

## **Evaluation Summary Memorandum**

**Application ID: 006**

**Project Name: Beaded Necklace Housatonic River Greenway**

**Consensus-Based Score: 162**

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 A1 (Natural Recovery Period), A3 (Sustainable Benefits), and A4 (Magnitude of Ecological Benefits): The proposal is for master planning and development of a detailed implementation plan for a combined bikeway/greenway. There was some uncertainty with these (and other) criteria about whether the plan that was developed would ever get built, and therefore whether injured resources would be restored. One reviewer mentioned that the plan would not be expected to degrade over time and would be valuable in the future even if it wasn't constructed immediately.
- Criterion B4 (Measurable Results): Scored low because there is no guarantee that projects "on the ground" will be developed, funded and implemented.
- Criterion C1 (Relationship of Expected Costs to Expected Benefits): Project budget scores were generally low because the project was expensive (this project would spend about 9% of all NRD funds), and was essentially a planning study. Budget seems high for what is being done – too many meetings, - too many layers of involvement.

### **Additional Review Team Comments:**

- Most of the Technical Merit criterion received high scores because reviewers believed that the application was well prepared.
- The project proposal assumes local communities can't plan on their own.
- For the most part since the roads follow the streams because of the gorging, that's where the bikeway will go. A bikeway linking trails and parks is one thing, but to use a bikeway to link boat launches is a stretch.
- If this project is funded it will be important to involve all social classes.
- The way the project is set-up, it will be four years before anything is done.
- Too many consultants; too much \$\$\$; too much of budget to salaries and overhead.

- BRPC should be in driver's seat with support from communities and VHB assistance on design as needed.
- Too much weight placed on feedback from "Delegated Rep." May not be the best or most accessible advisor for project.
- There were no support letters from communities.
- It was unclear whether the applicants were suggesting that DCR or MHD manage the consultant contract? If so, they should have been asked and included a support letter.
- Think focus should be on identifying and implementing beads –then work on necklace.
- Recommend getting clearer on overall goal - consensus & then applying for \$\$ to carry it out.

## Consensus Based Review Evaluation Summary

Application ID: 006

Project Name: Proposal for a Beaded Necklace Housatonic River Greenway

Total Score: 163

<b>A. RELEVANCE AND APPLICABILITY OF PROJECT</b>					
1. Natural Recovery Period	0	0	9	9	<b>4.5</b>
2. Location of Project	15	9	15	15	<b>13.5</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	6	10	10	10	<b>9</b>
6. Benefits to Multiple Restoration Categories	6	6	10	6	<b>7</b>
7. Enhancement of Remediation/Response Actions	3	3	5	3	<b>3.5</b>
<b>Subtotal (max=85)</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>37.5</b>

<b>B. TECHNICAL MERIT</b>					
1. Technical/Technological Feasibility	15	15	9	15	<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	6	<b>9</b>
4. Measurable Results	10	0	6	0	<b>4</b>
5. Contingency Actions	10	10	6	6	<b>8</b>
6. Administrative Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	5	5	5	5	<b>5</b>
<b>Subtotal (max=65)</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>54.5</b>

