

Evaluation Summary Memorandum

Application ID: 019

Project Name: Housatonic River Floodplain Forest Restoration Project

Consensus Score: 246

Method used to reach Consensus: Average of Revised Scores following 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 A7 (Enhancement of Remediation/Response Actions): Team considered as pertaining to actual PCB remediation in the rest of river and scored this criterion as “0” because it was not addressed in the proposal.
- Criterion B1 (Technical/Technological Feasibility): General concern among review team about technical merit. Anticipated that project would be slow to start with growing pains at beginning. Project would likely require more than 3 years of funding.
- Criterion B2 (Technical Capacity of Applicant and Project Team): Team divided with two members scoring lower because of apparent lack of experience and one scoring higher because experience of certain individuals on project team made up for lack of experience by others.
- Criterion B3 (Potential for Adverse Environmental Impacts): One reviewer concerned about adverse environmental impact from spraying invasive species. Consensus was that adverse impacts would be mitigated by permitting.
- Criterion B4 (Measurable Results): One reviewer scored lower because believed that monitoring plan was not sufficient.
- Criterion B5 (contingency actions): Consensus was that there was no mechanism for finishing within 3 years and a general concern existed about what would happen if the project was not finished within the established timeline.
- Criterion B6 (Administrative Capacity of Applicant and Project Team): reviewers agreed that although Project Native is a young organization, the strength of the team members was high enough to warrant a medium score.
- Criterion C1 (Relationship of Expected Costs to Expected Benefits): Although the group was confident that Conservation Restrictions (CRs) would be put in place, there was less certainty towards the restoration of these parcels.
- D1 (Enhancement of Public’s Relationship with Natural Resources): Two reviewers scored high because of the combination of the anticipated restoration, canoe launch area, and aesthetic value. One reviewer scored medium because it is his opinion that not everyone wants land tied up in CRs.

- D4 (Potential for Adverse Socioeconomic Impacts): One reviewer was concerned that this criterion was not addressed well and that production of plant nursery stock could create competition for other local nurseries.

Additional Review Team Comments:

- Management and stewardship needed beyond project timeframe (e.g., stewardship of CRs, invasive plant control, monitoring floral and fauna response).
- Aggressive timeline for nursery/seedbank startup. Short-term habitat restoration attainable, but long-term unknown or outside project timeframe. Land protection objectives attainable. Project objectives not attainable during timeframe if contingencies need to be used (especially habitat restoration, revegetation).
- Potential for competition w/ local, private nurseries – issue not addressed.

Consensus Based Review Evaluation Summary

Application ID: 019

Project Name: Housatonic River Floodplain Forest Restoration Project

Total Score: 246

A. RELEVANCE AND APPLICABILITY OF PROJECT					
1. Natural Recovery Period	15	15	15	15	15
2. Location of Project	15	15	15	15	15
3. Sustainable Benefits	9	9	9	9	9
4. Magnitude of Ecological Benefits	15	15	15	15	15
5. Human Health and Safety	10	10	10	10	10
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)	74	74	74	74	74

B. TECHNICAL MERIT					
1. Technical/Technological Feasibility	9	15	9	9	10.5
2. Technical Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	15	15	9	9	12
3. Potential for Adverse Environmental Impacts	10	10	10	10	10
4. Measurable Results	6	10	10	10	9
5. Contingency Actions	6	6	6	6	6
6. Administrative Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	3	3	3	3	3
Subtotal (max=65)	49	59	47	47	50.5

