

## Geographic Review Panel 1 – Bay Delta

**Proposal number:** 2001-E202

**Short Proposal Title:** Rhode Island  
Management/Restoration

**1. Applicability to CALFED ERP Goals and Implementation Plan and CVPIA priorities, and relevance to ERP and CVPIA priorities for your region.** References ERP vision, but not goals, and does not mention CVPIA. Proposal description of goals is generally inadequate.

**2. Linkages/coordination with previously funded projects or other restoration activities in your region.** Some reference to other projects applicant has worked on, but no information on linkages to, or coordination with those projects, nor how this project would benefit other activities in the region.

**3. Feasibility, especially the project's ability to move forward in a timely and successful manner.** Task 1 was feasibility study, funded and completed under previous CALFED grant, although applicant admits that more data is needed to address fisheries. Permits required for construction of this project have not yet been acquired; no time frame given. Activities proposed are feasible.

**4. Qualifications of the applicants and others involved in implementing the proposed project.** Uncertain. Applicant has participated in contract management for other projects in the area, but does not specify how these qualifications relate to the project at hand. No information on who would be performing construction duties (to be developed under this proposal), so cannot evaluate qualifications of subcontractors. Two years of post-project monitoring proposed to be developed for this project, but not identified who will be monitoring or their classifications.

**5. Local involvement (including environmental compliance).** No public outreach proposed. No impacts anticipated to third party, no opposition noted.

**6. Cost.** Difficulty to justify cost due to lack of specificity regarding project design, contractor arrangements, and anticipated benefits to ecosystem and species.

**7. Cost sharing.** Proposed cost-sharing is in-kind services for contract administration; no actual funds anticipated from other programs or entities.

**8. Additional comments.**

---

### Regional Ranking

**Panel Ranking:** Medium Low

**Provide a brief explanation of your ranking:** In general, the panel concurs with the TARP review that this proposal was poorly written and lacking in detail about project design and anticipated benefits.