

# **Proposal Reviews**

## **#12: Butte Creek Farms Fish Screen, Sacramento River Consolidation of Two Existing Pumps**

Butte Creek Farms

**Initial Selection Panel Review**

**Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review**

**Sacramento Regional Review**

**Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding**

**Environmental Compliance**

**Budget**

## Initial Selection Panel Review:

### CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

**Proposal Number:** 12

**Applicant Organization:** Butte Creek Farms

**Proposal Title:** Butte Creek Farms Fish Screen, Sacramento River Consolidation of Two Existing Pumps

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

#### Explanation of Recommendation Categories: Fund

- **As Is** (a proposal recommended for funding as proposed)
- **In Part** (a proposal for which partial funding is recommended for selected project phases or components)
- **With Conditions** (a proposal for which funds are recommended if the applicant contractually agrees to meet the specified conditions)

**Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan** (a proposal addressing a high priority action that requires some revision followed by additional review prior to being recommended for funding)

**Not Recommended** (a proposal not currently recommended for funding-after revision may be considered in the future)

#### Note on "Amount":

For proposals recommended as Fund As Is, Fund In Part or Fund With Conditions, the dollar amount is the amount recommended by the Selection Panel.

For proposals recommended as Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan, the dollar amount is the amount requested by the applicant(s).

| Fund                        |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| As Is                       | - |
| In Part                     | - |
| With Conditions             | - |
| Consider as Directed Action | - |
| Not Recommended             | X |

Amount:    **\$0**

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

**None**

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

**The proposal is to consolidate and screen two small diversions on the Sacramento River. Screening small diversions on large rivers was not identified as a priority in the PSP. The Selection Panel does not recommend funding this proposal.**

# Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review:

## CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review

**Proposal Number:** 12

**Applicant Organization:** Butte Creek Farms

**Proposal Title:** Butte Creek Farms Fish Screen, Sacramento River Consolidation of Two Existing Pumps

**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                         | Small diversion, perhaps not large enough to warrant funding. Cost sharing from landowner is a project benefit. Some questions regarding CEQA process. |
| -Above average                    |  |
| X 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?

**Many unscreened diversions in this part of river, including this project that could potentially harm large numbers of fish including spring and winter-run Chinook salmon, steelhead, and young-of-year. This project is a consolidation of 2 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?

**10 cfs diversion, not a significant proportion of the discharge.**

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?

**This technology has been used in 3 other diversions on the Sacramento river. No legal obstacles anticipated. Potential delays with permit processes. Potential adverse impacts to riparian area can be mitigated: appears to be a new location with trees/shrubs providing shade over the Sac. river (impacts to this area would need to be avoided/mitigated fully). Compatible with other restoration projects. No public involvement yet.**

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

**Seems reasonable and adequate.**

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

**Landowner cost-sharing 25%. No other partners/cost-sharing funds identified.**

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?

**Low. Project seems inappropriate at this time due to: previous failure at this site, small size of diversion, lack of participation by NRCS Small Screen Diversion Program, lack of technical input particularly the AFSP, inordinate cost of project management coordination.**

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?

**Last update in Calfed file is from February 2000. Compliance with NEPA required, not categorically exempt under CEQA, incidental take permit may be necessary. May require more funds than allotted to cover permit costs. No details given for tasks 4 & 6 in Budget Justification.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

**Good location for fishery benefits. Like consolidation of 2 pumps. Small diversion, though. Previous failure at this site should not immediately warrant discounting due to improvements to technology.**

## **Sacramento Regional Review:**

**Proposal Number:** 12

**Applicant Organization:** Butte Creek Farms

**Proposal Title:** Butte Creek Farms Fish Screen, Sacramento River Consolidation of Two Existing Pumps

Overall Ranking:    ☒Low    ☐Medium    ☐High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

**The panel felt that screen proposals in general need better prioritization by the AFSP and responsible agencies. Additionally, continued screening of small diversions along the Sacramento River do not seem to be warranted at this time unless site specific conditions are identified that require such. Finally, previous small fish screen installations along the Sacramento River have had a number of failures and need a better coordinated design effort.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

☒Yes ☐No

How?

**Proposed application is a follow-on to a small screen that failed. While small screen designs for the lower Sacramento River have been improved, there has not been satisfactory demonstration of long-term durability. Additionally, small screen installation on the main Sacramento should be evaluated in relation to whether there is greater benefit to first selecting larger installations.**

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

☒Yes ☐No

How?

**The proposal addresses Restoration Priorities for the Sacramento Region #6, "Continue Major Fish Screen Projects and Conduct Studies to Improve Knowledge of the Implications of Fish Screens for Fish Populations". It is questionable however that this installation on the main stem Sacramento River is appropriate at this time, given that there are higher priority larger diversions that remain unscreened. If it were represented as experimental (which it is not) it might serve to improve knowledge of screen design and application. Applicant has little provision in the proposal of long-term evaluation adaptive management that would be useful for future applications.**

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

☒Yes ☐No

How?

**Applicant has previously installed screen that failed and has apparently worked with AFSP participants to develop newer more effective design. Additionally, project is linked with previously funded the USDA NRCS Small Screen Diversion Program, although it is unclear why funding is not be provided by that program, or why no mention is made of input from AFSP.**

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Project is coordinated through the Family Water Alliance, which has a history of local involvement. It apparently has not however, directly involved the Anadromous Fish Screen Program (AFSP), the NRCS Small Screen Diversion Program or the Sacramento River Conservation Area (SRCA). The newly created SRCA, with representatives of all local counties is the "key" local contact for all restoration actions, and additionally the AFSP is "key" to screen design/application.**

Other Comments:

**Project seems inappropriate at this time for a number of reasons: 1) previous failures, 2) size of the diversion, 3) lack of technical input particularly the AFSP, 4) lack of direct participation by NRCS Small Screen Diversion Program, 5) Inordinate cost of project management coordination. It seems a better subject for a major "qualified" research project sanctioned by the AFSP.**

## **Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding:**

**New Proposal Number:** 12

**New Proposal Title:** Butte Creek Farms Fish Screen, Sacramento River Consolidation of Two Existing Pumps

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

**98-R01 NRCS Sacramento River Small Fish Screen Program**

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

**none**

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

**XYes -No -N/A**

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

**XYes -No -N/A**

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

**XYes -No -N/A**

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

**-Yes XNo -N/A**

If no, please explain deficiencies:

**Last update in the CALFED file is from February 2000**

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

-Yes -No **X**N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

**none**

## **Environmental Compliance:**

**Proposal Number:** 12

**Applicant Organization:** Butte Creek Farms

**Proposal Title:** Butte Creek Farms Fish Screen, Sacramento River Consolidation of Two Existing Pumps

1. Are the legal or regulatory issues that affect the proposal identified adequately in the proposal?

-Yes ☒No

If no, please explain:

**Fish screens are not categorically exempt under CEQA, need to do a negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration.**

**Need to comply with NEPA because of federally listed salmonid species.**

**Spring-run chinook salmon are a State listed species. If in-channel work will occur when spring-run chinook are present, a 2081/Incidental Take Permit is required.**

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

-Yes ☒No

If no, please explain:

**Timeline for obtaining permits is not clear. \$1500 for permit fees seems too low, the 1600 Agreement itself will cost \$772.75. May need more funds to cover permit/environmental documentation costs.**

3. Do the legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal significantly impair the project's feasibility?

-Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

**Appropriate NEPA and CEQA compliance necessary. CEQA compliance cannot be a categorical exemption.**

**If spring-run chinook present during in-channel work, must obtain 2081/Incidental Take Permit.**

Other Comments:

## **Budget:**

**Proposal Number:** 12

**Applicant Organization:** Butte Creek Farms

**Proposal Title:** Butte Creek Farms Fish Screen, Sacramento River Consolidation of Two Existing Pumps

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

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

**Details found in Budget Justification, Budget Summary provides primarily lump sums.**

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

☐Yes ☒No

If no, please explain:

**I found no details for Tasks 4 and 6 in the Budget Justification, nor was it clearly identified in the Budget Summary under Services or Consultants.**

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

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

**overhead rate is 12% of project management only, which includes rent, phones and general office staff. It is not budgeted anywhere else.**

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

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

☐Yes ☒No

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

**\$76,760 difference - Butte Creek Farms cost share partner to contribute the difference**

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

☐Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: