

i. Proposal number.# 2001-L212*

ii. Short proposal title.# SEWD and CCWD Fish Screen Facilities - Calaveras River*

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 Calaveras River, by developing a plan and completing preliminary design for consolidation and screening of diversions in the Calaveras River between Bellota and New Hogan Dam. This will prevent the entrainment of juvenile chinook salmon and assist in the effort to improve fish passage in the river. Contributes to the ERP target of screening flows on the Calaveras 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, addressing a programmatic action "to develop a cooperative program to install fish passage facilities [and state-of-the-art fish screens]at Bellota Weir" (CALFED ERPP, Volume II, Feb 1999). No quantification provided for amount of flow to be screened. *

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, the consolidation/screening study 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 San Joaquin River and tributary streams). 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 and improved fish passage as contributing to Goal 1, to assist in recovery of at-risk species ("R"). This project is targeting East side Delta tributaries fall-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 proposal addresses ERP goals, targets, and programmatic actions for the Calaveras River by developing a feasibility study and preliminary design for facilities to target unscreened water diversions and fish passage barriers in the Calaveras River between Bellota and New Hogan Dam.*

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).# Anadromous fish species potentially benefiting from this project include: fall- and possibly late-fall run chinook salmon and Central Valley steelhead trout. The magnitude of the project's contribution to natural production of these species is potentially high (relative to existing production in the Calaveras) because it could lead to reduced entrainment losses at SEWD's 75-cfs diversion at Bellota and at some two dozen presently unscreened diversions upstream (between New Hogan and Bellota). This reduction in mortality would be immediate and of long term duration. This project would help implement a medium priority action (Action 4) in the 1997 Revised Draft Restoration Plan for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program (AFRP) and thus further efforts to achieve the AFRP natural production target of 2,200 adult chinook/year.*

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 anadromous species potentially benefiting from the project would be limited to Central Valley steelhead trout (threatened). Central Valley fall- and late fall run chinook salmon, which are candidates for federal listing, would also benefit. The project would lead to an immediate, long term reduction in entrainment losses of juvenile chinook salmon and steelhead as well as resident species.*

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.# Large screening projects generally do not protect or restore natural channel or riparian habitat values because they are fixed, high capital investment structures that must be protected. As such, they may actually impede or prevent natural channel processes, especially if located in a geomorphologically active reach.*

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).# New Hogan Dam is not a CVP facility; the proposed project would probably not contribute to modification of CVP operations on the Stanislaus River.*

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 would qualify for funding under the Anadromous Fish Screen Program.*

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.# The Calaveras River supports a small (but unquantified) chinook salmon run and has been designated as critical habitat for Central Valley steelhead trout by the National Marine Fisheries Service. Screening all diversions in the Calaveras River to protect all life history stages of anadromous fish is identified as a medium priority action (Action 4) in the Revised Draft Restoration Plan for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program. This project would be appropriate for funding under CVPIA Section 3406(b)(21), the Anadromous Screen Program.*

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.#Project is directly related to ERP goals, targets and actions for the Calaveras River and is compatible with CVPIA and

CDFG Salmon, Steelhead Trout and Anadromous Fisheries Program Act. 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.# 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.# No apparent opposition or third party impacts.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# The applicant describes that compliance with CEQA and NEPA will occur, however on the environmental compliance check list page the proponent has “none required” checked for local, State, and Federal permits and conditions.

The applicant will need to obtain a county use permit, a Streambed Alteration Agreement, CWA 401 certification, Reclamation Board approval, and CWA 404 permit, and consultation with the federal resource agencies.*

4e. Specifically highlight and comment on any regulatory issues listed above that may prevent the project from meeting the projected timeline.# These permit requirements should not interfere with the applicant’s ability to meet the proposed deadlines.*

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.# Overhead included in

lump-sum consulting service contract amounts by task. Applicant in-kind contributions are described as a lump-sum amount.*

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:# \$10,000 proposed*

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

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# approx. 1.47% or $10,000/680,000=.014705882^*$

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

6a - 6c3.# Applicant proposes

contributing \$10,000 of in-kind services to project.*