

Proposal Reviews

#77: H & L Partnership & Furlan Fish Screen Project

H & L Partnership

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: 77

Applicant Organization: H & L Partnership

Proposal Title: H & L Partnership & Furlan Fish Screen 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).

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 screen a small diversion on the Sacramento River. Screening small diversions on large rivers was not identified as a priority in the PSP. The regional panel considered this project to be a low regional priority and both the regional panel and technical review panel commented that the costs were high. 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: 77

Applicant Organization: H & L Partnership

Proposal Title: H & L Partnership & Furlan Fish Screen 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
-Superior	Although this project was ranked low by the regional review, I feel it still has medium regional value because small diversions need to be addressed in the overall restoration plan. Individually, small diversions may play a minor role in the loss of fishery resources; cumulatively they could have a major impact. The cost seems very high.
-Above average	
XAdequate	
-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 is located on the mainstem Sacramento River near the town of Knights Landing where it will significantly benefit the fishery. The numerous unscreened diversions in the location have the ability to entrain large number of juvenile fish. All species of salmonids that include winter-run, spring-run, late-fall, fall run chinook salmon, steelhead and splittail. Downstream migrating juvenile fish are vulnerable to entrainment by unscreened diversions in the location. Natural habitat will be restored if the abandoned pump site removed of all structures and debris. The project will be long term and other similar size and type positive

barrier fish screens have demonstrated its biological effectiveness. The consolidation of unscreened diversions into one screened diversion will have long-term benefits.

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 a consolidated 25 cfs screened diversion is not a significant proportion of the waterway, it is located in an area where juvenile fish tend to migrate which is near shore. The removal of three unscreened diversions for one screened diversion reduces the number of possible encounters with an unscreened diversion.

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 the latest state-of-the-art fish screen technologies and 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. An obstacle maybe the need for NEPA compliance, which the project feels it, is not needed. There doesnt appear to be any adverse effects. Public support is being generated through an outreach program and education. Cant determine if public supports project. The project is part of an integrated restoration program that includes positive barrier fish screens. The project compliments other state and federal programs and projects in the upper watershed in the Sacramento River. The project will help prevent the loss of fishery resources from entrainment.

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

The budget of \$361,773.29 appears to be high when compared to other recently completed projects of similar screen design and size where the cost cfs was less than \$8,000 per cfs. This project would cost approximately \$16,000 per cfs.

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 fully involves appropriate partners and the applicants are willing participants. H&L Partnership and Furlan are cost sharing \$40,197.03.

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 low because it felt that the project lacked coordination with other fish screening efforts in the region. The request was not for a major fish screen project. The project doesnt have the appropriate permits and may need to NEPA documents. A major concern is the high cost per cfs to be screened, approximately \$16,000 per cfs. Generally, cost for a small diversion of similar size and screen type would cost between \$3,000 and \$5,000.

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?

There is a concern that CEQA/NEPA documentation is needed and that the project is not currently seeking them. Minor concern regarding budget justification and not being detailed for yearly office supplies. Also, difference in budget funds identified is the cost-share by the project.

Miscellaneous comments:

The cost to screen this project seems quite high. The technical team currently feels it would be difficult to build this type of screen for less than \$10,000 per cfs. Recently built screens of similar material and design were in the \$10,000 per cfs range. Not sure why the project thinks they dont need to comply with NEPA.

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 77

Applicant Organization: H & L Partnership

Proposal Title: H & L Partnership & Furlan Fish Screen Project

Overall Ranking: Low -Medium -High

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

This is a relatively small screen project with a relatively high cost/cfs. The Panel was concerned about a lack of coordination with other fish screening efforts in the region.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

The project appears to have to cooperation of the landowner, comply with screen criteria and be appropriate to the site.

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

Yes -No

How?

The PSP requested projects to Continue major fish screen projects and conduct studies to improve knowledge of the implications of fish screens for fish populations. While the individual diversions in this study are not major, their combined effects could be considered as such.

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

-Yes XNo

How?

The Review Panel was very concerned that project is not well linked with other screening efforts in the region including FWS and DFG.

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

Yes -No

How?

The participation of the Family Water Alliance should help to provide coordination.

Other Comments:

This project was previously submitted to CALFED, but funding was denied because of concerns about the design and cost/cfs. The revised proposal indicates that the applicants have been fairly responsive to these concerns. The design has been altered and the costs have been reduced. However, the current cost (\$16,000/cfs) is still higher than levels considered reasonable by DFG staff (eg \$3,000-5,000/cfs for diversions <40 cfs). The Panel would also be happier if this project was part of a larger effort to evaluate the cost-benefits of screening vs. other areas.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding:

New Proposal Number: 77

New Proposal Title: H & L Partnership & Furlan Fish Screen Project

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

CALFED # 98-B01, USBR # 98-FC-20-16630, Richter Brothers Fish Screen Project Phase I - Feasibility and Design

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 XNo -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

Agreement was extended once at no additional cost from January 31, 1999 to August 15, 1999. The deliverables (Feasibility Investigation from the applicants consultant) were received after this revised completion date of the Agreement. Sixteen pages of comments to the Feasibility Investigation report have never been addressed. A second request for a time extension was denied due to lack of response concerning the Feasibility Investigation report.

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

-Yes XNo -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

Status, No Progress, N/A Accomplishments, No

Status Agreement closed January 2, 2000.

Accomplishments While the feasibility investigation was prepared and submitted, a final version was never received that addressed comments to the initial submission.

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

-Yes XNo -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

Applicant failed to meet any milestones.

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

-Yes No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

Applicant was late in submitting quarterly reports, and didnt submit a final report to CALFED.

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:

Applicant failed to stay on top of consultant to insure that progress was maintained and to insure compliance with the grant requirements during the Phase I work.

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 77

Applicant Organization: H & L Partnership

Proposal Title: H & L Partnership & Furlan Fish Screen Project

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

-Yes No

If no, please explain:

A Categorical Exemption for CEQA does not apply to this project. NEPA documents may be necessary for ESA compliance.

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: 77

Applicant Organization: H & L Partnership

Proposal Title: H & L Partnership & Furlan Fish Screen 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:

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:

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).

question 17a funds identified are \$361,773.29 and funds identified in the budget summary are \$401,970.32 showing a difference of \$40,197.03

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:

under supplies & expendables the budget summary shows year 1 \$2,500 and year 2 \$1,761, but in the budget justification it only gives dollars for office supplies \$2130.50 and computing \$1,761.00 but does not break it down by year.