

Evaluation Summary Memorandum
Application ID: 009
Project Name: Aquatic Habitat Restoration
Consensus Score: 174

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 Discussion:

- Criterion A1 (Natural Recovery Period): Two of the reviewers lowered scores and one raised score for this criterion. These changes reflect the uncertainty associated with the proposed work, particularly implementation-related aspects of work.
- Criterion A2 (Location of Project): One of the reviewers raised score.
- Criterion A4 (Magnitude of Ecological Benefits): One reviewer lowered score. This change reflects the uncertainty associated with the proposed work, particularly implementation-related aspects of work.
- Criterion A5 (Human Health and Safety): One reviewer raised score, reflecting that there do not appear to be human health and safety issues associated with the work described in this proposal.
- Criterion A6 (Benefits to Multiple Restoration Categories): Two reviewers lowered scores, reflecting minimal discussion in the proposal of integration with project categories such as education and outreach.
- Criterion A7 (Enhancement of Remediation/Response Actions): Two reviewers lowered scores, reflecting minimal discussion in the proposal regarding coordination with future remediation/response actions.
- Criterion B3 (Potential for Adverse Environmental Impacts): One reviewer lowered score, reflecting minimal discussion in the proposal regarding existing pollutants in the project area and the consequent potential for adverse environmental impacts.
- 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 C1 (Relationship of Expected Costs to Expected Benefits): One reviewer raised score, reflecting potential benefits associated with implementation of this proposal while acknowledging uncertainty associated with such benefits.

- Criterion C3 (Budget Justification and Understanding): One reviewer lowered score, reflecting apparent lack of detail in budget.
- Criterion C4 (Leveraging of Additional Resources): Two reviewers lowered scores, reflecting proposed matching fund ratio.
- Criterion C5 (Coordination and Integration). One reviewer lowered score, reflecting apparent lack of coordination with other activities, such as future remediation/response actions.
- Criterion D2 (Fostering Future Restoration and Stewardship): Two reviewers changed scores, reflecting uncertainty in applicability of proposed work at fostering future restoration and stewardship.
- Criterion D3 (Community Involvement): Two reviewers changed scores, reflecting uncertainty in level of community involvement.
- Criterion D4 (Potential for Adverse Socioeconomic Impacts): Two reviewers changed scores, reflecting uncertainty in potential for adverse socioeconomic impacts.
- Criterion D6 (Public Outreach): Reviewers changed all scores, reflecting the lack of discussion whether the proposed work would be complementary with community goals.
- Criterion D7 (Diverse Partnerships): Two reviewers changed scores, reflecting the diversity of partnerships in this proposal.

Additional Comments:

- Potential benefits are unknown.
- Proposal would have benefited from coordination and input from private and public-sector resource groups. This is not mentioned in Section 4 of the proposal.
- There is uncertainty in the proposed modeling work and a lack of documentation that the model methodology would result in ecological benefits.
- The schedule and budget for the second phase of work (implementation) does not appear realistic.
- Monitoring of results could be difficult.
- There does not appear to be sufficient consideration for contingency actions, particularly with regard to permitting work.

Consensus Based Review Evaluation Summary

Application ID: 009

Project Name: Aquatic Habitat Restoration

Total Score: 174

| 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 | 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 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 7. Enhancement of Remediation/Response Actions | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Subtotal (max=85) | 61 | 61 | 61 | 61 | 61 |

| B. TECHNICAL MERIT | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 1. Technical/Technological Feasibility | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| 2. Technical Capacity of Applicant and Project Team | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| 3. Potential for Adverse Environmental Impacts | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 4. Measurable Results | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 5. Contingency Actions | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 3 |
| 6. Administrative Capacity of Applicant and Project Team | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Subtotal (max=65) | 47 | 41 | 47 | 41 | 44 |

