Unified Scoring Prioritization for Stormwater Master Plans

The following table is to assist in the standardized prioritization of projects identified in a Stormwater Master Plan (SWMP).

Criteria	Score range and descriptive anchors	Max score
Water Quality/Environmental impact		
Sediment reduction (using STP Calculator or professional judgment)	0-4 (natural groupings within the range of sediment reductions for proposed projects for a specific plan. 0=very low reduction, 4= very high sediment reduction)	4
Phosphorus/nutrient reduction (using STP Calculator or professional judgment)	0-4 (natural groupings within the range of phosphorus reductions for proposed projects for a specific plan. 0=very low p reduction, 4= very high P reduction)	4
Impervious area managed	1-4 (natural groupings within the range of impervious surface managed for proposed projects for a specific plan. More impervious treated gets more points)	4
Percent of Water Quality & Channel Protection Volume treated*	0-3 (0= no WQ treated, 1= ½ WQV treated, 2=meets WQV, 3=meets WQV and CPV). Do not apply to road projects.	3
Percent of Recharge criteria met *	0-3 (0 = no infiltration, 1 =infiltrates less than recharge volume, 2= meets full recharge, 3= exceeds recharge 1.5 times or more) Do not apply to road projects.	3
Mitigation of downstream erosion	0-2 (calculate volume= Length x avg. width x avg. depth, use natural groupings to divide volume into 3 categories)	2
Tier one practice in the stormwater management manual	0-1 (0=no, 1=yes)	1
* WQV, CPV and Recharge criteria as outlined in 2017 Vermont Stormwater Management Manual		
Total Water Quality Score (out of 21)		
Other considerations/Co-benefits		
Infrastructure conflicts	(Y= 0, N=1)	1
Total Estimated Project Cost	Enter engineering estimate+ construction estimate (no points)	
Cost Effectiveness ($/kg of p/nutrient removed)	6 groups * 2 points (Use natural grouping of $/lbs. removed)	12
Ease of O&M and ease of access for O&M	0-2 (based on municipal input on what is easiest to maintain, 0=high maintenance, 2=easy maintenance)	2
Educational benefits and or Recreational benefits	(0=doesn't address concern, 1=addresses concern)	1
Natural habitat creation/protection	(0=doesn't address concern, 1=addresses concern)	1
Infrastructure improvement (culvert replacement)	(0=doesn't address concern, 1=addresses concern)	1
Connected to receiving water (current state)	0=all runoff infiltrates on site, 1= runoff receives some treatment before reaching receiving water. 2=runoff drains via infrastructure directly to receiving water with no erosion or additional pollutant loading, 3 =runoff drains directly to receiving water	3
Flood mitigation (known problem)	(0=doesn't address concern, 1=addresses concern)	1
Existing local concerns	(0=doesn't address concern, 1=addresses concern)	1
Total Co-benefits Score (out of 23)		
Feasibility Criteria		
Public land or Private Landowner support	0-3 (3=willing public land, 2=willing private landowner, 1= unknown willingness, 0=unwilling Highlight row RED if unwilling land owner[1])	3
Project and Permitting complexity (number of permits required)	0-2 (2= simple permitting, 1= complex permitting, 0= potential denial Highlight row Red)	2
Total Feasibility Score (out of 5)		
Total Water Quality Scores (out of 49)		

[1] For All tables/ matrices showing prioritization ranking please list the "Total Water quality score" and the "Total Feasibility Score" for each project And show red highlighting when projects have a landowner or permitting score of zero.