

i. Proposal number.#2001-L215*

ii. Short proposal title.# Fish Screen and Intake Improvements to CNFH on Battle Creek*

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.# Proposed hatchery intake improvements and screening of Coleman Powerhouse are designed to prevent entrainment of juvenile chinook salmon and steelhead into hatchery facilities and assist in the effort to improve fish passage and restore native salmonids to 42 miles of Battle Creek above the hatchery. Contributes to the ERP target of screening flows on Battle Creek.*

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. If all eight actions identified to restore Battle Creek are implemented, predicted increases in populations of chinook salmon and steelhead are: winter-run salmon-2500, spring-run salmon-2500, fall-run salmon-4500, late fall-run salmon-4500, steelhead-5700*

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 screen and intake improvements 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.# 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 actions 5g-Coleman Hatchery Weir at Battle Creek for improved fish passage, and 17A-Butte Creek restoration to improve ecosystem health. Project will contribute to success of 17A by reducing entrainment and increasing the potential fish passage into Battle Creek.*

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"), targeting winter-run salmon, spring-run salmon, fall-run salmon, late fall-run 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.#

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 over all restoration of Battle Creek by implementing a fish screen and intake improvement project at Coleman National Fish Hatchery, contributing to ERP target to screen flows on Battle Creek to facilitate improved fish passage.*

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 species benefited include fall, late-fall, winter and spring-run salmon and steelhead.

Production estimates are as follows (1) winter run salmon 2,500 adults, (2) spring run salmon 2500 adults, (3) fall run natural production 4500 adults, (4) late fall run salmon 4500 adults, and (5) steelhead 5700 adults. All production estimates are based upon gravel surveys and professional opinion. Production increases are long-term and dependent upon other Battle Creek restoration components being completed. These include removal or modification to 8 dams and implementation of instream flows. Magnitude of benefits directly generated by project are not and may not be easily defined and are a factor of percent of flow, time of diversion, time of juvenile migration relative to diversion timing etc. The project supports AFRP Revised Restoration Plan action 8 for Battle Creek to screen Coleman National Fish Hatchery intakes for the protection of naturally produced anadromous fish.*

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 benefited are (1) winter run chinook salmon (state and federally endangered), (2) spring run salmon (state and federal threatened), (3) fall and late-fall run chinook salmon (federal candidate species), (4) steelhead (federal threatened)*

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 may restore some natural channel and riparian habitat values through the possible removal of some existing hatchery intake structures. It may also reduce those values over a short-term construction period.*

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).# The project could be considered a modification of CVP operations since Coleman Hatchery is a CVP facility. The hatchery is the primary mitigation for operations of Shasta Dam which blocked approximately 1/2 the historic spawning areas for anadromous fish.*

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.# Project may contribute to supporting measures 3406(b)(1)(B) through modifying a CVP operation, 3406(b)(11) through implementation of Coleman National Fish Hatchery Development Plan, and 3406(b)(21) through screening of the hatchery intakes. Project is specifically related to the AFSP*

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.# Project will fund final technical and environmental analysis of CNFH intake fish screen project, and will also provide funds for final design and construction. Project proposes to consolidate three intakes and increase diversion capacity at intake 1, from 89 cfs to 156 cfs. Seven fish screen options are still under evaluation. Several interim structures have been funded and which include installation of submerged retrievable screen (USBR Screen) at intake 3. Interim fixes, including USBR Screen were ineffective, but project proponent fails to discuss reasons. Additionally, the project proponent states that the diversion system should be designed to fully utilize the hatcheries existing water rights, or expanded rights as deemed necessary. Final fish screen options and water rights should be defined. The project supports AFRP Revised Restoration Plan action 8 for Battle Creek to screen Coleman National Fish Hatchery intakes for the protection of naturally produced anadromous fish. Appropriate for funding under AFSP.*

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.#Proposal directly supports CVPIA's Anadromous Fish Restoration Program and the California Salmon, Steelhead Trout and Anadromous Fish Program Act. Proposal complements funded Battle Creek restoration activities by CALFED 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.#CVPIA-AFRP: 99LB1, 98LC1a,98LC1b - Coleman Hatchery Intakes Alternatives Study
CALFED - 98B08 - Upstream Ladder and Barrier Weir at CNFH in Battle Creek*

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.#No*

3b2. If the answer is no, identify the inaccuracies:#Applicant did not discuss results of interim actions including the USBR fish screen experiment.*

3c1. Has the progress to date been satisfactory? Type yes or no.#No*

3c2. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answer, including source of information (proposal or other source):#Progress to date of interim fixes were not discussed in the proposal. CALFED project has just started. 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.#see 3a2 list*

3e1. Does the proposal contain a 2-page summary, as required on pages 57 and 58 of the PSP? Type yes or no.#no-mentioned an appendix in the proposal, but was not attached.*

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):#Proposal does not provide the summary.*

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.# Most issues are addressed in current process of technical and environmental analysis, however issue of source and right to additional flows may need significant review.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# No Comment*

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.# 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.# Yes, it is at 20%*

5d. Are project management costs clearly identified? Type yes or no.# No
mention of project management costs, only construction management costs*

**5e. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions
5a - 5d.#** Project management costs need to be clearly identified*

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:# In-kind services by the National Marine Fisheries Service is
estimated at 80,000 dollars*

6c2. Matching funds:# n/a*

**6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding
requested along with calculation.#** Phase II--USBR: 550,000 dollars; U.S. Fish
and Wildlife Service: 100,000 dollars; National Marine Fisheries Service
(in-kind): 80,000 dollars. Phase III--USBR: 550,000 dollars. Total:
1,280,000 dollars or 32% of total requested funding*

**6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions
6a - 6c.#** All information requested has been provided by project proponent
in a clear, concise, and understandable format*