

**CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP Directed Actions
Selection Panel Review**

Proposal Number: 185DA

Applicant Organization: UC Sea Grant Extension Program

Proposal Title: West Coast Ballast Outreach Project

Recommendation: Fund As Is

Amount: \$478,395

Conditions, if any, of approval (if there are no conditions, please put "None"): None.

Provide a brief explanation of your rating: Continuing this program will provide needed information and coordination that enhances enforcement activities to prevent new introductions of aquatic nuisance species via ballast water. The revised proposal responds to the need to document the program's effectiveness by outlining four activities to gain this evaluation information.

* * *

Research and Restoration External Review Form
CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program 2002 Proposal Solicitation Package

Proposal Title: West Coast Ballast Outreach Project

Review:

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?
 - a. yes – everything is clearly stated and consistent
 - b. yes – very timely and important
2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?
 - a. yes – the study is justified
 - b. yes – conceptual model is clearly stated and it explains the underlying basis for proposed work
 - c. yes – selection of outreach methods are justified
3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?
 - a. yes – good approach and variety
 - b. yes – outreach results will add to increased awareness and help prepare people for possible upcoming regulatory changes
 - c. yes – the information is designed and will be helpful to those affected by decision-makers
4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?
 - a.** yes –
 - b.** Based on this project's approach and evaluation methods, there is a high degree of achieving success
 - c.** Yes – scale of project is consistent with objectives
5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?
 - a.** Yes, - performance measures have been included that will be extremely helpful in assessing project goals and objectives and there are enough details. There is also the opportunity to change and fine-tune aspects based on input while project is ongoing.
6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?
 - a.** yes -
7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?
 - a. Good track record – project team is well qualified and the existing infrastructure is in place to give necessary support to accomplish the goals and objectives of project.
8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

Yes – budget is reasonable and adequate

Miscellaneous comments:

Based on the previous review comments, and going through the resubmitted package, the applicants have addressed the earlier concerns and have put together a very strong package. The applicants capitalize on existing expertise and knowledge through other organizations. They have developed a set of performance measures that will help them evaluate their outreach and educational efforts to include if they were able to contribute to changes in ballast management practices (indirectly). Although the application does not specify the specific teaching technique, the organizations they are coordinating with would be well qualified in that area of expertise. This well-coordinated effort will help many agencies and organizations in the future whether or not mandatory regulations become part of standard operations for handling ballast water. Educating and understanding implications of our actions are the first steps to changing our behaviors.

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating: Excellent: outstanding in all respects; Good: quality but some deficiencies; Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
- Excellent XX	Based on the efforts, outreach, evaluations, and coordination that will take place, this is an excellent investment. Because of partnering, the low cost for all that can be achieved through this project is an additional benefit.
- Good	
- Poor	

Research and Restoration External Review Form
CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program 2002 Proposal Solicitation Package

Proposal Title: West Coast Ballast Outreach Project

Review:

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important? I concur with all of the previous review statements as they are printed in the Technical E.E. Review. I would include “political” as a specific factor instead of the vague “other” Perhaps something like this...Many factors including economic and political can hinder the needed change of ballast management.
2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified? I still have reservations with this section. The project is more than justified but as written the proposal is still weak to confirm that the education program is causing any significant change in management.
3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers? I agree with most of the previously written review. Although the proposal indicates on page 25 “...there will be no significant data generated by this project.”, I think the data collected from the indicated surveys on page 24, #'s 4) & 5) could be useful to decision-makers.
4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? Yes. What is the likelihood of success? From the past dissemination of materials, complete success is possible. Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives? Yes
5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Although various evaluative tools are mentioned, this area is still somewhat vague. I feel that although this portion is not written clearly, that the intent to share, with appropriate audiences, the survey findings, will occur and hopefully modify future education outreach. Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? No For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed? NA
6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Yes. (see survey findings above in#3.) Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? NA Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project? Perhaps.
7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Appears to be very good. Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Yes. Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project? “totally”
8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed? Yes.

Miscellaneous comments:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating: Excellent: outstanding in all respects; Good: quality but some deficiencies; Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
- Excellent	This is a much needed educational project. It is something that needs to be ongoing. My hope is that it will actively target the <u>source</u> of the ANS problem and find a way to evaluate awareness, understanding and ultimately behavior change in the private shipping industry. More is needed than just checking to see if the posters are indeed posted in the appropriate areas of ships.
- Good X	
- Poor	

***CALFED Bay-Delta Directed Action
Administrative Review
Budget Evaluation***

Proposal number: 185

Proposal title: West Coast Ballast Outreach

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

If no, please explain:

Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified? Yes

If no, please explain:

Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs? No

If no, please explain: The proposal does not identify the types of expenses that are covered under "overhead".

Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified? No

If no, please explain: Explanation is provided that states that 100% of the project management costs are covered by California and National Sea Grant, but the details of just what those costs may be are not provided.

Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary? No

If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds included in budget summary). Line 17A Federal total (526,259) does not match the federal total on the budget summary form (551,609). The state totals match.

Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses? Yes

If no, please explain:

Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration? No

If yes, please explain:

* * *