

i. Proposal number.#2001-L207*

ii. Short proposal title.# Patterson Irrigation District Positive Barrier Fish Screen on San Joaquin River Diversion*

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 and D***

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) to maintain and enhance fish populations in the San Joaquin River, ecological processes (Goal B) and habitats (Goal D) by reducing disturbance of river bank habitat and associated biota, by completing a feasibility study to screen a 195 cfs diversion on the San Joaquin River. Contributes to the ERP target of screening flows along the San Joaquin 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 Mokelumne River. Although goals B and D are also cited, it will not contribute significantly to habitat improvement. This will screen a 195 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.# This diversion was specifically identified in Section 3.5 under fish screens as one of the screens to focus on for the lower San Joaquin River. This feasibility study would be the first step in implementing that action.*

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.# 12-continue high priority actions to reduce direct mortality to fishes, including screening diversions on the San Joaquin 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") as well as harvestable species. This project targets chinook salmon, steelhead, splittail, white sturgeon, and striped bass.*

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 a feasibility study to determine the most effective fish screen design for the Patterson Irrigation District's main pumping plant on the San Joaquin River. This diversion was specifically identified in Section 3.5 of the PSP as the focus for screening in the lower San Joaquin River and this study would be the first step in implementing that action.*

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 fish screen feasibility proposal is on the mainstem San Joaquin is consistent with the goal and objectives of the AFRP and San Joaquin River mainstem Action 3 in

the Revised Draft Restoration Plan that specifically recognizes the need to reduce entrainment at the Patterson Diversion. This feasibility study will primarily look at developing a positive fish screen at either the existing or an alternate site. It will also investigate alternative water sources but this appears to be less promising. This feasibility study has the potential to lead to action that could have substantial benefits to all juvenile fish that reside in this section of the river during the spring, summer and fall. The pumping plant has the potential to divert nearly 200 cfs during peak delivery and is located downstream of the Merced River. Although no tests for fish entrainment have occurred, an effective fish screen, or an alternate source of water, promises to hold substantial benefits for fall-run chinook salmon, steelhead, white sturgeon, striped bass, and splittail, all known to reside or pass by the influence of the diversion. The immediacy of benefit from future action is 3 years away, owed to the fact that final design, permitting, and environmental compliance and securing funding for the preferred alternative will take time. Durability of potential benefits should be tempered by the fact that this is a mechanical fix that will require vigilant operation and maintenance upkeep.*

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 federally threatened species Central Valley Steelhead ESU, splittail, and Delta smelt all likely reside, at least temporarily in the area of the diversion; the same is true for the candidate fall-run chinook salmon and striped bass and shad. All species would accrue some level of benefit and protection from a sound protective solution.*

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 preferred alternative is likely a fish screen. This mechanical fix will require annual maintenance and does not contribute to natural channel and riparian habitat values. A structural fix on the mainstem could also inhibit natural channel and riparian habitat values by creating a structure that would inhibit future channel migration.*

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).# Not directly applicable*

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.# This fish screen feasibility study is consistent with, and a good fit for, and most appropriately funded by the Anadromous Fish Screen Program, Section 3406(b)(21). However, to be funded for the Anadromous Fish Screen Program a local cost share providing at least 25% of the project cost needs to be identified.*

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 feasibility study is consistent with the goal and the objectives of the AFRP. Benefits will be accrued for numerous anadromous (fall-run chinook salmon, steelhead, white sturgeon, shad, and striped bass) and resident fish species such as the federally threatened splittail and Delta smelt, given that the feasibility leads to protective action. Although the proposed project would do little to improve natural channel and riparian habitat values, it is a physical fix that will provide benefits to anadromous fish given the diversion location on the San Joaquin and the amount of water it can take, given that these benefits are not countermanded by creating a had point in the river that could further disrupt beneficial natural channel and riparian habitat values. The Anadromous Fish Screen Program is the most appropriate CVPIA program to consider funding this effort.*

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.#Increased survival of salmon on this portion of the San Joaquin River complements ongoing restoration efforts in that ecozone, including supplemental river flows in the spring under the Vernalis Adaptive Management Plan and CALFED's habitat restoration projects on the San Joaquin River and its tributaries. 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.# This project has support of the local constituents. No outreach is planned outside of the District.*

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.# Cost proposal

is not further defined than the lump-sum consulting service contract amounts by tasks. Overhead is included in the consultant's lump-sum service contract amounts.*

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.#n/a*

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

6c1. In-kind:# \$25,000 proposed*

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

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# 14% or $25,000/175,000=.142857142^*$

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

6a - 6c3.# n/a*