

## Geographic Review Panel 1 – Bay Delta

**Proposal number:** 2001-G200

**Short Proposal Title:** Canal Ranch Acquisition

- 1. Applicability to CALFED ERP Goals and Implementation Plan and CVPIA priorities, and relevance to ERP and CVPIA priorities for your region.** Reference to ERP goals, but not CVPIA priorities. No detail on design of project and thus how species will benefit. Depending upon future implementation, the project could benefit the ERP species. This proposal would support the CVPIA AFRP plan, Mokelumne River Action number 7.
- 2. Linkages/coordination with previously funded projects or other restoration activities in your region.** Reference to other programs in the area, but not a lot of detail on how this proposal would complement them for the desired species.
- 3. Feasibility, especially the project's ability to move forward in a timely and successful manner.** Project's ability to move forward in a timely manner is at question, because the first two phases have not yet been completed. Acquisition itself appears to be feasible, and would probably be timely, although feasibility of this project being completed to benefit the identified species is questionable at this point.
- 4. Qualifications of the applicants and others involved in implementing the proposed project.** Application outlines qualifications of participants, but these are not necessarily applicable to this particular phase (acquisition) of the project. No scientific aspects to this phase, monitoring and evaluation indicated for phase IV.
- 5. Local involvement (including environmental compliance).** No plans for public outreach or public involvement in this project outlined in the proposal in this phase. Panel recommends an interpretive facility under future phases.
- 6. Cost.** The \$12,015,265 cost of the project is for fee title. Because fee title and easements are considered viable options for restoration purposes, cost-benefit analysis for both options should have been included in the proposal. This project seems very expensive, considering this particular phase is not expected to yield any direct benefits to species; benefits might accrue in subsequent phases (funding for these not guaranteed).  
  
Panel highly recommends that a cost-benefit analysis be conducted for fee title versus easement.
- 7. Cost sharing.** No cost share proposed.
- 8. Additional comments.** See comments under 6.

---

## **Regional Ranking**

**Panel Ranking:** Medium low

**Provide a brief explanation of your ranking:** TARP summary was fair. Panel concurs with TARP that funding could be considered for property appraisal. Panel also recommends providing funding for cost-benefit analysis (medium high rating). Could be a regionally important project. Right now, this request for full funding for fee title acquisition is premature.