

Proposal Reviews

#160: Phase III Conical Fish Screen Proposal

Suisun Resource Conservation District

Initial Selection Panel Review

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review

Bay Regional Review

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 160

Applicant Organization: Suisun Resource Conservation District

Proposal Title: Phase III Conical Fish Screen Proposal

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).

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:

The Panel determined that funding of this proposal is not appropriate at this time. The proposal listed five different properties which have diversions that may be screened under this proposal, but did not indicate the capacity or the location of those diversions. Furthermore, the proposal did not indicate whether the fishery agencies concurred that these particular diversions were the highest priority. This action was not listed as a priority in the PSP.

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review:

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

Proposal Number: 160

Applicant Organization: Suisun Resource Conservation District

Proposal Title: Phase III Conical Fish Screen Proposal

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	It is impossible to accurately assess the cost/benefit aspect of this project because neither the capacities of the five candidate screens nor their locations are specified. This information should be requested and reviewed prior to final judgement and award of funds. For the purposes of this review, and given the known locations of some of the diversions owned by the duck clubs named in the proposal, it is assumed that all five candidate diversions are located on Montezuma Slough. In addition, an audit of application of the overhead multiplier is recommended. Pending resolution of these concerns, this rating could be Superior because of location in very important native fish rearing habitat, location on a major migration route for anadromous species, and risks of repeated exposure to diversions in a tidally driven environment. Suisun Marsh represents valuable habitat for a variety of native fishes. Wildlife benefits also accrue from continuing operation of these diversions. The Regional Panel may have underestimated the benefits which would accrue from fish screens in Suisun Marsh, especially in light of other ERP investments in the area.
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?

- **Is the project located where it will significantly benefit the fishery?**

Yes, Suisun Marsh / Montezuma Slough

- **Do current fish passage barriers or water diversions there harm large numbers of fish?**

Yes, ongoing fish screen program

- **What species of anadromous fish are present?**

Fall chinook, spring chinook, winter run chinook, probably late fall chinook, steelhead, green sturgeon, possibly American shad, striped bass

- **Is the project located where these species are in their most vulnerable life stages?**

No. Salmon are most vulnerable in incubation / early rearing and adult marine life stages; green sturgeon are probably most vulnerable during egg and larval life stages; American shad are most vulnerable during earliest life stages (eggs, larvae); striped bass are most vulnerable during egg/larval life stages and as marine adults

- **Will it benefit other species of fish or the waterways community and ecosystem?**

Yes. Other species include delta smelt, splittail, longfin smelt (occasionally), other native and non-native resident species

- **Does it restore and protect natural habitats or habitat values?**

Yes. Will protect aquatic ecosystem restoration investment through protection of output (fish) and provide benefits to waterfowl

- **Will its benefits be long-term, or short-lived?**

Benefits will be long-term, but project life is not specified. Assume 25 years.

- **Is its biological effectiveness clearly demonstrable?**

Yes, however monitoring is not proposed. Population level benefits depend on the ability to estimate populations of species involved, as in any other ERP element. This has not been done to date.

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 is not applicable, since the project(s) will be in a tidally driven part of the system. Tidal flux is >> net flow, but is modified locally by the Salinity Control Structure. CAPACITIES OF THE FIVE CANDIDATE DIVERSIONS TO BE SCREENED ARE NOT SPECIFIED! NEITHER ARE LOCATIONS. THIS IS A SHORTCOMING OF THIS 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?

• **Does the project use proven and existing technology, or unproven and experimental technology?**

Proven technology

• **Can it be implemented in a timely fashion, or are protracted delays anticipated?**

Can be implemented in a timely fashion

• **Are project partners, including consultants and subcontractors, qualified?**

Yes

• **Will legal, regulatory, or technical obstacles impede it?**

Probably not

• **Can any adverse effects be reversed or adequately mitigated?**

Avoided

• **Does it enjoy public support?**

Yes

• **Is it compatible with other programs and projects, which are part of an integrated restoration program for the waterway?**

Not incompatible

• **Does it have synergistic effects with ongoing programs?**

Protects ERP investments, especially assumed increases in fish production from habitat restoration and other ERP actions.

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

Questions/issues arise: • Was there competitive pricing of components? • An overhead audit is strongly advised • NO DIVERSION CAPACITIES (OR LOCATIONS) ARE SPECIFIED

Given the locations of various intakes owned by the five duck clubs, it is assumed that the five candidate diversions are all on Montezuma Slough, and are therefore high priority candidates for screening.

Without site and capacity information, it is impossible to perform an adequate cost/benefit assessment.

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

- **Does the project fully involve appropriate partners?**

NO. There are five names given, but no amounts are specified.

- **Are the applicants willing participants?**

Yes

- **Are other cost-sharing funds available, and fully exploited?**

NO. There are five names given but no amounts are specified.

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?

- **How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)?**

Low. Reviewer cited more effective actions but did NOT SPECIFY what these might be. Regional reviewer should have specified the more effective actions he had in mind.

- **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?**

No. Only unspecified more effective actions.

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?

Environmental compliance: No concerns Budget: No concerns

HOWEVER, the overhead amount appears to be applied to purchased components and other items not usually subject to overhead/profit markup. AN AUDIT OF OVERHEAD IS RECOMMENDED

Miscellaneous comments:

It is impossible to adequately assess the cost/benefit aspect of this project because neither the capacities of the five candidate screens nor their locations are specified. This information should be requested and reviewed prior to final judgement and award of funds. For the purposes of this review, it is assumed that all five candidate diversions are located on Montezuma Slough. In addition, an audit of application of the overhead multiplier is recommended.

Bay Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 160

Applicant Organization: Suisun Resource Conservation District

Proposal Title: Phase III Conical Fish Screen Proposal

Overall Ranking: Low -Medium -High

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

not viewed as a high priority in relation to other proposals as far as benefits to at risk species. More effective actions available to acheive similar benefits to at risk species.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

project is covered under existing permits and is a requirement of some (ESA BOs), project is supported by the affected landowners and the SRCD has close working relationship.

project installs fish screens designed specifically for the Suisun Marsh and previously installed at other locations.

incorporates lessons from nearby research and restoration projects. affected landowners support, permits require screen installation, will improve management flexibility of managed seasonal wetlands.

project being done at request of landowners to comply with permit requirements, landowners assume operation and maintenance of facilities when installed.

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

Yes -No

How?

BR 1, enhance managed waterfowl wetlands, BR 6 Protect at-risk species using water management and regulatory approaches.

ERP Draft Phase I Implementation Plan: Achieve recovery of at risk fishes dependent upon Bay Delta and Improve strategies for managing at risk fish species.

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?

Previous implementation funded by Category III and Four Pumps agreement. Required by BOs and needed to facilitate management of managed seasonal wetlands.

allows compliance with NMFS, FWS BO requirements Project facilitates management of seasonal wetlands for waterfowl, supported by DFG, CWA, DU.

meets objectives of providing for enhanced management of Seasonal wetlands for waterfowl.

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

Yes -No

How?

SRCD, working with local landowners and appropriate management and regulatory agencies in the marsh. Involvement appropriate for type of project

Includes landowner workshops which are regularly held by the SRCD. SRCD will disseminate info to landowners and regulatory agencies.

Other Comments:

none

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding:

New Proposal Number: 160

New Proposal Title: Phase III Conical Fish Screen Proposal

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

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 **X**N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

X

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

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

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

X

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

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

If no, please explain deficiencies:

X

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

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

If no, please explain deficiencies:

X

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:

The applicant is requesting funds to design through May 2002, with construction to begin in July 2002. CEQA and NEPA are apparently covered in a Department of the Army General Permit that allows for limited disturbance in the marsh for fish screen installations through 2005.

Other Comments:

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 160

Applicant Organization: Suisun Resource Conservation District

Proposal Title: Phase III Conical Fish Screen Proposal

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

-Yes No

If no, please explain:

Notify BCDC and State Lands Commission.

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: 160

Applicant Organization: Suisun Resource Conservation District

Proposal Title: Phase III Conical Fish Screen Proposal

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).

difference of \$37,095.29, comment explained in the budget summary, SRCD will require an admin. fee (3.5% of the total) which will take place in year 2. The admin fee based on the Grand Total is \$37,095.29. That brings the TOTAL grant request to \$1,096,960.62.

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: