

# Winooski River Basin Clean Water Service Provider

Date: 13 February 2026

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 proposal:

1. [Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission – Preliminary Design – Lower Fairground Floodplain Restoration](#)

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-phase 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. 1. Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission – Preliminary Design – Lower Fairground Floodplain Restoration:** This proposal seeks funding to complete a Preliminary Design for the Lower Fairgrounds site in Waitsfield. The Town Selectboard and Conservation Commission support this project. The very preliminary phosphorous reduction estimate for this project is 50.7 kg / yr. At \$37,530 / kg p, this project is close to the line of what is considered cost-efficient. However, the Implementation Cost is a conservative cost estimate that is expected to decrease based on information developed during the Preliminary Design phase. The total project score of 14.16 is reasonable (albeit a bit low) for a Preliminary Design-phase project with a lot of unknowns.

**Recommendation: prioritize this funding request.**

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

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Value</b>
Funding Request	\$18,499
Future Funding Request	\$1,250,000
Total Cost	1,268,499
Phosphorous Reduction (kg / yr)	50.7
Design Life	10
Cost Effectiveness (\$ / kg)	37,530
<b>Cost-Effectiveness Score</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Cost Effectiveness Formula (\$ / kg / yr) = ((15 years / project design life) * (Total Cost)) / (Phosphorous Reduction (kg / yr))</b>	

<b>Maximum Implementation-phase Cost-Effectiveness Score = 75 points</b>
--

**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	2.5
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>7.5</b>

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

**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>0</b>	<b>30.44%</b>	<b>0</b>
Listed / Impaired Water Resource	0		
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>3</b>	<b>15.78%</b>	<b>0.4734</b>
Community Involvement	0		
Working Landscape	3		
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 1.6624</b>			

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

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

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>
Cost-Effectiveness Score	5
Project Risk Score	7.5
Design Life Score	0
Co-benefits Score	1.6624
<b>Total Project Score</b>	<b>14.16</b>