

Proposal Reviews

#52: Davis Ranches, Site 2 - Pumps 4 & 5, Fish Screen Project

Davis Ranches

Initial Selection Panel Review

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review

Sacramento Regional Review

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 52

Applicant Organization: Davis Ranches

Proposal Title: Davis Ranches, Site 2 - Pumps 4 & 5, Fish Screen Project

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:

This proposal is for planning, permitting, and constructing a fish screen for a combined diversion of 65 cfs, located on the lower Sacramento River. For fish screen proposals, the Draft Stage 1 Implementation Plan and the 2002 PSP prioritize two types of projects: 1) a specific list of screen projects to complete and 2) comprehensive studies of the effectiveness of screens, including the cumulative benefits for listed species. This proposal is not responsive to the PSP in either regard and as such, the Selection Panel does not recommend funding.

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review:

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

Proposal Number: 52

Applicant Organization: Davis Ranches

Proposal Title: Davis Ranches, Site 2 - Pumps 4 & 5, Fish Screen Project

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	High probability of success with proposed screen technology which has good operation records. Small diverters on the mainstem of the Sacramento River are numerous and should receive some attention for funding of screening. These small diversions, taken as a whole, may have a significant effect on fish losses.
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?

Many unscreened diversions in this part of river, including this project, which could potentially harm large numbers of fish including: Chinook, steelhead, splittail, including young-of-year. Unscreened diversions are a special threat to juvenile fish, which prefer to migrate along riverbanks in this part of the Sacramento.

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?

Total of 65 cfs, not a significant proportion of the discharge but is large enough to warrant attention. This project is combining 2 unscreened diversions into 1 screened diversion.

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?

3 other diversions on Sacramento river with same technology, successful operation, so far . No legal obstacles anticipated. Potential delays with permit processes. Using MBK engineers, who apparently have experience. Complements other restoration projects on Sacramento river to some extent. Potential impacts to riparian area; however, if applicant uses current diversion site, should be able to minimize or avoid riparian impacts. 1 year of maintenance and monitoring included. Good capability of feedback during operation of equipment. High probability of success. Applicant is proposing to use technology that has a good track record, not previous unsuccessful technology.

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

Reasonable and adequate. Satisfactory.

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

Approximately 10% cost share with landowner. No other partners or cost sharing funds identified. Applicant is working with Family Water Alliance (local, community based), which is a major advocate for improving fish passage for small diverters.

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. Concern over unsuccessful previous small diversion fish screen projects. Only nominal local involvement.

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?

Not categorically exempt under CEQA, incidental take permit may be necessary. Compliance with CEQA required. Budget summary does not break down costs.

Miscellaneous comments:

Good location for fishery benefits. Smaller diversion, but large enough to warrant attention. Some cost-sharing. Concern over technology raised by regional review, however, this technology is fairly new and seems to be the solution to the previous technologys problems. Concern raised

by regional review in regards to equipment may not be fully informed, since this particular type of fish screen has a good track record.

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 52

Applicant Organization: Davis Ranches

Proposal Title: Davis Ranches, Site 2 - Pumps 4 & 5, Fish Screen Project

Overall Ranking: ☒Low ☐Medium ☐High

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

The panel rated this proposal low and had concerns about previous unsuccessful screens of this type.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

☐Yes ☒No

How?

The panel believes previous small diversion fish screen projects conducted by proponents (e.g. Family Water Alliance) have not been implemented successfully. Also, the approach proposed is not rigorous for CALFED standards.

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

☒Yes ☐No

How?

The proposed project addresses ERP goals of implementing fish screen projects, however, this proposal concerns screening small diversions (65 cfs), which is a lower priority in the Sacramento region.

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?

Generally speaking, this project complements other CALFED projects that reduce entrainment of endangered species at diversions along the Sacramento River.

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

☐Yes ☒No

How?

There is nominal local involvement. Family Water Alliance will distribute information to neighboring landowners via newsletter and internet web page.

Other Comments:

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 52

Applicant Organization: Davis Ranches

Proposal Title: Davis Ranches, Site 2 - Pumps 4 & 5, Fish Screen Project

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

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

Fish screen installation is not categorically exempt under CEQA, will need to do at least a negative declaration.

Winter-run and spring-run chinook salmon are a State listed species. If in-channel work will occur when either of these species are present, a 2081/Incidental Take Permit is 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:

Timeline for permits is not specified, budget is adequate.

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

☐Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

All appropriate permits will be obtained but need to comply with CEQA with more than a categorical exemption.

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 52

Applicant Organization: Davis Ranches

Proposal Title: Davis Ranches, Site 2 - Pumps 4 & 5, Fish Screen Project

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support?

-Yes ☒No

If no, please explain:

Budget in Budget Summary provides only lump sums.

2. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified?

-Yes ☒No

If no, please explain:

The Budget Summary does not list costs for labor hours, salary, benefits, travel, supplies nor equipment. Budget Justification provides more detail.

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

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

Found in the Budget Justification: overhead is calculated in Project Management costs at 12% to cover rent, phones, and general office staff but not budgeted elsewhere.

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).

\$41,491.00 difference - Davis Ranches will contribute as a cost share partner

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: