

Proposal Reviews

#69: Estuary Action Challenge Environmental Education Program

Estuary Action Challenge/Earth Island Institute

Final Selection Panel Review

Initial Selection Panel Review

Environmental Education Technical Review

Bay Regional Review

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Final Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Final Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 69

Applicant Organization: Estuary Action Challenge/Earth Island Institute

Proposal Title: Estuary Action Challenge Environmental Education Program

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

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

Amount: **\$120,000.00**

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

none

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

The ABAG-CALFED Tak Force and San Francisco Estuary project's comments endorse this project and offer suggestions for refining its activities. In response, Selection Panel encourages the applicant to use its role in implementing this environmental education program opportunistically to reach other associated, at-risk communities who consume fishes caught in Bay waters.

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 69

Applicant Organization: Estuary Action Challenge/Earth Island Institute

Proposal Title: Estuary Action Challenge Environmental Education Program

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: **\$120,000**

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

None

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

The applicant has received past CALFED funding (1999, 2000) and has been successful in implementing a range of environmental education activities in economically disadvantaged East Bay communities. The proposal received positive reviews for merit, the presence of strong community support, and because the project would contribute to CALFED's efforts addressing environmental justice issues.

Environmental Education Technical Review:

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

Proposal Number: 69

Applicant Organization: Estuary Action Challenge/Earth Island Institute

Proposal Title: Estuary Action Challenge Environmental Education Program

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	<p>This group has a track record working in the Richmond community and with local agencies. Project addresses an underserved audience in environmental education. Furthermore these leaders are from the "community of color;" in EE is especially lacking.</p>
XAbove average	
-Adequate	
-Not recommended	<p>Project leaders should be linked/networked with other CAL-FED grant receivers;K</p>

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?

Clearly stated goals, objectives, outcomes, audience, location. Will somewhat broaden understanding among intended audience. Will focus on the local (Richmond) environment.

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?

Need to adjust "feedback" loops in conceptual model

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?

Provides and overall description of project but does not detail the actual program offered to the intended audience.

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?

Links to local resources ;V most appropriate for the audience.

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?

Leaders should be connected to other CalFed efforts;Kmore clearly linked.

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

Should request that the project managers share their outcomes with others.

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?

Leadership well trained and motivated. These are members of the community who propose to do this project.

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

Reasonable.

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?

Comments included: h Need to consult with Reclamation District about Encroachment Permit to do work. h Addresses a community of students who are economically disadvantaged with environmental justice issues h Proven track record ;V tied to local schools and local resources h Environmental Justice an important component of CALFED

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?

Endorsements good.

Miscellaneous comments:

Bay Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 69

Applicant Organization: Estuary Action Challenge/Earth Island Institute

Proposal Title: Estuary Action Challenge Environmental Education Program

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

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

Provides for environmental education of areas w/ high population of minorities that are also economically disadvantaged, thus addressing environmental justice. Some panelists supported a high ranking for the project.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

Proven track record that addresses the shortcomings of many such efforts

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

XYes -No

How?

Environmental education and environmental justice are important components of CALFED. (MR-3: Implement environmental education actions throughout the geographic scope).

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?

Tied in to local schools and uses local resources, such as creek cleanups.

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

XYes -No

How?

see above.

Other Comments:

Although not as sexy as restoration projects, provides important long-term benefits.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding:

New Proposal Number: 69

New Proposal Title: Estuary Action Challenge Environmental Education Program

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

01-N34, Estuary Action Challenge Environmental Education Program, ERP.

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

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 69

Applicant Organization: Estuary Action Challenge/Earth Island Institute

Proposal Title: Estuary Action Challenge Environmental Education Program

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

-Yes No

If no, please explain:

They need to consult with the Reclamation District to determine if an Encroachment Permit is required for any work they will perform on the levees.

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: 69

Applicant Organization: Estuary Action Challenge/Earth Island Institute

Proposal Title: Estuary Action Challenge Environmental Education Program

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).

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: