

**DUNGENESS RIVER MANAGEMENT TEAM
REVIEWER/MEMBER COMMENTS (6/17/13)
2013 NOBLE Project Proposals**

Key:

- A. *Dungeness River In-Stream Flow Restoration (DR Flow Restoration)*
 - B. *Dungeness River East Levee Setback Restoration (DR Floodplain Restoration)*
 - C. *Dungeness River Riparian Restoration (DR Riparian Restoration)*
 - D. *Dungeness Riparian Habitat Protection (DR Habitat Protection)*
 - E. *Dungeness River Large Wood (DR Large Wood)*
 - F. *Three Crabs Restoration Construction - Phase I (3 Crabs Construction)*
 - G. *Three Crabs Restoration Engineering - Phase II (3 Crabs Engineering)*
- No Score (NS)

REVIEWER 1:

- A. *DR Flow Restoration:* This the fourth and final phase of an important project that helps better meet the need for water during the low flow season, provides an additional 1-2cfs, and will result in a fully piped on demand system. I scored L for benefit to salmon because this is the only question I have about the project. How much would 1 cfs benefit salmon? Overall, this is a great project.
- B. *DR Floodplain Restoration:* This would complete design of a project that has been a high priority for the watershed for a long time.
- C. *DR Riparian Restoration:* NOSC's proposal to manage butterfly bush in the watershed is commendable. This project would positively affect the watershed, and is greatly needed.
- D. NS
- E. *DR Large Wood:* This will yield high benefit to salmon, and the Tribe has put a lot of planning into this to ensure a successful outcome.
- F. *3 Crabs Construction:* Restoration of wetlands and the shoreline are a dream come true. It's very exciting to see the vision come to fruition.
- G. NS

REVIEWER 2:

Flood plain restoration (B) seems to be unproven and with little results so far. Large wood (E) seems to be the most beneficial to promote salmon spawning and protection for the eggs from scouring. Three Crabs project (F) and (G) is worthwhile in restoring shorelines and for the fowl, but don't see much benefit for salmon recovery.

REVIEWER 3:

All of the proposed projects this year are worthy of funding and each had excellent presenters using prescribed format. Despite clustering of similar numerical scoring/ value perceived to be associated with projects, a rank order for prioritizing funding *from [our organization's view]* would have:

- #1 D, *DR Habitat Protection:* Timeliness trumps here...To have a willing seller at ~ \$ 222K and with the JSKT Trust providing good stewardship - before damage by development is done -is consistent with the approach recommended by PSP and is money well spent.
- #2 F, *3 Crabs Construction:* It is very important to move forward with enumerated steps to reverse damage to previous DR channel and adjacent marine shoreline. The high (~\$650k) cost is of concern, but some money could come from TNC, if project gets some SRFB funding to proceed.

**DUNGENESS RIVER MANAGEMENT TEAM
REVIEWER/MEMBER COMMENTS (6/17/13)
2013 NOPE Project Proposals**

- #3 E, *DR Large Wood*: Project investment in excellent analysis and design is already complete. This project addresses upper river salmon habitat with costly (~\$500k) large wood installations, but this is a needed effort to reverse past “crimes” of LWD removal.
- #4 B, *DR Floodplain Restoration*: “Recovering natural floodplain” IS a DRMT top priority, but concerns about timing/coordination with Corps of Engineering and possible funding source of TNC leads to a lower ranking for 2013 SRFB funding (yet high score for importance!).
- #5 C, *DR Riparian Restoration*: Restoring habitat of large riverfront acreage would improve ecosystem functions, provide educational outreach opportunities and involve “younger generation” so this project merits some funding.
- #6 A, *DR Flow Restoration*: Project can already advance with some of its residual (~\$400k) grant funding, and the estimated 1 cfs “return for another ~\$600k lowers ranking in priority for getting 2013 money (although complete piping would be an accomplishment –especially if it provided more verifiable metrics of our water resources).
- #7 G, *3 Crabs Engineering*: Phase II Engineering project would be better developed/evaluated after data is obtained from Phase I Construction efforts.

REVIEWER 4:

- A. *DR Flow Restoration*: Readiness to proceed is immediate; benefit to salmon is high (reducing irrigation water diversions from Dungeness River, thereby improving instream habitat conditions, especially in late summer), and history of successful previous projects. Socio-political benefits (especially among the three irrigation entities) will also arise from nearly completing piping of Clallam-Cline-Dungeness Group irrigation distribution system.
- B. *DR Floodplain Restoration*: DR Flow Restoration (A) scored higher due to (A)’s readiness to proceed with implementation. If DR Floodplain Restoration (B) was in construction phase, would have scored it 10. Floodplain recovery has ranked #1 on many project prioritization lists, including DRMT’s. Benefits to salmon and humans are high.
- C. *DR Riparian Restoration*: While riparian habitat restoration (C) is extremely important, other proposed projects have higher urgency. This project has several components which could possibly be phased.
- D. *DR Habitat Protection*: (D) scored High due to urgency of protecting priority riparian habitat from potential development, and for its usefulness in future channel restoration efforts.
- E. *DR Large Wood*: Implementing this project is an excellent way to improve instream habitat (restore missing pools, refuge) for salmon. The need for this work is high, but it ranked slightly lower than some others due to location (Lower River is priority at this time) and urgency/timing of other projects (A, B, D).

REVIEWER 5:

- A. *DR Flow Restoration*: This will go a long way to piping DIG’s system and give them efficient water conveyance. From now on, projects funded for flow restoration should have the water savings added to the 50% level for irrigation water management. Also -- re: metering diversions, the CCD outtake at the river still isn’t working. How often does DIG take their own delivery measurements?
- B. *DR Floodplain Restoration*: Surprised at no mention of previous BOR modeling or what the JS’KT schedule is for modeling results. Seems not quite ready.

**DUNGENESS RIVER MANAGEMENT TEAM
REVIEWER/MEMBER COMMENTS (6/17/13)
2013 NOPE Project Proposals**

- C. *DR Riparian Restoration*: Highly in favor of riparian plantings and weed control, but unclear as to acreages being treated. Meadowbrook not as high a priority as Dungeness. Agree with other comments that this needs to have landowner permissions figured out.
- D. *DR Habitat Protection*: Seems a good opportunity to secure land to eventually address lowermost Meadows dike. Also a high priority based on previous analysis of riverfront parcels.
- E. *DR Large Wood*: No funds can be spent on already-completed design work. Great to have additional wood in upper-river.
- F. *3 Crabs Construction*: No mention of other projects in vicinity and relationships among them, e.g., the water quality study for septic treatment being done by County, or the Ducks Unlimited project (small one) which were done a few years ago. No mention of how this follows the Meadowbrook Creek restoration plan or who will be designing and doing the re-grading and development of salmon habitat.
- G. *3 Crabs Engineering*: Unclear how this ties in with restoration plan or what exactly is going to be provided for the \$180K A and E study. It looks like the Feasibility and Design Report for some part of this larger effort is complete. Definitely needs strong outreach component.