

**DUNGENESS RIVER MANAGEMENT TEAM
REVIEWER/MEMBER COMMENTS (May 25, 2016)
2016 NOPE Project Proposals**

Key:

A. = Dungeness Floodplain Restoration: Kinkade Phase

B. = Dungeness Off-channel Reservoir Design

C. = Lower Dungeness River Floodplain Restoration

REVIEWER 1:

B. The off-channel reservoir design would be a huge benefit for the salmon in Dungeness during periods of severe drought. It might be just enough for the returning spawners to get upstream during the periods of low river water.

REVIEWER 2:

A. Dungeness Floodplain Restoration: Kinkade Phase: This is a strong project, but additional work is needed. Landowner willingness is one uncertainty that could negatively affect this project's ecosystem function benefits and likelihood of success. I still ranked those high because the Jamestown Tribe does such an excellent job with acquisitions. Relative to the other two projects, it scored lowest because of those considerations.

B. Dungeness Off-channel Reservoir Design: This project doesn't benefit salmon as much as the other two projects, but it does provide some benefit to salmon, and would greatly benefit the local agricultural community. Salmon Recovery Funding Board may not be the best fit for funding this important project, but my ranking reflects how important this project is.

C. Lower Dungeness River Floodplain Restoration: This is a high ranking priority in the Lead Entity's Workplan and has been for many years. This is my highest priority for funding in the Dungeness River watershed because I share the opinion of the Lead Entity.

REVIEWER 3:

All strong projects that would benefit salmon and ecosystem function. Ranking based more on immediacy of funding need.

A. Dungeness Floodplain Restoration: Kinkade Phase - The reason for the highest score is due to time sensitivity - capitalize on a willing seller. Wouldn't want to lose opportunity of purchasing high value ecological floodplain property. If the floodplain property is not acquired, would not want to see emergency bank armoring/dikes constructed to protect floodplain infrastructure, which could set back floodplain restoration/connectivity decades.

B. Dungeness Off-channel Reservoir Design: Like conceptual idea of project, however expensive. Would like to see assurances that all water savings benefit fish rather than get redirected for other uses.

C. Lower Dungeness River Floodplain Restoration: Great project that has been on the top of restoration list for years. Projects with ACOE historically take a long time, so immediacy is less than Kinkade acquisitions. Concern with issues regarding Towne Rd which would not allow for full floodplain connectivity/restoration.

**DUNGENESS RIVER MANAGEMENT TEAM
REVIEWER/MEMBER COMMENTS (May 25, 2016)
2016 NOPE Project Proposals**

REVIEWER 4:

Commented that reviewer's organization is a project sponsor. Did not score any project, but noted they "support all three projects!"

REVIEWER 5:

This reviewer found all projects worthy and very close in ranking of value to the fish, farmers, & folks trying to survive in our watershed. All presenters were well prepared, but did not "sell" projects as clearly as past years regarding COSTs & benefits- specifically with focus on the 5 criteria DRMT uses for scoring. After using the categorical ratings provided for the 5 criteria, this reviewer applied a numerical range -i.e. L could be 0 to 3, M: 4 to 7, H: 8 to 10, and status I, P, A, D each could range 0 to 10 to come up with the final required score for each.

C. Lower Dungeness River Floodplain Restoration: was highest scoring based on recognition of the years of ongoing work/effort and need to use momentum of USACE & sponsor funding with timely, important match (which with PSAR becomes ~ \$1.8 million).

B. Dungeness Off-channel Reservoir Design: 2nd ranked/score is B, because sometimes the first step is the most important for pursuing a HUGE project which may be needed to address climate change where we must anticipate droughts AND extreme flood/rain events. This project can help fish, farmers, and community with CARA/irrigation needs and reduction of damage by urban (Sequim) flooding. This ~first million spent seems like a very important investment in "water futures."

A. Dungeness Floodplain Restoration – Kinkade Phase: Third ranked - but not by much - is A. It depends considerably on willing sellers and although the project would improve habitat & reduce risks of debris and damage to poorly located structures, the estimated cost of ~\$2.2 million is not insignificant.

A: $8+9+9+10+8=44/5=8.8$

B: $8+9+8+10+10=45/5=9.0$

C: $9+10+9+10+10=48/5=9.6$

REVIEWER 6:

All 3 projects are very viable and valuable for salmon and watershed health; however, my understanding is that flow restoration is the most limiting factor for Dungeness species -- which makes Project B an especially important effort.

Also, if the purpose of a citizen group's (DRMT's) input to the overall process is to bring additional perspectives to the decision-making, it surprises me that almost all the criteria provided for evaluation are specific to the technical aspects of habitat restoration.

Specific comments:

Project A/Kinkade requires additional landowner cooperation and the urgency does not seem extremely high, so question 1 was rated less than Immediate; question 5 was L-M due to the lack of socio-political benefit beyond salmon recovery and the relatively low amount of interest likely generated by the general public during/after implementation.

DUNGENESS RIVER MANAGEMENT TEAM
REVIEWER/MEMBER COMMENTS (May 25, 2016)
2016 NOPE Project Proposals

Project B/Reservoir scores highest because (1) it immediately, directly addresses serious water supply issues in streamflow and aquifer levels (which in turn affect streamflow); (2) the streamflow restoration potential is higher than all historical such projects combined; and (3) the demand for the project is already high among area residents who see the obvious benefits of storing water to benefit salmon and otherwise, and are anxious to see it funded and underway.

Project C/Lower Dungeness continues an important effort with strong support from fish and wildlife resource managers and others. It rated high in all aspects except that it is not providing as many socio-political benefits other than salmon recovery.

A: $7+9+8+10+3+3=40 /6=6.67$

B: $10+10+9+10+10+10=59 /6=9.83$

C: $10+10+9+10+5+5=49 /6=8.17$

REVIEWER 7:

Benefit to Salmon: Salmon benefits from Projects A and C will vary according to yearly flow patterns. While there will be long-term benefits from both, there may be excellent short-term benefits during times of flood. Project B does not offer much in the way of direct benefits to salmon. However, in very low water years the benefit of higher flows enabled by the reservoir late in the year may have a moderate to high benefit for a few weeks.

Certainty of Success: For Projects A and C, we won't know for certain until each project is completed and implemented. Project B has more tangible and measurable projections. There is a little doubt that irrigation will be augmented by the construction of this reservoir.

Promotes Ecosystem Functions: We can assume with a great deal of confidence that ecosystem functions will improve greatly from both Projects A and C. However, the ecosystem benefits from the construction of the storage reservoir itself will be fairly minimal although the indirect benefits of increased late season flows in the river may be temporarily substantial.

Socio-Political Benefits: We see little reason to expect anything but support for river restoration projects such as A and C. However, the effects of B may be pretty much limited to those members of the public who walk their dogs around the reservoir. Water users will continue to get their water – no change there.

REVIEWER 7:

Commented that the reviewer's organization is a project sponsor. Did not score any project.

REVIEWERS 8-16:

Did not score or comment.