - the proposal asserts they are exempt from CEQA and will check into it thoroughly if funded. For wetlands and buffer projects, numerous permits may be needed and Ducks Unlimited says they know how to deal with those processes. I cannot say if government acts quickly enough in CA to allow implementation of the farm projects.</p>

External Technical Review #2

Feasibility - The proposal says these practices and on-farm projects have been piloted sufficiently in the region, and are now ready to be more widely demonstrated. I personally do not know of technical constraints.

Success - My biggest concern with this proposal is that there is no indication of how farms would be identified and selected for implementation of practices. Just because the project will do it for free (with grant funds) does not mean farmers will jump at the chance. The trust-building, outreach, personal relationships, publicity, and education materials needed to convince farmers to try a new conservation practice are not mentioned. (It is implied that the survey process and the festivals will stir up some interest, but that is not their purpose.) It is possible that TNC and DU have such a huge and well-established presence in this area that they already have deep relationships with farmers, but the proposal does not say so and I am not familiar with this region. Certainly, their national reputation is excellent.

Performance Evaluation

Rating	good
Comments	This project has very specific goals to implement habitat projects, including 40,000 feet of various buffers, numbers of practices, etc. These can be measured but their environmental impact probably cannot. Likewise the festivals can measure numbers of attendees but the impact probably cannot be measured. The proposal promised to create a monitoring plan, if funded, but it is not included here.

Proposed Outcomes

Rating	very good
---------------	-----------

External Technical Review #2

Comments	<p>The primary product of this project is the actual implementation of demonstration sites - using \$840,000 of the funding. These projects will undoubtedly directly benefit the environment - although this project will not measure those benefits. Whether the demonstrations themselves will provide a spur to other farmers to try the practices on their land is not clear - but certainly seeing is believing, so it seems likely.</p> <p>The research project would provide useful information to others on how to design programs to spur adoption, but exactly how it is to be disseminated is not clear.</p>
----------	--

Capabilities

Rating	very good
Comments	<p>The pairing of two national environmental organizations with deep scientific and field experience (TNC and DU), and a local commission representing numerous local government agencies (the Delta Protection Commission) seems like an excellent cooperative arrangement. There seems to be sufficient experience and capacity. The project leader at Delta is quite new in her position, but presumably she has the backing of her commission. Resumes were not provided for the DU and TNC personnel.</p> <p>I would like to see an explanation of how the three partners will collaborate - it would be all too typical for each partner to go off and do their own thing without achieving synergy from their collaboration. Meetings, conference calls, reporting, or other means of regularly sharing progress and problems is essential.</p>

Cost-Benefits

Rating	good
Comments	<p>I must say I am astonished that the availability of federal agriculture conservation programs is not mentioned. CRP, WRP, EQIP - these federal land retirement and cost-share programs are the primary means by which these types of farm practices are promoted in other areas of the country. This project proposes to directly bring technical assistance and funding to the farmer and offer to do the job for them. There is no description of how the cost share would be structured, or if it would be free.</p> <p>Hart would get \$520K and a subcontractor (either DU or unspecified, I'm not sure) would get \$320K for implementing the practices. I am not sure whether this is a cost-effective way to get the job done. Possibly some competitive bidding should be done for each installation to ensure low costs. Ask NRCS whether the deliverables are worth the implementation costs. I cannot say.</p>

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating

Rating	very good
Comments	<p>If the funders are looking for a broad partnership between local agencies and NGOs with strong technical abilities, then this proposal has promise. If the funders want to see change out there on the landscape, then this project promises to deliver real farm improvements. If farmers in the Delta area just need to see successful practices on other farms in order to consider adopting them, then this is a great demonstration approach. If building community support is critical to on-farm change, then this project incorporates a good plan for using educational festivals to engage the full community.</p>

External Technical Review #2

However, the research component is not fleshed out enough to determine whether it will provide useful information to others on barriers and solutions to farmer adoption. Further information could clarify this. There is no plan to monitor environmental benefits within the ecosystem. The means by which the project will find willing farmers to work with is not described - more information could help.

External Technical Review #3

Proposal Number: 0093

Proposal Name: Delta Working Landscapes

Applicant Organization: Delta Protection Commission

Amount Requested: \$1,274,066

Goals

Rating	excellent
Comments	The proposal is very well written and very clear as to how it will link ERP ecosystem and agricultural goals, and describes quite well how it will help farmers integrate their activities with restoration.

Justification And Conceptual Model

Rating	excellent
Comments	The actions proposed are well connected to both ecosystem and agricultural systems, and the projects are justified.

Approach

Rating	excellent
Comments	The integrated approach of the work will provide a great deal of information that will be useful both to farmers and other organizations.

Feasibility

Rating	excellent
Comments	Likelihood of success is high, and the authors understand how to implement the actions within

External Technical Review #3

	the time constraints inherent in a 3-year funding cycle.
--	--

Performance Evaluation

Rating	very good
Comments	I would have liked to have seen more specific monitoring plans for Performance measurements are well thought out and suitable for the environmental monitoring, although the work is conceptually presented.

Proposed Outcomes

Rating	excellent
Comments	The outcomes will be very valuable and will help guide future eco-ag plans in the future. Particularly important will be the report on impediments and incentives for farmers.

Capabilities

Rating	excellent
Comments	The team seems very capable of accomplishing the tasks and indicates a good deal of experience in similar projects.

Cost-Benefits

Rating	very good
Comments	The budget is certainly adequate for the work and may be a little generous.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating

Rating	excellent
Comments	The proposers understand the ecology of the Delta and the types of practices that will enhance wildlife

External Technical Review #3

values on farms, and they have the expertise to carry out the work successfully.

Delta Regional Panel Review

Proposal Number: 0093

Proposal Name: Delta Working Landscapes

Applicant Organization: Delta Protection Commission

1. Applicability to ERP goals and regional priorities.

The project meets goals and objectives of Calfed and ERP. Part II of this proposal addresses regional priorities by investigating various wildlife-friendly farming techniques and farmer interest and motivation for employing these techniques (or not). Currently limited information is available about these factors, and this information would be quite useful in prioritizing and implementing future restoration efforts.

notes:

The proposal is very focused on the North Delta region and some panel members questioned its broader regional value.

2. Links with other restoration actions.

Part I of this project proposes to expand on previously funded work by the participants; however, it is unclear how Part I will do so. The applicants state that significant work similar to this has already been conducted throughout the Delta, so the value of an additional pilot project is questionable. Results of previous efforts and applicability to other regions/areas should be examined first, and this information should be prepared and presented to appropriate audiences. If successful, results for Part II would build on previously funded work on Staten Island and by TNC and could serve as a model for other areas.

Delta Regional Panel Review

notes:

It was not clear how technical information about successful restoration techniques would be passed on to interested farmers.

3. Local circumstances.

The project appears to be feasible and appropriate to the region. Specific project sites have not been identified yet, but the applicant states that several farmers have already agreed to participate. I am not aware of any local constraints that would impede the project's ability to move forward; however, the applicants should consider the risk of moving NIS during field activities. It is easy to transport NIS on equipment used for agricultural methods.

notes:

4. Local involvement.

It is unclear how the applicants intend to involve the public initially in project development. The proponents state that there is public support and interest, but do not indicate how this information was obtained or how new partners would be developed (if any). There is detailed information on interim and post-project public involvement and outreach that should be sufficient to inform stakeholders about the project's implementation and results, at least locally.

notes:

The proposal indicated that several private landowners are

Delta Regional Panel Review

willing to participate in the demonstration project. The proposal does not list specifics such as the number or names of grower participants.

5. Local value.

While the outreach festivals should serve as a good forum to disseminate information after projects have been initiated and completed, it is not clear how the results of this work would be made available to a wider audience, or if educational materials will be developed to help farmers actually implement the studied practices on their own property.

notes:

Panel members questioned the emphasis on the Delta working landscape festival in the proposal. This type of public outreach can be very useful but the festival would provide little direct and technical information to farmers.

6. Applicant history.

I have no knowledge of the prior performance record of this applicant.

notes:

7. Summary of Overall Panel Discussion and Review

The panel felt that the proposal's goals and objectives fit with the PSP and ERP, but questioned the innovation and applicability of several elements of the proposal. Some panel members were particularly concerned that the proposal does not produce sufficient "hands on" tools for regional farmers. In

Delta Regional Panel Review

contrast, another panel member felt that by virtue of the parties involved (TNC, Delta Protection Commission, Ducks Unlimited) the information would reach a wide audience.

There was also discussion about the lack of technical detail presented to adequately evaluate the proposal. In addition, monitoring to assess the success of this project is not adequately addressed. The project needs scientific and technical review. But, the cooperators have good track records.

8. Panel Quality Ranking

Fair

notes:

9. Regional Priority Ranking

High

notes:

Environmental Compliance Review

Proposal Number: 0093

Proposal Name: Delta Working Landscapes

Applicant Organization: Delta Protection Commission

1. Is compliance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) required for this project?

Yes.

2. Is compliance with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) required for this project?

Yes.

3. Does this project qualify for an Exemption or Exclusion under CEQA and NEPA, respectively?

Yes.

4. Did the applicant correctly identify if CEQA/NEPA compliance was required?

No.

Comments

Correctly identified that CEQA was required but indicated that NEPA was not required. If federal permits are being issued for this project, NEPA compliance is required.

5. Did the applicant correctly identify the correct CEQA/NEPA document required for the project?

Yes.

Comments:

Identified the correct CEQA document.

6. Has the CEQA/NEPA document been completed?

No.

7. If the document has not been completed, did the applicant allot enough time to complete the document before the project start date?

#0093: Delta Working Landscapes

Environmental Compliance Review

Yes.

8. If the document has not been completed, did the applicant allot enough funds to complete it?

Yes.

Comments:

Did not indicate time or funds allotted to complete the CEQA document. Assuming the project qualifies for Cat. Ex's (both CEQA and NEPA), these documents have a short turn around time and are relatively low cost.

9. Did the applicant adequately identify other legal or regulatory compliance issues (Incidental Take permits, Scientific Collecting permits, etc.) that may affect the project?

Yes.

10. Does the proposal include written permission from the owners of any private property on which project activities are proposed or, if specific locations for project activities are not yet determined, is it likely that permission for access can be obtained?

Yes.

11. Do any of these issues affect the project's feasibility due to significant deficiencies in planning and/or budgeting for legal and regulatory compliance or access to property?

No.

Budget Review

Proposal Number: 0093

Proposal Name: Delta Working Landscapes

Applicant Organization: Delta Protection Commission

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of the requested support?

Yes.

2. Does the Budget Form include a detailed budget for each task identified on the Task and Deliverables Form and in the proposal text?

No.

If no, please explain:

Proposal text is general, not work plan oriented.

3. Are the costs associated with each task and deliverable reasonable costs for performing the services?

No.

If no, please explain:

Not enough detail provided.

4. Is each person (employee, consultant, subcontractor, etc.) identified on the Personnel Form also included on the Budget Form?

Yes.

5. Are there estimated hours and an associated hourly rate of compensation for each person identified on the Personnel, Tasks and Deliverables, and Budget forms?

No.

If no, please explain:

Not enough detail provided.

Budget Review

6. Does the budget include the benefit rate for all personnel identified on the Personnel and Budget forms?

No.

If no, please explain:

Cost not identified.

7. Are the proposed labor rates comparable to state rates?

No.

If no, please explain:

Not enough detail to evaluate.

8. Is more than 25% of the work proposed to be performed by subcontractors?

Yes.

If yes, what is the exact percentage to be performed by subcontractors?

74% plus admin costs.

9. Are project management expenses appropriately budgeted?

Yes.

10. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs? Are indirect rates, if used, appropriately applied?

No.

If no, please explain:

Not addressed.

11. Does the proposal adequately explain major expenses? Are the labor rates and other charges proposed reasonable in relation to current state rates?

No.

If no, please explain:

Task two and three need detailed breakdown of materials, and

Budget Review

subcontractor rates, costs, etc.

12. For equipment \geq \$5,000, was a separate worksheet filled out?

Please note: No overhead or indirect rate charges are allowed on the equipment purchases

No.

13. Is the purpose for all travel clearly represented in either the proposal itself, or in the Tasks and Deliverable Form?

Please note: Recurring travel costs for a specific task or subtask may be combined into one entry on the Budget Form, but the number of trips and cost for each trip must be clearly represented.

No.

14. Are travel and per diem at rates specified by the California Department of Personnel Administration for similar employees?

No.

15. Are other agencies contributing or likely to contribute a share of the projects? costs?

Yes.

If yes, when sufficient information is available, please total the amount of matching funds likely to be provided:

\$22,041.60

16. If the applicant identified cost share or matching funds, are they also described in the text of the proposal?

Yes.

17. Does the applicant take exception to the standard grant agreement's terms and conditions? If yes, are the approaches the applicant proposes to address these issues a reasonable starting point for negotiation a grant agreement?

No.

If no, please explain:

No exception to the std T's &C's.

Budget Review

18. Are there other budget issues or "red flags" that warrant consideration?

No.

19. Provide revised amount requested based upon your review:

\$