

## **Evaluation Summary Memorandum**

**Application ID: 010**

**Project Name: Proposal to Perform Bartholomew's Cobble Restoration**

**Consensus-Based Score: 203**

Method used to Reach Consensus: Average of final individual 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 B4 (Measurable Results): One reviewer raised score after a discussion that the feasibility study conclusion itself provided a measurable result. One reviewer lowered score because there was no identifiable monitoring plan described in the project proposal.
- Criterion B5 (Contingency Actions): One reviewer lowered score after a discussion of the other potential issues that could arise during the project implementation.
- Criterion C4 (Leveraging of Additional Resources): Project did an excellent job at matching funds, but was just below the agreed upon ratio for the assigned score. All felt that higher scores are justified, but could not be granted based upon the ranking criteria.
- Criterion D1 (Enhancement of Public's Relationship with Natural Resources): Majority of review team felt that there was no assurance that The Trustees of Reservations would actively support outreach of this project with defined programs, even though that is one of the Trustees of Reservations missions. Scoring this criterion required a bit of a leap beyond the project proposal.
- Criterion D5 (Complementary of Community Goals): Proposal did not directly cite that project is a priority to the community. Citation of the community master plan would have been appropriate.
- Criterion D6 (Public Outreach): Outreach is only implied for this project. It was not directly addressed how the public would be involved in this feasibility study.

### **Additional Comments:**

- There was a concern as to whether the Trustees of Reservations would have sufficient involvement with the project. There was not concurrence on this issue.
- The implementation timeline was rather confusing. If this feasibility study were implemented, it is likely that the potential ecological benefits would not be

realized unless additional NRD funding was used to pay for the actual restoration project.

- The proposal generally lacked details, partly due to its nature as a feasibility study.
- The project suffers from being a planning project only. If implementation of the restoration was certain, scores could have been much higher. If selected, would the actual restoration be funded in the second round?
- The team seems very technically capable to complete the project.
- It would have been advantageous to include other members of the Housatonic River watershed community in this proposal.

## Consensus Based Review Evaluation Summary

Application ID: 010

Project Name: Bartholomew's Cobble Restoration

Total Score: 203

<b>A. RELEVANCE AND APPLICABILITY OF PROJECT</b>					
1. Natural Recovery Period	9	9	9	9	<b>9</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	9	9	9	9	<b>9</b>
5. Human Health and Safety	10	10	10	10	<b>10</b>
6. Benefits to Multiple Restoration Categories	6	10	6	6	<b>7</b>
7. Enhancement of Remediation/Response Actions	3	0	0	0	<b>0.75</b>
<b>Subtotal (max=85)</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>59.75</b>

<b>B. TECHNICAL MERIT</b>					
1. Technical/Technological Feasibility	15	15	15	15	<b>15</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	10	<b>10</b>
4. Measurable Results	6	6	6	6	<b>6</b>
5. Contingency Actions	0	0	0	6	<b>1.5</b>
6. Administrative Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	5	5	5	5	<b>5</b>
<b>Subtotal (max=65)</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>52.5</b>

