

## **Draft Evaluation Summary Memorandum**

**Application ID: 020**

**Project Name: Rehabilitation of Forest Roads and Trails in the Housatonic River Watershed**

**Consensus-Based Score: 173**

Method Used to Reach Consensus: Average of individual scores.

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 B3 (Potential for Adverse Environmental Impact): Needs to be consistent project/contractor oversight to ensure that best/appropriate conservation management practices are followed otherwise potential exists for adverse environmental impacts.
- Criterion C3 (Budget Justification and Understanding): Much concern that project requests a sizeable budget of \$2 million, but the details of the budget are seriously lacking. This is a very expensive project and does not appear to provide adequate justification. One review team member mentioned that it looks as though the project is requesting a large sum of money that will basically be handed directly over to a contractor for the work.
- Criterion C4 (Leveraging of Additional Resources): Concern raised regarding the project being solely dependent on grants and bonds and the impact that could have on long-term stewardship (Criterion D2 – Fostering Future Restoration and Stewardship). It is not clear what will become of this project in the future.
- Criterion D3 (Community Involvement): One reviewer felt that the proposal did not talk about community involvement. Another pointed to the project goal to, “enhance safe and environmentally sound access opportunities for recreation use.” The review team conceded that given the criterion, “Projects should demonstrate how the community would be involved, such as through hands-on habitat restoration, science-based monitoring and/or training” the project does not provide opportunities for community involvement. It was noted that on page 9 of the proposal, it states “This proposed rehabilitation project does not complement any existing plans that incorporate public input and involvement.”

### **Additional Comments from Review Team:**

- Consistent concerns were raised about the lack of
  - partnerships beyond Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation,
  - an outreach component beyond the recreational survey, and
  - a long term maintenance plan.
- The review team feels the benefits of the project to the Housatonic watershed are clear.
- It is commonly understood that Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation is lacking necessary funding to provide for proper maintenance of roads and trails.
- The need for a project such as this is evident.

- Concept of the proposal is good, but the proposal itself is lacking attention to detail.
- Team questions whether the applicant is fully committed to the project at this time.
- The review team recommends the applicant reexamine this proposal, enhance the outreach and public involvement components, provide detailed justification for the \$2 million budget, and re-submit this proposal in Round 2.

**FINAL Consensus Based Review Evaluation Summary**

**Application ID: 020**

**Project Name: Rehabilitation of Forest Roads and Trails in the Housatonic River Watershed**

**Total Score: 173**

| <b>A. RELEVANCE AND APPLICABILITY OF PROJECT</b> |           |           |           |           |              |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------|
| 1. Natural Recovery Period                       | 15        | 9         | 15        | 9         | <b>12</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   | 10        | 10        | 10        | 6         | <b>9</b>     |
| 7. Enhancement of Remediation/Response Actions   | 0         | 5         | 3         | 3         | <b>2.75</b>  |
| <b>Subtotal (max=85)</b>                         | <b>68</b> | <b>67</b> | <b>71</b> | <b>61</b> | <b>66.75</b> |

| <b>B. TECHNICAL MERIT</b>                                |           |           |           |           |             |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| 1. Technical/Technological Feasibility                   | 15        | 15        | 15        | 9         | <b>13.5</b> |
| 2. Technical Capacity of Applicant and Project Team      | 15        | 15        | 9         | 15        | <b>13.5</b> |
| 3. Potential for Adverse Environmental Impacts           | 10        | 10        | 10        | 6         | <b>9</b>    |
| 4. Measurable Results                                    | 6         | 10        | 6         | 6         | <b>7</b>    |
| 5. Contingency Actions                                   | 6         | 10        | 6         | 6         | <b>7</b>    |
| 6. Administrative Capacity of Applicant and Project Team | 5         | 5         | 3         | 5         | <b>4.5</b>  |
| <b>Subtotal (max=65)</b>                                 | <b>57</b> | <b>65</b> | <b>49</b> | <b>47</b> | <b>54.5</b> |

