

# **Proposal Reviews**

## **#111: Pleasant Grove-Verona Mutual Water Company Positive Barrier Fish Screen Design and Environmental Review**

Pleasant Grove-Verona Mutual 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:** 111

**Applicant Organization:** Pleasant Grove-Verona Mutual Water Company

**Proposal Title:** Pleasant Grove-Verona Mutual Water Company Positive Barrier Fish Screen Design and Environmental Review

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

<b>Fund</b>	
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 Fish Screen and Ladder Construction Panel rated the proposal as adequate. The Selection Panel, after extensive discussion, concurred with the Technical Committee's rating of the project description. The Selection Panel also shared the technical panel's concerns about the apparent high cost and inadequate clarification of additional costs. The Selection Panel recognizes that that the project is listed as a priority in the 2002 Proposal Solicitation Package, but felt that the proposal lacked sufficient detail and justification to warrant funding now.**

**The comments provided by the single commenter expressed their disappointment that the proposal was not recommended, but did not provide a compelling reason to change the panel's recommendation.**

## Initial Selection Panel Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 111

**Applicant Organization:** Pleasant Grove-Verona Mutual Water Company

**Proposal Title:** Pleasant Grove-Verona Mutual Water Company Positive Barrier 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>In Part</b>	-
<b>With Conditions</b>	-
<b>Consider as Directed Action</b>	-
<b>Not Recommended</b>	<b>X</b>

Amount: **\$0**

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

**None**

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

**This proposal is for design and environmental review for a fish screen on a Pleasant Grove-Verona Mutual Water Company diversion on the Sacramento River. This project is specifically identified as a priority in the 2002 PSP and was rated a high regional priority by the regional panel. The technical review panel gave it an adequate rating and noted that the proposal lacked sufficient detail to fully assess the projects value and that costs were excessive. The Selection Panel does not recommend funding this proposal at this time.**

# Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 111

**Applicant Organization:** Pleasant Grove-Verona Mutual Water Company

**Proposal Title:** Pleasant Grove-Verona Mutual Water Company Positive Barrier 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.

<b>Overall Evaluation Summary Rating</b>	<b>Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating</b>
-Superior	<b>The project has high regional value and will be part of an overall ecosystem restoration plan. The budget for final design and environmental review seems to be high when compared to other projects of similar size or capacity. The proposal would have rated higher if given more detail on project description, not adequately explained.</b>
-Above average	
X 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 near the town of Verona where it will significantly benefit the fishery. Cumulatively, the current unscreened diversions of the Water Company in this 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, delta smelt and splittail are present in vulnerable stages of their life. Downstream migrating juvenile fish are vulnerable to entrainment by unscreened diversions in the**

**location. The project will benefit all species fish that reside or migrate past the project location. Natural habitat will be restored if the abandoned pump sites are 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.**

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 project is for fish screen design and environmental review. The diversion capacity to be screened is not given. Therefore, the it can't be determined if the diversion is a significant proportion of the waterway's discharge.**

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 environmental information. The project 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. There doesnt appear to be any obstacles that would impede the project. Public support is being generated through an outreach program. The project is part of an integrated restoration program that includes positive barrier fish screens. This project along with other screening projects 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 \$1,384,000 appears to be high when compared to other recently completed design and environmental review projects for similar project sizes. The need for additional cost aren't explained in proposal.**

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. PGVMWC is a cost sharing \$10,000 and is willing to furnish in-kind services. Other cost sharing has been exploited.**

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 high. The project is an integral part of the overall ecosystem restoration program for the mainstem Sacramento River. The project addresses CALFED Goals 1 & 4, PSP priorities SR-2 (Restore fish habitat + fish passage, especially for spring-run chinook and steelhead trout, + conduct passage studies) and SR-6 (continue major fish screen projects + conduct studies of fish screen's implications for fish populations), as well as CVPIA goal and objectives described in Section 3402, 3406(b)(1), 3406(b)(21).**

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 the project needs CDFG 2081 and is not Categorically Exempt for CEQA. Also, a State Land Commission Lease is needed since this is no NCCP for Sutter County. (Why these would be required of a study is unclear to the technical panel). The time line may need to be extended by a couple of months to make project feasible.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

**Cant determine if the project plans on screening two diversions or consolidating several at a new location. Is consolidation being considered in feasibility study?**

## **Sacramento Regional Review:**

**Proposal Number:** 111

**Applicant Organization:** Pleasant Grove-Verona Mutual Water Company

**Proposal Title:** Pleasant Grove-Verona Mutual Water Company Positive Barrier Fish Screen Design and Environmental Review

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?

**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 and Banta-Carbona Fish Screen Feasibility Study. 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?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**This project addresses CALFED Goal 1 and 4, and 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?

**X**Yes -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?

Yes -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.**

Other Comments:

**Because of the large funding requirements for screening diversions, the panel felt that the AFSP panel should rank all large fish screen projects reviewed by the Sacramento River Geographic Panel prior to potential funding.**

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

**New Proposal Number:** 111

**New Proposal Title:** Pleasant Grove-Verona Mutual Water Company Positive Barrier Fish Screen Design and Environmental Review

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)*

**#00FG200185**

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 completing the feasibility study and will be ready to start the design and environmental compliance in 2002.**

Other Comments:

## **Environmental Compliance:**

**Proposal Number:** 111

**Applicant Organization:** Pleasant Grove-Verona Mutual Water Company

**Proposal Title:** Pleasant Grove-Verona Mutual Water Company Positive Barrier 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:

**The environmental checklist indicates that the project would need an NCCP for CESA compliance. There is no NCCP for Sutter County, instead the project would need a 2081.**

**The project would likely need a grading permit, among other possible local permits, and it may need a State Land Commission Lease.**

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:

**The budget is fine, however the timeline seems tight. The proposal states that the draft EIR will be completed by January 2003 and the final EIR will be completed by February 2003. As the agency review period for an EIR is 45 days, it is unlikely that the project proponent will be able to respond to comments and have a final document within two months of presenting the draft.**

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

-Yes No

If yes, please explain:

**Permits listed above should be obtainable. The timeline would simply need to be extended by a month or two to be make this project feasible.**

Other Comments:

## **Budget:**

**Proposal Number:** 111

**Applicant Organization:** Pleasant Grove-Verona Mutual Water Company

**Proposal Title:** Pleasant Grove-Verona Mutual Water Company Positive Barrier 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:

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: