

**Housatonic River Natural Resource Damages Fund**  
Round 3, SubRound 2 Restoration Project Proposals for  
Land Acquisition to Conserve Habitat  
Doc. No. BWSC-NRD-2015-03

**EVALUATION SUMMARY**

**Project Name:** Lime Kiln Farm Wildlife Sanctuary (Proposal No. 308)

**Consensus-Based Score:** 245

Review Team Members: United States Fish and Wildlife Service (2), Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (2), Massachusetts Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (1), Massachusetts Department of Agricultural Resources (1), and Stantec Consulting Services Inc. (1).

**Summary of Criteria Discussed:**

- **Criterion A1 (Natural Recovery Period):** Multiple reviewers expressed that protection of land in perpetuity provides restoration benefits in advance of the natural recovery period because protection in perpetuity is not otherwise guaranteed and because land acquisition is a relatively “quick” action whereas other restoration actions can take a long time. One reviewer expressed that much of this parcel didn’t seem to have high probability / risk of development. One reviewer also noted that this criterion isn’t a strong fit for land protection projects. Unanimity among individual scores was not achieved in the course of the discussion, but all reviewers expressed consensus that the final individual scores yielded an acceptable average score for the criterion.
- **Criterion A3 (Sustainable Benefits):** One reviewer expressed that recurring land management needs seemed likely. Other reviewers felt that long-term self-sustaining benefits would be provided even without human maintenance or management. Unanimity among individual scores was not achieved in the course of the discussion, but all reviewers expressed consensus that the final individual scores yielded an acceptable average score for the criterion.
- **Criterion A4 (Magnitude of Ecological Benefits):** One reviewer expressed that they felt the project would provide only a moderate level of ecological benefits because portions of the land seem to have a low probability of development and thus may provide long-term conservation benefit without additional protections. Other reviewers expressed the opinion that the project would provide a high level of ecological benefit based on proximity to sensitive habitat. Unanimity among individual scores was not achieved in the course of the discussion, but all reviewers expressed consensus that the final individual scores yielded an acceptable average score for the criterion.
- **Criterion A7 (Enhancement of Remediation / Response Actions):** Reviewers discussed that the “enhancement of remediation/response actions” refers to USEPA actions addressing PCB clean-up, and agreed that this project does not appear to have a direct nexus with or enhance remediation/response actions.
- **Criterion B4 (Measurable Results):** Some reviewers expressed that specific, measurable results might be limited due to low risk that portions of the land would be developed. Other reviewers felt that the project included numerous measurable aspects (e.g., acreage) and that these provided the potential for quantifiable results. Unanimity among individual scores was not achieved in the course of the discussion, but all reviewers expressed consensus that the final individual scores yielded an acceptable average score for the criterion.
- **Criterion B5 (Contingency Actions):** Reviewers discussed differing opinions regarding contingency actions. One reviewer expressed that the proposal did not appear to include a contingency plan for additional funding or support if such a need were subsequently identified. Other reviewers noted that that due diligence that would subsequently be conducted for selected proposals includes an appraisal and that this would assist in confirming project viability relative to existing resources. Unanimity among individual scores was not achieved in the course of the discussion, but all

reviewers expressed consensus that the final individual scores yielded an acceptable average score for the criterion.

- **Criterion C1 (Relationship of Expected Costs to Expected Benefits):** Reviewers agreed that the project's qualitative cost-benefit relationship demonstrates net benefits, and some reviewers thought that the proposal demonstrated a high net benefit based on factors including acreage, nexus to sensitive habitat, and cost. Unanimity among individual scores was not achieved in the course of the discussion, but all reviewers expressed consensus that the final individual scores yielded an acceptable average score for the criterion.
- **Criterion C3 (Budget Justification and Understanding):** Reviewers expressed a range of opinions regarding this criterion. One reviewer identified that the proposal requested funding for an appraisal but noted that an appraisal had already been conducted. Some reviewers expressed that the budget did not appear strongly justified, while others felt that the budget was appropriately detailed and justified. Unanimity among individual scores was not achieved in the course of the discussion, but all reviewers expressed consensus that the final individual scores yielded an acceptable average score and appropriately reflected the lack of clarity in the budget.
- **Criterion D1 (Enhancement of Public's Relationship with Natural Resources):** The reviewers discussed that the proposal addressed the topic of public access, and most reviewers felt that this parcel would enhance the public's ability to use, enjoy, or benefit from the watershed. One reviewer felt that the extent of the potential to enhance the public's relationship with the watershed was not clear. Unanimity among individual scores was not achieved in the course of the discussion, but all reviewers expressed consensus that the final individual scores yielded an acceptable average score for the criterion.
- **Criterion D2 (Fostering Future Restoration and Stewardship):** Most reviewers felt the project would clearly support ongoing environmental stewardship and provide a foundation of future restoration activities. One reviewer agreed, but felt the extent of the potential to encourage future restoration/stewardship was not clear and thus the effect might be "limited". Unanimity among individual scores was not achieved in the course of the discussion, but all reviewers expressed consensus that the final individual scores yielded an acceptable average score for the criterion.
- **Criterion D3 (Community Involvement):** The reviewers discussed that the proposed project does appear to include community involvement opportunities in some stages of the project's life, and a majority of reviewers felt that these opportunities were "significant and meaningful". One reviewer noted that the proposal references future use of volunteer base to implement natural resource management projects. Unanimity among individual scores was not achieved in the course of the discussion, but all reviewers expressed consensus that the final individual scores yielded an acceptable average score for the criterion.
- **Criterion D5 (Complementary with Community Goals):** The reviewers discussed and generally agreed that the project has the potential to complement aspects of community goals, needs, and/or recommendations in existing plans that incorporated public input in their development. One reviewer felt that, while the proposal mentions the Town Master Plan, it did not specifically discuss how the project would complement its goals and, for this reason, provided a "medium" score instead of a "high" score. Unanimity among individual scores was not achieved in the course of the discussion, but all reviewers expressed consensus that the final individual scores yielded an acceptable average score for the criterion.
- **Criterion D6 (Public Outreach):** Reviewers discussed that the proposal included general mention of public outreach (e.g., referencing opportunity to improve habitat and recreational values in partnership with state agencies, town officials, environmental groups educational groups and other organizations); however, many reviewers felt that sufficiently detailed information (e.g., "clear plans for conducting public outreach") was not provided to warrant a "high" score. Unanimity among individual scores was not achieved in the course of the discussion, but all reviewers expressed consensus that the final individual scores yielded an acceptable average score for the criterion.

- **Criterion D7 (Diverse Partnerships):** The reviewers discussed that the proposal did not identify partners, though the proposal did mention potential future coordination with other entities. Most reviewers felt that the proposal did not appear to demonstrate “considerable diversity of partners contributing directly to the project” or to “demonstrate some diversity in direct contributions”. Unanimity among individual scores was not achieved in the course of the discussion, but all reviewers expressed consensus that the final individual scores yielded an acceptable average score for the criterion.

# Evaluation Scoring Summary

Project Name: **Lime Kiln Farm Wildlife Sanctuary**

Project Score: **245**

CATEGORY & CRITERIA	EVALUATION SCORES							
	GR1	GR2	GR3	GR4	GR5	GR6	GR7	Average
<b>A. RELEVANCE AND APPLICABILITY OF PROJECT</b>								
1. Natural Recovery Period	9	15	15	9	15	9	15	<b>12</b>
2. Location of Project	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	<b>15</b>
3. Sustainable Benefits	15	15	15	15	9	9	15	<b>13</b>
4. Magnitude of Ecological Benefits	15	15	15	15	15	9	15	<b>14</b>
5. Human Health and Safety	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	<b>10</b>
6. Benefits to Multiple Restoration Categories	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	<b>10</b>
7. Enhancement of Remediation/Response Actions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Subtotal (max=85)</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>B. TECHNICAL MERIT</b>								
1. Technical/Technological Feasibility	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	<b>15</b>
2. Technical Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	<b>15</b>
3. Potential for Adverse Environmental Impacts	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	<b>10</b>
4. Measurable Results	6	10	10	10	10	6	10	<b>9</b>
5. Contingency Actions	6	10	10	6	10	10	6	<b>8</b>
6. Administrative Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	<b>5</b>
<b>Subtotal (max=65)</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>C. PROJECT BUDGET</b>								
1. Relationship of Expected Costs to Expected Benefits	9	15	15	9	15	9	15	<b>12</b>
2. Implementation-Oriented	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	<b>15</b>
3. Budget Justification and Understanding	15	0	9	9	9	15	15	<b>10</b>
4. Leveraging of Additional Resources	3	3	3	0	3	3	3	<b>3</b>
5. Coordination and Integration	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	<b>5</b>
<b>Subtotal (max=60)</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>D. SOCIOECONOMIC MERIT</b>								
1. Enhancement of Public's Relationship w/ Natural Resources	15	15	15	9	15	15	15	<b>14</b>
2. Fostering Future Restoration and Stewardship	15	15	15	9	15	15	15	<b>14</b>
3. Community Involvement	15	15	15	0	9	15	9	<b>11</b>
4. Potential for Adverse Socioeconomic Impacts	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	<b>10</b>
5. Complementary with Community Goals	10	10	10	10	10	10	6	<b>9</b>
6. Public Outreach	3	5	5	0	3	5	3	<b>3</b>
7. Diverse Partnerships	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
<b>Subtotal (max=75)</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Total Score (max=285)</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>245</b>