



c/o Chittenden County RPC
 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202
 Winooski, VT 05404
www.ccrpcvt.org/northern-lake-champlain-cwsp/
 802-861-0133

Date: April 16, 2024

To: Basin 5 Water Quality Council

CC: DEC staff and subgrant applicants

Re: Staff recommendation: applications for Water Quality Formula Subgrants, 4/8/24 Round

Attached is a 3-page PDF showing how I scored the two requests we received for this round: 1) Wolcott Family Natural Area - Floodplain Restoration - Preliminary Design 2) UVM Hort Farm – Floodplain Restoration-Implementation. *Note that pursuant to Act 76 Rule and Guidance, the Council may adjust the co-benefit scores if it disagrees with my scoring.* Relative scoring of **Design or Construction** projects received is as follows:

	P-reduction	Co-Benefits	Other Considerations	Total	BWQC mtg date & action
<i>Projects below assessed on following P-reduction metric: an annual average cost-per-kilograms-p-reduction (\$-per-kg) of around \$25,000 and used a phosphorus scoring methodology whereby a project with a cost higher than \$50,000-per-kg scored zero points.</i>					
Wolcott Family Natural Area – Floodplain Reconnection – Preliminary Design [MAX COST SCENARIO]	10	7	8	25	4/18, _____
Wolcott Family Natural Area – Floodplain Reconnection – Preliminary Design [LOW COST SCENARIO]	20	7	8	35	4/18, _____
UVM Hort Farm – Floodplain Restoration - Construction	40	9	10	59	4/18, _____
Fairfax St. Culvert - Floodplain Restoration - Preliminary Design	30	4	8	42	3/24, Fund in full
<i>Projects below assessed on following P-reduction metric: an annual average cost-per-kilograms-p-reduction (\$-per-kg) of around \$13,000 and used a phosphorus scoring methodology whereby a project with a cost higher than \$25,000-per-kg scored zero points.</i>					
UVM Hort Farm – Floodplain Restoration - Construction	40	9	10	59	11/23, fund in part
McCabe’s Brook – Process-Based Restoration – Preliminary Design	40	4	0	44	2/23, Fund in full
Falls Road Trail Design – Final Design	70	1	6	77	2/23, Fund in full
Mill River Road, SE – Infiltration Chamber & Gully Restoration Design – Final Design	30	3	2	35	2/23, Fund in full
Mill River Road, NW – Regrading & Plunge Pool	10	3	2	15	2/23, denied

Our recommendation is to fund both projects for the following reasons:

DEC guidance that you cannot initially claim more than 10 years hurts the p-reduction scoring for both. The small investment for the Wolcott project is worth it however as this project has good potential for lower-cost construction methods and has high public visibility. The UVM request is justified on the basis of our now more flexible p-reduction scoring methodology.

NEW PHOSPHORUS-REDUCTION SCORING METRIC, AUTHORIZED BY CWSP, MARCH 1, 2024

			1. Cost effectiveness relative to Basin 5 target & available funds						
			Total cost	Annual Avg (kg/yr)	\$/kg	Design Life		\$/kg./yr.	
PROJECT	Request	\$ needed for 1) further design & 2) Construction	Total cost	Annual Avg (kg/yr)	\$/kg	15	* if life > 15	COST-EFFECTIVENESS per Chpt 6	70 POINTS
Example Project	\$20,000	\$60,000	\$80,000	3.00	\$26,667	15	15	\$26,667	40
Wolcott Family Natural Area - Floodplain Reconnection-PD [MAX COST]	\$8,000	\$32,000	\$40,000	1.02	\$39,216	12	15	\$49,020	10
Wolcott Family Natural Area - Floodplain Reconnection-PD [LOW COST]	\$8,000	\$23,000	\$31,000	1.02	\$30,392	12	15	\$37,990	20
UVM Hort Farm -Floodplain Restoration-Implementation	\$84,600	\$0	\$84,600	3.60	\$23,500	12	15	\$29,375	40

COST EFFECTIVENESS FORMULA (\$/kg/yr) = (15 years/design life years of your project) * (total capital project cost (dollars) for design and construction) / (annual average total phosphorus source load reduction (kg/yr)).

[P-reduction reduced relative to available funds, cost-effectiveness P-reduced per dollar, cost relative to design life phosphorus reduction benefits \(estimated using DEC protocols, cost-effectiveness relative to project type, etc.](#)

If design life greater than 15 years, just enter 15

* Note: Metric changed between version issued in Jan 2023 and this March 2024 version.

Scoring Scale	
< \$14,000	70
< \$20,000	60
< \$26,000	50
< \$32,000	40
< \$38,000	30
< \$44,000	20
< \$50,000	10
> \$50,000	0

Co-Benefit Scores

Scoring Template for Co-Benefits, as finalized, 8-17-2023

Benefit	Range	Weight, 1 or 2	Max Score		Wolcott Family NA	UVM Hort Farm
Hazard Mitigation	1-4	2	8		4	4
Education	1-4	2	8		4	4
Ecosystem Improvement	1-4	2	8		2	4
Habitat Improvement	1-4	2	8		1	4
Environmental Justice	1-4	2	8		0	0
Community Support	1-3	2	6		6	6
Other Benefits	1-4	1	4		1	1
		MAX	50		18	23
	Conversion to 20 point scale	>>>>	20		7	9

* Note: Co-Benefit matrix changed between version used in February 2023 and version finalized in August 2023

Scoring Template for Other Considerations

As issued by CWSP, January 2023

Proposed phase of project funding, certainty of costs in proposal, potential complications, demonstrated ability/experience of applicant to complete project, relative commitment of landowner to project phases, project operations & maintenance costs, design life beyond 15 years, conformance with Basin 5 Plan

						Possible points		Wolcott Family Natural Area	UVM Hort Farm
	Positive Scores								
	Construction proposal >>>					8			8
	Final Design proposal >>>					4			
	Conceptual Design proposal					0	0		
	Design life 16-20 years					2			
	Design life 21+					4	4		4
	Provides match up to 10% of overall budget					2			
	Provides match over 10% of overall budget					4	4		4
	Provides match over 20% of overall budget					6			
	Provides match over 30% of overall budget					8			
	Negative scores								
	Minor uncertainties in budget					-2			
	Major uncertainties in budget					-4			
	Minor but passable potential barriers					-4			
	Major potential barriers to implementation					-8			
	Key Landowner letter/email is missing					-4			
	Landowner commitment letter weak					-2			
	O & M costs exceed \$2,000 per year					-4			
	Project not in conformance with Basin 5 Plan					-10			
	Applicant has little applicable experience					-4			
							TOTAL	8	16
							MAX IS 10		