

Description

Proposal ID	200755700	Reviewer	USFWS CRFPO	Date	7/24/07
Brief Title	What was old is new again: evaluate traditional gears for selective				
Sponsor	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife				

Technical Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions with an innovative method or application of technology?	Y
2. Are the objectives clearly defined with measurable outcomes and tasks that contribute toward accomplishment of the objectives?	Y
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?	N
4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation to determine whether objectives are being achieved (including performance measures/methods) at the project level?	Y
5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations?	?
6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin?	?
7. Does the proposal demonstrate that all reasonable precautions have been taken, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of wildlife, native resident and anadromous fish?	Y
8. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used?	Y

Management Criteria

	Y or N
1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife related objectives, strategies, needs and actions as identified in the subbasin plan?	Y
2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection (i.e., threatened, endangered or sensitive species)?	Y
3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes or maintain desirable community diversity?	N
4. Is there cost share for the construction/implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project?	Y
5. Will the project complement management actions on private, public and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes and public?	N
6. Will the project provide data critical for in season, annual and/or longer term management decisions?	Y
7. Will this project provide or protect riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife?	N
8. Will the project address a lamprey key uncertainty as identified by the lamprey technical working group?	N
9. Does the project address a term and condition of the bull trout FCRPS biological opinion?	N

Category (Urgent, High Priority, Recommended Action, Do Not Fund)

Assignment.	Recommended Action
-------------	--------------------

Brief Description/Rationale:

While this project could provide useful information regarding selective harvest methods, the overall cost of the project does not seem to fit with the projected benefits. The project description is well organized but the funding could be used to benefit more on-the-ground restoration activities.