



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
<i>Example Project</i>	\$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		