

Proposal Reviews

#92: Meridian Farms Water Company - Positive Barrier Fish Screen Project

Meridian Farms Water Company

Final Selection Panel Review

Initial Selection Panel Review

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review

Sacramento Regional Review

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Final Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Final Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 92

Applicant Organization: Meridian Farms Water Company

Proposal Title: Meridian Farms Water Company - Positive Barrier Fish Screen Project

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

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

Amount: **\$750,000**

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

None

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

The comments from the Northern California Water Association and the Sacramento Valley Landowners Association supported the proposal, which is recommended for funding as is.

Comments have been received requesting more time for public input on this proposal. The CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program remains fully committed to local input and has provided opportunity for public involvement at multiple steps in the 2002 proposal solicitation and review process. Proposals have been available to the public since last fall, and local governments and watershed groups, including the Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum (the commenter asking for more time to review this proposal), were notified of proposals in their area. The process also included regional review panels comprised of individuals with local expertise and perspectives. Because of the extensive technical and regional reviews, and the unexpectedly large number of proposals this year, the process has taken longer than anticipated. The final recommendation and subsequent funding decisions are long overdue. The 2002 Proposal Solicitation Package identified a 30-day public review period, and the ERP honored that commitment. While the Selection Panel agrees that additional time would help some parties, the panel does not recommend extending the comment period for this years process

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 92

Applicant Organization: Meridian Farms Water Company

Proposal Title: Meridian Farms Water Company - Positive Barrier 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	X
In Part	-
With Conditions	-
Consider as Directed Action	-
Not Recommended	-

Amount: **\$750000**

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

None.

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

This proposal is to prepare a feasibility study to evaluate consolidation of three pumping facilities on the Sacramento River into one screened diversion. Collectively, these diversions have the potential to divert a significant portion of the Sacramento River flow. The project is specifically identified as a priority in the 2002 PSP, it received an above average rating from the technical panel, and was rated high by the regional review panel. The Selection Panel notes that the contractors identified in this proposal were also identified in another proposal recommended for funding by the panel (proposal number 109, Patterson Irrigation District Fish Screen Design and Environmental Review). The total time collectively identified in these proposals for specific individuals likely exceeds the time they have available. The Selection Panel recommends funding this proposal, but encourages the applicant to work with the Anadromous Fish Screen Program to address cost concerns and to assure that identified contracting personnel are adequate to complete the project.

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review:

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

Proposal Number: 92

Applicant Organization: Meridian Farms Water Company

Proposal Title: Meridian Farms Water Company - Positive Barrier 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	The project has high regional value and will be a part of an overall ecosystem restoration
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 is located on the mainstem Sacramento River south of Highway 20 near Colusa. Meridian Farms Water Company is preparing a feasibility study to evaluate the consolidation of three pumping facilities into one screened diversion. Winter-run, spring-run, late-fall, and fall run Chinook salmon, Central Valley Steelhead, and splittail are all present in vulnerable stages of their life at the existing facilities. The project will provide long-term benefits to these species. Positive barrier fish screens have demonstrated their biological effectiveness in eliminating fish entrainment.

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?

The combined capacity of the facilities would be 165 cfs. This is could be significant proportion of the river flow.

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 would use state-of-the-art fish screen technologies. It is compatible with other restoration programs. No major obstacles.

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

The project would use state-of-the-art fish screen technologies. It is compatible with other restoration programs. No major obstacles.

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

Yes, the applicants are contributing \$40,000. CVPIA funds have been secured and the applicant is applying for Calfed funds as part of the non-federal match.

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 as High since it is an integral part of the overall ecosystem restoration program for the mainstem Sacramento River. The project addresses CXVPIA and CALFED goals. Public involvement is sufficient.

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

Miscellaneous comments:

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 92

Applicant Organization: Meridian Farms Water Company

Proposal Title: Meridian Farms Water Company - Positive Barrier Fish Screen 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?

XYes -No

How?

The feasibility of fish screen projects in the Sacramento River is demonstrated in similar projects such as the M&T/Parrott Pumping Station and Fish Screen. Montgomery Watson Harza, selected contractor, has considerable expertise in designing fish screens and will be able to complete the final design and the environmental documentation within the time specified in the work schedule.

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

XYes -No

How?

This project addresses CALFED Goal 1 and 4, PSP priorities SR-2 and SR-6. It also addresses CVPIA goals and objectives described in section 3402, 3406(b)(1), 3406(b)(21) and 3406(b)(1).

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?

This project is an integral part of the overall ecosystem restoration program for the mainstem Sacramento River.

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

XYes -No

How?

Project proponents will hold public meetings with landowners, land users, governmental agencies and conservation groups with the intention of informing and educating local communities about the project. Key stakeholders involved in this project include Meridian Farms Water Company, CDFG, DWR, USFWS, USCOE, Sutter County, Town of Meridian, Town of Grimes, Andriotti Farms and other local landowners.

Other Comments:

Consolidating the intakes results in fewer hard points along the river contributing to more natural fluvial geomorphological processes.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding:

New Proposal Number: 92

New Proposal Title: Meridian Farms Water Company - Positive Barrier Fish Screen Project

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

#99FG200251

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 -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 -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 -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

Yes -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:

The applicant is currently completing the feasibility study, and will be ready to start design and environmental documents in 2002.

Other Comments:

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 92

Applicant Organization: Meridian Farms Water Company

Proposal Title: Meridian Farms Water Company - Positive Barrier 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:

Applicant will need a 2081 from DFG rather than an NCCP for CESA compliance. Depending on the details of design and construction, may need a grading permit and possibly a Board of Reclamation encroachment permit.

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:

As long as necessary permits are obtained, this project is feasible.

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 92

Applicant Organization: Meridian Farms Water Company

Proposal Title: Meridian Farms Water Company - Positive Barrier 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).

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: