



## 2024-01-24 Otter Creek Basin Water Quality Council Agenda

Otter Creek BWQC

Wednesday, January 24 · 2:00 – 4:00pm

Video call link: <https://meet.google.com/axc-ewxt-wtt>

Or dial: (US) +1 315-784-6186 PIN: 747 516 968#

1. Amendments to the Agenda
2. Approve [Minutes](#) of October meeting
3. Review of [Round 3 Project Proposals](#)
  - a. Vermont Land Trust - riparian plantings and wetland restoration
  - b. Vermont Family Forests - erosion control on logging roads
  - c. ACRPC - New Haven River berm
  - d. Trout Unlimited - Baker Brook berm removal
  - e. Rutland NRCD - Sargent Brook berm removal
  - f. Lake Dunmore/Fern Lake Assoc. - culvert development
4. Establishing a project cost efficiency threshold  
*CWSPs and BWQCs, “are strongly encouraged to identify and publicize a minimum acceptable phosphorus reduction cost effectiveness for projects they are willing to entertain”. Guidance [Chapter 6](#), Footnote 3, Pg. 5.*
5. Funded Projects Status update
6. Next Meeting - April 24,, 2023 at 2PM



## MEMO

**TO:** Otter Creek BWQC

**FROM:** Otter Creek CWSP Staff

**DATE:** January 17, 2024

**RE:** Round 3 Proposals Received

---

*Updates from January 5 version of memo: Corrected the P reduction calculation for the proposed VLT project throughout. Correction did not affect overall score. Updated to reflect DEC eligibility determinations.*

The Round 3 call for project proposals for the Otter Creek CWSP closed on Friday December 15th. We received six proposals: two for implementation and four for design projects. **The CWSP recommends funding all proposals.** DEC has determined that all projects are eligible for CWSP funding. The rest of this memo will provide background information on each of the remaining proposals, links to more information on the proposals, and a status update on CWSP funding.

The top scoring project was a proposal from the [Vermont Land Trust](#) (VLT) for a riparian planting on two properties in Weybridge, VT. The farms have been preserved by the land trust, and the plantings would involve removing some land from active production. The project would involve planting 11.6 acres with appropriate native species as guided by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Program. Riparian buffer plantings are categorically exempt from State Historic Preservation Review. Co-benefits of the project include reduction of runoff, restoration of habitat, protection of natural communities, and promotion of biodiversity. On 01/04/2024 the Vermont Agency of Agriculture confirmed that the project is eligible for CWSP funding. Draft score: 88.

The second implementation project came in from [Vermont Family Forests](#) (VFF) to address erosion issues on logging roads on the Seth Hill forest parcel owned by the town of Bristol. Most of the logging roads on the parcel lack adequate erosion control. Recreational access to the property has reduced the effectiveness of existing erosion control structures. Forestry projects are conditionally exempt from State Historic Preservation Review, and this project does not appear to meet any of the criteria that would trigger such review. Co-benefits identified include reduction of runoff and erosion, community support, and enhanced public recreation opportunities. On 12/28/2023 the



CWSP shared additional information from the applicant with DEC in order to determine the eligibility of this project for formula grant funding. Draft score: 85.

The four remaining proposals sought funding for various levels of project development or design. These projects were assigned between two and six points for Likelihood of Success, as opposed to the ten points given to the implementation projects. Two points were given for projects in the development stage; four points for preliminary design; and six points for final design. Additionally, the CWSP needed to estimate the percent of the total project cost represented by the funding request. We estimated that the proposals would be between 10 and 15% of the overall project cost, again depending on how far along the project was. As a result, the cost effectiveness determinations for these projects are subject to change dramatically pending completion of final design and actual construction bids.

A [berm removal project along the New Haven River](#) in Bristol came in without an official sponsor, but Addison County Regional Planning Commission (ACRPC) is willing to serve as project manager. Funds would be used for project development and preliminary design of work along a 1.3 mile stretch of the river. The project manager would seek consulting assistance to consider a suite of projects including removing berms, reconnecting floodplains, reconnecting flood chutes, conserving floodplains, buying out properties, and moving or re-designing infrastructure. This project will require preliminary Historic Preservation Review. Co-benefits include reduction of flood impacts, restoration of habitat, and reduction of runoff. Draft score: 83.

[Trout Unlimited](#) (TU) proposed a riparian restoration project at the confluence of Baker Brook and the Otter Creek in Danby. The project involves improving access to the floodplain, creating a floodplain bench, and replanting with native vegetation. Applicant has requested funding for final design. The project will require final review from Historic Preservation and likely other permits before it can advance to implementation. Co-benefits include reduction of flood impacts, restoration of habitat, removal of invasive species, improved habitat for the state designated RTE, and reduction of runoff. Draft score: 82.

The [Lake Dunmore Fern Lake Association](#) (LDFLA) seeks to develop a project to upgrade two culverts that carry an unnamed tributary to Lake Dunmore underneath a private road, Indian Trail. The project was identified as high priority in the lake



watershed action plan. Culvert and bridge projects are not a priority for water quality funding, which means there are assumptions built into the P-reduction calculations that will need to be tested as the project moves toward implementation. Nonetheless, replacing structures under 50% of bankfull width, as these structures are, offers potential water quality improvements. Development projects like this are categorically exempt from Historic Preservation review requirements, though such review would be required prior to implementation. Co-benefits include increased flood resilience, prior identification in a watershed plan, and active community involvement in the project. Draft score: 78.

The [Rutland Natural Resources Conservation District](#) (RNRCD) proposed a riparian restoration and berm removal design project at the confluence of Sargent Brook and Cold River in Shrewsbury, VT. The project was identified as a high priority in the 2013 River Corridor Plan for the Cold River Watershed. The stream sections in question were historically straightened and bermed impeding access to the floodplain. A restored floodplain would help mitigate flood damage and store flood water as well as sediment. This project will require preliminary Historic Preservation Review. Co-benefits include reduction of flood impacts, restoration of habitat, reduction of runoff, and prior identification in a watershed plan. Draft score: 75.



TABLE 1: Summary of proposed round 3 projects

Applicant	Project Description	Stage	Funding Requested	Estimated P reduced when implemented (kg/yr)	Estimated Cost Efficiency (\$/kgP)	Tentative Co- benefit Score (out of 20)	CWSP Recommendation
ACRPC	Berm removal	Prelim. design	\$41,974	63.5	\$6,610	10	Fund
LDFLA	Culvert replacement	Develop	\$3,000	9.28	\$4,849	6	Fund
RNRCD	Floodplain restoration	Prelim. design	\$16,522	9.6	\$1,721	12	Fund
TU	Floodplain restoration	Final design	\$24,938	14.48	\$17,222	14	Fund
VFF	Forestry	Implement	\$15,000	34.89	\$645	5	Fund
VLT	Riparian planting	Implement	\$35,763	53.63	\$1,342	8	Fund



TABLE 2: Status of CWSP funding and P load reductions

	Dollars	P Reductions (kg/yr)	P Reductions Developed (kg/yr)
At CWSP Contract	\$930,594	83.3 (target)	
Allocated Rd. 1	\$107,359	10.5	60.95
Allocated Rd. 2	\$111,200	7.4	
Allocated: Youngs Brook Dam	\$305,400	13.57	
Requested Round 3	\$137,197	88.52	96.86
Remaining from year 1 (assuming Round. 3 projects funded)	\$269,438	0	