

# **Proposal Reviews**

## **#109: Patterson Irrigation District Fish Screen Design and Environmental Review**

Patterson Irrigation District

**Initial Selection Panel Review**

**Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review**

**San Joaquin 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:** 109

**Applicant Organization:** Patterson Irrigation District

**Proposal Title:** Patterson Irrigation District Fish Screen Design and Environmental Review

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

Amount: **\$611000**

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 complete the final engineering design and environmental permits for a fish screen project on the San Joaquin River. The diversion that would be screened if this project were to be implemented has the potential to divert a significant portion of the San Joaquin 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 technical panel raised concerns that the costs for portions of this project were high. 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 92, Meridian Farms Water Company - Positive Barrier Fish Screen Project). 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:** 109

**Applicant Organization:** Patterson Irrigation District

**Proposal Title:** Patterson Irrigation District Fish Screen Design and Environmental Review

**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	<b>The CALFED Proposal Review Team rated the proposal as above average. The size of the existing intake is significant on the San Joaquin River of 195 cfs. The project will help prevent the loss of fishery resources from entrainment. CALFED should carefully review the project budget.</b>
XAbove 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 grant proposal is to complete the final engineering design and environmental permits for a fish screen project on the San Joaquin River. The fish screen barrier will eliminate entrainment of splittail, fall run chinook salmon, and steelhead from unscreened diversions.**

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 capacity of the Patterson Irrigation District is 195 cubic feet per second. Patterson Irrigation District intake is a significant intake on the San Joaquin River**

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 will use the latest state-of-the-art fish screen technologies. The project schedule is acceptable. The consultants are experienced with similar fish screening projects and are qualified for this project. An outreach program will be structured to maximize the participation of the stakeholders in order to inform and educate the community about the project and its intent to protect Anadromous fish. Cant determine if the public supports the project. 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?

**Year 1 costs in the Budget Summary Table seem high. Project management costs of \$64,000 are high. The CALFED Review Team recommends a cost reduction for project management costs or better justification. Environmental Documentation expenses appear high. The 10 percent of project costs seems high for design costs. The CALFED Review Team recommends that the design consultant submit to CALFED a cost breakdown of total hours for design, personnel names, rates, and estimated number of engineering drawings needed for the project. The consultant is experienced in fish screen design and the review team believes that design costs should probably be decreasing compared to design costs of previous fish screens projects.**

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

**There are no funding partners associated with the 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?

**The Regional Review Panel rates the proposal High. This committee ranked the proposal as having a high priority for the San Joaquin region. Regional priorities place a high value on screening the diversions at Patterson Irrigation District.**

**The project is important for the San Joaquin River, San Joaquin, Merced River system. Patterson Irrigation District owns the land that will be affected by the project. PID is significantly advanced in its feasibility studies (Phase I, CALFED funding) to ask for funding for the second phase, (project design and environmental review.)**

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 significant concerns were addresses by the administrative review.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

**None.**

# San Joaquin Regional Review:

**Proposal Number:** 109

**Applicant Organization:** Patterson Irrigation District

**Proposal Title:** Patterson Irrigation District Fish Screen Design and Environmental Review

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

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

**The committee ranked this proposal as having a high priority for the San Joaquin region. Regional priorities place a high value on screening the diversions at patterson.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Project is important for the San Joaquin region and the San Joaquin, Merced River system. Patterson Irrigation District (PID) owns the land that will be affected by the project. PID is significantly advanced in its feasibility studies( Phase I, CALFED funding) to ask for funding for the second phase,( project design and environmental review). Anadromous Fish Screen Project (AFSP) will be involved with design and operation criteria. Subcontractor has completed similar projects and has experience in this type of project. Limitations to feasibility are the limitations of the permitting process.**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Fish screens address strategic goals #1 and #3 (at-risk, habitat) and regional goals SJ#3 to improve fish passage. CVPIA goals are also addressed: life stages, flows, fish passage, minimization of juvenile entrainment, enhance migration of adults and downstream migration of juveniles.**

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 will increase effectiveness of restoration goals upstream on the Merced by allowing downstream migration of juvenile salmonids to increase with a decrease in entrainment. Will also decrease the entrainment of other species at the diversion.**

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

Yes -No

How?

**Applicant will conduct public outreach and information workshops to inform and educate local stakeholders about the project. Need to incorporate more local people and agencies into the fish screen program.**

Other Comments:

**The fish screen implementation projects are important to preserving and protecting aquatic species from being lost to entrainment at the different pumping facilities.**



## **Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding:**

**New Proposal Number:** 109

**New Proposal Title:** Patterson Irrigation District Fish Screen Design and Environmental Review

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

**01-N56, patterson Irrigation District Positive Barrier Fish Screen on the San Joaquin River Diversion, Ecosystem Restoration**

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?

**XYes -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?

**XYes -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?

**XYes -No -N/A**

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

**XYes -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?

**XYes -No -N/A**

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

## **Environmental Compliance:**

**Proposal Number:** 109

**Applicant Organization:** Patterson Irrigation District

**Proposal Title:** Patterson Irrigation District Fish Screen Design and Environmental Review

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

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

**May need State Lands Commission Land Use Lease.**

**All other permits and environmental documentation will be obtained and filed.**

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:

**Budget and timeline to obtain permits and comply with NEPA/CEQA are adequate.**

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

-Yes No

If yes, please explain:

**Proposal will be in compliance with applicable permits and environmental documentation but may need State Lands Commission Land Use Lease.**

Other Comments:

**Budget:**

**Proposal Number:** 109

**Applicant Organization:** Patterson Irrigation District

**Proposal Title:** Patterson Irrigation District Fish Screen Design and Environmental Review

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

**only 1 year.**

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:

**none charged.**

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).

**17.a. = \$611,000.00**

**Grand Total = \$611,000.00**

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: