

DUNGENESS RIVER MANAGEMENT TEAM
Rank Summary, Comment Summary, Optional Criteria Ratings and
Individual Reviewer/Member Comments (May 2025)
2025 NOBLE Project Proposals

DRMT (East Side) NOBLE Project Scores (See attached Score Sheet/Details)

Proposed Project	DRMT Score Average (0 = lowest; 10 = highest)	DRMT Project Rank 1 = Highest Priority
A. Dungeness River Riparian Acquisition	9.78	1
B. Dungeness River Planting and Design	9.33	2

DRMT ranks Project A (Dungeness River Riparian Acquisition) as #1 and Project B (Dungeness River Planting and Design) as #2 in priority for funding, based on three submitted score sheets. (See attached NOBLE Score Tally for individual scores).

DRMT Comment Summary

DRMT ranks Project A (Dungeness Riparian Stewardship) as #1 in priority for funding this round, based on three submitted score sheets. Both projects received a high average score (column 2, above), and both projects received two perfect scores of 10. The overall ranking is essentially based on one reviewer's score, since only three scores were provided, and only one did not provide perfect scores of 10. The main justification for ranking Project A above Project B, based on the comments received, relates to perceived higher certainty around land use factors and promoting ecosystem functions. For the Optional Criteria Categories (see below), all three scorers provided "High" responses for the Benefit to Salmon, Certainty of Success, and Promotes Ecosystem Functions criteria. Project A received two more "High" responses than did Project B. The projects received equal responses for the Status/Urgency and Socio-Political Benefits categories. See the attached NOBLE Score Tally and individual reviewer comments below).

"Optional Criteria" Ratings (see attached for criteria definitions)

Reviewers gave each criterion category a rating (Immediate, Planning, Active, or D for Status/Urgency and High, Low or Medium for all others – see attached for criteria definitions). Reviewer ratings are in **blue text** in the table below:

PROPOSED PROJECT	OPTIONAL CRITERIA CATEGORIES				
	1. Status/ Urgency	2. Benefit to Salmon	3. Certainty of Success	4. Promotes Ecosystem Functions	5. Socio- Political Benefits
	(I, P, A, D)	(H, M, L)	(H, M, L)	(H, M, L)	(H, M, L)
A. Dungeness River Riparian Acquisition	I, I, I	H, H, H	H, H, H	H, H, H	M, H, M
B. Dungeness River Planting and Design	I, I, I	H, H, H	H, H, M	H, H, M	M, H, M

Individual Reviewer/Member Comments

REVIEWER 1:

Restoring salmon habitat through riparian acquisition, and planning and design, is the highest priority. Decades of development have destroyed salmon habitat and these projects have the potential to reverse the damage that has been done.

REVIEWER 2:

I believe both these projects are urgent at the highest level and will provide the benefits of criteria numbers 2-5.

REVIEWER 3:

Dungeness River Riparian Acquisition:

Status/Urgency: Immediate (2 pts.) based on (assumed) pre-negotiated agreement with land owner.

Benefit to Salmon: High (2 pts.) based on protection/conservation of riparian corridor and addressing key habitat condition that significantly limits the productivity of the salmonid species in the area.

Certainty of Success: High (2 pts.) as the project involves an acquisition of land and land conservation as habitat is a well-tried and proven technique in restoration projects.

Promotes Ecosystem Functions: High (2 pts.) based on spatial extent of project within a critical reach of the river, on permanent nature of land conservation and close link with adjacent projects and conserved land.

Socio-Political Benefits: Medium (1.33 pts.) based on uncertainty related to proposed restoration efforts and opposing land use and community priorities for adjacent properties.

Dungeness River Planning and Design:

Status/Urgency: Immediate (2pts.) based on stated readiness to proceed with assessment study.

Benefit to Salmon: High (2 pts.) based on stated goals and key habitat condition problem statement.

Certainty of Success: Medium (1.33 pts.) based on uncertainty related to potential opposing land use and community priorities for adjacent properties.

Promotes Ecosystem Functions: Medium (1.33 pts.) based scope uncertainty/pre-preliminary project status.

Socio-Political Benefits: Medium (1.33 pts.) based on uncertainty related to opposing land use and community priorities for adjacent properties.

REVIEWER 4:

Reviewer recused themselves from scoring due to: already scored as a LEG member.

REVIEWER 5:

Reviewer recused themselves from scoring due to: other.

REVIEWER 6:

Reviewer recused themselves from scoring due to: already scored as a LEG member, and alternate already scored as a TRG member.

REVIEWER 7:

Reviewer recused themselves from scoring due to: already scored as a TRG member.

REVIEWER 8:

Reviewer recused themselves from scoring due to: organization is the project sponsor.

REVIEWER 9:

Reviewer recused themselves from scoring due to: already scored as a TRG member.

REVIEWERS 10-17:

Did not respond.