

Evaluation Summary Memorandum

Application ID: 021

Project Name: Hazard and Debris Removal from the Housatonic River

Consensus Score: 143

To reach consensus on scores for each criterion, the Review Team either averaged the revised individual scores or decided by consensus on the group score for a criterion.

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 B2 (Technical Capacity of Applicant and Project Team): One reviewer lowered score based on clarification that this was to be reviewed as a “Project Idea.”
- Criterion C1 (Relationship of Expected Costs to Expected Benefits): One reviewer changed score to reflect that solicitation of proposals for implementation of this “Project Idea” could result in higher implementation costs. The relevance of this criterion to a “Project Idea” is questionable.
- Criterion C4 (Leveraging of Additional Resources): One reviewer lowered score during discussion. The relevance of this criterion to a “Project Idea” is questionable.
- Criterion D3 (Community Involvement): One reviewer lowered score. General discussion was that this proposal could have included additional community involvement. This is reflected in the comments presented below, particularly with regard to stakeholder input.
- Criterion D5 (Complementary with Community Goals): One reviewer lowered score reflecting the lack of proposed discussion whether the proposed work would be complementary with community goals.
- Criterion D6 (Public Outreach). One reviewer lowered score reflecting the lack of discussion whether the proposed work would be complementary with community goals.
- Criterion D7 (Diverse Partnerships): One reviewer lowered score reflecting the lack of stakeholder input.

Additional Comments:

- Proposal did not pass threshold criteria for completeness and was subsequently reviewed as a project idea.
- Question amongst reviewers whether to consider as a project idea or as a project. This question affected results of criteria such as B2 (Technical Capacity of Applicant and Project Team), which is not relevant to a project idea.

- Reviewers noted benefits of coarse woody debris (CWD) in river and questioned affects of removal.
- Reviewers noted that other project proposals involving recreational access (i.e., canoeing) on the river are somewhat contingent on clearing of pathways where debris blockage is across the entire channel of the river.
- Reviewers suggested that proposals to remove debris should include the following:
 - Stakeholder input prior to issuing a RFP based on this project idea. This could be performed during the second round of project solicitations.
 - Development of a management plan for debris removal, including an assessment of benefits associated with debris removal.
 - Trash management goals, including education outreach to limit deposition of trash into the river.
- Reviewers determined that this project should not have been funded as presented in the original proposal.

Consensus Based Review Evaluation Summary

Application ID: 021

Project Name: Hazard and Debris Removal from the Housatonic River

Total Score: 143

A. RELEVANCE AND APPLICABILITY OF PROJECT					
1. Natural Recovery Period	0	0	9	9	9
2. Location of Project	15	15	15	15	15
3. Sustainable Benefits	9	0	0	0	2.25
4. Magnitude of Ecological Benefits	0	0	0	NA	0
5. Human Health and Safety	10	6	6	6	6
6. Benefits to Multiple Restoration Categories	10	6	0	10	6.5
7. Enhancement of Remediation/Response Actions	0	3	0	3	1.5
Subtotal (max=85)	44	30	30	43	40.25

B. TECHNICAL MERIT					
1. Technical/Technological Feasibility	15	15	9	0	9.75
2. Technical Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	idea	9	0	0	3
3. Potential for Adverse Environmental Impacts	6	10	0	6	5.5
4. Measurable Results	10	6	6	6	7
5. Contingency Actions	0	0	0	0	0
6. Administrative Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	idea	0	3	0	1
Subtotal (max=65)	31	40	18	12	26.25

