

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board

## INDIVIDUAL PROJECT COMMENT FORM

### PROJECT INFORMATION

Panel Member

Name: **SRFB Review Panel**

Lead Entity: **Island Co.**

Project Location: **Several sites in WRIAs 2 and 6**

Project Sponsor: **SRSC**

Project Number:

Project Name: **Origin of Juvenile Chinook Salmon in WRIA 6 Mixed Stock Rearing Environments**

Date: **July 11, 2007**

Project type: **Assessment**

Please refer to the criteria listed below or Manual #18, Appendix C, for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "Why" area explain your reason for selecting this as a preliminary project of concern.

1. Is this a preliminary project of concern according to the SRFB's criteria?

Yes ☒ No ☐ NMI ☐

Why?

Preliminary POC at this stage: Criterion #2. The project scope at present does not make a clear case that this assessment would clearly lead to beneficial projects. Proposal needs to follow SRFB policy for "data gaps" outlined in Manual #18, page 14.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

As discussed with the sponsor during the presentation, the proposal should clearly explain how the project team will work with the WRIA 2 and 6 lead entities and TAGs to use the project results to 1) prioritize the existing projects on their respective SRP 3-year implementation lists and 2) identify potential new high-priority projects. The application states that the results will be used to "link river-based recovery plans with nearshore recovery plans," but it does not give any specific information describing how it will actually do this and how it will lead to the detailed formulation of specific projects. At the meeting, WRIA 6 TAG members requested that the project synthesize its results with the results of WFC's on-going West Whidbey nearshore assessment in order to develop as a clear, quantifiable basis for ranking the SRP 3-year project list. It is recommended that this task also be completed for WRIA 2. The sponsor is encouraged to think of other things that can be done to link the proposed assessment results directly to the development of beneficial restoration projects.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

#### 4. Other comments.

### Criteria

For restoration and protection-related projects:

1. It is unclear there is a problem to salmonids the project is addressing.
2. Information provided or current understanding of the system, is not sufficient to determine the need for, or the benefit of, the project.
3. The project is dependent on other key conditions or processes being addressed first.
4. The project has a high cost relative to the anticipated benefits and the project sponsor and lead entity have failed to justify the cost.
5. The project does not account for the conditions or processes in the watershed.
6. The project may be in the wrong sequence with other habitat protection, assessments, or restoration actions in the watershed.
7. The project uses a technique that has not been considered successful in the past.
8. It is unclear how the project will achieve its stated objectives.
9. It is unlikely that the project will achieve its stated objective.
10. There is low potential for threat to habitat conditions if the project is not completed.
11. The project design is not adequate or the project is improperly sited.
12. The stewardship description is insufficient or there is inadequate commitment to stewardship and maintenance and this would likely jeopardize the project's success.
13. The project has not been shown to address an important habitat condition or watershed process in the area.
14. The main focus is on supplying a secondary need, such as education, streambank stabilization to protect property, or water supply.

For assessment, design, feasibility, and research projects:

15. It is not clear there is a problem to salmonids the project is addressing (per the research plan).
16. The project does not address an information need important to understanding the watershed, is not directly relevant to project development or sequencing, and will not clearly lead to beneficial projects.
17. The methodology does not appear to be appropriate to meet the goals and objectives of the project.
18. The project has a high cost relative to the anticipated benefits.

19. The assessment or research does not account for the conditions or processes in the watershed, may be in the wrong sequence with other habitat assessment or restoration activities, or may be inconsistent with a larger assessment or research need.
20. The assessment uses a technique that has not been proven successful in past applications.
21. There are significant constraints to the implementation of high priority projects following completion of the assessment.
22. It is unclear how the assessment will achieve its stated objectives.
23. It is unlikely that the assessment will achieve its stated objective.
24. The main focus is on supplying a secondary need, such as education, streambank stabilization to protect property, or water supply.