

# **Proposal Reviews**

## **#184: Bay-Delta Bioinvasions Information, Coordination, and Outreach Project (ICOP)**

University of California Sea Grant Extension Program

**Initial Selection Panel Review**

**Environmental Education Technical Review**

**Bay Regional Review**

**Delta Regional Review**

**San Joaquin Regional 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:** 184

**Applicant Organization:** University of California Sea Grant Extension Program

**Proposal Title:** Bay-Delta Bioinvasions Information, Coordination, and Outreach Project (ICOP)

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).

<b>Fund</b>	
<b>As Is</b>	-
<b>In Part</b>	-
<b>With Conditions</b>	-
<b>Consider as Directed Action</b>	-
<b>Not Recommended</b>	<b>X</b>

Amount: **\$0**

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

**None.**

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

**Although generally a good proposal to compile existing data in one location, and add new information, the program is aimed at regional agencies and schools without a clear plan for outreach. For example, how does this proposal relate to existing resource agency programs? What is the application to California schools?**

# Environmental Education Technical Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 184

**Applicant Organization:** University of California Sea Grant Extension Program

**Proposal Title:** Bay-Delta Bioinvasions Information, Coordination, and Outreach Project (ICOP)

**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.

<b>Overall Evaluation Summary Rating</b>	<b>Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating</b>
-Superior	<b>It is unclear which audience this proposal is trying to reach. The idea to compile and provide information to resource management agencies is important and valuable. However, the weak part of this proposal is the education for middle school and high school, which is not adequately described and appears to be an afterthought. There is no evidence that teachers will attend the workshops that will be offered through this proposal, nor are connections to the California Standards addressed</b>
-Above average	
XAdequate	
-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?

**The projects educational goals, objectives, and outcomes are clearly stated. The primary target audience is resource management agencies. A lesser audience is the general public and middle school and high school students. The project should broaden understanding for resource agencies about restoring the Bay-Delta ecosystem system because it will compile the existing data to one location and will continue to add to the data as new information arises. It might change behaviors that affect Bay-Delta restoration, through their public awareness program.**

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 conceptual model explains how the project will attain its goals. But the connection to the middle school and high school students is vague. The research conducted and included in this proposal is impressive.**

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?

**The project integrates activities. The materials and activities are appropriate to the primary audience, which is resource agencies, but not appropriate to teachers and a middle and high school students. The curriculum to be used with middle school and high school students in California was designed in Oregon.**

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?

**The project is integrated with some community programs. The Aquatic Nuisance Species Education Kits are being developed by the Oregon State University Sea Grant, and this project will offer teacher workshops in California. But no evidence was provided to show how the middle school and high school curriculum project fits into the California Frameworks. Also the Zebra Mussel, which is the focus of the Aquatic Nuisance Species Education Kits is less relevant to the Bay/Delta than other nuisance species. Although the proposal describes gathering information concerning bioinvasion management, it is not mentioned that other K-12 curriculum guides will be reviewed for any lessons on such topics.**

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?

**The project can be replicated. The part of the project that focuses on resource management agencies will be shared through a newsletter and the information will be on a website.**

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

**The evaluations are on going and an advisory committee will oversee this. But the focus of this proposal is on providing information for resource management agencies, not for schoolteachers or students.**

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 are qualified. The project is not adequately supported by the school system, but it is adequately supported by the resource management agencies.**

**The presence of a website and the structure of the Sea Grant organization will most likely sustain this project.**

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

**The budget seems reasonable and adequate for the work proposed for the resource agencies**

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?

**The regional panels rated the proposal in the following way: 1 Low; 2 Medium, and 1 High. Some of their comments are listed below: Despite the applicant's ample ability to implement the project, the program emphasized only programmatic actions which are only secondarily linked to active control of biological invasions, and emphasized a substantial budget allocation to generalized outreach, a function which is not now demonstrably limiting the efficacy of invasive species control efforts. It is not clear whether the proposed program would establish redundancies in information coordination with natural resource agencies. The links to implementation functions were not well developed.**

**Sea Grant is an established institution with contacts for sharing and acquiring information. Assembling and making available information is doable.**

**Tries to contact most agencies and researchers. Not much with the general public.**

**This proposal meets PSP priorities MR-1+3, prevent the establishment of additional non-natives and environmental education.**

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?

**There are no significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

## Bay Regional Review:

**Proposal Number:** 184

**Applicant Organization:** University of California Sea Grant Extension Program

**Proposal Title:** Bay-Delta Bioinvasions Information, Coordination, and Outreach Project (ICOP)

Overall Ranking:    -Low    Medium    -High

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

**Despite the applicant's ample ability to implement the project, the program emphasized only programmatic actions which are only secondarily linked to active control of biological invasions, and emphasized a substantial budget allocation to generalized outreach, a function which is not now demonstrably limiting the efficacy of invasive species control efforts. It is not clear whether the proposed program would establish redundancies in information coordination with natural resource agencies. The links to implementation functions were not well developed.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

**There are no identifiable constraints on feasibility for this programmatic proposal, and the applicants have ample ability to manage data and outreach.**

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

Yes -No

How?

**The project broadly addresses the high priority issue of invasive species in the region (MR-1, BR-3).**

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 Sea Grant program is extensively coordinated within the State.**

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

-Yes No

How?

**Although the Sea Grant program is extensively coordinated within the State, the panel found that the lack of identified links to the principal existing regional collators of invasive species information was a serious deficiency.**

Other Comments:

**Despite the applicant's ample ability to implement the project, the program emphasized only programmatic actions which are only secondarily linked to active control of biological invasions, and emphasized a substantial budget allocation to generalized outreach, a function which is not now demonstrably limiting the efficacy of invasive species control efforts. It is not clear whether the proposed program would establish redundancies in information coordination with natural resource agencies. The links to implementation functions were not well developed.**



## **Delta Regional Review:**

**Proposal Number:** 184

**Proposal Title:** Bay-Delta Bioinvasions Information, Coordination, and Outreach Project (ICOP)

Overall Ranking:    -Low    Medium    -High

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

**This project is appropriate for the Delta given the large number of aquatic nuisance species and its potential for even more species introductions.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

**The applicant states the following: "The University of California Sea Grant Program is the logical location to house the ICOP project. A major role of Sea Grant Extension is to provide objective technical information to marine and coastal resource users and managers. Sea Grant Extension has been in existence nationwide since 1968, and, among other things, conducts workshops and training seminars, produces targeted publications and videos, and develops websites and other media. UC Sea Grant Extension in the San Francisco Bay region currently places a major emphasis on developing outreach and information on ANS issues in the marine environment and Bay-Delta. We will utilize this expertise, as well as the Sea Grant model of outreach and communication, to develop the ICOP program."**

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

Yes -No

How?

**From the Restoration Priorities for the Delta and Eastside Tributaries Region:**

**"5. Implement actions to prevent, control and reduce impacts of non-native invasive species**

**· Education efforts to help the public better understand the non-native species threat actions (Strategic Goal 5, non-native invasive species)."**

**And, from the Restoration Priorities for Multi-Region Bay-Delta Areas:**

**"1. Prevent the establishment of additional non-native species and reduce the negative biological, economic, and social impacts of established nonnative species in the Bay-Delta estuary and its watersheds**

**· Prevention. Preventing the introduction of additional non-native invasive species into the Bay-Delta and its watersheds is identified as the top priority in the CALFED Strategic Plan for Managing Nonnative Invasive Species. Of the ten NIS objectives identified in the CALFED ERP Strategic Plan, eight specifically address preventing the introduction of new NIS. The continued introduction of NIS into the natural areas of California causes negative environmental, socioeconomic and public health impacts whose severity is often not widely known or recognized. This lack of understanding and documentation hinders our ability to respond rapidly and effectively to new invasions and limits the vision and the opportunity to prevent new introductions. This leaves California with NIS management problems that are economically costly, technically challenging and frequently irreversible.**

**NIS introductions continue to come into California from many sources and pathways. Often seemingly harmless activities, such as releasing non-native fish or imported baits, has the potential to cause large-scale economic and/or ecological damage. Public outreach and education, industry collaboration and evaluating management and policy options must be pursued to the extent possible."**

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 applicant proposes to link the ICOP with at least 2 existing programs (i.e., California Zebra Mussel Training Initiative and Invader Investigators! Aquatic Nuisance Species Education Kits for the West Coast), and possibly others.**

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

Yes -No

How?

**The applicant mentions coordinating with "neighboring state Sea Grant programs and with Cooperative Extension Resources and faculty (Ted Grosholz) on campuses that will be employed through this project."**

Other Comments:

N/A

## San Joaquin Regional Review:

**Proposal Number:** 184

**Applicant Organization:** University of California Sea Grant Extension Program

**Proposal Title:** Bay-Delta Bioinvasions Information, Coordination, and Outreach Project (ICOP)

Overall Ranking: Low -Medium -High

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

**Bay-Delta focus with much less emphasis on SJ Valley.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

**Sea Grant is an established institution with contacts for sharing and acquiring information. Assembling and making available information is doable.**

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

Yes -No

How?

**With reservations. MR 1 Prevent the establishment of NIS, and 3 Implement environmental education actions throughout the geographic scope. Much more important for Bay-Delta than SJ Valley.**

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 applicant states that they are in touch with others working on the aquatic nuisance species issues.**

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

Yes -No

How?

**Tries to contact most agencies and researchers. Not much with the general public.**

Other Comments:

**Mostly a Bay-Delta focus. A vague proposal without a convincing argument that the work will not get done unless they do it.**

## **Sacramento Regional Review:**

**Proposal Number:** 184

**Applicant Organization:** University of California Sea Grant Extension Program

**Proposal Title:** Bay-Delta Bioinvasions Information, Coordination, and Outreach Project (ICOP)

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

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

**This is a much needed program and a good insurance policy**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**This is highly feasible and Sea Grant is highly qualified to do the work.**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**This proposal meets PSP priorities MR-1+3, prevent the establishment of additional non-natives and environmental education.**

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Sea Grant is currently involved in other restoration efforts.**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**The proposal includes all the entities involved in ANS management.**

Other Comments:

**X**

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

**New Proposal Number:** 184

**New Proposal Title:** Bay-Delta Bioinvasions Information, Coordination, and Outreach Project (ICOP)

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

**97-C07 Preventing Introductions of Exotic Species from Ballast Water: the San Francisco Bay-Delta Ballast Management Education Program**

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*
3. Have negotiations about contracts or contact amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

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 -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 -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

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 N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:



## **Environmental Compliance:**

**Proposal Number:** 184

**Applicant Organization:** University of California Sea Grant Extension Program

**Proposal Title:** Bay-Delta Bioinvasions Information, Coordination, and Outreach Project (ICOP)

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:** 184

**Applicant Organization:** University of California Sea Grant Extension Program

**Proposal Title:** Bay-Delta Bioinvasions Information, Coordination, and Outreach Project (ICOP)

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:

**No separate PM task. All PM costs are covered in salary of Project Director.**

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).

**State funding.**

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: