|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lead Entity | Date | Application Complete | Status |
| Early App. Review-Site Visit  | 5/25/11 | No | NMI |
| July Review Panel Mtg. | 7/6/2011 |  |  |
| Post Application | 8/2011 |  |  |
| Final |  |  |  |
| Status Options |
| NMI | Need More Information |
| POC | Project of Concern (Post Application and Final only) |
| FLAGGED | Needs full panel discussion |
| CLEAR | Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process.  |

Lead Entity: Chelan County

Project Number: 11-1372A

Project Name: Nason Creek LWP Ponds and Flats Acquisition

Project Sponsor: Chelan/Douglas Land Trust

Grant Manager: Marc Duboiski

# Early Application Review/Site Visit - REVIEW PANEL comments

Date: 5/31/11

Panel Member(s) Name: Tom Slocum and Steve Toth

**Early Project Status:**

Project Site Visit? Yes (5/26/11)

1. Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria.

2. Missing Pre-application information.

3. Comments/Questions:

This project proposes to acquire fee simple title to two separate properties along Nason Creek, the Rimson property (“Flats”) and the Click and Parker parcels (“Ponds”). Both properties ranked high on a BOR protection reach assessment for Nason Creek.

The site visit showed that the Click and Parker parcels would provide high value for protecting riparian and relict side channel habitat. Because of their frontage on Hwy 2, the eastern part of the Click property probably also is attractive for development, so overall this site appears to be a strong candidate for protection. It would be good idea to discuss stewardship plans with Mr. Click, if the sponsor has not already done so. In particular, the review panel believes that the eroding left bank along the eastern part of the Click property should be allowed to erode and not be armored. One option could be to drive log piling into the eroding floodplain area to slow the rate of erosion (allowing for tree establishment) and to provide wood input as it is eroded. The review panel would recommend future restoration design work on this portion of the property. Planting of native riparian trees in this part of the site would also be recommended.

The review panel believes that the Rimson (“Flats”) property is a weaker candidate for acquisition. The floodplain area appears to be partially isolated from the river by riprap and is cut up with drainage ditches and old road grades, possibly left over from construction of the power lines. While the mature floodplain cottonwood forest is an attractive feature, it does not appear that it would be threatened by development in the foreseeable future. The presence of the power lines and wet ground make access difficult beyond the power line easement, and it seems unlikely that people would want to develop in this area. Overall, the proposal would be strengthened by focusing solely on the Click/Parker parcels and not on the Rimson site.

## EARLY APPLICATION Review/Site VISIT - lead entity & project sponsor responses

**Directions:** Lead Entity or Sponsor must post their response to Review Panel comments in **PRISM** with document name: Response to Review Panel Comments. Attach this as a separate document in PRISM to become part of your application, and send your grant manager an e-mail.

All Flagged and NMI projects will be reviewed at the July 6th full Review Panel meeting. Sponsor responses received no later than one week prior to the meeting will be considered by the Review Panel.

**CDLT Response**:

**The Flats (Rimson) site has been deleted; CDLT appreciates the local and State reviewer’s comments, as these parcels were perhaps over-rated in the Bureau of Reclamation’s Reach Assessment process.**

**The project now includes the 3.16 acre WaDOT property that is intertwined with the Click and Parker parcels. WaDot has signed a Landowner Acknowledgment to see to Parker, who has indicated his willingness to sell to CDLT.**

**With regard to any future restoration, CDLT with work with technical reviewers and restoration sponsors after acquisition to determine appropriate actions.**

# JULY 6th REVIEW PANEL MEETING - REVIEW PANEL comments

Date:

Panel Member(s) Name:

**Early Project Status:**

1. Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria.

2. Missing Pre-application information.

3. Comments/Questions:

## JuLY 6th REVIEW PANEL MEETING - lead entity & project sponsor responses

Directions: Lead Entity or Sponsor must post their response to Review Panel comments in **PRISM** with document name: Response to Review Panel Comments. Attach this as a separate document in PRISM to become part of your application, and send your grant manger an e-mail.

Response:
*Attach Response to PRISM, and send your Grant Manager an e-mail.*

*Grant Manager will put in the PRISM attachment number here.*

#  Post Application - REVIEW PANEL comments

Date:

Panel Member(s) Name:

**Application Project Status:**

Refer to Manual # 18, Appendix E-1, for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “Why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

1. Is this a draft project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB’s criteria? (Yes or No)

Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments:

## Post application - lead entity & project sponsor responses

Directions: Lead Entity or Sponsor must post their response to Review Panel comments in **PRISM** with document name: Response to Review Panel Comments. Attach this as a separate document in PRISM to become part of your application, and send your grant manger an e-mail.

Response:
*Attach Response to PRISM, and send your Grant Manager an e-mail.*

*Grant Manager will put in the PRISM attachment number here.*

# FINAL REVIEW PANEL Comments

Date:

Panel Member(s) Name:

**Final Project Status:**

Refer to Manual # 18, Appendix E-1, for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “Why” box, explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

1. Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB’s criteria? (Yes or No)

Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments: