

Draft Evaluation Summary Memorandum

Application ID: 012

Project Name: The River Institute

Consensus-Based Score: 193

Method used to Reach Consensus: Average of final individual scores after discussion.

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:

- Criterion A1 (Natural Recovery Period): Difference in how each of the reviewers interpreted “the natural recovery period.” Although there was disagreement on this point, all agreed that it was not clear the proposal adequately addressed this issue.
- Criterion A4 (Magnitude of Ecological Effects): Tied to criteria A1 (Natural Recovery Period), there was not agreement on the direct application of ecological recovery and effects. One reviewer raised score based on the fact that two of the reviewers scored this category “0” and that at best the reviewer felt that moderate benefits are described.
- Criterion A7 (Enhancement of Remediation/Response Actions): Two reviewers lowered scores based upon further review of the proposal and through the conversation. Consensus was that the proposal did not demonstrate that synergy between the ongoing actions in the watershed were adequately described, even though it could be assumed that such coordination would occur.
- Criterion B1 (Technical/Technological Feasibility): Two reviewers lowered scores based upon the discussion that utilization of the University laboratory alone would give them a high score. Specific techniques and tests to be applied were not adequately addressed in the proposal to ensure that methods were appropriate and directed to Housatonic River protection and cleanup. Additional information would have raised this score.
- Criterion B3 (Potential for Adverse Environmental Impacts): Two reviewers lowered scores after a third reviewer pointed out that the lack of details on the techniques left some doubt as to whether the tests performed could have a negative impact on the watershed by physically damaging ecologically sensitive areas during collection of samples.
- Criterion B5 (Contingency Actions): Two reviewers changed scores based upon consensus that contingency actions were not adequately detailed (e.g., how to determine if there are sensitive species or what to do if they are encountered).
- Criterion C2 (Implementation Oriented): Reviewers believed costs associated with general support were high, but all agreed that they were only moderate.

- Criterion C4 (Leveraging of Additional Resources): Two reviewers changed scores based upon the proposed matching funds ratio.

Additional Review Team Comments:

- The various perspectives of the reviewers led to varied views of how to interpret the reviewing criteria.
- Part of the review team felt that the proposal had the basis for a good project, however it was unclear whether additional testing outside of what EPA and DEP was needed. There was not consensus on this comment.
- Part of the review team felt that this proposal quality and detail did not align with the reputation of the Riverkeeper program and that the approach and description was unfocused. There was not a consensus on this issue.
- All agreed that the socioeconomic and educational benefits of the proposed project were the strong point and of merit.
- There were several comments that the scoring criteria of high, medium, or not addressed to be a bit restrictive for some of the sections.

Consensus Based Review Evaluation Summary

Application ID: 012

Project Name: The River Institute

Total Score: 193

A. RELEVANCE AND APPLICABILITY OF PROJECT					
1. Natural Recovery Period	0	0	9	0	2.25
2. Location of Project	15	15	15	15	15
3. Sustainable Benefits	0	0	9	0	2.25
4. Magnitude of Ecological Benefits	9	0	9	0	4.5
5. Human Health and Safety	10	10	10	10	10
6. Benefits to Multiple Restoration Categories	10	6	10	6	8
7. Enhancement of Remediation/Response Actions	3	3	3	3	3
Subtotal (max=85)	47	34	65	34	45

B. TECHNICAL MERIT					
1. Technical/Technological Feasibility	9	9	9	9	9
2. Technical Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	9	9	15	15	12
3. Potential for Adverse Environmental Impacts	6	6	10	6	7
4. Measurable Results	6	6	6	6	6
5. Contingency Actions	6	6	6	6	6
6. Administrative Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	3	3	3	3	3
Subtotal (max=65)	39	39	49	45	43

