Salmon Recovery Funding Board

INDIVIDUAL PROJECT COMMENT FORM

PROJECT INFORMATION

Panel Member Name:	**SRFB Review Panel**		
Lead Entity:	**WRIA 6**	Project Location:	**Camano Island - Island County**
Project Sponsor:	**Whidbey Camano Land Trust**	Project Number:	
Project Name:	**South Camano Salmon Recovery Planning**		
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 applicant proposes to do an assessment of several parcels along a long bluff on the SE corner of Camano Island. The assessment will include studying site features that contribute to salmon habitat functions, community and individual landowner willingess to sell/protect the parcels, and a prioritization scheme for identifying the key parcels to protect. The area has key feeder bluffs and is in a top geographical priority area. In the proposal, the applicant should identify the criteria that it will use for evaluating and prioritizing the parcels. Because assessments must directly lead to specific restoration projects, the proposal should commit to protecting x number of top priority parcels and doing restoration activities on them if appropriate. The baseline assessment should focus on specific existing conditions on the high priority parcels and the need for specific restoration activities, rather than on a general ecological evaluation of salmon habitat functions, since it is already established that the feeder bluffs and wetlands are important features for the WRIA's recovery goals.

4. Other comments.
The applicant is encouraged to research the Skagit Land Trust's Middle Skagit acquisition assessment and the Blue Mountain Land Trust's Coppei Creek in SE Washington for ideas on strategy and methodology, rather than developing strategy ideas from scratch.

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

INDIVIDUAL PROJECT COMMENT FORM

PROJECT INFORMATION

Panel Member Name: **Review Panel**

Lead Entity: **Island Co.** Project Location:

Project Sponsor: **Whidbey Camano Land Trust** Project Number: **07-1590A**

Project Name: **South Camano Nearshore Protection and Planning**

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?

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.

The application adequately addressed the issues raised in the initial Review Panel 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: **Whidbey Camano Land Trust** Project Number: **07-1590A**

Project Name: **South Camano Nearshore Protection and Planning**

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 ☐

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.

The application adequately addressed the issues raised in the initial Review Panel comments.