

Evaluation Summary Memorandum

Application ID: 005

Project Name: Lee River Walk

Consensus-Based Score: 157

Method used to reach Consensus: Average of Revised 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 A4 (Magnitude of Ecological Benefits): One reviewer pointed out that the plan lacked detail and that the proposal could result in increased invasive species colonization due to disturbance and would have scored the criterion higher had more detail been provided.
- Criterion A7 (Enhancement of Remediation/Response Actions): One reviewer viewed this criterion as strictly dealing with ongoing restoration activities. Remaining reviewers took this criterion to signify the synergistic benefits that would result from the various components of the project such as habitat improvement and improved access to the river.
- Criterion B1 (Technical/Technological Feasibility): Low scores resulted from the apparent lack of landowner permission, whereas medium scores resulted from the simplicity of the project.
- Criterion B3 (Potential for Adverse Environmental Impacts): One reviewer lowered score based on discussion concerning lack of detail in proposal.
- Criterion B4 (Measurable Results): One reviewer scored low because applicant did not demonstrate how results would be measured.
- Criterion C3 (Budget Justification and Understanding): Reviewers would have scored higher had the budget narrative been more detailed. Proposal did not describe what construction materials would be required, nor provide details on the footbridge needed to cross the intermittent stream. Two reviewers lowered scores because discussion concerning lack of detail in budget.
- Criterion C5 (Coordination and Integration): After discussion, reviewers felt criterion was not addressed and therefore scored the criterion as “Not Addressed” (0 points).
- Criterion D7 (Diverse Partnerships): Potential exists for diverse partnerships, but not adequately addressed by applicant.

Additional Comments:

- Consensus among reviewers that implementation of the proposal would provide valuable socioeconomic benefits.
- Reviewers concerned about applicant statement “Permission or agreements will be a challenge due to the diversity of landowners to be contacted.”
- Consensus among reviewers that project is vague in details.
 - There is not much detail in project design or logistics. Feasibility depends on cooperation of many parties such as land owners and the Town of Lee. It is unclear from the application that these issues have been resolved and that all parties are agreeable. The ecological benefits from the project are limited. Invasive control is mentioned but not addressed in any detail and therefore can't be properly assessed. The total project costs are quite low which is positive. However, the costs seem remarkably low for the proposed project which makes certain reviewers skeptical about completion.
- Reviewers were concerned that the letter provided by Lee Bank did not correlate well with the proposal and added to the lack of project feasibility.

Consensus Based Review Evaluation Summary

Application ID: 005

Project Name: Lee River Walk

Total Score: 157

A. RELEVANCE AND APPLICABILITY OF PROJECT					
1. Natural Recovery Period	9	9	9	9	9
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	0	9	6.75
5. Human Health and Safety	6	10	10	6	8
6. Benefits to Multiple Restoration Categories	10	6	6	10	8
7. Enhancement of Remediation/Response Actions	3	3	3	0	2.25
Subtotal (max=85)	67	61	52	58	59.5

B. TECHNICAL MERIT					
1. Technical/Technological Feasibility	9	0	9	0	4.5
2. Technical Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	0	0	0	0	0
3. Potential for Adverse Environmental Impacts	6	6	6	6	6
4. Measurable Results	6	0	6	6	4.5
5. Contingency Actions	0	0	0	0	0
6. Administrative Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	3	0	3	0	1.5
Subtotal (max=65)	24	6	24	12	16.5

