Proposal Reviews

#1: Adopt-A-Watershed Leadership Development, Next Phase

Adopt-A-Watershed

Final Selection Panel Review

Initial Selection Panel Review

Environmental Education Technical Review

Delta Regional Review

San Joaquin Regional Review

Sacramento Regional Review

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Final Selection Panel Review:

Proposal Number: 1

Applicant Organization: Adopt-A-Watershed

Proposal Title: Adopt-A-Watershed Leadership Development, Next Phase

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

Fund	
As Is	X
In Part	-
With Conditions	-
Consider as Directed Action	-
Not Recommended	-

  Amount: **$1,518,395.00**

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

None

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

The Selection Panel had two concerns with the proposal which were addressed by the applicant in a comment letter. The Panel appreciates clarification provided by the applicant regarding 1) breadth of proposed project (i.e., it does include San Joaquin and Delta regions), which addresses the Selection Panel's concern regarding perceived scope limited to the Sacramento Basin, and 2) need for immediate funding to allow for implementation of project as proposed, which is the Panel's interest.

Initial Selection Panel Review:

Proposal Number: 1

Applicant Organization: Adopt-A-Watershed

Proposal Title: Adopt-A-Watershed Leadership Development, Next Phase

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

Explanation of Recommendation Categories: Fund

- **As Is** (a proposal recommended for funding as proposed)
- **In Part** (a proposal for which partial funding is recommended for selected project phases or components)
- **With Conditions** (a proposal for which funds are recommended if the applicant contractually agrees to meet the specified conditions)

Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan (a proposal addressing a high priority action that requires some revision followed by additional review prior to being recommended for funding)
Not Recommended (a proposal not currently recommended for funding-after revision may be considered in the future)

Note on "Amount":

For proposals recommended as Fund As Is, Fund In Part or Fund With Conditions, the dollar amount is the amount recommended by the Selection Panel.

For proposals recommended as Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan, the dollar amount is the amount requested by the applicant(s).

Fund	
As Is	-
In Part	-
With Conditions	-
Consider as Directed Action	X
Not Recommended	-

Amount: **$1,518,395.00**

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

None

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

This proposal for next phase funding would continue the successful work of Adopt-A-Watershed to refine and adapt its educational leadership models in schools in the Sacramento Valley, where they would reach an additional 75,000 students. In consideration of the technical and regional reviews, the Selection Panel would like to see the applicant continue their work but with a much broader geographic scope. For that reason, the Panel would like the applicant to revise the proposal, to reflect expansion of efforts into the Delta and San Joaquin Regions, to be reconsidered as a directed action.

Environmental Education Technical Review:

Proposal Number: 1

Applicant Organization: Adopt-A-Watershed

Proposal Title: Adopt-A-Watershed Leadership Development, Next Phase

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Superior: outstanding in all respects;
Above Average: Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;
Adequate: No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;
Not Recommended: Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Superior **X**Above average **-**Adequate **-**Not recommended	***This project continues to refine and adapt important educational leadership methods. *Primarily focused on Sacramento River Watershed with smaller area of emphasis in Bay Area and San Joaquin. Suggest to reach out to this larger audience to locate new teams rather than perpetuate with same collaboraters in the northeastern CA region--try to balance project outreach within CALFED geographic region. *Model and evaluations need to be shared with a larger EE audience *Link to other CALFED projects--site training of teachers within the CALFED area and other CALFED active restoration projects. *Find other teams within CALFED ERP solution area. *Funds not needed until Summer 2003.**

1. **Clearly stated educational goals, objectives and expected outcomes.** Are the project's educational goals, objectives, and outcomes clearly stated? Is its target audience important because of its size, diversity, location, or influence? Will it broaden understanding about restoring the Bay-Delta ecosystem? Will it change behaviors that affect Bay-Delta restoration?

   Extremely well organized proposal. All items above are explained.

2. **Justification (including conceptual model, likelihood of success).** Does the conceptual model satisfactorily explain how the project will attain its goals? Is it supported by research or past results?

Conceptual model well explained and justified.

3. **<u>Approach (including appropriate curriculum for target audience).</u>** Does the project appropriately integrate activities (curricula, equipment, field activities, audiovisual communications, earned coverage in news media, etc)? Are its materials and activities appropriate to its audience? Can it be implemented readily by teachers and other participants?

   Yes, but access to other outstanding curriculum and resources not demonstrated. Project could be strengthened with collaboration with additional partners.

   Very highly evolved model that places great importance in team-building and leadership development.

4. **<u>Linkages and compatibility to existing school, community and stewardship programs (fits into existing curricula, demonstrated learning value.</u>** Is the project satisfactorily integrated with ecosystem restoration partnerships or community programs? For K-12 projects, is the project adequately aligned with the California state Educational Frameworks or other mandatory teaching standards? Does it make full use of suitable existing curricula and facilities?

   Yes--extremely well lined and aligned to California Frameworks and Standards.

5. **<u>Replicability and dissemination of the program or project.</u>** Can the project be replicated, if successful? Are there satisfactory plans for sharing project materials and results with others?

   Yes, but at a very high cost.

6. **<u>Pre- and post-project evaluation component.</u>** Are the evaluation methods effective and appropriate to the project?

   Yes, but the results need to be shared with the wider EE community.

7. **<u>Capabilities (qualifications and infrastructure).</u>** Is the project staff, including consultants and subcontractors, qualified? Is the project adequately supported by existing educational infrastructure? Will it develop the leadership, partnerships, and financial support to sustain it over the long term? Does the proposal incorporate adequate steps to assure that the project can be sustained after CALFED's funds are expended?

   Very qualified team.

8. **<u>Cost/benefit.</u>** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

   Yes, cost per participant slightly high but justified.

9. **<u>Regional Review.</u>** How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Did the regional panel(s) identify significant benefits (regional priorities, linkages with other activities, local involvement) or impediments (local constraints, conflicts with other activities, lack of local involvement) to this proposal? What were they?

   *2-medium, 1-high *Expressed concerns about high cost and noted that this is continued funding - group presently funded for 2001-04. *Very limited outreach in San Joaquin Delta and Bay area *High level of competency and evolved process

10. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

Only concern was the high cost.

Miscellaneous comments:

Delta Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 1

Proposal Title: Adopt-A-Watershed Leadership Development, Next Phase

Overall Ranking: **-**Low   **X**Medium   **-**High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

The panel felt that although this could be a good project, it is not a priority for funding this year. Applicants have two years of funding remaining on a previously-funded CALFED grant.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

   XYes **-**No

   How?

   This environmental education project proposes to expand AAW's Leadership Development Program. No CEQA or NEPA compliance required. Permission to access any property for student activities would be obtained through resource or regulatory agencies involved in the various projects.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

   XYes **-**No

   How?

   PSP priority MR-3, specifically as it relates to hands-on education activities for adults and K-12

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

   XYes **-**No

   How?

   This program currently provides an educational component for ecosystem restoration projects implemented by local groups.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

   XYes **-**No

   How?

Leadership Development Institute teams work closely with other stakeholders in the community through AAW's Advisory Committee and partnership network. Outreach to stakeholder groups and individuals would be handled by teams' Community Coordinators, and Regional Coordinators would work with restoration groups and local schools to identify common educational needs.

Other Comments:

Seems to be a successful and beneficial program, however, $1.5 million over three years seems to be expensive for an environmental education project. This project was funded for three years with a CALFED ERP grant in 2001.

San Joaquin Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 1

Applicant Organization: Adopt-A-Watershed

Proposal Title: Adopt-A-Watershed Leadership Development, Next Phase

Overall Ranking: **-**Low   **X**Medium   **-**High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

A good program, but no serious outreach into the San Joaquin Valley. It is Bay-Delta focused.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

    XYes **-**No

    How?

    The program is entirely feasible as it has already been successfully implemented and this application represents a continuation and expansion of the program.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

    XYes **-**No

    How?

    The proposal addresses the Bay-Delta Multi regional priority for Implementing environmental education throughout the geographic scope. The panel notes however, that this proposal, as well as all the other environmental educational proposals strongly lean to the Bay-Delta and only cursory outreach to the San Joaquin watershed has been made (1 Fresno school).

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

    XYes **-**No

    How?

    The program is integrated with a variety of different schools and communities. In addition, it coordinates with the FARMS and SLEWS programs.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

    XYes **-**No

How?

The program involves a variety of communities, teachers and other environmental programs, including proposed outreach to 75,000 students.

Other Comments:

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 1

Applicant Organization: Adopt-A-Watershed

Proposal Title: Adopt-A-Watershed Leadership Development, Next Phase

Overall Ranking: **-**Low   **-**Medium   **X**High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

This is continuation of a good education project implemented by qualified applicants.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

    XYes **-**No

    How?

    Next phase project with a good plan and highly qualified entities.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

    XYes **-**No

    How?

    This proposal meets the PSP Multi Region Priority #3 to implement environmental education.

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

    XYes **-**No

    How?

    As well as an education program could be.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

    XYes **-**No

    How?

    This program works at the grass roots level.

Other Comments:

X

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding:

New Proposal Number: 1

New Proposal Title: Adopt-A-Watershed Leadership Development, Next Phase

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: (*list only projects for which you are the contract manager*)

   01-N39, Adopt-A-Watershed Leadership Institute, Ecosystem Restoration

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: (*list only projects for which you are the contract manager*)

   N/A

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contact amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

   XYes **-**No **-**N/A

   If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

   XYes **-**No **-**N/A

   If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

   XYes **-**No **-**N/A

   If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

   XYes **-**No **-**N/A

   If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

   XYes **-**No **-**N/A

If no, please explain:

Applicant will be ready for next phase funding in 2002.

Other Comments:

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 1

Applicant Organization: Adopt-A-Watershed

Proposal Title: Adopt-A-Watershed Leadership Development, Next Phase

1. Are the legal or regulatory issues that affect the proposal identified adequately in the proposal?

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

3. Do the legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal significantly impair the project's feasibility?

   -Yes **X**No

   If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 1

Applicant Organization: Adopt-A-Watershed

Proposal Title: Adopt-A-Watershed Leadership Development, Next Phase

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

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

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

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

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

   XYes **-**No

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

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

   -Yes **X**No

   If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: