Winooski River Basin Clean Water Service Provider

Date: 16 November 2026

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 three proposals:

1. Friends of the Winooski River – Huntington Town Forest – Riparian Buffer Planting – Implementation
2. Friends of the Winooski River – Northfield Wellfield – Riparian Buffer Planting – Implementation
3. Friends of the Winooski River – Moscow Recreation Field – Riparian Buffer Planting – Implementation

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-phase 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. **Friends of the Winooski River – Huntington Town Forest – Riparian Buffer Planting – Implementation:** This proposal seeks funds to restore 0.5 acres of riparian habitat by establishing a buffer width of 100+ feet and a planting density of 300 stems per acre along the Huntington River (Huntington). The expected phosphorous reduction for this project is 0.45 kg / yr. At $12,162 / kg p, this project is considered cost-efficient. The total project score of 80.82 is a good score for an Implementation-phase project.
   Recommendation: prioritize this funding request.

Table 1 – 1: Cost-Effectiveness Score

Criteria	Value
Funding Request	$5,473
Future Funding Request	$0
Total Cost	$5,473
Phosphorous Reduction (kg / yr)	0.45
Design Life	15
Cost Effectiveness ($ / kg)	$12,162
Cost-Effectiveness Score	65

Maximum Implementation-phase Cost-Effectiveness Score = 75 points

Table 1 – 2: Project Risk Score

Risk Category	Points
Landowner Relations	2.5
Organizational Capacity	2.5
Operations & Maintenance	0
Permitting	2.5
Total Score	**7.5**

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	**0**	**30.44%**	**0**
Listed / Impaired Water Resource	0		
Priority Water Resource	0		
Habitat & Species Enhancement	0		
Ecosystem Services	**10**	**23.78%**	**2.378**
Flood Regulation	5		
Carbon Sequestration	5		
Community Building	**6**	**15.78%**	**0.9468**
Community Involvement	4		
Working Landscape	0		
Recreation	2		
Education	**0**	**12.22%**	**0**
Interpretive Signage	0		
Meetings & Workshops	0		
Total Co-benefits Score			**3.3248**

Maximum Weighted Score = 10 points

Table 1 – 4: Total Project Score

Criteria	Score
Cost-Effectiveness Score	65
Project Risk Score	7.5
Design Life Score	5
Co-benefits Score	3.3248
Total Project Score	**80.82**

2. **Friends of the Winooski River – Northfield Wellfield – Riparian Buffer Planting – Implementation:** This proposal seeks funds to restore 3 acres of riparian habitat by establishing a buffer width of 50 feet along a small tributary of the Dog River and expanding a previously planted area along the mainstem of the Dog River to 100 feet. Planting density will be 400 stems per acre (Northfield). The expected phosphorous reduction for this project is 2.94 kg / yr. At $8,106 / kg p, this project is considered cost-efficient. The total project score of 91.58 is an excellent score for an Implementation-phase project. However, future funding requirements for Operations & Maintenance ($8,712 / yr) is expensive and will exceed the cost of implementation by year 3. **Recommendation: clarify Operations & Maintenance needs before prioritizing funding for this proposal.**

Table 2 – 1: Cost-Effectiveness Score

Criteria	Value
Funding Request	$23,831
Future Funding Request	$0
Total Cost	$23,831
Phosphorous Reduction (kg / yr)	2.94
Design Life	15
Cost Effectiveness ($ / kg)	$8,106
Cost-Effectiveness Score	75

Maximum Implementation-phase Cost-Effectiveness Score = 75 points

Table 2 – 2: Project Risk Score

Risk Category	Points
Landowner Relations	2.5
Organizational Capacity	2.5
Operations & Maintenance	0
Permitting	2.5
Total Score	**7.5**

Maximum Total Score = 10 points

Table 2 – 3: Co-Benefits Score

Co-benefit	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Environmental Justice	**6**	**17.78%**	**1.0668**
Income	3		
Race	3		
Language	0		
Ecological Benefits	**0**	**30.44%**	**0**
Listed / Impaired Water Resource	0		
Priority Water Resource	0		
Habitat & Species Enhancement	0		
Ecosystem Services	**10**	**23.78%**	**2.378**
Flood Regulation	5		
Carbon Sequestration	5		
Community Building	**4**	**15.78%**	**0.6312**
Community Involvement	4		
Working Landscape	0		
Recreation	0		
Education	**0**	**12.22%**	**0**
Interpretive Signage	0		
Meetings & Workshops	0		
Total Co-benefits Score			**4.076**

Maximum Weighted Score = 10 points

Table 2 – 4: Total Project Score

Criteria	Score
Cost-Effectiveness Score	75
Project Risk Score	7.5
Design Life Score	5
Co-benefits Score	4.076
Total Project Score	**91.58**

3. **Friends of the Winooski River – Moscow Recreation Field – Riparian Buffer Planting – Implementation:** This proposal seeks funds to restore 0.5 acres of riparian habitat by establishing a buffer width of 60-100 feet with a planting density of 400 stems per acre along the Little River (Stowe). The expected phosphorous reduction for this project is 0.75 kg / yr. At $8,905 / kg p, this project is considered cost-efficient. The total project score of 91.89 is an excellent score for an Implementation-phase project.
   Recommendation: prioritize this funding request.

Table 3 – 1: Cost-Effectiveness Score

Criteria	Value
Funding Request	$6,679
Future Funding Request	$0
Total Cost	$6,679
Phosphorous Reduction (kg / yr)	0.75
Design Life	15
Cost Effectiveness ($ / kg)	$8,905
Cost-Effectiveness Score	75

Maximum Implementation-phase Cost-Effectiveness Score = 75 points

Table 3 – 2: Project Risk Score

Risk Category	Points
Landowner Relations	2.5
Organizational Capacity	2.5
Operations & Maintenance	0
Permitting	2.5
Total Score	**7.5**

Maximum Total Score = 10 points

Table 3 – 3: Co-Benefits Score

Co-benefit	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Environmental Justice	**6**	**17.78%**	**1.0668**
Income	3		
Race	3		
Language	0		
Ecological Benefits	**0**	**30.44%**	**0**
Listed / Impaired Water Resource	0		
Priority Water Resource	0		
Habitat & Species Enhancement	0		
Ecosystem Services	**10**	**23.78%**	**2.378**
Flood Regulation	5		
Carbon Sequestration	5		
Community Building	**6**	**15.78%**	**0.9468**
Community Involvement	4		
Working Landscape	0		
Recreation	2		
Education	**0**	**12.22%**	**0**
Interpretive Signage	0		
Meetings & Workshops	0		
Total Co-benefits Score			**4.3916**

Maximum Weighted Score = 10 points

Table 3 – 4: Total Project Score

Criteria	Score
Cost-Effectiveness Score	75
Project Risk Score	7.5
Design Life Score	5
Co-benefits Score	4.3916
Total Project Score	**91.89**