

# **Proposal Reviews**

## **#89: M&T/Llano Seco Fish Screen Facility - Short-Term/Long-Term Protection Project**

M & T Chico Ranch

**Final Selection Panel Review**

**Initial Selection Panel Review**

**Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review**

**Sacramento Regional Review**

**Environmental Compliance**

**Budget**

# Final Selection Panel Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 89

**Applicant Organization:** M & T Chico Ranch

**Proposal Title:** M&T/Llano Seco Fish Screen Facility - Short-Term/Long-Term Protection Project

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

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

Amount: **\$1,816,500**

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

**None**

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

**The applicant responded to the Selection Panels recommendation to consider this proposal as a direction action, and asked for clarification on CALFEDs position regarding river sedimentation, meander, and hard points for pumping plants on the river, for a contact person and a well-defined framework to guide them through the directed action process, and for assurances to meet ongoing water needs of the beneficiaries of the diversion. The Selection Panel recommends that the Ecosystem Restoration Program identify a contact person (or persons) to assist the applicants with the directed action process, and that the ERP consider the applicant's need to meet ongoing water needs of the beneficiaries of the facility while a long-term solution is identified.**

## Initial Selection Panel Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 89

**Applicant Organization:** M & T Chico Ranch

**Proposal Title:** M&T/Llano Seco Fish Screen Facility - Short-Term/Long-Term Protection 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>X</b>
<b>Not Recommended</b>	-

Amount: **\$\$1,816,500.00**

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

**None**

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

**The applicant proposes to implement a short-term and to study a long-term solution to threats posed by river meander to continued operation of the M&T/Llano Seco fish screen facility. The facility contributes to efforts to restore Butte and Big Chico creeks. The river meander and sediment deposition processes that threaten the facilities continued operation are key to efforts to restore the Sacramento River corridor. Efforts to maintain M&T/Llano Secos ability to divert water from the Sacramento River in a fish friendly manner is highly visible and has broad public and agency support. The proposal has the potential to provide information on how to maintain river meander and protect fish from the impacts of water diversion. This information should have broad application for the Valley sections of many Central Valley rivers.**

**The technical review panel gave the proposal an adequate rating, recommended some reimbursement for work already performed on the short-term solution and did not recommend future studies intended to provide information leading to a long-term solution. The short-term solution has already been implemented and the Selection Panel does not recommend funding this portion of the proposal. The technical panel based their recommendation to not fund future studies on the perception that there is a lack of certainty regarding river meander and sediment deposition and that this uncertainty warrants inaction. Because river meander and sediment deposition will continue (only the rate of meander and deposition is uncertain), and because the proposed study will reduce uncertainty and provide information needed to make informed decisions, the Selection Panel recommends that the applicant revise the study portion of the proposal for consideration as a directed action. The Selection Panel does not recommend funding for task 12, described as obtain funding for a preferred alternative.**

**The revised proposal should not be solely focused on protecting the existing facility, but should consider alternative means of meeting the water needs of beneficiaries of the present facility, including modifications to the existing facility to accommodate river meander and sediment deposition. The Selection Panel encourages the applicant to structure the process to develop the long-term solution such that it is likely to result in innovative solutions, informed by experts on innovative diversion techniques, fish protection facilities, and natural riverine processes from outside the Central Valley. The Selection Panel recommends formation of a steering committee to guide development of the long-term solution to ensure it appropriately considers objectives to maintain an effective, fish-friendly diversion for M&T/Llano Seco and to maintain river meander.**

# Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 89

**Applicant Organization:** M & T Chico Ranch

**Proposal Title:** M&T/Llano Seco Fish Screen Facility - Short-Term/Long-Term Protection 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.**

<b>Overall Evaluation Summary Rating</b>	<b>Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating</b>
-Superior	<b>Some reimbursement may be justified for the work already performed in order to restore function to this important fish screen.</b>
-Above average	
XAdequate	
-Not recommended	
	<b>The part of the proposal that requests funding for future studies is not recommended at this time, but some future action may be warranted if the situation worsens.</b>

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?

**Project is located on the mainstem Sacramento River, just downstream of the confluence of Big Chico Creek, in very valuable habitat for all runs of chinook salmon and steelhead fry. The existing screen (circa 1996) already provides important benefits to all these fish resources as well as other resident species. The screen, while well designed, was threatened by hydraulic conditions and unforeseen sediment deposition. It may be threatened again, but it is difficult to assess or quantify the benefits to fish and ecosystem resources of the proposed project due to the level of uncertainty.**

**The proposal is in two parts: 1) dredge away sediment deposition to restore proper fish screen hydraulic conditions (already complete), 2) study the nature of the problem and try to determine the long term solution.**

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?

**Existing screen is designed for approximately 130 cfs. While this amount of flow is less significant to the Sacramento River, compared to some other large diversions, it must be remembered that this amount of water was transferred out of Butte Creek- where it would be a very very significant amount of flow. In other words, it is highly desirable to keep this screen functioning, rather than fall back to the old diversion scheme.**

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 proposal is quite implementable. In fact, the first phase (dredging) has already been accomplished. The question is: what if any percent of the project should be reimbursed? What is the merit of conducting anticipatory studies at this time?**

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

**Budget seems high for what is being proposed. Attention should be paid to the amount of money charged to M&T by State Parks for the recently completed dredging operation. State Parks asked to be reimbursed for the real estate value of the gravel bar deposition (which did not exist prior to winter 1997-98 )**

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

**M&T has been a leader in developing partnerships since this projects inception in 1996. This diversion was relocated, from Butte Creek to the mainstem Sacramento River, in 1996 as part of a highly acclaimed public-private partnership, within the context of the comprehensive Butte Creek watershed restoration project**

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?

**This project was ranked HIGH by the regional panel because it is an integral part of the Butte + Big Chico Creek restoration efforts.**

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?

**A lease from the State Lands Commission and local grading permit may be needed for the sediment removal. The budget's indirect costs, while small, need a careful review to determine if they are calculated correctly.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

**The screen complements the overall Butte Creek Restoration Plan, and it is an important component of cooperative, public-private understandings reached in the comprehensive Butte Creek solution. As such, it is very important to protect the fish screen and ensure its long term operation, as well as consider the context of the situation with respect to unforeseen costs born by M&T.**

## **Sacramento Regional Review:**

**Proposal Number:** 89

**Applicant Organization:** M & T Chico Ranch

**Proposal Title:** M&T/Llano Seco Fish Screen Facility - Short-Term/Long-Term Protection Project

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

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

**The review panel agreed overall that this was a high priority project for the Sacramento River Geographical Region.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Excavation of the gravel bar would return flow patterns to those that occurred when the project was first constructed in 1995. Up to 100,000 cubic yards of sand and gravel would be removed from an 8-acre excavation site. The excavated gravel would remain available for river and floodplain restoration activities of the SRCA at any future date. A longterm solution to the sediment deposition that threatens the operation of the M&T/Llano Seco Ranch Fish Screen Facility will be developed, including a model to determine an appropriate long-term solution.**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Ensures continued recovery of at-risk species, spring-run and winter-run chinook salmon and steelhead in Big Chico and Butte creeks. (PSP priorities SR-1, SR-2, SR-3, SR-4, SR-6 and SR-7 and AFRP objectives).**

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?

**This project is an integral part of an overall ecosystem restoration program for Butte Creek.**



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

XYes -No

How?

**This project has involved key adjacent river property owners, the City of Chico, the California Department of Parks and Recreation, the Sacramento River National Wildlife Refuge, the Sacramento Valley Landowners Association, and the Sacramento river Conservation Area (SRCA). The SRCA has written a letter of support for the proposed actions described in this proposal.**

Other Comments:

**Work has already been completed for short term fix and proposal seeks reimbursement for actual costs. Reimbursement should not exceed what's in the budget.**

## **Environmental Compliance:**

**Proposal Number:** 89

**Applicant Organization:** M & T Chico Ranch

**Proposal Title:** M&T/Llano Seco Fish Screen Facility - Short-Term/Long-Term Protection Project

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

-Yes  No

If no, please explain:

**State Lands Commission land use lease required. Local grading permit may be 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:

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:** 89

**Applicant Organization:** M & T Chico Ranch

**Proposal Title:** M&T/Llano Seco Fish Screen Facility - Short-Term/Long-Term Protection 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:

**Applicant states that there are no indirect costs, yet in Year 1 they show \$2,300 under indirect costs.**

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).

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: