

Proposal Reviews

#105: Northside Diversion Dam Fish Passage Feasibility Study

Orland Unit Water Users' Association

Final 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: 105

Applicant Organization: Orland Unit Water Users' Association

Proposal Title: Northside Diversion Dam Fish Passage Feasibility Study

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

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 proposed project would investigate the impact on migration of anadromous fish at the Northside Diversion Dam on Stony Creek, and would study potential solutions to improve migration if necessary. The Fish Screen and Ladder Construction Panel did not recommend it. The Selection Panel received a letter from the applicant urging immediate funding for the project.

The Selection Panel concurs that the project should not be funded now. The Sacramento Regional Review Panel felt the proposal inaccurately described spring-run chinook salmon as a species that could benefit, and gave the proposal a medium rank. The Fish Screen and Ladder Construction Panel also questioned the suitability of Stony Creek as anadromous fish habitat, and stated that the proposed fish ladder may be temporary due to the possible future replacement of the dam. The technical panel questioned the long-term benefit of the project and did not recommend the project. The applicant responded to the panels concerns in regard to the suitability of Stony Creek as habitat for anadromous fish, stating that the proposal was to study impacts to migration and would include assessments of the suitability of the creek as habitat. The applicant cited a National Marine Fisheries Service draft biological opinion (applicant included copy with comments) that suggests that Stony Creek may have value as habitat for anadromous fish, including spring-run chinook salmon. The Selection Panel agrees that Stony Creek has value as anadromous fish habitat, but this value is likely low relative to the value of other tributaries in the Sacramento region. The Selection Panel, therefore, 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: 105

Applicant Organization: Orland Unit Water Users' Association

Proposal Title: Northside Diversion Dam Fish Passage Feasibility Study

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	Rated as not recommended since the suitability of salmonid habitat in Lower Stoney Creek is uncertain. More extensive fish sampling over several years should probably be conducted prior to conducting a design feasibility study. Also, the proposed project fish ladder may ultimately be temporary in nature due to the possible future replacement of the Northside diversion Dam. The longterm benefit/cost may be questionable.
-Above average	
-Adequate	
XNot 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?

Approximately 20 miles of Stoney Creek is accessible to anadromous fish from the confluence of the Sacramento River to Black Butte Dam. Upstream and downstream migration of salmon and steelhead do occur in this reach. The suitability for spawning of winter-run and spring-run Chinook, and Central Valley steelhead in this reach is, however, uncertain at this time.

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?

N/A

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 compatible with CALFED ERP and CVPIA programs and goals for fisheries restoration. No major obstacles anticipated in conducting a feasibility study

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

Benefit/cost has not been developed sufficiently at this time.

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

Ouwua is a willing participant. Cost share partners have not been identified yet.

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 regional panel gave this proposal a Medium ranking. The project is likely to be feasible and is consistent with other restoration activities in the region. However, this reach of Stoney Creek is basically in the valley and is of low elevation. This reach probably supports a warm water fishery. Water temperatures may generally be too warm for high quality anadromous fish production.

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: 105

Applicant Organization: Orland Unit Water Users' Association

Proposal Title: Northside Diversion Dam Fish Passage Feasibility Study

Overall Ranking: -Low Medium -High

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

The purpose of this project is to determine if the dam has an impact on upstream/downstream migration of salmonids; then reduce the impact (aka construct a fish passage facility.) The panel gave it a medium.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

Yes, this project seems feasible. The Orland Water Users are working closely with engineers from a potential consulting firm (Montgomery Watson Harza) and have proposed a step-wise project for this feasibility study.

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

Yes -No

How?

Yes, this project pursues restoration priorities; it takes the first step toward identifying, then remedying a fish passage problem. Fish passage is a restoration goal of both the CVPIA and CALFED.

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

-Yes No

How?

No, the WUA needs to work more closely/align their work with the recommendations already prepared by the USBR.

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

Yes -No

How?

Yes, although more diverse representation would be advantageous to achieve a balanced viewpoint. At least one of the engineers identified as a potential subcontractor is familiar with screening projects in the general locale.

Other Comments:

The proposal inaccurately describes spring run as a species that could benefit... but this stream is too low elevation to support spring run (i.e. water temps too high, this is not a spring run stream).

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 105

Applicant Organization: Orland Unit Water Users' Association

Proposal Title: Northside Diversion Dam Fish Passage Feasibility Study

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

-Yes XNo

If no, please explain:

It is not clear how surveys for vegetation, wildlife, and fish species will be conducted. At a minimum, need a Scientific Collecting Permit. Applicant states that they will be looking for special status wildlife species and there are listed anadromous fish species in the project area. Depending on how surveys are conducted, may need a 2081/Incidental Take permit to comply with CESA.

Applicant will be complying with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act; on the Environmental Compliance Checklist, under Federal Permits and Approvals, list "required" next to "Other."

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

XYes -No

If no, please explain:

No budget or timeline for permits specified.

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

-Yes XNo

If yes, please explain:

Need to obtain appropriate permits for environmental analysis of vegetation, wildlife, and fish. All other aspects of project study are good.

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 105

Applicant Organization: Orland Unit Water Users' Association

Proposal Title: Northside Diversion Dam Fish Passage Feasibility Study

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: