

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking

Date:

18-Jan-18

List of Workplan Projects

ID	Title	Category
12096	Acquisition of Priorities identified in the HCP	Capital
09005	Sekiu Mainstem (RM 2-5) LWD Restoration	Capital
13101.1	Lower Hoko Acquisition and Restoration Project	Capital
09001.1	Little Hoko River Large Wood Restoration Project	Capital
09002	Hoko River- Emerson Flats LWD Supplementation	Capital
09003	WRIA 19 Riparian Restoration	Capital
09004	Hoko River/ Hermans Creek - Instream LWD Supplementation	Capital
11084	Upper Hoko LWD Restoration Project	Capital
11085.1	Pysht River Watershed Wood Restoration Phase 4 Project	Capital
09086.1	Pysht Floodplain Acquisition and Restoration	Capital
09009.1	Pysht River Salt Marsh Estuary Restoration Project	Capital
09011	Twin River Acquisition	Capital
10080.1	Lyre River Protection and Restoration	Capital
09013	Lower Salt Creek Restoration and Protection	Capital
09015	Salt Creek Final Fish Passage Corrections Project	Capital
09015.1	Kreaman Creek, Trib. To Salt Creek	Capital
14106	Elwha Acquisition and Restoration Project	Capital
09016.2	Elwha River ELJ Project	Capital
11087	Elwha River Revegetation Project	Capital
09018	Elwha River Estuary Restoration	Capital
09055.1	Elwha River Estuary/Nearshore Conservation and Restoration	Capital
13102	Little River LWD Project	Capital
16103	Indian Creek Habitat Restoration Project	Capital
16104	Elwha Hot Springs Road Restoration	Capital
13103	Ediz Hook Restoration-Phase 5	Capital
09021	Valley Creek Restoration Phase 3	Capital
11088.1	Ennis Creek Fish Passage Barrier Removal	Capital
09026	Morse Creek Property Acquisition	Capital
16102	Morse Creek Acquisition & Restoration	Capital
11090.1	Siebert Creek Large Wood Restoration	Capital
10078.1	McDonald Creek Large Wood Restoration	Capital
09039.2	McDonald Creek Barrier Removal and Channel Restoration	Capital
13104.2	3 Crabs Estuarine and Nearshore Restoration	Capital
09029.1	Dungeness River Large Wood Restoration	Capital
09030.1	Dungeness River Riparian Habitat Protection	Capital
Projects ranked 36 & up are eligible to apply for SRFB/PSAR funding		
09031.1	Dungeness River Riparian Restoration	Capital
09032.1	Dungeness Drift Cell Conservation	Capital
09091	Dungeness River Instream Flow Restoration-Irrigation Efficiencies	Capital
12098	Dungeness River Instream Flow Restoration-Storage	Capital
09092.1	Dungeness River Floodplain Restoration	Capital
09046	Washington Harbor Habitat Protection Project	Capital
14107	Sequim Bay Shoreline Restoration	Capital
09093	North Sequim Bay Drift Cell Conservation Project	Capital
11094	Chicken Coop Road Culvert Replacement Project	Capital
09053	Clallam Watertype Inventory and Assessment	Non-Capital

OPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Ranked Workplan Projects

Rank	Project ID	Title	Category	Weighted Mean Score	Normalized Score	Cap Max Possible Score = 206.95	Non-Cap Max Possible Score = 151.80
1	09092.1	Dungeness River Floodplain Restoration	Capital	188.27	0.910		
2	09055.1	Elwha River Estuary/Nearshore Conservation and Restoration	Capital	181.45	0.877		
3	09030.1	Dungeness River Riparian Habitat Protection	Capital	177.34	0.857		
4	14106	Elwha Acquisition and Restoration Project	Capital	175.51	0.848		
5	16103	Indian Creek Habitat Restoration Project	Capital	174.96	0.845		
6	09029.1	Dungeness River Large Wood Restoration	Capital	174.44	0.843		
7	13102	Little River LWD Project	Capital	173.07	0.836		
8	09032.1	Dungeness Drift Cell Conservation	Capital	173.05	0.836		
9	09031.1	Dungeness River Riparian Restoration	Capital	170.77	0.825		
10	16102	Morse Creek Acquisition & Restoration	Capital	169.29	0.818		
11	09093	North Sequim Bay Drift Cell Conservation Project	Capital	168.80	0.816		
12	13101.1	Lower Hoko Acquisition and Restoration Project	Capital	168.29	0.813		
13	09009.1	Pysht River Salt Marsh Estuary Restoration Project	Capital	167.66	0.810		
14	09016.2	Elwha River ELJ Project	Capital	167.52	0.809		
15	16104	Elwha Hot Springs Road Restoration	Capital	166.08	0.803		
16	12096	Acquisition of Priorities identified in the HCP	Capital	165.70	0.801		
17	13104.2	3 Crabs Estuarine and Nearshore Restoration	Capital	163.97	0.792		
18	09091	Dungeness River Instream Flow Restoration-Irrigation Efficiencies	Capital	163.48	0.790		
19	09011	Twin River Acquisition	Capital	162.15	0.784		
20	09013	Lower Salt Creek Restoration and Protection	Capital	161.50	0.780		
21	09086.1	Pysht Floodplain Acquisition and Restoration	Capital	159.95	0.773		
22	13103	Ediz Hook Restoration-Phase 5	Capital	159.22	0.769		
23	11087	Elwha River Revegetation Project	Capital	158.93	0.768		
24	11085.1	Pysht River Watershed Wood Restoration Phase 4 Project	Capital	156.98	0.759		
25	14107	Sequim Bay Shoreline Restoration	Capital	156.73	0.757		
26	09046	Washington Harbor Habitat Protection Project	Capital	156.46	0.756		
27	09039.2	McDonald Creek Barrier Removal and Channel Restoration	Capital	155.77	0.753		
28	10080.1	Lyre River Protection and Restoration	Capital	153.48	0.742		
29	09053	Clallam Watertype Inventory and Assessment	Non-Capital	112.37	0.740		
30	09001.1	Little Hoko River Large Wood Restoration Project	Capital	151.53	0.732		
31	09003	WRIA 19 Riparian Restoration	Capital	149.78	0.724		
32	11090.1	Siebert Creek Large Wood Restoration	Capital	149.15	0.721		
33	11084	Upper Hoko LWD Restoration Project	Capital	148.44	0.717		
34	12098	Dungeness River Instream Flow Restoration-Storage	Capital	147.71	0.714		
35	10078.1	McDonald Creek Large Wood Restoration	Capital	146.66	0.709		
36	11088.1	Ennis Creek Fish Passage Barrier Removal	Capital	144.18	0.697		
Projects ranked 36 & up are eligible to apply for SRFB/PSAR funding							
37	09026	Morse Creek Property Acquisition	Capital	138.29	0.668		
38	09015	Salt Creek Final Fish Passage Corrections Project	Capital	133.57	0.645		High CoV% for 2 criteria, plus 1 scorer outside 2 SDs
39	11094	Chicken Coop Road Culvert Replacement Project	Capital	128.36	0.620		High CoV% for 2 criteria
40	09015.1	Kreaman Creek, Trib. To Salt Creek	Capital	127.13	0.614		High CoV% for 2 criteria
41	09005	Seki Mainstem (RM 2-5) LWD Restoration	Capital	122.16	0.590		High CoV% for 3 or more criteria, plus 1 scorer outside 2 SDs
42	09021	Valley Creek Restoration Phase 3	Capital	118.39	0.572		High CoV% for 2 criteria
43	09002	Hoko River- Emerson Flats LWD Supplementation	Capital	118.08	0.571		High CoV% for 3 or more criteria, plus 1 scorer outside 2 SDs
44	09004	Hoko River/ Hermans Creek - Instream LWD Supplementation	Capital	104.81	0.506		High CoV% for 3 or more criteria, plus 1 scorer outside 2 SDs
45	09018	Elwha River Estuary Restoration	Capital	102.19	0.494		High CoV% for 3 or more criteria, plus 5 scorers outside 2 SDs

NOPLÉ 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking

Date:
18-Jan-18

List of Workplan Projects

ID	Title	Statistical Analysis		CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)
		Score(s) Outside 2 Std Deviations?	CoV% Flags for Specific Criteria?	
12096	Acquisition of Priorities identified in the HCP		5	
09005	Seki Mainstem (RM 2-5) LWD Restoration	Y	5,7,12	This project flagged because of high CoV% (>50%) on multiple criteria
13101.1	Lower Hoko Acquisition and Restoration Project	Y	5	
09001.1	Little Hoko River Large Wood Restoration Project	Y	5,7	
09002	Hoko River- Emerson Flats LWD Supplementation	Y	5,7,12	This project flagged because of high CoV% (>50%) on multiple criteria
09003	WRIA 19 Riparian Restoration	Y	5,7	
09004	Hoko River/ Hermans Creek - Instream LWD Supplementation	Y	2,5,7,11,12	This project flagged because of high CoV% (>50%) on multiple criteria
11084	Upper Hoko LWD Restoration Project		5,7	
11085.1	Pysht River Watershed Wood Restoration Phase 4 Project		5,7	
09086.1	Pysht Floodplain Acquisition and Restoration		5	
09009.1	Pysht River Salt Marsh Estuary Restoration Project		5,7	
09011	Twin River Acquisition		8	
10080.1	Lyre River Protection and Restoration		5	
09013	Lower Salt Creek Restoration and Protection			
09015	Salt Creek Final Fish Passage Corrections Project	Y	5,7	
09015.1	Kreaman Creek, Trib. To Salt Creek		5,7	
14106	Elwha Acquisition and Restoration Project			
09016.2	Elwha River ELJ Project	Y	7	
11087	Elwha River Revegetation Project	Y	7	
09018	Elwha River Estuary Restoration	Y(x5)	2 thru 12	This project flagged because of high CoV% (>50%) on multiple criteria
09055.1	Elwha River Estuary/Nearshore Conservation and Restoration			
13102	Little River LWD Project	Y	7	
16103	Indian Creek Habitat Restoration Project	Y	7	
16104	Elwha Hot Springs Road Restoration	Y	7	
13103	Ediz Hook Restoration-Phase 5		7	
09021	Valley Creek Restoration Phase 3		7,12	
11088.1	Ennis Creek Fish Passage Barrier Removal		7	
09026	Morse Creek Property Acquisition		12	
16102	Morse Creek Acquisition & Restoration	Y		
11090.1	Siebert Creek Large Wood Restoration	Y	7	
10078.1	McDonald Creek Large Wood Restoration		7	
09039.2	McDonald Creek Barrier Removal and Channel Restoration		7	
13104.2	3 Crabs Estuarine and Nearshore Restoration	Y	7	
09029.1	Dungeness River Large Wood Restoration		7	
09030.1	Dungeness River Riparian Habitat Protection			
Projects ranked 36 & up are eligible to apply for SRFB/PSAR funding				
09031.1	Dungeness River Riparian Restoration	Y		
09032.1	Dungeness Drift Cell Conservation			
09091	Dungeness River Instream Flow Restoration-Irrigation Efficiencies	Y	7	
12098	Dungeness River Instream Flow Restoration-Storage	Y	7,8	
09092.1	Dungeness River Floodplain Restoration	Y		
09046	Washington Harbor Habitat Protection Project		8,12	
14107	Sequim Bay Shoreline Restoration	Y		
09093	North Sequim Bay Drift Cell Conservation Project		8	
11094	Chicken Coop Road Culvert Replacement Project		5,7	
09053	Clallam Watertype Inventory and Assessment	Y	6	

22 of 45 projects had at least 1 scorer outside 2 SDs

36 of 45 projects had a CoV% >50% for at least one criterion


- 7 (27 flags) Criterion 7: Protects high-quality fish habitat
- 5 (15 flags) Criterion 5: Addresses an ESA-listed stock
- 12 (7 flags) Criterion 12: Project Readiness
- 8 (4 flags) Criterion 8: Restores formerly productive habitat

NOPLÉ 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking

Date:
18-Jan-18

Workplan Projects

Rank	Normalized Score
1	0.910
2	0.877
3	0.857
4	0.848
5	0.845
6	0.843
7	0.836
8	0.836
9	0.825
10	0.818
11	0.816
12	0.813
13	0.810
14	0.809
15	0.803
16	0.801
17	0.792
18	0.790
19	0.784
20	0.780
21	0.773
22	0.769
23	0.768
24	0.759
25	0.757
26	0.756
27	0.753
28	0.742
29	0.740
30	0.732
31	0.724
32	0.721
33	0.717
34	0.714
35	0.709
36	0.697
37	0.668
38	0.645
39	0.620
40	0.614
41	0.590
42	0.572
43	0.571
44	0.506
45	0.494



Projects ranked 36 & up are eligible to apply for SRFB/PSAR fund

NOPL 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking

Date:

18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	4.03
SD of all Scores:	0.46
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.92521
Mean - 2 X:	3.11
Mean + 2 X:	4.96

Workplan Projects

Acquisition of Priorities identified in the HCP

165.70

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

12096

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	4.639		4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639		4.639	4.639	4.639	4.64	2.96	13.73	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	5.00		4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00		5.00	5.00	2.00	4.13	4.08	16.86	25.6%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	5.00		5.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	3.50	4.5	4.00	4.00	3.00		5.00	5.00	3.00	4.07	2.88	11.71	20.2%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	5.00		5.00	5.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	4.50	4.50	3.00		5.00	4.00	2.00	3.87	2.81	10.87	28.7%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00		3.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.50	3.00	4.00		0.00	0.00	3.00	2.37	3.65	8.64	60.0%
6	Addresses other stocks	4.00		5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.50		4.00	4.50	3.00	4.27	3.27	13.95	18.2%	
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	5.00		4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00		4.50	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.12	19.23	11.2%	
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.00		4.50	4.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	3.00	5.00	3.50	3.00		4.50	3.00	2.00	2.97	4.04	11.99	46.6%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00		4.50	5.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.50	4.00		5.00	4.50	3.00	4.07	3.88	15.78	22.7%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	5.00		4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.50	3.50	3.50	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00		5.00	4.00	3.00	3.97	3.62	14.36	22.1%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	5.00		5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	5.00	5.00	4.97	3.23	16.04	2.6%	
12	Project Readiness	5.00		5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	2.00		4.50	4.50	5.00	4.40	2.85	12.54	20.2%
Mean		4.72		4.47	4.30	3.30	3.72	3.76	3.64	3.47	4.51	4.55	4.26	3.93		4.34	4.09	3.39	Overall Weighted Score		165.70	
CoV		13.1%		13.9%	28.3%	40.4%	31.9%	34.0%	25.3%	36.9%	21.7%	11.9%	16.3%	25.0%		32.3%	34.6%	35.5%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N		N	N	N				

Comments
 No description found
 not clear from this project how many parcels are in play, so hard to assess spatial scale of influence...a bit of benefit of the doubt there. No ESA stocks here? But otherwise a well supported and conceived project using a tried and true method.
 Proj. 12096 Acquisition Priorities in WRIA 19: The scope of this project is huge (entire WRIA, freshwater and nearshore) and the narrative is short on details. Thus the project remains hazy in my mind and scoring is difficult.
 No mention of project readiness in narrative and would like more information on temporal scale of influence based on design of structures.
 Addresses multiple stocks and multiple limiting factors; therefor benefits to the ecosystem are increased. Project benefits represent an excellent value for the cost. All depends on timing and willing landowners -- this is a long game and project duration should be extended. Sponsor has already scoped landowners, therefor high score for Readiness

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking

Date:

18-Jan-18

Workplan Projects

Sekiu Mainstem (RM 2-5) LWD Restoration

122.16

09005

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	2.96
SD of all Scores:	0.58
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.15098
Mean - 2 X:	1.81
Mean + 2 X:	4.11

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.83	2.96	8.38	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	5.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	5.0	3.50	1.00	4.50	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.47	4.08	14.16	31.2%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.00	3.50	2.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	2.00	3.50	3.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.82	2.88	11.01	28.9%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	2.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	5.0	4.50	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	3.00	3.38	2.81	9.50	30.7%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.00	4.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	3.50	2.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	1.15	3.65	4.19	137.6%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.0	4.50	3.50	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.50	5.00	3.88	3.27	12.70	19.1%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	3.00	3.50	5.0	4.50	0.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	1.88	4.12	7.76	86.3%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	4.00	3.50	1.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	3.50	4.00	3.50	3.50	4.00	4.00	3.76	4.04	15.21	24.9%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	5.0	4.50	3.50	4.00	3.50	3.00	3.50	3.00	3.24	3.88	12.55	35.5%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.00	2.50	4.0	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.79	3.62	10.11	31.7%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	3.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	2.00	1.00	3.50	5.0	4.50	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	3.23	11.31	30.7%
12	Project Readiness	2.00	3.00	2.00	5.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	4.0	2.00	0.50	1.00	3.50	3.50	0.00	0.00	1.85	2.85	5.28	87.8%
Mean		2.74	3.24	2.40	3.74	2.49	3.07	1.99	2.44	3.11	4.32	3.65	2.32	3.03	2.94	2.82	3.11	2.99	Overall Weighted Score		122.16	
CoV		49.5%	17.1%	37.1%	30.8%	62.9%	58.1%	67.4%	45.4%	35.1%	23.3%	40.8%	69.4%	45.9%	48.3%	49.2%	53.6%	51.5%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 Project 9005 requires major narrative improvements. Straight-forward LWD project to restore lost services. Not much in the way of description or clear justification of the need, hence the low score on limiting factors specific to this system, but it seems fairly straightforward and addresses a general WRIA limiting factor

Proj. 09005 Sekiu ELJs: The narrative is too lacking in information to allow the project to score very many points. Sekiu Mainstem - Needs detail; needs updating; ready? Difficult to score.

Only short conceptual description provided; no scope details or budget to indicate scale of the effort. Are Sekiu R. chinook ESA-listed? Not mentioned. Project would be stronger if riparian vegetation enhancement included. Project readiness was not addressed.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	4.05
SD of all Scores:	0.47
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.94046
Mean - 2 X:	3.11
Mean + 2 X:	4.99

Workplan Projects

Lower Hoko Acquisition and Restoration Project

168.29

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

13101.1

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494		3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.49	2.96	10.34	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		4.00	5.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.63	4.08	18.87	14.0%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	3.00		4.00	3.50	4.00	5.0	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.88	2.88	11.16	20.3%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	3.00		3.00	3.50	4.00	5.0	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.22	2.81	11.85	18.3%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	1.00		2.00	0.00	4.00	3.0	3.00	3.50	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	1.84	3.65	6.73	79.0%
6	Addresses other stocks	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	4.00	4.00	4.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	3.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	3.27	14.72	14.6%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.00		5.00	4.00	3.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.12	18.28	14.8%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.00		1.00	4.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.50	4.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.04	17.17	25.4%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		4.00	4.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.59	3.88	17.82	13.9%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00		4.00	3.50	4.00	5.0	4.00	5.00	4.50	3.00	4.50	3.50	5.00	4.13	3.62	14.93	16.3%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.81	3.23	15.54	8.4%
12	Project Readiness	4.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		3.00	3.00	3.00	5.0	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.50	4.00	4.50	5.00	3.81	2.85	10.87	26.2%
Mean		3.79	3.04	4.71	4.46	3.96		3.62	3.58	3.92	4.62	4.33	4.37	3.71	3.71	4.04	4.21	4.71	Overall Weighted Score		168.29	
CoV		38.7%	14.8%	14.7%	21.1%	30.7%		33.9%	35.6%	10.7%	15.4%	18.6%	18.3%	35.2%	20.3%	34.0%	34.5%	14.7%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	Y	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 Well described project. No ESA listed stocks but nearshore and estuary component suggest some minor benefit
 Lower Hoko R is an estuary. Salt water at highest tides penetrates river as far as Highway 112. Lower estuary heavily used by migrating juvenile chum and chinook. Listed Puget sound and Hood Canal chum are probably using this estuary.
 Landowner discussions are part of project, so readiness score is 5. Construction and acquisition are years in the future; long project duration is justified. Excellent write-up, addressed all issues.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.67
SD of all Scores:	0.46
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.91362
Mean - 2 X:	2.76
Mean + 2 X:	4.58

Workplan Projects

Little Hoko River Large Wood Restoration Project

151.53

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09001.1

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494		3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.49	2.96	10.34	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00		5.00	4.00	5.0	4.50	5.00	4.50	4.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.08	17.98	14.5%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.00	3.50	5.00	3.00	3.00	4.00		2.00	3.50	5.0	4.00	3.50	3.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.63	2.88	10.44	25.4%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	5.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	3.00	3.00		3.00	3.50	5.0	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.09	2.81	11.50	18.5%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.00	4.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	0.00		4.00	3.00	3.0	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	1.38	3.65	5.02	118.4%
6	Addresses other stocks	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00		4.00	3.00	5.0	4.50	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.41	3.27	14.41	16.2%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	3.00	2.00	5.00	2.00	1.00	1.00		4.00	3.00	5.0	4.50	5.00	3.00	0.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	2.97	4.12	12.23	52.4%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	3.50	5.00	3.00	4.00	4.00		4.00	3.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.50	5.00	4.00	4.25	4.04	17.17	17.7%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	2.00	4.00		4.00	4.00	5.0	4.50	5.00	4.50	3.50	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.22	3.88	16.37	20.3%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00		3.00	3.00	4.0	3.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.00	3.50	3.00	3.34	3.62	12.10	11.9%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		4.00	3.00	5.0	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.00	2.00	5.00	4.00	4.25	3.23	13.73	19.7%
12	Project Readiness	4.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00		3.00	3.00	5.0	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	4.50	3.00	4.00	3.59	2.85	10.24	25.5%
Mean		3.62	3.37	4.29	3.87	3.12	3.37		3.62	3.29	4.62	3.79	4.00	3.58	3.00	3.08	4.00	4.04	Overall Weighted Score		151.53	
CoV		41.2%	16.9%	18.9%	35.7%	50.2%	44.3%		21.3%	12.0%	15.4%	35.8%	30.2%	35.6%	50.3%	40.2%	36.6%	20.1%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N		N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 Restoration maintenance - relatively inexpensive and straight-forward. Its not clear how many fish this trib supports, so its not clear how it addresses stock status and trends for the Hoko overall. The restoration benefit of a project like this isn't enormously clear in terms of the marginal benefit that you might get facilitating bed aggradation and pool development.
 LWD Projects protect redds/stabilized river bed, so given protection score
 Excellent write-up, addresses all criteria.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	2.87
SD of all Scores:	0.69
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.38691
Mean - 2 X:	1.48
Mean + 2 X:	4.26

Workplan Projects

Hoko River- Emerson Flats LWD
Supplementation

118.08

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09002

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.49	2.96	10.34	0.0%	
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	5.00	3.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	5.0	3.50	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	3.79	4.08	15.48	23.3%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.00	3.50	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	5.0	4.00	3.50	3.00	2.50	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.26	2.88	9.40	30.2%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.00	3.50	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	5.0	4.50	3.50	4.00	2.50	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.41	2.81	9.59	22.1%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.50	3.00	3.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	1.03	3.65	3.76	150.2%
6	Addresses other stocks	4.00	3.00	2.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.50	3.00	5.0	4.50	3.00	3.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.74	3.27	12.21	22.8%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	5.0	4.50	0.00	3.00	0.00	2.50	1.00	0.00	1.65	4.12	6.79	90.3%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.00	3.50	1.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	5.0	5.00	3.50	4.00	2.50	3.50	3.00	4.00	3.29	4.04	13.31	33.5%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	4.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	0.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	5.0	4.50	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.50	3.00	3.32	3.88	12.90	37.6%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.00	3.50	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	2.50	4.0	2.50	3.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.38	3.62	8.62	39.6%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	5.0	4.50	3.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.32	3.23	10.74	44.2%
12	Project Readiness	4.00	3.00	1.00	4.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	5.0	2.00	0.50	2.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	1.74	2.85	4.95	93.4%
Mean		3.12	3.37	2.04	3.54	2.46	2.87	1.96	2.21	2.21	4.62	3.58	2.62	3.17	2.17	2.87	2.75	3.21	Overall Weighted Score		118.08	
CoV		42.1%	16.9%	53.7%	34.8%	62.2%	59.4%	69.2%	61.4%	55.0%	15.4%	40.3%	58.1%	37.1%	55.1%	40.0%	57.8%	52.9%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 Project 9002 requires major narrative improvements.
 Not a lot of detail here, but limiting factor addressed. Its not clear how important this particular area is to the hoko in general, therefore didn't give full score to addressing stock status and trends or progress towards recovery
 Proj. 09002 Emerson Flats ELJs: The narrative is too lacking in information to allow the project to score very many points.
 No mention of project readiness
 Hioko Emerson Flats - Needs more detail; needs updating?; ready? Should this project be combined with 13101.1?
 Not enough information on project scope/spatial scale of influence. Project readiness not addressed. Well-designed LWD projects have strong benefits.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.64
SD of all Scores:	0.59
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.1717
Mean - 2 X:	2.47
Mean + 2 X:	4.81

Workplan Projects

WRIA 19 Riparian Restoration

149.78

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09003

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494		3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.49	2.96	10.34	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	5.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.50		3.50	3.00	4.00	5.0	3.50	5.00	4.00	4.50	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.06	4.08	16.58	21.0%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	5.00	3.50	4.00	3.00	3.00		2.00	3.00	4.00	5.0	4.00	3.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.81	2.88	10.98	23.4%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	3.50		2.00	3.00	4.00	5.0	4.50	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.50	5.00	4.00	4.00	2.81	11.24	21.4%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.00	2.50	0.00	1.00	0.00		2.00	2.50	4.00	3.0	3.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	1.38	3.65	5.02	105.0%
6	Addresses other stocks	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		2.00	2.50	4.00	5.0	3.50	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.19	3.27	13.69	23.8%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	0.00		0.00	2.00	3.50	4.0	4.00	3.50	3.00	0.00	1.00	4.50	3.00	2.53	4.12	10.43	63.9%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	3.50	5.00	4.00	3.50		2.00	3.50	4.50	5.0	4.50	4.00	5.00	3.50	2.50	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.04	16.54	23.3%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	2.00		3.00	3.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.22	3.88	16.37	21.6%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	5.00	3.50	3.00	5.00	4.00		3.00	3.00	4.00	5.0	3.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	2.50	4.50	5.00	4.06	3.62	14.71	22.0%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	5.00		3.00	4.00	4.00	5.0	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.28	3.23	13.83	15.9%
12	Project Readiness	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00		3.00	3.00	2.50	5.0	3.00	3.00	2.00	1.50	4.00	4.50	5.00	3.53	2.85	10.06	30.4%
Mean		3.87	3.25	3.87	3.96	3.08		2.42	3.00	3.83	4.62	3.83	3.71	3.46	3.37	3.12	4.33	4.46	Overall Weighted Score		149.78	
CoV		39.0%	18.0%	37.4%	32.5%	53.5%		40.3%	17.4%	12.9%	15.4%	16.1%	36.1%	41.6%	48.6%	45.3%	33.1%	18.8%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N		Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 hmmm - nice spatial scale, etc. Only issue is the temporal scale over which you see benefit....long-term its great, but would be strengthened coupled with LWD placement maybe?
 Long-term project -- substantial benefits will take decades to realize.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	2.55
SD of all Scores:	0.82
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.64168
Mean - 2 X:	0.91
Mean + 2 X:	4.20

Workplan Projects

Hoko River/ Hermans Creek - Instream LWD
Supplementation

104.81

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09004

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.49	2.96	10.34	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.00	3.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	0.00	4.0	3.50	1.00	3.00	3.50	3.00	4.00	5.00	2.76	4.08	11.28	51.6%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.00	3.50	0.00	1.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	2.50	2.00	4.0	4.00	3.50	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	2.91	2.88	8.39	44.3%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	2.00	3.50	0.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	5.0	4.50	1.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.85	2.81	8.02	45.0%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	4.00	1.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	3.65	3.65	162.0%
6	Addresses other stocks	4.00	4.00	1.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.50	3.0	4.00	1.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.47	3.27	11.35	30.3%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.0	4.50	0.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	1.38	4.12	5.70	109.7%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	4.00	3.50	1.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.50	3.00	5.0	4.50	1.00	2.00	4.00	3.50	3.00	4.00	3.41	4.04	13.78	34.5%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	4.00	3.00	0.00	5.00	1.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	2.0	4.00	0.50	3.00	3.50	3.00	3.50	3.00	2.85	3.88	11.07	47.5%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.00	3.50	0.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	3.0	2.50	0.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.06	3.62	7.45	47.7%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.00	4.00	0.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	2.00	4.00	0.00	3.0	4.50	0.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	2.97	3.23	9.60	57.2%
12	Project Readiness	3.00	3.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	3.0	2.00	0.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	1.47	2.85	4.19	87.1%
Mean		2.71	3.37	0.54	2.62	2.46	2.79	1.96	2.96	1.87	3.46	3.46	0.96	2.46	2.75	2.92	2.83	3.29	Overall Weighted Score		104.81	
CoV		43.4%	16.9%	190.5%	58.1%	59.7%	59.9%	69.2%	40.4%	84.4%	35.7%	39.2%	132.4%	42.0%	50.5%	39.2%	51.2%	52.0%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 Project 09004 needs major narrative improvements. The project sponsor should move this placeholder proposal to the not ready for at least 7 years group, the proposals that are not part of this review. very brief description makes it difficult to assess. Is the project ready to go? How does this area fit into others in terms of priorities?
 No mention of project readiness
 Hermans Creek - Needs detail; needs updating; ready? Should this project be removed from the active list?
 Not enough information

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.59
SD of all Scores:	0.35
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.70001
Mean - 2 X:	2.89
Mean + 2 X:	4.29

Workplan Projects

Upper Hoko LWD Restoration Project

148.44

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

11084

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494		3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.49	2.96	10.34	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00		5.00	4.50	5.0	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.50	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.38	4.08	17.85	17.0%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.00	3.50	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.00		3.00	3.00	4.0	4.00	3.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.44	2.88	9.90	23.1%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00	3.50	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00		3.50	4.00	5.0	4.50	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.50	5.00	4.00	3.88	2.81	10.89	17.3%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00		4.50	4.00	1.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	1.09	3.65	3.99	156.8%
6	Addresses other stocks	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		4.50	4.00	5.0	4.50	5.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.53	3.27	14.82	11.7%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	4.00	4.0	4.50	3.00	3.00	0.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	2.59	4.12	10.69	50.4%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	3.50	1.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		4.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.50	5.00	4.00	4.31	4.04	17.42	24.6%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	4.00	3.50	5.00	2.00	4.00		4.00	4.50	5.0	4.50	5.00	4.50	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.19	3.88	16.25	19.9%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.00	3.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00		4.00	3.50	4.0	3.50	3.50	3.50	4.00	3.50	4.50	3.00	3.66	3.62	13.24	11.9%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		4.00	3.50	4.0	4.50	4.50	4.00	3.50	2.00	5.00	4.00	4.19	3.23	13.53	18.9%
12	Project Readiness	4.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00		3.00	3.00	2.0	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.50	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.34	2.85	9.53	24.9%
Mean		3.37	3.46	3.08	4.04	3.21	3.71		3.67	3.79	3.96	3.79	3.75	3.37	3.04	3.17	4.08	3.96	Overall Weighted Score		148.44	
CoV		42.4%	16.8%	50.3%	31.0%	49.5%	44.7%		28.1%	13.1%	32.5%	34.9%	37.9%	36.9%	48.8%	37.7%	35.7%	19.0%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 clearly described project. Stock status and trends, and project influence on those, not clearly described
 Good project that could improve productivity on a large stretch of Hoko

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.81
SD of all Scores:	0.45
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.9098
Mean - 2 X:	2.90
Mean + 2 X:	4.72

Workplan Projects

Pysht River Watershed Wood Restoration
Phase 4 Project

156.98

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

11085.1

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494		3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.49	2.96	10.34	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00		5.00	4.00	4.0	4.50	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.08	17.72	16.1%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.00	3.50	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00		3.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.31	2.88	12.42	20.2%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	5.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	3.00	3.00		4.00	3.50	5.0	5.00	4.50	4.00	3.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.28	2.81	12.03	18.1%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.00	4.00	2.50	2.00	0.00	0.00		1.00	3.00	3.0	0.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	1.53	3.65	5.59	93.5%
6	Addresses other stocks	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00		4.00	4.00	5.0	4.50	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.53	3.27	14.82	11.0%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.00	2.00	4.50	4.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	4.50	4.0	4.50	3.50	3.00	0.00	2.50	4.00	4.00	2.84	4.12	11.72	52.8%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	3.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.00		4.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.04	18.18	12.8%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	4.00		4.50	4.50	5.0	4.50	5.00	4.50	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.25	3.88	16.49	19.2%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	4.00	3.50	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.00		3.00	4.00	4.0	3.50	3.50	3.00	4.50	2.50	4.00	5.00	3.66	3.62	13.24	17.8%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00		5.00	4.00	5.0	4.50	4.00	4.00	3.50	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.31	3.23	13.93	18.9%
12	Project Readiness	4.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		2.00	4.00	5.0	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.50	4.00	2.50	4.00	3.69	2.85	10.51	26.1%
	Mean	3.71	3.46	4.33	4.21	3.46	3.37		3.33	3.96	4.46	3.96	3.96	3.62	3.25	3.12	4.33	4.46	Overall Weighted Score		156.98	
	CoV	43.2%	16.8%	20.5%	23.5%	48.3%	44.3%		41.6%	11.4%	16.2%	35.5%	29.7%	20.5%	48.0%	42.1%	21.1%	16.2%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
clearly described project. Fairly straight-forward...on a trajectory. Hard to get a handle from this and other proposal regarding the estimated influence of the project itself, or the suite of projects it is associated in, regarding how it influence stats and trends.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.88
SD of all Scores:	0.45
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.89384
Mean - 2 X:	2.99
Mean + 2 X:	4.77

Workplan Projects

Pysht Floodplain Acquisition and Restoration

159.95

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09086.1

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494		3.494	3.494	3.494	3.49	2.96	10.34	0.0%	
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00		5.00	5.00	3.00	4.25	4.08	17.34	20.1%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	4.50	4.00		5.00	5.00	5.00	4.56	2.88	13.14	13.2%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	4.50	4.00		5.00	5.00	4.00	4.03	2.81	11.33	18.4%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.00	3.50	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	1.50	4.0	0.00	1.00	2.00		0.00	3.00	2.00	1.25	3.65	4.56	110.3%
6	Addresses other stocks	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.0	5.00	5.00	4.00		4.00	5.00	5.00	4.56	3.27	14.92	13.8%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00		4.00	5.00	5.00	4.38	4.12	18.03	20.2%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	3.00	4.50	3.00	0.00	4.00	1.00	4.50	3.50	5.0	5.00	4.00	4.00		4.50	3.00	2.00	3.50	4.04	14.14	41.7%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	3.00	4.50	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.50	5.0	5.00	4.00	5.00		5.00	5.00	3.00	4.19	3.88	16.25	20.4%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.50	3.50	5.0	4.00	3.50	4.50		4.00	4.00	3.00	3.81	3.62	13.80	15.8%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	3.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	5.00	5.00	4.72	3.23	15.24	13.4%
12	Project Readiness	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.0	4.00	4.00	3.50		4.50	5.00	4.00	3.81	2.85	10.87	20.2%
Mean		3.96	3.17	4.04	3.96	3.21	3.46	3.21	4.21	3.62	4.62	4.29	4.08	3.96		4.12	4.46	3.71	Overall Weighted Score		159.95	
CoV		39.0%	10.3%	34.0%	30.7%	54.6%	37.7%	45.8%	22.9%	20.5%	12.3%	33.9%	27.6%	19.8%		34.0%	18.8%	30.7%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N		N	N	N				

Comments
 nicely described and justified project, though the connection between the project elements and stock status and trends could be made more explicit. Also confusing as to whether this is just an acquisition/easement project, or INCLUDES ELJ as well? Or is that a separate phase?

Proj. 09086.1, Pysht Floodplain Acquisition and Restoration. With references to multiple land conservation phases, ELJ phases, and approved SRFB projects, this project narrative is confusing. The map doesn't make clear the remaining work being proposed by the project. References are made to ELJ work, but it's unclear whether or not ELJ's will be built as a part of this project. The 2018 ELJ work that is referenced (RCO Grant #15-1061) is actually a part of the Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe's Pysht Floodplain Restoration project, and is not a part of this current proposal. I have to conclude that the proposal doesn't include any restoration work.

The restoration piece of this project seems similar to that being implemented by 11085.

Spatial scale enhanced because of previous phases.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	4.06
SD of all Scores:	0.54
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.08802
Mean - 2 X:	2.98
Mean + 2 X:	5.15

Workplan Projects

Pysht River Salt Marsh Estuary Restoration
Project

167.66

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09009.1

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639		4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.64	2.96	13.73	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	5.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00		5.00	5.00	4.0	5.00	5.00	3.50	3.50	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.08	18.23	16.6%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		4.50	4.50	5.0	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	2.88	12.96	18.1%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	5.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00		3.50	3.50	5.0	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.31	2.81	12.12	16.3%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.00	3.00	2.50	4.00	0.00	4.00		2.00	2.00	4.0	5.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	2.72	3.65	9.92	51.1%
6	Addresses other stocks	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00		5.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	3.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.59	3.27	15.02	13.9%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	5.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	0.00	0.00		3.00	3.00	4.0	5.00	5.00	3.50	0.00	2.00	4.50	5.00	3.00	4.12	12.36	61.2%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	3.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.59	4.04	18.56	17.9%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	4.00	4.50	5.00	4.00	5.00		5.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	3.50	2.00	5.00	4.00	4.44	3.88	17.22	18.3%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	4.00	3.50	4.50	4.00	4.00	3.00		3.00	4.00	5.0	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.50	5.00	3.91	3.62	14.14	18.2%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		4.00	5.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.50	3.50	5.00	4.00	4.63	3.23	14.94	11.5%
12	Project Readiness	3.00	2.50	3.00	5.00	1.00	2.00		1.50	3.50	4.0	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.97	2.85	8.46	32.2%
Mean		4.22	3.39	4.39	4.55	3.55	3.72		3.84	4.05	4.64	4.72	4.64	3.97	3.30	3.01	4.47	4.55	Overall Weighted Score		167.66	
CoV		28.4%	20.7%	19.0%	19.6%	56.3%	40.9%		32.2%	22.2%	10.4%	13.1%	13.1%	15.9%	38.3%	45.8%	18.2%	14.4%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 this proposal is screaming for a map. To me this is a really clearly beneficial project, and may support ESA listed species
 Addresses loss of estuary habitat directly and substantially. System benefits coordinated with upriver projects. Existing conservation easement on site.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.93
SD of all Scores:	0.44
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.88729
Mean - 2 X:	3.05
Mean + 2 X:	4.82

Workplan Projects

Twin River Acquisition

162.15

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09011

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.64	2.96	13.73	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	4.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	2.50	4.50	4.0	5.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.03	4.08	16.44	20.3%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.00	3.00	4.50	3.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.50	4.0	5.00	4.50	3.50	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.97	2.88	11.44	23.8%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	5.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	4.50	3.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.09	2.81	11.49	20.8%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.00	3.50	2.50	3.00	1.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	2.50	1.0	4.50	3.50	3.00	4.00	0.00	3.50	3.00	2.71	3.65	9.88	44.3%
6	Addresses other stocks	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.50	4.00	4.0	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.24	3.27	13.85	16.2%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	5.00	3.00	4.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.50	3.0	5.00	5.00	3.50	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.15	4.12	17.09	19.4%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	3.00	4.50	2.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.50	3.50	3.50	3.00	3.21	4.04	12.95	50.9%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	4.00	4.50	4.00	5.00	0.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.24	3.88	16.43	28.0%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	4.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	3.75	3.00	5.00	4.0	4.00	4.00	4.50	2.50	4.00	4.50	4.00	3.93	3.62	14.21	16.8%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.0	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	3.50	5.00	5.00	4.65	3.23	15.01	13.6%
12	Project Readiness	3.00	4.00	2.50	3.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	5.0	3.00	3.50	3.00	2.00	4.50	4.00	5.00	3.38	2.85	9.64	26.9%
Mean		4.14	3.47	4.22	3.55	3.55	3.22	3.62	3.39	4.22	4.05	4.68	4.34	3.76	3.84	3.76	4.59	4.47	Overall Weighted Score		162.15	
CoV		28.4%	16.3%	20.6%	26.9%	44.9%	53.9%	30.9%	25.8%	18.0%	28.2%	13.1%	12.5%	17.9%	21.3%	37.1%	13.0%	17.5%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 Project 09011 had me reading the narrative several times as most of the discussion, photos, and map relates to the mole and not to the acquisition which is what the proposal is trying to do.
 hmmm, interesting project proposal, left with numerous questions largely focused around readiness (i.e. is this the right approach for this property vs. cheaper easements?), limiting factors assessment (i.e. is this the key limiting factor in the watershed) and whether this is the right project relative to fish restoration. Its a gem of a location though...
 Twin River - Since liability is no longer a factor, shouldn't NOLT be not listed as a partner?
 2017 nearshore restoration opens way for acquisition -- assumed ready in 1 year. Includes west bank only of W. Twin R. -- what is ownership and use of east bank?

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.70
SD of all Scores:	0.56
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.1105
Mean - 2 X:	2.59
Mean + 2 X:	4.81

Workplan Projects

Lyre River Protection and Restoration

153.48

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

10080.1

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193		3.193	3.193	3.193	3.19	2.96	9.45	0.0%	
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	4.0	5.00	5.00	3.00		4.00	5.00	3.00	3.63	4.08	14.79	24.4%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	2.00	2.50	4.00	4.0	5.00	4.00	4.00		4.00	4.50	4.00	3.63	2.88	10.44	23.9%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	5.0	4.50	4.50	3.00		4.00	3.50	4.00	3.53	2.81	9.92	28.5%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00	3.50	2.50	2.00	0.00	4.00	2.00	1.00	4.50	2.0	0.00	4.00	2.50		0.00	3.50	3.00	2.47	3.65	9.01	65.1%
6	Addresses other stocks	5.00	3.00	4.50	5.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.50		4.00	4.00	5.00	4.19	3.27	13.69	20.4%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	5.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00		3.50	5.00	5.00	4.38	4.12	18.03	17.0%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	4.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	2.50	4.00	4.0	5.00	5.00	3.00		3.50	3.00	3.00	3.25	4.04	13.13	33.2%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00		5.00	5.00	3.00	4.22	3.88	16.37	19.8%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.0	4.00	5.00	3.00		4.00	5.00	3.00	3.84	3.62	13.91	16.3%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00		5.00	5.00	5.00	4.63	3.23	14.94	13.4%
12	Project Readiness	5.00	2.50	3.50	2.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	5.00	4.00	4.0	3.00	3.50	2.00		4.50	4.00	5.00	3.44	2.85	9.80	40.4%
Mean		4.18	3.14	3.64	3.77	3.02	3.85	2.43	3.18	4.06	4.18	4.14	4.52	3.27		3.72	4.22	3.85	Overall Weighted Score		153.48	
CoV		19.4%	11.9%	20.0%	34.0%	51.0%	21.3%	41.4%	36.9%	8.7%	21.9%	36.2%	14.9%	20.0%		34.8%	18.6%	24.0%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N		N	N	N				

Comments
 I thought this project was complete??
 Project 10080.1 would be helped by a map that indicates the proposal area in relation to the overall provided map. Is this 280 acre parcel to the east of the 2017 conservation parcel that removed a house and required a bridge? The actual location is confusing.
 I like this - each of our major waterways should have conservation-based plans associated with them, focused on floodplain acquisition. In this particular case, though, I'm sort of left feeling not particularly clear regarding what the conservation targets are given the included map. Makes it hard to assess the possible outcomes and manifests mostly in the project readiness category. Its not clear if this addresses stock status and trends
 Proj. 10080.1 Lyre River Estuary Protection and Restoration: Much of the work described in the narrative has been completed, which makes the narrative misleading.
 Property contains high value nearshore and estuary habitat, rearing for critical salmonid populations.
 Project 10080.1 Lyre River Protection only describes the phase 1 project which has been completed. Description needs to be updated
 Acquire key remaining private parcels to make protected corridor increased spatial score. Map would be helpful! Project readiness depends on landowners; timing not clear.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.86
SD of all Scores:	0.50
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.0037
Mean - 2 X:	2.86
Mean + 2 X:	4.86

Workplan Projects

Lower Salt Creek Restoration and Protection

161.50

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09013

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530		2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.53	2.96	7.49	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	5.00		4.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.28	4.08	17.47	17.0%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	5.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00		4.00	3.50	4.00	5.0	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.91	2.88	11.25	19.9%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.00		3.00	3.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	4.50	3.50	4.50	4.00	4.50	5.00	4.00	2.81	11.24	20.4%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	4.00	3.00	2.50	4.00	2.00		3.00	3.00	4.00	3.0	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.50	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.25	3.65	11.86	21.8%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.00	2.50	4.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.38	3.27	14.31	18.9%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	4.00	3.00	2.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	5.00	4.50	4.5	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.12	18.28	19.2%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.00		3.00	4.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.50	5.00	3.97	4.04	16.03	22.3%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.00		4.00	4.50	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.25	3.88	16.49	18.7%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00		4.00	3.50	3.50	5.0	4.00	5.00	4.50	2.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.94	3.62	14.25	20.7%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.75	3.23	15.34	9.4%
12	Project Readiness	2.00	2.00	2.50	3.00	2.00		2.00	2.00	3.00	4.0	2.00	3.50	2.00	1.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	2.63	2.85	7.48	34.4%
Mean		3.79	2.92	2.96	4.13	3.46		3.71	3.84	3.84	4.50	4.29	4.46	3.67	3.42	3.92	4.46	4.38	Overall Weighted Score		161.50	
CoV		23.4%	16.0%	28.3%	21.9%	36.6%		27.1%	27.9%	14.9%	19.4%	24.4%	18.0%	23.4%	28.4%	22.2%	19.3%	20.0%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 good location, good proposal (i.e. mix of conservation and restoration). There seems to be a conflict tho with the next project in terms of the key limiting factors in the system. Makes it hard to assess both projects

Readiness depends on landowners - no information on initial contacts. Massive project; maybe better to split it into instream (\$5.3M) and shoreline components (\$11M). How will public access to shoreline be managed?

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.25
SD of all Scores:	0.56
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.12019
Mean - 2 X:	2.13
Mean + 2 X:	4.37

Workplan Projects

Salt Creek Final Fish Passage Corrections
Project

133.57

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09015

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530		2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530		2.53	2.96	7.49	0.0%	
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.00	3.00	2.00	5.00	4.00	4.00		5.00	4.00	5.0	3.00	5.00	4.00	3.50	5.00	5.00		4.03	4.08	16.46	24.1%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.00	2.50	1.00	5.00	3.00	4.00		3.50	2.00	5.0	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.00		3.43	2.88	9.89	33.0%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00	2.50	2.00	5.00	3.00	3.00		3.00	3.50	5.0	5.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.00		3.70	2.81	10.40	24.4%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.00	2.50	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00		3.00	0.00	2.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.70	3.65	2.56	157.0%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.00	2.50	2.50	5.00	3.00	5.00		5.00	4.00	5.0	4.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	4.00	5.00		3.83	3.27	12.54	26.9%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	4.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	3.00	4.0	3.50	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	2.00		1.63	4.12	6.73	91.4%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	2.50	2.00	5.00	3.00	5.00		5.00	3.50	5.0	4.00	3.50	5.00	4.50	0.00	4.50		3.83	4.04	15.49	38.1%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	4.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	4.00		5.00	3.50	5.0	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	5.00		4.00	3.88	15.52	18.3%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00		4.00	3.00	4.5	3.00	4.00	5.00	2.50	4.00	4.00		3.53	3.62	12.79	23.0%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	3.00	5.0	4.50	4.50	4.50	5.00	4.00	5.00		4.43	3.23	14.32	19.9%
12	Project Readiness	5.00	2.00	2.50	4.00	3.00	3.00		3.00	4.00	4.5	2.00	3.50	3.50	3.00	4.50	2.00		3.30	2.85	9.41	29.1%
Mean		3.38	2.34	2.29	3.96	2.71	3.29		3.67	3.00	4.38	3.29	3.38	3.46	2.96	3.00	3.59		Overall Weighted Score		133.57	
CoV		32.8%	23.0%	52.1%	39.7%	52.4%	52.7%		41.2%	37.5%	23.8%	40.6%	39.4%	40.6%	52.6%	63.1%	44.8%					
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N		N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N					

Comments
 Project 09015 narative needs some updating of time scale and additional site specific information such as which culverts are partial barriers, which are barriers to adults and/or juveniles, which are low flow barriers, etc. Cost estimates are needed. Chum salmon in the watershed are mentioned but are the culverts within the chum salmon habitat?
 fish passage is a no-brainer. No cost estimate.
 Salt Creek Fish Passage - Needs detail; needs updating
 Needs map of remaining fish barrier locations within watershed; and description of implementation strategy. No cost estimate provided.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.10
SD of all Scores:	0.64
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.28775
Mean - 2 X:	1.82
Mean + 2 X:	4.39

Workplan Projects

Kreaman Creek, Trib. To Salt Creek

127.13

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09015.1

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530		2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.53	2.96	7.49	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00		4.00	4.50	5.0	3.00	5.00	3.50	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.88	4.08	15.81	25.2%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	1.00	2.00	1.00	5.00	3.00	4.00		2.50	3.50	5.0	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.44	2.88	9.90	37.1%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00	2.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	3.00		3.00	4.00	4.5	5.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.66	2.81	10.27	26.8%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.00	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	1.00	2.5	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.44	3.65	1.60	160.9%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.00	2.00	2.50	4.00	3.00	4.00		3.00	4.00	5.0	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.63	3.27	11.85	26.9%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	3.50	4.0	3.50	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	3.00	1.63	4.12	6.70	85.9%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	4.00	2.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	4.00		4.00	3.50	5.0	4.00	3.50	4.00	3.00	0.00	4.50	5.00	3.53	4.04	14.27	37.5%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	4.00	2.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	4.00		4.00	3.50	5.0	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.88	3.88	15.04	22.3%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00		2.50	3.00	3.5	3.00	2.50	3.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.81	3.62	10.18	21.4%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	3.00	5.0	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.41	3.23	14.23	19.5%
12	Project Readiness	3.00	2.50	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00		3.00	3.00	5.0	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	4.50	3.00	4.00	3.44	2.85	9.80	27.5%
Mean		2.54	1.96	2.34	3.71	2.63	3.21		2.79	3.25	4.34	3.38	3.34	3.00	2.54	2.92	3.59	4.13	Overall Weighted Score		127.13	
CoV		51.3%	33.6%	51.9%	43.9%	52.0%	52.0%		54.2%	27.4%	22.6%	37.9%	34.6%	38.9%	50.6%	64.0%	43.2%	31.8%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 Project 09015.1 needs additional narrative concerning conditions above and below this culvert; is this culvert a complete blockage or partial, are there additional culverts below this one that block access, and how much stream would be available to salmon and trout if this culvert is fixed? I am not sure what the term 2.5 miles of global habitat means.
 same as above - a no brainer, but I am struggling to figure out why this individual fish passage project is not a part of 09015??
 Kreaman Creek - Needs more detail; needs updating
 Well-defined project. Scores similar to 9015 above, but better readiness.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	4.25
SD of all Scores:	0.48
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.96823
Mean - 2 X:	3.28
Mean + 2 X:	5.22

Workplan Projects

Elwha Acquisition and Restoration Project

175.51

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

14106

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000		5.000	5.000	5.000	5.00	2.96	14.80	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	4.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	1.00	3.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.50		5.00	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.08	16.70	28.3%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.00	3.50	1.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	3.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	5.00	5.00	4.31	2.88	12.42	26.1%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00	3.50	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00		5.00	3.00	5.00	3.91	2.81	10.98	23.9%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.50		5.00	5.00	5.00	4.59	3.65	16.77	14.4%
6	Addresses other stocks	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.50		4.00	5.00	5.00	4.59	3.27	15.02	12.1%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	5.00	2.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.50		4.50	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.12	18.41	19.4%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	4.00	3.50	3.50	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	4.00	3.00	4.0	5.00	5.00	3.50		4.50	2.50	4.00	3.34	4.04	13.51	36.5%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	4.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.50		5.00	4.00	4.00	4.31	3.88	16.73	15.8%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	5.00	3.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.5	4.00	5.00	3.50		5.00	1.00	4.00	3.84	3.62	13.91	25.5%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	5.00	5.00	4.88	3.23	15.75	7.0%
12	Project Readiness	5.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	5.0	3.00	4.00	3.50		4.50	2.00	5.00	3.69	2.85	10.51	24.2%
Mean		4.58	3.67	3.46	4.42	4.42	3.92	3.83	4.00	3.79	4.88	4.75	4.92	3.92		4.79	3.96	4.75	Overall Weighted Score		175.51	
CoV		14.6%	19.6%	35.1%	20.4%	26.4%	23.0%	31.1%	30.2%	15.4%	6.4%	13.1%	5.9%	17.1%		7.0%	36.7%	9.5%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N		N	N	N				

Comments
 Project 14106 narrative needs updating (e.g. the dams have been removed and we are past 2014 so are better cost estimates available?).
 ranking conservation projects across NOPL is hard, most notably because there is an absence of some sort of evaluation of pressure that would assist with ranking, spatially, different parts of the LE
 Proj. 14106 Elwha Acquisition and Restoration Project: As a general rule, conservation easements seem appropriate for Indian Creek and Little River. On the Elwha River, ever effort should be made to purchase properties outright.
 Is the Plan completed? Narrative needs to be updated. Scored as pure acquisition, \$500k for phase 1

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	4.08
SD of all Scores:	0.59
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.1749
Mean - 2 X:	2.90
Mean + 2 X:	5.25

Workplan Projects

Elwha River ELJ Project

167.52

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09016.2

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000		5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.00	2.96	14.80	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	4.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	2.00	5.0	4.50	5.00	4.00	4.50	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.13	4.08	16.83	26.0%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.00	3.50	1.00	3.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	3.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.22	2.88	12.15	28.4%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	5.00	3.50	2.00	2.00	4.00	3.00		4.00	3.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	2.50	4.00	4.50	4.00	5.00	3.84	2.81	10.80	28.0%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.75	3.65	17.34	9.4%
6	Addresses other stocks	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00		5.00	4.00	4.0	4.50	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.41	3.27	14.41	11.1%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	4.00	2.00	3.50	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.50	2.00	4.5	4.50	4.50	2.00	0.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	2.66	4.12	10.94	57.0%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	3.50	3.50	3.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	2.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	3.50	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.25	4.04	17.17	21.9%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	4.00		5.00	1.00	5.0	4.50	5.00	4.50	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.13	3.88	16.01	26.0%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	4.00	3.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00		3.00	1.00	4.5	3.50	4.00	3.00	4.00	2.50	4.00	4.00	3.31	3.62	11.99	25.2%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	1.00	5.0	4.50	4.50	4.00	3.00	2.00	5.00	4.00	4.13	3.23	13.32	28.9%
12	Project Readiness	5.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		4.00	4.00	5.0	4.00	4.00	4.50	3.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.13	2.85	11.76	18.0%
Mean		4.50	3.67	3.50	3.58	4.25	4.17		4.38	2.67	4.83	4.58	4.75	3.92	3.58	3.75	4.63	4.50	Overall Weighted Score		167.52	
CoV		15.0%	19.6%	35.0%	40.3%	30.3%	30.4%		25.4%	51.4%	6.7%	10.2%	8.4%	24.2%	35.1%	27.6%	12.3%	11.6%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N		N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 Project 09016.2 narrative needs updating (e.g. both dams have been removed, etc.).
 hmmm, not clear to me from the description that this is a current limiting factor - wood accumulation after dam removal not addressed, for example.
 Strong project on an important river system that is ready to be implemented.
 What has been learned from the first 52 ELJs?

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.88
SD of all Scores:	0.66
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.3217
Mean - 2 X:	2.56
Mean + 2 X:	5.20

Workplan Projects

Elwha River Revegetation Project

158.93

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

11087

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)	
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17					
1	Watershed Priority	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000		5.000		5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.00	2.96	14.80	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	4.00		4.00		4.0	3.50	5.00	3.50	3.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.60	4.08	14.69	28.8%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	0.00	3.50	2.00	4.00	5.00	5.00		4.00		4.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	2.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.97	2.88	11.42	36.7%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	0.00	3.50	3.00	5.00	4.00	3.00		4.00		5.0	5.00	5.00	3.00	2.50	4.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.77	2.81	10.58	36.1%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	3.00	3.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00		5.00		5.0	4.50	5.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.23	3.65	15.45	24.0%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.00	3.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00		5.00		4.0	3.50	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.10	3.27	13.41	22.7%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	0.00		1.50		4.0	4.00	4.50	3.00	0.00	1.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.50	4.12	10.30	59.5%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.00	3.50	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00		4.00		4.0	4.50	5.00	4.00	2.50	3.50	5.00	3.00	3.00	3.80	4.04	15.35	25.7%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	4.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	2.00	4.00		5.00		5.0	5.00	5.00	3.50	3.50	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.13	3.88	16.04	21.7%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.00	3.50	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00		3.00		5.0	3.50	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.43	3.62	12.43	17.3%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	5.00		5.00		5.0	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.10	3.23	13.24	21.7%
12	Project Readiness	0.00	3.00	4.00	1.00	5.00	5.00		5.00		5.0	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.93	2.85	11.21	39.3%
Mean		2.50	3.42	2.92	3.83	3.67	3.92		4.21		4.58	4.29	4.63	3.92	3.13	3.96	4.67	4.58	Overall Weighted Score		158.93		
CoV		67.1%	21.5%	37.2%	38.3%	37.4%	36.9%		25.6%		11.2%	14.4%	13.9%	18.7%	39.9%	25.5%	14.0%	14.6%					
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		Y	N	N	N	N	N		N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N					

Comments
 11087 Elwha River Revegetation Project - makes no reference to what is currently unfinished, does not indicate any current need
 My understanding is that this project is winding down. Wrong?
 Project 11087 narrative needs updating (e.g. both dams have been removed, etc.). Some or all of this narrative appears to not been updated since 2011. How successful has this project (6 years and counting) been with regard to river migration, ungulate grazing, etc? Since aspects of this project, I believe, have been ongoing for years, if no progress is reported why should it continue to be funded?
 Is this a current work plan proposal - clearly written before the dam removal, so its not clear if the proposal is to continue to fund crews...and if so, the need/justification needs to be described
 Elwha Reveg - Needs updating?
 Need to update narrative for 2018 proposal. Assumed this project was to continue previous work.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	2.42
SD of all Scores:	1.58
2 X SD of all Scores:	3.15116
Mean - 2 X:	-0.73
Mean + 2 X:	5.58

Workplan Projects

Elwha River Estuary Restoration

102.19

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09018

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.00	2.96	14.80	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.00	4.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	4.00	0	1.00	0.00	4.0	5.00	1.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	0.00	3.00	2.18	4.08	8.88	81.6%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	0.00	3.50	0.00	3.00	0.00	5.00	0	4.00	0.00	4.5	5.00	4.00	5.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	3.00	2.41	2.88	6.95	85.9%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	0.00	3.50	0.00	5.00	0.00	3.00	0	3.00	0.00	5.0	5.00	2.00	3.00	3.50	3.00	0.00	3.00	2.29	2.81	6.45	83.7%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00	4.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	5.00	0	5.00	0.00	5.0	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.50	5.00	0.00	5.00	3.26	3.65	11.92	68.5%
6	Addresses other stocks	4.00	4.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	4.00	0	5.00	0.00	4.5	5.00	0.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	0.00	5.00	2.68	3.27	8.75	81.1%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	3.00	2.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	4.00	0	3.00	0.00	5.0	5.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	1.88	4.12	7.76	95.6%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.00	3.50	0.00	2.00	0.00	4.00	0	5.00	0.00	5.0	5.00	2.50	2.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	4.00	2.29	4.04	9.27	83.0%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.00	4.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	5.00	0	3.00	0.00	5.0	5.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	4.00	2.29	3.88	8.90	85.5%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.00	3.50	0.00	1.00	0.00	3.00	0	3.00	0.00	4.5	4.00	2.50	2.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	3.00	2.03	3.62	7.35	80.5%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	5.00	0	5.00	0.00	5.0	5.00	2.50	2.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	5.00	2.50	3.23	8.08	84.9%
12	Project Readiness	0.00	3.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0	2.00	0.00	4.5	2.50	0.50	0.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	1.09	2.85	3.10	133.2%
Mean		2.67	3.67	0.42	3.00	0.42	3.92	0.42	3.67	0.42	4.75	4.71	2.17	2.50	2.42	3.25	0.42	3.58	Overall Weighted Score		102.19	
CoV		66.6%	19.6%	346.4%	55.0%	346.4%	36.9%	346.4%	37.4%	346.4%	7.1%	16.0%	71.9%	55.3%	67.7%	41.7%	346.4%	40.3%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N				

Comments
 9018 Elwha River Estuary Restoration - no effort in updating, makes no reference to what is currently unfinished, does not indicate any current need
 Project 09018 narrative requires major improvements. The project sponsor should move this placeholder proposal to the not ready for at least 7 years group, proposals that are not part of this review.
 not much detail to work with here - hard to evaluate, especially scale, readiness, etc.
 Proj. 09018 Elwha River Estuary Restoration: There's insufficient information to score this project.
 Needs more detail.
 Project 09018 Elwha River Estuary Restoration did not have enough information to evaluate.
 Elwha River Estuary - Needs detail; needs updating; difficult to score; ready? Delete and combine with 09055.1? LEKT, TNC, and CWI need to be added as partners.
 Project incorporated into 9055.1 below

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	4.39
SD of all Scores:	0.44
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.88032
Mean - 2 X:	3.51
Mean + 2 X:	5.27

Workplan Projects

Elwha River Estuary/Nearshore Conservation and Restoration

181.45

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09055.1

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.00	2.96	14.80	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.50	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	5.00	4.00	4.56	4.08	18.60	10.2%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	5.00	3.50	4.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.62	2.88	13.30	12.4%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	5.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.50	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.00	3.50	4.50	4.00	5.00	4.24	2.81	11.90	16.8%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.50	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.74	3.65	17.28	8.4%
6	Addresses other stocks	4.00	4.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.50	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.56	3.27	14.91	10.2%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	5.00	2.00	4.50	2.00	2.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.5	5.00	5.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.03	4.12	16.60	27.6%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	3.50	4.50	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	2.50	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.32	4.04	17.47	17.3%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.47	3.88	17.35	12.2%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	5.00	3.50	5.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.50	5.0	4.00	5.00	3.00	3.50	4.50	4.00	3.00	3.88	3.62	14.05	20.1%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.53	3.23	14.63	16.3%
12	Project Readiness	5.00	3.00	4.00	1.00	3.00	5.00	2.00	5.00	4.00	4.5	4.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	4.50	5.00	3.71	2.85	10.56	32.4%
Mean		4.92	3.67	4.58	3.83	4.25	4.50	3.92	4.67	4.08	4.83	4.83	4.92	3.96	3.71	4.58	4.75	4.58	Overall Weighted Score		181.45	
CoV		5.9%	19.6%	9.1%	33.1%	24.8%	15.0%	22.3%	13.2%	12.6%	9.2%	8.1%	5.9%	23.1%	17.7%	9.1%	8.4%	14.6%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 Project 09055.1 narrative could use some additional narrative, photos, on how the first 2 phases have improved the nearshore and watershed, improved habitat, helped river migration?
 hmmm, its not super clear here exactly what is being proposed, and how this is different from or related to 09055. I think the focus here is on the levee, but the map suggests some additional armoring removal on the east and conservatoin on the west. what is this about? As such it is hard to evaluation things like project readiness

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	4.21
SD of all Scores:	0.45
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.89753
Mean - 2 X:	3.31
Mean + 2 X:	5.11

Workplan Projects

Little River LWD Project

173.07

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

13102

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000		5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.00	2.96	14.80	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00		4.50	3.50	5.0	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.08	18.23	14.4%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	4.00	3.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.66	2.88	13.41	12.2%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00		4.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.50	4.00	4.50	4.00	5.00	4.28	2.81	12.03	15.4%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00	3.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.00		5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.69	3.65	17.11	10.2%
6	Addresses other stocks	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00		5.00	4.00	4.5	4.50	5.00	4.50	3.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.38	3.27	14.31	14.2%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	4.00	2.00	5.00	2.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	3.50	5.0	4.50	4.00	3.00	0.00	3.50	3.50	3.00	2.88	4.12	11.85	53.7%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00		4.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	3.50	4.50	5.00	4.00	4.38	4.04	17.68	14.2%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	2.00	4.00		5.00	4.50	5.0	4.50	5.00	4.50	3.50	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.31	3.88	16.73	21.9%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00		4.00	4.00	4.0	3.50	3.50	3.00	4.00	2.50	3.50	4.00	3.50	3.62	12.67	14.8%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00		4.00	3.00	5.0	4.50	4.50	4.00	3.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.06	3.23	13.12	22.4%
12	Project Readiness	5.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.00		3.00	3.00	5.0	3.00	3.00	4.50	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.91	2.85	11.13	23.0%
Mean		4.50	3.21	4.50	4.42	3.92	3.92		4.13	3.92	4.88	4.46	4.58	4.17	3.50	4.00	4.67	4.58	Overall Weighted Score		173.07	
CoV		11.6%	21.5%	17.1%	20.4%	33.5%	29.7%		28.4%	15.2%	6.4%	14.7%	15.3%	16.4%	36.0%	26.1%	13.2%	14.6%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	Y	N	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 Little River seems like a clear candidate for LWD treatment, and coupled with the restoration trajectory associated with dam removal this seems like it could really benefit fish. Log jams physically protect habitat by stabilizing it, providing habitat diversity. Ready to start design now - construction complete in two years.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	4.25
SD of all Scores:	0.55
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.10616
Mean - 2 X:	3.15
Mean + 2 X:	5.36

Workplan Projects

Indian Creek Habitat Restoration Project

174.96

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

16103

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000		5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.00	2.96	14.80	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	3.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.50	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.08	18.36	17.7%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	4.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.69	2.88	13.50	12.2%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00	3.50	4.50	5.00	4.00	3.00		5.00	3.00	4.5	5.00	5.00	3.00	3.50	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.19	2.81	11.77	18.9%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00		5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.69	3.65	17.11	10.9%
6	Addresses other stocks	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00		5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	3.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.53	3.27	14.82	15.8%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	4.00	2.00	5.00	2.00	0.00	1.00		2.00	3.00	5.0	4.50	4.00	3.00	0.00	4.50	3.50	3.00	2.91	4.12	11.97	55.9%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	2.50	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	3.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	2.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.04	17.93	20.1%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	4.00		5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.50	2.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.22	3.88	16.37	22.1%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	5.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00		4.00	3.00	4.0	4.00	3.50	3.00	3.00	3.50	3.50	4.00	3.59	3.62	13.01	16.2%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		4.50	3.00	5.0	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.53	3.23	14.64	14.8%
12	Project Readiness	5.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.00		3.00	4.00	5.0	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.75	2.85	10.69	24.8%
Mean		4.75	3.17	4.71	4.25	4.08	4.08		4.46	3.63	4.88	4.67	4.50	3.88	3.13	4.54	4.67	4.67	Overall Weighted Score		174.96	
CoV		9.5%	22.7%	13.2%	22.7%	36.9%	30.4%		22.2%	17.8%	6.4%	13.2%	20.7%	20.7%	38.7%	11.0%	13.2%	14.0%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N				

Comments
 Project 16013 references a push up dike by DOT, please clarify if any problems may occur with dike removal (e.g. will the highway, another road, or property be in peril), why was the dike initially constructed?
 good project, clearly justified - could be better connected to expected fish benefit. Not really a limiting factor project I don't think...more of an enhancement
 This appears to be a high value project with potentially significant benefit to productivity at a relatively modest cost.
 Log jams physically protect habitat by stabilizing it, providing habitat diversity. Ready to start design now - construction complete in two years.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	4.03
SD of all Scores:	0.78
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.56812
Mean - 2 X:	2.46
Mean + 2 X:	5.60

Workplan Projects

Elwha Hot Springs Road Restoration

166.08

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

16104

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000		5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.00	2.96	14.80	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.00		1.00	4.00	3.0	4.00	5.00	2.00	1.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.69	4.08	15.05	38.0%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.00	3.50	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00		3.00	4.00	4.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	2.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.22	2.88	12.15	22.1%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00	3.50	4.50	3.00	4.00	3.00		2.00	4.00	4.5	5.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	3.91	2.81	10.98	23.5%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	3.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00		2.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.50	2.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.25	3.65	15.51	23.9%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00		2.00	4.00	4.0	4.50	5.00	3.50	2.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.09	3.27	13.39	23.3%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	3.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	2.00	0.00		2.00	4.50	4.0	4.50	4.50	3.50	0.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	3.41	4.12	14.03	50.6%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.00	3.50	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00		4.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.50	2.00	4.00	4.50	5.00	4.19	4.04	16.92	20.9%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		4.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.41	3.88	17.10	21.6%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.00	3.50	4.50	3.00	3.00	3.00		2.00	5.00	4.0	3.50	3.50	2.50	2.00	3.50	3.50	4.00	3.34	3.62	12.10	24.2%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00		4.50	5.00	5.0	5.00	4.50	4.00	1.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.47	3.23	14.43	20.2%
12	Project Readiness	3.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	3.00		2.50	2.50	5.0	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.38	2.85	9.62	33.6%
Mean		3.33	3.67	4.75	4.25	4.42	3.67		2.83	4.25	4.46	4.54	4.54	3.33	2.17	4.58	4.75	4.92	Overall Weighted Score		166.08	
CoV		19.5%	19.6%	12.3%	22.7%	22.6%	37.4%		44.1%	16.3%	14.7%	15.2%	20.2%	27.4%	55.1%	12.2%	10.5%	5.9%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N				

Comments
 Project 13103 references the removal of the "row house", although not mentioned in miscellaneous uses (sculling/rowing), please include what, if any, progress any entity has in finding a new home for these folks. The Port Townsend sculling/rowing facility is world class and Sequim is home to an Olympic medal winner in this event in 1936. Also in the Restoration or Protection of Ecosystem Function of the narrative reference is made to the habitat being at least partial restored by sediment supplies to Ediz Hook through removal of Elwha River dams, please provide a reference for this statement as it appears that sediment now fails to be carried over the north shore rip rap or around the point to any decernable degree.

This is clearly an important project, but I don't know that the benefit to salmon (vs the benefit to access/transport) is clearly spelled out
 Ready to start design phase now. No construction cost estimate yet; timing also is TBD. Treated this as design-only proposal.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.89
SD of all Scores:	0.58
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.16488
Mean - 2 X:	2.72
Mean + 2 X:	5.05

Workplan Projects

Ediz Hook Restoration-Phase 5

159.22

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

13103

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)		
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17						
1	Watershed Priority	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000		5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.00	2.96	14.80	0.0%	
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	4.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	3.00	3.00		3.00	3.00	4.5	4.50	5.00	2.50	4.50	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.94	4.08	16.07	22.2%	
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.00	3.50	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00		3.00	3.00	4.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.91	2.88	11.25	23.9%	
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	3.00		3.50	3.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.00	3.50	3.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.81	2.81	10.71	23.4%	
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	4.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00		3.00	0.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	3.69	3.65	13.46	36.7%	
6	Addresses other stocks	5.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.00		3.00	3.00	5.0	4.50	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.09	3.27	13.39	21.0%	
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	4.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	0.00		2.00	2.50	3.0	4.50	4.00	3.00	0.00	3.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	2.53	4.12	10.43	56.1%	
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00		3.50	2.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.94	4.04	15.91	22.2%	
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	3.50	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00		4.00	3.00	5.0	4.50	5.00	3.00	4.50	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.91	3.88	15.16	21.5%	
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	5.00	2.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00		2.00	4.00	4.5	3.50	4.00	2.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.69	3.62	13.35	24.7%	
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00		4.00	2.00	5.0	4.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.06	3.23	13.12	20.5%	
12	Project Readiness	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00		5.00	3.00	5.0	4.00	3.50	3.50	3.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.06	2.85	11.58	18.5%	
Mean		4.33	3.17	3.83	3.83	3.83	3.42		3.42	2.83	4.67	4.54	4.67	3.50	3.79	3.38	4.63	4.33	Overall Weighted Score		159.22			
CoV		15.0%	22.7%	18.7%	33.1%	31.1%	38.4%		28.5%	41.4%	13.2%	11.0%	11.5%	23.6%	34.9%	23.7%	12.3%	20.5%						
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N					

Comments
 Important nearshore restoration project that probably addresses a key limiting factor (shoreline steepening) for nearshore fish use in the harbor
 One year to design and permit, one year for construction. Ready to start.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	2.87
SD of all Scores:	0.70
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.40716
Mean - 2 X:	1.46
Mean + 2 X:	4.28

Workplan Projects

Valley Creek Restoration Phase 3

118.39

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09021

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566		1.566	1.57	2.96	4.64	0.0%	
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	4.00	3.00	2.50	5.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	5.0	4.00	4.00	4.50	2.50	3.50		5.00	3.78	4.08	15.43	22.1%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	4.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	5.0	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.50	3.50		3.00	3.25	2.88	9.36	26.9%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.0	4.50	2.00	4.50	3.00	3.00		5.00	3.56	2.81	10.01	28.5%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.00	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	3.0	4.00	0.00	4.50	3.00	2.00		0.00	1.44	3.65	5.25	112.8%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.00	2.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.5	4.50	2.00	4.00	3.00	2.00		5.00	3.25	3.27	10.63	34.2%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	3.00	1.00	4.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	3.00	4.0	4.50	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00		1.00	1.72	4.12	7.08	92.6%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	2.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	0.00	2.00	3.50	5.0	5.00	2.00	4.00	2.50	2.00		3.00	3.13	4.04	12.63	45.4%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	3.00	4.00	5.0	4.50	2.00	4.00	2.50	3.50		4.00	3.34	3.88	12.97	41.5%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.50	2.00	3.00	3.0	3.50	1.00	4.00	2.50	3.00		4.00	2.84	3.62	10.29	27.8%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	5.0	4.50	1.50	4.00	4.00	4.00		5.00	3.69	3.23	11.91	32.8%
12	Project Readiness	4.00	2.50	1.00	5.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	3.00	5.0	2.00	5.00	3.50	3.00	4.00		3.00	2.88	2.85	8.19	52.6%
Mean		3.30	1.88	2.76	3.63	2.38	2.30	2.34	2.13	2.80	4.17	3.88	2.17	3.71	2.51	2.67		3.30	Overall Weighted Score		118.39	
CoV		36.6%	34.1%	56.4%	42.6%	58.7%	63.1%	68.3%	56.6%	37.4%	26.9%	27.2%	66.7%	25.6%	38.8%	44.4%		51.7%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N		N				

Comments
 I think these urban creek projects are important, but its not incredibly clear what sort of "bang for the buck" you get in terms of salmon restoration. But certainly it will address a limiting factor for that watershed

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.50
SD of all Scores:	0.71
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.42725
Mean - 2 X:	2.08
Mean + 2 X:	4.93

Workplan Projects

Ennis Creek Fish Passage Barrier Removal

144.18

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

11088.1

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530		2.530	2.53	2.96	7.49	0.0%	
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	3.00	4.00	4.50	4.50	4.00	5.00	4.19	4.08	17.09	17.4%	
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.00	2.50	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.50	5.0	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.94	2.88	11.34	19.0%	
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	5.00	2.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	4.50	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	5.00	3.97	2.81	11.15	22.3%	
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00	2.50	5.00	4.00	3.00	0.00	2.50	2.50	4.50	4.5	4.50	0.00	3.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	3.41	3.65	12.43	48.0%	
6	Addresses other stocks	5.00	2.50	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.5	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.27	13.08	18.3%	
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	3.00	1.00	4.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.50	4.50	4.0	3.50	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	1.78	4.12	7.34	90.5%	
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	2.50	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	5.0	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	0.00	5.00	3.72	4.04	15.02	35.4%	
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	4.50	5.0	4.00	3.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.81	3.88	14.79	23.4%	
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.00	2.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	2.50	3.50	4.00	4.5	3.00	1.00	3.50	4.00	2.00	4.00	3.25	3.62	11.77	31.8%	
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	2.00	4.50	4.00	5.0	4.50	1.50	4.50	4.50	4.00	5.00	3.91	3.23	12.62	31.1%	
12	Project Readiness	4.00	2.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.50	3.50	4.5	3.00	3.00	3.50	3.00	4.50	5.00	3.53	2.85	10.06	25.0%	
Mean		3.96	2.34	4.04	4.29	3.38	2.71	2.71	3.25	4.13	4.54	3.71	2.34	3.67	3.46	3.13	4.38	Overall Weighted Score		144.18		
CoV		25.4%	23.0%	21.3%	24.4%	37.4%	50.0%	38.1%	35.5%	15.4%	15.7%	18.5%	53.5%	21.9%	35.6%	53.3%	24.3%					
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N					

Comments
 great project - a small urban stream, but a productive one. Clear low hanging fruit in terms of limiting factors.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.37
SD of all Scores:	0.87
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.74323
Mean - 2 X:	1.63
Mean + 2 X:	5.11

Workplan Projects

Morse Creek Property Acquisition

138.29

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09026

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.10	2.96	12.12	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	4.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	3.50	4.5	5.00	1.50	2.50	2.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	3.15	4.08	12.84	38.0%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	4.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	5.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	5.0	5.00	4.50	4.50	2.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	3.68	2.88	10.59	32.6%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	5.00	2.00	4.50	3.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.50	3.00	5.0	5.00	1.50	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	2.81	9.84	33.1%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	4.00	2.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	5.0	5.00	2.50	4.00	3.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	3.59	3.65	13.10	35.9%
6	Addresses other stocks	4.00	1.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	2.00	3.50	3.00	5.0	5.00	2.50	4.00	4.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	3.74	3.27	12.21	32.5%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	4.00	1.00	3.00	4.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	3.50	3.50	4.5	5.00	3.00	3.50	2.00	2.50	5.00	4.00	3.21	4.12	13.21	40.9%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	3.50	5.0	5.00	0.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	3.50	4.00	2.82	4.04	11.41	46.8%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	4.00	2.00	2.50	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	3.50	5.0	5.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.24	3.88	12.55	37.5%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.00	2.00	2.50	3.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.5	4.00	1.00	2.50	1.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	2.44	3.62	8.84	42.8%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	3.50	5.0	5.00	3.00	4.50	2.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.29	3.23	13.87	23.3%
12	Project Readiness	5.00	0.50	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	2.50	2.00	5.0	2.50	0.50	2.50	2.00	4.50	5.00	4.00	2.71	2.85	7.71	55.5%
Mean		4.01	2.05	3.13	3.34	3.42	3.34	2.17	3.26	3.22	4.80	4.63	2.09	3.34	2.34	3.34	4.47	4.34	Overall Weighted Score		138.29	
CoV		15.1%	47.9%	35.7%	37.0%	40.4%	29.7%	39.3%	36.3%	15.9%	6.5%	16.5%	67.3%	26.0%	38.6%	37.5%	16.0%	14.9%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
lots of questions after reading this proposal - the focus is on acquisition...its not clear how the floodplain reconnection is happening? There is no restoration activity described. On the map, which are the WWRP parcels, vs the SRFB parcels? In the write-up the primary limiting actors are described for the lower part of the river, yet this doesn't seem to address them?
Project 092016 Morse Creek Property Acquisition needs to describe how purchase of these two small parcels significantly advances restoration in this reach given the completion of previous acquisitions and remainder restoration.
Morse Creek Property Acquisition - Needs more detail; needs updating; Map does not show which properties are proposed for acquisition; Delete and combine with 16102?
Finishes the restoration component of a successful project. Cost not addressed in narrative. I assume funds leveraged with WDFW funds.

NOPL 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	4.09
SD of all Scores:	0.61
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.22512
Mean - 2 X:	2.87
Mean + 2 X:	5.32

Workplan Projects

Morse Creek Acquisition & Restoration

169.29

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

16102

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096		4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.10	2.96	12.12	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	4.00		4.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	4.00	3.50	3.50	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.19	4.08	17.09	17.4%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	4.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	5.00		3.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	4.50	4.50	3.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.16	2.88	11.97	21.8%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	5.00	2.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00		3.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	3.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.88	2.81	10.89	19.1%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00	2.50	3.50	5.00	5.00	4.00		1.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.22	3.65	15.40	26.7%
6	Addresses other stocks	5.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00		3.50	4.00	5.0	5.00	4.50	4.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.28	3.27	14.00	19.5%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	5.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	0.00	5.00		4.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	4.00	4.50	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.16	4.12	17.12	31.6%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	1.00	3.50	4.00	3.00	4.00		3.50	4.00	5.0	5.00	4.00	3.00	2.50	2.50	4.00	5.00	3.69	4.04	14.90	30.1%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	4.00		4.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.22	3.88	16.37	16.7%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	4.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00		2.00	3.00	5.0	4.00	3.50	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.69	3.62	13.35	23.2%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	4.50	4.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.66	3.23	15.04	12.2%
12	Project Readiness	4.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.00		5.00	4.00	5.0	3.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	3.88	2.85	11.04	25.2%
Mean		4.51	2.51	3.76	4.59	3.59	4.09		3.51	3.92	4.92	4.67	4.05	3.92	3.80	4.17	4.59	4.84	Overall Weighted Score		169.29	
CoV		11.4%	31.3%	22.4%	11.0%	38.5%	16.3%		32.8%	7.5%	5.3%	13.8%	9.8%	13.2%	16.4%	16.4%	11.0%	7.7%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	Y	N	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 Project 16102 references the diversion dam. Please provide narration whether or not other uses of the dam (e.g. irrigation districts, home water use, other users) still exist and whether other users have alternative water supplies. With dam removal would increased flooding be an issue?
 well described and clear project. Not clear that the wood restoration will occur as stated
 Isn't it the City's responsibility to decommission the diversion dam? NOLT could buy the property and the City could use the funds to remove the dam.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.60
SD of all Scores:	0.57
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.14686
Mean - 2 X:	2.46
Mean + 2 X:	4.75

Workplan Projects

Siebert Creek Large Wood Restoration

149.15

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

11090.1

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867		1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.87	2.96	5.53	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	4.00	2.50	5.00	5.00		4.00	4.00	4.50	4.00	5.0	4.00	4.00	4.50	3.50	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.19	4.08	17.09	17.9%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.00	2.50	2.00	4.00		3.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	5.0	4.00	3.50	3.50	4.00	4.00	3.50	5.00	3.66	2.88	10.53	21.6%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00	3.00	4.50	5.00		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.50	5.00	4.00	4.13	2.81	11.59	16.9%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00	2.00	3.50	5.00		3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.03	3.65	14.71	25.0%
6	Addresses other stocks	4.00	3.00	3.50	5.00		4.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	5.0	4.50	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.03	3.27	13.18	17.8%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	3.00	2.00	4.00	2.00		1.00	0.00	4.00	3.50	4.0	4.50	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	3.50	1.00	2.22	4.12	9.14	71.7%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	4.00	2.50	3.50	5.00		4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	3.00	4.00	3.50	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.03	4.04	16.29	20.0%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.0	4.50	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.03	3.88	15.64	18.4%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00		3.00	4.00	3.00	3.50	4.0	3.00	3.00	3.50	2.50	2.00	4.00	3.50	3.13	3.62	11.31	19.8%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	2.50	5.00	4.00		5.00	3.00	5.00	3.50	4.5	4.50	4.50	4.50	3.00	2.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.23	12.92	23.7%
12	Project Readiness	3.00	2.00	3.00	5.00		5.00	4.00	5.00	3.50	5.0	3.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.94	2.85	11.22	23.1%
Mean		3.57	2.41	3.57	4.16		3.49	3.41	3.91	3.61	4.53	4.07	3.03	3.66	2.86	3.03	4.41	3.95	Overall Weighted Score		149.15	
CoV		22.9%	17.9%	28.4%	29.3%		33.9%	38.9%	21.8%	16.7%	20.4%	24.0%	29.9%	23.5%	37.7%	46.2%	22.8%	33.1%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	Y	N	N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 Great project description, clearly outlined need and benefit. Really nicely done
 Very timely project.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.54
SD of all Scores:	0.53
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.0687
Mean - 2 X:	2.47
Mean + 2 X:	4.61

Workplan Projects

McDonald Creek Large Wood Restoration

146.66

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

10078.1

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867		1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.87	2.96	5.53	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	4.00	2.50	3.00	5.00		4.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	5.0	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.50	3.50	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.08	16.70	18.0%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.00	2.50	2.00	3.00		3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.5	4.00	3.50	3.50	4.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.53	2.88	10.17	27.1%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.00	3.00	4.50	4.00		4.00	4.00	2.50	3.50	5.0	5.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	3.50	4.00	3.84	2.81	10.80	18.8%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	4.00	2.00	3.50	5.00		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.50	4.5	5.00	3.00	4.50	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.91	3.65	14.26	24.8%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.00	3.00	3.50	5.00		4.00	4.00	3.50	3.50	4.5	4.50	3.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.94	3.27	12.88	17.9%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00		1.00	0.00	2.00	3.00	5.0	4.50	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	3.50	1.00	2.06	4.12	8.50	74.5%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	4.00	2.50	3.00	5.00		4.00	4.00	2.00	3.50	4.0	5.00	3.00	4.50	3.50	3.50	4.50	4.00	3.75	4.04	15.15	22.3%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	4.00	3.00	3.00	5.00		4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	5.0	4.50	3.00	4.50	3.50	3.00	5.00	5.00	3.97	3.88	15.40	20.3%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00		3.00	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.5	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.00	3.78	3.62	13.69	17.4%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.00	2.50	5.00	4.00		5.00	3.00	4.50	4.00	4.5	4.50	4.50	4.50	3.50	2.00	5.00	4.00	3.97	3.23	12.82	23.2%
12	Project Readiness	4.00	2.50	3.00	5.00		5.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	5.0	3.00	3.50	4.50	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.78	2.85	10.78	25.5%
Mean		3.24	2.53	3.20	4.07		3.49	3.28	3.07	3.28	4.45	4.07	3.03	3.86	3.41	3.32	4.36	3.99	Overall Weighted Score		146.66	
CoV		23.9%	16.4%	27.6%	29.1%		33.9%	38.5%	32.9%	17.4%	19.6%	24.0%	29.9%	24.8%	37.9%	42.6%	22.6%	32.6%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 Project 10078.1 narrative needs updating (e.g. how did phase 2 from 2011 go and is this phase 3 or 4?).
 Same as seibert - well done. The productivity possibility of the creek is a bit lower
 McDonald Creek LWD - Needs updating
 Update narrative to reflect that PH2 is done (if it is). What is cost and scope of remaining work (Ph 3)?

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.77
SD of all Scores:	0.60
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.19576
Mean - 2 X:	2.58
Mean + 2 X:	4.97

Workplan Projects

McDonald Creek Barrier Removal and Channel Restoration

155.77

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09039.2

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	1.867		1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.87	2.96	5.53	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	5.00		5.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.50	4.5	3.00	4.00	4.50	3.50	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.08	17.34	18.2%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	5.00		4.50	5.00	3.50	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.5	4.00	3.50	3.50	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.09	2.88	11.79	16.8%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00		4.50	5.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.13	2.81	11.59	15.6%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00		4.50	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.5	4.50	3.00	4.50	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.31	3.65	15.74	14.6%
6	Addresses other stocks	4.00		4.50	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	5.0	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.13	3.27	13.49	15.6%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	4.00		4.50	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	5.0	3.50	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	1.00	1.94	4.12	7.98	93.7%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00		4.50	5.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	4.50	4.00	5.0	4.00	3.00	4.50	3.50	3.50	5.00	4.00	4.09	4.04	16.54	21.9%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00		5.00	5.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	5.0	4.00	3.00	3.50	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	3.91	3.88	15.16	27.3%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.00		4.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.00	5.0	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.50	3.50	5.00	5.00	3.97	3.62	14.37	22.3%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00		5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.00	5.0	4.50	4.50	5.00	4.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.63	3.23	14.94	9.3%
12	Project Readiness	5.00		4.00	5.00	2.00	5.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	5.0	2.00	3.50	5.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.97	2.85	11.31	29.3%
Mean		4.24		4.32	4.49	2.74	3.66	3.41	3.28	3.70	4.61	3.61	2.95	3.86	3.28	3.32	4.66	4.24	Overall Weighted Score		155.77	
CoV		23.4%		19.5%	26.6%	44.0%	39.7%	42.7%	35.1%	19.5%	19.4%	27.0%	32.4%	26.6%	38.5%	39.1%	19.8%	32.5%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 another good one - clear well described project, benefits are clear
 Proj. 09039.2 McDonald Creek Barrier Removal and Channel Restoration. The Agnew diversion dam is considered a partial fish passage barrier. An examination of spawner distribution data and coho smolt production data indicate that the structure does not seriously impede adult fish passage in most years.
 McDonald Creek Barrier Removal - WDFW should be a partner on this project.
 Most strategic to remove these barriers soonest. Please reconcile the RM citations for fish usage extent between the 2 McDonald Creek projects.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.94
SD of all Scores:	1.23
2 X SD of all Scores:	2.4528
Mean - 2 X:	1.48
Mean + 2 X:	6.39

Workplan Projects

3 Crabs Estuarine and Nearshore Restoration

163.97

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

13104.2

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639			4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.64	2.96	13.73	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	5.00	3.00	0.00	4.00			5.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	4.00	5.00	3.00	1.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	3.93	4.08	16.05	38.1%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	4.00	3.00	0.00	4.00			4.00	4.50	3.50	4.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	2.88	11.52	32.0%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	5.00	3.00	0.00	5.00			4.00	5.00	3.00	4.5	5.00	5.00	3.50	2.50	4.50	3.00	5.00	3.87	2.81	10.87	36.4%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00	3.00	0.00	5.00			5.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.40	3.65	16.06	30.7%
6	Addresses other stocks	4.00	3.00	0.00	5.00			4.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	4.50	5.00	4.00	2.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.27	13.08	33.7%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	5.00	2.00	0.00	3.00			5.00	3.50	4.50	4.5	4.50	5.00	2.00	0.00	3.00	5.00	1.00	3.20	4.12	13.18	56.9%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	3.00	0.00	5.00			4.00	5.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.13	4.04	16.70	35.0%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	3.00	0.00	5.00			4.00	5.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	2.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.17	3.88	16.17	33.5%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	4.00	2.00	0.00	4.00			4.00	4.00	4.00	5.0	3.50	5.00	3.00	2.50	4.50	4.00	3.00	3.50	3.62	12.67	36.6%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	5.00	3.00	0.00	5.00			4.50	5.00	5.00	5.0	4.50	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.27	3.23	13.78	31.0%
12	Project Readiness	5.00	2.50	0.00	1.00			4.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	2.50	4.00	4.00	2.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	3.57	2.85	10.17	44.9%
Mean		4.72	2.93	0.39	4.22			4.34	4.72	4.14	4.80	4.43	4.89	3.80	2.64	4.39	4.72	4.47	Overall Weighted Score		163.97	
CoV		9.5%	22.7%	346.4%	28.4%			10.4%	10.5%	13.0%	6.8%	17.3%	6.1%	21.6%	48.0%	12.1%	13.1%	27.6%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	Y	N			N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

I thought this project was complete??

Project 13104.2 narrative needs major updating, most or all of this work has been accomplished under project 13104.1 and what this project or phase would accomplish is not addressed.

confused about this one - isn't this project complete?

3-Crabs - Needs updating. What project elements remain incomplete? No specific mention of the need to remove creosote pilings, if that's the remaining element.

This project is substantially complete, but I scored it anyway, on the assumption that some essential work remains.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	4.23
SD of all Scores:	0.48
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.9682
Mean - 2 X:	3.26
Mean + 2 X:	5.20

Workplan Projects

Dungeness River Large Wood Restoration

174.44

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09029.1

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699		4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.70	2.96	13.91	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	5.00	3.50	5.00	5.00		5.00	5.00	5.00	3.50	5.0	4.50	5.00	4.00	4.50	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.08	18.62	14.9%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	4.00	5.00	3.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.59	2.88	13.23	14.4%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	5.00	3.00	4.50	5.00		3.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.34	2.81	12.21	18.7%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00	4.00	4.50	5.00		5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.66	3.65	17.00	10.2%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.00	3.50	4.50	5.00		4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.5	4.50	5.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.28	3.27	14.00	14.8%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	4.00	2.00	4.50	2.00		1.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	5.0	4.50	4.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	2.75	4.12	11.33	51.9%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	3.50	4.50	5.00		5.00	4.00	5.00	3.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.00	3.50	5.00	4.00	4.47	4.04	18.05	13.8%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	3.50	5.00	4.00		4.00	4.00	5.00	3.50	5.0	4.50	5.00	4.50	3.50	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.34	3.88	16.85	16.1%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	4.00	4.00	4.50	5.00		4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	3.50	4.00	4.50	4.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	4.38	3.62	15.84	12.9%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	3.50	5.00	4.00		5.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.5	4.50	4.50	4.50	3.50	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.19	3.23	13.53	20.4%
12	Project Readiness	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00		5.00	3.50	1.50	3.00	4.5	2.50	4.00	2.50	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.47	2.85	9.89	27.6%
Mean		4.47	3.43	4.56	4.39		4.22	3.93	4.43	3.64	4.85	4.43	4.68	4.10	3.52	3.52	4.89	4.56	Overall Weighted Score		174.44	
CoV		14.7%	19.4%	11.9%	22.4%		28.4%	21.3%	28.4%	14.2%	4.7%	16.6%	9.4%	22.8%	34.2%	24.9%	6.0%	19.6%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 hmmm - nicely put together, big ELJ project. The likelihood of positive outcomes for salmon is not addressed in the likelihood of success section. How well do the ELJs work in terms of supporting salmon? This concern is reflected in project readiness
 Past phases have demonstrated the value of this project

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	4.30
SD of all Scores:	0.50
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.00594
Mean - 2 X:	3.30
Mean + 2 X:	5.31

Workplan Projects

Dungeness River Riparian Habitat Protection

177.34

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09030.1

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699		4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.70	2.96	13.91	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	4.00	3.50	4.50	5.00		3.00	4.00	4.50	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.08	17.60	15.2%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.56	2.88	13.14	17.8%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00	3.00	4.50	5.00		3.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.25	2.81	11.94	19.7%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00	3.50	4.50	5.00		4.00	4.00	5.00	3.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.59	3.65	16.77	12.7%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.00	3.50	4.50	5.00		4.00	4.00	5.00	3.50	4.5	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.28	3.27	14.00	17.0%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00		5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.5	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.12	18.15	13.9%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00		2.00	1.00	5.00	3.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.50	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.34	4.04	13.51	35.7%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	3.50	4.50	5.00		3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.50	5.00	3.00	4.22	3.88	16.37	18.3%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.00		4.00	4.00	5.00	3.50	5.0	4.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.00	3.50	4.16	3.62	15.05	10.5%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.72	3.23	15.24	12.2%
12	Project Readiness	4.00	3.00	3.00	5.00		5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	4.00	2.50	1.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.09	2.85	11.67	26.5%
Mean		4.14	3.39	4.39	4.72		3.97	3.89	4.77	3.81	4.89	4.89	4.85	4.10	3.43	4.35	4.72	4.52	Overall Weighted Score		177.34	
CoV		16.7%	15.5%	12.2%	13.1%		25.7%	27.2%	8.2%	13.8%	4.1%	6.0%	6.4%	18.2%	24.7%	18.7%	13.1%	18.3%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 Nice, big, well justified conservation approach. Pressure on property is clearly described
 High value project given that development pressures continue within the floodplain of the Dungeness.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	4.16
SD of all Scores:	0.51
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.01997
Mean - 2 X:	3.14
Mean + 2 X:	5.18

Workplan Projects

Dungeness River Riparian Restoration

170.77

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09031.1

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699			4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.70	2.96	13.91	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	4.00	3.00	4.50	5.00			3.50	3.50	4.00	5.0	3.50	5.00	3.50	3.50	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.08	16.32	18.3%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	4.00	3.50	5.00	5.00			3.00	5.00	3.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.43	2.88	12.77	18.0%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	5.00	3.50	4.50	5.00			4.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.50	5.00	4.43	2.81	12.46	14.7%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00	3.00	4.50	5.00			2.00	5.00	3.50	5.0	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.50	4.00	5.00	4.33	3.65	15.82	20.8%
6	Addresses other stocks	4.00	3.00	4.50	5.00			2.50	5.00	3.50	5.0	3.50	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.50	4.00	5.00	4.10	3.27	13.41	20.7%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	3.00	2.00	4.00	2.00			3.50	3.00	4.00	4.0	4.00	3.00	2.00	0.00	4.00	4.50	5.00	3.20	4.12	13.18	40.0%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	3.50	4.00	5.00			3.50	4.50	3.00	4.5	4.50	5.00	4.50	3.50	3.00	4.50	3.00	4.07	4.04	16.43	18.5%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	3.50	4.50	5.00			4.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	4.50	5.00	4.00	3.00	3.50	5.00	3.00	4.27	3.88	16.55	17.6%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	4.00	3.50	4.50	5.00			4.00	4.50	3.50	5.0	3.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	4.07	3.62	14.72	13.8%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00			4.00	4.50	4.50	4.5	4.00	3.50	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	3.23	14.00	14.2%
12	Project Readiness	5.00	3.00	4.00	5.00			4.00	1.50	4.50	5.0	2.50	4.00	4.00	2.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	3.93	2.85	11.21	29.6%
Mean		4.47	3.35	4.47	4.72			3.56	4.27	3.85	4.81	4.06	4.56	4.02	3.10	4.06	4.52	4.52	Overall Weighted Score		170.77	
CoV		14.7%	19.4%	7.6%	18.3%			21.0%	25.4%	14.6%	6.7%	19.6%	15.2%	18.7%	38.3%	15.7%	9.5%	18.3%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N			N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N			

Comments
 Should this be a different project from 09030.1?
 another straight-forward well described and justified project

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	4.19
SD of all Scores:	0.64
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.27447
Mean - 2 X:	2.91
Mean + 2 X:	5.46

Workplan Projects

Dungeness Drift Cell Conservation

173.05

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09032.1

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639		4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.64	2.96	13.73	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	5.00	3.50	5.00	3.00		4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	3.50	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.28	4.08	17.47	19.5%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.00		5.00	3.00	3.50	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.50	3.50	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.16	2.88	11.97	23.5%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00	3.00	4.50	5.00		4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.0	5.00	5.00	3.50	3.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.97	2.81	11.15	16.9%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00	3.00	4.50	5.00		4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.50	3.00	5.00	3.50	4.28	3.65	15.63	18.6%
6	Addresses other stocks	5.00	3.00	4.50	5.00		4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.50	3.00	5.00	3.50	4.22	3.27	13.80	19.3%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.00		5.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	2.50	2.50	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.12	18.15	21.2%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	2.00	4.50	2.00		1.00	0.00	4.00	4.50	4.0	5.00	5.00	2.00	3.00	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.16	4.04	12.75	48.0%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00		4.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	2.50	4.00	5.00	3.50	4.50	3.88	17.46	16.2%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00		4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.0	4.00	4.50	2.00	3.00	4.50	4.00	3.00	4.19	3.62	15.16	21.3%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00		5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.56	3.23	14.74	13.8%
12	Project Readiness	5.00	2.00	4.00	2.00		5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.0	5.00	4.00	2.50	2.00	3.50	5.00	4.00	3.88	2.85	11.04	31.4%
Mean		4.89	3.26	4.72	4.05		4.14	3.39	4.68	4.43	4.80	4.89	4.84	3.59	3.26	3.30	4.64	4.09	Overall Weighted Score		173.05	
CoV		6.1%	24.7%	7.0%	28.2%		26.5%	39.7%	11.4%	9.5%	8.1%	6.1%	6.5%	26.1%	23.8%	25.1%	13.9%	19.6%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 well put together - connection between the bluffs, spit and estuarine habitats is nicely drawn. Hard to assess readiness given complexities. Also not clear that this really addresses a limiting factor...sort of?
 Dungeness Drift Cell Conservation - Should NOLT, CC, and CWI be partners on this project?

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.98
SD of all Scores:	0.90
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.8074
Mean - 2 X:	2.18
Mean + 2 X:	5.79

Workplan Projects

Dungeness River Instream Flow Restoration-
Irrigation Efficiencies

163.48

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09091

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699		4.70	2.96	13.91	0.0%	
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	5.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.50	5.00	3.50	5.0	4.00	5.00	3.50	3.00	1.00	5.00	4.13	4.08	16.83	27.1%	
3	Addresses stock status and trends	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	1.00	5.00	4.25	2.88	12.24	26.5%	
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00	3.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	4.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	1.00	5.00	3.97	2.81	11.15	28.5%	
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	4.00	3.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	2.50	5.00	3.00	5.0	4.50	5.00	4.50	2.00	2.50	5.00	4.09	3.65	14.94	26.8%	
6	Addresses other stocks	4.00	3.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.50	5.00	3.00	4.5	4.50	5.00	4.00	2.00	1.00	5.00	3.94	3.27	12.88	30.0%	
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	5.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	4.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	3.19	4.12	13.13	65.0%	
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.00	3.00	4.50	2.00	0.00	4.00	2.50	4.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	2.50	0.00	5.00	3.34	4.04	13.51	48.8%	
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.50	5.00	3.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.50	2.00	2.00	5.00	4.09	3.88	15.88	26.5%	
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.50	4.00	5.0	3.50	4.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	5.00	3.81	3.62	13.80	26.2%	
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	2.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.50	4.50	4.00	5.0	5.00	4.50	4.00	3.50	3.00	5.00	4.22	3.23	13.63	18.8%	
12	Project Readiness	5.00	3.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.00	2.00	4.5	2.50	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.06	2.85	11.58	23.7%	
Mean		4.14	3.06	4.77	4.72	4.39	3.97	3.10	4.56	3.56	4.81	4.47	4.68	4.02	2.64	1.85	4.97	Overall Weighted Score		163.48		
CoV		16.7%	20.6%	5.2%	18.3%	32.7%	33.5%	38.3%	13.6%	20.1%	6.7%	17.5%	9.4%	8.3%	45.4%	80.3%	1.7%					
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N					

Comments
 well put together project proposal - compelling limiting factors benefit Dungeness Instream Flow - Need updating?
 This project is of foundational importance to the Dungeness. Relationship with WUA essential for permanent benefit.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.60
SD of all Scores:	0.88
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.7529
Mean - 2 X:	1.85
Mean + 2 X:	5.36

Workplan Projects

Dungeness River Instream Flow Restoration-
Storage

147.71

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

12098

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)	
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16					Scorer 17
1	Watershed Priority	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699		4.70	2.96	13.91	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	4.00	2.50	4.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	2.50	4.50	3.50	5.0	3.50	5.00	3.50	3.50	1.00	4.50		3.63	4.08	14.79	30.0%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	4.00	2.50	3.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	2.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	1.00	4.50		3.88	2.88	11.16	32.1%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	5.00	2.50	4.50	3.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.00	3.50	1.00	5.00		3.84	2.81	10.80	33.8%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	4.00	2.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	2.50	5.00	3.00	5.0	3.50	5.00	4.00	3.00	2.50	5.00		4.00	3.65	14.60	25.8%
6	Addresses other stocks	4.00	2.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	4.5	3.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	5.00		3.69	3.27	12.06	33.5%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	5.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	4.00	5.0	4.00	4.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	4.50		2.72	4.12	11.20	69.1%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.00	2.50	4.00	3.00	0.00	4.00	1.50	4.00	4.00	5.0	4.00	5.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	4.50		3.03	4.04	12.25	52.3%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	1.00	5.00	3.50	5.0	4.00	5.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	5.00		3.41	3.88	13.22	39.8%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.0	3.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	5.00		3.50	3.62	12.67	25.6%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	2.50	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	4.50	4.00	5.0	4.00	5.00	3.00	3.50	3.00	5.00		4.09	3.23	13.22	21.5%
12	Project Readiness	4.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	2.50	2.00	3.5	1.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	2.00		2.75	2.85	7.84	41.5%
Mean		4.06	2.68	3.77	3.39	4.22	3.81	2.27	4.35	3.56	4.81	3.72	4.72	3.02	2.85	1.85	4.56		Overall Weighted Score		147.71	
CoV		15.7%	26.2%	22.8%	35.6%	34.9%	36.3%	51.8%	19.3%	20.1%	9.2%	29.3%	9.4%	36.2%	42.8%	80.3%	18.4%					
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N					

Comments
 hmmm...not entirely sure what the project is here, specifically, makes it hard to assess especially readiness or whether it really addresses a limiting factor (i.e. what is the scale of the benefit?)
 Narrative did not address readiness or costs/phasing.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	4.54
SD of all Scores:	0.38
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.75008
Mean - 2 X:	3.79
Mean + 2 X:	5.29

Workplan Projects

Dungeness River Floodplain Restoration

188.27

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09092.1

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	4.699		4.699	4.699			4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.70	2.96	13.91	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	5.00		4.50	5.00			4.50	4.50	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.08	19.38	6.8%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	5.00		5.00	4.00			4.50	4.50	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.50	5.00	4.61	2.88	13.27	9.7%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	5.00		4.50	5.00			4.00	4.50	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.68	2.81	13.15	9.0%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00		4.50	5.00			4.50	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.82	3.65	17.60	6.6%
6	Addresses other stocks	4.00		4.50	5.00			4.00	5.00	4.00	4.5	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.46	3.27	14.60	12.0%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	4.00		5.00	5.00			3.50	4.50	3.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	2.50	3.50	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.12	17.51	21.0%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00		4.50	5.00			5.00	4.50	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.50	4.50	5.00	4.00	4.61	4.04	18.61	10.6%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00		5.00	5.00			4.00	4.50	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.57	3.88	17.74	13.5%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	4.00		5.00	5.00			4.00	5.00	4.50	5.0	4.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.50	5.00	4.00	4.46	3.62	16.16	10.3%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	5.00		5.00	5.00			4.00	5.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.79	3.23	15.46	7.9%
12	Project Readiness	4.00		5.00	4.00			4.00	5.00	3.00	5.0	2.50	4.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.82	2.85	10.89	27.9%
Mean		4.64		4.77	4.81			4.22	4.72	4.14	4.93	4.68	4.85	3.93	3.77	4.56	4.93	4.64	Overall Weighted Score		188.27	
CoV		10.4%		5.2%	8.1%			9.8%	5.3%	12.1%	3.3%	15.9%	6.4%	21.9%	19.7%	13.6%	3.3%	10.4%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N		N	N			N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
clearly connects LFA to project list - big project, but works. LFA not addressed = low flow

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.78
SD of all Scores:	0.67
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.3326
Mean - 2 X:	2.44
Mean + 2 X:	5.11

Workplan Projects

Washington Harbor Habitat Protection Project

156.46

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09046

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639		4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.64	2.96	13.73	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00		4.00	3.00	4.50	3.00	5.0	4.50	5.00	3.50	1.50	3.00	4.50	5.00	3.91	4.08	15.94	25.7%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	4.00	3.00	3.00	5.00		5.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	5.0	5.00	4.50	4.00	2.50	2.00	5.00	5.00	3.88	2.88	11.16	29.2%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00		3.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	5.0	5.00	4.50	3.50	3.00	3.00	4.50	3.00	3.66	2.81	10.27	27.2%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00	3.00	4.50	5.00		5.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	5.0	4.50	5.00	4.50	3.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.16	3.65	15.17	22.7%
6	Addresses other stocks	5.00	3.00	3.00	5.00		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	5.0	4.00	4.00	4.50	2.50	3.00	5.00	5.00	3.81	3.27	12.47	25.3%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	5.00	2.00	4.00	5.00		5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.12	18.41	19.8%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00		0.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	4.0	4.50	3.50	5.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	0.00	2.69	4.04	10.86	52.6%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	3.00	3.00	5.00		0.00	3.50	4.50	4.00	5.0	4.50	5.00	5.00	2.00	3.00	5.00	0.00	3.59	3.88	13.94	47.2%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.00	2.00	3.00	4.00		3.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	5.0	3.50	4.00	4.50	2.00	4.50	4.50	3.00	3.59	3.62	13.01	24.5%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	4.00	5.00	3.50	5.0	4.50	5.00	5.00	3.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.53	3.23	14.64	16.4%
12	Project Readiness	4.00	2.50	4.00	2.00		0.00	2.00	1.50	2.00	4.0	2.00	2.50	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	0.00	2.41	2.85	6.86	54.8%
Mean		4.30	2.93	3.76	4.39		3.14	3.01	3.80	3.26	4.80	4.30	4.39	4.26	2.72	3.39	4.59	3.39	Overall Weighted Score		156.46	
CoV		17.6%	22.7%	19.6%	26.3%		65.5%	36.0%	27.4%	24.7%	8.1%	19.6%	17.7%	21.0%	36.3%	24.2%	13.0%	64.1%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 Missing information, here.
 This type of habitat is so rare on the strait, seems like a no-brainer. Would be nice to see some fish use data from the harbor...it must be out there? Project readiness not clear - willing owners?
 Project 09046 Washington Harbors Protection Project fails to describe what exactly the project is?
 Washington Harbor Protection - Needs more detail

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.79
SD of all Scores:	0.73
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.45269
Mean - 2 X:	2.34
Mean + 2 X:	5.25

Workplan Projects

Sequim Bay Shoreline Restoration

156.73

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

14107

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639			4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.64	2.96	13.73	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00			2.00	4.50	4.00	4.5	3.50	5.00	3.50	3.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	3.80	4.08	15.50	21.6%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00			2.00	4.00	3.50	5.0	5.00	4.50	4.00	3.50	2.00	5.00	4.00	3.77	2.88	10.85	25.5%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00	3.00	3.00	5.00			2.00	3.00	3.50	5.0	5.00	4.50	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.60	2.81	10.12	25.8%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00			2.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	4.50	5.00	4.00	3.50	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.65	14.60	21.7%
6	Addresses other stocks	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00			2.00	4.00	4.00	5.0	4.00	4.00	3.50	3.50	3.00	5.00	4.00	3.87	3.27	12.64	21.0%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	3.00	2.00	3.00	4.00			2.00	4.50	4.00	4.5	4.50	3.50	4.00	0.00	2.00	4.00	1.00	3.07	4.12	12.63	45.2%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	3.00	3.00	4.00			1.00	4.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	5.00	3.50	3.80	4.04	15.35	32.2%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00			1.00	4.50	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.50	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.88	15.52	27.1%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	4.00	2.00	3.00	3.00			3.00	4.00	4.00	5.0	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.60	3.62	13.03	20.5%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00			3.00	4.50	4.00	5.0	4.50	5.00	4.50	4.50	3.50	5.00	5.00	4.37	3.23	14.10	16.5%
12	Project Readiness	4.00	2.50	1.00	5.00			0.00	2.00	4.00	4.0	3.00	2.50	3.50	2.50	3.50	3.00	5.00	3.03	2.85	8.65	45.1%
Mean		4.05	2.93	3.47	4.39			2.05	4.05	4.01	4.80	4.39	4.39	3.80	3.22	3.05	4.39	3.93	Overall Weighted Score		156.73	
CoV		11.5%	22.7%	30.1%	14.8%			56.7%	20.2%	8.1%	6.8%	14.8%	17.7%	13.6%	37.0%	26.4%	17.7%	28.3%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N			Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 Project 14107 narrative needs updating? (e.g. how did the Dawley construction phase of 2016 go? Is it complete?). Other phases need to be listed.
 not clear if this is a larger project or just the Dawley...will assume Dawley. Limiting factor analysis is partially compelling, but 9% armor limiting for two relatively small creeks? Assuming Dawley for readiness purposes
 Project14107 Sequim Bay Shoreline Restoration is specific to an already completed project (Dawley) and includes no information on other properties.
 Narrative does not address next phases after Dawley, witch is complete.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	4.09
SD of all Scores:	0.63
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.25916
Mean - 2 X:	2.83
Mean + 2 X:	5.35

Workplan Projects

North Sequim Bay Drift Cell Conservation
Project

168.80

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09093

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639		4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.64	2.96	13.73	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	5.00	3.00	4.50	3.00		4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.50	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.19	4.08	17.09	19.4%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	4.00	3.00	5.00	3.00		5.00	3.00	3.50	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.50	2.00	5.00	4.00	4.09	2.88	11.79	23.3%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	4.00	3.00	4.50	5.00		3.00	3.00	3.50	4.00	4.5	5.00	5.00	3.00	4.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.94	2.81	11.06	19.6%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00	3.00	4.50	5.00		4.00	3.00	3.50	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.00	4.50	3.00	4.50	5.00	4.19	3.65	15.28	19.9%
6	Addresses other stocks	5.00	3.00	4.50	5.00		3.00	3.00	3.50	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	3.00	3.60	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.10	3.27	13.41	22.3%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	5.00	2.00	4.00	4.00		5.00	5.00	4.00	4.50	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.12	17.90	23.3%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	4.00	3.00	4.50	2.00		0.00	0.00	3.00	4.00	4.0	5.00	5.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.91	4.04	11.74	52.6%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00		0.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	4.13	3.88	16.01	33.0%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00		4.00	4.00	3.50	4.50	5.0	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.22	3.62	15.27	15.0%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00		5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.0	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	4.59	3.23	14.84	14.4%
12	Project Readiness	4.00	2.50	5.00	4.00		5.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.0	5.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	3.75	2.85	10.69	28.8%
Mean		4.55	3.01	4.68	4.22		3.55	3.39	3.84	4.05	4.76	4.89	4.80	3.59	3.98	3.05	4.68	4.39	Overall Weighted Score		168.80	
CoV		11.0%	19.9%	6.9%	24.6%		50.9%	39.7%	18.2%	10.2%	8.3%	6.1%	8.1%	27.4%	26.0%	26.4%	13.1%	17.7%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 Nice project, built around the same structure as the Dungeness assessment. This one is obviously not as far along, and doesn't have that same relationship to shallow water habitat as the dungeness project does...which influenced my scoring a bit. Readiness for the first phase seems high??

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.14
SD of all Scores:	0.70
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.39999
Mean - 2 X:	1.74
Mean + 2 X:	4.54

Workplan Projects

Chicken Coop Road Culvert Replacement
Project

128.36

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

11094

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17				
1	Watershed Priority	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.57	2.96	4.64	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.00	3.00	5.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	5.0	3.00	4.00	4.50	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.74	4.08	15.24	28.4%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	3.50	4.00	3.0	5.00	4.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.94	2.88	11.35	24.9%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.00	2.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	3.50	5.0	4.50	3.50	3.00	2.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.62	2.81	10.17	23.7%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	3.00	0.50	4.50	1.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.0	4.00	3.50	3.00	2.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	2.68	3.65	9.77	51.1%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.00	2.00	4.50	4.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.0	4.00	3.50	3.00	2.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	3.41	3.27	11.16	28.0%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	3.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	3.0	3.50	0.00	2.50	0.00	0.00	4.00	1.00	1.53	4.12	6.30	104.3%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	4.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.50	5.0	4.00	3.00	3.00	2.50	0.00	5.00	5.00	3.24	4.04	13.07	42.0%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	4.00	2.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	3.50	5.0	4.00	3.00	3.50	2.50	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.44	3.88	13.35	32.8%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.00	3.00	4.0	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.50	4.00	3.50	2.68	3.62	9.69	37.3%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	4.5	4.50	3.00	4.00	1.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.74	3.23	12.07	35.8%
12	Project Readiness	4.00	2.50	5.00	5.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	5.0	4.00	5.00	4.50	3.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.06	2.85	11.57	25.0%
Mean		2.96	1.88	4.51	3.05	2.63	3.05	2.59	2.67	3.09	4.09	3.76	3.05	3.13	2.13	2.92	4.05	3.76	Overall Weighted Score		128.36	
CoV		27.0%	34.1%	21.8%	46.4%	55.5%	50.5%	39.1%	55.3%	23.3%	26.7%	24.0%	44.3%	28.7%	49.0%	55.8%	40.0%	43.6%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
 Project 11094 narrative needs updating: with the new road alignment in Blyn, were the culverts replaced/ fixed along 101 and Chicken Coop? The narrative suggests that this culvert is next one upstream of 101 or are their additional barriers between 101 and this culvert?

 so the lack of passage to this barrier makes the scores low in a number of categories...
 Chicken Coop Culvert - It's unclear from the narrative as to the status of the Hwy 101 culvert work.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	3.66
SD of all Scores:	0.68
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.351034
Mean - 2 X:	2.31
Mean + 2 X:	5.01

Workplan Projects

Clallam Watertype Inventory and Assessment

112.37

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

09053

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)	
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17					
1	Advances robust harvestable stocks	3.00	4.00	3.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.50	4.00	4.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.26	3.23	10.55	18.1%	
2	Advances implementation of recovery plan(s)	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	3.00	4.00	4.50	3.74	3.73	13.93	23.2%	
3	Advances habitat protection and restoration	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	3.50	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.50	3.50	3.00	5.00	2.00	3.91	4.05	15.84	25.3%	
4	Advances recovery of ecosystem function(s)	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.50	3.50	4.50	4.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.50	3.47	4.21	14.61	24.1%	
5	Advances ecosystem awareness	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	2.50	3.00	4.00	5.00	2.00	4.00	4.50	3.74	2.81	10.50	25.5%	
6	Advances integration	5.00	1.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	5.00	4.50	3.03	2.05	6.21	53.0%	
7	Fulfills requirements of external entities	5.00	4.00	5.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.50	4.50	5.00	4.50	3.00	0.00	5.00	5.00	3.74	1.71	6.39	37.6%	
8	Advances multi-entity funding strategy	5.00	4.00	5.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	5.00	4.00	2.50	1.00	3.00	5.00	3.32	1.81	6.02	38.7%	
9	Has large spatial scale of effects	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.50	3.50	5.00	3.50	4.00	4.50	4.00	2.50	4.50	5.00	4.00	3.38	13.52	18.2%	
10	Has large temporal scale of effects	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	3.50	3.50	4.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.38	3.38	14.81	17.4%	
Mean		4.50	3.70	4.75	3.30	3.20	3.50	2.80	2.80	3.60	4.50	3.40	3.80	4.15	3.60	2.25	4.15	4.20	Overall Weighted Score		112.37		
CoV		15.7%	25.6%	11.4%	28.7%	32.3%	15.1%	22.6%	44.7%	12.8%	10.5%	21.7%	39.8%	11.4%	26.8%	62.2%	21.3%	24.6%					
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N					

Comments
 hmmm, I see the note about recovery plans...but I didn't find anything in the recovery plans focused on this. I will accept their justification though. Not quite sure what external entity requirement is?, or multi-entity funding strategies?
 Clallam Watertype Inventory - It's unclear how long this assessment would be valid and how often it would have to be updated. 5 - 10 years? 10+ years?
 Narrative does not indicate cost of this effort, or timing.

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	5.00
SD of all Scores:	0.00
2 X SD of all Scores:	0
Mean - 2 X:	5.00
Mean + 2 X:	5.00

Workplan Projects

206.95

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

MAX SCORE

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)	
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17					
1	Watershed Priority	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.00	2.96	14.80	0.0%	
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.08	20.40	0.0%	
3	Addresses stock status and trends	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	2.88	14.40	0.0%	
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	2.81	14.05	0.0%	
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.65	18.25	0.0%	
6	Addresses other stocks	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.27	16.35	0.0%	
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.12	20.60	0.0%	
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.04	20.20	0.0%	
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.88	19.40	0.0%	
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.62	18.10	0.0%	
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.23	16.15	0.0%	
12	Project Readiness	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	2.85	14.25	0.0%	
Mean		5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	Overall Weighted Score		206.95	
CoV		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

NOPLE 2018 & 2019 Project Proposal Ranking	Date:
	18-Jan-18

Mean of all Scores:	5.00
SD of all Scores:	0.00
2 X SD of all Scores:	0
Mean - 2 X:	5.00
Mean + 2 X:	5.00

Workplan Projects

151.80

NS = No Score Given
 CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

MAX SCORE

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best																	Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)	
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14	Scorer 15	Scorer 16	Scorer 17					
1	Advances robust harvestable stocks	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.23	16.15	0.0%
2	Advances implementation of recovery plan(s)	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.73	18.65	0.0%
3	Advances habitat protection and restoration	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.05	20.25	0.0%
4	Advances recovery of ecosystem function(s)	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.21	21.05	0.0%
5	Advances ecosystem awareness	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	2.81	14.05	0.0%
6	Advances integration	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	2.05	10.25	0.0%
7	Fulfills requirements of external entities	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	1.71	8.55	0.0%
8	Advances multi-entity funding strategy	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	1.81	9.05	0.0%
9	Has large spatial scale of effects	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.38	16.90	0.0%
10	Has large temporal scale of effects	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.38	16.90	0.0%
Mean		5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	Overall Weighted Score		151.80	
CoV		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
Outside 2 Standard Deviations?		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				