

# Winooski Basin Clean Water Service Provider

Date: 14 June 2024

To: Winooski Basin Water Quality Council

Re: Winooski Basin Clean Water Service Provider Staff Funding  
Recommendation for FY24 Round 4 Project Solicitation – June 2024

This memo offers a funding recommendation for the proposal received in response to the FY24 Round 4 Project Solicitation. Proposals were evaluated using the following criteria: Phosphorous reduction cost-effectiveness (75%), Project Risk (10%), Design Life (5%) and Co-benefits (10%).

For a 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.

The Winooski Clean Water Service Provider has an annual budget of approximately \$1,000,000 to fund non-regulatory phosphorous-reduction projects. The annual phosphorous-reduction target is 69.6 kg / yr. The Winooski Basin Water Quality Council should consider prioritizing projects with phosphorous-reduction costs at or below the average per kilogram cost of \$14,953.

## Funding Recommendations

1. Vermont Land Trust: This proposal requests funding for both the Final Design and Implementation phases of the John Fowler Road Berm Removal project. Budgets for each phase are presented separately in the proposal package. If the Basin Water Quality Council elects to prioritize funding for this proposal, Implementation-phase funds will not be made available to Vermont Land Trust until the Final Design has been completed and reviewed to ensure the p-reduction estimate remains valid and the cost-efficiency metric is confirmed. Although the p-reduction estimate has decreased (significantly) from the Preliminary Design phase, due to its relatively low cost, this project remains cost-efficient under the current funding model. **Recommendation: prioritize this funding request.**

**Table 1-1: Cost-Effectiveness Score**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Value</b>
Funding Request	\$112,878
Prior Funding Request	\$44,604
Total Cost	\$157,482
Phosphorous Reduction (kg / yr)	14.9
Design Life	15
Cost Effectiveness (\$ / kg)	\$10,569
<b>Cost-Effectiveness Score</b>	<b>62.72</b>

**Cost Effectiveness Formula (\$ / kg / yr) = ((15 years / project design life) \* (Total Cost)) / (Phosphorous Reduction (kg / yr))**

**Maximum Design-Phase Cost-Effectiveness Score = 37.5 points**

**Table 1-2: Project Risk Score**

<b>Risk Category</b>	<b>Points</b>
Landowner Relations	2.5
Organizational Capacity	2.5
Operations & Maintenance	0
Permitting	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>5</b>

**Maximum Total Score = 10 points**

**Table 1-3: Co-benefits Score**

<b>Co-benefit</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>
<b>Environmental Justice</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17.78%</b>	<b>0</b>
Income	0		
Race	0		
Language	0		
<b>Ecological Benefits</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>30.44%</b>	<b>1.8264</b>
Listed / Impaired Water Resource	3		
Priority Water Resource	0		
Habitat & Species Enhancement	3		
<b>Ecosystem Services</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>23.78%</b>	<b>2.378</b>
Flood Regulation	5		
Carbon Sequestration	5		
<b>Community Building</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>15.78%</b>	<b>1.2624</b>
Community Involvement	2		
Working Landscape	2		
Recreation	4		
<b>Education</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>12.22%</b>	<b>1.222</b>
Interpretive Signage	5		
Meetings & Workshops	5		
<b>Total Co-benefits Score</b>			<b>6.6888</b>

<b>Maximum Weighted Score = 10 points</b>
---

**Table 1-4: Total Project Score**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>
Cost-Effectiveness Score	62.72
Project Risk Score	5
Design Life Score	5
Co-benefits Score	6.69
<b>Total Project Score</b>	<b>79.41</b>