

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

Proposal Number: 256DA

Applicant Organization: Yolo Basin Foundation

Proposal Title: Pacific Flyway Center Initial Planning

Recommendation: Fund With Conditions

Amount: \$334,021

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

This project must be closely coordinated with the California Department of Fish and Game and the Wildlife Conservation Board. The applicant must provide evidence that this proposal is integrated with the proposal submitted to the Wildlife Conservation Board for funding construction of the Pacific Flyway Center. The final decision to fund this proposal will be dependent on and linked to the decision made by the Wildlife Conservation Board.

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

The Selection Panel is aware of the proposal being developed by the Yolo Basin Foundation (Foundation) for construction and operation of the Pacific Flyway Center just outside of the Yolo Bypass. The development of this proposal is being closely coordinated with the California Department of Fish and Game, and will be submitted for consideration to the Wildlife Conservation Board.

The proposal being considered by the Selection Panel would allow the Foundation to continue to provide outreach, planning, oversight, and coordination of the development of the Pacific Flyway Center.

The Foundation has received ERP grants for their work in the Yolo Basin, and has successfully implemented these projects. The Foundation works closely with CDFG at the existing Yolo Basin facility, but the success of the education programs within the community has generated interest in creating a larger space to better accommodate these programs. In addition, the CDFG Yolo Basin Wildlife Area has recently been expanded to almost 14,000 acres, and there is a State interest in highlighting this investment and bringing the public closer to the Wildlife Area. As part of this recent expansion, CDFG holds title to the land being considered for a Pacific Flyway Center. There are also federal funds from the US Army Corps of Engineers to assist in construction of the Pacific Flyway Center facility.

The Selection Panel is supportive of the Pacific Flyway Center concept, but wants to take action on this proposal in concert with any action taken by the Wildlife Conservation Board to support construction of the facility. We request that ERP staff work closely with CDFG as these plans move forward, and if it is determined by ERP staff that this

specific grant is integrated with the larger proposal submitted to WCB, that the funds be awarded to the Foundation.

* * *

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

Proposal Title: #256 Pacific Flyway Center Initial Planning

Review:

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

a. yes – all info. is clear and internally consistent

b. yes – for ERP goals

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?

This proposal is justified as this initial planning step is critical in determining if an educational center will be placed in the area. The proposal gives a clear conceptual model and explains the underlying basis for the work to be done.

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?

The approach looks to be well designed and appropriate and the results are needed to move forward with an educational center. The information will be critical to 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?

The approach looks to be fully documented and technically feasible and the scale of the project is consistent with the objectives. Success will be achieved through the development of a conceptual plan and other objectives that this plan should achieve.

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?

Because this is an initial planning phase, the outcomes from this endeavor would be the way to measure the success of the project's goals and objectives. It is very clear what they need to achieve with this project.

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?

Information feeding into a larger picture will be the product from this project

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?

The YBF has done very well with educational efforts in the area. Through an already existing project, they have had 11,000 students, 372 teachers, and 1,400 parents out at this area over the last 5 years. They have partnered with the Army Corp. of Engineers and Dept. of Fish and Game. They also have the support of a consultant with experience in planning and design for natural resources.

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

The budget seems to be reasonable and adequate for the proposed work, but this is not my area of expertise.

Miscellaneous comments:

The revised proposal addresses development of a long term funding strategy and explains the basic assumption of the management and program funding plan is that DFG will own the facility, be responsible for the basic operations and the YBF will be responsible for funding education-related programs. Therefore, the infrastructure needed should be there. The project seems to be well coordinated, and the location will not overlap significantly with other existing facilities. Qualifications were provided and seem quite sufficient.

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	There doesn't seem to be a high priority for this unless it's a high priority for the ERP. Funding this part of the process would help identify how realistic building the center and supporting it is. Since the Pacific Flyway Program already has done so much to train educators and teach students, and there is so much opportunity in the existing area and agencies, it is a logical next step to see if a Center could be built and supported. There is no doubt, if it was built and supported, it would be heavily utilized to the public's benefit.
- Good XX	
- Poor	

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

Proposal Title: # 256 Pacific Flyway Center Initial Planning

Review:

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? **YES** Is the concept timely and important? **YES.** However, this is just a planning project with no guarantee that the Center will ever be constructed.
2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? **YES** Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? **YES** Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified? **YES** The Discover the Flyway Program is highly successful but the scope of this project includes much more. A Center could reach thousands of visitors and provide the needed comprehensive Valley/Bay/Delta/Pacific Flyway educational connection. All “partners” and stakeholders could be represented.
3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? **YES** Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? **NA** Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? **NA** Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers? **NA** from the sense that this project only addresses the planning phase. The assumption is that appropriate materials would be developed along with the construction stage.
4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? **The study is, of course, feasible but the “next step” is not well documented.** What is the likelihood of success? **Unknown** at this point, because no funding has been secured for construction, displays, and for ongoing Center function. Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives? **The scale is consistent with the objectives.**
5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? **This is a planning project only.** Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? **NA** 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? **A plan would be produced as a product.** Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? **NA** Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project? **NA**
7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? **Other than the Discover the Flyway Program, their track record is unknown to me.** Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? **The brief written qualifications seem to be adequate.** Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project? **I did not find this documented specifically in the proposal, but the applicants seem to have been working for some time with several partners.**
8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed? **I still find this project to be a very costly one for only an initial planning phase with absolutely no guarantee that the Center will come to fruition.**

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	The concept of a Pacific Flyway Center is excellent. I still have all the same concerns that were originally expressed in the E.E. Technical Review. How the Center would sustain itself is a major concern. Turtle Bay Museum, Redding CA. has not (after careful studies, etc.) had the anticipated visitor numbers and has had to reduce staff and expenses. Turtle Bay has from outward appearances done an excellent job of marketing, and yet still, there is a definite concern for cash flow. This is something to think about as we consider funding a large sum of money to explore and plan a Center that may be hard to fund for construction and then funding for continuing operation.
- Good X-	
- Poor	

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

Proposal number: **#256DA**

Proposal title: ***Pacific Flyway Center Initial Planning***

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? **Yes**

However, while the applicants identify the overhead rate as 32%, which is the rate the Yolo Basin Foundation negotiated for a 1998 CALFED ERP grant using federal funds (and anticipate that the same rate is appropriate for a grant using state funds), they do not appear to consistently use this rate for all tasks. The 32% rate appears to be used only for Task 3 Conceptual Plan Development and Task 6 Project Management task. (Note that the Task Numbers in the Budget Summary are labeled incorrectly for Tasks 2 through 6, when compared to the Task Numbers identified in the proposal text, the Project Budget Detail and Consultant Cost Detail.) The overhead rates used for the other four tasks are:

Task 1: 18.6%

Task 2: 22.4%

Task 4: 20.5%

Task 5: 16.9%

It's possible this discrepancy could be explained by some line items being subject to overhead while others are not; however, if this is the case, it is not clearly stated in the proposal.

If no, please explain:

Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified? **Yes**

If no, please explain:

Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary? **Yes**

If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds included in budget summary).

Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses? **Yes**

If no, please explain:

Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration? **Yes**

If yes, please explain:

There are several math errors or inconsistencies in the multiple budgets presented:

Budget Summary. Task 1 Total Direct Costs should be \$25,265 rather than \$25,205, a difference of \$60 resulting in a Total Cost for Task 1 of \$29,945, a Total for Year 1 of \$207,896, and a Grand Total of \$334,081. This error for Task 1 Total Direct Costs is also shown in the Project Budget Detail on p. 14.

Project Budget Detail. The Services or Consultants line items do not all agree with those in the Consultant Cost Detail spreadsheet. The sum of the Consultant Cost Detail costs is \$113,960 rather than 114,235 as shown on the Project Budget Detail and Budget Summary spreadsheets, a difference of -\$275. Correcting the math error for Task 1 and assuming that the Consultant Cost Detail is correct, the grand total requested would be \$333,806 rather than \$334,021. Also “Conceptual Plan Kick-off Meeting” is repeated 5 times in the listing of subtasks under Task 1, while different subtask labels are provided under Task 1 in the Consultant Cost Detail spreadsheet.

*** * ***