

**Evaluation Summary Memorandum**  
**Application ID: 004**  
**Project Name: Housatonic River Museum**  
**Consensus-Based Score: 207**

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

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

**Criteria Discussed:**

- Criterion A1 (Natural Recovery Period): General consensus among reviewers that proposal failed to make a strong connection between museum implementation and resource recovery. However, one reviewer felt that an indirect impact through environmental education warranted a medium score.
- Criteria A3 (Sustainable Benefits) and A4 (Magnitude of Ecological Benefits): Review Team scored these criteria low because a strong argument was not made linking museum activities to restoration of the watershed.
- Criterion A6 (Benefits to Multiple Restoration Categories): Review Team decided that implementation of the project could benefit both recreation and environmental education categories. Two reviewers raised scores based on discussion.
- Criterion A7 (Enhancement of Remediation/Response Actions): Three reviewers viewed this criterion as strictly dealing with ongoing restoration activities. Remaining reviewer took this criterion to signify the synergistic benefits that would result from the various components of the project.
- Criterion B4 (Measurable Results): Reviewers agreed that results could be measured in the development of a museum, but tangible “on the ground” restoration results would be difficult to quantify. Scores would have been higher had the applicant demonstrated likely improvements to the watershed that could be measured.
- Criterion B5 (Contingency Actions): Proposal is requesting \$298,100, yet \$2,389,700 would be needed to implement the entire project. Reviewers would have scored this criterion higher had they been assured that this additional funding was available.
- Criterion C1 (Relationship of Expected Costs to Expected Benefits): Reviewers would have scored criterion higher if a stronger linkage to benefits within the watershed had been created.
- Criterion C5 (Coordination and Integration): Reviewers agreed that proposal did mention some element of coordination between City of Pittsfield, and University of Massachusetts.

**Consensus Based Review Evaluation Summary**

**Application ID: 004**

**Project Name: Housatonic River Museum**

**Total Score: 207**

<b>A. RELEVANCE AND APPLICABILITY OF PROJECT</b>					
1. Natural Recovery Period	0	9	0	0	<b>2.25</b>
2. Location of Project	15	15	15	15	<b>15</b>
3. Sustainable Benefits	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
4. Magnitude of Ecological Benefits	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
5. Human Health and Safety	10	10	10	10	<b>10</b>
6. Benefits to Multiple Restoration Categories	6	10	6	6	<b>7</b>
7. Enhancement of Remediation/Response Actions	0	3	0	0	<b>0.75</b>
<b>Subtotal (max=85)</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>35</b>

<b>B. TECHNICAL MERIT</b>					
1. Technical/Technological Feasibility	15	15	15	9	<b>13.5</b>
2. Technical Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	15	15	15	15	<b>15</b>
3. Potential for Adverse Environmental Impacts	10	10	10	10	<b>10</b>
4. Measurable Results	6	10	6	6	<b>7</b>
5. Contingency Actions	0	6	6	6	<b>4.5</b>
6. Administrative Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	5	5	5	5	<b>5</b>
<b>Subtotal (max=65)</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>55</b>

