

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board

## INDIVIDUAL PROJECT COMMENT FORM

### PROJECT INFORMATION

Panel Member

Name: **SRFB Review Panel**

Lead Entity: **WRIA 6**

Project Location: **Whidbey Island - Island County**

Project Sponsor: **Whidbey Camano Land Trust**

Project Number:

Project Name: **Shorecrest Lagoon and Nearshore Habitat**

Date: **July 11, 2007**

Project type:

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?

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?

The project should include a commitment by the HOA and the development of a conceptual plan for restoring habitat forming processes in the lagoon, and in particular restoring tidal flow and fish passage through the tidegate. The applicant is encourage to work with the Whidbey Conservation District, SRSC, or WDFW for assistance in developing the restoration plan. The acquisition of the tideland parcels should include a clear commitment and at least a conceptual plan for restoring landscape processes (removing an unused access road?) in this area. Alternatively, as discussed at at the TAG meeting, the applicant may want to simplify this proposal by focusing only on the lagoon and including the tideland parcels in its "Skagit Bay Nearshore Protection" project. The proposal should contain a map showing the locations of each of the parcels.

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.

