

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

Proposal Number: 116

Applicant Organization: Reclamation District 108

Proposal Title: Reclamation District No. 108 Consolidated Pumping Facility and Fish Screen

Recommendation: Fund As Is

Amount: \$630,000

Conditions, if any, of approval (if there are no conditions, please put "None"): None

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

The applicant's original proposal requested \$7,200,000 to design and construct a diversion consolidation and screening project. While the Selection Panel and technical reviewers supported implementation of the project, concerns were expressed about the overall cost displayed in the original proposal. The Selection Panel recommended that the applicant work with the Anadromous Fish Screen Program to establish a reasonable cost for an appropriately designed facility, and that an independent value engineering analysis be conducted. The applicant responded by revising the budget and reducing the request to those costs associated with developing a final design, such that reviewers will have the opportunity to review and approve the final design prior to approving additional requests for funding. The proposal also includes a commitment to working closely with the Anadromous Fish Screen Program (the source of Federal funds for the project) and to a value engineering analyses. The Selection Panel finds that the applicant responded appropriately to the panels previous recommendations and recommends funding in the amount requested. The panel also recommends that the Ecosystem Restoration Program continue to work with the Anadromous Fish Screen Program to ensure that the final design and costs are appropriate and reasonable.

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review

CALFED Bay-Delta ERP

Proposal Number: 116

Applicant Organization: Reclamation District 108

Proposal Title: Reclamation district No. 108 Consolidated Pumping Facility and Fish Screen

Review

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating: Superior

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating

This project is considered to be very desirable, but the total cost of the project is very high. Funds requested for the first year are, however, reasonable for the work proposed. The review panel recommends full funding for the first year request with a recommendation of up to the total amount of \$7,055,000 requested over the next two years through annual contracts that are developed and evaluated against independent cost estimates conducted through the Bureau of Reclamation and AFSP Technical Team. Costs for subsequent years' contracts would be negotiated and evaluated against Bureau of Reclamation and AFSP Technical Team cost estimates to establish reasonable costs for the proposed design, thus ensuring a quality product at a fair price.

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 lies on the primary migration route for the endangered winter-run Chinook salmon. Additionally, spring-run Chinook (threatened), central valley steelhead trout (threatened), and fall/late fall-run Chinook salmon populations migrate through the area affected by the project. These species are not in their most vulnerable life stages (egg and larval stages) in the vicinity of the project, but fry-sized salmonids are present, and the screen should be designed with that consideration. Benefits of the project will be LONG TERM; after consolidation, the existing facilities will be demolished. With the consolidated diversion, the total diversion capacity can be 117 less than the total diversion capacity of the three existing diversions.

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 maximum diversion rate of the proposed consolidated facility could be as much as 5-10% of the river flow, which is considered significant.

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 uses proven, existing technology. Several diversions of similar size and larger have been constructed successfully in recent years with designs similar to that proposed for the consolidated facility. Contractors for this project have not been chosen at this time, although there are several qualified contractors available to perform the work. Any foreseeable adverse impacts can most likely be mitigated satisfactorily. The project is compatible with NMFS's goal to prevent take of listed species by screening water diversions. Applicant participation is voluntary.

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

The project is pricey. Total project cost is \$54,000 per cfs, twice the cost (on a per cfs basis) than another consolidation/screening project completed within the past few years. Benefits are high. These are some of the last large diversions on the Sacramento River and must be screened to achieve maximum benefit of the other large screening projects already completed.

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 involves appropriate partners. The applicant is a willing participant. Funding partners involved include USBR for \$1,345,000 awarded in September 2002, and \$190,000 from DFG in 2001. RD108 will meet administrative costs during design and construction and long term operations and maintenance.

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 regional review panel ranked the proposal as HIGH. It noted the importance of screening these diversion, although they thought the price was very 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?

Neither administrative review had concerns with the project.

Miscellaneous comments:

The Technical Review panel recommends authorization of up to the full amount for the first year funds, and up to the full amount for subsequent years contingent on detailed budget approval by AFSP.

* * *

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

Proposal number: 116

Proposal title: *Reclamation District No. 108 Consolidated Pumping Facility and Fish Screen*

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

No

A detailed budget was provided for the first year funding request (Table 1). Subsequent year budget requests are, however, far more general. A more detailed cost breakdown within many of the cost items would have been desirable for the year 2 and 3 requests.

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

No

Sufficient details for Tasks 1, 2, and 3 are included for the first year costs (Table 1). Subsequent year budget requests for each task are, however, far more general. A more detailed cost breakdown within many of the tasks would have been desirable for the year 2 and 3 requests.

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

No

The proposal indicates in the first year budget (Table 1) that rates include overhead and expenses, but does not elaborate further. Subsequent budget year needs do not address specific indirect/overhead costs.

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

No

In first year budget request (Table 1), yes. In subsequent year budget requests, no

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

No

The applicant is requesting \$640,000 of the total of \$7,055,000 cost-share requested. This reflects the applicant removing any requested construction funds until resource/regulatory agencies approval of the final design.

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

Yes

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

Yes

The proposal does not clearly indicate the status, and cost, of required easements and/or land acquisitions. RD108 indicates that landowners have expressed willingness to work with the District. RD108 has not, however, entered into negotiations with willing landowners at this time.

* * *

Ecosystem Restoration Program –Directed Action: Land Acquisition

116DA

RD 108

Reclamation District No. 108 Consolidated Pumping Facility and Fish Screen

1. Is the site's ecological importance documented in the proposal? If yes, please import relevant text and citations here

Yes.

“This fish screen project will help achieve recovery of at-risk native fish species as a step toward establishing large, self-sustaining populations of these species. This project will directly help contribute to the resolution of the conflict between protecting endangered species and providing reliable supplies of water for agriculture. This project will help achieve the recovery of the following at-risk fish species: all runs of chinook salmon, steelhead trout, and Sacramento splittail.... Construction of the consolidated pumping facility and fish screen meeting federal and state agencies’ design criteria will protect fish species by eliminating the entrainment of juvenile fish into the pump intakes during their migration and protecting the fish from predators in the area of the diversion and screen facilities.”

2. Is the owner's willingness to sell the site documented in the proposal? If no, please explain:

No. According to the proposal, “RD 108 has spoken to the landowners potentially involved and they have indicated their willingness to work with RD 108. However, the precise amount of land and its location will not be known until Task 1—Design Development and Modeling is completed. RD 108 has spoken to the landowners potentially involved and they have indicated their willingness to work with RD 108. However, the precise amount of land and its location will not be known until Task 1—Design Development and Modeling is completed.” RD 108 will then enter negotiations with affected landowners, at which time the proposal says it will “address” the CALFED criteria of working with willing landowners. The proposal does not include an explicit pledge to avoid condemnation of land for the project.

3. Is evidence of local government support for the purchase included in the proposal? If yes, please explain:

Although the proposal doesn't include evidence of local government support, a supportive letter was received from the Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum, which includes Colusa County where the project is located.

4. Is the use proposed for the site after its purchase clearly consistent with the site's general plan designation and zoning? If no, please explain:

The site is zoned for exclusive agriculture and is designated for General Agriculture in the county general plan. It seems reasonable to conclude irrigation diversion facilities are consistent with these designations.

5. Is the land mapped as prime farmland, farmland of statewide significance, unique farmland, or farmland of local importance? If yes, please explain the classification:

Yes, the site is "Irrigated Farmland".

- Is the site under a Williamson Act contract? Yes
- Will use of the site change from agriculture after its purchase?

About 50 acres of land will be converted from cropland to use for a pumping plant and irrigation conveyance and delivery facilities.

- 6 Is this a time-sensitive acquisition opportunity, according to the proposal? If yes, please import relevant text here:

No information about time sensitivity is included in the proposal.

Other Comments:

* * *