

i. Proposal number.# 2001 - L202.*

ii. Short proposal title.# Suisun Marsh Fish Screening Program.*

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, B, C*

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 program would benefit at-risk species (Goal 1) such as chinook, delta smelt, steelhead, sturgeon and splittail, as well commercial and recreation species (Goal 3) such as striped bass. The proposal also states it will indirectly rehabilitate natural processes (Goal 2) by preventing aquatic species from moving into seasonal wetlands. No quantification is provided for these statements. Difficult to assess the actual contribution to ERP 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.#

For Goal 1 the proposal would address Objective 1 - recover the Big R species and for Goal 3 it would meet Objective 2 which is to maintain and enhance populations of selected species. There is no clear link to an objective under Goal 2. *

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.#

Section 3.5 Does not specifically discuss fish screens in the Suisun Marsh.*

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.# Screening is not identified as a Stage 1 action for Suisun Marsh. .*

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.# Assuming that screening diversions benefits at-risk species, then the program will assist in recovering those species listed in 1a.*

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.# The proposal identifies uncertainties related screening in the Marsh and how those issues have been addressed. No monitoring plan is described beyond testing of the screen by DFG and NMFS. *

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.# The proposal meets the general restoration action of screening diversions. However, it does not incorporate monitoring or adaptive probing to learn about the actual effects of the work.*

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).# The natural production of steelhead, striped bass, and all races of chinook salmon that migrate past the Suisun Marsh diversion sites that will be screened in this proposal will benefit due to the removal of a potential source of mortality associated with diversion out of their migration channel. This proposal will select two wetland diversions located in the Suisun Resource Conservation District in the Suisun Marsh for installation of fish protective screens. Once funding has been approved selection of the screen sites will begin and should be completed by January 2001. Upon selection of the sites, the screens will be installed and should be in place and operational by November 2001. The owners of

the diversions will be obligated to operate and maintain the screens as per operational criteria established by California Department of Fish and Game. The expected magnitude of the contribution to natural production is undetermined but should reduce diversion-related mortality. The certainty of the expected benefits is high, as long as the screens are operated as per the operational criteria. The immediacy of the expected contribution will be realized as soon as the fish screen is operational, which will be no later than November 2001. The duration of the expected contribution should be long-term, as long as the fish screens are operated as per the operational criteria.*

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.# The threatened/endangered and special status species expected to benefit from this project include steelhead trout, winter-run, fall-run, and late-fall-run chinook salmon, delta smelt, and Sacramento splittail. The principal benefit associated with this proposal is that by installing a fish screen, and subsequently operating and maintaining it in a prescribed fashion, migratory fish will not be diverted from their migration corridor and resident species will remain in their preferred habitat, thereby decreasing mortality associated with diversion.*

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.# The project neither protects nor restores natural channel or 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).# No evidence is presented to indicate whether/how the project would contribute to efforts to modify CVP operations. No such relationship is apparent.*

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 implementation of the Anadromous Fish Screen Program by installing fish screens at selected sites in the Suisun Marsh.*

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 project is appropriate for funding support from the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program and the Anadromous Fish Screen Program. This proposal will select two wetland diversions located in the Suisun Resource Conservation District in the Suisun Marsh for installation of fish protective screens. Once funding has been approved selection of the screen sites will begin and should be completed by January 2001. Upon selection of the sites, the screens will be installed and should be in place and operational by November 2001. The owners of the diversions will be obligated to operate and maintain the screens as per operational criteria established by California Department of Fish and Game. This is consistent with Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Evaluation No.12 (Evaluate the benefits to juvenile anadromous fish of and opportunities for screening diversions and re-locating riparian diversions in the Delta and Suisun Marsh.) in the Revised Draft Restoration Plan for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, May 30, 1997; this is considered a medium priority in the draft plan. A strength of the proposal is that the entire process from selection of the candidate screen sites to installation of the screens will be done in one contiguous effort and under the singular control of one program manager. Another strength is the immediacy of the benefits - once the screens are installed, and operated according to acceptable criteria, fish will no longer be diverted. A potential weakness is that if the screens are operated at unacceptable criteria the diversion efficiency would be jeopardized.*

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.#Proposed screens indirectly tie back to

ecosystem restoration projects by keeping aquatic organisms in the channels and streams of the Suisun Marsh and in nutrient-rich environments. The species will utilize shallow water and tidal marsh habitats being

established by CALFED. 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.#none*

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.#

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.#

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

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

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

REQUESTS FOR NEXT-PHASE FUNDING

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

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

3e1. Does the proposal contain a 2-page summary, as required on pages 57 and 58 of the PSP? Type yes or 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.#

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

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.# Landowners who need/want to prevent unnecessary diversion of fish onto their property should support this proposal since the proposal will develop criteria useable for a range of screen site criteria. The Suisun Resource Conservation District has garnered stakeholder support for this proposal.

Third party impacts to those landowners on whose property the screens are installed are limited to responsibility for the long-term operation and maintenance of the screen. Landowners who allow fish protective screens to be installed on their diversion will have the additional benefit of being able to divert water for the maintenance of seasonal wetlands during periods when, in the absence of fish screens in place to prevent diversion of fish, diversions would have been halted.*

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.# no*

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

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.# Funds will be used to construct up to 2 fish screens, plus an additional 2 screens will be constructed with other sources of funding for approximately a total of \$1,802,300. Total request is for subcontracted effort for which no additional detail is provided. Calculations for overhead and indirect costs should be verified in order to verify total request for either state or federal funds. Executive summary indicates federal indirect rate is 19.9% which would indicate the federal funding request would be

higher. SF424 is quoting the state indirect rate which is an error.*

COST SHARING

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

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:# \$1,600 proposed*

6c2. Matching funds:# \$880,000 in hand*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# approx. 51% or $920,700/1,802,300=.51084725$ based on state indirect rate*

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

6a - 6c3.# Executive Summary

states \$929,658.73 is available for cost share, however page 9 of proposal indicates only \$881,600 is available. Cost share funding from federal and state sources is for construction of 2 screens in addition to 2 screens funded by this request. Not apparent if the other sources of funding necessitate applicant securing specific type of funding.*