

Evaluation Summary Memorandum

Application ID: 001

Project Name: Great Barrington Housatonic River Walk

Consensus-Based Score: 258

Method used to Reach Consensus: Average of individual scores following discussion.

Review Team Members: United States Fish and Wildlife Service (1) (USFWS), Massachusetts Executive Office of Environmental Affairs (EOEA) Department (2), and Woodlot Alternatives, Inc. (1)

Criteria Discussed:

- **Criterion A7 (Enhancement of Remediation/Response Actions):** One reviewer viewed this criterion as strictly dealing with ongoing remediation activities. Other reviewers took this criterion to signify the synergistic benefits that would result from the various components of the project. The consensus was that synergistic benefits would be provided by the various components of the project and the one reviewer adjusted his score accordingly.
- **Criterion B1 (Technical/Technological Feasibility):** One reviewer scored this criterion low because of concerns that compost tea application may be an inappropriate technology due to the necessity of repeated applications and the reviewer's impression that this technology does little to improve the water holding capacity of soils. Because the applicant describes the soils as being comprised of demolition debris, sand, and "other non-geologic fill", soil augmentation with organic matter may be a more appropriate technology. Consensus was not reached.
- **Criterion B4 (Measurable Results):** RE connectivity enhancement. One reviewer was of the opinion that the applicant's assertion River Walk would enhance connectivity between upstream and downstream rare species habitats was not substantiated. The criterion would have scored higher had the applicant provided specific information such as the species affected and how River Walk would enhance connectivity. The individual hoped for expansion of the width and/or length of the vegetated riparian buffer instead of merely enhancing existing riverfront area that has already been restored and is in relatively good condition.
- **Criterion C1 (Relationship of Expected Costs to Expected Benefits):** Two reviewers agreed that the proposal requests a great deal of money but the applicant's previous endeavors warrant the expenditure and the proposal will add a new dimension to the existing river walk.
- **C4 (Leveraging of Additional Resources):** Following discussion of the standards assigned to the criterion two reviewers lowered their scores.
- **D6 (Public Outreach):** Reviewers generally agreed that it would be desirable for the applicant to attempt to disseminate the knowledge and other benefits of the River Walk project to others in the Housatonic Watershed.

Consensus Based Review Evaluation Summary

Application ID: 001

Project Name: Great Barrington Housatonic River Walk

Total Score: 258

A. RELEVANCE AND APPLICABILITY OF PROJECT					
1. Natural Recovery Period	15	15	15	9	13.5
2. Location of Project	15	15	15	15	15
3. Sustainable Benefits	15	9	9	9	10.5
4. Magnitude of Ecological Benefits	9	9	9	9	9
5. Human Health and Safety	10	10	10	6	9
6. Benefits to Multiple Restoration Categories	10	6	10	10	9
7. Enhancement of Remediation/Response Actions	5	5	5	5	5
Subtotal (max=85)	79	69	73	63	71

B. TECHNICAL MERIT					
1. Technical/Technological Feasibility	15	15	15	9	13.5
2. Technical Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	15	15	15	15	15
3. Potential for Adverse Environmental Impacts	6	10	10	10	9
4. Measurable Results	10	6	10	10	9
5. Contingency Actions	10	10	10	6	9
6. Administrative Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	5	5	5	5	5
Subtotal (max=65)	61	61	65	55	60.5

