Chautauqua County Occupancy Tax Grant-Lakes and Waterways Watershed Application Ranking & Evaluation

Organization Project Measure		Project	Number
			Reviewer Score
1. W	/ater Quality Benefits (Weight 15%)		
Quant	tified anticipated reductions:		
	Total Suspended Solids		
	Total Nitrogen		
	Total Phosphorus		
	Other Pollutants:		
a.	Amount of pollutants removed:		
No	one = 0, Very Low = 1, Low = 2, Mediur	m = 3, High = 4, Very High = 5	
b.	Projected longevity of pollutant rem	oval benefits with required	
	maintenance:		
No	one = 0, One year = 1, 2-5 years = 2, 5-	10 years = 3, 10-15 years = 4, More	
th	an 15 years = 5		
2. Er	rosion and Sediment Control or Storm	water Reduction Benefits (Weight 15%	5)
Quant	tified Erosion & Sediment Reductions:		
	Sheet and rill erosion (cropland, pas	tureland, unvegetated critical erosion a	reas)
	Gully erosion		
	Road ditch erosion		
	Streambank or shoreline erosion		
<u>OR</u> Qι	uantified Stormwater Reductions:		
	Increase in permeability of develope	ed sites	
	Reduced peak flow in stormwater ru	inoff	
	Flood plain mitigation		
a.	Amount of erosion and sediment de	livery or stormwater reductions:	
No	one = 0, Very Low = 1, Low = 2, Mediur	m = 3, High = 4, Very High = 5	
b.	Projected longevity of E & S or storn	nwater benefits with required	
	maintenance:		
No	one = 0, One year = 1, 2-5 years = 2, 5-	10 years = 3, 10-15 years = 4, More	
th	an 15 years = 5		
3. Ri	iparian Buffers (Weight 10%)		
a.	Width of riparian buffer to be imple	mented over project length:	
	None = 0, 1-5' = 1, 6-10' = 2, 11-20' =	= 3, 21-35' = 4, More than 35' = 5	
b.	Riparian buffers include a mixture of	f native woody plants, and the species	
	are specified:		
	Grass & legume only = 0, 1 species =	1, 2 species = 2, 3 species = 3, 4	
	species = 4, 5 species = 5		
4. To	ourism and Recreation Benefits (Weig	ht 20%)	
Specif	fically identified tourism and recreation	benefits that the applicant commits to	carry out:
	Watershed projects that improve wa	ater quality by reducing nutrients and n	utrient runoff
		ion projects that improve water quality	by reducing
	erosion and capturing nutrients		

Projects that maximize retention and minimize the volume of stormwater runoff							
Improvements to public infrastructure that improve water quality							
Improvements to private property or businesses that improve water quality							
a. Tourism opportunity enhancements:							
None = 0, Very Low = 2, Low = 4, Medium = 6, High = 8, Very High = 10							
b. Recreational opportunity enhancements:							
None = 0, Very Low = 2, Low = 4, Medium = 6, High = 8, Very High = 10							
5. Ecological Benefits (Weight 15%)							
Quantified effects of the project on NYS or Federally recognized resources:							
Reference <u>http://www.dec.ny.gov/gis/erm/;</u> <u>http://www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/36730.html;</u>							
http://www.dec.ny.gov/animals/7494.html; https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/l							
Protected stream	Mapper.ntm						
 Protected stream Protected freshwater wetlands 							
 Rare plants or animals 							
·							
 Significant natural communities Water bodies with recognized issues on DW/ 							
 Water bodies with recognized issues on PWL Threatened and and an engine 							
Threatened and endangered species							
Evaluation Factors:							
□ Size of treated area							
Habitat quality & ecological condition							
Proximity to other habitat areas							
Quantity of habitat created or improved							
a. Ecological benefits:							
None = 0, Very Low = 1, Low = 2, Medium = 3, High = 4, Very High = 5							
 Projected longevity of ecological benefits with required maintenance: 							
None = 0, One year = 1, 2-5 years = 2, 5-10 years = 3, 10-15 years = 4, More							
than 15 years = 5							
6. Feasibility (Weight 10%)							
Evaluation Factors:							
Application complete:							
 Verbiage clear, does not exceed limits 							
 Site photos (not to exceed 6) 							
 Location map 							
• Designs contain the following details, including relative elevations:	plan view, cross-						
sections, profile							
Documented benefits to the public							
The project is likely to receive the required permits for construction							
No anticipated negative impacts to adjacent properties							
Operation & maintenance plan signed by the landowner							
Project is not phased, and does not require future 2% funds for success							
 Construction feasibility 							
 Project budget is properly prepared 							
a. Documented public or off-site benefits:							
None = 0, Very Low = 1, Low = 2, Medium = 3, High = 4, Very High = 5							
b. Application is complete, project designs and budgets are adequate,							
proposed evaluation and monitoring procedures are outlined, and							
operation & maintenance commitments are secured:							

		None = 0, Very Low = 1, Low = 2, Medium = 3, High = 4, Very High = 5				
7.	7. Partnerships and Project Leveraging (Weight 10%)					
Eva	Evaluation Factors:					
		Partner contributions are only in the form of cash or in-kind contributions				
	□ Partner contributions only count from the date of contract approval through date of contract					
	completion					
	All partners have submitted letters of commitment with cash/in-kind funds specified					
	a.	Amount of funds/in-kind services from other sources:				
		0-5% = 0, 6-10% = 1, 11-20% = 2, 21-30% = 3, 31-40% = 4, > 41% = 5				
	b.	Number of contributing partners submitting letters of commitment:				
		0=0, 1=1, 2=2, 3=3, 4=4, 5=5				
8. Other Benefits (Weight 5%)						
Evc	Evaluation Factors:					
	Project contributes toward the implementation of an existing watershed implementation plan					
	 Cost of the project relative to the benefits derived 					
	Synergy with other restoration, research, or maintenance projects					
	Public or neighborhood acceptance					
		Project not dependent upon other uncommitted grants or phases				
		Additional items identified using the reviewer's professional judgement				
	a.	Reviewer's assessment of other benefits:				
	None = 0, Very Low = 1, Low = 3, Medium = 5, High = 8, Very High = 10					

Rating Summary:

Factor		Reviewer Rating	Weight	Score
1.	Water Quality		15%	
2.	E&S, Stormwater		15%	
3.	Riparian Buffers		10%	
4.	Tourism & Recreational		20%	
5.	Ecological		15%	
6.	Feasibility		10%	
7.	Partnerships/Leveraging		10%	
8.	Other Benefits		5%	
To	tal Reviewer Score			