

Proposal Reviews

#185: West Coast Ballast Outreach Project

University of California Sea Grant Extension Program

Final Selection Panel Review

Initial Selection Panel Review

Environmental Education Technical Review

Bay Regional Review

Delta Regional Review

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Final Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Final Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 185

Applicant Organization: University of California Sea Grant Extension Program

Proposal Title: West Coast Ballast Outreach Project

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

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

Amount: **\$526,259**

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

None

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

A comment letter from the Clean Estuary Partnership endorsing the project confirms this project's potential value in the region, if the proposal's shortcomings are addressed adequately when it is reconsidered for potential directed action.

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 185

Applicant Organization: University of California Sea Grant Extension Program

Proposal Title: West Coast Ballast Outreach Project

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 | X |
| Not Recommended | - |

Amount: **\$526,259.00**

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 the need for further education of the maritime industry concerning the introduction of non-native invasive species from ballast water and the management practices available to reduce and eliminate those occurrences. The Panel indicated the need for the proposal to include performance measures to assess the success of the program to date, especially relative to participation in the education program and implementation of best management practices. Therefore, the Panel recommends that the proponent revise the proposal for reconsideration with the above-recommended features.

Environmental Education Technical Review:

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

Proposal Number: 185

Applicant Organization: University of California Sea Grant Extension Program

Proposal Title: West Coast Ballast Outreach Project

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 planned outcomes include the continuation of producing and distributing outreach materials to reduce the establishment of aquatic nuisance species. These materials include a newsletter, poster, brochure and website. Although the agency is well qualified to do the work, the weakness of this proposal is the lack of a comprehensive plan to distribute materials to shipping crews and captains. This proposal goes hand-in-hand with the other proposal by this agency entitled Bay-Delta Invasion Information Coordination and Outreach. |
| -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?

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, private industry, (shipping crews), regulators and researchers concerned with ballast water management in the San Francisco Bay-Delta Region.

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

Will it change behaviors that affect Bay-Delta restoration? The project has the potential to change behaviors within the target audience. So many factors, economic and others can hinder the needed change.

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 proposal lacks information to confirm that the program is changing ballast management behavior, or even that its techniques for teaching maritime professionals incorporate adult education methods of proven effectiveness.

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, through newsletters, poster, brochure and website. A speaker seminar is also planned and will be videotaped. The targeted audience may be able to provide further outreach with the available materials.

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, through the California Maritime Academy.

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?

Somewhat. Most of the information will be on a website

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

component. Are the evaluation methods effective and appropriate to the project?

Adequate but somewhat vague overall. Evaluation includes input from advisory committee, number of requests for specific projects, surveys at seminars. Indicates that overall success will be equated with compliance to regulatory programs and industry involvement with ballast water treatment technology projects. But no measures of ballast management behavior will be taken.

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, including consultants and subcontractors, qualified? The Project Leader and Project Coordinator are qualified. It is unknown who the Project Representatives are.

Is the project adequately supported by existing educational infrastructure? YES.

Will it develop the leadership, partnerships, and financial support to sustain it over the long term? From the information given, it appears that it could be sustained.

Does the proposal incorporate adequate steps to assure that the project can be sustained after CALFEDs funds are expended? Most likely, because of the status of the Sea Grant Program.

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

The 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?

Medium (Bay) and High (Delta). Both panels thought this was a good project worth continuing.

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?

No administrative issues

Miscellaneous comments:

Bay Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 185

Applicant Organization: University of California Sea Grant Extension Program

Proposal Title: West Coast Ballast Outreach Project

Overall Ranking: -Low Medium -High

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

Good project. This works directly with the pilots and crews and those bringing vessels into the Bay that potentially harbor exotic species. Continuation of ongoing effective program.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

Ongoing work.

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

Yes -No

How?

Preventing the introduction of nuisance exotic species is a CALFED priority (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?

This will help prevent problems for restoration efforts through helping minimize potential for new introductions. They are talking with other CALFED exotic species programs.

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

Yes -No

How?

Yes they are working with local agencies and the folks on the ships.

Other Comments:

The team all thought this is a good project worth continuing.

Delta Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 185

Proposal Title: West Coast Ballast Outreach Project

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

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

The regional panel rated this proposal high because it is a continuation of a successful element of a comprehensive, coordinated program addressing NIS.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

We could not identify any local constraints that would impede the project's ability to move forward in a timely and successful manner.

Y Expertise gained from 2.5 years of implementing a ballast water outreach program will have direct applicability to this proposal so the degree of potential success is high

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

XYes -No

How?

Proposal claims it contributes to meeting one related priority for each of the CALFED Areas. For example, DR-5 states:

Y Implement actions to prevent, control and reduce impacts of non-native invasive species in the Delta.

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 project proposal will coordinate and integrate with other invasive species efforts underway in the estuary, e.g. purple loosestrife prevention work, hydrilla control, and UCD's RIDNIS, funded by CALFED. Work will have restoration and conservation consequences.

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

Yes -No

How?

Ballast water courses and seminars and general outreach meetings and workshops should work together to ensure good local public involvement.

The proposal itself basically includes significant elements of local involvement.

Other Comments:

Y Investigators, Ms. Jodi Cassell and Dr. Karen McDowell have the experience and perspective to ensure the success of this proposal.

Y The contribution of this project could be significant since extensive restoration has been targeted by CALFED and that restoration could either fail now or gradually be degraded depending on the success of efforts to minimize the introductions of new invasive species

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding:

New Proposal Number: 185

New Proposal Title: West Coast Ballast Outreach Project

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 contract 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: 185

Applicant Organization: University of California Sea Grant Extension Program

Proposal Title: West Coast Ballast Outreach Project

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: 185

Applicant Organization: University of California Sea Grant Extension Program

Proposal Title: West Coast Ballast Outreach Project

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. PM costs covered in salaries covered in salaries paid by other programs, therefore no money has been budgeted for PM costs.

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 funds.

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: