

# **Proposal Reviews**

## **#7: San Pablo Baylands & San Francisco Flyway Education Project**

Arc Ecology

**Environmental Education Technical Review**

**Bay Regional Review**

**Environmental Compliance**

**Budget**

# Environmental Education Technical Review:

## CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Environmental Education Technical Review Form

**Proposal Number:** 7

**Applicant Organization:** Arc Ecology

**Proposal Title:** San Pablo Baylands & San Francisco Flyway Education Project

**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	<b>This project will expand a one-day event to a year-round environmental education program that serves previously underserved students. In addition, a campaign about restoration and conservation issues will be implemented. One of the weaknesses of this proposal is not describing the support of schools in the area. Another weakness is budgeting hours of labor for environmental document review and public meetings. This technical review of the Mare Island conversion is not appropriate use of CALFED funds. It would have been more appropriate if the base cleanup were part of an issue investigation strategy as opposed to environmental advocacy activities.</b>
-Above average	
-Adequate	
XNot recommended	

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?

**The projects educational goals, objectives, and outcomes are clearly stated. The target audience is important it will reach underserved youth in Vallejo and American Canyon. It will broaden understanding about restoring the Bay-Delta ecosystem system, especially the connection to Mare Island and its cleanup and restoration activities. It is uncertain whether this project will change behaviors that affect Bay-Delta restoration**

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?

**The conceptual model should have included the names of the schools that agreed to participate in this project. On the plus side, the San Francisco Flyway Festival has increased the number of participants in the past couple of years. The organization is going to use a curriculum model that has been successful in Alameda County. It would have been helpful to grant reviewers if an example of this curriculum model was provided or the model further described.**

3. **Approach (including appropriate curriculum for target audience).** 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?

**The project integrates activities and it appears that its materials and activities are appropriate to its audience. The project can probably be implemented by teachers and other participants.**

4. **Linkages and compatibility to existing school, community and stewardship programs (fits into existing curricula, demonstrated learning value).** 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?

**There is evidence that the project is integrated with ecosystem restoration partnerships, especially at Mare Island. This project is weak in its alignment with the California state Educational standards. The principal curriculum to be used is patterned after another a curriculum model but does not mention additional curricula that might be used.**

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

**The educational part of the project could be replicated. A newsletter will be published to share the project results with others.**

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

**The evaluation methods are weak.**

7. **Capabilities (qualifications and infrastructure).** 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?

**Is the project staff, including consultants and subcontractors, qualified? Yes Is the project adequately supported by existing educational infrastructure? Weak, in that schools who are to participate are not identified. Will it develop the leadership, partnerships, and financial support to sustain it over the long term? Possibly Does the proposal incorporate adequate steps to assure that the project can be sustained after CALFEDs funds are expended? Possibly. The proposal included partnerships and descriptions of past grants, so it is assumed that the partnerships and future grants will continue to support the program.**

The project staff is very qualified to implement the Festival, but weak in including existing educational infrastructure because the schools, which are to participate, are not identified. It is not evident that this project will develop the leadership, partnerships, and financial support to sustain it over the long term, although the proposal includes partnerships and descriptions of past grants.

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

The budget is reasonable for expanding the festival. However, the technical review of the Mare Island conversion is not appropriate use of CALFED funds. It would have been more appropriate if the base cleanup were part of an issue investigation strategy as opposed to environmental advocacy activities. The 1560 hours of labor allocated for environmental document review and public meetings during Year 1; 3120 hours for year 2; and 3120 hours for year 3 are unreasonably high. The focus of the grant should be school and public outreach.

9. **Regional Review.** 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?

The regional panel(s) ranked the proposal as Medium. Regional panels comments were that the proposal is well grounded on past successful programs, although there is not sufficient detail about the expanded components (working with local schools on a year-round basis). No schools are identified as participants, no demographics cited to indicate stated classification of "underserved". Also the regional panel noted that the organization has worked in past years with many local organizations - although it's unclear what relationship is between Mare Island work and Festival/public school outreach efforts - has a history of a successful weekend festival (since 1996) to introduce citizens to annual migration and wintering of migratory waterfowl in the North Bay.

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?

The administrative review indicated the following: The Project Management/Direction task allocates 2080 hours of labor each year and 1560 hours of labor are allocated for environmental document review and public meetings during Year 1 and that seems high.

**Miscellaneous comments:**

## Bay Regional Review:

**Proposal Number:** 7

**Applicant Organization:** Arc Ecology

**Proposal Title:** San Pablo Baylands & San Francisco Flyway Education Project

Overall Ranking:   -Low   **XMedium**   -High

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

**The regional panel supports expansion of the Flyway Festival, an effective education and outreach project**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

**XYes -No**

How?

**- has worked in past years with many local organizations - although it's unclear what relationship is between Mare Island work and Festival/public school outreach efforts - has a history of a successful weekend festival (since 1996) to introduce citizens to annual migration and wintering of migratory waterfowl in the North Bay**

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

**XYes -No**

How?

**- fulfills env. ed. component of the multi-regional Bay-Delta area (MR-3: Implement environmental education actions throughout the geographic scope) - will work with local schools and Golden Gate Audubon to set up programs coordinated with the Refuge and State Wildlife Areas. - will engage students in organizing the annual Flyway Festival**

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?

**yes and no**

**- both components of this project are connected to on-going work in the area - refuges in the area currently not involved with planning festival**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**yes and no**

**- builds on established connections through Festival and Mare Island Restoration Advisory Board - will be working with Golden Gate Audubon Society and local schools, although schools aren't identified**

Other Comments:

**proposal is well grounded on past successful programs, although there is not sufficient detail about the expanded components (working with local schools on a year-round basis). No schools are identified as participants, no demographics cited to indicate stated classification of "underserved".**

## **Environmental Compliance:**

**Proposal Number:** 7

**Applicant Organization:** Arc Ecology

**Proposal Title:** San Pablo Baylands & San Francisco Flyway Education Project

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

-Yes ☒No

If no, please explain:

**If exotic species removal includes the use of pesticides, CA Dept. of Pesticide Regulation and County Agriculture Commissioner approvals are required.**

**CEQA documentation is required when complying with Fish and Game Code sections 2081 and 1600.**

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

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

**The Project Management/Direction task allocates 2080 hours of labor each year. 1560 hours of labor are allocated for environmental document review and public meetings during Year 1**

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

-Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

## **Budget:**

**Proposal Number:** 7

**Applicant Organization:** Arc Ecology

**Proposal Title:** San Pablo Baylands & San Francisco Flyway Education Project

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

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

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

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

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

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

☒Yes -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?

-Yes ☒No

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

**Funding carried forward does not match funding requested.**

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

☒Yes -No



If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: