

i. Proposal number.# 2001-L200 *

ii. Short proposal title.# City of Sacramento Intake Fish Screen Replacement Project *

APPLICABILITY TO CALFED ERP GOALS AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

1a1. Link to ERP Strategic Goals: What Strategic Goal(s) is /are addressed by this proposal? List the letter(s) of all that apply.

- A. At-risk species**
- B. Rehabilitate natural processes**
- C. Maintain harvested species**
- D. Protect-restore functional habitats**
- E. Prevent non-native species and reduce impacts**
- F. Improve and maintain water quality# A***

1a2. Describe the degree to which the proposal will contribute to the relevant goal. Quantify your assessment and identify the contribution to ERP targets, when possible.# The proposal states that the project could decrease the number of fish impacted, especially at-risk species. There is no quantification or support provided for this statement. Proposal also mentions potential reduced risk of flooded though, again, no justification is provided. Very little detail in proposal and section missing on applicability to goals.*

1b. Objectives: What Strategic Objective(s) is/are addressed by this proposal? List Objective (from the table of 32 objectives) and describe potential contribution to ERP Goals. Quantify your assessment, when possible.# This may address Objective 1 - recover the Big R species. Again, very little detail in proposals and no quantification provided.*

1c. Restoration Actions: Does the proposal address a Restoration Action identified in Section 3.5 of the PSP? Identify the action and describe how well the proposed action relates to the identified Restoration Action.# Fish screens are identified in Section 3.5 however, this screen is not called out specifically.*

1d. Stage 1 Actions: Is the proposal linked directly, indirectly or not linked to proposed Stage 1 Actions? If linked, describe how the proposal will contribute to ERP actions during

Stage 1.# The ERP discussed the importance of screening large diversions for the protection of anadromous fish. This screen is not specifically called out as a Stage 1 action.*

1e. MSCS: Describe how the proposal is linked to the Multi-Species Conservation Strategy and if it's consistent with the MSCS Conservation measures. Identify the species addressed and whether the proposal will "recover", "contribute to recovery" or "maintain" each species.# To the extent it assumed that the screen helps at-risk species, then the proposal may assist in recovering those species. They list chinook, delta smelt, splittail, green sturgeon and steelhead. Very few specifics are included in the proposal*

1f. Information Richness/Adaptive Probing related to the proposal: Describe the degree to which the proposal provides information to resolve one of the 12 scientific uncertainties (Section 3.3 of the PSP), and whether the proposal offers a prudent approach to answer these uncertainties.# Not addressed*

1g. Summarize comments from section 1a through 1f related to applicability to CALFED goals and priorities. Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, highlighting the applicability of the proposed project to CALFED and CVPIA goals and priorities. Focus on aspects of the proposal that may be important to later stages in the project review and selection process.# This proposal may address ERP Goal 1. However, no support information is contained in the proposal and the reason provided for the project as described in the conceptual model is to meet regulatory standards. Numerous sections of the proposal, such as applicability to ERP goals, are not even included in the application. This proposal was not responsive to the PSP format.*

APPLICABILITY TO CVPIA PRIORITIES

1i. Describe the expected contribution to natural production of anadromous fish. Specifically identify the species and races of anadromous fish that are expected to benefit from the project, the expected magnitude of the contribution to natural production for each species and race of anadromous fish, the certainty of the expected benefits, and the immediacy and duration of the expected contribution. Provide quantitative support where available (for example, expected increases in population indices, cohort replacement rates, or reductions in mortality rates).# This proposal would have a direct affect on natural production by reducing mortality experienced by down stream migrating anadromous fish. All races of Central Valley chinook salmon (winter, spring, fall and late fall-run chinook) and Central Valley Steelhead pass this diversion as they migrate down the Sacramento River to the Delta. Other anadromous fish species benefiting from this effort would include sturgeon, green and white, Striped bass and American shad. The magnitude of the contribution to any of these species would be difficult to quantify specifically, but you could extrapolate from the reduction in take of these species at the new facility and generally determine the

decrease in mortality. The benefits would be certain, and realized immediately after construction and would last the life of the project. *

1j. List the threatened or endangered species that are expected to benefit from the project. Specifically identify the status of the species and races of anadromous fish that are expected to benefit from the project, any other special-status species that are expected to benefit, and the ecological community or multiple-species benefits that are expected to occur as a result of implementing the project.

Listed species expected to benefit are winter-run chinook salmon, federally listed as endangered; spring-run chinook salmon, federally and state listed as threatened; Central Valley steelhead, federally listed as threatened. Reduction of entrainment would also benefit Delta smelt, federally listed as threatened and Sacramento splittail, a species of special concern. One of the diversions discussed in this proposal is located on the mainstem of the Sacramento River. All anadromous species and those species that inhabit the Sacramento River in general (i.e., native minnows, and exotics like sunfish, and delta fishes) benefit from diversion facilities that meet state and federal screen criteria because of the reduced screen opening minimizes the opportunity of being entrained (sucked through the screen) and the reduced "through screen" velocities allow small fish the ability to avoid being impinged (stuck) on the screen. The Revised Draft Restoration Plan for the AFRP lists fish screen projects on the mainstem of the Sacramento River as a high priority Action (#6). *

1k. Identify if and describe how the project protects and restores natural channel and riparian habitat values. Specifically address whether the project protects and restores natural channel and riparian habitat values, whether the project promotes natural processes, and the immediacy and duration of benefits to natural channel and riparian habitat values.

This project does nothing to restore or protect natural channel and riparian habitat values. *

1l. Identify if and how the project contributes to efforts to modify CVP operations. Identify the effort(s) to modify CVP operations to which the proposed project would contribute, if applicable. Efforts to modify CVP operations include modifications to provide flows of suitable quality, quantity, and timing to protect all life stages of anadromous fish as directed by Section 3406 (b)(1)(B) of the CVPIA, including flows provided through management of water dedicated under Section 3406(b)(2) and water acquired pursuant to Section 3406(b)(3).

This project does not affect CVP operations. *

1m. Identify if and how the project contributes to implementation of the supporting measures in the CVPIA. Identify the supporting measure(s) to which the proposed project would contribute, if applicable. Supporting measures include the Water Acquisition Program, the Comprehensive Assessment

and Monitoring Program, the Anadromous Fish Screen Program, and others.# The project contributes to the implementation of the Anadromous Fish Screen Program, b (21), by being a fish screen modification/construction. *

1n. Summarize comments from section 1i through 1m related to applicability to CVPIA priorities (if applicable, identify the CVPIA program appropriate to consider as the source of CVPIA funding [for example, the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, Habitat Restoration Program, Water Acquisition Program, Tracy Pumping Plant Mitigation Program, Clear Creek Restoration Program, Comprehensive Assessment and Monitoring Program, and Anadromous Fish Screen Program]). Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, highlighting the applicability of the proposed project to CALFED and CVPIA goals and priorities. Focus on aspects of the proposal that may be important to later stages in the project review and selection process.# This fish screen project will benefit all anadromous and local fish species by reducing the mortality/loss of these fishes into the diversion. By replacing and upgrading these fish screen facilities to meet state and federal criteria impacts to the mentioned fish populations are greatly reduced. This action is appropriate for the Anadromous Fish Screen Program to fund, and supports AFRP Sacramento River high priority Action 6 from the Revised Draft Restoration Plan.*

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECTS

2a. Did the applicant explain how the proposed project relates to other past and future ecosystem restoration projects, as required on page 57 in the PSP? Type in yes or no.#yes.*

2b. Based on the information presented in the proposal and on other information on restoration projects available to CALFED and CVPIA staff, describe how the proposed project complements other ecosystem restoration projects, including CALFED and CVPIA. Identify projects or types of projects that the proposed project would complement, now or in the future. Identify source of information.#Fish screen replacements will provide a significant benefit to aquatic resources and at-risk species in both the lower American and Sacramento Rivers. Source: Proposal.*

RESULTS AND PROGRESS ON PREVIOUSLY FUNDED CALFED AND CVPIA PROJECTS, INCLUDING REQUESTS FOR NEXT-PHASE FUNDING

3a1. Based on the information presented in the proposal and on project reports and data available to CALFED and CVPIA staff, has the applicant previously received CALFED or CVPIA funding? Type CALFED, CVPIA, both, or none.#both.*

3a2. If the answer is yes, list the project number(s), project name(s) and whether CALFED or CVPIA funding. If the answer is none, move on to item 4.# CALFED

98B28 - City of Sacramento Fish Screen Replacement Project (Phase 2)
CVPIA - AFRP, Development of Positive Barrier Fish screen Designs for Installation in the Sacramento and American Rivers.

7-FG-20-14960.*

3b1. Based on the information presented in the proposal and on project reports available to CALFED and CVPIA staff, did the applicant accurately state the current status of the project(s) and the progress and accomplishments of the project(s) to date? Type yes or no.#no.*

3b2. If the answer is no, identify the inaccuracies:#

3c1. Has the progress to date been satisfactory? Type yes or no.#no.*

3c2. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answer, including source of information (proposal or other source):#City of Sacramento says they are

nearly complete with the engineering design and preparation of plans, specifications and cost estimate in order to go forward with construction. However, they do not even have a signed contract to complete the earlier work under 98B28.

Source: Proposal, contract manager information.*

REQUESTS FOR NEXT-PHASE FUNDING

3d1. Is the applicant requesting next-phase funding? Type yes or no.#yes.*

3d2. If the answer is yes, list previous-phase project number(s) here. If the answer is no, move on to item 4.#98B28.*

3e1. Does the proposal contain a 2-page summary, as required on pages 57 and 58 of the PSP? Type yes or no.#no.*

3e2. Based on the information presented in the summary and on project reports available to CALFED and CVPIA staff, is the project ready for next-phase funding? Type yes or no.#no.*

3e3. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers, including source of information (proposal or other source):#See comments under 3c2.

Source: Proposal, contract information.*

LOCAL INVOLVEMENT

4a. Does the proposal describe a plan for public outreach, as required on page 61 of the PSP? Type yes or no.# No*

4b. Based on the information in the proposal, highlight outstanding issues related to support or opposition for the project by local entities including watershed groups and local governments, and the expected magnitude of any potential third-party impacts.# No third party impacts are mentioned and there is no mention of outstanding issues.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# None*

4e. Specifically highlight and comment on any regulatory issues listed above that may prevent the project from meeting the projected timeline.# None*

COST

5a. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support? Type yes or no.# yes*

5b. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified? Type yes or no.# yes*

5c. Is the overhead clearly identified? Type yes or no.#no*

5d. Are project management costs clearly identified? Type yes or no.#no*

5e. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions

5a - 5d.# Detail on construction

cost per intake are provided on the SF424. Contingencies are an unallowable federal financial assistance cost and should be addressed if federal funding is provided. Overhead and project management costs are not detailed.*

COST SHARING

6a. Does the proposal contain cost-sharing? Type yes or no.# no*

6b. Are applicants specifically requesting either state or federal cost share dollars? Type state, federal, or doesn't matter.# Doesn't matter*

6c. List cost share given in proposal and note whether listed cost share is identified (in hand) or proposed.

6c1. In-kind:# \$0*

6c2. Matching funds:# \$41,199,005 proposed*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# 15% CALFED contribution or $6,020,995/41,199,005=.146144184^*$

6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions

6a - 6c3.# Applicant indicates

cost share funding is available from CVPIA AFSP - \$11,055,125 and City of Sacramento - \$30,143,880. CVPIA AFSP requires a non-federal cost share match. Applicant did not address if they require either state or federal CALFED funding.*