

# **Proposal Reviews**

## **#47: York Creek Fish Passage Improvement and Stream Restoration Project**

City of St. Helena

**Final Selection Panel Review**

**Initial Selection Panel Review**

**Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review**

**Bay Regional Review**

**Environmental Compliance**

**Budget**

## Final Selection Panel Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 47

**Applicant Organization:** City of St. Helena

**Proposal Title:** York Creek Fish Passage Improvement and Stream Restoration Project

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

<b>Fund</b>	
<b>As Is</b>	-
<b>In Part</b>	-
<b>With Conditions</b>	-
<b>Consider as Directed Action</b>	-
<b>Not Recommended</b>	<b>X</b>

Amount:    **\$0**

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

**None**

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

**The Selection Panel recognizes and appreciates the significance of this project to the Bay Area region, as noted in a letter from the local Congressman. But given the CALFED ERP priorities this year, the Panel does not recommend funding. Since the project is aimed at benefiting steelhead in the Bay Area, and this region is part of the recovery planning for coastal steelhead, State and federal coastal restoration programs may be more appropriate and immediate sources of funding.**

## Initial Selection Panel Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 47

**Applicant Organization:** City of St. Helena

**Proposal Title:** York Creek Fish Passage Improvement and Stream Restoration Project

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).

<b>Fund</b>	
<b>As Is</b>	-
<b>In Part</b>	-
<b>With Conditions</b>	-
<b>Consider as Directed Action</b>	-
<b>Not Recommended</b>	<b>X</b>

Amount:    **\$0**

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

**None**

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

**Although this proposal received generally favorable reviews, the Selection Panel does not recommend funding. York Creek is a tributary of the Napa River, and this region is not a priority for the ERP in the 2002 PSP. In addition, there is no local cost-share identified for the project.**

**The Selection Panel also recommends greater coordination between the Ecosystem Restoration Program and the Department of Water Resources' Fish Passage Program.**

# Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 47

**Applicant Organization:** City of St. Helena

**Proposal Title:** York Creek Fish Passage Improvement and Stream Restoration Project

**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
XSuperior	<b>The proposed project addresses important fish passage issues identified by NMFS for impacts on a listed species. The costs are reasonable, considering potential benefits to be gained.</b>
-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 should have a significant benefit to the fishery by increasing passage, opening 2.5 miles of habitat, and preventing entrainment in the Citys diversion. Benefits will be LONG TERM. Fish affected include steelhead trout, listed as Threatened.**

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?

**Although the screen is sized for only 2 cfs, any diversion from a creek this size is significant during normal summer time flows.**

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 not without technical and practical challenges. Since the dam is very close to a road, not only will the road need to be closed during much of the work, but road protection measures must be implemented to prevent road failure as the creek establishes its new channel. Large trucks on the narrow road will negatively impact residents, which must be addressed in the CEQA documents. There is a degree of uncertainty in the results; however, I believe potential benefits far outweigh the risk. This would be a major feather in the cap of DWRs barrier removal program, and a valuable case study for future projects around the state.**

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

**Cost is nearly \$1.4 million. Potential returns are significant and long term, giving this project a favorable cost/benefit ratio.**

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 has the support of the City of St. Helena, the Napa County RCD, and Friends of the Napa River. DWR is contributing to project administration.**

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?

**Ranked HIGH. Benefits include opening 2.5 miles of habitat, and restoring natural hydrology regime. Lots of bang for the buck.**

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?

**The environmental compliance review commented that NEPA/CEQA costs were not included in the budget. DWRs barrier removal program will perform that task so budgeting is not required in the proposal. No other budget or environmental compliance concerns.**

#### **Miscellaneous comments:**

**York Dam was identified as a barrier some time ago, but legal actions have been unsuccessful in having it removed. At this time there is support for the project from all relevant parties, so this is the ideal opportunity to act. Cost-share potential from the City of St. Helena should be reviewed. The project provides benefits to species other than steelhead by restoring habitat and natural fluvial geomorphic processes.**

## Bay Regional Review:

**Proposal Number:** 47

**Applicant Organization:** City of St. Helena

**Proposal Title:** York Creek Fish Passage Improvement and Stream Restoration Project

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

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

**project an excellent model of watershed restoration, includes partnerships and is action-oriented**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**- a feasibility study has been completed - CEQA/NEPA in progress conducted by DWR and City of St. Helena - Property owned by City of St. Helena**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**BR- % (Restore shallow water, local stream + riparian habitats to benefit at-risk species) - Will restore habitat of many endangered species - NMFS identified York Creek Dam as a complete barrier to 2 miles of high quality steelhead habitat - Will add 2.5 miles of rearing and spawning habitat for steelhead - Will restore natural hydrologic regime to York Creek**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**- project is identified as a specific restoration opportunity in Napa Valley Watershed Management Feasibility Study - is linked to Friends of the Napa River's juvenile steelhead count in Napa River Watershed - Napa County Flood Protection and Watershed Improvement Authority identifies York Creek as part of its floodplain and open space management**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**- applicant is a local agency (City of St. Helena) and is working with Napa County RCD to coordinate with local landowners - has support of Friends of the Napa River - will conduct public meetings to provide input from local individuals - no organized watershed group in York Creek watershed**

Other Comments:

**a well thought out proposal, with much of the feasibility work already accomplished; seems to provide lots of "bang for the buck"**



## **Environmental Compliance:**

**Proposal Number:** 47

**Applicant Organization:** City of St. Helena

**Proposal Title:** York Creek Fish Passage Improvement and Stream Restoration Project

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:

**There is no money allocated in the budget for CEQA/NEPA compliance and obtaining environmental permits. The timeline to obtain permits is too short. The Negative Declaration needs to be completed before the permits can be issued.**

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

☒Yes -No

If yes, please explain:

**But if they budget for completing the environmental documents, the project is feasible.**

Other Comments:

**Budget:****Proposal Number:** 47**Applicant Organization:** City of St. Helena**Proposal Title:** York Creek Fish Passage Improvement and Stream Restoration Project

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:

**see table 4**

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

☐Yes ☒No

If no, please explain:

**Table 4 is referenced, but I couldn't determine what the rates are.**

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

☐Yes ☒No

If no, please explain:

**Table 4 is references, but I couldn't determine what was included in "Project Management"**

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).

**17.a. = \$1,500,000.00**

**Grand Total = \$1,377,414.00**

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: