

i. Proposal number.# 2001-L206 *

ii. Short proposal title.# RD 2035 Fish Screen Design and Environmental Review *

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 and 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.# Project addresses needs of at-risk ("R") native species (Goal A) and harvestable species (Goal C) to maintain and enhance fish populations in the Sacramento River, by screening a 400 cfs diversion on the Sacramento River. Contributes to the ERP targets of screening flows along the Sacramento River.*

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 proposal addresses objective 1 - recovery of "R" at-risk species in the Sacramento River and Goal C-objective 1 to enhance fisheries for salmonids and native species. Will screen a 400 cfs diversion.*

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, including an emphasis on the upper Sacramento River. However, screening this particular diversion 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.# Screening all large diversions is discussed in the ERP and Implementation Plan (Page 2-9, #12-continue high priority actions to reduce direct mortality to fishes, including screening diversions on the Sacramento River and its tributaries). This project is linked to action 5a, the Agricultural Diversion Screening Program, but 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.# The ERP and MSCS have identified fish screens and improved fish passage as contributing to Goal 1, to assist in recovery of at-risk species ("R"); this project targets chinook salmon, splittail and steelhead.*

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.

Unscreened diversions are not covered in the twelve uncertainties*

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 project is the next phase in activities designed to screen an unscreened diversion on the Sacramento River and addresses specific goals and actions identified by CALFED. It is the next phase for the project, having completed their feasibility study with input from fisheries agencies.*

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 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 extrapolation from the reduction in take of these species at the new facility would generally show 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; fall-run, a federally listed candidate species; Central Valley steelhead, federally listed as threatened. Reduction of entrainment would also benefit green sturgeon and Sacramento splittail, both species of special concern. All anadromous species and those species that inhabit the Sacramento River in general (i.e., native minnows, and exotics like sunfish etc...) benefit from diversion facilities that meet state and federal screen criteria because of the reduced screen opening minimizes the opportunity of aquatic organisms 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 fish screen facilities to meet state and federal criteria, impacts to 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. #Screening projects on the Sacramento River will improve survival of migrating salmon and other native fish species. Complements other Sacramento River fish screen efforts, including the GCID intake, M & T/Parrott intake in Chico, Maxwell Irrigation District intake, RD108 near Grimes, and the Sacramento River Water Treatment Plant in Sacramento. Source: Proposal, CALFED tracking table.*

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.#CALFED.*

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.# 98N01 - RD2035 Fish Screen Feasibility Study.*

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.#yes.*

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

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

3c2. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answer, including source of information (proposal or other source):#This feasibility study evaluated 7 fish screen alternatives, currently three options eliminated and four were refined and modified. A preferred alternative is being developed which combines best aspects of two options and will be completed in summer 2000. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports.*

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.#98N01.*

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

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.#yes.*

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

Alternatives analysis expected to be complete and option identified this year are ready for next phase of design and environmental review. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports, contract deliverables.*

LOCAL INVOLVEMENT

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

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.# The proposal indicates support for the project and lists no third party impacts. *

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.# yes*

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

5a - 5d.# No further cost detail

provided than the lump-sum consulting service contract amounts by tasks. Overhead is included in the consultant's lump-sum service contract amounts. Applicant also providing project management through in-kind contributions.*

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.# state*

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

6c1. In-kind:# \$30,000 proposed*

6c2. Matching funds:# \$0 proposed*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# 1.6% or $30,000/1,820,000=.016483516^*$

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

6a - 6c3.# Applicant requests

state funding in anticipation of combining that with local contributions to match against future federal funding. Will accept federal funding for this phase if state funding not available. Declined a CVPIA AFSP grant for the feasibility study work under the first phase of the project.*