

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP Directed Actions -- Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 59DA

Applicant Organization: Ducks Unlimited, Inc.

Proposal Title: White Mallard Dam and Associated Diversions – Phase III Construction

Recommendation: Fund In Part

Amount: \$753,415

Conditions: Funding should only be for those costs associated with constructing the White Mallard Dam upgrade (task 3.1, total cost of \$669,269), including appropriate levels of funding for project management (task 1.0, total cost of \$72,904 for managing 5 construction tasks, only one of which is recommended for funding) and bidders package (task 2.0, total cost of \$11,242 for bidding 5 construction tasks, only one of which is recommended for funding). Total cost is expected to be less than \$753,415.

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

The proposed project would improve passage and screen diversions on Butte Creek, and is part of a regionally significant, large-scale restoration effort. Based on review of the original proposal, the Selection Panel highlighted three issues: (1) the Sacramento Regional Review Panel felt that the project was not ready for construction, save for task 3.1 - the upgrade to White Mallard Dam; (2) the regional panel also recommended that funding for task 3.1 should be conditioned upon completion of two management agreements and environmental review; and (3) the fish screen and ladder construction panel was concerned about a potential change of point of diversion that was not presented in the original proposal. The applicants responded adequately to the second and third issues, but did not adequately address the first. The Selection Panel recommends that only those costs associated with constructing the White Mallard Dam upgrade be funded at this time.

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review

CALFED Bay-Delta ERP

Proposal Number: 59DA

Applicant Organization: Ducks Unlimited, Inc.

Proposal Title: White Mallard Dam and Associated Diversions - Phase III Construction

Review

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating: *Above Average.*

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating

The project is an integral part of an ongoing system wide restoration project in the Butte Creek Watershed. The costs for this project are reasonable when compared to other projects of similar type and size. However, the proposal is lacking details about the amount of water that is going to be screened. Given this information, could have been rated higher if the proposal demonstrated that the diversions were taking a greater proportion of Butte Creek's flow.

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 Butte Creek in the middle of the Butte Sink Basin between the towns of Colusa and Gridley where it will significantly benefit the fishery. The current fish ladder and unscreened diversions either impede or block migration or cause entrainment to large number of juvenile and adult fish. All species of salmonids that include spring-run, late-fall, fall run Chinook salmon; and steelhead trout are present in vulnerable stages of their life. The project will benefit other species fish that reside or migrate past the project location. Also, the waterway community and ecosystem will benefit by being provided quality water to surrounding wetlands and riparian corridors. The project will protect and restore natural habitat and habitat values. The benefits will be long term. Its biological effectiveness has been demonstrated through other similar projects in the Butte Creek Watershed and surrounding areas.

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?

Can't determine the volume of water to be screened by the five diversions, either individually or cumulatively. Collectively, the screening of five diversions in this area could be *taking* a significant proportion of the water.

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 part of an ongoing system wide project in the Butte Creek Watershed. The project uses the latest state-of-the-art fish screen and fish ladder technologies. The project is scheduled in a reasonable and timely manner. The list of consultants and subcontractors has been used in other similar fish screening projects and are qualified for this project. There doesn't appear to be any obstacles that would impede the project. Public support is being generated through an outreach program. Local support for the completion of these structures is high because of the perceived benefits to fish and increases in water management capabilities afforded the operators. This project will build on the successes of earlier fish passage projects in the Butte Creek Watershed and other efforts to restore salmonid populations. This project is an integral part of an overall ecosystem restoration program for the Butte Creek Watershed.

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

The budget of \$7,047,987 for fish ladder and fish screens appears to be reasonable when compared to other recently completed projects of similar size.

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

The project is in the next phase of an ongoing system wide restoration program for the Butte Creek Watershed. The project fully involves appropriate partners and the applicants are willing participants. Other cost sharing has been exploited.

6. Regional Review. How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Did the regional panel(s) identify significant benefits (regional priorities, linkages with other activities, local involvement) or impediments (local constraints, conflicts with other activities, lack of local involvement) to this proposal? What were they?

The panel ranked the proposal “high” with conditions. Funding should be conditioned upon 1) completion of the management agreement for Sanborn Slough, 2) completion of a draft management agreement for flow management through the Butte Sink, 3) completion of the draft environmental review (CEQA/NEPA), 4) conditioned upon a post construction ongoing management agreement that commits the landowner operator to maintain and operate the structures to the original design standards approved by NMFS and CDFG. The project is an integral part of the overall ecosystem restoration program for the mainstem Sacramento River. The project specifically addresses restoration targets contained in the various restoration plans 1) CDFG Central Valley Action Plan, 2

The Directed Action proposal resubmittal indicates that the Sanborn Slough and Butte Sink Management Agreements are currently in negotiations, the CEQA/NEPA documents have been completed and submitted for public review, and permit applications and Section 7 consultations were initiated in September 2002. The Sanborn Slough and Butte Sink Management Agreements are scheduled for completion by April 1, 2004. The completion date of these agreements is prior to initiation of any construction.

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 significant concerns about proposals regarding prior performance, environmental compliance or budget are noted.

Miscellaneous comments:

The technical review panel recommends overall full project funding. Within the recommendation of funding up to the amount requested over the three year period, the technical review panel specifically recommends full funding for the first year request with subsequent year funding agreements negotiated and evaluated against independent cost estimates developed by Reclamation and the AFSP Technical Team. This type of approach will help establish fair and reasonable costs for the project overall.

* * *

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

Proposal number: 59DA

Proposal title: White Mallard Dam and Associated Diversions – Phase III Construction

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

Yes

However, the breakdown of construction costs still indicate large lump sums. A more detailed cost breakdown within many of the construction cost items would have been desirable.

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

Yes

However, See comment above. A more detailed cost breakdown within the construction tasks would have been desirable.

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

No

The proposal does not address specific indirect/overhead costs, just the totals for each task.

Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

Yes

Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary?

Yes

Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

No

Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

No

There appears to be no need for easements and/or land acquisition costs. The project is well coordinated and supported by local landowners. No other known budget issues.

* * *