

i. Proposal number.# 2001-L214.*

ii. Short proposal title.# Mokelumne River Water Diversion Screening Feasibility Study.*

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 and B***

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.# Proposal stated that feasibility study addresses need to protect at-risk species ("R") by prioritizing screening needs in the Mokelumne River to decrease entrainment of chinook salmon and steelhead trout, and will develop an approach to evaluate the ability to simulate natural flow regimes and understand channel dynamics and their effects on habitat restoration for at-risk species. No physical action, but establishes a basis to contribute to ERP targets.*

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 and addresses Goal B-objective 1 to rehabilitate natural processes in the Mokelumne River. 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, screening along the Mokelumne River is not called out specifically. This project addresses the need to explore alternative screening methods (structural and nonstructural) for diversions on the Mokelumne River and how they affect channel morphology. *

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 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"); this project targets chinook salmon and steelhead.*

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.#

In developing fish screen alternatives, proponents will include hydrologic modeling to help develop a better understanding of channel dynamics and the potential changes which could result from a variety of fish screens at given locations.*

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 is a study to determine the best locations and screening methods to screen diversions along the Mokelumne River. They were responsive to the need to study both structural and nonstructural alternatives and are modeling screen effects on hydrology in order to decrease entrainment of at-risk species and rehabilitate habitat processes in the river.*

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).#

The natural production of steelhead and San Joaquin River fall-run chinook salmon spawned in the Mokelumne River upstream from the points of diversion that are being considered for fish protection will benefit due to the removal of a potential source of mortality associated with diversion out of their migration channel. This proposal will evaluate structural and non-structural alternatives to installing fish protective screens at one in-stream and two channel diversions on the Mokelumne River near Lockeford. A hydrologic model will be developed to evaluate the alternatives and to assess the impacts and uncertainties of installing the fish screens. The expected magnitude of the contribution to natural production is undetermined but should reduce diversion-related mortality. The certainty of the expected benefits is high, as long as the fish protective devices are operated as per the operational criteria. The immediacy of the expected contribution is indeterminate because the proposal does not identify a timeline for the work. The duration of the expected contribution should be long-term, as long as the fish protective facilities are operated as per the operational criteria.*

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.#

Steelhead (threatened) and San Joaquin River fall-run chinook (candidate for listing) would benefit from the eventual implementation of the fish protective measure(s) recommended in this proposal.*

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 project neither protects nor restores natural channel 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).# No evidence is presented to indicate that this project would contribute to efforts to 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 would contribute to implementation of the Anadromous Fish Screen Program if the alternative for preventing the diversion of fish at three sites on the Mokelumne River selected is a fish protective screen.*

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 project is appropriate for funding support from the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program and the Anadromous Fish Screen Program. This proposal will evaluate structural and non-structural alternatives to installing fish protective screens at one in-stream and two channel diversions on the Mokelumne River near Lockeford. A hydrologic model will be developed to evaluate the alternatives and to assess the impacts and uncertainties of installing the fish screens. This is consistent with Mokelumne River Action No.5 (Screen all diversions to protect all life history stages of anadromous fish.) In the Revised Draft Restoration Plan for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, May 30, 1997; this is considered a medium priority in the draft plan. The strength of the proposal is that thorough evaluations of alternatives for three fish screen installations will be made. The weakness of the proposal is that the ultimate implementation of the recommended actions, and the subsequent evaluation of the effectiveness of these actions, will have to be funded and carried out under a separate proposal; there is no guarantee if/when funding of the work in the subsequent phases will be secured.*

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. Benefits from the feasibility study will be information on CALFED priority species and habitats, screen diversion options and complements Lower Mokelumne River Project Joint Settlement Agreement. 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.# The San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District submitted a letter of support of the project. The letter indicated the project is consistent with the RCD's efforts to ensure survivability of Mokelumne River anadromous fish and endorses the project for its support of the CALFED Vision for the Mokelumne River. The proposal indicates the Mokelumne River Technical Advisory Committee and relevant landowners have also endorsed the project, but those endorsements are not included in the attachments to the proposal.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# It is not clear in the proposed scope of work section number 5 as to how the applicant will conduct these evaluations. If they are done on paper, then no permits are required. However, if the applicant wants to conduct in channel work, then the following permits will be required: Incidental Take Permit, Streambed Alteration Agreement, CESA, CEQA, CWA 401, CWA 404, NEPA, and ESA will need to be evaluated.*

4e. Specifically highlight and comment on any regulatory issues listed above that may prevent the project from meeting the projected timeline.# No Comment*

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.# A yearly budget was not provided nor an anticipated timeline for completing the project. Not all costs are associated with the 8 identified tasks and the Conference with Natural Resource Agencies is not specifically identified in the narrative. All displayed costs are described as direct - no overhead specifically detailed. Project management is not shown as a separate cost.*

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.# no*

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:# \$0 Proposed*

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.# none*