

Proposal Reviews

#71: Cultivating Watershed Stewardship

FARMS Leadership, Inc.

Final Selection Panel Review

Initial Selection Panel Review

Environmental Education Technical Review

Bay Regional Review

Delta Regional Review

San Joaquin Regional Review

Sacramento Regional Review

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Final Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Final Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 71

Applicant Organization: FARMS Leadership, Inc.

Proposal Title: Cultivating Watershed Stewardship

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

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

Amount: **\$1,497,500**

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

none

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

The Selection Panel recognizes and appreciates the clarifying comments provided by the applicant (both the budget and location of the Farm and Nature Center), and recommends full funding for this project.

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 71

Applicant Organization: FARMS Leadership, Inc.

Proposal Title: Cultivating Watershed Stewardship

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: **\$136,137**

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

None

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

The Selection Panel recommends funding in full, including Task 3, which the Environmental Education Panel suggested not funding. The Learning Center's location near Willows and the interest expressed by numerous cost-sharing partners (Audubon, Yolo County Resource Conservation District, The Nature Conservancy, San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District, and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation) make this a strategic investment.

Environmental Education Technical Review:

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

Proposal Number: 71

Applicant Organization: FARMS Leadership, Inc.

Proposal Title: Cultivating Watershed Stewardship

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 |
|--|---|
| XSuperior | This was a well-thought out proposal that links many partners to high school students. The place-based and hands-on projects guided by professional mentors will enable a large audience to experience the CALFED education objectives. Educational goals and performance objectives are clear and well defined. The proposal includes cost-share contributions. |
| -Above average | |
| -Adequate | The panel does not, however, recommend funding Task 3. (The Learning Center) The Center is not directly within a watershed that is a high priority for the CALFED Bay Delta area. Funding for this Center perhaps can come from another source. |
| -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, Very few programs target high school age students. This program covers nine counties within the CAL-FED area.

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

Will it change behaviors that affect Bay-Delta restoration? As designed, it should affect a change IF the presentations consistently link the restoration/study sites to the Bay-Delta

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?

YES, the conceptual model is well thought out and very doable. Yes.

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. The opportunities for first-hand, hands-on science activities on site provides exemplary teaching moments.

Are its materials and activities appropriate to its audience? YES.

Can it be implemented readily by teachers and other participants? Yes, as place-based learning and with help back in the classroom.

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?

YES to all areas. There is an extensive list of current and potential partners of a high caliber. The use of a state aligned program i.e. Adopt-a-Watershed will further ensure success.

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?

YES, the project Can be replicated, if successful. But the plans to replicate and/or share this project are not well documented in this proposal. There is mention of expanding the program to other counties.

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

Yes. A thorough timeline is presented.

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?

Although not specifically mentioned, the many partnerships and schools involved imply that this project could sustain itself.

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?

Two mediums and two Highs. The panels liked the many partners, hand-on work, + links to CALFED-supported restoration projects.

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 needs for hands-on projects aren't adequately addressed in the application.

Miscellaneous comments:

Bay Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 71

Applicant Organization: FARMS Leadership, Inc.

Proposal Title: Cultivating Watershed Stewardship

Overall Ranking: -Low Medium -High

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

good education project, leveraging of funds and builds on successful partnerships in other areas of the state; regional panel determined project as medium priority for Bay region

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

- project has many local partners in 4 geographic areas of CALFED region - good coordination between identified school districts and local restoration sites and cooperating farms

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

Yes -No

How?

- combines hands-on restoration work with environmental education - fulfills many CALFED regional and multi-regional goals (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?

Yes -No

How?

- connected to many local restoration activities, especially CALFED funded projects - building on successful partnerships in other areas of state

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

Yes -No

How?

- links local partners (RCD's, school districts, etc.) with CALFED and other restoration projects - multiple local partners in all 4 identified geographical areas and includes educational, environmental and agricultural partners

Other Comments:

good leveraging of funds, medium priority for Bay region

Delta Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 71

Proposal Title: Cultivating Watershed Stewardship

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

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

Effort has good potential and record of demonstrated success in other areas.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

Already have numerous cost-share partners lined up (although approx. \$400,000 dependent on PSP 2002 awards) FARMS and SLEWS programs have been previously successfully implemented

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

Yes -No

How?

Priority 3, regionwide education addressed well, sets up mentor programs and research projects.

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?

Builds on existing programs developed by FARMS.

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

Yes -No

How?

Cost share w/ many others; numerous support letters from TNC, Sacto. R. Project, Yolo Basin Foundation, San Joaquin Co. Office of Education; SRCD, Adopt-A-Watershed; would coordinate Farm and Nature Center w/ AAW as Regional Center for AAW

Other Comments:

Well-developed proposal.

San Joaquin Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 71

Applicant Organization: FARMS Leadership, Inc.

Proposal Title: Cultivating Watershed Stewardship

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

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

The panel would like to see two coordinators in the San Joaquin Valley.

In addition, there are numerous existing facilities that could be expanded in the SJV to include this type of environmental education- Edison Ag-Tech, for example. The project needs to consider a different location than Winters, which is not a SJV location.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

The program has various partners, has already been implemented and is completely feasible as an environmental educational program. The focus of this grant is to expand the FARMS and SLEWS programs in other areas and to build a Farm and Nature Center in Solano County on a 325 acre farm,

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

XYes -No

How?

This program directly supports the Bay-Delta Multi-regional priority No. 3 to implement environmental educational actions throughout the geographic scope. It includes a preliminary outreach to Fresno County in the San Joaquin Basin as well.

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 proposal is related to the Adopt-a-watershed program and also is integrated to other programs through the Nature Conservancy and the Audubon Society, as well as partner schools.

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

Yes -No

How?

Yes, the program has many partners, including Audubon, the Nature Conservancy and stakeholders. It reaches out to dozens of local and regional students.

Other Comments:

Environmental problems cannot be solved until they are recognized and accepted as such. If environmental values can be developed in our youth, perhaps environmental problems would be caught in earlier stages.

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 71

Applicant Organization: FARMS Leadership, Inc.

Proposal Title: Cultivating Watershed Stewardship

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

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

Strong proposal meeting PSP needs for K-12 education and watershed restoration projects.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

All sites and partners are in place, as is the infrastructure. Strong outreach program.

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

XYes -No

How?

Strong partnerships with multi-regional projects and linked to 4 other 2002 CALFED proposals. This project directly addresses Restoration Priority 3 (ERP 2002 PSP p. 18), MR-3 (PSP p.21). Combines education program with restoration and hands-on activities for K-12 and curriculum development and teacher training.

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?

Multiple partners with multiple types of projects, including restoration and ag science and production.

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

XYes -No

How?

Includes local schools, farmers, restoration projects, universities, other mentors.

Other Comments:

This is an extremely strong project with tight partnerships and coordination that have been proven through their 8 years of experience and expanding programs. Has the ability to maximize CALFED's dollars and multi-regional need for environmental education and restoration. Should the Adopt-A-Watershed project also be funded, quantum leaps could be made for CALFED's education priorities. A feasibility study for the center is a sensible approach, however, the panel does not believe it is in the Bay Delta. Y.F.C. is a potentially conflicting/duplicative project, however, FARM's proposal is further reaching, educationally, and its direct (and current) hands-on restoration component is a big plus. Both proposals serve their own niches and are also compatible. The FARMS students are already in the field learning science and planting ecosystems. Students are also required to produce a research paper with the knowledge they gain, leading to good program evaluation opportunities. Strong A.M. qualities.

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 71

Applicant Organization: FARMS Leadership, Inc.

Proposal Title: Cultivating Watershed Stewardship

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

-Yes XNo

If no, please explain:

The proposal has insufficient information to determine whether authorizations, CEQA and/or NEPA documentation are necessary for the following restoration demonstration activities (Table 4, subtask 3.2):

Two one-acre tailwater ponds; riparian buffer/hedgerow, 1,400 x 20; grassed roadsides, 2,000 x 15; 2 swale buffers, 2,400 x 30 and 2,000 x 30; oak woodland buffer; replanting, weed control methodology, building construction/ expansion.

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

-Yes XNo

If no, please explain:

Possibly not:

Depends upon environmental compliance needs of the above-referenced demonstration activities.

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

-Yes XNo

If yes, please explain:

However:

The goals of the project will be delayed unless the following proposed activities have achieved environmental compliance requirements:

Riparian, Wetland and Upland areas restoration Research project and site monitoring Integrated pest management Seed collection Wildlife habitat improvements Hands-on restoration demonstration activities Non-natives eradication methodologies

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 71

Applicant Organization: FARMS Leadership, Inc.

Proposal Title: Cultivating Watershed Stewardship

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).

Since there is a cost share, it looks like it was 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: