

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form



**Lead Entity:** Kalispel Tribe

**Project Number:** 11-1461 R

**Project Name:** Kulczyk Restoration

**Project Sponsor:** WDFW

**Grant Manager:** Dave Caudill

Lead Entity	Date	Application Complete	Status
Early App. Review-Site Visit	6/22/2011	No	FLAGGED
July Review Panel Mtg.	7/6/2011		
Post Application	8/2011		
Final			
Status Options			
NMI	Need More Information		
POC	Project of Concern (Post)		
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process.		

## EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW/SITE VISIT - REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

**Date:** 7/7/2011

**Panel Member(s) Name:** Steve Toth and Kelley Jorgensen

**Early Project Status:** FLAGGED

**Project Site Visit?** Yes 6/22/2011

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

This project has the potential to improve in-stream and riparian habitat complexity in lower Cedar Creek, however the current proposal includes several elements that are of concern to the review panel. The final application would need to address the following in more detail:

- The current project proposal would not meet the SRFB technical evaluation criteria because the main focus of the project is stream bank stabilization to protect property. The proposal needs to provide further context on habitat conditions within lower Cedar Creek and the type of restoration work needed to improve habitat conditions. A technically sound proposal should describe a reach-based restoration plan and potential phases for implementation (e.g., the current project area could be considered one phase of a larger restoration plan).
- We recommend that the sponsor leave the existing large wood recruiting from the right bank alone, (it could be okay to potentially add wood to that area but don't remove or modify what is naturally recruiting) and use that as a template for where and how to add other instream wood complexity;
- Describe the habitat impacts and enhancement needs in context of the reach scale considerations and how the lower stream is adapting to the geomorphological changes taking place in response to the removal of the upstream Cedar Creek dam removal;
- How wide and what species are proposed for the riparian restoration; what is the agreement with the landowner about maintenance of the plantings?
- The sponsor needs to confer with Dave Caudill, the RCO grant manager about the eligibility of sole source contracting the construction of the project with the landowner, even if he is a contractor. That could serve as eligible match but handing over the grant money for implementation may have issues.

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form



2. Missing Pre-application information.

3. 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 and NMI projects will be reviewed at the July 6<sup>th</sup> 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 6<sup>TH</sup> 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 6<sup>TH</sup> 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.

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form



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.

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form



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: