SOUTHEAST SUSTAINABLE SALMON FUND – FFY 2008

SCIENCE COORDINATION PANEL

November 17, 2008 Juneau, Alaska

MEETING SUMMARY

The Alaska Sustainable Salmon Fund (AKSSF) Science Coordination Panel for Southeast Alaska met on November 17, 2008 to consider proposals for funding with AKSSF funds for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2008.[1] The objectives of the meeting were:

1. Determine priority ranking of 21 AKSSF proposed projects for Southeast Alaska, for recommendation to Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) Commissioner.
2. Discuss comments regarding projects that implement the Pacific Salmon Treaty (PST) and have been given priority by the Commissioner for funding.

Summary of Meeting Results

1. Priority Ranking of Proposed Non-Treaty Projects – The Panel's recommended funding 17 projects with FFY 2008 AKSSF funds, for a total of $1,772,268 (Attachment 1). Three proposals were not recommended for funding. The scores and written comments provided by 13 Panel members on the non-treaty projects are listed in Attachment 4.

2. Comments on PST Projects – There are 11 priority PST projects pre-approved for funding with FFY 2007 funds (total $1,395,303) and five projects with FFY 2008 funds (total $760,047). These projects are listed in Attachment 2. The Science Panel did not offer comments on these PST projects.

3. TO DO: In future AKSSF Calls for Proposals, include a section specifically asking the applicant to summarize past project results for projects that have received prior funding.

Summary of Meeting Discussion

Introduction

Sue Aspelund, ADF&G Commissioner's Office, offered the following opening remarks:

- Alaska received $14.5 million in Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Funds (PCSRF) in FFY 2008; $4 million is available for projects in Southeast Alaska. This is five-year capital funding, which must be spent by FFY12. Most of the projects proposed in this funding cycle would begin in State FY 2010.

[1] Meeting attendance is provided at the end of the meeting summary.

- For FFY 2009, the President's proposed PCSRF budget is $30 million (compared to $67 million in FFY 2008). The House of Representatives PCSRF budget mark is $67 million; the Senate Commerce, Justice and Science (CJS) Committee mark is $90 million. It is expected that NOAA will issue a grant application solicitation in early 2009, for a range of $30-67 million for FFY 2009. Alaska will not know its AKSSF allocation for FFY 2009 until late spring 2009.
- There is a new 33.3% non-federal match requirement for FFY 2008.
- ADF&G is tracking the proposed Pacific Salmon Stronghold Conservation Act of 2008; unsure what effects there may be on PCSRF fund allocations if the program anticipated in the legislation is established.
- There are currently over 400 active AKSSF projects in Southeast Alaska.

Pacific Salmon Treaty Projects

Gordy Williams described the priority PST-related projects that have been approved for funding with FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 AKSSF funds (Attachment 2). He noted that the Northern Fund is not expected to be able to fund projects next year (2009), due to the declining stock market and value of the Canadian dollar. However, if the five projects on the PST list that have applied for Northern Fund support in the coming year receive that support, they will not receive AKSSF funding. He also noted that Northern Fund grants can be used as non-federal match for the AKSSF. The Science Panel did not comment on the individual PST projects.

Non-Treaty Project Rankings and Panel Recommendations

The Panel was provided with a spreadsheet that ranked the non-treaty proposals in order of their averaged total score (the average of scores provided by 13 Panel members.) During the meeting, the spreadsheet was corrected to rank the projects by the average RANK given by the 13 scorers (see Attachment 1).

During its discussion, the Panel recommended that the Proposal Form require proposals to document past results, if they have previously received AKSSF funding.

The Science Panel recommended that 17 projects be approved for funding, for a total of $1,906,432 million in FFY 2008 AKSSF funds (Attachment 1).

The 17 projects listed in Attachment 1 were recommended for funding as they were proposed, with the following three exceptions:

- Disappearance Creek Chum Weir (PI: Piston) – Fund for FY10 only; project can reapply in next funding cycle for a subsequent year.
- Genetic Changes Associated with In-Basin Supplementation of Sockeye Salmon, Part 2 (PI: Smoker/Gharrett) – Technical committee (involving Science Panel members from NOAA, ADF&G, University of Alaska) will meet with the Principal Investigators to revise the project budget, due to expected lack of availability of Northern Fund support. Final project budget would not exceed

$189,817. Required AKSSF funding is expected to be less than this total amount, as non-federal match funds would likely replace some AKSSF funding.

- Salmon Habitats of the Taku River (PI: Nichols) – Fund for FY10 only – either through the AKSSF Statewide Call for Goal 1 (scoring process now underway), or through this Call. Project can reapply in next funding cycle for a subsequent year.

As noted above, the Panel recommended that two projects proposed for two years (FY10-FY11) be funded for only FY10 at this time. While the full allocation of $2.5 million will not be expended for Southeast region projects in FY10, the funding can be held and used to support projects in coming years.

<u>The following three proposals were not recommended for funding:</u>

- Evaluation of Age-0 smolt strategy (PI: Rabung) – The Science Panel noted that the project should have selected a parent stock that naturally has an age-0 smolt component, such as the Keta River Chinook. There is concern that the selected parent stock, which does not have an age-0 smolt component as part of their legacy, will compromise project success. In addition, the project should be proposed as a research project – that would focus on researching the further development of an age-0 smolt strategy – rather than implementation of this as a smolt production strategy.[2]

- Documenting Anadromous Waters SE (PI: Ott) – The Panel noted that the project is proposed at too large a scale and the cost is far too high (proposed use of over 50% of the available AKSSF funding). While continued documentation and cataloguing of anadromous fish streams is important, this level of programmatic expansion is not warranted. The proposal should be scaled-back, propose a more reasonable staffing level and approach, and provide clearer priorities for use of funds (e.g., identify priority watersheds to document anadromous fish.)

- Effects of Enhancement on Wild Coho, Part 2 (PI: Gray) – The Panel noted that use of juvenile coho within such a project is faced with two technical issues; specifically, the problem of juvenile collections being of few families and secondly, the propensity of juvenile coho to display nomad behavior. Both have the potential to significantly influence genetic analyses and make their use inappropriate in such a study. Future proposals for such research should avoid use of juveniles and instead utilize tissues from adult coho. Further, of significant concern, was the lack of an experimental study design wherein the hypotheses being investigated through the research effort would be explicitly exercised in an efficient manner. Rather than simply analyzing all possible tissue collections, future research efforts should define appropriate sample sizes needed as well as define before-enhancement and post-enhancement strata.

[2] The Panel also recommended that this change be made in the Southeast Region, Goal 2&3, Information Needs and Gap Analysis, which now says: "Continue the evaluation of age-0 smolt production strategies." Revise to say: "Research development of age-0 smolt production strategies."

Additional Project Specific Comments

In addition to the recommendations above, the Science Panel offered the following comments:

- Auke Creek Salmonids Monitoring, PI: Joyce – Appropriately ranked as top priority project.
- SECM Sampling & Pink Salmon Forecasting, PI: Orsi – Appropriately ranked as top priority project.
- McDonald Lake Sockeye, PI: Gilk – Appropriately ranked as top priority project.
- Instream Flow Quantification & Protection, PI: Johnson – Proposal would have been stronger had it better documented past results.
- Hydrologic & Adjudication Support, PI: Johnson – Proposal would have been stronger, had it better documented past results.
- Chilkat Salmon Assessment – Fish Wheels, PI: Bachman – Project provides full assessment for fall sockeye run and index for fall chum.
- SEAK Subsistence Sockeye, PI: Conitz – Continuation of subsistence sockeye surveys that had been funded by federal Office of Subsistence Management in past years. Data important to address management issues.
- Chuck Creek coho CWT and escapement, PI: McCurdy – Only long-term wild coho salmon indicator stock in its geographic area (outer coast). Continuation project.
- Effects of hatchery strays on wild Chinook, PI: Thrower – Bill Smoker and Alex Wertheimer will consult with PI on some minor adjustments that should be made in analytical and statistical approach.
- ACWA Grants RSA, PI: Cappiello – No comments.
- Chickamin coho sampling, PI Johnson – Last year of project; no additional comments.
- Disappearance Creek Chum Weir, PI: Piston – Successful weir; good workable project. Fund FY10; have it resubmit for continuation in FY11.
- Genetic Changes / In-Basin supplementation of sockeye salmon, PI: Smoker/Gharett – see notes above.
- Haines Salmon Distribution Assessment, PI: Shields – Continuing nominations to anadromous fish catalog; builds on previous successful nominations.
- Nakwasina River coho escapement, PI: Tydingco – This will be last year of sampling; no additional comments.

- Salmon Habitats of the Taku River, PI: Nichols – Documentation potentially useful information for evaluation of Tulsequah mine project and hover barge access. However, recommended for funding only for FY10 (see above.)
- Stress Effects & Mass Marking in Salmon, PI: Oxman – Project was initially submitted to Northern Fund which suggested it establish more partnerships and submit to AKSSF. Proposing to develop an alternative method of mass marking. Some concern expressed about success of sending embryos the distance of Baylor University. Appropriate ranking at end of list.

Meeting Attendance

Science Panel Attendance
Sheila Cameron, ADF&G Habitat
John Clark, ADF&G CF
John DerHovanisian, ADF&G SF
Doug Eggers, ADF&G CF
Joran Freeman, ADEC
Ed Jones, ADF&G SF
Joe Klein, ADF&G, SF
Scott McPherson, ADF&G SF
Cecil Rich, ADF&G SF
Leon Shaul, ADF&G CF
Bill Smoker, University of Alaska
Alex Wertheimer, NMFS

Staff & Facilitation
Sue Aspelund, ADF&G
Gordy Williams, ADF&G
Debbie Maas, ADF&G
Hannah Baldwin, ADF&G
Cecelia Curtis, ADF&G
Diane VanEpps, ADF&G
Jan Caulfield (Facilitator), janc@gci.net

AKSSF Southeast Region - Science Panel Recommendations for Funding of Non-Treaty Projects (FFY 2008)

Agency	Project Proposal	Principal Investigator	Recommended Funding (includes 3% ADFG indirect cost)	Goal / Info Needs	Project Years Requested (State FY)	Average Rank (of 13 ranked scores)	Subtotal Cost	Recommendation
NOAA Auke Bay Lab, TSMRI	Auke Creek Salmonids Monitoring	Joyce	$86,726	2A-1	FY10-FY11	3.62	$86,726	Fund
NOAA Auke Bay Lab, TSMRI	SECM Sampling & pink salmon forecasting*	Orsi	$55,620	3A-3	FY10	5.54	$142,346	Fund
ADFG Gene Lab	McDonald Lake Sockeye	Gilk	$132,380	2A-2	FY10	5.92	$274,726	Fund
ADFG SF	Instream Flow Quantification & Protection**	Johnson	$187,460	1A-2	FY10	6.23	$462,186	Fund
ADFG SF	Hydrologic & Adjudication Support**	Johnson	$15,038	1A-2	FY10	6.31	$477,224	Fund
ADFG CF	Chilkat Salmon Assessment - Fish Wheels	Bachman	$269,860	2A-1	FY10-FY11	7.08	$747,084	Fund
ADFG CF	SEAK Subsistence Sockeye	Conitz	$75,705	2A-1	FY10	7.62	$822,789	Fund
ADFG SF	Chuck Creek coho CWT and escapement	McCurdy	$79,826	2A-3	FY10	8.23	$902,615	Fund

Agency	Project Proposal	Principal Investigator	Recommended Funding (includes 3% ADFG indirect cost)	Goal / Info Needs	Project Years Requested (State FY)	Average Rank (of 13 ranked scores)	Subtotal Cost	Recommendation
NOAA Auke Bay Lab, TSMRI	Effects of hatchery strays on wild Chinook	Thrower	$102,955	3A-11	FY10-FY12	9.38	$1,005,570	Fund
ADFG SF	ACWA Grants RSA to DEC	Cappiello	$51,500	1C-1	FY10	9.85	$1,057,070	Fund
ADFG SF	Chickamin Coho sampling	Johnson	$60,459	2A-1	FY10	9.85	$1,117,529	Fund
ADFG CF	Disappearance Creek Chum Weir	Piston	$106,529	2A-1	FY10-FY11	10.15	$1,224,058	Fund for one year only (FY10); project can resubmit for another year during next AKSSF funding cycle.
UAF	Genetic changes assoc w in-basin supplementation of sockeye salmon, Phase 2	Smoker/Gharrett	$189,817	2E-2	FY10	11.42	$1,413,875	Subcommittee will meet to revise project budget with maximum total project cost of $189,817. (Final AKSSF funding may be less, as non-federal match funds may replace AKSSF funds.)
Takshanuk Watershed Council	Haines Salmon Distribution Assessment	Shields	$30,432	1A-5	FY10-12	11.54	$1,444,307	Fund

Agency	Project Proposal	Principal Investigator	Recommended Funding (includes 3% ADFG indirect cost)	Goal / Info Needs	Project Years Requested (State FY)	Average Rank (of 13 ranked scores)	Subtotal Cost	Recommendation
ADFG SF	Nakwasina River coho escapement	Tydingco	$40,000	2A-3	FY10	11.85	$1,484,307	Fund
ADFG SF	Salmon Habitats of the Taku River**	Nichols	$147,460	1A-5	FY10-FY11	12.46	$1,631,767	Fund one year only (FY10), whether from Statewide Call or this call. Project can resubmit for another year during next AKSSF funding cycle.
ADFG CF	Stress Effects & Mass Marking in Salmon	Oxman	$90,501	3A-11	FY10-FY11	14.46	$1,772,268	
TOTAL			**$1,772,268**					

NOTES:
* Applied for funding from Northern Fund
** Applied for funding in Statewide AKSSF Goal 1 Call for Proposals (scoring process now underway)
If funding for these projects is received from these other sources, FFY 2008 AKSSF funds will not be expended for the projects.

Not Recommended for AKSSF funding (FFY 2008)								
Agency	**Project Proposal**	**Principal Investigator**	**Requested Funding** (includes 3% ADFG indirect cost)	**Goal / Info Needs**	**Project Years Requested** (State FY)	**Average Rank** (of 13 ranked scores)	**Subtotal Cost**	**Recommendation**
Armstrong-Keta	Evaluation of Age-0 smolt strategy	Rabung	$145,065	3A-11	FY10-FY12		$145,065	Do not fund
ADFG Habitat	Documenting Anadromous Waters SE	Ott	$1,543,778	1A-4	FY10-12		$1,543,778	Do not fund
NOAA Auke Bay Lab	Effects of enhancement on wild coho, Part 2	Gray	$42,560	2E-3	FY10-FY11		$42,560	Do not fund
TOTAL			**$1,731,403**					

AKSSF Southeast Region - Priority PST Projects

Agency	Project Proposal	Principal Investigator	Project Cost	Project Years (State FYs)	Applied for NF
AKSSF "Year 8" Projects (FFY 2007 AKSSF)					
NOAA Auke Bay Lab	ABL N. Boundary Sockeye District 101/4 - FY10	Guyon	$207,545	FY10-11	*
ADFG SF	Chickamin River Chinook - FY10	Johnson	$95,378	FY10	*
ADFG SF	Chilkat Chinook CWT - FY10	Chapell	$99,518	FY10	*
ADFG SF	Chinook ASL - FY10	Weller	$75,109	FY10	
ADFG CF	CTC Biometrician II - FY10	Carlile	$54,717	FY10	
ADFG CF	SEAK Chinook GSI Sampling-Archiving - FY10	Reynolds	$51,912	FY10-11	*
ADFG CF	Mark Tag & Age Lab Support - FY 10	Josephson	$77,250	FY10	
ADFG CF	NBTBR Sockeye Stock ID - FY10	Oliver	$371,168	FY10	
ADFG CF	Salmon Aerial Surveys - FY10	Heinl	$110,857	FY10	
ADFG CF	Sockeye matched sampling - FY10	Reynolds	$184,085	FY10	*
ADFG SF	Taku River Smolt & Escapement - FY10	Jones	$67,764	FY10	*
TOTAL			**$1,395,303**		
AKSSF "Year 9" Projects (FFY 2008 AKSSF)					
ADFG SF	Chilkat River Smolt CWT - FY10	Chapell	$108,065	FY10	
ADFG SF	Chinook ASL - FY11	Weller	$76,202	FY11	
ADFG CF	Mark Tag & Age Lab Support - FY11	Josephson	$80,340	FY11	
ADFG CF	NBTBR Sockeye Stock ID - FY11	Oliver	$383,833	FY11	
ADFG CF	Salmon Aerial Surveys - FY11	Heinl	$111,607	FY11	
TOTAL			**$760,047**		

Non-Treaty Projects – Total Scores & Written Comments by 13 Reviewers
(in order listed in Attachment 1)

Proposal: NOAA ABL – Auke Creek Salmonids Monitoring – Joyce

Score	Written Comment
91	The Auke Creek program has provided one of the longest datasets on salmonid production on the West Coast. This program has been funded by PCSRF in the past, and was identified as a high priority need in the 2008 GAPS analysis. I consequently gave high scores to the key criteria. I assigned sub-maximum scores to criteria 3 and 4 because sustainability and indirect costs/leveraging non-AKSSF resources were not detailed.
98	Excellent project, long-term data base; fund for 2 years
98	This project is a continuation of previously funded AKSSF project. The project has strong inter-agency partnerships, providing information for research institutions and for direct management applications. NOAA provides in-kind support and ADF&G provides direct match-budget support; the project also provides a nexus for outreach and capacity building in conjunction with UAF.
92	Excellent project that leverages use of the Auke Creek weir for information on several species of salmon.
92	Good fisheries mgmt project with long-term data sets and indicator stock.
96	This project has always been big in the area of partnerships having ADFG, NOAA, and UAF partnerships. In my mind, it is one of the most important coho salmon indicator stocks in the region having one of the best long-term datasets for coho on the entire coast.
92	(no written comment)
78	Longest term Full SA coho, plus sockeye, pink, Chum, DV and CT. Experienced, needed, good track record, cost effective due to multi-sp. Of actual SA & management fish data.
93	important project - large amount of data gathered for cost
98	Supports a variety of very important research and monitoring projects by various agencies and the most long-term detailed data series for salmon in the region.
87	This project provides an important legacy dataset for fisheries management and long term monitoring.
96	Excellent, well-written proposal, clear objectives, clear connection to important management objectives. It is important to maintain this weir. FUND
95	Strategic import explicit ID in SSF call. Tech merit --long track record as index stock, etc. Funding leveraged by Fed contribution. Outreach needs a web site for real-time, archived, data. No evidence of stakeholder support.

Proposal: NOAA ABL – SECM Sampling & Pink Salmon Forecasting - Orsi

Score	Written Comment
100	Proven project - perfect in every way.
95	Important work, fund.
98	This project is double-tracked with both AKSSF and the Northern Fund because of the uncertainty of NF endowment earnings being available in 2009.I am obviously biased towards this project; I think it belongs in the PST-preapproved category with the other projects that have been previously funded by the Northern Fund, and that have been approved through the Concept Proposal review for 2009 funding from the NF.
85	Reasonable continuation of a valuable forecasting tool.
83	Continuation of pink forecasting model with good historic results.
87	This project is essential and has shown very good potential and performance is solid. Definitely benefits management.
85	(no written comment)
84	This is a needed project, the only source to predict SEAK pink salmon. PI proven track record, reasonable cost, partnering.
78	The only question I have on this one is what defines a "habitat" - what are the parameters?
91	This project has relatively high importance because earlier research in this area has proven the method to be the most effective available indicator for pink salmon returns and has provided insight on early marine survival.
90	This project will replace declining funding from the NF to continue the SECM project.
97	This is an important project, a bargain, and should be funded.
86	Strateg import: In SSSF Call, is continuing project. Tech Meri: good review of progress, promising contribution to forecast. Exper/Qual: Scope of project warrants qualified oceanographer. Funding: not leveraged by support from pink salmon industry. Should have outreach website.

Proposal: ADFG Gene Lab – McDonald Lake Sockeye - Gilk

Score	Written Comment
99	This proposal addresses a high priority information need identified in the 2008 GAPS analysis, and is the final phase of a previously funded PSCRF project. Supporting projects have been funded by the PSC (hence max score for criterion 1). The technical aspects appear to be sound and objective criteria are provided (max score for criterion 2). The PIs are qualified, the budget is reasonable and is leveraged (but funding source for match should be identified - presume GF), and there are partners and adequate outreach (max scores for remaining criteria).
93	Good and high priority project; fund.
94	This project is the final phase of a previously funded PCSRF project. Funding is reasonable, with ADF&G match. No partnership cost-sharing or in-kind support.
89	A much needed continuation of improved assessment projects on this depressed stock.
95	Project needed to assist with future mgmt decisions to help meet escapement.
85	Year 3 of 3; let's get this wrapped up and very interesting results so far.
87	(no written comment)
75	Need project for important sockeye stock.
85	Good potential information, however there could be many other factors than fishing that are impacting this population…
85	A one-time project that addresses an important harvest/exploitation question for a stock of concern.
95	Project will complete a genetic baseline to allow for better in season management of interception of this depressed stock.
93	Important project and third year needed. FUND
91	Strateg Import SSF call in goal 2A and prior support. Tech Merit: good review of progress, techniques widely accepted in field. Exper/Qual: Highly experienced/educated team of 6. Funding request is appropriate, but not levered with outside participation

Proposal: ADFG SF – Instream Flow & Quantification - Johnson

Score	Written Comment
99	This proposal addresses a high priority information need identified in the 2008 GAPS analysis and five associated projects have received PSCRF monies since 2000. The project has some in-kind support form by various watershed councils, and water reservation is identified as a priority need in the department's strategic plan and various Lamps (hence max score for criterion 1). The technical aspects are sound as dictated by statute and USGS protocols (max score for criterion 2). The PI is qualified, the budget is reasonable and leveraged (but funding source for match should be identified - presume GF), and there are partners and adequate outreach (max scores for remaining criteria).
85	Continue to fund.
94	Continuation of previously funded AKSSF work quantifying and reserving in-stream flow for high-priority watersheds. Match funding is from ADF&G. Some in-kind support identified with Watershed Council stream gauge projects.
92	Continuation of excellent project to collect, analyze, and prepare reservations of water for high priority waterbodies in SEAK
98	Continuation of project to prepare reservations for high priority waterbodies in SEAK. Good project that provides cost-effective protection throughout SEAK.
84	Essential aspect of flow work. Costly yet necessary to complete the work. Again, the big question is the importance of doing this work now vs. down the road.
59	(no written comment)
68	Water produces fish.
90	Instream flow is SO critical to the life cycle of salmonids - good project - potentially HUGE benefits to salmonids.
90	Given a relatively high ranking because it's an important ongoing habitat protection project to determine appropriate flows for salmon.
95	Funding of this ongoing project would help support continued efforts by ADFG to identify priority waterbodies and collect needed to data to support applications for instream flow reservations.
95	This work should continue. FUND
86	High strateg import due Sport fish strategic plan, 5 regional land management plans, and continues several earlier projects. High Tech Merit--quantifies 82 filings over 23 watersheds,+12 gages, give good statement of objectives but not quantified, deliverables not quantified (all streams filed? No explicit statement of leveraging support from watershed councils, etc. Should have estimation of volunteer work hours to be performed at the prevailing rate of pay. Work group has dedicated outreach person but no apparent support

Proposal: ADFG SF – Hydrologic & Adjudication Support - Johnson

Score	Written Comment
99	This proposal addresses a high priority information need identified in the 2008 GAPS analysis and was funded in Years 6, 7 and 8. The project has some in-kind support from DNR, and is apparently endorsed by various watershed councils (hence max score for criterion 1). The technical aspects are sound as dictated by statute (max score for criterion 2). The PI is qualified, the budget is reasonable and is leveraged (but funding source for match should be identified - presume GF), and there are partners and adequate outreach (max scores for remaining criteria).
95	Continue to fund this activity.
95	Continuation of previously funded AKSSF work on in-stream flow. Interagency, cooperative effort, with DNR providing the match-budget, and DNR and ADF&G providing in-kind support. Low cost, good bang for the buck.
95	Excellent project to increase the rate of adjudication of water reservations on high priority waterbodies in SEAK.
90	Continuation project to increase rate of reservations on important water bodies in SEAK.
72	Always a tough priority call w/ these type proposals. The work is necessary but just how essential it is to fund at this time is questionable. Nevertheless, water reservations are baseline and necessary and must do work.
67	(no written comment)
71	Cost is low, provides support to DNR to process SEAK adjudication applications.
88	Minimal cost for potentially large benefits.
93	An important function for protection of salmon habitat. Provides key support for establishment of adequate flow reservations for salmon in streams likely to be impacted by industrial development. Low cost.
100	Funding of this ongoing project would help to address one of the bottlenecks in the system to establish protection of instream flows for salmon.
92	Inexpensive and continuing project. FUND
67	Strat Import: included in 5 regional Land Management Plans and Sportfish Strategic Plan, ID'd in SSF at 1AA1/, but Goal is vague--no indication of how many applications are on hand or coming. Tech Merit: no indication of how many this continuing project has accomplished in past. Technical merit reduced--apparently this would entirely support public process of reviewing application,, there's no indication of how hydrology practiced by a hydrologist enters into the project, the goals, results and deliverables are not measured--giving no evidence of the agency's case load and the effect of this project on it. Funding: No budget partnership or leverage with local organizations--ADNR and ADFG do share in the project but it seems that all of the budgeted effort will be DNR's combining project monies and DNR budget. There is no testament from DNR that DNR is committed to the plan and will commit state-appropriated funds to it. Partners: Proposers say that they've worked with several watershed councils salmon recovery boards, agencies, on capacity building but give no indication of how this project will use those partnerships to accomplish the goals of the proposal and no indication of how they will reach out through those organizations to communicate the results of the project. No indication from those councils that they even support the project

Proposal: ADFG CF – Chilkat Salmon Assessment Fish Wheels – Bachman

Score	Written Comment
91	This is a long-term project that is not only critical for the assessment of sockeye and fall chum salmon, but also Chinook and coho salmon (funds are provided by the Division of Sport Fish to monitor these species). This project addresses information need 2A-1; the PI stated that this project addresses Goal 3, which it does, but he did not identify which information need is met. I gave a sub-maximum score for criterion 4 because there was no non-AKSSF leverage, yet the annual budgets are reasonable. I also gave criterion 5 a sub-maximum score because there is a quasi-local partner, yet the project provides sufficient outreach through public meetings.
95	Solid and needed project, fund.
95	This project is necessary to complete the assessment of prior PCSRF-funded research and assessment projects on Chickamin coho salmon. Funding is reasonable, with ADF&G match. No partnership cost-sharing or in-kind support.
85	Continuation funding of assessment for an important sockeye stock in Northern SEAK.
87	Continuation of sockeye stock assessment in Northern SEAK.
84	The fish wheel project on this river is the crux of stock assessment for Chin, sock, coho, and fall chum.
95	(no written comment)
79	TWO YEARS. Big sockeye producer escapement + chum index, proven track record. Project is needed; could fund only one year at this time.
93	good project - needed information
93	A key project for inseason management and post-season stock assessment for sockeye as well as other species in the Chilkat River, one of the most important salmon producing streams in the region.
87	Project provides data important to determining production, exploitation, and marine survival of an important coho stock. Proposal was well written.
82	Important and on-going project. No effort at outreach. FUND
65	Strateg Import: Named in SSF call, previous funding; Tech Merit: sketchy indication of methods. no evidence of past performance. Exper/Qual no indication of investigator qualifications. Funding: No local partners. No budget leverage. Need real time availability of counts for outreach--web site

Proposal: ADFG CF – SEAK Subsistence Sockeye - Conitz

Score	Written Comment
94	This proposal addresses a high priority information need identified in the 2008 GAPS analysis, and PSCRF has provided supplementary support for the subsistence sockeye program since 2002. This program has received primary funding support through the Federal Office of Subsistence Management's (OSM) Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, and this is year 3 of 3-year project to estimate sockeye escapement in four systems (hence a maximum score for criterion 1). Funding is for the PI salary - seems we've discouraged this in the past. Description of the methodologies is too general and no objective criteria are provided. I gave maximum scores to the remaining criteria because the budget is leveraged, there are partners/local partnerships/capacity building, and sufficient outreach.
80	An expensive project that will produce nebulous results, low priority in my opinion.
94	This project has been funded in part with SSF money in the past. It has interagency support, and is a collaborative project with a number of tribal groups. The proposal did not make a strong connection to the 2008 AKSSF priorities, but did identify that the escapement assessments were a priority for the Federal OSM. This is the eighth year of the program; the information provided has been very useful at defining the size of these small sockeye stocks. The proposal does not make clear how the information will be used from a management perspective. Funding is reasonable, with ADF&G match, and there is substantial in-kind support from other agencies/organizations.
90	(no written comment)
90	Continuation of stock & subsistence sockeye harvests.
84	Provides 9 months of full time salary to manage the subsistence sockeye program conducted at several important subsistence sockeye runs in SEAK. This work is valuable to management and necessary to document the status and health of these systems.
80	(no written comment)
66	Assess escapements and subsistence harvest in Hetta, Klawock, Falls, and Kanalku Lakes.
88	This is an ongoing project in it's 3rd year - should be funded at some level.
93	Provides continued monitoring of very important subsistence sockeye salmon populations and for resolving key subsistence and commercial fishery management questions.
100	This project works with subsistence users in local communities to collect needed information for management of small populations of sockeye.
94	On-going project provides valuable subsistence harvest and stock assessment information.
80	Strateg Impor: not in SSF call but is in OSM Strategic Plan. Technical methods are not described in detail. Qual/exper: not detailed. Funding: Budget is probably leveraged significantly--OSM and Cooperating Tribe -- but details not given. Hydaburg, Klawock, Kake, Angoon are apparently significant partners, but no documentation is given.

Proposal: ADFG SF – Chuck Creek Coho CWT & Expansion – McCurdy

Score	Written Comment
97	This project was funded by PSCRF from 2001 to 2008 and has successfully met all objectives since its inception. Chuck Creek is the only Southern Outside coho indicator stock, and this project was identified as a high priority need in the 2008 GAPS analysis. I consequently gave high scores for criteria 1 and 2. I gave maximum scores for the remaining criteria because: 1) the PI has worked on this project since 2001 and is well qualified; 2) the project budget is reasonable and there is non-AKSSF leverage; 3) the project has a partner and there is outreach through online reports.
90	Good project, fund.
94	This project continues PCSRF funding for the Chuck Creek coho indicator stock. The project has been successful and effectively contributes to the ability of ADF&G to sustainably manage coho salmon in SEAK. Funding is reasonable, with ADF&G match. No partnership cost-sharing or in-kind support.
80	Continuation funding for development of an indicator stock for coho.
85	Continuation of coho stock assessment and indicator stock.
85	Interesting work is being performed on this small stock of coho salmon located in the SW quadrant of SEAK. This is our only indicator stock for management use.
	(no written comment)
70	Only S. Outside coho indicator stock. Though small, data is great for all aspects--smolt, harvest, escapement, survival and total prod.
91	good project - funding necessary to complete life cycle currently tagged under SSSF grant.
95	The only long-term wild coho salmon indicator stock in its geographic area. An on-going project that provides precise population and exploitation estimates for reasonable cost.
90	Project continues data collection toward development of an escapement goal for a southern outside population of coho.
83	Index stock, on-going project, escapement goal development. FUND.
65	Strateg Import: Index stock funded by SSF, ID'd in SSF Call. Tech Merit: no evidence of past performance. Exper/Qual: sketchy indication of qualifications of PI. Funding: little budget leveraging--no match budget justification. Partner: no local partnerships or capacity building (not even ATA). Outr: Search of linked SF report website returned zero results on 'Chuck Creek Coho'; need real-time, archive website

Proposal: NOAA ABL – Effects of hatchery strays on wild Chinook - Thrower

Score	Written Comment
93	This proposal addresses a high priority information need identified in the 2008 GAPS analysis, and the PI has considerable experience doing this type of research (hence, high scores in criteria 1 and 3). Sample sizes seem adequate for estimating most of the parameters identified, and brief discussion on power is provided (max score in criterion 3). I gave a sub-maximum score for criterion 4 because indirect costs were not identified and there is no non-AKSSF leverage; also, Armstrong-Keta, Inc. is providing the match, but it's not clear what their source of funding is (note that this company has submitted an AKSSF proposal). I also suggest that this be limited to a 2-year project. I gave a maximum score for criterion 5 because there is a partner and public outreach through an AFS presentation and website postings is adequate.
95	A very well designed experiment that will provide useful information; fund.
95	This project directly addresses significant issues of concern identified under Goal 3A.11 regarding genetic implications of segregated hatchery brood stocks. It has substantial NOAA in-kind support, and a partnership match with an independent PNP.
85	Reasonable project to investigate the effect of straying in Chinook salmon.
85	Interesting project that may provide unique insights on the effect of straying in Chinook salmon.
79	This is a ever-growing concern and due to increased constraints on Treaty Chin availability, likely hatchery production will be explored to counter. Such information is highly valuable.
66	(no written comment)
52	Due to good aquaculture practices and low stray rates for Chinook salmon in SEAK, there is not a need to fund this project.
85	Good potential data
85	Addresses an identified priority. Would investigate effect on fitness (survival) and other traits of wild & hatchery fish & hybrids. Would not address freshwater survival in a stream.
100	This project may provide information to infer potential impacts of hatchery Chinook salmon on wild populations.
83	There is a lot of speculation without reference. It is unclear that they will have sufficient statistical power to detect differences in marine survival for instance. Important issue.
75	Strateg Imp: not in strategic plan or SSF call or other support, not continuation. Tech Merit: doesn't consider methods, results of recent similar research. Calls 'wild' fish which have been cultured in hatchery ~3 generations--no justification given, cited refs absent. funding: Sketchy justification of AKI in-kind contribution.

Proposal: ADFG SF – ACWA Grants RSA to DEC – Cappiello

Score	Written Comment
80	This is an ongoing program that has been consistently funded by PCSRF. In the past, the Science Panel has asked for examples of specific projects that have been funded and their level of success, which is lacking in this proposal. Without that info, it's difficult to assess criteria 1 and 2, hence the sub-maximum scores. Re: experience, the PI is obviously qualified, but I scored criterion 3 as I did because there is no way to assess the qualifications of the grantees without project-specific information. The funding request is reasonable, but I assigned criterion 4 a sub-maximum score because it depends on a grantee's ability to provide a match.
85	Fund as in past years.
97	This project has been previously funded by PCSRF, as a multi-agency process for addressing identification and restoration of habitat and fish passage issues in high-priority watersheds. Grants are specifically designed to leverage non-Federal resources at a local partnership level.
85	Good project that multiplies the use of AKSSF dollars to restore impaired waterbodies. Would like to see list of waterbodies addressed by this funding in prior years. No up front match needed.
85	Good project that identifies water bodies that need to be restored and screens project to provide cost-effective grants with leverage from DNR & DEC funds.
79	ACWA funding is necessary and I rank it fairly high in all facets of scoring criteria. The big question is just how valuable it is in comparison to other projects.
66	(no written comment)
57	Commissioner will fund regardless.
100	this project funds other local projects of importance
79	A useful on-going project to support watershed protection & restoration efforts. Appears to have a good system for project selection. Ranked lower than some core assessment needs.
95	Project funds a grant program that effectively involves citizen and other groups in salmon projects that leads to on the ground conservation, local capacity building and education benefits.
94	This sounds like a commissioner level priority, with funding that has been on-going for some time. It is an inexpensive project that can leverage funds through its proposal process. FUND
50	Strategic import--no mention of project's pertinence to an adopted plan, not identified in SSF plan. Tech Merit: little evidence in proposal of past performance, nature/number of projects, effect of projects; Funding--no evidence of leverage from local sources, no evidence of local partners, no nonfederal match. No link to outreach website

Proposal: ADFG SF – Chickamin Coho Sampling – Johnson

Score	Written Comment
88	Chickamin coho pre-smolt/smolt were successfully CWTd from 2001 to 2008, and escapements were sampled from 2003 to 2008 (both components funded by SSSF) to estimate the CWT marked fraction and ASL composition. This proposal would fund escapement sampling in 2009. Data collected by this project, in combination with surveys to estimate escapement (separate funding), will meet information needs identified in the 2008 GAPS analysis. I consequently gave high scores to the key criteria. I gave a sub-maximum score to criterion 4 because indirect costs were included in the direct cost line, yet costs are reasonable and there is non-AKSSF leverage. I also gave criterion 5 a sub-maximum score because there were no partners/local partnerships/capacity building, yet provides sufficient outreach through online reports.
81	Good project, fund if money is available.
94	This project is necessary to complete the assessment of prior PCSRF-funded research and assessment projects on Chickamin coho salmon. Funding is reasonable, with ADF&G match. No partnership cost-sharing or in-kind support.
85	Continuation funding of assessment for an important coho stock in Southern SEAK.
90	Good fisheries mgmt project with long-term data sets and indicator stock.
80	One of the largest coho producers in southern SEAK; wraps up previously funded work; valuable management tool.
81	(no written comment)
72	Southern inside coho stock, ID'd as biggest need for coho for SA. Plan to get full set of parameters with expanded aerial esc. counts. Proven track record Pis, decent cost benefit. Used for large geo area
93	finishing project previously funded - minimal cost for benefit
81	An excellent candidate for a long-term wild coho indicator stock in southern Southeast. I would rank this project much higher if it included mark-recapture estimation. The survey expansion method is far less reliable.
80	Project completes a 6 year effort to estimate production of an important coho stock. Documentation of previous years results was a bit sparse in proposal.
84	Well-written, continuing project, germane to escapement goal development for important indicator stock. No effort to show outreach. FUND
77	Strateg Import: not in any strategic plan or SSF plan but is continuation of funded SSF work. Tech Merit: No evidence of past performance-- search of linked page, sport fish division reports, returned zero results for "chickamin coho escapement", Funding: only leverage ASDFG/MTA lab. no participation of stakeholders.. no outreach

Proposal: ADFG CF – Disappearance Creek Chum Weir – Piston

Score	Written Comment
90	This proposal is for the second and third years of a 3 year project (the first year was funded by PSCRF). Information on the Disappearance fall chum stock was identified as a high priority information need in the 2008 GAPS analysis, hence a high score for criterion 1. The technical aspects seem complete/correct and address several information needs; objective criteria are provided (so max score). The PI is well qualified and has pertinent experience (max score). I gave sub-maximum scores for criteria 4 and 5 because there is no non-AKSSF leverage, and although there is outreach through public meetings, there are no partners.
85	Good, but expensive project. Fund if money's available.
95	This is a continuation of an on-going PCSRF project for Disappearance Creek Chum Salmon. Given the paucity of high-quality data on chum salmon escapements in SEAK, this is a very important assessment project. Funding is reasonable, with ADF&G match. No partnership cost-sharing or in-kind support.
85	Excellent project that will attempt to raise the level of stock assessment and management of wild chum salmon in southern SEAK.
90	Good project to improve chum stock assessment in southern SEAK.
79	Continues previously funded work. Funds operation of weir and allows for comparison of aerial and foot counts of chum w/ this actual known count. Benefits chum salmon management.
81	(no written comment)
76	TWO YEARS (suggest funding one) Chum stock with a down trend after big years. Approach is mostly good and will provide expansions in years w/o weir.
76	no partnerships or outreach … or much funding match. But a good project.
89	One of the few wild chum salmon assessment projects in the region. Important for resolving important management and conservations questions about Cholmondeley Sound chum salmon fishery.
75	Project initiates year 1 and 2 of a 3 year project to estimate escapement to manage a POW chum population.
86	Relevant for escapement goals, continuation of funded effort. FUND.
65	Strategic Import: continues earlier funded project; Tech Merit: No indication of past performance; Exper/qual of project leader Heinl not given. Not clear who is qualified to carry out biometric analyses; Funding: no leverage indicated; No partners, outreach

Proposal: UAF – Genetic changes assoc w/in-basin supplementation of sockeye – Smoker/Gharrett

Score	Written Comment
98	This proposal is for funding in year 2 for a project that was funded by PSCRF in year 1. The project has also received funding from the PSC, and has in-kind support from UAF and ABL. The proposal addresses a high priority information need identified in the 2008 GAPS analysis (hence max score for criterion 1). The technical aspects seem adequate and the PIs identify potential problems and contingencies; the PIs are qualified (max scores for criteria 2 and 3). I gave a sub-maximum score for criterion 1 because the match seemed to be incorrectly classified as leverage. There are partners and adequate outreach efforts.
45	The feasibility work was funded last year through the Northern Fund. The NF identified $60k for 2nd year as a limit because we need results from year 1 before continuing. I am against provided additional funding at this time.
92	This is a continuation of a project funded by the Northern Fund and supplemented by SSF. The match budget is contingent of NF approval and funding, so funding will be contingent on the NF status in February. This project was requested by ADF&G to examine impacts of supplementation, and should continue to be a high priority for the NF and AKSSF. It has strong collaborative support, which will be reinforced by the formation of an oversight committee. It can be a "legacy" project for innovative research and capacity building through UAF. This proposal is still the feasibility phase and does not identify a graduate student project. The proposal is a bit unclear as to what samples will actually be processed with this money; will this complete the 2008 samples, or will it also cover processing of the 2009 samples? The project is underfunded for actually initiating supplementation in 2010, as there is no funding for fry culture, marking, and stocking in the proposal.
75	Had trouble discerning strategic importance of this project from the proposal.
75	Assess supplementation effects of sockeye. Importance and benefits not fully understood.
92	This is a continuation of a highly valuable and potentially useful project. This work is scaled down significantly from previously planned work in the effort to ID the most appropriate avenues of research and funding by use of an oversight committee.
87	(no written comment)
64	Commissioner will likely fund regardless. Project ID'd as needed, methods appear to be sound, experienced PIs.
88	Good potential information to be gleaned from this study & applied to other places.
88	Addresses an important current policy question about the effectiveness of hatchery back planting in restoring sockeye populations and long-term effects on fitness.
95	Project will support feasibility of a long term project to elucidate the genetic effects of supplementation. This project would lay the groundwork for long-term observation of changes to a wild stock due to introgression of hatchery fish into the wild population.
75	This is an important long term initiative. This proposal is essentially the same as a previously funded Northern Fund project. Results of that effort should form this funding request. DO NOT FUND.

Proposal: Takshanuk Watershed Council – Haines Salmon Distribution Assessment - Shields

Score	Written Comment
98	This primary goal of this proposal addresses a high priority need information need identified in the 2008 GAPS analysis, and also addresses 1A-4 (probably more so; the number of priority stream miles added to the FDD and AWC is one of ADF&G's means and measures). The PI mentions 1A-10, but that's not in the priority needs list. This project was previously funded by PSCRF (Year 8, I think) and has received funding from the USFWS. The technical merits appear to be sound, as do the qualifications of the PI. The budget is reasonable, there are partners, and outreach is sufficient.
85	Seems like a cost effective effort.
96	This project has been previously funded with PCSRF funds. It is an extremely cost-effective approach to identifying nominations to the anadromous water catalog in the Haines area. Scope of contributions was explicitly identified, and past performance was demonstrated. The project provides for local capacity building and outreach.
92	Excellent AWC project that leverages existing work in the area.
93	Continuation of cost-effective AWC project.
77	This project mentions continued work w/ DFG personnel. I do not know the specifics behind this work and refer to other personnel's expertise.
43	Scope of the problem not identified. Are there significant areas of the Chilkat watershed not listed as Anadromous waters catalog?..
44	Baseline cataloging of anadromous waterbodies to add "several miles" to AWC. Already have done a lot in area. Not sure it's a high priority this year. Unnecessarily verbose proposal.
63	I think this one is a good project… just concerned with protocol with an unknown number of volunteers… and want to make sure info is "sufficient" for AWC.
77	An ongoing habitat mapping project. The proposal is a little short on methodology. Cost is reasonable.
87	This is a cost effective project to add to the coverage of the AWC in the Haines area.
91	Project is very inexpensive and has a great collaborative aspect. FUND
41	Strategic Import--not clear from proposal how threatened are the habitats of Chilkat, Chilkoot and Ferebee; these are large watersheds with varied histories of development and not homogenous. It's not clear from proposal how TWC relates to the people of Haines/Klukwan--there's no documentation of partnerships, no evidence of monetary or in-kind commitment

Proposal: ADFG SF – Nakwasina River Coho Escapement - Tydingco

Score	Written Comment
95	The primary goal addressed by this proposal was identified as a high priority information need in the 2008 GAPS analysis, and the proposal also addresses three additional information needs. Research on Nakwasina River coho salmon has been funded by PSCRF projects 45051, 45295, 45458, 45760, and 45761(hence the high score for criterion 1). The technical merits are sound, but objective criteria are not provided. The PI is qualified, the budget is reasonable and leveraged, and there is a partner and adequate outreach (max scores for remaining criteria).
90	Good project, fund.
92	Continuation of a coho indicator stock assessment, not clear if previously funded by PCSRF. Important component of SEAK coho management; assessment is based on peak counts. Funding is reasonable, with ADF&G match. No partnership cost-sharing or in-kind support.
80	Continuation funding for development of an indicator stock for coho.
80	Continuation of coho indicator stock assessment for N. Outside areas.
79	Along with Ford Arm, serves as an indicator stock for NW quadrant. Has proven track record of success. Proponents are experienced and can do the work.
87	(no written comment)
69	Cost effective project for coho escapement, operated 1998-2006.
90	As this is the last year of data collection for this system and it is an indicator stream for the coho population, it seems important to complete this work.
86	Continuation of a long-term project. Survey-based escapement estimate is less precise than mark-recapture estimate but also less expensive.
80	Project will monitor for previously CWT'd fish, collect ASL, and infer abundance. Level of detail/justification in proposal was scant.
81	Continuing study. FUND
55	Strateg Import:tied into several other ongoing projects; not in SSF Call or other strateg plan. Tech merit: methods description sketchy. Exper/Qual sketchily described--no info about education, publications, pertinent experience. Funding: Budget leveraging by Sport Fish Div is not explained or justified. No local groups contribute leveraging. No partners and no outreach planned

Proposal: ADFG SF – Salmon Habitats of the Taku River - Nichols

Score	Written Comment
85	This proposal addresses a high priority information need identified in the 2008 GAPS analysis, and the associated projects were funded in Years 7 and 8 (hence high score for criterion 1). The methodology seems sound, but no objective criteria are provided. The PI is qualified. The budget seems reasonable, but I couldn't figure out if he intends to use SWG funds as the match (hence the low score - SCP needs to contact PI for clarification). There are partners and adequate outreach
45	An expensive project that will produce nebulous results, low priority in my opinion.
93	Continuation of previously-funded AKSSF work quantifying salmonid habitat in the Taku watershed. Proposal is well-detailed, technically sound. Funding is with ADF&G match. No partnership cost-sharing or in-kind support. The cost as a multi-year project was large, and it was unclear how this project was double-tracked with a "habitat" statewide RFP? Suggest that the project be considered in that arena as a habitat issue; also, could consider a single year of funding to relieve funding pressure on this year SEAK AKSSSF RFP.
82	Good project to continue the characterization of juvenile (and adult) salmon habitats in the Taku drainage.
77	Good project to continue the characterization salmon habitats in the Taku drainage.
79	Interesting information but not essential for mngt. However, given the recent Tulsequah mine emphasis, this type of information is exactly what is necessary to facilitate the evaluation of potential barging/mining impacts.
67	(no written comments)
67	TWO YEARS (suggest funding 1 year). Like to see a presentation on this project and where it is going and how it incorporates existing Taku stock assessment data for all species.
78	Not enough details to determine technical merit, although if the information could be gathered and, potentially applied to other systems, it would be beneficial.
76	This project has merit but is relatively expensive.
95	Project will fund 2 years of a three year project to elucidate relationships between rearing salmon and habitat parameters leading to increased ability to evaluate and avoid impacts of resource development on wild salmon populations in an important transboundary river system that has recent threats due to development activities.
87	Continuing project. Partial funding from habitat call?
92	Strat Impor:related to and continues earlier projects, directly related to goal of AK SSF and to Sport Fish Div Plan. Tech Merit: plan is carefully laid out, identifying standard as well as novel techniques. Exper/Qual: Highly qualif team. Funding: leveraged by shared equipment and collaboration with other ADFG division, but not explicitly described. Potential partners identified, but not really developed. Shows good consideration of outreach through web but doesn't give past history of AFS presentations, etc.

Proposal: ADFG CF – Stress Effects & Mass Marking in Salmon - Oxman

Score	Written Comment
94	This proposal addresses a high priority information need identified in the 2008 GAPS analysis and has support of Macauley Hatchery (hence maximum score for criterion 1). Technical merits seem sound, but no objective criteria. PI is qualified, as is the associate investor, but have reservations re: farming work out to an out-of-state entity, hence a sub-maximum score for criterion 3. There is no leverage in the budget (hence sub-max score), but there are partners and sufficient outreach.
85	An excellent research proposal. I think it worth funding.
94	This project would provide information on possible alternate mechanisms for mass marking hatchery fish, and on the degree of stress associated with some standard hatchery practices. Strategic importance is there, but not as strong as for the majority of the proposals. The project has a strong collaborative aspect, with match funding from both ADF&G and Baylor, and in-kind infrastructure support from DIPAC, ADF&G, and Baylor.
75	Not completely responsive to call for proposals. Seems redundant to existing thermal marking work.
73	Assessment of stress in salmon.
65	The importance of this project is questionable and sending funding south to Baylor University is not exactly my idea of proper use of AKSSF funds.
46	I am unclear what the problem is. There have been many year of otolith marking, with return rate consistent with unmarked releases.
42	Not sure this is an effective approach and not convinced it covers ground not already covered in the past. Suggest deferring.
90	This looks to have been well thought out and a lot of planning has gone into the proposal. Would like to see results!
73	Interesting project. Main aim (promoting fish fitness & survival of hatchery fish) does not address an identified priority in this funding cycle.
80	Project will examine stress due to mass marking and work to provide information to improve hatchery marking methods.
78	Are developmental issues that are highlighted in the introduction likely detected by the simple assessments outlined (length, weight, growth)? If other stressors do induce otolith marks, they are not likely distinguishable from thermal marks, so how will they help increase marks? If the idea is to reduce stress at the hatchery, then this is at cross purposes with mark utility. Do not fully understand the use of the Baylor facility. How does improvement to hatchery fish survival (page 6) help protect wild stocks?
70	Strat Import:moderate. Not in SSF Call or in other strateg plan. Technic merit: high. Exper/Qual high. Funding:Budget is leveraged by contribution by DIPAC/UA Lab at Macualay hatchery, though not acknowledged in proposal. No other local participation. Use of Baylor rather than local laboratories diminishes Alaska capacity building

Proposal: Armstrong-Keta – Evaluation of Age-0 Smolt Strategy - Rabung

Score	Written Comment
98	This proposal addresses a high priority information need identified in the 2008 GAPS analysis. The main purpose of AKI's Chinook program is to provide fish for the common property, primarily the commercial troll fishery and, more recently, sport fishery. In view of the Chinook retention limitations imposed by stock conservation agreements within the recently renegotiated Pacific Salmon Treaty, cost-effective means of producing non-treaty fish would be beneficial. Because of this and the FED grant received in 2006, I gave a maximum score for criterion 1. The technical merits are good, CWT sample size appears adequate, and the PI is qualified (max scores in criteria 2 and 3). I gave a sub-maximum score for criterion 4 because there is no non-AKSSF leverage. There are partners and public outreach is adequate.
95	Good project; fund.
94	This project directly addresses significant issues of concern identified under Goal 3A.11 regarding age-0 smolt technology. It utilizes existing infrastructure to evaluate the technology on a site-specific basis. Funding is reasonable, with AKI match, no partnership cost-sharing.
95	Good project to optimize hatchery production of Chinook.
75	Project to assess hatchery production of Chinook. Benefit to AKSSF not fully demonstrated.
62	I believe it is a futile effort to explore production of age-0 Chinook smolt using primarily an age-1 stock for brood. Strategically, this would be a highly valuable project if it was successful; however, this project is doomed from the start in my mind.
25	Enhancement - low priority
41	THIS PROJECT, in my opinion, IS FATALLY FLAWED IN USING A NON-0-CHECK PARENT STOCK. I would support this project if they would use Keta River Chinook, which naturally have 10% age-0.
80	Concerned that others have met with mixed success on producing Age-0 smolts-has AKI learned from others mistakes?
65	This project has potential to help improve chinook salmon enhancement but does not address an identified high priority need/action. Fairly expensive.
70	Project will assess efficacy of age 0 hatchery Chinook. Study design not adequately described.
79	Project should review results of previous attempts at age 0 releases to define how their project will add knowledge.
63	Strateg Import:explicitly named by SSF under Goal 3A11. Tech merit: Should first do a laboratory study of physiological effects (smoltific/maturat/etc) of accel rearing--recent chinook research (NOAA NWFSC) indicates may be problems. Then small pilot study (reduce the fish cultural costs) should tag all fish and evaluate the effect on all fisheries/districts and on other stocks as well as local returns. Size pilot releases by power analysis. Review the experience of nearby NSRAA. Exper/Qual:good in fish culture but analytical not described. There is well-justified budget leverage from the company.

Proposal: ADFG Habitat – Documenting Anadromous Waters SE - Ott

Score	Written Comment
0	TOO EXPENSIVE, even if reduced to a one year project. As far as I'm concerned, it automatically goes to the bottom of the heap.
60	The justification is inadequate to support a request of $1.5 million to simply extend the anadromous catalogue in the Juneau area. While some effort to extent the cat. In the Juneau are is certainly worthwhile, 6 fulltime staff is an overkill, perhaps consider a smaller scale effort.
75	This project addresses an identified and ongoing need of improving the completeness and accuracy of the anadromous waters catalog. The proponents have the necessary expertise to address the issue. However, the amount requested is disproportionate to the needs of the AKSSF to address a number of priority issues. The proposal identifies a substantial match budget committed to what needs to be a long term effort in SEAK. SSSF funding to support specific tasks may be appropriate, but I question the scope of programmatic expansion proposed here.
60	Level of work (where/when/why) not adequately explained. Too expensive for work described.
62	Project details, prioritization, staffing, outcomes, etc. not adequately explained to support funding request.
76	Can't tell if this is an overlap of work, necessary, ongoing already. I refer to the habitat folks on this one.
41	This project is very expensive, outcome not worth the cost.
46	Documenting AWC in Juneau area and roaded Tongass. THREE YEARS. Does not ID watersheds, lacks specifics and outcomes, is expensive. Suggest deferring.
72	Obviously, this is an important project… but it seems unreasonable that 6 biologists would be able to devote ALL their time to this project. Fund at lower level recommended.
53	Extremely expensive proposal to improve the stream catalog. A large amount of effort has been expended on this problem over decades. There are undoubtedly many very small streams with some anadromous fish presence that have not been cataloged. However, this project is too expensive for the level of urgency in this problem.
60	Project would fund 3 years of AWC cataloging by Region 1 Habitat Biologists.
86	Project is very expensive. It seems as though some effort should have been made to more specifically identify target areas. It is left very general. If flights are involved, line 200 seems a little light.
35	Srategic Import--focus on Juneau area, but not mentioned in plan. Value of expanding Catalog not clear from proposal. Tech merit: not clear if methods (minnow traps, etc.) apply only to Juneau area, but to larger area. Exper/Qual PI is clearly experienced and qualified but actual investigators are not identified. Funding: No local partners or actual leverage are committed to the project. Budget is unaffordable

Proposal: NOAA ABL – Effects of enhancement on wild coho, Part II - Gray

Score	Written Comment
92	This proposal is for Phase II of a project funded by PSCRF during Phase I to assess enhancement impacts on wild coho salmon. This was identified as a high priority information need in the 2008 GAPS analysis, hence a high score for criterion 1. The technical aspects seem complete and correct, but no objective criteria are provided. The budgets seem reasonable, but gave criterion 4 a sub-maximum score because there was no indirect cost detail or non-AKSSF leverage. The project has partners and sufficient public outreach, so I gave criterion 5 a max score.
65	This project has potential, however, sample sizes per type and year are low, differences detected to date are likely due to family differences, not history of enhancement. Simply because collections are statistically different does not imply enhancement based changes have taken place. This type of study and analysis does not create clear answers, but instead, provides murky implications. Obj. 1 and 2 are realistic. Obj 3 is doable in the first part (analyze all samples), but not doable in the second part, "estimate the acumm. genetic impacts that large-scale enhancement has had .." Only fund if other higher priority projects are first funded.
95	This project is the second-phase of a previously funded AKSSF project. This is one of the few PCSRF projects to address the impacts of large-scale enhancement on wild stocks in SEAK., Goal 2E. It has strong inter-agency partnerships, with NOAA providing in-kind support and ADF&G providing direct match-budget support.
97	Excellent continuation of a project to look at the effects of enhancement on wild coho genetics.
95	Continuation project to assess gene flow of hatchery fish to wild coho. May provide better mgmt and policy insight.
95	This project is phase II of a previously-funded project; assessing the effects of hatchery production on wild stocks is a high priority of the Science Panel.
76	(no written comment)
65	Good study, and supported by Leon as needed. Doesn't seem to have priority over coho SA projects.
93	Good potential data - have heard from "locals" about how hatchery fish are breeding with local fish and the harms… benefit to cost ratio is high!
92	This project would be the first in the region to address a very important question about the effects of straying on wild coho salmon populations near release sites.
95	This project will provide badly needed to assess impacts of hatchery fish on a wild coho population and will evaluate the suitability of historic scale samples as genetic samples.
94	Continuing project, FUND.
85	Strateg Import: continues funded project, explicitly addresses goal in SSF call. Tech Merit: good review of past results including problems encountered, approach. Exper/Qual clear.Fund: Sketchy narrative of contract costs and in match budget no indication of who is renting what equipment to project--probably is existing equipment, don't know if ADFG can account for its use as a separate cost center. No local partners, no local capacity building.