

Proposal Reviews

#164: Working at a Watershed Level: A Training Course for Project Partners and Stakeholders

Tetra Tech

Environmental Education Technical Review

Bay Regional Review

Delta Regional Review

San Joaquin Regional Review

Sacramento Regional Review

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Environmental Education Technical Review:

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

Proposal Number: 164

Applicant Organization: Tetra Tech

Proposal Title: Working at a Watershed Level: A Training Course for Project Partners and Stakeholders

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	*Information required not provided *Lack of documentation *No evidence of CalFed need or focus *Uses "We've done this before, thus trust us" approach; not enough.
-Above average	
-Adequate	
XNot 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?

Yes, the project's goals, audience size and location etc. are stated. Yes, this project could change 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 project model is supported by past consensus and positive feedback.

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?

Yes, this project can do all of the above.

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?

No ;V this project does not link to California's teaching standards or frameworks.

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?

No ;V plans for sharing information.

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

Yes, evaluation methods are indicated.

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?

Yes, staff is qualified.

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

Yes, budget is 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?

Bay ;V low; not adequately linked to other programs Delta ;V medium, no well developed, especially how specifically addresses Delta issues. SJ ;V low ;V more structured to landowners and farmers. Sac - 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?

Budget ;V some differences with the cost-share

Miscellaneous comments:

Bay Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 164

Applicant Organization: Tetra Tech

Proposal Title: Working at a Watershed Level: A Training Course for Project Partners and Stakeholders

Overall Ranking: Low Medium High

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

The SFBay regional panel favors action-oriented project that secure and restore critical habitats in the Bay and Suisun Marsh. This proposal does not describe links to restoration efforts. Its distance from Bay area will likely limit participation from the area.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes No

How?

Yes attendees can be found at anytime of the year; the location (Chico or Sacramento) is accessible

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

Yes No

How?

Yes MR #3 Env Edu collaborative networks

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?

No How does this program relate to existing environmental education projects? How does this program relate to existing watershed groups?

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

Yes No

How?

Yes Cal State Univ will partner in presenting course (campus and partnership method not specified [facility at no charge?]); Workshop attendees pay (average) only \$90 each for a full week course (plus expenses?), CalFed subsidy is \$62,000

No How does this program relate to existing environmental education projects? How does this program relate to existing watershed groups? (some groups reportedly put on similar trainings Sacramento Valley Watershed Group)

No specify scholarships in the budget; specify whether \$6,800 the 75 attendees will pay is a token amount, because CalFed is subsidizing the travel (incl. hotel) expenses of the weeklong course, or whether the attendees will have to pay for travel and lodging on top of the \$90 token course fee.

Other Comments:

1)You could strengthen your proposal by mentioning that the Planning Team has the latitude to decide how attendees will be selected (there may be some already identified needs). 2)You could strengthen your proposal by including scholarships in the budget, and by mentioning that the Planning Team has the latitude to decide how they will be distributed. 3)There are many similar env edu forums. If yours has been offered 3 times in the last 4 years, please describe why it is still relevant and valuable. You could bolster your case with letters from watershed groups and agencies requesting that the course be conducted. 4)Budget doesnt add up: \$62,000 CalFed + \$6,800 attendees > \$63,415

Delta Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 164

Proposal Title: Working at a Watershed Level: A Training Course for Project Partners and Stakeholders

Overall Ranking: -Low Medium -High

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

Has great potential but not well-developed in how it will specifically address/benefit Delta-specific issues

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

training program-no State or Federal permits; may require access to public land as field trip; course has proven successful throughout the US and has been presented through CSU.

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

Yes -No

How?

Addresses ecosystem restoration education Prior #3; good comprehensive foundation course-not sure how applicable to CALFED-specific issues

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?

Yes, but weak. Course curriculum prepared in concert w/ Interagency Watershed Training Cooperative (Federal) and Council of State Gov'ts (State); also Ecological Society of America; but no evidence that they will coordinate with CALFED and local Bay-Delta restoration-involved entities.

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

-Yes No

How?

Weak. No evidence that they will coordinate with CALFED and local Bay-Delta restoration-involved entities except that they will send brochures to CALFED Agencies.

Other Comments:

If the course is already developed and there is no evidence in the proposal that it will be tailored to address CALFED-specific examples or be more relevant to local issues, why is there so much time in the budget for planning and curriculum development? If they plan the above, need to communicate it. Has potential, but not well-developed; also not clear if the class participants will have to pay or not.

San Joaquin Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 164

Applicant Organization: Tetra Tech

Proposal Title: Working at a Watershed Level: A Training Course for Project Partners and Stakeholders

Overall Ranking: Low -Medium -High

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

Good program. This particular proposal addresses areas and is planned for outside the SJV.

Needs more outreach to farmers and landowners, instead of agencies.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

The project partners with the California State University system for assistance with implementation and provision of meeting facilities.

The seminar has been presented successfully several times already in different parts of California. With the increasing number of watershed projects, it is important that landowners, stakeholders and agency personnel become familiar with restoration and study planning processes.

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

Yes -No

How?

This seminar provides explanation and training to lay persons regarding the implementation of riverine restoration. Priority 1 for the SJR is to continue habitat restoration actions in collaboration with local groups. Increased understanding of these processes and their impacts, will hopefully encourage cooperation on restoration studies or actions.

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?

This training course provides direct support to educate the public regarding how and why to implement river restoration activities. A lack of understanding and a fear of the impacts of such actions has minimized participation and increased fear of participation in restoration activities in the SJR watershed. Major restoration planning efforts are ongoing on the mainstem SJR and its tributaries. Such a training workshop can only help those who are interested in participating in the processes, if it were to be held in the SJV. It may also help to make for positive awareness of the need for restoration in those who do not actively participate.

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

Yes -No

How?

In addition with its CSU partnership, the program has various agency partners to help fund the project. They also provide scholarships for individuals who may not otherwise be able to afford to attend such a workshop. The project also reaches out to local businesses to sponsor food and break activities. Could be greatly improved by enhancing landowner, stakeholder and environmental group outreach.

Other Comments:

Would be a great project in the SJV, but had to rate it low because of location.

This has been a highly successful workshop. Participant evaluations have generally reflected highly upon the course and the high calibre of the instructors. More could be said about this in the proposal.

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 164

Applicant Organization: Tetra Tech

Proposal Title: Working at a Watershed Level: A Training Course for Project Partners and Stakeholders

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

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

This proposal offers an opportunity for needed local training on watershed assessment, planning and management. The applicants have a successful track record. Could possibly be expanded to two presentations in different regional locations.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

Educational outreach for watershed management very appropriate to the region.

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

XYes -No

How?

Associated with PSP Sacramento Region Priority No. 1

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?

Project Development involved many agency organizations to develop the course outline.

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

XYes -No

How?

Local people will be involved when they attend the one-week class.

Other Comments:

The one-week course is already developed and has been offered successfully in the past.

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 164

Applicant Organization: Tetra Tech

Proposal Title: Working at a Watershed Level: A Training Course for Project Partners and Stakeholders

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

-Yes No

If no, please explain:

Not sure:

Watershed Assessment and BMP field trips: Any proposed physical changes, such as species collecting? Habitat modifications? Water discharges?

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:

If no physical changes are proposed for the field trips.

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: 164

Applicant Organization: Tetra Tech

Proposal Title: Working at a Watershed Level: A Training Course for Project Partners and Stakeholders

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).

Funding carried forward does not match funding requested, seems to be a difference with cost share.

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: