

Proposal Reviews

#24: Lower Butte Creek Project: Sutter Bypass - Willow Slough Weir Fish Passage Project - Preliminary Engineering Investigation

California Department of Water Resources

Initial Selection Panel Review

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review

Sacramento Regional Review

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding	#1
	#2
	#3

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 24

Applicant Organization: California Department of Water Resources

Proposal Title: Lower Butte Creek Project: Sutter Bypass - Willow Slough Weir Fish Passage Project
- Preliminary Engineering Investigation

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	X
In Part	-
With Conditions	-
Consider as Directed Action	-
Not Recommended	-

Amount: **\$155,000**

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

None.

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

Improving passage at Willow Slough Weir rates above average from the Technical Panel. It has strategic and regional values in recovery of at-risk salmonids species in Butte Creek. The Selection Panel strongly suggests the proponent move the development of alternatives right up front as an initial task. Input on alternatives could influence the data collection and design activities.

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review:

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

Proposal Number: 24

Applicant Organization: California Department of Water Resources

Proposal Title: Lower Butte Creek Project: Sutter Bypass - Willow Slough Weir Fish Passage Project
- Preliminary Engineering Investigation

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	Important project, which could have large beneficial impacts to fishery, but is not the only solution in this specific area.
XAbove 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?

Chinook, steelhead, others present including juveniles. Potential to decrease mortality by predators on juvenile outmigrants at the weir. High potential for positive impact to spring run chinook salmon and steelhead, since all migrating salmon must go through Sutter bypass. Concern over current impacts at this site for poaching, which could potentially be alleviated by this project. This project is one of many barriers for this area to fish passage, so this project should be considered to be a part of the comprehensive Butte Creek Restoration Plan, and not the entire solution to fish passage in this area. Holding pool below

fish ladder is not at an optimal temperature, so increased fish passage at this location could have further benefits to fish by decreasing time at this suboptimal habitat .

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?

Not a fish screen.

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?

Project lead by DWR staff, good likelihood of on-time completion of project. Public supportive, high level of future public involvement. Project is compatible with other restoration projects in area. This project is part of the lower Butte Creek Project Ecosystem Restoration Program (next-phase funding). Important that applicant thoroughly examine alternatives for this project.

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

Reasonable and adequate as compared to other like projects.

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

No partners, just DWR. No cost-share 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?

High. Part of a large, well-developed plan that has moved forward in a successful, timely fashion. Good public involvement. Suggested for funding.

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 sig. concerns with prior performance or environmental compliance. Budget concerned about lack of explanation of major expenses.

Miscellaneous comments:

Excellent likelihood of on-time completion and excellent potential benefit to fishery. High public support. Benefits to salmon and steelhead only, though.

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 24

Applicant Organization: California Department of Water Resources

Proposal Title: Lower Butte Creek Project: Sutter Bypass - Willow Slough Weir Fish Passage Project
- Preliminary Engineering Investigation

Overall Ranking: -Low -Medium **XHigh**

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

Butte Creek has been a model effort and we should continue to improve spring-run passage as often as we have opportunity. Project as proposed is part of the above mentioned restoration plans and is therefore a component of implementation. The project is however, also addressing DWR flow and flood management responsibilities. It may be reasonable to have DWR contribute funding to this effort in proportion to the benefits to their management responsibilities.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

This project is one component of a large, well developed plan that has continued to move forward in a successful, timely fashion. Project proponents have been individually involved with engineering analysis and design on adjacent projects, and have been closely coordinated with local landowner constituency groups. Additionally, DWR is owner/operator of structure for proposed evaluation, including flood control responsibility for the bypass.

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

XYes -No

How?

Fish passage improvement is specifically addressed in PSP priority Sac Region-2.

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

XYes -No

How?

As mentioned above, this is one project of the larger Butte Creek Spring-Run Restoration Program which is a multi-year restoration effort that involves a broad and diverse group of stakeholders.

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

XYes -No

How?

DWR is a local stakeholder and has closely coordinated with the local stakeholder group organized by Ducks Unlimited. That stakeholder group works in conjunction with responsible regulatory agencies including CDFG, NMFS, USFWS and BOR.

Other Comments:

X

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1

New Proposal Number: 24

New Proposal Title: Lower Butte Creek Project: Sutter Bypass - Willow Slough Weir Fish Passage Project - Preliminary Engineering Investigation

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

CALFED # 99-B02, USBR # 99-FC-20-0055, Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II - Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Analysis for Butte Sink Structural Modifications and Flow-Through System.

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?

-Yes -No **X**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?

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

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

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

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

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

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

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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:

Note that applicant for 99-B02 is Ducks Unlimited, Inc. and the applicant for work in the same general area (Lower Butte Creek) is DWR, therefore the questions concerning the applicant are answered N/A.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2

New Proposal Number: 24

New Proposal Title: Lower Butte Creek Project: Sutter Bypass - Willow Slough Weir Fish Passage Project - Preliminary Engineering Investigation

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

01-N54, Lower Butte Creek Project, Ducks Unlimited, Inc.

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

N/A

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

-Yes -No XN/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

NFWF's Agreement for the previous phase is with Ducks Unlimited, Inc. NFWF does not have any primary agreements with the applicant, DWR.

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

-Yes -No XN/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

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

-Yes -No XN/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

-Yes -No XN/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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:

However, current progress on the previous phase of 01-N54 is satisfactory.

Other Comments:

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #3

New Proposal Number: 24

New Proposal Title: Lower Butte Creek Project: Sutter Bypass - Willow Slough Weir Fish Passage Project - Preliminary Engineering Investigation

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

96-MO2 Prospect Island Restoration Proj

96-MO3 Lower Sacramento River Reveg

96-M26 Prospect Island Monitoring

97-MO2 Battle Creek Fish Screen

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*
3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

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

If no, please explain any difficulties:

Capable DWR staff has difficulty processing contracts.

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?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

☒Yes ☐No ☐N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 24

Applicant Organization: California Department of Water Resources

Proposal Title: Lower Butte Creek Project: Sutter Bypass - Willow Slough Weir Fish Passage Project
- Preliminary Engineering Investigation

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

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

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:

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

☐Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 24

Applicant Organization: California Department of Water Resources

Proposal Title: Lower Butte Creek Project: Sutter Bypass - Willow Slough Weir Fish Passage Project
- Preliminary Engineering Investigation

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

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

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

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

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

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

☐Yes ☒No

If no, please explain:

Direct Labor hours is provided in the budget justification, but not in the budget summary

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).

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

☐Yes ☒No

If no, please explain:

it only states salary, but does not identify who and what is being done

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

the information only provides for salaries and it could be that is all that is needed.