

Evaluation Summary Memorandum

Application ID: 007

Project Name: Revitalization of the West Branch of the Housatonic River

Consensus Score: 196

To reach consensus on scores for each criterion, the Review Team either averaged the revised individual scores or decided by consensus on the group score for a criterion.

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:

Note that one of the reviewers assigned separate scores for the greenway and Mill Street Dam components of this proposal, and included a general comment recommending the separation of this proposal into two distinct proposals. At the start of the review team discussion it was clarified that the proposal should be considered as submitted. Single scores were therefore assigned by this reviewer during the consensus discussion. Discussion of changes to the scores of this reviewer are not presented here unless the final score of this reviewer was different than either of the two scores initially provided by this reviewer.

- Criterion A3 (Sustainable Benefits): One reviewer lowered score reflecting uncertainty of sustainable benefits associated with aspects of the greenway component of this proposal.
- Criterion A4 (Magnitude of Ecological Benefits): One reviewer lowered score reflecting uncertainty of ecological benefits associated with the greenway component of this proposal and some of the proposed alternatives associated with the Mill Street Dam, such as the “rock ramp.”
- Criterion B1 (Technical/Technological Feasibility): One reviewer lowered score reflecting technological feasibility of project components, such as the “rock ramp.”
- Criterion B2 (Technical Capacity of Applicant and Project Team): One reviewer lowered score.
- Criterion B3 (Potential for Adverse Environmental Impacts): While the greenway component of this proposal does not appear to have a high potential for adverse environmental impacts, the consensus score for this criterion was weighted by the potential adverse impacts associated with the Mill Street Dam component and the relative amount of requested funds associated with this component of the proposal.
- Criterion B4 (Measurable Results): One reviewer lowered score reflecting the lack of discussion on measurable results.

- Criterion B5 (Contingency Actions): One reviewer lowered score reflecting the lack of discussion on contingency actions.
- Criterion C3 (Budget Justification and Understanding): One reviewer lowered score reflecting apparent lack of detail in budget, including the apparently large lump-sum costs for work such as sediment sampling
- Criterion C4 (Leveraging of Additional Resources): One reviewer lowered score reflecting the proposed matching fund ratio.
- Criterion C5 (Coordination and Integration). One reviewer raised score reflecting apparent coordination with other activities, such as future remediation/response actions.
- Criterion D1 (Enhancement of Public's Relationship with Natural Resources): Two reviewers lowered scores reflecting lack of discussion of project benefits related to the enhancement of the public's relationship with natural resources.
- Criterion D3 (Community Involvement): One reviewer raised score reflecting the community involvement aspects of the greenway component of this proposal.
- Criterion D6 (Public Outreach). One reviewer lowered score from reflecting the apparent lack of public outreach associated with the Mill Street Dam component of this proposal.
- Criterion D7 (Diverse Partnerships): One reviewer lowered score reflecting the lack of diversity of partnerships described in this proposal.

Additional Comments:

- There was a general consensus that the two components of work described in this proposal should be separated into two distinct proposals.
- The reviewers concurred that dam removal would be the preferred approach to the Mill Street Dam component of this proposal. The "rock ramp" alternative does not appear to be technologically viable and is without precedent on the proposed scale in the Northeast.
- A number of questions regarding the Mill Street Dam component of this proposal were discussed, including:
 - Dam owner liability and cooperation with the proposed work.
 - A lack of discussion of the current condition of the dam and associated liability.
 - The apparent lack of discussion regarding the determination of a potentially responsible party as related to potentially-contaminated sediments.

Consensus Based Review Evaluation Summary

Application ID: 007

Project Name: Revitalization of the West Branch of the Housatonic River

Total Score: 196

A. RELEVANCE AND APPLICABILITY OF PROJECT					
1. Natural Recovery Period	15	15	n/a	9	12
2. Location of Project	15	15	15	15	15
3. Sustainable Benefits	9	9	9	9	9
4. Magnitude of Ecological Benefits	9	9	9	9	9
5. Human Health and Safety	10	10	10	10	10
6. Benefits to Multiple Restoration Categories	10	10	6	10	9
7. Enhancement of Remediation/Response Actions	3	3	3	3	3
Subtotal (max=85)	71	71	52	65	67

B. TECHNICAL MERIT					
1. Technical/Technological Feasibility	9	9	9	9	9
2. Technical Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	9	9	9	9	9
3. Potential for Adverse Environmental Impacts	6	6	6	6	6
4. Measurable Results	6	10	6	10	8
5. Contingency Actions	6	6	6	6	6
6. Administrative Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	5	5	5	5	5
Subtotal (max=65)	41	45	41	45	43

