

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

**Applicant Organization: Sutter Mutual Water Company**

**Proposal Title: Sutter Mutual Water Company Tisdale Positive Barrier Fish Screen Pumping Plants**

**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:**

A “fund-as-is” rating is warranted, as this is a high-priority project that diverts up to 960cfs from the Sacramento River, adversely affecting threatened or endangered salmonids and other fish species by entraining them into the project pumps. This proposal received a superior technical rating, satisfactory budget evaluation, and has a 50% funding match from the USBR. Unfortunately, there was no evaluation of the potential quantitative benefit of this screening action; however, screening is warranted based on the size of the diversion and CALFED’s designation of this as a high priority project.

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:** Sutter Mutual Water Company

**Proposal Title:** Sutter Mutual Water Company – Tisdale Positive Barrier Fish Screen and Pumping Plant

**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.**

| <b>Overall Evaluation Summary Rating</b> | <b>Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating</b>                                                                                             |
|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Superior X                               | This is a high priority project. This project is ranked the highest priority unscreened diversion on the Sacramento River by the AFSP Technical Team. |
| 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 above Knights Landing, and is the largest unscreened diversion on the River. A fully 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 Tisdale Pumping Plant is the main Sutter Mutual Water Company diversion and diverts approximately 960 cfs directly from the river. This amount of diverted water constitutes a major proportion of river flow. In worst case scenarios, this diversion could remove as much as 20% 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.

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

The total project cost is about \$18 million, which equates to about \$13,500/cfs. This is a reasonable total cost, and cost per cfs for the project. This project has been through several successful cost control reviews through the AFSP

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. Sutter Mutual Water Company will provide approximately \$150,000 in labor for administrative, legal tasks, and land acquisition.

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

Was rated High in the 2002 PSP process. Regional panel had concerns about costs. These concerns have been addressed through coordination with the AFSP.

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:**

This project is of high priority to CDFG, NOAA Fisheries and the AFSP Technical Team. Cost issues have been addressed through coordination and review from the AFSP.

\* \* \*

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

Proposal title: Sutter Mutual Water Company Tisdale Positive Barrier Fish Screen Pumping Plants Project

Reviewer: Bill O'Leary

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:

\* \* \*