

CALFED 1998 Proposal Rating
Comments on the proposals by Marianne K. Hallet
August 17, 1998

- A1000 - No specific comment.
- A1001 - This study has been funded since 1994 by BOR. It seems to me that the value of additional field work would mostly benefit the dam operators. With this in mind it doesn't seem as if CALFED should be providing additional funding.
- A1002 - RD 2035 - Positive Fish Barrier. Important project.
- A1003 - No specific comment.
- A1004 - Since Butte Creek seems to be so important to the fisheries resource, this seems like a reasonable project. I like the approach of getting local input and starting.
- A1005 - Not rated - Potential NRCS conflict.
- A1006 - Proactive approach to making changes at dams being sold.
- A1007 - Not rated - Potential NRCS conflict.

- B1000 - Clough Dam on Mill Creek - Looks like a good project. There is no cost sharing even though the north end of the dam is washed out and diverters will have to replace. I propose that the diverters pay a cost share equal to what repair of the dam would cost. Overhead of 70 percent seems extremely high.
- B1001 - Important project. Seems to me that overhead on Task 2 should be 19 % of DFG labor and not on the construction of the screen.
- B1002 - Not rated - Potential NRCS conflict
- B1003 - Seems like a good project, however, I'm not sure that I believe that CALFED should pay for it. BOR is already required to provide cold waters. It seems to me that this is a normal O & M cost that doesn't provide CALFED benefits. If our team decides that it is CALFED worthy, I propose that a BOR cost share be provided.
- B1004 - Seems like a good project. The costs seem low to do an adequate job on what is proposed.
- B1005 - No specific comments.
- B1006 - There was not a B1006 proposal in my package.
- B1007 - No specific comments.
- B1008 - How is this study integrated with project B1004. It seems as this is proposed for TCCA but has not been coordinated with the TCCA proposal to study alternatives for the Red Bluff Diversion dam. The time lines do not match up. This proposal has a year study time line, while B1004 has selected an alternative by Feb. 1999. I am concerned that the smaller version has not been tested in the field yet. I would be more comfortable with proposal if there was field testing on the smaller 22 cfs size.
- B1009 - Seems like a good project. Good Cost sharing.
- B1010 - No specific comments.
- B1011 - No specific comments.
- B1012 - References cite study of temperature regulation through Whiskeytown. Is this study really needed? Is CALFED being asked to research something that has already been adequately researched?
- B1013 - No specific comments.
- B1014 - The cost of post project monitoring and Reporting seems high..
- B1015 - No specific comments.
- B1016 - No specific comments.