

Proposal Reviews

#189: Bay Area Water Restoration Library and Clearinghouse

University of California, Berkeley, Water Resources Center Archives

Initial Selection Panel Review

Environmental Education Technical Review

Bay Regional Review

Delta Regional Review

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 189

Applicant Organization: University of California, Berkeley, Water Resources Center Archives

Proposal Title: Bay Area Water Restoration Library and Clearinghouse

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

Amount: **\$0**

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

None

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

This project would fill a gap in providing public access to information regarding past and on-going restoration projects in the nine Bay Area counties, and would be implemented by a highly qualified applicant. The Selection Panel did have concerns regarding the ability of the applicant to obtain information regarding restoration projects in the nine Bay Area Counties simply from the perspective of scale, diversity of information sources, and consistency of available information across sources. In addition, and in line with the technical reviews, the Panel felt that the project should either encompass a larger geographic scope (i.e., San Joaquin and Delta regions), or describe how the current proposal would be used to initiate similar efforts in the San Joaquin and Delta regions. The applicant should consider revising the proposal and resubmitting in a future funding round.

Environmental Education Technical Review:

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

Proposal Number: 189

Applicant Organization: University of California, Berkeley, Water Resources Center Archives

Proposal Title: Bay Area Water Restoration Library and Clearinghouse

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 would be a good pilot since this type of information is needed in all regions. The findings and recommendations found at the end of the 3 years is of great interest.
XAbove average	
-Adequate	
-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 goals, objectives and outcomes are clearly stated. The Bay Area is an important area to the CALFED Bay-Delta Program. This project would broaden understanding about Bay Area restoration for CALFED and non-CALFED endeavors. Understanding and knowledge are both necessary components 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?

This proposal establishes a need and a status for how it will attain its goals. It is also based on existing functions that will be expanded.

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?

Activities are appropriate and access will be unlimited.

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 restoration information for nine Bay Area counties will be accessible to anyone including teachers for any grade level.

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?

Information dissemination plans are included.

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

Independent review is part of the evaluation method and is appropriate.

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?

The qualifications are very good. It is not clear how the information obtained would be maintained or new information obtained after the 3-year project is over.

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

This budget is reasonable and adequate.

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 medium; project is needed but should use interns Delta medium; useful if expanded to include other areas and 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?

Compliance good Budget no separate PMs costs and years dont match up

Miscellaneous comments:

Bay Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 189

Applicant Organization: University of California, Berkeley, Water Resources Center Archives

Proposal Title: Bay Area Water Restoration Library and Clearinghouse

Overall Ranking: -Low Medium -High

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

project is needed, but the regional panel favors an approach that includes a team of interns/students to seek the information, fill out forms and enter the information, rather than sending out a survey

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

- **thorough analysis and good use of existing technology and databases**
- **some support from agencies**

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

Yes -No

How?

- **does carry out multi-region goal on environmental education (MR-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?

- **project is linked effectively to other existing efforts (Cross Media Database and Natural Resources Project Inventory at UC Davis) - would provide needed information to entities doing restoration**

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

Yes -No

How?

- there are many entities in the Bay region that could assist with outreach, but the proposer selected a non-local entity - proposal includes an outreach/education plan that will form an advisory committee with stakeholders, academia and agencies to provide input on restoration community's needs and services - will develop an outreach program to disseminate information, outreach efforts will be made to low-income and under-represented communities

Other Comments:

this project would be very useful to the restoration community, however the regional panel favors an approach that would use a team of student interns to gather information and fill out the survey

Delta Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 189

Proposal Title: Bay Area Water Restoration Library and Clearinghouse

Overall Ranking: -Low Medium -High

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

The panel felt that there is an identified need for this type of information for the Bay Area, but also felt that this project might be more useful if it were expanded to include other areas and projects, as well.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

This proposal would establish the Bay Area Restoration Library & Clearinghouse, to catalog info on all restoration projects funded within the nine Bay Area counties. The proposed Clearinghouse would be housed at an existing facility at UC Berkeley. No permits or access required.

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

-Yes No

How?

The project proposes to collect information on existing restoration projects through the use of existing systems, as an environmental education project. Although this type of activity is not called out in the PSP as an ideal environmental education project, the panel felt it could be a good project.

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 project would, by design, allow for extensive information dissemination to project proponents and managers, and the general public, about other projects in the Bay Area of interest to them.

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

XYes -No

How?

The Clearinghouse format and usefulness would be evaluated by an Advisory Committee, and several Concept Workshops would be held with stakeholders in the restoration community to receive their input on the Clearinghouse. The project would also sponsor a one-day Symposium and design and implement a public outreach plan.

Other Comments:

none

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 189

Applicant Organization: University of California, Berkeley, Water Resources Center Archives

Proposal Title: Bay Area Water Restoration Library and Clearinghouse

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: 189

Applicant Organization: University of California, Berkeley, Water Resources Center Archives

Proposal Title: Bay Area Water Restoration Library and Clearinghouse

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:

All costs are "Direct" not "Indirect".

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

Yes No

If no, please explain:

No separate PM task. One task each of the 3 years identified as the Librarian, no PM costs identified.

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).

Requesting \$243,574 State funds OR \$299,818; Grand Total of Budget Summary for 3-Year Budget is \$221,431.

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: