

# Winooski River Basin Clean Water Service Provider

Date: 12 October 2024

To: Winooski Basin Water Quality Council

Re: Winooski Basin Clean Water Service Provider Staff recommendation for project prioritization & funding

This memo offers funding recommendations for the following three proposals:

1. Lamoille County Conservation District – Upper Little River Project Development
2. Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission – Berlin Riparian Buffer and Culvert Replacement Project Development
3. Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission – Marshfield Road Stormwater Gully Final Design

Project development proposals were evaluated on the likelihood of successfully identifying water quality restoration projects that can be advanced through implementation using Formula Grant funds. Design- and implementation proposals were evaluated using the following criteria: Cost effectiveness of phosphorous reduction (75 points), Project Risk (10 points), Design Life (5 points) and Co-benefits (10 points).

For a more detailed description of the Design- and Implementation-phase project proposal review process, refer to the [Co-benefits scoring methodology](#), the March 2023 Clean Water Service Provider [presentation](#) to the Winooski Basin Water Quality Council and the [minutes](#) from that meeting. Assessment / Identification and Development-phase projects are scored according to their likelihood of success in identifying cost-efficient, non-regulatory water quality improvement projects in the Winooski Basin.

## Funding Recommendations

- 1. Lamoille County Conservation District – Upper Little River Project Development:** This proposal seeks funding to conduct project scoping for up to 15 riparian buffer, stream / floodplain restoration, river corridor easement and wetland restoration projects in the Lamoille County portion of the Upper Little River Watershed. ***The budget estimate for this project has been revised.*** The original budget request was for \$15,000 with a \$5,000 match from the

Lamoille County Conservation District. The revised budget request is for \$30,000 with a \$5,000 match from the Lamoille County Conservation District. **Recommendation: prioritize this funding request.**

**2. Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission – Berlin Riparian Buffer and Culvert Replacement Project Development:**

This proposal seeks funding to conduct project scoping for up to 20 projects in Berlin within the Dog River and Steven’s Branch sub-watersheds. Specific project development will be completed for 3 – 5 of the highest priority projects identified through this effort. The Berlin Conservation Commission and Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission Staff have identified a preliminary list of projects and are actively soliciting additional projects for consideration via a public outreach campaign. **Recommendation: prioritize this funding request.**

- 3. Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission – Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission – Marshfield Road Stormwater Gully Final Design:** This proposal seeks funding to complete a final engineering design for a gully stabilization project along Marshfield Road in Calais. The original proposal requested funds for preliminary design work at this site. Following a consultation with the Basin Planner, Department of Environmental Conservation staff determined that due to the relative simplicity of the project a preliminary engineering design was not necessary. ***As a result, the budget estimate for this project has been revised.*** The revised budget request is \$5,979. The anticipated total project cost (including implementation-phase expenses) is well below the cost-effectiveness rate necessary to achieve the phosphorous-reduction target for the basin. **Recommendation: prioritize this funding request.**

**Table 1-1: Cost-Effectiveness Score**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Value</b>
Funding Request	\$5,979
Future Funding Request	\$35,000
Total Cost	\$40,979
Phosphorous Reduction (kg / yr)	4.87
Design Life	15
Cost Effectiveness (\$ / kg)	\$8,415
<b>Cost-Effectiveness Score</b>	<b>37.5</b>

**Cost Effectiveness Formula (\$ / kg / yr) = ((15 years / project design life) \* (Total Cost)) / (Phosphorous Reduction (kg / yr))**

**Maximum Design-Phase Cost-Effectiveness Score = 37.5 points**

**Table 1-2: Project Risk Score**

<b>Risk Category</b>	<b>Points</b>
Landowner Relations	2.5
Organizational Capacity	2.5
Operations & Maintenance	0
Permitting	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>5</b>

**Maximum Total Score = 10 points**

**Table 1-3: Co-benefits Score**

<b>Co-benefit</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>
<b>Environmental Justice</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17.78%</b>	<b>0</b>
Income	0		
Race	0		
Language	0		
<b>Ecological Benefits</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>30.44%</b>	<b>0.9132</b>
Listed / Impaired Water Resource	3		
Priority Water Resource	0		
Habitat & Species Enhancement	0		
<b>Ecosystem Services</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>23.78%</b>	<b>1.189</b>
Flood Regulation	5		
Carbon Sequestration	0		
<b>Community Building</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15.78%</b>	<b>0</b>
Community Involvement	0		
Working Landscape	0		
Recreation	0		
<b>Education</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12.22%</b>	<b>0</b>
Interpretive Signage	0		
Meetings & Workshops	0		
<b>Total Co-benefits Score</b>			<b>2.1022</b>

<b>Maximum Weighted Score = 10 points</b>
---

**Table 1-4: Total Project Score**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>
Cost-Effectiveness Score	37.5
Project Risk Score	5
Design Life Score	5
Co-benefits Score	2.1
<b>Total Project Score</b>	<b>49.6</b>