

# **Proposal Reviews**

## **#51: Kids for Our Creeks**

Cottonwood Creek Watershed Group

**Initial Selection Panel Review**

**Environmental Education Technical Review**

**Sacramento Regional Review**

**Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding**

**Environmental Compliance**

**Budget**

## Initial Selection Panel Review:

### CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

**Proposal Number:** 51

**Applicant Organization:** Cottonwood Creek Watershed Group

**Proposal Title:** Kids for Our Creeks

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

Amount:    **\$164,579**

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

**None**

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

**Cottonwood Creek is an important tributary to the Sacramento River, with anadromous fish and other significant wildlife, and is a major source of spawning gravel to the mainstem. CALFED previously supported the formation of the Cottonwood Creek Watershed Group in this largely rural area. This proposal will build on prior environmental education efforts and will target K-8 grades. The proposal was rated highly by the regional panel and the Environmental Education panel agreed that this has "great merit", although it did note the proposal could have been more artfully written. The Selection Panel viewed the proposal very positively and recommends full funding.**

# Environmental Education Technical Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 51

**Applicant Organization:** Cottonwood Creek Watershed Group

**Proposal Title:** Kids for Our Creeks

**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>The panel felt much the same as the Regional Review stated that the project has great merit but was not written as well as it could have been. There needs to be clearly defined links to ecosystem management and to go beyond just another E.E. program, which if you read between the lines, it is not. The area and site is important as a CALFED site, with the planned dam removal nearby. The project involves a significant number of schools with the possibility of 7 more and uses proven curriculum</b>
XAbove average	
-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?

**Are the projects educational goals, objectives, and outcomes clearly stated? YES.**

**Is its target audience important because of its size, diversity, location, or influence? Yes, the target audience is clearly delineated (students within 940 sq. mi. Area 1 middle school and 7 elementary schools.)**

**Will it broaden understanding about restoring the Bay-Delta ecosystem system? Possibly.**

**Will it change behaviors that affect Bay-Delta restoration? Although identified, this was not clearly elaborated upon.**

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?

**Does the conceptual model satisfactorily explain how the project will attain its goals? YES.**

**Is it supported by research or past results? YES, by past results of projects by Cottonwood Creek Watershed Group.**

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?

**Does the project appropriately integrate activities (curricula, equipment, field activities, audiovisual communications, earned coverage in news media, etc)? YES, creation of a web page.**

**Are its materials and activities appropriate to its audience? YES, data collection that can be shared.**

**Can it be implemented readily by teachers and other participants? YES, not only will parents be encouraged to participate, a special integrated environmental education packet will be developed for all of the teachers involved.**

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?

**Is the project satisfactorily integrated with ecosystem restoration partnerships or community programs? YES.**

**For K-12 projects, is the project adequately aligned with the California state Educational Frameworks or other mandatory teaching standards? YES, the main program utilizes the Childs Place in the Environment which totally aligns with all State standards/frameworks.**

**Does it make full use of suitable existing curricula and facilities? YES, plus the use of an outdoor site**

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?

**Can the project be replicated, if successful? YES.**

**Are there satisfactory plans for sharing project materials and results with others? Linkages with other counties is noted. Share information with others to develop their own environmental programs.**

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

**YES, extensive and thorough**

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? YES.**

**Will it develop the leadership, partnerships, and financial support to sustain it over the long term? Possibly, partnerships include, school district, Adopt-A-Watershed Program, CDFG and CCWG and other informal partnerships.**

**Does the proposal incorporate adequate steps to assure that the project can be sustained after CALFEDs funds are expended? Not really addressed in detail.**

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

**YES**

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?

**How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Sacramento Regional Review High.**

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?

**Environmental Compliance: Mild concerns as data collecting and possible specimen collecting was not clearly defined.**

**Administration: O.K.**

**Budget: O.K.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

## **Sacramento Regional Review:**

**Proposal Number:** 51

**Applicant Organization:** Cottonwood Creek Watershed Group

**Proposal Title:** Kids for Our Creeks

Overall Ranking:    -Low    -Medium    **XHigh**

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

**The committee saw through the minor improvements needed in this proposal to rank this proposal high in terms of its long term benefits to the young people living near the "largest tributary on the west side", Cottonwood Creek. The high quality of this school's education/environmental education program would be complemented with the dedicated hours of an education coordinator, the field study supplies and enviro ed curriculum that could be developed under the guidance of an outstanding environmental education teacher. The coordinator has worked well in similar programs and has a proven track record.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

**XYes** -No

How?

**This project is extremely feasible. The proponent is an outstanding teacher who has developed a remarkable program to assist children develop their values toward the natural environment and learn to understand the important role that water plays in the life of creatures and people in the Cottonwood Creek/Central Valley Region.**

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

**XYes** -No

How?

**This project does not address specific CALFED priorities for Cottonwood Ck. It does address general environmental education priorities.**

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, this project is linked closely with the Cottonwood Creek watershed group and regional planning efforts.**

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

XYes -No

How?

**This proposal focuses on the involvement of local people and local institutions.**

Other Comments:

**In addition to the primary school targeted for implementation, 7 additional schools are identified for this project. Reviewers were concerned the these 7 schools had not yet "bought in" to this educational opportunity. Separately, reviewers thought that the proposal was vague in terms of "how learning would occur" and "how parents would be involved" The quality of the proposal was poor; the thesis statement was unclear. The proponent may need technical guidance/assistance to fully flesh out this project.**

## **Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding:**

**New Proposal Number:** 51

**New Proposal Title:** Kids for Our Creeks

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

**98-E05, Cottonwood Creek Watershed Group Formation, 2000-E03, Cottonwood Creek Assessment, 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 contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

**X**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 **X**N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

**Applicant did not state current status of 98-E05 or 2000-E03.**

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

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

**Progress on 2000-E03 has been satisfactory; 98-E05 is complete.**

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

**X**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 **X**N/A

If no, please explain:

**This is not a next phase project.**

Other Comments:

## **Environmental Compliance:**

**Proposal Number:** 51

**Applicant Organization:** Cottonwood Creek Watershed Group

**Proposal Title:** Kids for Our Creeks

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

-Yes **X**No

If no, please explain:

**There is a field work component to this proposal but the methodology is not described. A Scientific Collecting Permit from CDFG may be required as well as CESA/ESA compliance for the listed Spring Run salmon in Cottonwood Creek. An Encroachment Permit may be required for any planting or field work conducted on levees.**

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

-Yes **X**No

If no, please explain:

**There is no indication of money or time being allocated for the environmental compliance process.**

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

**X**Yes -No

If yes, please explain:

**If they obtain the proper permits and have the funding to do so, the project is feasible.**

Other Comments:

**I am not sure how Educational Curriculum's deal with obtaining permits. If individual teachers are using this curriculum and conducting the field work, then permits will be required. It is not clear if this curriculum includes collecting data in the field or if teachers will use resource personnel to collect the data.**

## **Budget:**

**Proposal Number:** 51

**Applicant Organization:** Cottonwood Creek Watershed Group

**Proposal Title:** Kids for Our Creeks

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

**X**Yes -No

If no, please explain:

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

**X**Yes -No

If no, please explain:

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

**X**Yes -No

If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

**X**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?

**X**Yes -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?

**X**Yes -No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: