

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

Organization	Project	Number
Project Measure		Reviewer Score
1. Water Quality Benefits (Weight 15%)		
<i>Quantified anticipated reductions:</i> ☐ Total Suspended Solids ☐ Total Nitrogen ☐ Total Phosphorus ☐ Other Pollutants:		
a. Amount of pollutants removed: None = 0, Very Low = 1, Low = 2, Medium = 3, High = 4, Very High = 5		
b. Projected longevity of pollutant removal 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		
2. Erosion and Sediment Control or Stormwater Reduction Benefits (Weight 15%)		
<i>Quantified Erosion & Sediment Reductions:</i> ☐ Sheet and rill erosion (cropland, pastureland, unvegetated critical erosion areas) ☐ Gully erosion ☐ Road ditch erosion ☐ Streambank or shoreline erosion OR <i>Quantified Stormwater Reductions:</i> ☐ Increase in permeability of developed sites ☐ Reduced peak flow in stormwater runoff ☐ Flood plain mitigation		
a. Amount of erosion and sediment delivery or stormwater reductions: None = 0, Very Low = 1, Low = 2, Medium = 3, High = 4, Very High = 5		
b. Projected longevity of E & S or stormwater 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		
3. Riparian Buffers (Weight 10%)		
a. Width of riparian buffer to be implemented 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 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. Tourism and Recreation Benefits (Weight 20%)		
<i>Specifically identified tourism and recreation benefits that the applicant commits to carry out:</i> ☐ Watershed projects that improve water quality by reducing nutrients and nutrient runoff ☐ Streambank and lakeshore stabilization 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%)	
<i>Quantified effects of the project on NYS or Federally recognized resources:</i> Reference http://www.dec.ny.gov/gis/erm/ ; http://www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/36730.html ; http://www.dec.ny.gov/animals/7494.html ; https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/Mapper.html	
☐ Protected stream ☐ Protected freshwater wetlands ☐ Rare plants or animals ☐ Significant natural communities ☐ Water bodies with recognized issues on PWL ☐ Threatened and endangered species	
<i>Evaluation Factors:</i> ☐ 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	
b. 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%)	
<i>Evaluation Factors:</i> ☐ 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. Partnerships and Project Leveraging (Weight 10%)		
<i>Evaluation Factors:</i>		
☐ 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%)		
<i>Evaluation Factors:</i>		
☐ 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%	
Total Reviewer Score			