

i. Proposal number.# 2001-L210*

ii. Short proposal title.# Fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam - Balance of Phase II Funding With Requested Change of Scope (aka Tasks 1-7)*

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.# Project addresses needs of at-risk ("R") native species (Goal A) to maintain and enhance fish populations in the Sacramento River, by developing and evaluating measures to improve fish passage at Red Bluff Diversion Dam and enhance the reliability of TCCA's water supply during spring and fall. Contributes to the ERP targets of improving fish passage for salmonids along the Sacramento River, minimizing survival problems for adult and juvenile anadromous fish at RBDD by permanently raising the gates during the non-irrigation season and improving passage facilities during the irrigation season.*

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 A-1 - recovery of "R" at-risk species. Contribution to goals was described under 1a2. *

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 fish screen was 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.# 12-continue high priority actions to reduce direct mortality to fishes, including screening diversions on the Sacramento River). This project is linked to implementation plan action 5a-Agricultural Diversions Screening Program. This program is to consolidate and screen local agricultural diversions to reduce fisheries entrainment impacts.*

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 as contributing to Goal 1, to assist in recovery of at-risk species ("R"). This project is targeting green sturgeon, splittail, steelhead, winter-run, late fall-run, fall-run, and spring-run chinook salmon.*

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 to complete the remaining work of Phase II of the Fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam. This is a high priority, since resource agencies have been seeking a solution to the problem for twenty years and will now analyze three viable alternatives to achieve the solution.*

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 project would contribute greatly to natural production by remedying an upstream and downstream fish passage problem at Red Bluff Diversion Dam (RBDD). Specifically, these actions would benefit fall and late-fall chinook juveniles, and spring and winter-run chinook adults. More than 75 percent of naturally spawning chinook salmon spawn in the sixty mile reach of the Sacramento River above RBDD. Following this proposal, multiple steps would still need to occur (e.g., analysis, design, construction), therefore, the expected benefits are still several years into the future. The benefits would be perpetual.*

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.# Sacramento River Winter-run chinook salmon (federal and state listed endangered); Central Valley Spring-run chinook salmon (federal and state listed threatened); Steelhead (federally listed threatened); fall and late-fall run - candidates; sturgeon - species of concern. Multiple species benefits (e.g. improved upstream passage of shad and lamprey) may also occur.*

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 could protect and restore natural channel and riparian habitat values by increasing the channel velocity. The immediacy and duration of benefits would be immediate and long-term, respectively. In the current situation, the natural channel is highly modified into a 7 mile long lake, with associated lakeshores, 4 months of the year. The downstream side of the dam exhibits aggraded gravel that is another example of non-natural processes. *

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 diversion at Red Bluff Diversion Dam provides water to the Tehama-Colusa and Corning canals. The Corning Canal is a locally operated water delivery system. This project would directly contribute to efforts to modify CVP operations since the Tehama-Colusa Canal is part of the Central Valley Project.*

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 project would contribute to the implementation of supporting measure 3406(b)(10) to minimize fish passage problems at Red Bluff Diversion Dam. It also supportive of AFRP Upper Sacramento River High Priority Evaluation 3 identify solutions to passage at RBDD.*

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.# Since the fisheries impacts of the RBDD component of the CVP have not yet been fully mitigated, this project is clearly an opportunity to improve the CVP (refer to CVPIA 3406(b)(10) minimize fish passage problems at Red Bluff Diversion Dam and AFRP Upper Sacramento River High Priority Evaluation 3 identify solutions to passage at RBDD.) . Lowering the RBDD gates into the Sacramento River causes the elevation of the water surface behind the dam to raise and allows gravity diversion into the Tehama-Colusa and Corning Canals for delivery to irrigation districts. In this situation, RBDD presents a barrier for both downstream-and upstream-migrating fish during the months of May - September. The current situation could be improved by decreasing adult migration time (e.g., spring and winter-run chinook adults, shad, lamprey and sturgeon) and decreasing disorientation/possible predation (e.g. fall and late-fall chinook juveniles). Correcting fish passage problems at the RBDD would allow maximum utilization of available spawning and rearing habitat in the upper watershed (the sixty miles between RBDD and Keswick Dam). The magnitude of the benefits for adult salmonids would be moderate; the magnitude of benefits for adult sturgeon would be high.*

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. #Resources agencies have been seeking solutions to fish passage problems at RBDD for 20 years and are linked to CALFED actions, Federal biological opinions, testing and evaluation projects, CVPIA, and the Draft Winter-run Salmon Recovery Plan. This project coordinates with the Red Bluff Fish Passage Management Group 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. #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. #99B07 - Fish Passage Improvement Project at RBDD, 98B22 - Fish Passage Improvement Project at RBDD, Phase I*

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): #Phase I prescoping report completed. Work in progress on tasks 1-3 of Phase II, with partial funding for tasks 4-7. Work ongoing. Source: Contract documents, Project tracking table*

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. #99B07*

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.
Proposed work completes the work on Phase II, which was only partially funded, in order to include more site-specific investigations, and fully complete environmental documentation, permitting, and finalize the Implementation Plan. Source: Contract documents, CALFED tracking table*

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 outstanding issue is the choice among the three feasible alternatives identified in the

Prescoping Report. The stakeholder advisory group, the Red Bluff Fish Passage Study Management Group, and the Consultant Team (Figure 8) will be working together to form a team that will be able to work with the public and local government to identify the best solution for this fish passage problem. Several workshops have been held to develop an implementable solution. Stakeholder meetings will also be held to achieve the goal of a consensus based decision. The third party impacts to agricultural interests should be much improved over the current water delivery situation. Because the project will provide a more reliable water supply for agricultural, the project will benefit agricultural water users in Tehama, Glenn, Colusa, and Yolo counties who receive their water from the TCCA and from districts served by the TCCA.

In relation to the interface between this project and the Sacramento River Discovery Center, students will benefit from direct involvement in learning to understand watershed function, and participate in watershed restoration efforts that benefit natural process (see proposal I201).*

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 applicant in-kind services; and consultants' overhead included as lump-sum amount in service contracts. This proposal correctly assumes that the amendment on CALFED project 99-B07 was approved. Need to review terms of the amendment as an additional \$90,000 was approved that may not be factored into this proposal.*

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:# \$139,000 proposed*

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

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.#

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

6a - 6c3.# unknown*