|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lead Entity | Date | Application Complete | Status |
| Early App. Review-Site Visit  | 5/25/11 | no | CLEAR |
| July Review Panel Mtg. | 7/6/2011 |  |  |
| 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: 11-1441 R

Project Name: Upper Chumstick Barrier Removal

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:

This project will complete a 15-year effort to remove fish passage barriers from the lower 9.8 miles of Chumstick Creek by replacing partial barrier culverts at four private driveways with concrete, channel-spanning bridges. While the project sites were not visited during the field review, the photos of site conditions suggest that the projects will be technically straight-forward. In the application, please provide conceptual site plans (if available) and Barrier Evaluation Forms for the four proposed project sites as well as the other required information for fish passage projects listed in Section 4 (p. 40) of Manual 18. Please clarify the discrepancy in the pre-application budget for the “bridge installation” item that suggests that two bridges will be built, at $66,000 each, rather than four bridges. Also include a landowner acknowledgement form for the Baumanns, which wasn’t included with the pre-application material.

Review of the photos of the project four sites indicates that riparian forest vegetation is either absent or lacking at each. This project would be strengthened by adding a riparian revegetation component beyond the bridge sites: even a narrow buffer of trees along the creek frontage would add greatly to the ecological benefit of these projects.

## 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:

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: 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.**