

# Proposal Reviews

## **#163: Fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam, Phase III**

Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority

**Final Selection Panel Review**

**Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review**

**Land Acquisition**

**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:** 163

**Applicant Organization:** Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority

**Proposal Title:** Fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam, Phase III

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

<b>Fund</b>	
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:

**Comments from the Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority, the TAG and the WCWA expressed their support for this project, disappointment thazt it could not be funded now, and concern for loss of momentum and enthusiasm among the project's supporters. They expressed the opinion that the absence of a single preferred alternative was the sole rationale for the denial of funding at this time.**

**The Selection Panel agrees with the technical panel that this project has high regional value and should eventually be implemented because of the importance of fish passage at Red Bluff Dam. However, the Selection Panel also supports the technical panel's conclusion that funding this project during the current funding cycle is premature because of the status of the project's current phase and because much of the information needed to properly evaluate the project was unavailable when the proposal was submitted. Although the availability of the appropriate information may be imminent, it is still not available, making the project impossible to properly evaluate. While the Selection Panel shares some of the concerns of the applicant and does not want to see enthusiasm for this project wane, the review process should not be circumvented. The applicants should note that the Selection Panel also felt that the technical panel's comments regarding costs are appropriate and another possible impediment to completing the project. Costs are high and poorly justified in the proposal. The panel recommends that the applicant take careful note of this and come up with a strategy to fully justify their cost estimates in any future applications for phase III funding.**

# Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 163

**Applicant Organization:** Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority

**Proposal Title:** Fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam, Phase III

**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>The review panel believes this project has high regional value and must be implemented eventually as part of the overall ecosystem restoration of the Sacramento River. The panel thought, however, that proceeding with the final design and land acquisition may be premature. The final alternative should be chosen prior to committing funding to this next phase design and land acquisition. Also, the cost estimate justification needs to be more detailed and thorough.</b>
-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 on the mainstem Sacramento River at the upper end of the Butte and Colusa Basin watersheds in Tehama County. Winter-run, spring-run, and fall run Chinook salmon, and Central Valley Steelhead, are all present in vulnerable stages of their life at the existing facilities. The project would provide long-term benefits to these species.**

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 facilities appears to be 2,500 cfs. This is a significant proportion of the 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 would use state-of-the-art fish screen, pumping, and ladder technologies. It is compatible with other restoration programs. No major obstacles.**

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

**The applicant is applying for \$5,943,000 to complete the design of the alternative selected in Phase II, for land purchases associated with the chosen alternative, for construction planning, and for construction contract bidding. The costs appear high. A more detailed breakdown of how costs were developed may be justified.**

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

**Cost share partners have not been identified yet. The applicant will be contributing approximately \$200,000 in in-kind services. Applicant has received CALFED funds for previous phases.**

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 panel ranked the proposal as High since it is an integral part of the overall ecosystem restoration program for the mainstem Sacramento River. The project addresses CVPIA and CALFED goals. Public involvement is sufficient.**

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?

**Generally No, however, the Budget Review indicated a need for more detailed breakdown of costs and clarification of tasks as presented.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

## Land Acquisition:

**Proposal Number:** 163

**Applicant Organization:** Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority

**Proposal Title:** Fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam, Phase III

1. Is the site's ecological importance documented in the proposal?

Yes -No

If yes, please import relevant text and citations here:

**The purposes of this project are to 1) improve fish passage at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam by reducing or eliminating TCCAs influence on RBDD operations and 2) enhance the reliability of TCCAs water supply during periods when normal gravity water diversions are precluded by the gates out operation. The range of approaches to achieving these purposes includes developing a completely new screened intake to the Canals and entirely eliminating the need for the RBDD for agricultural irrigation, devising a new operating schedule for the RBDD, incorporating existing pumping facilities and constructing minor additional facilities, or a combination of these elements in conjunction with improved, expanded, or new fish ladders. The Prescoping Report (CH2M HILL, 2000), produced under a CALFED grant during Phase I of this project, summarizes the range of previously identified alternatives to meeting the projects objectives (Reclamation, 1992)... Three viable alternative approaches for fish passage improvement and reliable water delivery were defined in the Prescoping report...Each of the six sub-alternatives requires that existing facilities be upgraded and new facilities be constructed to meet the stated needs of the project. These facilities include fish screens,intake, pump station, and other fish passage facilities....Even though many potential alternatives exist to improve the existing facilities, it is the objective of project Phase II to develop the preferred configuration of the facilities to meet the needs of each alternative. There is a potential need to acquire land for construction of the intake and pump station facilities and associated fish screening and fish passage provisions.**

2. Is the owner's willingness to sell the site documented in the proposal?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

3. Is evidence of local government support for the purchase included in the proposal?

Yes No

If yes, please explain:

4. Is the use proposed for the site after its purchase clearly consistent with the site's general plan designation and zoning?

-Yes No

If no, please explain:

**The 2 alternative sites under construction are designated for industrial use in the local general plan, and zoned for industrial use. It isn't clear that this public facility would be consistent with the sites' general plan designation and zoning, but it seems unlikely that they would preclude this utility infrastructure.**

5. Is the land mapped as prime farmland, farmland of statewide significance, unique farmland, or farmland of local importance?

-Yes No

If yes, please explain the classification:

Is the site under a Williamson Act contract?

-Yes No

Will use of the site change from agriculture after its purchase?

-Yes -No Not Currently in Agriculture

6. Is this a time-sensitive acquisition opportunity, according to the proposal?

Yes -No

If yes, please import relevant text here:

**One of the 2 sites is currently for sale. Purchase of a site will be needed for this long planned improvement to proceed, unless further study shows the needed facilities can be constructed without land purchase.**

Other Comments:

## Sacramento Regional Review:

**Proposal Number:** 163

**Applicant Organization:** Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority

**Proposal Title:** Fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam, Phase III

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

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

**Reviewers on the committee were concerned that, although this is the "next phase" on a multi-phase project, the cost was exorbitant (5.9 million for design, permitting, land acquisition).**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**The fish passage improvement project at RBDD builds upon years of study and many previous actions. The prior project, Prescoping, has identified several alternatives. The current project is doing preliminary design, then environmental documentation that will result in a preferred alternative. The proposed project will encompass final design, permitting and basically everything leading up to construction.**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**The ERP's priorities SR-2 and SR-6 are the primary regional needs that are addressed; these are both related to the need to screen and the need to improve upstream fish passage. CVPIA's Section 3406 b 10 also seeks improvement of fish passage facilities. Additionally, a "non-ecological objective" of providing a more reliable water supply for agriculture is met.**

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?

**Resource agencies have been seeking solutions to fish passage problems at the RBDD for more than 20 years. The current effort is linked with these agencies and has involved substantial outreach to interested parties.**

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

XYes -No

How?

**Beginning in January 2000, the consultant has led public outreach efforts to interested parties. These outreach efforts are continuing.**

Other Comments:

**This project also supports NMFS 1993 Biological Opinion for Winter-run chinook salmon.**



## **Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1**

**New Proposal Number:** 163

**New Proposal Title:** Fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam, Phase III

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

**CALFED # 99-B07, USBR # 00-FC-20-0032, Fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam, Phase II**

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

**None**

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:

**Applicant did not address the fact that \$750,000 of Federal funding (W&RR) was added to their CALFED grant (99-B07) by amendments.**

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?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

**Yes, expected completion date of 99-B07 is March 31, 2002.**

Other Comments:

## **Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2**

**New Proposal Number:** 163

**New Proposal Title:** Fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam, Phase III

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

**ERP 01-N58 - Fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam, Phase II**

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?

**X**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?

**X**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?

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

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

**X**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?

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

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

## **Environmental Compliance:**

**Proposal Number:** 163

**Applicant Organization:** Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority

**Proposal Title:** Fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam, Phase III

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

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

**Obtaining a 2081/Incidental Take Permit also requires obtaining a Scientific Collecting Permit.**

**Need State Lands Commission Land Use Lease.**

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:

**Budget and timeline for permits adequate.**

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:** 163

**Applicant Organization:** Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority

**Proposal Title:** Fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam, Phase III

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:

**Nothing in the proposal identifies a breakdown of the budget summary**

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

-Yes No

If no, please explain:

**Page 15 of proposal, D. Cost, there is no mention of indirect or overhead costs. Budget Justification lists none for indirect costs.**

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

-Yes No

If no, please explain:

**none is described**

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:

**Under the budget justification, the only item addressed is Services/Consultants.**

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

Yes -No

If yes, please explain:

**There is no justification in the proposal that documents the budget summary.**

Other Comments: