

**CALFED Bay-Delta ERP Panel Review
Selection Panel Review Form**

Applicant Organization: Reclamation District No. 108
Proposal Title: Wilkens Slough Positive Barrier Fish Screen Sediment Removal Project

Please provide an overall recommendation.

Fund As Is

Conditions, if any (if there are no recommended improvements, please put "None"):

None

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

The Selection Panel recommends funding this project in full, as proposed.

This project is in an important location on the mainstem of the Sacramento River and provides needed fish protection for a major diversion on the river.

This project is a necessary modification to the fish screen to assure that it performs properly and meets its original design standards. The present screen is accumulating sediment that had not been forecasted. A subsequent sediment removal pilot study that included testing of a prototype sediment removal system was very successful. The Selection Panel concurs with the Anadromous Fish Screen Program Technical Team that the sediment removal system is needed, should operate as anticipated, and should be considered an integral feature of the fish screen.

The project should also provide a significant opportunity to validate and apply this fish screen and sediment removal technology to other diversions. The Selection Panel stressed the need to carry out and document the six-month performance testing program for the sediment removal system.

As with all ERP projects, compliance with NEPA/CEQA and obtaining any necessary permits needs to be assured before the project proceeds.

* * *

**CALFED Bay-Delta Program ERP
Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review**

Application Organization: Reclamation District 108

Proposal Title: Reclamation District 108 Wilkins Slough Positive Barrier Fish Screen-Sediment Removal Project

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Superior: Outstanding in all respects;

Above Average: Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;

Adequate: No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;

Not Recommended: Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
Superior X	This is a high priority project. Controlling sediment buildup at the RD108 Wilkins Slough Fish Screen Facility will allow the screen to comply with DFG and NOAA Fisheries design criteria during peak diversion rates
Above Average	
Adequate	
Not Recommended	

1. **Location in terms of potential impact on fishery.** Is the project located where it will significantly benefit the fishery? Do current fish passage barriers or water diversions there harm large numbers of fish? What species of anadromous fish are present? Is the project located where these species are in their most vulnerable life stages? Will it benefit other species of fish or the waterway's community and ecosystem? Does it restore and protect natural habitats or habitat values? Will its benefits be long term, or short lived? Is its biological effectiveness clearly demonstrable?

The project is located on the mainstem Sacramento River and is a large screened diversion on the River. A fully functioning screened facility will provide major benefits to fisheries by preventing entrainment mortality of several ESA-listed

species, such as winter-run/spring-run Chinook salmon and Central Valley steelhead.

2. **Diversions taking a greater proportion of flow.** If the project is a fish screen, is the size of the diversion to be screened a significant proportion of the waterway's discharge?

The RD108 Wilkins Slough Fish Screen Facility and Pumping Plant diverts approximately 830 cfs directly from the river. This amount of diverted water constitutes a major proportion of river flow.

3. **Implementability** (minimal legal, regulatory or technical obstacles): Does the project use proven and existing technology, or unproven and experimental technology? Can it be implemented in a timely fashion, or are protracted delays anticipated. Are project partners, including consultants and subcontractors, qualified? Will legal, regulatory, or technical obstacles impede it? Can any adverse effects be reversed or adequately mitigated? Does it enjoy public support? Is it compatible with other programs and projects, which are part of an integrated restoration program for the waterway? Does it have synergistic effects with ongoing programs?

The project is highly implementable using proven flat plate screen technology. The sediment removal technology proposed has been proven successful through the implementation of the pilot study conducted during the fall of 2000.

4. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

RD108 has provided sufficient cost estimate detail to show the proposed costs to be reasonable. This budget is reasonable for the work proposed.

5. **Partnership/Opportunities.** Does the project fully involve appropriate partners? Are the applicants willing participants? Are other cost-sharing funds available, and fully exploited?

The project involves a 50/50 CALFED partnership with the CVPIA Anadromous Fish Screen Program. RD108 will provide approximately \$50,000 in labor for administrative, legal tasks, and on-site construction management.

6. **Regional Review.** How did the regional panel rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)?

The regional panel ranked the proposal as High.

7. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

No identified problems.

Miscellaneous Comments:

None.

* * *

***CALFED Bay-Delta Directed Action
Administrative Review
Budget Evaluation***

Proposal title: Reclamation District 108 Wilkins Slough Positive Barrier Fish Screen-Sediment Removal Project

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support?

Yes

If no, please explain:

2. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified?

Yes

If no, please explain:

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

Yes

If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

Yes

If no, please explain:

5. Do the total funds requested equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary?

Yes

If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimburse by cost share funds included in budget summary).

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

Yes

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

No

If yes, please explain:

* * *