

Winooski River Basin Clean Water Service Provider

Date: 10 April 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 – Implementation – Marshfield Road Gully Stabilization

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. Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission – Implementation – Marshfield Road Gully Stabilization:** This proposal seeks funding to stabilize a gully conveying stormwater along Marshfield Road (Calais) to prevent long-term erosion at the site. The Final Design for this project was completed using Formula Grant funding. Both the Town of Calais Selectboard and the private landowner support project implementation. The phosphorous reduction estimate for this project is 5.61 kg/yr. Operations & Maintenance requirements at this site are anticipated to be minimal. The total project score of 55.99 is acceptable for an Implementation-phase project. **Recommendation: prioritize this funding request.**

Table 1-1: Cost-Effectiveness Score

Criteria	Value
Funding Request	\$56,226
Future Funding Request	\$0
Total Cost	\$56,226
Phosphorous Reduction (kg / yr)	5.61
Design Life	10
Cost Effectiveness (\$ / kg)	\$15,034
Cost-Effectiveness Score	45
Cost Effectiveness Formula (\$ / kg / yr) = ((15 years / project design life) * (Total Cost)) / (Phosphorous Reduction (kg / yr))	

Maximum Implementation-phase Cost-Effectiveness Score = 75 points
--

Table 1-2: Project Risk Score

Risk Category	Points
Landowner Relations	2.5
Organizational Capacity	2.5
Operations & Maintenance	0
Permitting	2.5
Total Score	7.5

Maximum Total Score = 10 points
--

Table 1-3: Co-benefits Score

Co-benefit	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Environmental Justice	0	17.78%	0
Income	0		
Race	0		
Language	0		
Ecological Benefits	6	30.44%	1.8264
Listed / Impaired Water Resource	3		
Priority Water Resource	0		
Habitat & Species Enhancement	3		
Ecosystem Services	5	23.78%	1.189
Flood Regulation	5		
Carbon Sequestration	0		
Community Building	3	15.78%	0.4734
Community Involvement	3		
Working Landscape	0		
Recreation	0		
Education	0	12.22%	0
Interpretive Signage	0		
Meetings & Workshops	0		
Total Co-benefits Score 3.4888			

Maximum Weighted Score = 10 points

Table 1-4: Total Project Score

Criteria	Score
Cost-Effectiveness Score	45
Project Risk Score	7.5
Design Life Score	0
Co-benefits Score	3.4888
Total Project Score	55.99