

Proposal Reviews

#117: Reclamation District No. 108 Wilkins Slough Positive Barrier Fish Screen Sediment Removal Project

Reclamation District 108

Final Selection Panel Review

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review

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: 117

Applicant Organization: Reclamation District 108

Proposal Title: Reclamation District No. 108 Wilkins Slough Positive Barrier Fish Screen Sediment Removal Project

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:

This proposal was rated low by the Sacramento Regional Review and was not recommended by the Fish Screen and Ladder Construction Panel, which recommended against funding unless Reclamation District No. 108 participated substantially in funding the sedimentation removal system.

During the public review period the district responded that it is already providing a cost share through support for a sediment removal pilot test and its commitment to operate and maintain the facility. It asserted that the screen's sedimentation problems did not result from design oversights, as the Fish Screen and and Ladder Construction Panel believed, but from a deliberate decision to defer installation of sediment control systems. The Northern California Water Association also commented that it was disappointed that the project was not funded.

These views were considered during the Selection Panel discussion on providing additional funding for pumps to remove sediment from the newly constructed fish screen, but the panel did not find compelling reasons to change its recommendation. The panel lacks sufficient information to determine whether the district or the fish screen and passage panel is correct about the screen designers' responsibility for dealing with the sediment problem. The panel is concerned that the project proposed may not provide a durable, long-term solution to the screen's sedimentation problems. In addition, it is reluctant to recommend funds for work that may be considered screen

maintenace, which the ERP cannot afford to fund at the many screens under development in the Bay-Delta system.

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review:

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

Proposal Number: 117

Applicant Organization: Reclamation District 108

Proposal Title: Reclamation District No. 108 Wilkins Slough Positive Barrier Fish Screen Sediment Removal 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 new fish screen facility is already constructed without effective sediment protection systems. The proposed sedimentation removal system is critical for the proper operation of the fish screen intake. However, the CALFED Proposal Review Team recommends not to fund the proposal unless Reclamation District No. 108 participates substantially in the funding for the sedimentation removal system. Specifically, the CALFED Proposal Review Team recommends the District seek funding from the engineering design firms insurance carrier to pay for at least a portion of what can be viewed as a foreseeable need for the sedimentation removal system for the project. The design firm did not consider sedimentation in the original design and should share in the responsibility of providing funds through their omissions and errors insurance.
-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?

The project is located at an existing fish screen on the mainstem of the Sacramento River near the town of Grimes, California. The screen structure eliminates entrainment of all species of salmonids which include winter-run, spring-run, late-fall, fall run Chinook salmon, steelhead, and splittail which reside or migrate past the project location.

Sediment now builds up on the screen, impairing the district's diversion and increasing its O&M costs. Sediment removal features would lower these costs and improve the screen's performance.

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?

Fish screen structure is already built and sized for an approach velocity of 0.33 feet per second.

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 sedimentation removal system is a new technology to push away sedimentation on both sides of the screens. A small prototype sedimentation removal system was tested at the site to study if the design of the sedimentation removal system would actually work. According to Reclamation District 108, the prototype sedimentation removal system performed well. There are no evident impediments to implementation. The current fish screen structure is built in accordance with the regulatory agencies criteria.

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

The cost for the project is \$830,000. The review panel recommends that Reclamation District 108 reevaluate the project costs

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, Reclamation District No. 108 has \$415,000 of CVPIA funds. Reclamation District has not volunteered to be a funding partner

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 rated the proposal as Low. This project already has the cost share federal dollars from USBR and is requesting the state cost share dollars through CALFED. This request, if funded, is considered by the Sacramento Regional Panel as precedent setting as to how CALFED should deal with Adaptive Management or large O&M projects, whichever action category CALFED decides this request represents. Public funds have already been spent on a screen design that did not take into consideration the large sediment loads associated with the Sacramento River system. Consequently, this screen design could be considered deficient and

other screen design teams could learn from this situation. The Regional Panel considers the sedimentation problem as a maintenance obligation of the district.

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:

None

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 117

Applicant Organization: Reclamation District 108

Proposal Title: Reclamation District No. 108 Wilkins Slough Positive Barrier Fish Screen Sediment Removal Project

Overall Ranking: Low -Medium -High

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

This project already has the cost share federal dollars from USBR and is requesting the state cost share dollars through CALFED. This request, if funded, is considered by the Sacramento Geographic Panel as precedent setting as to how CALFED should deal with Adaptive Management or large M&O projects whichever CALFED decides what action category this request represents. Public funds have already been spent on a screen design that did not take into consideration the large sediment loads associated with sector of the Sacramento River system. Consequently, this screen design could be considered deficient and other screen design teams could learn from this situation. The Panel considers this problem a maintenance obligation of the district.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

A sediment removal pilot study was successfully conducted. The results indicated that the proposed sediment removal facilities are feasible and will solve the sediment problem at the Wilkin's Slough Positive Barrier Fish Screen. This system is designed to continually control deposition and sediment buildup in order to maintain the approach velocity below the design maximum of 0.33 fps at near maximum pumping rates of 830 cfs.

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

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?

Yes -No

How?

This is an "adaptive management" adjustment to an already constructed fish screen on a 830 cfs diversion.

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

Yes -No

How?

Development of the project is proceeding with the regular participation and input from the AFSP Technical Team, USFWS, CDFG and NMFS. Public meetings and hearing have been held and the project appears to have public support.

Other Comments:

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1

New Proposal Number: 117

New Proposal Title: Reclamation District No. 108 Wilkins Slough Positive Barrier Fish Screen Sediment Removal 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)*

#7FG2015040

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 has completed the design of the sediment removal system and is awaiting funding to complete construction of the project in 2002.

Other Comments:

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2

New Proposal Number: 117

New Proposal Title: Reclamation District No. 108 Wilkins Slough Positive Barrier Fish Screen Sediment Removal Project

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?

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:

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: 117

Applicant Organization: Reclamation District 108

Proposal Title: Reclamation District No. 108 Wilkins Slough Positive Barrier Fish Screen Sediment Removal Project

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

Yes No

If no, please explain:

Possibly need a Waste Discharge Permit and State Lands Commission Land Use Lease. These permits may already be included under "Other" for State Permits and Approvals.

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:

Previously obtained permits and environmental documentation may need extensions/amendments to comply with this project. No specific budget or timeline for these extensions/amendments was specifically listed.

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

Yes No

If yes, please explain:

All appropriate State and federal permits have been obtained but may need updating for this project. It is not clear what is included under "Other" for State Permit and Approvals but may need a Waste Discharge Permit and State Lands Commission Land Use Lease.

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 117

Applicant Organization: Reclamation District 108

Proposal Title: Reclamation District No. 108 Wilkins Slough Positive Barrier Fish Screen Sediment Removal 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: