|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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: 11-1442 R

Project Name: Peshastin Forest Service Road System Improvement

Project Sponsor: Chelan County NRD

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? No

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

2. Missing Pre-application information.

3. Comments/Questions:

The sponsor proposes to design, permit, and construct the treatment of 28 miles of USFS roads in the Peshastin Creek watershed and the decommissioning/storage of an additional 20 miles of roads for the purpose of reducing sediment delivery from the roads into water bodies of this Category 2 watershed. The proposed work would be done in conjunction with an ongoing USFS “Legacy Roads Program” project that will decommission a further 20 miles of roads in the watershed. No site specific information was provided on the potential for sediment delivery to impact specific salmon-bearing streams from the individual road treatment/decommissioning sites, but the project sponsor stated that the sites were chosen based on a prioritization of risk of impact to salmon habitat.

The proposed project is similar to several other SRFB-funded USFS road treatment/decommissioning projects that have been completed in several other WRIAs/lead entity areas, so the review panel believes that the technical and project management issues will be straight forward. The application would be strengthened, however, by explicitly making the link between the proposed treatment(s) at the various road segments with the anticipated specific benefit to ESA-listed salmon resources. Road density and the risk assessment measures are too generalized to identify site-specific road work priorities or sedimentation/hydrological impacts to aquatic habitat. For example, while it may be true that a particular segment of road is subject to erosion, please show that the erosion at that particular site has a direct impact to salmon. Please provide as much detail on the proposed treatment sites and treatment designs as may currently be available. Please identify which roads will be addressed under Phase 1 and which under Phase 2. It is unclear if the $20,000 allocated for community outreach and education would be eligible for SRFB funding.

The review panel feels that it would also be helpful, for both USFS and the Chelan County Lead Entity, to articulate a broader strategy for identifying and prioritizing locations for subsequent USFS road treatment and decommissioning projects. It appears that the primary factor for identifying roads to decommission is based on USFS’ transportation needs analysis, rather than on assessing risk to salmon. For example, why was the Peshastin basin, a Category 2 watershed, chosen for this treatment, rather than a higher priority Category 1 watershed? Are there particular geologic factors or other circumstances in the Peshastin basin that make the roads there more susceptible to erosion and sediment delivery?

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

**Responses to SRFB Comments:**

* Please show that the erosion at that particular site has a direct impact to salmon.

A summary of all available sediment data will be provided in the final proposal.

* Please provide as much detail on the proposed treatment sites and treatment designs as may currently be available.

The final proposal will contain Figures 1-6 and Tables 2 & 3 for proposed treatment sites. Attachment C will define the different treatments and methods that will be used.

* Please identify which roads will be addressed under Phase 1 and Phase 2.

The final proposal will include Tables 2-4 as well as Figures 1-6 to identify roads proposed for treatments. All roads proposed for decommissioning will be addressed in Phase I and all proposed stormproofing will be addressed in Phase II.

* It is unclear if the $20,000 allocated for community outreach and education would be eligible for SRFB funding.

This effort was incorrectly described in the pre-proposal. It should have been described as NEPA support. CCNRD will assist USFS with stakeholder coordination and NEPA meetings. The cost for this task will be reduced in the final proposal because NEPA is being started in summer 2011.

* Why was the Peshastin basin, a Category 2 watershed, chosen for this treatment? Are there particular geologic factors or other circumstances in the Peshastin basin that make the roads there more susceptible to erosion and sediment delivery?

Section 2B and 2D in the final proposal will explain this further.

The final proposal will be uploaded to PRISM on June 30th to see responses to the comments above.

# 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: