|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Date** | **Status** |
| Early App. Review-Site Visit  | 5/23/12 | Reviewed |
| July Review Panel Mtg. |  |  |
| **Status Options** |
| **REVIEWED** | Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments. |
| **REVIEWED & FLAGGED** | Review Panel has flagged this project as needing full panel discussion. |
|  | Date | Status |
| Post Application | 10/5/2012 | CLEAR |
| Final | 10/26/2012 | CLEAR |
| **Status Options** |
| **POC** | Project of Concern  |
| **CLEAR** | Project is clear |

**Lead Entity:**  Okanogan Co-Colville Tribe

**Project Number:**  12-1648

**Project Name:**  9 Mile Creek Riparian Restoration

**Project Sponsor:** Trout Unlimited

**Grant Manager:** Marc Duboiski

**Project Summary**: Restoration of Ninemile Creek, a tributary to Lake Osoyoos and the Okanagon River that supports steelhead. Proposed restoration activities include fencing along 1.3 miles of stream (2.6 miles of fence because fence would be on both sides of creek), development of two wells for off-channel watering for animals, replace 3 road crossings, revegetation of 3 acres of riparian vegetation, and stream channel restoration. Ninemile Creek is partly situated in a protected 5750-acre WDFW wildlife area, and the sponsor is acquiring 750 acres of private inholdings (fee title with a life estate) and all surface water flow rights with funding from BPA and WWRP. This restoration would take place on the former private inholdings.

# Early Application Review/Site Visit - REVIEW PANEL comments

**Date:** 6/20/2012

**Panel Member(s) Name:** Kelley Jorgensen and Paul Schlenger

**Early Project Status: Reviewed**

**Project Site Visit?** Yes

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

*Comment Updates following Proposal Presentation on June 13:*

All comments provided based on pre-application and site visit need to be addressed in final proposal.

The project was changed based on site visit comments, and is now proposed to replace the two lower road crossings with bridges, convert the upper crossing to a hardened crossing with gates (for ATV crossings mostly), to move the cattle water access out of the stream and replace with a trough system, remove the relic water diversion structure, fence cattle out of the stream. “Soft engineering” habitat structures and riparian plantings have been removed from the proposal with the idea that removal of cattle in the creek will allow for passive restoration. The review panel supports these changes and the final application will need to be updated to reflect the current project proposal.

The budget and match calculation also needs to be updated to match the current proposal budget items.

*Draft comments based on pre-application materials and site visit:*

Relatively low gradient stream habitat is rare in this stretch of the Okanogan and this project offers a unique opportunity to restore steelhead habitat from RM 1.5 to approximately 7.0 that was secured with other funds. The sponsor is to be commended for securing such a valuable habitat area from a long time farming family. While the project is excellent in concept, the final application would be greatly strengthened by addressing the following questions:

* Please clarify the proposal text describing the specific work to be done. How many stream crossings will be removed vs. replaced? The proposal states three replacements but on the site visit some crossing removals were mentioned.
* Please describe in more detail the “soft restoration”… revetments are not considered soft. Are “biologs” the same as habitat logs or in-stream wood? A few carefully placed logs that are channel spanning would go a long way to capture fine sediment and allow for shoreline areas to re-vegetate native woody vegetation through natural recruitment or strategically placed cuttings. Please provide a map or planview schematic showing where, how many and how large an area or stream length is proposed for treatment, and what actions are proposed.
* What is known about the likelihood of success of the shallow wells proposed? Explain the next step if the initial effort to develop 2 wells does not succeed. How will the project proceed to exclude the cows from the creek?
* Adjust the budget to ensure the proposed restoration project provides at least a 15% cost match.

**2. Missing Pre-application information.**

**3. Staff Comments/Questions:**

## 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 projects will be reviewed at the July 12th full Review Panel meeting. Sponsor responses received no later than one week prior to the meeting will be considered by the Review Panel.

**![C:\Users\Sue\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary Internet Files\Content.IE5\ZRTWWKN2\MC900434750[1].png]()Special Note:** To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please re-attach your proposal in PRISM in WORD “track changes.” This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

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

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

# JULY 12th REVIEW PANEL MEETING - REVIEW PANEL comments

**Date:**

**Panel Member(s) Name:**

**Early Project Status:**

**Project Site Visit?**

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

**2. Missing Pre-application information.**

**3. Staff Comments/Questions:**

## JuLY 12th 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:** 10/5/2012

**Panel Member(s) Name:** Review Panel

**Application Project Status:** CLEAR

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

No.

**Why?**

Early review panel comments were sufficiently addressed.

**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?**

This is a noteworthy project in combination with the larger acquisition and restoration actions, nicely done!

**4. Staff Comments/Questions:**

## 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:** October 26, 2012

**Panel Member(s) Name:** Review Panel

**Final Project Status: Clear**

**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. Staff Comments/Questions:**