

Evaluation Summary Memorandum

Application ID: 003

Project Name: Housatonic Environmental Literacy Program (HELP)

Consensus-Based Score: 239

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 A1 (Natural Recovery Period): There was a difference in how each of the reviewers interpreted “the natural recovery period”. Although there was disagreement on this point, all agreed that the proposal inadequately addressed this issue.
- Criterion A3 (Sustainable Benefits): Two reviewers raised scores because they felt that the school funding would provide a moderate amount of sustainable security. One reviewer lowered score because there would be an amount of human intervention that would be required for the length of the project.
- Criterion A4 (Magnitude of Ecological Effects): There was no clear demonstration of direct ecological benefits as part of this proposal.
- Criterion C1 (Relationship of Expected Costs to Expected Benefits): Two reviewers lowered scores because they felt the proposal did not demonstrate that the project demonstrated exemplary net benefits. One reviewer raised score reflecting expected net benefits pointed out by other reviewers.

Additional Review Team Comments:

- Scores were similar from most of the reviewers. Most changes were made as the group addressed items that were not considered during their individual review.
- Project would have scored higher if more partners or additional financial support from others had been secured.
- There was a question as to what the direct relationship is between biological/ecological restoration/remediation and outreach and education. Also, there was a note that the project proposal could have better linked how education and outreach would enhance the natural recovery period and provided direct ecological benefits.
- Description of sustainability of the project after the funding period expired was poorly addressed in the proposal.
- Ratio of other committed funds was rather low compared to what was being requested.

- The project describes a well structured environmental education and outreach program and has the potential to provide many indirect impacts on the restoration of the watershed.

Consensus Based Review Evaluation Summary

Application ID: 003

Project Name: Housatonic Environmental Literacy Program (HELP)

Total Score: 239

A. RELEVANCE AND APPLICABILITY OF PROJECT					
1. Natural Recovery Period	9	9	9	9	9
2. Location of Project	15	15	15	15	15
3. Sustainable Benefits	9	9	9	9	9
4. Magnitude of Ecological Benefits	0	0	0	0	0
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	3	3	3	3	3
Subtotal (max=85)	56	56	56	56	56

B. TECHNICAL MERIT					
1. Technical/Technological Feasibility	15	15	15	15	15
2. Technical Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	15	15	15	15	15
3. Potential for Adverse Environmental Impacts	10	10	10	10	10
4. Measurable Results	10	10	10	10	10
5. Contingency Actions	6	10	6	10	8
6. Administrative Capacity of Applicant and Project Team	5	5	5	5	5
Subtotal (max=65)	61	65	61	65	63

Consensus Based Review Evaluation Summary

Application ID: 003

Project Name: Housatonic Environmental Literacy Program (HELP)

Total Score: 239

C. PROJECT BUDGET					
1. Relationship of Expected Costs to Expected Benefits	9	9	9	9	9
2. Implementation-oriented	15	15	15	15	15
3. Budget Justification and Understanding	15	15	15	15	15
4. Leveraging of Additional Resources	3	3	3	3	3
5. Coordination and Integration	3	3	5	5	4
Subtotal (max=60)	45	45	47	47	46

D. SOCIOECONOMIC MERIT					
1. Enhancement of Public's Relationship with Natural Resources	15	15	15	15	15
2. Fostering Future Restoration and Stewardship	15	15	15	15	15
3. Community Involvement	15	15	15	15	15
4. Potential for Adverse Socioeconomic Impacts	10	10	10	10	10
5. Complementary with Community Goals	10	10	10	10	10
6. Public Outreach	5	5	5	5	5
7. Diverse Partnerships	3	5	5	3	4
Subtotal (max=75)	73	75	75	73	74

Total Score **235** **241** **239** **241** **239**