

Proposal Reviews

#118: Reclamation District 2035 Fish Screen Construction

Reclamation District 2035

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review

Sacramento Regional Review

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review:

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

Proposal Number: 118

Applicant Organization: Reclamation District 2035

Proposal Title: Reclamation District 2035 Fish Screen Construction

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 CALFED Review Team agreed that a fish screen should be installed at the Districts intake, but that awarding construction funds now would be premature.
-Above average	The District is applying for fish screen construction funding. However, the District did not provide drawings with the proposal. The design approach velocity has not been finalized with the regulatory agencies. Therefore, the proposed cost estimate may be incorrect. The CALFED Review Team also questioned the intake flow capacity of 400 cfs. The District may need to submit information on their historic diversions to CALFED for clarification. Cost estimates for years 1, 2, and 3 seem high. The CALFED Review Team recommends the design consultant submit to CALFED a cost breakdown of total hours for design, personnel names, labor hours, rates, and estimated number of engineering drawings needed for the project. The consultant is experienced with fish screen design and the design costs should decrease with experience.
-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 on the Sacramento River mainstem, where its construction will protect juvenile and migrating fish species, such as chinook salmon, steelhead trout, and Sacramento splittail.

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 Reclamation District No. 2035 diversion is 400 cubic feet per second, which is a significant proportion of the rivers flow.

However, the CALFED Review Team believes that the Districts historic maximum diversion may be about 250 cfs, much less than 400 cubic feet per second for which this screen is designed. This difference needs to be clarified, because AFSP does not fund fish screen costs attributable to increases in diversion capacity. Water rights adequate to support any increase in diversion also need to be demonstrated.

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. The District has sent letters to inform the local government agencies that they are considering constructing a fish screen at the diversion point. 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. There is public support for 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 \$70,000 seem high. The CALFED Review Team recommends a cost reduction for project management costs. Bid and Award Services, construction management, and engineering assistance during construction should be reduced or better justified. The design consultant should submit to CALFED a cost breakdown of total hours for design including, personnel names, estimated hours, rates, and 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 be decreasing compared to design costs of previously completed 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 Panel agreed overall that this was a high priority project for the Sacramento River Geographical Region.

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:

This project has been discussed and coordinated with the USFWS and USBR under the CVPIA Anadromous Fish Screen Program. Screening the Reclamation District No. 2035 is in line with CALFED and CVPIA goals and objectives for screening major diversions in the Central Valley.

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 118

Applicant Organization: Reclamation District 2035

Proposal Title: Reclamation District 2035 Fish Screen Construction

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?

XYes -No

How?

This project approach has proven successful for other major fish screen construction projects on the Sacramento River. The project constructs a positive barrier fish screen on a 400 cfs pump station.

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

XYes -No

How?

Specific CALFED priority, SR-2 and SR-6, in the ERP 2002 PSP and addresses the CVPIA 3406(b)(21).

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

XYes -No

How?

This project has been discussed and coordinated with the USFWS and USBR under the CVPIA AFSP. NMFS and CDFG have been consulted in terms of their respective fish screen project regulatory programs. Screening the Reclamation District No. 2035 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?

XYes -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:

The panel felt that the \$13.5 million should be cost-shared with state funds. Unclear if this is ½ cost of the project or total cost. They need to state what part of the \$13.5 million is state funds and federal funds.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding:

New Proposal Number: 118

New Proposal Title: Reclamation District 2035 Fish Screen Construction

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

01-N55 RD 2035 Sacramento River Pump Intake Positive Barrier Fish Screen - Design and Environmental Review, 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:

Accurately stated at time of writing proposal. Current phase has been extended by 3 months to February 2003.

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:

Please note, the proposal suggests an October 2002 start. The current phase has been extended by 3 months to February 2003 to account for subcontracting delays.

Other Comments:

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 118

Applicant Organization: Reclamation District 2035

Proposal Title: Reclamation District 2035 Fish Screen Construction

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:

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: 118

Applicant Organization: Reclamation District 2035

Proposal Title: Reclamation District 2035 Fish Screen Construction

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: