

Proposal Reviews

#178: Trinity River Fishery Restoration and Protection of Delta Water Supply Through Replacement of Four Trinity River Bridges

Trinity County Planning Dept

Initial Selection Panel Review

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review

Delta Regional Review

Sacramento Regional Review

External Scientific Review #1
#2

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 178

Applicant Organization: Trinity County Planning Dept

Proposal Title: Trinity River Fishery Restoration and Protection of Delta Water Supply Through Replacement of Four Trinity River Bridges

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:

Although the proposal received generally favorable reviews, the Selection Panel does not recommend funding. The Trinity River is not within the scope of the ERP, and therefore the ERP is not an appropriate funding source. In addition, the Selection Panel questions the technical argument provided by the applicant regarding benefits to the Sacramento Valley from reoperation of the Trinity River. The Selection Panel supports the efforts of Trinity County to restore the Trinity River, and encourages appropriate programs to fund this proposal.

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review Form

Proposal Number: 178

Applicant Organization: Trinity County Planning Dept

Proposal Title: Trinity River Fishery Restoration and Protection of Delta Water Supply Through Replacement of Four Trinity River Bridges

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	From a technical aspect, the external reviewers both judged this proposed project to be excellent. The balance between ecological restoration and engineering approach was addressed very well. A major concern was the efficacy of continuing the practice of diverting water from Klamath to the Sacramento Basin, and justifying this project on continued water withdrawal from the Klamath River basin and its impaired water quality and limited water quantity. An important note is that the issues raised by the regional reviews need reconciliation to enable this project to go forward.
X Above average	
-Adequate	
-Not recommended	

1. **Goals and Justification.** Does the proposal present a clear statement of goals, objectives and hypotheses? Does the proposal present a clear justification and conceptual model for the project?

This proposal is straightforward and is based on previous work that have recommended winter flushing flows to improve fishery habitat. The ultimate goal is to restore fishery quality flows and the objective is to replace 4 bridges to enable the increased flushing.

2. **Likelihood of Success (Approach, Feasibility, Capabilities and Performance Measures).** Is the project likely to succeed based on the approach, feasibility and project team capabilities? Are the proposed performance measures adequate for measuring the project's success?

The justification is inherent in the previous projects where the restoration was recommended. However, the proposal did not justify whether the flows were needed for the sediment transport. The approach described is adequate and very dependent upon the

bridge design, which is currently underway. All of this is technically feasible. Performance measures are well described. Capabilities appear to be high quality.

3. **Outcomes and Products.** Will the project advance the state of scientific knowledge in general and/or make an important contribution to the state of knowledge of the Bay-Delta Watershed? For restoration proposals, is the project likely to contribute to ecosystem restoration or species recoveries in a significant way? Will the project produce products useful to decision-makers and scientists?

Four new bridges that allow winter flushing and accommodate better fishery habitat are the ultimate outcome and product.

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

Costs seem reasonable. No budget issues were raised in the budget review.

5. **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?

Two regional reviews - one low and the other medium rank. Both regions believe this proposal does not meet the goals of ERP, contrary to the claim of the applicants. Funding from CVPIA may be warranted. The regional reviews were split over the relevance to restoration priorities, and also on the adequacy of involving local people.

6. **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 environmental compliance review stressed that the project might need a grading permit and possibly a Board of Reclamation encroachment permit. No administrative review was done for this proposal.

Miscellaneous comments:

Delta Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 178

Proposal Title: Trinity River Fishery Restoration and Protection of Delta Water Supply Through Replacement of Four Trinity River Bridges

Overall Ranking: Low -Medium -High

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

The proposal indicates that the action is consistent with ERP Draft Stage 1 Multi-Region Restoration Priority # 6. The panel disagrees that the action is related to this priority or to any other priority in the Multi- Region or in the Delta and Eastside Tributaries Region. There is no certainty that the action will result in the direct transfer of any amount of water to the Central Valley or, if any water is delivered, how it will be utilized.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

o This proposal is predicated on the assumption that water efficiencies realized from Trinity Reservoir operations associated with a higher reservoir spill capacity will amount to a mean saving of 254,000 acre-feet per year that can be directed into the Sacramento River basin through CVP facilities.

o The schedule for the replacement of the four bridges on the Trinity River to allow higher controlled reservoir releases was developed by the Bureau of Reclamation and is to occur over a 240-construction day period, probably to be completed over a two-consecutive summer period. This schedule is dependent on securing all necessary permits on a timely basis.

o Several smaller flood hazard reduction actions must also be accomplished prior to release of the peak flows that could be made once the bridges are replaced. These actions must be funded from some other source.

o Property owners affected by the project and/or the owners of the four bridges have provided written approval of the proposal.

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

-Yes XNo

How?

o The proposal indicates that the action is consistent with ERP Draft Stage 1 Multi-Region Restoration Priority # 6. We disagree that the action is related to this priority or to any other priority in the Multi- Region or in the Delta and Eastside Tributaries Region. There is no

certainty that the action will result in the direct transfer of any amount of water to the Central Valley or, if any water is delivered, how it will be utilized.

o The proposal indicates that the action is consistent with three restoration priorities in the Sacramento River Region. For the reasons stated above, we disagree.

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?

o The applicant indicates the primary reason for the bridge replacement is to allow greater reservoir releases for sediment removal from the Trinity River substrate. This action is supported by numerous documents that prescribe remedial actions to restore the Trinity River fishery.

o There is no certainty whether or how the water saved by the action (mean of 254,000 acre-feet per year) would be utilized in the Central Valley.

o This project is consistent with Central Valley Project Improvement Act sections 3402(a) and 3406(b)(23).

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

-Yes XNo

How?

o The proposal does not address local involvement issues. No public outreach program is identified. There is no indication of public and/or stakeholder sentiments on the proposal, or whether any attempts were made or will be made to solicit such sentiment. o The only indication of local involvement is the consent of the owners of the four bridges to proceed with the project.

o The Bureau of Reclamation has agreed to assume responsibility for developing, advertising, awarding and administering the construction contracts to replace the bridges. o The Fish and Wildlife Service has approved \$1,500,000 to be used in support of the bridge replacement actions. These funds will be merged with additional funds once they are secured.

Other Comments:

X

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 178

Applicant Organization: Trinity County Planning Dept

Proposal Title: Trinity River Fishery Restoration and Protection of Delta Water Supply Through Replacement of Four Trinity River Bridges

Overall Ranking: -Low Medium -High

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

The review panel did not rank this proposal since they deemed it was outside the ERP. The panel felt it was a good proposal and deferred this to the technical panels and CVPIA. This proposal is inextricably linked to the CVPIA because the transfer of water from the Trinity River to the Sacramento River watershed is a key detriment to fish habitat on the Trinity. This proposal could alleviate some of the detrimental impacts of the CVP to many miles of fish habitat in the Trinity River. Funding from CVPIA is appropriate for this project.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

Yes, the local people are informed of the proposed changes as it is a federal responsibility to increase the flows. This project will not result in a change in land use; this project is to replace 4 bridges to allow for higher flows to be released.

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

Yes -No

How?

Yes. The Trinity River is officially a Bay-Delta Watershed under Proposition 204, this project directly serves the first stated project of the CVPIA "protect, restore, and enhance fish, wildlife, and associated habitats in the Central Valley and Trinity River Basins of California."

PSP priorities: MR-6 (recover at risk spp), SR-3 (conduct adaptive mgt experiments in regard to natural and modified flow regimes), SR-4 (restore geomorphic processes), and SR-7 (develop conceptual models to support restoration of river, stream, and riparian habitat).

Under CVPIA: general, Stressor #2, "Mitigate for other identified adverse fish and wildlife impacts of the CVP"

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?

Intensive scientific investigation since 1984 into the causes of and possible remedies for fishery declines in the Trinity River Basin lead to the finding that habitat condition is the prominent concern. This flow increase would remedy this concern. The project is linked with other restoration activities in the region via the Trinity River multi-agency/stakeholder task force.

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

Yes -No

How?

Local people and institutions have been involved in this project at several levels for many years. Landowners have provided letters of support for this proposed project. A federal advisory committee has been in place for approx. 15 years; this group consists of representatives from three Indian tribes, two counties, federal and state agencies, and affected industries and user groups.

Other Comments:

Replacing these four bridges is a necessary action to implement the vast amount of scientific research and analysis that has led up to this point in the restoration of the Trinity River. The work for this proposed action dates back to 1999 when a comprehensive and authoritative study was commissioned by the Secretary of Interior on the Trinity River to evaluate the effectiveness of increased flows (etc) for rebuilding Trinity River salmon and steelhead populations. Following this document, the USFWS produced the Fisheries Restoration EIS/EIR that specified the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative and Record of Decision call for the replacement of four bridges to further enhance fisheries on the Trinity River. Some on the panel recognized that this project is a federal trust responsibility that needs to be funded.

External Scientific: #1

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: 178

Applicant Organization: Trinity County Planning Dept

Proposal Title: **Trinity River Fishery Restoration and Protection of Delta Water Supply Through Replacement of Four Trinity River Bridges**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

Correct

Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

none

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
XExcellent	This project is feasible and will remove the major impediment to increasing flows in the Trinity River, which will be of value in more efficiently scouring sediments from system
-Good	
-Poor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

Trinity River flow evaluation in 1999 and follow-up study in 2000 recommend winter flushing flows to improve habitat. These include very wet years 11,000cfs for 5 days in, wet years and 8,500 cfs for 5 days in wet years. Currently flow is limited to 6,000 cfs because of limitations of 4 bridges. The proposal would replace the 4 bridges to allow the higher flows. Claim is made that at the lower flow additional 244,000 of water is required for the habitat restoration effort. With replacement of bridges this saved water could be used for diversion. Improving flow to reconstruct habitat is important and timely. This project also represents a potential savings of water for diversion

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

A 15 year long evaluation which was peer reviewed indicated an increase in flows would make sediment transport 5 (@ 8,500 cfs) to 12 (@11,000 cfs) times more efficient than releases @ 6,000 cfs. The analysis justifying the value of the improved flows appears extensive and scientifically sound. A comprehensive review process was implemented resulting in a Record of Decision. This is a full scale restoration project, no intermediate scale temporary removal of bridges was not considered, but ultimately it is unlikely anything but a full scale project would be cost effective. The project is also a demonstration project in testing the effectiveness of scouring flows.

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

The replacement appears straightforward. Feasibility of replacement is documented in the report including hydraulic environment evaluations, USBR is developing designs and funding has been arranged for permitting, USBR will receive the funding and assume general contracting duties. Novel information will come with the monitoring of the habitat response once scouring flows are implemented. This will provide valuable information demonstrating the effectiveness of flow based habitat restoration actions. This will be very useful to managers considering similar projects in the future.

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

The approach is technically feasible.

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

Performance is clear involving subcontracts and construction of replacement bridges.

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

Four new bridges are the main product. Secondary and perhaps equally important is the possibility that with the ability to use higher flows, 254,000 acre-feet of water can be diverted to the Delta pumping program. Without the project this water would likely be needed to scour the habitat. Finally the project will facilitate a monitoring project on the effectiveness of scouring flows.

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

The project administrator T. Stokley has experience as a Trinity County Planner, has managed numerous federal and state grants and has experience with fisheries issues relating to this project. He works for the Natural Resources Division of the Trinity County Planning Department. He and his agency appear to have ample qualifications to carry out the project.

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

Cost seem reasonable, over head is 10%.

Miscellaneous comments:

This appears to be a project with great potential and value. Although the proposal has no information on the technical conclusions regarding the effectiveness of the flows, the results seem very reasonable and the external review process in developing the plan was considerable.

External Scientific: #2

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: 178

Applicant Organization: Trinity County Planning Dept

Proposal Title: **Trinity River Fishery Restoration and Protection of Delta Water Supply Through Replacement of Four Trinity River Bridges**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

Correct

Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

None

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent	The proposal was well-written and followed the criteria very closely. I rated it excellent, because the project was well thought out and the supporting information and background substantiated the feasibility and approach.
<input type="checkbox"/> -Good	
<input type="checkbox"/> -Poor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

Rating: Excellent. The goal is to restore fishery quality flows in the Trinity River. The objective is to replace four bridged that presently prevent the restoration implementation.

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

Rating: Excellent. The background rationale is adequately explained, both for the fish habitat suitability information and the restoration recommendations. The justification for this project is well described.

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

Rating: Very Good. The approach is briefly described and is dependent upon another activity (bidge design) that is currently underway. A bidding process will be followed to obtain a construction contractor. No information is given as to selection criteria, which may greatly affect the success of this project.

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

Rating: Excellent. The feasibility and technical merit has already been determined. This project is highly feasible.

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

Rating: Excellent. The endpoint of this project, i.e., construction of four replacement bridges, is directly linked to the objective. Restoring the necessary hydrological flows would then be the final goal. Comprehensive monitoring is proposed to ensure restoration is complete.

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

Rating: Excellent. The value of the product, i.e., four replacement bridges, is high because it is the goal of the project. Outcomes of this project may serve as a template for similar projects.

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

Rating: Excellent. Mr. Stokelys credentials appear to be excellent for the job. Because the actual work will be done by contractors, the ultimate responsibility of Mr. Stokely will be to ensure the highest quality workmanship.

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

Rating: Very Good. High costs, but they are likely required for the construction and inspection of the bridges.

Miscellaneous comments:

This project is restoration to allow salmon recovery in the Trinity River. Although environmental assessments have been conducted to provide the underpinnings of this project, the restoration of the hydrological flows does not guarantee the likelihood of the return of viable salmon populations.

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 178

Applicant Organization: Trinity County Planning Dept

Proposal Title: Trinity River Fishery Restoration and Protection of Delta Water Supply Through Replacement of Four Trinity River Bridges

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

-Yes No

If no, please explain:

Project might need a grading permit and possibly a Board of Reclamation encroachment permit. There is not enough detail on actual construction methods to be certain.

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:

Note: Project proponents state that funding for environmental documents and permits has been arranged through the Board of Reclamation and DFG's California Coastal Salmon Recovery Program.

3. Do the legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal significantly impair the project's feasibility?

-Yes No

If yes, please explain:

As long as necessary permits are obtained, This project is feasible.

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 178

Applicant Organization: Trinity County Planning Dept

Proposal Title: Trinity River Fishery Restoration and Protection of Delta Water Supply Through Replacement of Four Trinity River Bridges

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: