

Geographic Review Panel 1 – Bay Delta

Proposal number: 2001-L202 **Short Proposal Title:** Suisun Marsh Fish Screen Program.

1. Applicability to CALFED ERP Goals and Implementation Plan and CVPIA priorities, and relevance to ERP and CVPIA priorities for your region. This proposal is specifically applicable to the Delta, and supports ERP goals 1 and 3. The study will be centered in Suisun Marsh and the results will be applicable to the Marsh. Preventing the diversion of listed and special status aquatic species onto unscreened seasonal wetlands supports ERP Goal 1, and maintenance of species that utilize the Marsh during a portion or all of their life cycle supports ERP Goal 3. The installation of the fish screens in the Marsh supports the CVPIA Revised Draft Restoration Plan for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Supplemental Action Not Requiring Water 15 (high priority) and Delta action Evaluation Number 12 (medium priority).

2. Linkages/coordination with previously funded projects or other restoration activities in your region. This project could reduce a potential source of mortality associated with diversions, protecting the fish produced by restoration projects up river or in other locations.

3. Feasibility, especially the project's ability to move forward in a timely and successful manner. Installation of fish screens is feasible. Permission for access may be difficult. Lack of monitoring is a concern.

4. Qualifications of the applicants and others involved in implementing the proposed project. Panel concurs with TARP.

5. Local involvement (including environmental compliance). Since it will be a cooperative effort with willing landowners, no opposition is identified.

6. Cost. The costs appear reasonable for the installation of a fish screen. However, there is no information on the level of diversion losses; in the absence of such information, it is not possible to determine whether the costs is justified.

7. Cost sharing. In-kind and matching funds of \$926,000.

8. Additional comments.

Regional Ranking

Panel Ranking: Medium

Provide a brief explanation of your ranking: The TARP ranked this proposal as “poor”. This panel feels this is a regionally significant project with good cost sharing. Panel notes that monitoring has not been addressed and is an important element of CALFED goals.