

Proposal Reviews

#119: Performance Monitoring of Egeria Control Actions in Frank's Tract, West Delta Region

ReMetrix LLC

Initial Selection Panel Review

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review

Delta Regional Review

External Scientific Review #1
#2
#3

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 119

Applicant Organization: ReMetrix LLC

Proposal Title: Performance Monitoring of Egeria Control Actions in Frank's Tract, West Delta Region

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:

The proposal seeks to compare aerial photography with satellite imagery to document the extent of Egeria in Franks Tract. There was disagreement among the external scientific reviewers and the proposal provides little information on several important issues (e.g., the nature of the imagery, the design of the monitoring program, how the proponents will address species other than Egeria). These and other technical concerns must be addressed for a project such as this to be successful. The CBW control program was to provide essential data to the monitoring effort but there is no explicit acknowledgement of their involvement or details of their control program that the monitoring proposed here will address. Given this lack of detail and technical concerns expressed in the external scientific review, the Selection Panel does not feel this proposal is worthy of support.

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review Form

Proposal Number: 119

Applicant Organization: ReMetrix LLC

Proposal Title: Performance Monitoring of Egeria Control Actions in Frank's Tract, West Delta Region

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
XSuperior	<p>The goals and objectives are clear and timely. This proposed work could provide a new cost-savings technique for monitoring Egeria. The proposal would have been even stronger if more supporting data concerning current costs of Egeria control and monitoring would have been provided. However, the budget is modest and the potential benefits make it an attractive project.</p> <p>The panel felt that the poor ranking by one reviewer may be due to the concern of that reviewer that the project is not research. But the panel feels that the monitoring category that the applicants put it in was appropriate. It does address invasive species PSP priorities. And there is actually a research component to the project.</p> <p>The panel recommends a superior ranking.</p>
-Above average	
-Adequate	
-Not recommended	

1. **Goals and Justification.** Does the proposal present a clear statement of goals, objectives and hypotheses? Does the proposal present a clear justification and conceptual model for the project?

Goals. The goals and objectives are stated clearly. They propose to assess control measures of the aquatic vegetation Egeria and to compare two remote sensing techniques. They will do 1-m multispectral aerial imagery in the spring (Phase I) and late summer (Phase II), before and after control measures. At the time of the second aerial photography they will also get 2.8-m resolution multispectral satellite imagery (Phase III). Then they will compare the two techniques.

Apparently the California Department of Boating and Waterways has an on-going effort to control Egeria, therefore this project is timely.

A reviewer says the hypothesis as stated is weak, but the work is timely.

Justification. This project is appropriately classified as a Monitoring project. It is quite well written with the objectives clear. One of the driving forces for conducting Phase III of the study is the cost saving that it could demonstrate. According to the budget, one set of aerial imagery is \$8,000 while one set of satellite imagery is \$1,600. This is a significant difference if such imagery is needed very often. For that reason we believe the study is justified. However, the applicants would have had a much more compelling case had they shown how often such Egeria monitoring is currently needed how often do they monitor Egeria spread either by aerial imagery or by ground crews? They really should have provided an estimate of the dollar cost savings that would result from the new satellite technique if it proved to be successful. Also, how much is currently spent on Egeria control? There was no indication of how big the Egeria problem is in the region and a dollar amount for the control measures currently in use would have been helpful. The applicants did say that currently the monitoring, i.e. accountability for control measures, has not been at the level it should be to warrant the high expenditure of public funds on control measures. This seems like a good argument, but it would be better if there were some numbers to back it up.

A reviewer says the economic impact of Egeria in the Delta is not stated nor the annual cost of control, but he says they both are probably in the tens of millions. The reviewer questions whether this granting program is proper for this type of work since it is not research. But the panel felt it was appropriate however for the non-native invasive species topic area in the restoration program (which is not the research arm of the program), plus it was listed in the monitoring category.

2. **Likelihood of Success (Approach, Feasibility, Capabilities and Performance Measures).** Is the project likely to succeed based on the approach, feasibility and project team capabilities? Are the proposed performance measures adequate for measuring the project's success?

Approach. The approach is well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives. If they show that this new satellite imagery works well, then it would generate a new methodology and approach to monitoring Egeria. It would have been very helpful to have some support information that demonstrated the ability of the aerial imagery to distinguish Egeria from other aquatic vegetation. One panel member tried to find Hendersons Aquatics article but their library doesnt carry that journal, nor could it be obtained online. So it could be that in that article there is such information. We understand that the satellite proposed for use has not been available until now, but some documentation about how well other satellite imagery can resolve aquatic species would have been helpful. We will take it on faith that it is possible since Henderson has apparently conducted numerous remote sensing studies on aquatic vegetation, as has Heilman although he has no published studies listed.

A reviewer questions whether ReMetix has its own plane or will use a contractor. Also, how will the image analysis be done? Can spectral ratios be used to identify Egeria? How does siltation and submergence in turbid water affect the data. Can species be distinguished? How does the presence of water hyacinth influence image data quality? They should have a letter of cooperation from CBW.

Feasibility. The project is feasible. They have a backup plan of a different satellite if the satellite they prefer to use is not in operation at the time of the planned study. One panelist wondered what is the advantage of the new satellite over the old one. They have permission to use ground truth data collected by CA Boating and Waterways to aid in data interpretation.

A reviewer states that the computers and software for the analyses are not described.

Capabilities. The team appears well qualified. Published papers by applicants is a positive indicator.

A reviewer says the principals have an excellent record in aquatic weed management and mapping.

Performance Measures. Their performance measures are basically accomplishing the tasks outlined, i.e. collecting and analyzing the various imagery, which are appropriate for this type of study.

3. **Outcomes and Products.** Will the project advance the state of scientific knowledge in general and/or make an important contribution to the state of knowledge of the Bay-Delta Watershed? For restoration proposals, is the project likely to contribute to ecosystem restoration or species recoveries in a significant way? Will the project produce products useful to decision-makers and scientists?

The products will be the quarterly and final reports, conference presentations, and hopefully a published paper. Also there will be the maps indicating success of control measures and hopefully the indication that the new satellite imagery will be useful in future monitoring efforts. These are all products of value. The imagery and GIS files will be available to other agencies working in Franks Tract.

4. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

The budget appears very reasonable and they have also provided two alternate and lower budgets/work plans which is very helpful. The panel strongly recommends funding all phases of the project, however if this is not possible we think the analysis of the new satellite imagery technique (Budget Option 3) would have the most future benefit and potential cost savings to the Egeria control program.

A reviewer suspects that aerial imagery isnt used at all currently because of the cost.

5. **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?

Rank = Medium

The reviewer states that the panel favors NIS monitoring that are part of comprehensive, coordinated programs. It does pursue the priorities of the PSP invasive species. They are coordinating with Boating And Waterways, but no mention of USDA or FWS NIS Task Force.

6. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

Prior Performance no previous CalFed or CVPIA Funding

Environmental Compliance no problems

Budget In 17A they rounded the number to \$42,556 from \$42,555.52.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific Review. 2 Excellent (1 is Excellent-Good), 1 Poor

Delta Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 119

Proposal Title: Performance Monitoring of Egeria Control Actions in Frank's Tract, West Delta Region

Overall Ranking: -Low **XMedium** -High

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

the panel favors NIS monitoring that are part of comprehensive, coordinated programs

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

timing of aerial photos will be critical to success of this project

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

XYes -No

How?

invasive species control/monitoring (MR-1 + DR-5)

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?

This is an experiment to develop a new method to monitor NIS control success that could be expanded in the future

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

XYes -No

How?

coordinating with Boating and Waterways but no mention of USDA or FWS NIS Task Force

Other Comments:

contingent on getting new satellite up

no assurances provided

External Scientific: #1

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **119**

Applicant Organization: **ReMetrix LLC**

Proposal Title: **Performance Monitoring of Egeria Control Actions in Frank's Tract, West Delta Region**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

Correct

Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

None

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent	A very cost effective and timely project which will quickly give managers the information they need in regards to egeria control in the delta.
<input type="checkbox"/> -Good	
<input type="checkbox"/> -Poor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

Excellent, yes, yes.

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

Excellent, yes, yes, yes.

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

Excellent, Yes, yes, yes, yes.

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

Excellent, yes, good, yes.

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

Excellent, yes, yes.

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

Excellent, yes, yes, yes.

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

Excellent Good, yes, yes.

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

Excellent, yes.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #2

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **119**

Applicant Organization: **ReMetrix LLC**

Proposal Title: **Performance Monitoring of Egeria Control Actions in Frank's Tract, West Delta Region**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

XCorrect

-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

none

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Excellent	I am critical of the design of this study, its justification, the proposed interaction with Cal Boating and Waterways and the description of resources that ReMetrix has available to accomplish the work. The most serious obstacle to funding is the nature of the work itself and its relationship to this CALFED program.
-Good	
XPoor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

Although the goals are clearly stated, the hypothesis driving the research is weak and inaccurate. A stronger hypothesis would be whether aerial or satellite imagery can be used to quantify and identify submersed vegetation. The work is timely in the sense that control efforts for Egeria are underway and a rapid and cost effective method of measuring treatment effects is desirable.

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

The present economic impact of Egeria in the Delta is not stated nor the annual cost of control but these figures are both probably in the tens of millions of dollars. The cost of this proposal is relatively modest in comparison. However, the proposed work is not research. It is monitoring of control efforts by the California Department of Boating and Waterways. The information is valuable but is this granting program the proper way to fund the work?

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

The project seems fairly simple. In the first segment of work, aerial images of Franck's tract will be acquired at the time that CBW does a survey of plant distribution. After treatment, at some time defined by CBW, more images will be acquired and another survey done by CBW. No mention is made of the means by which the aerial images will be acquired, nor for that matter, how the satellite images for the latter part of the project will be acquired. Does ReMetrix have its own plane and cameras or will a contractor be used? Also, no mention is made of how the image analysis will be done and what problems might be encountered between the two systems (aerial vs satellite imaging). For instance, can spectral ratios be used to identify Egeria; if so, how do siltation and submergence in turbid water affect these data? If species cannot be distinguished, how does one differentiate lack of control from control followed by growth of another species (Ceratophyllum)? How does the presence of water hyacinth influence image data quality? Is there enough water hyacinth in this part of the Delta to cause a potential problem? Is spatial resolution of the infestation the major problem, rather than identification of the species? Although the proposal states that California Boating and Waterways will cooperate in providing data to interpret the aerial and satellite images and will receive data from the analysis by ReMetrix, there is no statement from CBW to that effect, no letter of cooperation. Although there is no reason to suspect this is not the case, it would improve the proposal system if a brief letter from potential (or essential) cooperators were included with each proposal, verifying this

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

The project seems feasible in the sense that aerial images can be obtained, satellite images probably can be obtained and contingency plans have been made in case the latter are unavailable. From past work by this company and past publications by the PIs, the computers and software to do the analysis are in place. However, these tools are not described in the proposal.

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

The performance measures presented were weak. While the past record of the company is apparently good in terms of delivering a product on time, to quote the stock ads: "Past performance is no indicator of future success." What system is in place to ensure timely performance

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

The product in this case will be the images and the maps produced by GIS analysis. These will be valuable both to California Boating and Waterways and other agencies concerned with the condition of the Delta. How will data from this project be made available to other CALFED agencies for their use? If the data are available does that mean they are FREE or at cost?

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

The principals have an excellent record in the area of aquatic weed management and mapping. Insufficient information is presented in the proposal to judge either computer resources or other personnel available to work on this project.

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

There is insufficient information to approximate a cost/benefit analysis. The budget is relatively small over a two year period. If the work indicated that satellite imagery was as good as aerial imagery in terms of quantifying Egeria infestations, there are potential savings in going from aerial to satellite imagery. However, I suspect that aerial imagery isn't used at all - because of the cost.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #3

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **119**

Applicant Organization: **ReMetrix LLC**

Proposal Title: **Performance Monitoring of Egeria Control Actions in Frank's Tract, West Delta Region**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

XCorrect

-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

none

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
X Excellent	I would rank this between Excellent and Good. The goals and objectives are clear and timely. A new cost-savings technique could be identified for monitoring Egeria. More supporting data concerning current costs of Egeria control and monitoring would have provided stronger justification for the project. The budget is modest.
-Good	
-Poor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

The goals and objectives are stated clearly. They propose to assess control measures of the aquatic vegetation Egeria and to compare two remote sensing techniques. They will do 1-m multispectral aerial imagery in the spring (Phase I) and late summer (Phase II), before and after control measures. At the time of the second aerial photography they will also get 2.8-m resolution multispectral satellite imagery (Phase III). Then they will compare the two techniques.

Apparently the California Department of Boating and Waterways has an on-going effort to control Egeria, therefore this project is timely.

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

This project is appropriately classified as a Monitoring project. It is quite well written with the objectives clear. One of the driving forces for conducting Phase III of the study is the cost saving that it could demonstrate. According to the budget, one set of aerial imagery is \$8,000 while one set of satellite imagery is \$1,600. This is a significant difference if such imagery is needed very often. For that reason I believe the study is justified. However, the applicants would have had a much more compelling case had they shown how often such Egeria monitoring is currently needed - how often do they monitor Egeria spread either by aerial imagery or by ground crews? They really should have provided an estimate of the dollar cost savings that would result from the new satellite technique if it proved to be successful. Also, how much is currently spent on Egeria control? I didn't get a good feeling of just how big the Egeria problem is in the region and a dollar amount for the control measures currently in use would have been helpful. The applicants did say that currently the monitoring, i.e. accountability for control measures, has not been at the level it should be to warrant the high expenditure of public funds on control measures. This seems like a good argument, but it would be better if there were some numbers to back it up.

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

The approach is well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives. If they show that this new satellite imagery works well, then it would generate a new methodology and approach to monitoring Egeria. Since my expertise is not in the area of aquatic vegetation remote sensing, it would have been very helpful to have some support information that demonstrated the ability of the aerial imagery to distinguish Egeria from other aquatic vegetation. I tried to find Henderson's Aquatics article but our library doesn't carry that journal, nor could I get it online. So it could be that in that article there is such information. I understand that the satellite proposed for use has not been available until now, but some documentation about how well other satellite imagery can resolve aquatic species would have been helpful. I will take it on faith that it is possible since Henderson has apparently conducted numerous remote sensing studies on aquatic vegetation, as has Heilman although he has no published studies listed.

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

The project is feasible. They have a backup plan of a different satellite if the satellite they prefer to use is not in operation at the time of the planned study. They have permission to use ground truth data collected by CA Boating and Waterways to aid in data interpretation.

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

Their performance measures are basically accomplishing the tasks outlined, i.e. collecting and analyzing the various imagery, which are appropriate for this type of study.

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

The products will be the quarterly and final reports, conference presentations, and hopefully a published paper. Also there will be the maps indicating success of control measures and hopefully the indication that the new satellite imagery will be useful in future monitoring efforts. These are all products of value. The imagery and GIS files will be available to other agencies working in Frank's Tract.

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

The team appears well qualified. Published papers by applicants is a positive indicator.

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

The budget appears very reasonable and they have also provided two alternate and lower budgets/work plans which is very helpful. I would suggest funding all phases of the project, however if this is not possible I think the analysis of the new satellite imagery technique (Budget Option 3) would have the most future benefit and potential cost savings to the Egeria control program.

Miscellaneous comments:

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 119

Applicant Organization: ReMetrix LLC

Proposal Title: Performance Monitoring of Egeria Control Actions in Frank's Tract, West Delta Region

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: 119

Applicant Organization: ReMetrix LLC

Proposal Title: Performance Monitoring of Egeria Control Actions in Frank's Tract, West Delta Region

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:

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).

difference of .48. rounded off to nearest dollar.

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:

section D in the proposal have 3 options shown under cost.