

## Chapter 8. Interim Recommendations



## 8. Interim Recommendations

The ultimate goal of the Cayuga Lake Watershed Management Planning process is to develop and implement recommendations for restoring, protecting, and enhancing water quality in the Cayuga Lake Watershed. During the first two years of the Watershed Management Plan process “interim” lists of implementation recommendations for projects of watershed-wide significance and impact was developed for the New York State Department of State.

The process included the following steps:

- Technical Committee development and Intermunicipal Organization approval of Evaluation Criteria
- Solicitation of recommendations from each municipality, county, and county water quality coordinating committee
- Joint Technical Committee/Intermunicipal Organization review
- Intermunicipal Organization review and approval

### 8.1 Evaluation Criteria

#### 8.1.1 1999 Evaluation Criteria

The following evaluation criteria is used as a description of each numbered column of the Evaluation Matrix where the numbers below are directly related to the numbers in the columns of the Evaluation Matrix (see Table 8.3.1):

1. Might this project be implemented on other areas of the lake or contributing watersheds?
  - This could allow for demonstration projects and/or model development
  - This could allow for watershed-wide integration of many related individual projects
  - If the project needs can not be identified elsewhere in the watershed will its impact be as significant as more watershed-wide projects
  - Is it an innovative project
  - What is the likelihood of success or degree of failure
2. Does the problem to be addressed have an existing solution? (A proven remediation technology but just lacks funding?)(i.e., Best Management Practices documentation/implementation plans exist, versus a unique problem, where data collection and analysis are required prior to devising a remediation approach.)
  - Use of existing models assist with implementation efficiency and effectiveness
3. Does the project have a means of being evaluated -- proving that the \$'s were invested correctly. (This begins the process of establishing a baseline of data from which to evaluate cost/benefits.)
  - Projects can be evaluated based on the target of mitigation and the technical description of the application or on historical data of existing applications already in the field if applicable.
4. Operation and maintenance consideration
  - What is the cost of operating and maintaining the project in subsequent years
  - What is the degree of assurance that maintenance will be covered throughout the life span of the project
5. Does the project address an identified impairment
  - Use existing means to rank. One of the means presently available is the 1996 Priority Waterbodies List(PWL)\*. In the future the Cayuga Lake Watershed Characterization can be used.
6. Does the project address potential human use of the lake and the watershed (e.g. bathing, fishing, boating, drinking, aesthetic enjoyment, wastewater disposal, power generation, cooling, access, transportation, tourism, recreation)
  - Without solid data how does the project potentially effect human use of the lake and watershed

7. Does the project address potential lake and watershed ecology (e.g. wildlife habitat, fisheries)
  - Without solid data how does the project potentially effect the lake and watershed ecology
8. Does the project potentially benefit/degrade the general quality of the lake, or the watershed feeding the lake?
  - a project might exacerbate existing water quality concerns, for example downstream
  - a project might benefit water quality but not have lake-wide/watershed-wide impact
  - a project might potentially have watershed-wide impact
9. Capital expenditure limit? (spreading the wealth, versus all the eggs in one or a few baskets?)
  - The approximate cost of the project would be considered but not ranked within the other criteria. A determination would be made after project ranking how to proceed given the proposed approximate cost.
10. Actual use consideration (swimming, power generation, access, boating, drinking, fishing/fisheries, wildlife habitat, aesthetics, waste disposal, cooling, transportation, tourism, recreation)
  - Projects impacts on uses of the lake and the watershed
  - Because of lack of data at the present time this could be considered outside of the project ranking scheme. As more data becomes available this category can be used for the purposes of ranking
  - PWL\* information should be considered
11. Funding considerations.
  - Consider outside of the project ranking scheme.
  - Has other funding sources been applied to previously?
  - Has all other possible sources of funding been exhausted.

\*Periodically, the NYSDEC Division of Water publishes a list of surface waters that either cannot be fully used as a resource, or have problems that can damage their environmental integrity. This list – The Priority Waterbodies List (PWL) – is used as a base resource for Division of Water program management. The listing of the PWL includes individual waterbody data sheets describing the conditions, causes, and sources of water quality problems in a given basin. Users of the information contained in the PWL are reminded of the following special considerations:

- The PWL is a reflection of priority waterbodies at a specific moment in time.
- In many cases, surface water systems are highly interrelated.
- Resolution potential can be noted as high, medium, or low. High resolution potential indicates that the water quality problem has been deemed to be worthy of the expenditure of available resources (time and dollar) because of the level of public interest and the expectation that the commitment of these resources will result in a measurable improvement in the situation. Medium resolution generally indicates that the resources necessary to address the problem are beyond what is currently available. Segments with low potential for resolution indicate water quality problems so persistent that improvements are expected to require an unrealistically high commitment of resources, not likely to become available (e.g. acid rain lakes).

PWL information for Cayuga Lake and many of its tributaries are in Chapter 1.5.4.1 and associated Table 1.5.4.1.1. Information includes name of waterbody, resolution potential, use impairment(s), severity, documentation, type of pollutant(s), and source(s) of pollutant(s).

### **8.1.2 2000 Evaluation Criteria**

1. What is the overall positive long-term impact on the watershed and/or lake\*\*
  - This could allow for demonstration projects and/or model development
  - Might this project be implemented on other areas of the lake or contributing watersheds?

- This could allow for watershed-wide integration of many related individual projects
  - If the project needs can not be identified elsewhere in the watershed will its impact be as significant as more watershed-wide projects
  - What is the likelihood of success or degree of failure
2. Does the problem to be addressed have an existing solution? \*\* (A proven remediation technology but just lacks funding?)(i.e., Best Management Practices documentation/implementation plans exist, versus a unique problem, where data collection and analysis are required prior to devising a remediation approach.)
    - Use of existing models assist with implementation efficiency and effectiveness
  3. Does the project have a means of being evaluated -- proving that the \$'s were invested correctly.\*\* (This begins the process of establishing a baseline of data from which to evaluate cost/benefits.)
    - Projects can be evaluated based on the target of mitigation or enhancement and the technical description of the application or on historical data of existing applications already in the field if applicable.
  4. Operation and maintenance consideration
    - What is the cost of operating and maintaining the project in subsequent years
    - What is the degree of assurance that maintenance will be covered throughout the life span of the project
  5. Does the project address an identified impairment\*\*
    - 1996 Priority Waterbodies List (PWL)\*.
    - Cayuga Lake Preliminary Watershed Characterization
    - Other
  6. Does the project address potential human use of the lake and the watershed (e.g. bathing, fishing, boating, drinking, aesthetic enjoyment, wastewater disposal, power generation, cooling, access, transportation, tourism, recreation)
  7. Does the project address potential lake and watershed ecology (e.g. wildlife habitat, fisheries)
  8. Does the project potentially benefit/degrade the general quality of the lake, or the watershed feeding the lake?
    - a project might exacerbate existing water quality concerns, for example downstream
  9. Capital expenditure limit? (spreading the wealth, versus all the eggs in one or a few baskets?)
    - The approximate cost of the project would be considered but not ranked within the other criteria. A determination would be made after project ranking how to proceed given the proposed approximate cost.
  10. Actual use consideration (swimming, power generation, access, boating, drinking, fishing/fisheries, wildlife habitat, aesthetics, waste disposal, cooling, transportation, tourism, recreation)\*\*
    - Projects impacts on uses of the lake and the watershed
    - PWL\* information should be considered
    - Cayuga Lake Preliminary Watershed Characterization should be considered
  11. Funding considerations.
    - Consider outside of the project ranking scheme.
    - Has other funding sources been applied to previously?
    - Has all other possible sources of funding been exhausted.
  12. Amount of criteria met

\*Periodically, the NYSDEC Division of Water publishes a list of surface waters that either cannot be fully used as a resource, or have problems that can damage their environmental integrity. This list – The Priority Waterbodies List (PWL) – is used as a base resource for Division of Water program management. The listing of the PWL includes individual waterbody data sheets describing the conditions, causes, and sources of water quality problems in a given basin. Users of the information contained in the PWL are reminded of the following special considerations:

- The PWL is a reflection of priority waterbodies at a specific moment in time.
- In many cases, surface water systems are highly interrelated.
- Resolution potential can be noted as high, medium, or low. High resolution potential indicates that the water quality problem has been deemed to be worthy of the expenditure of available resources (time and dollar) because of the level of public interest and the expectation that the commitment of these resources will result in a measurable improvement in the situation. Medium resolution generally indicates that the resources necessary to address the problem are beyond what is currently available. Segments with low potential for resolution indicate water quality problems so persistent that improvements are expected to require an unrealistically high commitment of resources, not likely to become available (e.g. acid rain lakes).

PWL information for Cayuga Lake and many of its tributaries are attached. Information includes name of waterbody, resolution potential, use impairment(s), severity, documentation, type of pollutant(s), and source(s) of pollutant(s).

\*\*Scores for Criteria 1, 2, 3, 5, 10 will be both aggregated with all Criteria and shown separately for Bond Act, EPF and Section 319 related projects

\*\*\*Final qualitative ranking – the IO has the option to rerank all projects based on a qualitative consideration of overall positive impact on the watershed.

## **8.2 Implementation Recommendations**

### **8.2.1 1999 Implementation Recommendations**

The following implementation recommendations were submitted to the Intermunicipal Organization (see Appendix I for project description):

1. Conduct Suitability Analysis for Open Space Acquisition
2. Conduct a Source Water Assessment to Improve Lake-Source Drinking Water Quality
3. Increase Public Education and Participation in Lake and Water Quality Management
4. Assess Climate-Related Impacts, Land Use, and Effects on Water Quality
5. EQIP Funding for Cayuga Lake (Cayuga County)
6. Town of Ulysses Safe Drinking Water Project
7. Streambank Stabilization Within Cayuga Lake Watershed (Seneca County)
8. Comprehensive Nutrient Management Planning (Tompkins County)
9. Streambank Stabilization and Debris Removal (Tompkins County)
10. Aquifer Research and Monitoring
11. Location and Identification of Farmstead Dumps
12. Highway Department Stormwater Education
13. Manure Handling
14. Trophic State of Cayuga Lake
15. Ithaca/Cayuga Heights/Lansing Area Wastewater Collection and Treatment System Improvements
16. Development of Natural Trail
17. Watershed Planning and Streambank Restoration in Subwatersheds of Fall Creek Watershed
18. Six Mile Creek Restoration

### **8.2.2 2000 Implementation Recommendations**

The following implementation recommendations were submitted to the Intermunicipal Organization (see Appendix I for project description):

1. Biomonitoring of Four Major Tributaries of Northern Cayuga Lake: Yawger Creek, Great Gully, Paine's Creek and Salmon Creek
2. Water Remediation
3. Cayuga Lake Road: Hydrologic Modification
4. Ithaca/Cayuga Heights/Lansing Area Wastewater Collection And Treatment System Improvements
5. Ag Nutrient Management in Seneca County
6. Proposed Water System Improvements Village of Interlaken
7. High resolution-multispectral remote-sensing chlorophyll- $\alpha$  quantitation
8. Six Mile Creek Riparian Buffer Restoration Program
9. The Trophic State of Cayuga Lake
10. Defining a Source Water Assessment Program (SWAP) for the Cayuga Lake Watershed and the Hydrological, Ecological and Environmental Conditions of Watersheds Undergoing Socio-Economic Changes Affecting Land and Water Use
11. Stream Restoration at the Barrile Site in the Town of Caroline

### **8.3 Ranking**

Ranking of submitted implementation recommendations was done by a ranking committee that was made up of representatives of the Cayuga Lake Watershed Management Plan Technical Committee and the Intermunicipal Organization. The rankings (see Table 8.3.1 and 8.3.2) was then submitted to and approved by the Intermunicipal Organization.

Table 8.3.1

1st Year Interim Recommendations Evaluation Matrix

5, 3, 1 Ranking - 5 best, 1 worst)

Project	1) Implement Watershed-Wide	Standard Deviation	2) Existing Tools	Standard Deviation	3) Can Project Be Evaluated	Standard Deviation	4) Operation & Maintenance Consideration	Standard Deviation	5) Addresses Identified Impairment	Standard Deviation	6) Addresses Human Use	Standard Deviation	7) Addresses Lake/Watershed Ecology	Standard Deviation	8) Benefit to Lake/Watershed	Standard Deviation	Average Score	Average Deviation	9) Capital Expenditure Amount	10) Benefiting Use(s)	11) Funding Considerations
15	4 1 5 5 5 2 5 4 1	1.74	5 5 5 5 5 5 5 4 5	0.33	5 3 4 5 5 5 5 2 5	1.12	4 4 5 5 2 5 1 5	1.55	5 5 4 5 5 5 5 4 5	0.44	5 5 4 5 5 4 5 5 5	0.44	5 5 4 5 5 4 5 5 5	0.44	5 5 4 5 5 4 5 4 5	0.50	4.46	0.49	\$ 3,000,000.00	4 1	Big bang for \$/ 2 rankings indicated endorse BA
6	4 5 1 4 1 1 5 5 3	1.79	4 3 4 5 4 5 3 4 5	0.78	4 1 4 4 4 1 3 3 5	1.39	4 5 5 5 1 1 3	1.77	4 3 5 5 1 5 5 5	1.39	5 5 5 4 5 5 4 5 5	0.44	4 3 1 5 5 4 4 5 3	1.30	5 3 1 5 5 4 4 4 3	1.30	3.85	0.33	\$ 3,400,000.00	3 4	SDW part of Bond Act SWAP & Bond Act
5	4 5 4 5 5 1 5 5 3	1.36	4 5 4 5 5 5 4 5 5	0.50	4 3 4 5 3 4 4 2 3	0.88	4 3 5 3 2 4 1 3	1.25	5 3 3 5 5 4 5 3 3	1.00	4 1 3 5 5 2 5 2 1	1.69	5 3 3 5 4 3 5 3 1	1.33	5 5 3 5 3 4 5 4 1	1.36	3.76	0.28	\$ 200,000.00	2 3	Support letter Bond Act SWAP & Bond Act
9	4 5 3 5 3 5 5 5 3	0.97	4 5 3 3 5 5 5 5 3	0.97	5 1 3 5 5 1 5 1 3	1.86	4 3 5 5 4 5 1 1	1.69	5 5 3 5 5 5 1 4 3	1.41	4 1 3 5 3 2 5 3 3	1.30	5 3 3 5 3 4 5 4 1	1.32	5 3 3 5 3 4 5 5 3	1.00	3.76	0.25	\$ 100,000.00	4 4	Bond Act BA
8	4 5 3 5 5 5 5 5 3	0.88	4 5 3 3 5 4 5 5 3	0.93	5 3 5 5 3 2 4 1 1	1.64	4 2 5 3 2 1 1 5	1.64	5 5 5 5 5 2 2 5 3	1.36	3 3 3 5 5 4 5 4 1	1.32	5 3 3 5 4 2 5 4 1	1.42	5 5 2 5 3 2 5 5 3	1.36	3.75	0.21	\$ 500,000.00	2 4	Bond Act BA
7	4 5 3 5 3 5 5 5 3	0.97	4 5 4 4 5 5 5 5 3	0.73	4 1 3 5 5 1 5 3 3	1.58	3 2 4 5 4 5 1 1	1.64	4 5 4 5 5 5 1 4 3	1.32	3 1 3 5 3 2 5 2 3	1.32	5 3 3 5 3 4 5 4 1	1.32	5 3 3 5 3 4 5 4 3	0.93	3.72	0.26	\$ 158,400.00	4 4	Bond Act BA
13	4 5 3 5 5 5 5 5 3	0.88	4 5 3 4 5 3 5 5 3	0.93	4 3 3 4 5 4 5 1 5	1.30	5 3 5 1 1 1 1 1	1.83	5 5 3 5 5 2 1 4 3	1.50	4 3 3 5 5 2 5 4 1	1.42	5 3 3 5 3 2 5 4 1	1.42	5 5 3 5 3 3 5 4 3	1.00	3.68	0.26	\$ 300,000.00	2 2	Bond Act BA
14	4 3 2 5 5 2 5 2 3	1.33	4 3 2 5 4 2 5 4 3	1.13	5 1 2 5 5 2 3 2 5	1.66	5 2 4 5 4 3 1 1	1.64	5 3 2 5 5 4 5 4 1	1.48	5 3 2 5 5 4 5 4 1	1.48	5 5 2 5 4 5 5 4 3	1.09	5 5 2 5 3 5 5 4 3	1.17	3.68	0.19	\$ 790,250.00	3 2	Other funding sources BA
12	4 5 3 5 3 5 3 5 5	0.97	4 3 2 5 5 5 3 5 5	1.17	5 3 2 3 5 2 3 1 5	1.48	4 2 4 3 1 3 1 1	1.30	5 5 4 5 5 3 3 4 5	0.87	5 1 2 2 2 2 3 3 1	1.22	5 3 3 5 3 4 3 4 5	0.93	5 5 2 5 5 4 3 5 5	1.12	3.62	0.16	\$ 50,000.00	3 3	Use existing models, do on watershed-wide basis BA
18	4 5 2 5 3 5 4 3	1.13	4 5 4 5 3 5 5 3	0.89	5 1 2 4 2 5 1 3	1.64	4 2 3 3 5 1 3	1.29	5 3 3 5 3 1 4 5	1.41	3 1 2 2 2 5 4 3	1.28	5 5 2 5 3 5 4 5	1.16	5 5 2 5 3 5 3 5	1.25	3.60	0.15	\$ 110,000.00	2 2	Ongoing SWAP & Bond Act
10	4 3 3 5 3 5 5 4 5	0.93	4 5 3 5 4 2 1 5 5	1.48	5 1 5 5 2 1 1 5	2.00	4 3 3 5 5 1 1 3	1.55	5 3 5 2 1 2 1 3 1	1.59	5 5 5 2 5 5 5 3 3	1.13	5 1 3 5 1 1 5 4 5	1.87	5 3 3 1 2 2 5 3 3	1.32	3.46	0.27	\$ 65,000.00	3 2	BA
2	4 5 4 5 5 3 4 5 5	0.73	3 3 3 4 3 3 1 4 3	0.87	3 1 3 5 5 2 3 1 3	1.45	3 3 3 2 4 1 1 5	1.39	3 3 3 4 5 4 1 3 3	1.09	4 3 2 5 5 3 4 4 5	1.05	3 3 3 5 5 3 4 4 3	0.87	4 3 3 5 3 3 4 4 3	0.73	3.44	0.23	\$ 100,000.00	2 4	BA
11	4 5 3 5 2 5 4 5 3	1.12	4 3 3 1 2 3 4 4 3	1.00	5 3 3 2 4 2 4 1 5	1.39	4 3 3 2 5 1 1 1	1.51	5 3 4 2 2 4 1 4 3	1.27	5 3 3 1 2 4 3 5 1	1.50	5 3 2 3 2 3 3 4 1	1.17	5 5 2 4 2 3 3 5 3	1.24	3.17	0.15	\$ 75,000.00	4 3	This is phase 1 BA
3	4 5 4 5 5 3 4 5 5	0.73	3 3 3 3 5 4 1 4 5	1.24	3 1 2 5 5 3 1 1 1	1.67	2 2 5 2 2 1 1 5	1.60	1 1 2 5 5 3 1 3 3	1.58	5 3 1 5 5 3 4 4 1	1.59	3 1 1 5 4 3 3 4 1	1.48	4 3 1 5 4 3 3 4 3	1.12	3.14	0.26	\$ 75,000.00	4 4	BA
17	4 5 2 5 5 5 4 1	1.55	3 3 5 1 5 3 5 3	1.41	4 1 2 1 1 1 1 3	1.16	4 2 1 4 1 1 1 1	1.41	4 5 3 5 5 1 4 3	1.39	3 1 2 1 2 1 3 3	0.93	3 3 2 5 4 3 4 3	0.92	4 3 2 5 4 3 4 3	0.93	2.98	0.23	\$ 15,000.00	2 4	Falls under 9 BA
4	4 5 4 5 3 4 3 5 5	0.83	4 3 4 5 4 2 1 5 3	1.33	4 1 1 3 4 3 1 1 1	1.36	3 2 3 3 4 1 1 3	1.07	3 1 1 4 2 3 1 3 1	1.17	5 1 1 5 2 2 2 4 1	1.67	5 3 1 5 3 4 3 4 1	1.48	4 3 1 5 4 4 3 5 3	1.24	2.97	0.19	\$ 75,000.00	3 2	BA
1	4 3 4 5 1 2 4 5 3	1.33	3 3 4 5 3 2 1 4 1	1.36	4 1 2 0 3 2 1 1 3	1.27	4 4 3 2 2 1 1 1	1.28	2 1 1 4 1 2 1 3 1	1.09	4 1 2 3 5 3 4 2 1	1.39	3 1 2 3 1 2 5 3 1	1.32	4 3 2 5 1 3 5 4 3	1.32	2.59	0.06	\$ 25,000.00	3 2	Bond Act (BA)
16	1 1 1 1 1 4 1 3 1	1.13	1 1 5 1 3 4 1 3 3	1.51	4 1 5 1 5 1 1 1 3	1.81	1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1	0.35	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 3 1	0.67	3 1 1 1 5 3 1 3 1	1.45	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0.00	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0.00	1.62	0.61		3 3	BA

Table 8.3.2  
 Cayuga Lake Watershed Management Plan  
 2nd Year Interim Recommendations  
 Ranking Matrix  
 Scoring 1 through 5 (1 low, 5 high)

Project #	Quantitative Scoring																	Qualitative Scoring/Comments/Considerations																																																
	Criteria 1			Criteria 2			Criteria 3			Criteria 4			Criteria 5*			Criteria 6			Criteria 7			Criteria 8			Criteria 9*			Quantitative Sum	Average Deviation	Criteria 10		Criteria 11			Criteria 12																															
	Overall	Impact**	SD	Existing Solution**	SD	Means of Evaluation**	SD	O & M	SD	Identified Impairment**	SD	Address Human Use	SD	Address Ecology	SD	Benefit/Degrade WQ	SD	Use Consideration**	SD	Capital Expenditure Limit	Funding Considerations	# Criteria Met																																												
4	4	4	5	4	5	0.55	5	5	3	5	5	0.89	5	5	3	5	3	1.10	3	5	5	5	0.89	5	5	0	5	5	2.24	4	5	0	5	5	2.17	4	5	0	5	4	2.07	4	5	4	5	5	0.55	5	5	3	5	5	0.89	193.0	1.57	3	Reasonable - multi-million	1	High impact on southern end of lake, big bucks for big problem	1		5	10	11		
7	1	5	5	4	4	1.64	3	5	5	4	5	0.89	3	4	5	5	0.89	1	3	5	4	2	1.58	4	5	5	4	5	0.55	3	5	5	4	5	0.89	3	4	5	5	3	1.00	3	5	5	5	5	0.89	189.0	1.52	4	44,000 Good to fit into satellite imaging in the future	3	Nice idea, but not enough "bang" for the money, method development rather than a proven tool?	5	Good match	3	11	ok								
8	3	4	5	4	5	0.84	4	5	5	4	5	0.55	1	5	5	3	1.79	1	2	3	5	2	1.52	4	5	5	4	5	0.55	4	5	5	4	4	0.55	4	5	5	4	5	0.55	4	5	5	4	5	0.55	4	5	4	5	0.89	189.0	1.36	4	100,000	1	Buffer strip improvements, good utility, pilot project?	5		4	10	11			
11	1	5	3	4	5	1.67	3	5	5	4	5	0.89	2	5	0	4	5	2.17	3	5	3	4	3	0.89	4	5	5	4	5	0.55	4	5	3	4	5	0.84	4	5	5	4	5	0.55	3	5	3	4	5	1.00	182.0	1.54	4	250,000	3	Small area project and impact, again this type of project rated higher than expected	5	Budget high	5	11	11							
1	3	4	5	4	5	0.84	3	2	5	2	5	1.52	5	4	5	3	5	0.89	3	5	3	4	5	1.14	4	5	5	4	5	0.55	4	4	5	4	3	0.71	4	4	5	3	5	0.84	3	3	5	3	3	0.89	4	4	5	3	5	0.84	181.5	1.41	5	38,000 Budget info lacking	4	Northeastern watershed assessments, good as initial survey, fairly cheap	3	ok	1	10	ok	11
9	3	4	5	4	3	0.84	3	4	5	4	5	0.84	3	4	5	4	4	0.71	3	4	3	4	3	0.67	4	4	5	4	5	0.55	3	5	5	4	5	0.89	3	5	4	5	0.89	3	3	5	4	5	1.00	180.5	1.30	4	34,000	5	Good for monitoring P improvements - already in other programs? - provides some baseline assessment	4		5	11	ok	11							
5	4	5	5	3	5	0.89	5	5	4	3	5	0.89	3	3	0	3	2	1.30	3	3	5	3	1	1.41	5	5	5	3	5	0.89	4	5	5	3	3	1.00	4	5	5	3	3	1.00	4	5	3	3	5	1.00	5	5	5	3	5	0.89	176.0	1.49	4	885,000 Creates new problem	1	High impact on reducing NPS loads from Seneca City	3		4	11	11	
3	1	5	1	4	3	1.79	4	5	4	4	5	0.55	1	3	0	4	3	1.64	4	4	3	4	5	0.89	4	5	5	4	5	0.55	3	5	4	4	4	0.82	4	5	4	4	0.50	4	5	4	4	5	0.55	4	5	0	4	5	2.07	162.5	1.53	5	10,000 Good project - length	5	Small area impact, pilot project? Overall surprised it ranked this high	1		5	10	11		
2	1	4	0	5	2	2.07	4	5	4	4	5	0.55	1	5	5	4	3	1.67	4	5	5	4	2	1.22	4	5	0	5	4	2.07	4	5	5	5	5	0.45	3	3	0	3	3	1.34	3	3	0	4	5	1.87	4	5	0	4	2	2.00	156.0	1.69	3	177,000 Too high budget	1	Clean-up of local drinking water supply - doesn't address source of TCE or cleanup	2		2	10	9	
10	2	5	3	5	1	1.79	2	5	2	5	1	1.87	4	4	2	5	1	1.64	2	1	5	1	1.89	3	4	5	5	3	1.00	3	5	5	3	1.10	3	4	5	5	3	1.00	3	4	5	5	3	1.00	3	4	5	5	1	1.67	155.0	1.66	3	700,000	1	Good for SWAP assessment, but the rest of project is questionable add on, although it facilitates public involvement	4		1	10	ok	4		
6	1	1	0	1	1	0.45	2	5	4	1	5	1.82	1	1	1	3	1	0.89	1	1	5	4	1	1.95	1	1	0	2	1	0.71	4	5	5	3	1.00	1	1	0	1	1	0.45	1	1	0	2	3	1.14	1	1	0	2	2	0.84	82.0	1.06	2	Not in our realm	1	Not even a subwatershed project - impact on lake minimal, capital fund request	1		1	2	3		

For explanation of all criteria refer to Evaluation Criteria  
 \* Refer to PWL for Cayuga Lake and Cayuga Lake Tributaries  
 \*\* Scores will be both aggregated with all criteria and shown separately for Bond Act, EPF and Section 319 related projects

[Back to Table of Contents](#)