

Proposed Project	2015 Individual DRMT Member Scores 0 (lowest) - 10.0 (highest) or NS (no score)															# of Scores Submitted	Score Average	Project Rank (1 = highest priority)
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15			
A. Sequim Bay Shoreline Restoration - Dawley Phase	9	7	8	7	8	6	7.0	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	7	7.43	<b>2</b>
B. Dungeness Floodplain Restoration - Robinson Phase	10	8	10	10	8.5	4	9.0	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	7	8.50	<b>1</b>
C. Dungeness R. RR Reach Floodplain Restoration	6	5	5	5	9	9	8.0	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	7	6.71	<b>3</b>

*NOTE: The 2015 DRMT consists of 11 voting members and 4 advisory members (and alternates). Advisory members are given the option of whether or not to provide score sheets. Members who are also TRG/LEG representatives (or project sponsors or partners) either elected not to provide scores/comments, or had their alternate provide them. The Team considered presentations, application materials and the following criteria in their scoring: status/urgency, benefit to salmon, certainty of success, extent of promoting ecosystem functions and socio-political benefits. 7 score sheets were received, 1 of which was from an advisory member. Scores of zero are included in average; scores of NS are not.*

**2015 DRMT (East WRIA 18 CFG) SUMMARY COMMENTS:**

**1. Project B - Dungeness Floodplain Restoration: Robinson Phase**

**The DRMT ranked Project B as having the highest priority for funding.** Project B was the only project to receive an individual highest score of "10", and it received three of them. It received the largest number of "high" ratings for "benefit to salmon" and second highest ratings for "socio-political" benefits. All but two reviewers gave it their highest numbered score among all three projects. Supportive comments emphasized the objective of improved floodplain habitat. Some reviewers noted the need for some remaining landowner permissions and the potential for project delays.

**2. Project A - Sequim Bay Shoreline Restoration: Dawley Phase**

**The DRMT ranked Project A as second in priority for funding.** Project A was the only project to receive all "high" ratings for the "promotes ecosystem functions" criterion, and it received the highest number of "high" ratings in the "certainty of success" criterion. However, some reviewers felt this project was less time-sensitive, and it received the lowest "socio-political benefits" ratings. All but one reviewer gave this project their second highest score.

**3. Project C - Dungeness R. Railroad Reach Floodplain Restoration**

**The DRMT ranked Project C as third in priority for funding.** While this project received the largest number of "high" ratings for the "socio-political benefits" criterion, it received the lowest number of "high" ratings for both the "promotes ecosystem functions" and the "benefits to salmon" criteria, and was the only project to receive any "low" ratings. While some commenters mentioned the urgency of the project, the project received the most number of "actively being designed/planned", rather than being "immediately ready to proceed". Reviewers noted some high benefits of the project, but indicated that other sources of funding might be more appropriate. One reviewer noted that the socio-political and economic benefits would outway the high cost of the project.