

.
i. Proposal number.#2001-L211*

ii. Short proposal title.# Sutter Mutual Water Company Positive Barrier Fish Screen 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.# Project addresses needs of at-risk ("R") native species (Goal A) to maintain and enhance fish populations in the Sacramento River, by screening one of the largest remaining unscreened diversions on the Sacramento River. Contributes to the ERP target 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 A-1 - recovery of "R" at-risk species. Will screen a 1000 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, 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.# 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). 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 screen the Tisdale Pumping Plant, one of the last large water diversions (1000 cfs) that is not screened along the Sacramento River and has been targeted for screening by NMFS, USFWS, and DFG.*

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 provide immediate and long-term benefit to all upper Sacramento River anadromous fish, including winter, fall, late-fall and spring-run salmon, and steelhead. Also benefiting would be green and white sturgeon, striped bass, and shad. This diversion is the largest remaining unscreened diversion on the upper Sacramento River.

Installation

of this fish screen will eliminate juvenile entrainment, which is generally assumed to be roughly proportional to flow. This structure is an incremental component of the whole fix of the upper mainstem Sacramento River system as included under AFRP Sacramento River Action 6.*

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.# Special status species potentially impacted at this site include the listed spring (federal/state threatened) and winter (federal/state endangered) run salmon, steelhead (federal threatened), and splittail (federal threatened). Also potentially impacted are the federal candidate species fall and late-fall salmon, and the green sturgeon, a state species of concern*

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.# Project has no impact on natural process 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).# 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 fish screen project directly implements an AFSP action, and is considered a high priority by the California Department of Fish and Game and other AFSP participating agencies..*

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. # Proposal would complete design and engineering, environmental permitting and construction of a positive barrier fish screen at the Sutter Mutual Tisdale pumping plant. The pumping plant is located on the Sacramento River downstream of the Tisdale Bypass at River Mile 118.5, and has a maximum diversion capacity of approximately 1000 cfs. All upper Sacramento River anadromous fish are potentially impacted at this site including the state and/or federally listed spring and winter run salmon, and steelhead. Also potentially impacted are the federally listed splittail, and other CVPIA target species including green and white sturgeon, striped bass and shad. This site has been identified as a high priority by the California Department of Fish and Game based upon the location and volume, and would be appropriate for consideration for funding by the CVPIA Anadromous Fish Screen Program. Project is priority for fish screens in the upper Sacramento River and is also supported by the National Marine Fisheries Service, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. A separately funded initial feasibility and options analysis has not yet been completed.*

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. #This project has been discussed and coordinated with USFWS and USBR under CVPIA Anadromous Fish Screen Program and will help achieve recovery of at-risk native fish species on the Sacramento River. 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. #CVPIA*

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.#Applicant had requested, but as of date of this application had not received funding for a feasibility study under CVPIA 3406(b)(21)*

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):#Applicant, as of date of this proposal, had not yet received funding for the first phase feasibility analysis, so no judgement can be made regarding progress to date.*

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.#Applicant had requested, but as of date of this application had not received funding for a feasibility study under CVPIA 3406(b)(21)*

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.#no*

3e3. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers, including source of information (proposal or other source):#Applicant had requested, but as of date of this application had not received funding for a feasibility study under CVPIA 3406(b)(21). Completion of the feasibility analysis is essential to any future design and construction of the proposed fish screen*

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.# Project has not yet been closely coordinated with local groups, although applicant proposes to develop this coordination in future phases of the project. There do not appear to be any significant local issues that would impact implementation of this project, although applicant should coordinate with the recently created Sacramento River Conservation Area*

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.# Project cost data

provided in lump-sum format by phases, II through IV, with no further breakdown by tasks or year. Phased costs estimated in 2000 dollars. Phase I is under consideration for funding by CVPIA AFSP.*

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.#state*

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:# \$0*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# \$0%*

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

6a - 6c3.# Phase I is under consideration for CVPIA AFSP funding in the amount of \$250,000. Applicant indicates they are seeking state matching cost share, but based upon the budget for Phases II-IV, the \$15,100,000 represents more than a 50 % match against CVPIA AFSP.*