

# Proposal Reviews

## #116: Reclamation District No. 108 Consolidated Pumping Facility and Fish Screen

Reclamation District 108

**Final Selection Panel Review**

**Initial Selection Panel Review**

**Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review**

**Land Acquisition**

**Sacramento Regional Review**

**Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding** #1  
#2

**Environmental Compliance**

**Budget**

## Final Selection Panel Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 116

**Applicant Organization:** Reclamation District 108

**Proposal Title:** Reclamation District No. 108 Consolidated Pumping Facility and Fish Screen

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

<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: **\$7,200,000**

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 requested \$630,000 as a directed action this year, noting that a Federal cost-share is available. The Selection Panel encourages the Ecosystem Restoration Program to work with the Anadromous Fish Screen Program (the source of the Federal funds) to address the applicant's concerns concurrently with efforts to establish a reasonable cost for an appropriately screened facility.**

## Initial Selection Panel Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 116

**Applicant Organization:** Reclamation District 108

**Proposal Title:** Reclamation District No. 108 Consolidated Pumping Facility and Fish Screen

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: **\$7,200,000.00**

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

**None**

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

**This 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 recommended that an independent value engineering analysis to establish a reasonable cost for an appropriately screened facility. The Selection Panel concurs with the technical panel and recommends that the applicant work with the Anadromous Fish Screen Program to establish a reasonable cost for an appropriately screened facility, and submit a revised proposal for consideration as a directed action.**

# Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 116

**Applicant Organization:** Reclamation District 108

**Proposal Title:** Reclamation District No. 108 Consolidated Pumping Facility and Fish Screen

**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>This project is considered to be very desirable, but the cost is excessive. If the project applicant made a greater financial contribution to the project it would have received a higher ranking</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 project lies on the primary migration route for the endangered winter-run chinook salmon. Additionally, spring-run chinook (threatened), central valley steelhead trout (threatened), and fall/late fall-run chinook salmon populations migrate through the area affected by the project. These species are not in their most vulnerable life stages (egg and larval stages) in the vicinity of the project, but fry-sized salmonids are present, and the screen should be designed with that consideration. Benefits of the project will be LONG TERM; after consolidation, the existing facilities will be demolished. With the consolidated**

**diversion, the total diversion capacity can be 117 cfs less than the total diversion capacity of the three existing 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 maximum diversion rate of the proposed consolidated facility could be as much as 5-10% of the river flow, which is considered significant.**

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 proven, existing technology. Several diversions of similar size and larger have been constructed successfully in recent years with designs similar to that proposed for the consolidated facility. Contractors for this project have not been chosen at this time, although there are several qualified contractors available to perform the work. Any foreseeable adverse impact can most likely be mitigated satisfactorily. The project is compatible with NMFS's goal to prevent take of listed species by screening water diversion. Applicant participation is voluntary.**

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

**The project is pricey. The new screen will be half the size of a similar consolidation project at a similar price. The cost of this project is approximately \$54,000 per cfs, substantially higher than comparable projects. Benefits are high; these are some of the last large diversions on the Sacramento River and must be screened to achieve maximum benefit of the other large screening projects already completed.**

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 applicant is a willing participant. Appropriate partners are unknown.**

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 ranked the proposal as HIGH. It noted the importance of screening these diversions, although they thought the price was very high.**

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?

**Niether administrative review had concerns with the project.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

**The review panel recommends an independent value engineering analysis to establish a reasonable price for an appropriately screened facility. The project is very important, but fish screen cost inflation has exceeded greater economic trends.**

## **Land Acquisition:**

**Proposal Number:** 116

**Applicant Organization:** Reclamation District 108

**Proposal Title:** Reclamation District No. 108 Consolidated Pumping Facility and Fish Screen

1. Is the site's ecological importance documented in the proposal?

Yes No

If yes, please import relevant text and citations here:

**In 1997, RD 108 signed a Letter of Intent with the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) in which RD 108 and the resource agencies committed to work cooperatively to develop solutions to prevent the entrainment of fish at RD 108s seven pumping plants on the Sacramento River. The potential solutions were required to benefit the fishery while not adversely impacting water delivery to RD 108.**

**RD 108 conducted a reconnaissance investigation (CH2M HILL, 2001) to evaluate the engineering feasibility, costs, and benefits to screen three diversion. The reconnaissance investigation, completed in September 2001, evaluated seven alternatives. The seven alternatives included the following: Boyers BendScreen existing pumping facility Howells LandingScreen existing pumping facility Tyndall MoundScreen existing pumping facility Tyndall MoundScreen new pumping facility Boyers Bend and Howells Landing Pumping Facility combined New Combined FacilityAlternative 1 (pumps on river side of levee) New Combined FacilityAlternative 2 (pumps on land side of levee)**

**The result of the reconnaissance investigation is the project for which this proposal is submitted. The screening of RD 108s three diversions will best be accomplished by a project that includes the following: A new consolidated pumping plant with a 260-cfs capacity that would provide water to the three existing irrigation service areas A fish screen structure with vertical plate screens Canal facilities to connect the three irrigation service areas to the new pumping plant Demolition/salvage of the existing pumping plants at Boyers Bend, Howells Landing, and Tyndall Mound once the new facility is operational**

**Results of the entrainment loss and percentage reduction calculations (Table 1) show that the cumulative entrainment losses would be reduced by 76 percent over the 20-year period, assuming construction of a consolidated pumping plant and fish screen facility completed by 2005. The magnitude of fishery benefits (i.e., percentage reduction in entrainment losses) depends, to a large extent, on the schedule of implementing positive barrier fish screens.**

**Results of this analysis show that the consolidation of pumping plants and fish screen offer substantial biological benefit in reducing the mortality of both migratory and resident fish species inhabiting the Sacramento River.**

2. Is the owner's willingness to sell the site documented in the proposal?

Yes No

If no, please explain:

**The application states only that the district has "spoken to the landowners" and that they have "indicated their willingness to work with RD 108".**

3. Is evidence of local government support for the purchase included in the proposal?

-Yes XNo

If yes, please explain:

4. Is the use proposed for the site after its purchase clearly consistent with the site's general plan designation and zoning?

XYes -No

If no, please explain:

**The site is designated for agriculture general in the county's land use plan and zoned for Exclusive Agriculture. It is hard to conceive of an exclusive ag zone that would not permit these irrigation related facilities.**

5. Is the land mapped as prime farmland, farmland of statewide significance, unique farmland, or farmland of local importance?

XYes -No

If yes, please explain the classification:

**irrigated cropland**

Is the site under a Williamson Act contract?

XYes -No

Will use of the site change from agriculture after its purchase?

XYes -No -Not Currently in Agriculture

6. Is this a time-sensitive acquisition opportunity, according to the proposal?

XYes -No

If yes, please import relevant text here:

**The magnitude of fishery benefits (i.e., percentage reduction in entrainment losses) depends, to a large extent, on the schedule of implementing positive barrier fish screens.**

Other Comments:

## **Sacramento Regional Review:**

**Proposal Number:** 116

**Applicant Organization:** Reclamation District 108

**Proposal Title:** Reclamation District No. 108 Consolidated Pumping Facility and Fish Screen

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

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

**Some of the panel members felt the fish screens too costly for numbers of fish saved. Nevertheless, 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?

**This project approach has proven successful for other major fish screen construction projects on the Sacramento River (see proposal, p 4). The project combines three individual pumping plants with a combined capacity of 377 cfs and reduces the capacity to 260 cfs, a 30% reduction. It is estimated that this project would reduce cumulative entrainment losses by 76 percent over a 20 year period (p6). The effects of natural channel processes on such a structure and the effects of this structure on natural channel processes and the 50 acres of riparian habitat easement cannot be determined from this proposal. Both CEQA and NEPA should address these impacts.**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**A specific priority, SR-6, in the ERP 2002 PSP, directly includes the consolidation and screening of Reclamation District 108's diversions from the Sacramento River.**

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 has been discussed and coordinated with the USFWS and USBR under the CVPIA Anadromous Fish Screen Program. NMFS and CDFG have been consulted in terms of their respective fish screen project regulatory programs. Screening the Reclamation**

**District No. 108 is in line with CALFED and CVPIA goals and objectives for screening major diversions in the Central Valley.**

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

Yes -No

How?

**Project proponents have held public meetings and report that the project appears to have public support. They are also working closely with USBR, USFWS, CDFG, NMFS representatives and district landowners.**

Other Comments:

**Some on the panel felt that the benefits of screening juvenile salmonids outweigh those associated with impacts on geomorphological processes and riparian habitat on a section of the Sacramento River that is already heavily channelized.**

**Note that there is existing federal cost share for this project.**

## **Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1**

**New Proposal Number:** 116

**New Proposal Title:** Reclamation District No. 108 Consolidated Pumping Facility and Fish Screen

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)*

**#01FG200029**

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 with designs and environmental documentation in 2002.**

Other Comments:

## **Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2**

**New Proposal Number:** 116

**New Proposal Title:** Reclamation District No. 108 Consolidated Pumping Facility and Fish Screen

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

**97-C01**

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?

**X**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?

**X**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?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

**X**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 **X**N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

**In the 97-C01 contract, the state-mandated 10% retention was held in an escrow account "subject to release with written approval of CALFED contract manager." Project proponents released some escrow funds without receiving this approval.**

## **Environmental Compliance:**

**Proposal Number:** 116

**Applicant Organization:** Reclamation District 108

**Proposal Title:** Reclamation District No. 108 Consolidated Pumping Facility and Fish Screen

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

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

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:

**Timeline budgets 7 months for environmental permitting and documentation.**

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:** 116

**Applicant Organization:** Reclamation District 108

**Proposal Title:** Reclamation District No. 108 Consolidated Pumping Facility and Fish Screen

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: