

Evaluation Summary Memorandum

Application ID: 016

Project Name: Old Mill Trail

Consensus-Based Score: 227

Method Used to Reach Consensus: Average individual scores.

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 Discussion:

- Criterion A2 (Location of Project): Review Team concluded that this was a worthy project in close proximity to the Housatonic River.
- Criterion A4 (Magnitude of Ecological Benefits): One reviewer felt that there would be no measurable ecological benefit associated with the project and elected to not indicate a score
- Criterion A7 (Enhancement of Remediation/Response Actions): Review Team gave no points for criterion, but concluded that it wasn't possible for the applicant to identify such opportunities given that remediation/response actions have yet to be defined.
- Criterion B3 (Potential for Adverse Environmental Impacts): Review Team recognized that there would be minor ecological impacts associated with increased human use in the riparian corridor.
- Criterion C1 (Relationship of Expected Costs to Expected Benefits): Budget struck the Team as somewhat high and some concern was expressed over the proportion of the budget devoted to salaries, benefits, and overhead. A more detailed budget justification, therefore, may be warranted.
- Criterion C3 (Budget Justification and Understanding): Budget amount for permitting struck some Team members as low.
- Criterion C3 (Budget Justification and Understanding): \$84,000 of committed non-NRD funding was credited to the Crane & Company Conservation Restriction. Means of establishing the fair market value of easement, however, was not explained (see Review Team Guidance for Criterion C.3., which requires the applicant to have an independent appraisal of the property).

Additional Comments:

- In general, Team members gave relatively similar scores for each criterion and there were no points of contention regarding the consensus scores.

- While recognizing that both towns support the project, the Review Team recommends seeking explicit assurance from both towns that they would be responsible for maintaining the trails and bridges.
- Concern was expressed regarding the fate of the project if a safe crossing of Route 8 can't be accomplished. The Team recommends, therefore, asking the applicant to seek input from the appropriate local and State highway officials prior to funding the project.

Consensus Based Review Evaluation Summary

Application ID: 016

Project Name: Old Mill Trail

Total Score: 227

A. RELEVANCE AND APPLICABILITY OF PROJECT					
1. Natural Recovery Period	15	15	9	15	13.5
2. Location of Project	15	15	15	15	15
3. Sustainable Benefits	9	9	9	9	9
4. Magnitude of Ecological Benefits	9	9	0		6
5. Human Health and Safety	10	10	6	6	8
6. Benefits to Multiple Restoration Categories	10	10	10	10	10
7. Enhancement of Remediation/Response Actions	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal (max=85)	68	68	49	55	61.5

B. TECHNICAL MERIT					
1. Technical/Technological Feasibility	15	15	15	15	15
2. Technical Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	9	15	15	15	13.5
3. Potential for Adverse Environmental Impacts	6	6	6	6	6
4. Measurable Results	10	10	6	10	9
5. Contingency Actions	6	10	6	6	7
6. Administrative Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	5	5	5	5	5
Subtotal (max=65)	51	61	53	57	55.5

