

# 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?

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board

## INDIVIDUAL PROJECT COMMENT FORM

### PROJECT INFORMATION

Panel Member

Name: **Review Panel**

Lead Entity:

**Island Co.**

Project

Location:

Project Sponsor:

**SRSC**

Project

Number: **07-1589 N**

Project Name:

**Origins of Juvenile Chinook In WRIA 6 Nearshore**

Date:

**October 25, 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?

#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.

This project is flagged as a PPOC due to the need for consistency among the multiple nearshore fish assessments seeking SRFB funding, rather than individual project merits. The assessments propose a variety of sampling and data collection techniques, rather than one consistent approach. The Review Panel calls attention to this issue because the quality of data and ability to compare findings across study areas is significantly impaired by the use of different methods. In addition, the assessments appear to be too focused on single species and therefore may not take advantage of the opportunity to collect information on all salmonids and forage fish. It is recommended that a standard sampling procedure be developed for Puget Sound and incorporated into all assessments prior to the initiation of the proposed assessments.

The current proposal does not explain 1) how the "data gap" clearly limits subsequent project development and 2) how the results will determine criteria for specific subsequent projects. It is accepted science that pocket estuaries, forage fish spawning beaches, and the landscape processes that maintain these and other nearshore features are necessary salmon habitat. Given that there are a limited number of these features in WRIA 6, it is unclear how the current proposal will add additional information that is necessary for identifying restoration and protection projects at these sites.

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

It is still not clear how this project will be utilized to determine beneficial restoration projects. It appears to be much more of a fish population management project, hence the need for genetic sampling. It appears that sampling locations have been selected with the highest likelihood of collecting juvenile Chinook so genetic sampling can be accomplished. If the objective of the project is to determine where restoration projects are needed across the landscape wouldn't it make sense to look at sites with unknown usage?

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

**4. Other comments.**

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board

DRAFT

## INDIVIDUAL PROJECT COMMENT FORM

### PROJECT INFORMATION

Panel Member

Name: **Review Panel**

Lead Entity:

**Island Co.**Project  
Location:

Project Sponsor:

**SRSC**Project  
Number:**07-1589 N**

Project Name:

**Origins of Juvenile Chinook In WRIA 6 Nearshore**

Date:

**November 6, 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 draft project of concern.

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

Yes ☐ No ☒ NMI ☐ CONDITION

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.

**CONDITION:** As one of the nearshore fish distribution assessments proposed in this grant funding round, the condition for the project is that project sponsors participate in upcoming discussions/workshops to work on issues of regional consistency among SRFB-funded nearshore fish distribution assessments. These efforts should also include participation by lead entities, regional staff, RCO staff, and appropriate scientific experts in the field. The topics identified for attention include but are not limited to: consistency in fish assessment design and sampling methods (e.g., gear type, gear size, sampling frequency), data parameters collected, species of interest, tag types, and study duration assessment.

An outcome of these discussions regarding regional consistency may be recommendations to modify one or more project elements. It is expected that the outcomes of these discussions will be incorporated into nearshore fish assessment projects proposed for funding in future SRFB grant cycles.