

Proposal Reviews

#110: Multi-media Education and Outreach Program for the Ecosystem Restoration Program

Pelican Media

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

Environmental Education Technical Review:

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

Proposal Number: 110

Applicant Organization: Pelican Media

Proposal Title: Multi-media Education and Outreach Program for the Ecosystem Restoration 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	The panel felt this project needs to have more agency and stakeholder involvement and should be framed in the context with the larger effort. It also
-Above average	needs to give a better sense of user needs and better distribution. The need for the exhibit boards was also questioned.
-Adequate	It was also undetermined if there does exist a CALFED Education Outreach Subcommittee as referenced in the proposal. Although it has been discussed in different forums, it has not come to fruition to our knowledge.
XNot recommended	The panel noted that the team applying for the grant is a highly qualified group.

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 project and its goals are clearly stated. Target Audience concept is good, and if reached, would lead to better understanding which is the first step to changing behaviors.

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 leap between concept and attaining goals is weak. The proposal suggests marketing the video to Public TV, contacting the Lawrence Hall of Science for potential inclusion in their ed. Resources program, approaching a non-profit org. for distribution, and CALFED staff to receive 100 copies. This does not guarantee that it will be shown, adopted, or distributed. As well, how will the local planning groups receive the video or be notified of its availability? The actual plan for utilizing the video is too vague

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?

Materials and activities support the goal, and the audience is defined, but no definite way to reach them is included.

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?

Once again, the concept is good, but the links are weak or not addressed.

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?

More tapes could be purchased at cost, and most likely handbooks as well, but replication for the video is not an option.

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

The evaluation of content for the video is good, but it needs to be developed in the larger context of the Program and other efforts and have wider agency and stakeholder input.

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?

This looks like an extremely well qualified group.

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

Budget for the video seemed slightly high.

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?

Bay low Delta medium San Joaquin high; distribution not addressed Sacramento low; good concept; wrong group handling it no agencies

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?

Compliance good Budget - good

Miscellaneous comments:

Bay Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 110

Applicant Organization: Pelican Media

Proposal Title: Multi-media Education and Outreach Program for the Ecosystem Restoration Program

Overall Ranking: Low -Medium -High

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

regional panel believes some of the proposed products already exist and project is more suitable for other regions, the panel determined project a low priority for Bay region

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

yes and no

- has received assurances from some groups involved in restoration projects, but states in proposal that feasibility depends on those groups carrying out there commitment in developing the content of products - how products would be distributed (outreach) is not indicated, although audience is stated as local planners, community activists, regulatory staff and general public - funding for distribution not discussed

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

Yes -No

How?

- addresses environmental education issues of multi-regions, but of low priority to Bay region

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?

Indirectly

- proposal mentions support of regional and state-wide organizations (Nature Conservancy, Bay Institute, PRBO, and GGAS), but no specific restoration or planning projects are mentioned for any region

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

XYes -No

How?

Yes and no

- again, some regional groups are cited as supportive, but not tied to any specific local organizations or projects

Other Comments:

proposal may benefit from focusing on one or two products, (exhibit and documentary),and there was no discussion of distribution of materials

Delta Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 110

Proposal Title: Multi-media Education and Outreach Program for the Ecosystem Restoration Program

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

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

Good well-presented proposal.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

No applicable permits, etc. Well-rounded team w/ Delta experience. "Content Core Team" and advisors include key Delta participants and the CALFED Education Outreach SubCommittee so issues should get fair representation. Pelican well-experienced in this type of filming effort.

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

Yes -No

How?

Addresses Multi-Regional priority #3 (Implement environmental education 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?

Wide representation by those active in Deltarestoration- TNC, The Bay Institute, Point Reyes Bird Observatory, Golden Gate Audubon Society buy-in. CALFED Ecosystem Outreach subcommittee engaged.

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

Yes -No

How?

Included in composition of Team.

Other Comments:

Resources guide (\$40,000) is a good idea, but much of this information is available through other sources, such as ICE. Focusing on case studies is a good approach.

San Joaquin Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 110

Applicant Organization: Pelican Media

Proposal Title: Multi-media Education and Outreach Program for the Ecosystem Restoration Program

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

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

Educational themes are very clearly targeted to communicating ERP program actions. Multiple learning styles addressed in the materials. Content core team is well represented for regional perspectives. Effective process identified to develop local information - need more representatives from San Joaquin Region on general advisory group.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

Demonstrated past performance of a similar nature and credible assembly of partners to make the needed information and contact linkages.

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

Yes -No

How?

educational themes and materials linked to ERP actions in the region

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?

Proposal shows clear understanding of ERP communication needs and regional programmatic perspectives, especially for Bay Delta and Sacramento Valley. Past projects demonstrate linkages with ERP programs. Weak in San Joaquin basin regional perspectives, based on team representation.

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

Yes -No

How?

Focus seems very complete for Bay-Delta and Sacramento Valley. Vorster and Cain good in themes for SJR mainstem on Content Core Team. Needs better local contacts with San Joaquin basin interests in general Team Advisors.

Other Comments:

Distribution of the products was not addressed: Who will use; how will it get to them?

Display Panels: Who will use? can they be done in electronic, user-friendly, format so they can be downloaded, printed?

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 110

Applicant Organization: Pelican Media

Proposal Title: Multi-media Education and Outreach Program for the Ecosystem Restoration Program

Overall Ranking: Low -Medium -High

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

The Panel felt this was a good concept. The issue of greatest concern with the program is the portion of the proposal outlining a plan to provide information and define terms to local decision makers. These activities may be more appropriately provided by CALFED agencies. Local entities would be more comfortable with programs that are outlined by CALFED rather than representatives from a specific community. The proposal applicants are probably not the right group to be acting as an intermediary between CALFED agencies and local participants for legal, political and cultural reasons.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

-Yes No

How?

The project is likely to experience local legal, political, and cultural impediments.

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

Yes -No

How?

The public education portion of the program supports CALFED objectives. Additional objectives were listed that would not be met by the program.

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 proposed public education portion of the program would outline selected previously completed CALFED programs. But, there is no link to ongoing activities.

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

-Yes XNo

How?

Local involvement does not include partners from the regulated community (local districts, water agencies, etc.).

Other Comments:

The public education portion of the program meets the criteria of supporting CALFED priorities and would serve an important function. The public outreach section is good, but additional local coordination is needed.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1

New Proposal Number: 110

New Proposal Title: Multi-media Education and Outreach Program for the Ecosystem Restoration Program

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

CALFED #99-B24, USBR #99-FC-20-0009 - Independent Documentary Group - Arrange, Publicize, & Produce a 6-Film Environmental Festival and Exhibit Highlighting the Bay-Delta

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?

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

If no, please explain any difficulties:

Unknown? NOTE - I was not the person actually involved in the original dealings with the agreement, so I am not personally aware of how this part of the process went.

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?

-Yes -No N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

None

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2

New Proposal Number: 110

New Proposal Title: Multi-media Education and Outreach Program for the Ecosystem Restoration Program

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

01-N36

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?

-Yes -No **X**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:

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

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

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

-Yes -No **X**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:

Other Comments:

Judy Irving, one of the authors of this proposal from Pelican Media, was the project manager for the Contractor of 01-N36, IDG Films. Ms. Irving left IDG Films in late summer of 2001. NFWF has not managed grants involving Pelican Media.

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 110

Applicant Organization: Pelican Media

Proposal Title: Multi-media Education and Outreach Program for the Ecosystem Restoration Program

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: 110

Applicant Organization: Pelican Media

Proposal Title: Multi-media Education and Outreach Program for the Ecosystem Restoration 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: