

# **Proposal Reviews**

## **#162: Sutter Mutual Water Company-Tisdale Positive Barrier Fish Screen and Pumping Plant**

Sutter Mutual Water Company

**Final Selection Panel Review**

**Initial Selection Panel Review**

**Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review**

**Sacramento Regional Review**

**Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding**

**Environmental Compliance**

**Budget**

# Final Selection Panel Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 162

**Applicant Organization:** Sutter Mutual Water Company

**Proposal Title:** Sutter Mutual Water Company-Tisdale Positive Barrier Fish Screen and Pumping Plant

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

<b>Fund</b>	
As Is	-
<b>In Part</b>	<b>X</b>
With Conditions	-
Consider as Directed Action	-
Not Recommended	-

Amount: **\$1,270,000**

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

**Provide funding for project feasibility and final design only, so that they can proceed while remaining questions about the project are resolved.**

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

**Sutter Mutual Water Company commented on the panel's recommendation, urging full funding of its proposal, for which federal matching funds are available. However, the comments by the water company have offered nothing to change the panel's recommendation on funding this project. Nor does the panel recommend that the program reserve funds for portions of any project that does not yet merit full funding.**

**Comments have been received requesting more time for public input on this proposal. The CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program remains fully committed to local input and has provided opportunity for public involvement at multiple steps in the 2002 proposal solicitation and review process. Proposals have been available to the public since last fall, and local governments and watershed groups, including the Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum (whose comments asked for more time to review this proposal), were notified of proposals in their area. The process also included regional review panels comprised of individuals with local expertise and perspectives. Because of the extensive technical and regional reviews, and the unexpectedly large number of proposals this year, the process has taken longer than anticipated. The final recommendation and subsequent funding decisions are long overdue. The 2002 Proposal Solicitation Package identified a 30-day public review period, and the ERP honored that commitment. While the Selection Panel agrees that additional time would help some parties,**

**the panel does not recommend extending the comment period for this years process**

**The panel continues to look most favorably on construction projects with merit that include a significant cost share from the applicant or other source, especially when the benefits to the applicant are so tangible. The panel encourages the water company to consider innovative ways they might contribute to the costs of building the new pumping facility since the new facility should significantly benefit Sutter Mutual Water Company. Savings from reduced operating and maintenance costs associated with the new facilities might, for example, provide potential cost share funds. The company should also consider seeking other sources of cost share to make the project more competitive with other high priority projects. The Selection Panel reaffirms the recommendations of the technical panel and recommends that the applicant work with the Anadromous Fish Screen Program to establish reasonable costs for the proposed project and come up with a plan that is suitable for this particular project.**

## Initial Selection Panel Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 162

**Applicant Organization:** Sutter Mutual Water Company

**Proposal Title:** Sutter Mutual Water Company-Tisdale Positive Barrier Fish Screen and Pumping Plant

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>X</b>
<b>With Conditions</b>	-
<b>Consider as Directed Action</b>	-
<b>Not Recommended</b>	-

Amount: **\$1,270,000**

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

**Provide funding for project feasibility and final design only, so that they can proceed while remaining questions about the project are resolved.**

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

**This project is a high priority fish screen project because it is the biggest unscreened diversion remaining in the system. However, the proposal has many shortcomings. The budget is large, the proposed cost share appears to be tenuous and reviewers question whether CALFED should be building a new pumping facility with little or no cost share from the company. The Selection Panel concurs with the recommendations of the technical panel and recommends that the applicant work with the Anadromous Fish Screen Program to establish reasonable costs for the proposed project. The panel also recommends that an independent value engineering analysis be performed to establish reasonable costs for the project. The applicant should take note that the panel looks most favorably on construction projects with merit that include a significant cost share from the applicant or other source.**

# Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 162

**Applicant Organization:** Sutter Mutual Water Company

**Proposal Title:** Sutter Mutual Water Company-Tisdale Positive Barrier Fish Screen and Pumping Plant

**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 is an exceptionally important project and very high priority. The Proposal is rated Above Average, but it could be rated higher, i.e.- Superior if stated concerns are satisfactorily addressed. (Budget, cost-sharing, technical review)</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Above 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 is located on the mainstem Sacramento River above Knights Landing, and it is the largest remaining unscreened diversion (approximately 1000 cfs) on the River. A well screened facility will provide major benefits to the fishery by preventing entrainment mortality of several ESA-listed species (winter-run/spring-run chinook, steelhead).**

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 Tisdale Pumping Plant is the main Sutter Mutual water diversion. The engineering consultant has asked for permission to design the new screen for nearly 1100 cfs. This amount of diverted water constitutes a major proportion of river flow for an on-river diversion. In worst case, this diversion could remove as much as 20% of river flow.**

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 is highly implementable, but given the magnitude of the diversion detailed studies are warranted (including physical and/or mathematical modeling)**

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

**The budget contemplates 50% cost sharing with CVPIA funds, for a total project cost approaching \$22 Million. A budget audit is recommended.**

**This project engineers are proposing a relocation of the pumping plant to a more favorable site. Question: can additional costs to move the pumping plant be justified? Should the amount awarded be judged based on that which is necessary for screening the existing site only?**

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 project involves a 50/50 CALFED partnership with the CVPIA/Anadromous Fish Screen Program. No local cost share 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?

**Rated high, but concerns about cost. Fits PSP priorities.**

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 identified problems**

#### **Miscellaneous comments:**

**This project is considered by Resource Agencies as the highest (private diversion) screening priority in California. As such, it is very important to move it forward. However, budget line items and technical design elements should be carefully reviewed.**

## Sacramento Regional Review:

**Proposal Number:** 162

**Applicant Organization:** Sutter Mutual Water Company

**Proposal Title:** Sutter Mutual Water Company-Tisdale Positive Barrier Fish Screen and Pumping Plant

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

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

**This is a well-written proposal that appears to be technically sound. The Review Panel appreciated the fact that Sutter Mutual has taken the initiative to investigate the feasibility of the project and provide an analysis of the prospective benefits. One concern was that the overall price tag is relatively high the \$20 million estimate for the project is equivalent to about \$20,000/cfs. More specifically, should CALFED funds be used to pay for a new pumping plant?**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**A feasibility study has already been completed that indicates that the current proposal is the preferred alternative.**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**The proposal clearly fits the following PSP priority: Continue major fish screen projects and conduct studies to improve knowledge of the implications of fish screens for fish populations.**

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 is part of a larger effort to screen diversion in the region.**

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

**X**Yes -No



How?

**The proponents are committed to working the SMWC landowners, the public and agencies.**

Other Comments:

**Given the high cost of the project, the Panel would have appreciated more specific information about the results of the project feasibility report. As for other fish screen projects in the region, the Review Panel believes that better objective criteria and guidance are needed from CALFED and CVPIA to help prioritize these efforts.**

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

**New Proposal Number:** 162

**New Proposal Title:** Sutter Mutual Water Company-Tisdale Positive Barrier Fish Screen and Pumping Plant

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)*

**#00FG200155 (CVPIA), #01FG200101 (Prop 204)**

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 completing the feasibility study and will be ready to start design and permitting in FY02.**

Other Comments:

## **Environmental Compliance:**

**Proposal Number:** 162

**Applicant Organization:** Sutter Mutual Water Company

**Proposal Title:** Sutter Mutual Water Company-Tisdale Positive Barrier Fish Screen and Pumping Plant

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:** 162

**Applicant Organization:** Sutter Mutual Water Company

**Proposal Title:** Sutter Mutual Water Company-Tisdale Positive Barrier Fish Screen and Pumping Plant

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: