

Proposal Reviews

#20: Bay-Delta Invasive Species Education Outreach: Developing and Piloting an Invasive Species Tool Kit

California Department of Food and Agriculture

Initial Selection Panel Review

Environmental Education Technical Review

Bay Regional Review

Delta Regional Review

San Joaquin Regional Review

Sacramento Regional Review

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding #1
#2

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 20

Applicant Organization: California Department of Food and Agriculture

Proposal Title: Bay-Delta Invasive Species Education Outreach: Developing and Piloting an Invasive Species Tool Kit

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	-
Not Recommended	X

Amount: **\$0**

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

None.

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

The proposal was weak in its educational goals and their relation to the educational standards. Unclear that proponents have sought educator review, identified how the materials will be used, identified a target grade level, or described how this fits within California curriculum.

Environmental Education Technical Review:

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

Proposal Number: 20

Applicant Organization: California Department of Food and Agriculture

Proposal Title: Bay-Delta Invasive Species Education Outreach: Developing and Piloting an Invasive Species Tool Kit

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	Clear description of the implementation strategy needs to be provided. Would have a higher rating if there were direct connections to state academic standards and distribution of kits linked to areas of invasive species in areas with other CALFED education projects
-Above average	
X Adequate	
-Not 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?

This project has potential to change behaviors but is weak in educational goals, that is, how it relates to current educational standards.

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 kit is an assemblage of existing materials. Unclear how teachers are introduced to use these items or if really relevant to their needs.

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?

Plan does not clarify how the kit is provided to teachers or how they use it once they have it. Have materials been reviewed by teachers and found useful? Where does this fit into their curriculum? Grade levels? Subjects?

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?

Proposal does not address these areas. There is mention that connections with Project WILD, Learning Tree and WET can be a vehicle to get these materials to teachers, but no plan of how this works is provided

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?

This plan could be replicated with adjustments noted above.

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

Evaluation components are provided.

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?

Invasive species is a high priority for use of CALFED funds.

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

Some question of why funds should be allocated to agency staff.

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?

Overall given a medium rating. Did not clearly address educational value of this program. Some local connectivity, especially in the San Joaquin-Delta region Proposal does note how the kit can be used as a collaborative effort among many agencies with invasive species information and issues.

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?

No comments

Miscellaneous comments:

As presented is a cost effective project.

Bay Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 20

Applicant Organization: California Department of Food and Agriculture

Proposal Title: Bay-Delta Invasive Species Education Outreach: Developing and Piloting an Invasive Species Tool Kit

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

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

The substantive educational aspects of the program are not strongly developed.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

x

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

XYes -No

How?

MR-1 Precent establilshment of additional non-native species and reduce negative impacts of established populations

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?

x

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

-Yes **X**No

How?

The panel agreed that close involvement with local and regional experts, emphasizing local experiences and issues rather primary reliance on packaged educational kits, is essential for a strong educational outreach program.

Other Comments:

Delta Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 20

Proposal Title: Bay-Delta Invasive Species Education Outreach: Developing and Piloting an Invasive Species Tool Kit

Overall Ranking: -Low Medium -High

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

Panel felt that this outreach tool kit could be helpful in disseminating information on the impacts of NIS on the ecosystem and potential for its restoration.

The panel, however, did not feel this information was urgently needed at this point.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

I could not identify any local constraints that would impede the projects ability to move forward in a timely and successful manner

 Cooperation with local school districts is highly likely.  Expertise from other invasive species outreach efforts have direct applicability to this proposal so the degree of potential success is high

er.

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

Yes -No

How?

Proposal claims it contributes to meeting one related priority for each of the CALFED Areas. For example, MR-1 states:

 Prevent the establishment of additional non-native species and reduce the negative biological, economic, and social impacts of established nonnative species in the Bay-Delta estuary and its watersheds.

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

Yes -No

How?

The project proposal integrates well with other invasive species efforts underway in the estuary, e.g. purple loosestrife prevention work, hydrilla control, etc. Project also acknowledges that it will coordinate with other educational outreach efforts such as DFGs Project Wild. Work will have restoration and conservation consequences.

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

XYes -No

How?

By working closely with educators in pilot areas and then involving the local community in projects such as local invasive species eradication efforts.

While there is no specific plan for local involvement the proposal itself basically includes a significant element of local involvement.

Other Comments:

 Investigators have the experience and perspective to ensure the success of this proposal.

 The contribution of this project could be significant since extensive restoration has been targeted by CALFED and that restoration could either fail now or gradually be degraded depending on the success of efforts to reduce existing invasive species and minimize the introductions of new species.

San Joaquin Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 20

Applicant Organization: California Department of Food and Agriculture

Proposal Title: Bay-Delta Invasive Species Education Outreach: Developing and Piloting an Invasive Species Tool Kit

Overall Ranking: -Low Medium -High

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

A good workable proposal. As written is more Bay-Delta oriented. Would probably rank higher with a greater emphasis on the SJ Valley.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

Coordination with other environmental education efforts and assimilate into them. Involves agencies and groups in region working with the issue. Proposes to get teachers interested and involved (hardest part).

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

Yes -No

How?

MR 1 to prevent the establishment of NIS, and SJ 1 (purple loosestrife) More important for Bay-Delta than SJ Valley

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

Yes -No

How?

Coordination with Project Learning Tree and Project Wild. Coordination with Weed Management Area groups, watershed groups, CA Exotic Plant Pest Council and Teachers and school districts.

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

Yes -No

How?

Will pull in local Bay-Delta teachers so will have local impact.

Other Comments:

Discusses plants and animals but this is a highly plant oriented proposal that has more current applicability in the Bay-Delta region than the SJ Valley as written.

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 20

Applicant Organization: California Department of Food and Agriculture

Proposal Title: Bay-Delta Invasive Species Education Outreach: Developing and Piloting an Invasive Species Tool Kit

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

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

Good proposal, specifically listed in the PSP, however, there is concern about paying for existing agency staff and the lack of educators to guide or build the project.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

Needed project with good regional support from a number of NIS groups and environmental educators. May be a problem getting teachers involved.

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

XYes -No

How?

Addresses PSP priorities Multi-regional under MR-1 and, in part, MR-3

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?

Many NIS and Env. Ed partners. Lead agency for weed issues statewide. Project will make use of existing and new materials and curriculum (to state Ed standards) on NIS.

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

XYes -No

How?

Local schools, WMAs, etc., although there is no specific plan outlined on how to get teachers involved.

Other Comments:

Positives: Project is specifically called for in PSP (M-R) and fills a real need. Good partners.

Negatives: Hardest job is getting teachers to cooperate. What's missing is the substitute teacher and transportation elements of the FARMS proposal. Suggest a collaboration between projects is ripe here.

Proposal does not use a person with technical expertise in the education field, which was a concern. Also, panel had trouble giving financial support for agency staff already in place.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1

New Proposal Number: 20

New Proposal Title: Bay-Delta Invasive Species Education Outreach: Developing and Piloting an Invasive Species Tool Kit

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

ERP 99-N11 - Purple Loosetrife Prevention, Detection & Control Actions for the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta System

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:

Other Comments:

Carri Bennefield has been a knowledgeable and effective project manager.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2

New Proposal Number: 20

New Proposal Title: Bay-Delta Invasive Species Education Outreach: Developing and Piloting an Invasive Species Tool Kit

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

99-F08 Purple Loosestrife Prevention, Detection, & Control in the Sac/SJ Delta and Associated Hyrdologic Units.

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*
3. Have negotiations about contracts or contact amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

Yes -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?

Yes -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?

Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

Yes -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?

-Yes -No N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

N/A- this is not a next phase project.

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 20

Applicant Organization: California Department of Food and Agriculture

Proposal Title: Bay-Delta Invasive Species Education Outreach: Developing and Piloting an Invasive Species Tool Kit

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

Yes 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?

Yes No

If no, please explain:

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: 20

Applicant Organization: California Department of Food and Agriculture

Proposal Title: Bay-Delta Invasive Species Education Outreach: Developing and Piloting an Invasive Species Tool Kit

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).

difference of .31, rounded off the nearest dollar.

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:

page 17 of the proposal under D. Cost states a excel spreadsheet is availble upon request in regards to the budget. information was defined in the budget summary/justification.