

Proposal Reviews

#124: Fish Screen Feasibility and Interim Fish Protection Measures for Diversion Facilities of the South Yuba and Brophy Water Districts

S.P. Cramer & Associates, Inc.

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: 124

Applicant Organization: S.P. Cramer & Associates, Inc.

Proposal Title: Fish Screen Feasibility and Interim Fish Protection Measures for Diversion Facilities of the South Yuba and Brophy Water Districts

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 regional panel ranked this project low. The proposal requests funding to conduct an evaluation study of a facility that has already been identified as a hazard to juvenile fish and feasibility study for a project (installation of a positive barrier fish screen that meets NMFS criteria) that SWRCB decision 1644 requires to be done. In fact, SWRCB D1644 requires that South Yuba and Brophy Water districts submit a plan to the Board by March 2002, well before any information acquired through this project would be available. It may not be appropriate that this project be funded by CALFED.
-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 proposed project would identify and implement interim measures to reduce entrainment and predation losses of juvenile salmonids into the South Yuba-Brophy diversion (currently a rock gabion barrier) and determine the feasibility of installing a positive barrier fish screen at the facility. The two water districts are required to prepare a plan to address these issues by the SWRCB (D 1644).

The project does not restore natural habitat values and, at best, may provide some protection to juvenile salmonids, although no specific protective actions are either identified or proposed.

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?

This information is not provided in the proposal.

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 proposed project consists of a protracted 3-year evaluation of a facility that has already been identified as a passage hazard and inadequate water diversion screen. The qualifications of the listed contractors appear adequate although the proposal seemed aimed at acquiring funding to develop information that will then be used to support an anticipated subsequent request for additional funding to actually implement the needed (and required) diversion screening project.

The proposal does raise legitimate concerns that possible mercury contamination in sediments at or near the site may complicate and/or delay modification of the existing barrier and/or installation of a new fish screen.

There is no evidence of outreach to or integration with local watershed or restoration groups or of public support for this project.

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

Both the budget and the schedule are excessive in relation to the anticipated informational and restoration/fish protection benefits.

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

No, although regularly scheduled interaction with agency personnel is proposed.

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?

Low. The regional panel was not convinced that the proposed project would successfully address the issues identified. The panel also indicated that the planned multi-year fish sampling program was unnecessary to implement interim measures and a conduct a feasibility study for a fish screen. The panel also noted the lack of involvement by local restoration groups

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?

The review noted legal and regulatory issues would likely not affect the project but that the proposal failed to identify that a State Lands Commission land use permit would be required.

Miscellaneous comments:

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 124

Applicant Organization: S.P. Cramer & Associates, Inc.

Proposal Title: Fish Screen Feasibility and Interim Fish Protection Measures for Diversion Facilities of the South Yuba and Brophy Water Districts

Overall Ranking: Low -Medium -High

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

It is a priority action for all involved to have the situation at SY-Brophy taken care of, the panel was not convinced this proposal will accomplish the task. The project looks legitimate through review of the proposal, but there is a concern this proposal is actually misdirected. Four years of fish sampling are not needed to implement interim measures and conduct a feasibility study for a screen. With some modifications this could be an acceptable proposal with near term and long term benefits.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

-Yes No

How?

This is a highly contentious issue between the Districts and the agencies. SWRCB Decision -1644 requires SY-Brophy to reduce losses. The project is feasible if you remove the fish sampling (task 2), and focus on interim measures and feasibility.

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

Yes -No

How?

As a screening project it addresses PSP priority Sac Region-6.

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?

There has been some attempt to coordinate this activity, but they have not been successful. The Districts are operating outside of the restoration/local group. The proposal does consider other restoration activities and includes coordinating timelines.

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

Yes -No

How?

Sort of. The Districts have maintained a communication effort with the agencies, there are many others who are involved who are not included.

Other Comments:

X

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding:

New Proposal Number: 124

New Proposal Title: Fish Screen Feasibility and Interim Fish Protection Measures for Diversion Facilities of the South Yuba and Brophy Water Districts

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)*

Evaluate the use of radio-tagged juvenile chinook salmon to identify cause and location of mortality. Contract # 11332-9-J010 Juvenile salmon outmigration monitoring at Caswell. Contract # 10181-1-C084

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:

The applicant did not discuss the current status or progress of previously funded contracts

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 **X**N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

S.P. Cramer has been an outstanding performer regarding invoicing, communication and project deliverables.

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 124

Applicant Organization: S.P. Cramer & Associates, Inc.

Proposal Title: Fish Screen Feasibility and Interim Fish Protection Measures for Diversion Facilities of the South Yuba and Brophy Water Districts

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

-Yes No

If no, please explain:

A State Lands Commission land use lease would be required.

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: 124

Applicant Organization: S.P. Cramer & Associates, Inc.

Proposal Title: Fish Screen Feasibility and Interim Fish Protection Measures for Diversion Facilities of the South Yuba and Brophy Water Districts

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:

None used.

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

-Yes No

If no, please explain:

Could not find any reference to "Project Management" or its related costs.

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:

the Budget Justification has a lot of text describing separate costs and the Budget Summary has all these costs laid out in a readable table.

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

Yes -No

If yes, please explain:

Indirect Costs and Project Management costs were omitted.

Other Comments: