|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lead Entity | Date | Application Complete | Status |
| Early App. Review-Site Visit  | 5/26/11 | 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: Okanogan County

Project Number: 11-1240 R

Project Name: Driscoll Island Cold Water Refuge

Project Sponsor: Cascade Columbia FEG

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 one or two new groundwater-fed blind channels at WDFW’s Driscoll Island wildlife area. The objective of the problem is to address the high-temperature limiting factor in the Similkameen River by creating late season cold water rearing refuges. The review panel believes that this project can potentially lead to high benefit for supporting the local recovery goals, but that further site characterization and engineering design work is needed before a reliable construction budget can be developed. The panel feels that the sponsor would be better served by carrying out the project in two phases: a first phase to develop a preliminary design, preliminary permitting, and landowner commitments to construct and operate the project, then a second phase to complete the design, permitting, and construction.

If the sponsor decides to continue to propose the project as a single phase project, then at minimum, the proposal should contain the following information to provide assurances of certainty of success: 1) pump test data showing ground water yield and temperatures during late summer low flow conditions, 2) characterization of sediment transport dynamics at high flows, and how sediment will impact the new channel(s), 3) sufficient preliminary engineering design to confidently develop a detailed construction plan and budget, and 4) binding assurances by WDFW management that the agency will commit to implementing, maintaining, and operating the project, including paying for groundwater pumping.

## 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 28, 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 by proposing a design only project to produce preliminary designs. The application is cleared to move forward.

## 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? (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:

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