Winooski Basin Water Quality Council (BWQC)
Meeting Minutes – 21 August 2025

Winooski Basin Water Quality Council Members: ✓

NRCDs		**RPCs**	
✓	Peter Danforth, Lamoille NRCD	✓	Garret Mott, CCRPC
	Emily Porter-Goff, Alternate	✓	Lisa Cicchetti, CCRPC alternate
✓	Daniel Koenemann, Winooski NRCD		Royal DeLegge, CVRPC
✓	Lucas Goldfluss, Alternate	✓	Rich Turner, CVRPC alternate
Land Conservation Organizations		**Municipalities**	
	Erin De Vries, VT River Conservancy	✓	Annie Costandi, Essex
✓	Remy Crettol, Alternate		Vacant, Alternate
Watershed Protection Organizations		✓	Alice Peal, Waitsfield
✓	Sam Puddicombe, Friends of the Winooski River	✓	David Stapleton, Moretown, Alternate
	Michele Braun, Alternate		
	Taylor Litwin, Alternate		
	Ira Shadis, Friends of the Mad River		
✓	Julie Frost, Alternate		
	Kinny Perot, Alternate		

CVRPC Staff: Brian Voigt & Lincoln Frasca

Guests: Keith Fritschie & Chris Rotler (Department of Environmental Conservation)

Call to order & Roll call: G. Mott called the meeting to order at 1:03 PM.

Updates to agenda: A vote is needed to move S. Puddicombe into the member seat and M. Braun into the alternate seat for Friends of the Winooski River.

Public comment: None

Friends of the Mad River Alternate Seat (action):
J. Frost introduced herself and her role as Watershed Project Coordinator with Friends of the Mad River

R. Turner made motion to elect J. Frost as an alternate member for the Friends of the Mad River Watershed Organization seat, D. Stapleton seconded. All were in favor and the motion passed.

D. Koenemann made a motion to elect S. Puddicombe as the member for the Friends of the Winooski Watershed Organization seat and move M. Braun to the alternate seat, D. Stapleton seconded. All were in favor and the motion passed.

Review & approve minutes from 17 July 2025 meeting (action)
R. Turner made a motion to approve the minutes of the 17 July 2025 meeting. D. Stapleton seconded. R. Crettol abstained, all others were in favor and the motion passed.

Project Proposal Final Review (see slides)
Vermont Land Trust

Project Development on Vermont Land Trust - Conserved Land in the Winooski River Basin:

This proposal seeks funding to identify and scope up to 10 strategic wood addition, forest road & skid trail, gully stabilization or riparian buffer planting projects on lands owned by the Vermont Land Trust or encumbered by conservation easements held by the organization. Three-to-five priority projects from the list of 10 scoped projects will undergo further development. The Clean Water Service Provider (CWSP) recommendation is to prioritize funding for this project.

A. Peal asked if Vermont Land Trust would be working in coordination with the Vermont Department of Forest Parks and Recreation to mitigate erosion on forest roads and trails.
B. Voigt mentioned the trainings that have been offered through the state to train project implementors on use of the mobile app to complete Forest Road and Trail Erosion Inventories.
A. Peal asked if there are any permanent logging trails on the Vermont Land Trust lands?
B. Voigt explained that Clean Water Funding does not currently apply to full time logging roads.

J. Frost asked for more information on the meaning of the project proposal's statement that, "projects demonstrating a strong potential for phosphorus reduction will be prioritized."
B. Voigt explained that project development involves identifying promising clean water projects and progressing the most cost-effective projects to further stages of design. A larger set of projects will be scoped and prioritized based on their Phosphorus reduction potential. Priority projects with high-cost efficiency for Phosphorus will likely come back to the BWQC for a vote on design and implementation phases.

J. Frost asked if there is a low threshold for phosphorus reduction cost efficiency?

B. Voigt stated that the Basin's target rate is $15,000 per kilogram of phosphorus with the lowest threshold at which a project may still be considered for funding being $30,000 per kilogram. These rates are based on the amount of funding the CWSP receives to meet its annual phosphorus reduction target.
S. Puddicombe asked if the money spent on project development carries forward in the cost efficiency formula when scoring subsequent design and implementation proposals?
B. Voigt explained that cost efficiency calculations only account for costs incurred as part of the design and implementation phases.
K. Fritschie referenced chapter 6 page 12 of the Clean Water Guidance Document where the cost effectiveness calculation is described: Chapter 6 Clean Water Projects.pdf. He confirmed that it is just design and implementation phases that are factored into the calculation.
C. Rottler explained that the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) allocates a certain amount of funding specifically for development in their annual budget allocation to the CWSP.

S. Puddicombe mad a motion to approve $25,000 for funding the Vermont Land Trust Project Development on Vermont Land Trust Conserved Land in the Winooski River Basin. R. Turner seconded, all were in favor and none opposed. The motion passed.

Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission

Northfield Water Street – Project Adoption:

This proposal seeks funding to adopt a stormwater treatment (WPD ID #4975) at the intersection of Union and Water Streets to support Operations & Maintenance activities. The Operations & Maintenance Plan calls for the inspection of the inlet catch basin, splitter structure, manifold, isolator row and pipes and the removal of sediment from the pipes / structures on an as-needed basis. The total annual phosphorous load reduction for this project is 22.3 kg / yr. The CWSP recommendation is to prioritize funding for this project.

J. Frost asked if adopting this project would max out the CWSP adoption funds?
B. Voigt explained that there is not a set amount of money that can be spent on adoption but rather a threshold on adoptable phosphorus credits. The adoption threshold only counts for projects that are within their operation and maintenance agreement period. Projects that have exceeded their design life can be adopted at no cost against the phosphorus cap. Adopting this project will not max out the kilogram cap for adoptable projects in the Winooski Basin.
J. Frost asked if anything can be done after the project is completed to verify that the phosphorus estimate was accurate?
B. Voigt said that we should address that topic at a separate meeting.

R. Crettol asked when the project was implemented?
B. Voigt said it was constructed around 2018 or 2019 and the project is still within its design lifespan. The Town is interested in having these funds for operation and maintenance and the CWSP could benefit from the phosphorus credits. Once approved, a Request for Proposals will go out to subcontract with a firm over a five-year period to provide the necessary maintenance including a vactor truck for sediment removal. A separate party will verify the project annually. CVRPC will be working with the town and managing the funds.
S. Puddicombe asked if we should prioritize projects that are passed their design life when considering adoption.
B. Voigt said that is not much of a concern until we hit our adoptable phosphorus cap. He recommended working with the CWSP to make sure the projects you are investigating are eligible for adoption based on multiple factors including previous funding sources.
K. Fritschie shared the DEC Adoption and Watershed Project Database Update spreadsheet which shows currently fundable project adoption types. He offered assistance determining project adoption eligibility if needed. He also mentioned "old" riparian buffer plantings should be eligible for adoption soon.

D. Stapleton made a motion to approve $13,000 for funding the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission Northfield Water Street Project Adoption.
D. Koenemann seconded. All were in favor and none opposed. The motion passed.

Project Verification + Operations & Maintenance Expenses
Friends of the Winooski River – Riparian Buffer Plantings Tyler Place, 1735 Main Road (Huntington), John Fowler Road, Huntington Acres
B. Voigt explained there is no vote associated with these expenses. After implementation projects need to be maintained and verified to ensure long term success and confirm functionality. When the BWQC votes to implement a project, they are also agreeing to use operation and maintenance funding for that project once completed. That is different than adopting a project which does require a vote by the BWQC. Friends of the Winooski completed four buffer planting projects this past spring. These projects were already funded by the BWQC so operation and maintenance funding is guaranteed.

J. Frost asked if operation and maintenance costs are included in the cost efficiency formula?
B. Voigt explained that it was not explicitly included in the implementation proposal for these projects. The CWSP receives a separate budget allocation specifically for operation and maintenance. However, the operation and maintenance costs were

reviewed and refined between the Friends of the Winooski and CVRPC during the application phase.

S. Puddicombe mentioned that Friends of the Winooski generally considers the cost of maintenance when implementing a planting project. He shared operation and maintenance cost breakdown tables for all four of the completed planting projects (see slides). The project management costs have been removed after speaking with CWSP. The long-term management of the buffer is not guaranteed to be a Friends of the Winooski project and could be adopted by another project verifier. The costs being shared in the graphs are the contractual costs to maintain a planting including string trimming twice per year for the first two years following by a single round of string trimming in 2027. The costs reflect what the Intervale Nursery charges for their full and half day rates based on the number of stems planted.
B. Voigt explained that in the short-term Friends of the Winooski will manage this effort and the indirect costs will go towards their time coordinating with the landowner and subcontractor. It is possible that if we have enough projects implemented in the future it may be cost efficient to contract with one subcontractor to maintain several if not all riparian buffer plantings.
R. Crettol asked why the Friends of the Winooski coordination time would come out of the indirect rate rather than the project management line item?
S. Puddicombe responded that Friends of the Winooski has already worked with Intervale to do the plantings, so they have a prestablished relationship with them and the landowner.
B. Voigt mentioned that if costs of project management were to increase for Friends of the Winooski, then they can work with the CWSP to adjust the budget accordingly.
R. Crettol asked what the cost of these plantings were?
S. Puddicombe responded that the cost per acre was between $10,000 and $13,000 for implementation.
B. Voigt added that there is about $45,000 per year for operation and maintenance funds for the entire Basin. These operation and maintenance account for three years. The CWSP could work with DEC to reallocate more funds to operation and maintenance if that money is needed in the future.
R. Crettol mentioned that in the future understanding the operation and maintenance costs will be important to consider as we implement more projects. Even if they are not reflected in the calculation they should be considered along the way.
B. Voigt agreed and explained the potential cost savings benefit of contracting with one entity for all buffer plantings in the future.
K. Fritschie shared the Clean Water Project Verification and O&M | Department of Environmental Conservation webpage. In the Winooski CWSP project application there is a section that and asks for future anticipated costs.

S. Puddicombe said that Friends of the Winooski also works with other partners who help fund operations and maintenance beyond the DEC requirements. Some plantings involve National Wildlife Federation and the US Fish and Wildlife Service. The budget he is sharing only reflects the costs of what DEC asks for in terms of operation and maintenance.
G. Mott asked if those entities are coordinating amongst themselves and not duplicating maintenance efforts.
S. Puddicombe responded that is part of the reason Friends of the Winooski will want to continue to be involved in the maintenance even if another entity is verifying the projects so they can help coordinate amongst these different agencies.
R. Crettol asked if there is a per acre cost for operation and maintenance of a buffer planting?
S. Puddicombe said he can share out those costs with anyone interested. It is site specific but mostly relies on the number of stems.

Announcements

- Winooski River Basin Forest Roads and Trails Inventory Workshop:
  - 22 August 2025 , 9:00AM – 2:00PM
  - Berlin Town Forest
  - Contact frasca@cvregion.com for registration details
  - DEC Wastewater Workshop, Woodbury Lake Watershed
  - 19 September 2025, 2:00PM – 4:00PM
  - Registration and location details to follow

- Winooski & South Lake CWSPs to partner with UVM Environmental Problem-Solving Lab to develop a two-year Forestry Outreach Plan (scope of work TBD)

- Next round of proposals due 11 September 2025 – schedule a meeting with Brian & Lincoln for proposal development assistance

D. Stapleton announced the Moretown Planning Commission will be meeting with National Park Service to look at potential buyout locations along the Mad River. These buyouts are an opportunity to combine recreation and flood resilience planning.

Adjourn

D. Stapleton made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 2:15 PM. A. Peal seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Next meeting scheduled 18 September 2025.

Minutes submitted by CVRPC staff member Lincoln Frasca