|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lead Entity | Date | Application Complete | Status |
| Early App. Review-Site Visit  | 5/25/11 | no | NMI |
| July Review Panel Mtg. | 7/6/2011 |  | CLEAR |
| Post Application | 8/2011 |  |  |
| Final | 10/7/2011 |  | CLEAR |
| 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: 11-1347R

Project Name: Nason Creek LWP Coulter Creek Barrier Replacements

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? 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 will replace a pair of partial fish passage barrier culverts across Coulter Creek on a private forest road. Coulter Creek will have a higher habitat priority after the downstream barriers are removed as part of the Lower White Pine oxbow reconnection project. This project appears to be a straightforward culvert replacement project and no technical difficulties are anticipated. Please include any relevant design information that may currently be available in the application, as specified in Section 4 (p. 40) of Manual 18. In particular, a channel profile view would be helpful for understanding the design issues. As required in Manual 18, a standard WDFW Barrier Evaluation Form must also be included with the application, as well as a landowner agreement form signed by the Smiths (property owners). While the value of this project is dependent upon completion of the Lower White Pine reconnection work, it appears that the timing for implementation would be roughly the same.

## 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.

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

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

# JULY 6th REVIEW PANEL MEETING - REVIEW PANEL comments

Date: July 27, 2011

Panel Member(s) Name: Review Panel

**Early Project Status: CLEAR**

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 project sponsor has addressed the early review comments, and the application is cleared to move forward. The final application (which currently in PRISM and instead has the B+ Reconnection project as attachment #4) will be reviewed by the Review Panel upon formal submittal.

## 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: 10/7/2011

Panel Member(s) Name: Review Panel

**Final Project Status: CLEAR**

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? 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:

**The project sponsor has addressed the previous comments, and the application is cleared to proceed for funding.**