

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form



Lead Entity: Pend Oreille

Project Number: 11-1512

Project Name: East Fork Smalle Fish Passage Design

Project Sponsor: Pend Oreille County

Grant Manager: Dave Caudill

Lead Entity	Date	Application Complete	Status
Early App. Review-Site Visit	6/22/2011	NO	CLEAR
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: Kelley Jorgensen and Steve Toth

Early Project Status: CLEAR

Project Site Visit? Yes, 6/22/11

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

Given the pending land sale across from the East Fork Smalle Creek crossing, the project sponsor should investigate the land ownership serviced by the county road and determine the potential cost of buying the parcel(s) necessary or otherwise investigating alternative road access for the abandonment of the road which would allow wholesale removal of the crossing altogether.

The application would be improved by having a more detailed discussion of the status and timeline for removing the passage barrier at the Cusick pump station.

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.

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form



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.

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form



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 manager 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.

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: