

**i. Proposal number.# 2001-L213\***

**ii. Short proposal title.# American Basin Fish Screen and Habitat Improvement \***

**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,C, 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 immediate needs of at-risk ("R") species and maintained harvested species (Goals A and C) by consolidating and screening facilities on one of the largest remaining unscreened diversions on the Sacramento River. Removal and consolidation of diversions from Natomas Cross Canal will help restore a natural flow regime (Goal B) and allow for restoration efforts to improve habitats along the rivers (Goal D). Contributes to ERP target to screen 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.#** As described in 1a2, this proposal potentially contributes to goals A-D and addresses several objectives:

- objective A-1 - recovery of "R" at-risk species,
- objective 2-1 - establish and maintain hydrologic and hydrodynamic regimes to support recovery,
- objectives 3-1 and 3-2 - to enhance fisheries for salmonids, white sturgeon, and native cyprinids and maintain fisheries for striped bass and American shad, and
- objective 4-1 - restore habitat types to support recovery of native species. No quantification provided.\*

**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 screens and habitat improvements proposed here are 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, improved fish passage, and habitat restoration as contributing to Goal 1, to assist in recovery of at-risk species ("R"). This proposal targets salmonids, sturgeon, and other native fishes, as well as nonnative anadromous species including striped bass and American shad.\*

**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 an important step in the overall restoration of the American Basin by implementing a consolidation of diversions and new fish screen to reduce entrainment of at-risk species and facilitate habitat improvements at the Natomas Cross Canal.\*

#### **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 is for final design and environmental documentation of fish screening facilities,

consolidation of diversion facilities and removal of migration barriers. While this proposal does not directly influence natural production of anadromous fish, should this project be constructed, benefits to natural production would be realized. This benefit would be realized in the form of increased access to rearing habitats along with reduced mortality because of consolidated diversions and improved diversion facilities. 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 (winter, spring, fall and late fall-run chinook) 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 you could extrapolate from the reduction in take of these species at the new facility and generally determine 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; Central Valley steelhead, federally listed as threatened, fall-run federal candidate species, spring-run state and federal listing of threatened and winter-run listed federally as endangered. Reduction of entrainment would also benefit Delta smelt, federally listed as threatened and Sacramento splittail and green sturgeon, 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, and delta fishes) benefit from the consolidation of multiple diversions and improved diversion facilities that meet state and federal screen criteria. The new facility will reduce mortality because the reduced screen openings minimize the opportunity of 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 removal of migration and access barriers will provide increased habitat for rearing also. The Revised Draft Restoration Plan for the AFRP lists fish screen projects on the mainstem of the Sacramento River as high and medium priority Actions (Action 6 and 9, respectively.). \*

**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 benefit natural channel and riparian habitat values by removing barriers that affected the habitat values of the small stream that they were located on. Opening up access to this habitat will likely restore some function to the stream. \*

**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 modify 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. The removal of access and migration barriers supports Central Valley-Wide Evaluation 11, a high priority evaluation, which promotes making small stream and tributaries more fish friendly. \*

**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 project contributes to the implementation of the Anadromous Fish Screen Program, b (21), by being a fish screen modification/construction. The removal of access and migration barriers supports Central Valley-Wide Evaluation 11, a high priority evaluation, which promotes making small stream and tributaries more fish friendly. \*

## **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 would screen one of the largest remaining unscreened diversions on the Sacramento River and represents a significant step toward the goal of screening all large diversions on the Sacramento River. Consistent with restoration efforts to remove migration barriers and is coordinated with the American River Basin cooperating agencies. 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.#both\***

**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.**#98B29&99FC-20-0165 - American Basin Fish Screen and Habitat Improvement Project\*

**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 feasibility study is on schedule and will be completed on schedule. Preliminary design and environmental documentation will be completed by the end of 2000, with input**

from the AFSP Technical Team. Source: Proposal\*

### **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.#98B29 and 99-FC-20-0165\***

**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. Ready for next phase\***

### **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.#** One outstanding issue is the complexity of water issues in the Sacramento area. The applicant has been coordinating with other entities for over 5 years and over that time various opportunities, proposals and changes in water management have changed such that it affected this proposal. This will continue to happen as this is a very complex water use area. The applicant will continue to communicate and coordinate with other entities on this project, but intends to move forward with final design of facilities to meet their present needs. Aside from that caveat, the applicant lists evidence of strong support for this action.\*

\*

### **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.#** Grant chart indicates

Phase III will take approximately 3 years, but proposal and cost data information assume 1 year for completion of Phase III. No overhead or project management costs shown for applicant; and consultants' overhead included as lump-sum amount in service contracts.\*

## **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:#** \$0 proposed\*

**6c2. Matching funds:#** \$950,000 CVPIA proposed\*

**6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.#** 50% or  $\$1,900,000 \times .5 = 950,000$ \*

**6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 6a - 6c3.#** none\*