

## **Evaluation Summary Memorandum**

**Application ID: 008**

**Project Name: Enhanced Public Access to the Housatonic River in Massachusetts  
Consensus-Based Score: 208**

Method Used to Reach Consensus: Average individual scores following discussion.

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

### **Criteria Discussed:**

- Criterion C1 (Relationship of Expected Costs to Expected Benefits): Cost of project struck the review team as being high (\$490,000).
- Criterion C2 (Implementation-oriented): A significant portion of the funds would go to the consulting company's overhead costs and profit.
- Criterion C3 (Budget Justification and Understanding): Given the scale of the proposed project, the review team felt that a more detailed budget would have been helpful. Some review team members felt that permitting, land acquisition, and construction costs were potentially under estimated.
- Criterion D6 (Public Outreach): Review team noted that the proposed project includes a significant amount of public outreach regarding site selection.

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

- While noting the potential benefits of enhancing public access to the Housatonic River, the review team had a sense that the proposed project was potentially disproportionate to the actual needs for additional access. The review team considered, for example, whether it was going to be feasible to identify 6 to 8 viable sites in the study area.
- The Housatonic Valley Association's role in the project was not clear to the review team.
- In general, the Team felt that the project should be scaled back to provide fewer sites in an effort to reduce potential costs and to ensure that the number of access points on the river was commensurate with actual needs.
  - The merit of a phased approach to the project was also discussed.
  - Some Team members noted the potential environmental impacts associated with increased public access to the river.
- The Team discussed who would be responsible for the future monitoring and maintenance of the sites. Ideally, the sites would explicitly become the responsibility of the municipality in which they are located, or they would become state-operated facilities. Regardless, the Team recommends that the future management of the sites be made more explicit.

## Consensus Based Review Evaluation Summary

Application ID: 008

Project Name: Enhanced Public Access to the Housatonic River in Massachusetts

Total Score: 208

<b>A. RELEVANCE AND APPLICABILITY OF PROJECT</b>					
1. Natural Recovery Period	9	15	15	9	<b>12</b>
2. Location of Project	15	15	15	15	<b>15</b>
3. Sustainable Benefits	9	9	9	9	<b>9</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	10	10	10	10	<b>10</b>
7. Enhancement of Remediation/Response Actions	3	5	5	0	<b>3.25</b>
<b>Subtotal (max=85)</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>59.25</b>

<b>B. TECHNICAL MERIT</b>					
1. Technical/Technological Feasibility	9	15	9	15	<b>12</b>
2. Technical Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	15	15	15	15	<b>15</b>
3. Potential for Adverse Environmental Impacts	6	6	6	6	<b>6</b>
4. Measurable Results	6	6	10	10	<b>8</b>
5. Contingency Actions	6	10	10	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>47</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>54</b>

