Winooski River Basin Clean Water Service Provider

Date: 11 July 2024

To: Winooski Basin Water Quality Council

Re: Winooski Basin Clean Water Service Provider Staff recommendation for project prioritization & funding

This memo offers funding recommendations for the following two proposals:

1. Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission – Huntington River Project Development
2. Vermont Land Trust – John Fowler Road Berm Removal Final Design.

Project development proposals were evaluated on the likelihood of successfully identifying water quality restoration projects that can be advanced through implementation using Formula Grant funds. Design- and implementation proposals were evaluated using the following criteria: Cost effectiveness of phosphorous reduction (75 points), Project Risk (10 points), Design Life (5 points) and Co-benefits (10 points).

For a more 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.

Funding Recommendations

1. **Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission:** This proposal seeks funding to conduct project scoping along the Huntington River for at least 15 projects and specific project development for three to five of those projects. Staff from the Town of Huntington, Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission and Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission collaborated to select 15 priority projects originally identified in the 2009 Huntington River Corridor Plan based on their perceived likelihood of meeting Clean Water Initiative Program Funding Policy and Winooski River Basin Water Quality Council Formula Grant cost-efficiency requirements. ***The budget estimate for this project has been revised.*** The original request estimated $30,000

for engineering contractor services, but following the close of a Request for Proposals, that amount has been reduced to $14,246. As a result, the total funding request has decreased from $35,811 to $20,058 (see the revised budget table below). **Recommendation: prioritize this funding request.**

Expense / Item	Grant Request
Applicant	
Project Management	$3,100
Mileage Charges	$201
Subcontractors	
Project Development	$14,246
Project Completion Sub-total	**$17,547**
Indirect: 81% of Salary + Benefits	$2,511
Project Completion Total	**$20,058**

2. **Vermont Land Trust:**

   Original Recommendation: 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.**

   Updated Recommendation: Based on the findings of the preliminary archaeological survey conducted during the Preliminary Design phase of this project, the Vermont Department of Historic Preservation is requiring a more extensive archaeological survey at the project site. The original budget request included $7,500 to complete the archaeological survey. Vermont Land Trust solicited a bid to complete the more in-depth survey, and the cost was $16,000 ($8,500 more than originally budgeted). Even with this added expense, the project is still cost-efficient ($11,140 / kg). The tables below reflect the revised scoring based on the increased budget request. **Recommendation: prioritize this funding request.**

Table 1-1: Cost-Effectiveness Score

Criteria	Value
Funding Request	$121,378
Prior Funding Request	$44,604
Total Cost	$165,982
Phosphorous Reduction (kg / yr)	14.9
Design Life	15
Cost Effectiveness ($ / kg)	$11,140
Cost-Effectiveness Score	**60.44**

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

Risk Category	Points
Landowner Relations	2.5
Organizational Capacity	2.5
Operations & Maintenance	0
Permitting	0
Total Score	**5**

Maximum Total Score = 10 points

Table 1-3: Co-benefits Score

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

Maximum Weighted Score = 10 points

Table 1-4: Total Project Score

Criteria	Score
Cost-Effectiveness Score	60.44
Project Risk Score	5
Design Life Score	5
Co-benefits Score	6.69
Total Project Score	**77.13**