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

Organization	Project	Number					
Project Measure Review							
1. Water Quality Benefits (Weight 15%)							
Quantified anticipated reductions:							
□ Total Suspended Solids							
□ Total Nitrogen							
☐ Total Phosphorus							
☐ Other Pollutants:							
a. Amount of pollutants removed:							
None = 0, Very Low = 1, Low = 2, Mediu							
<ul> <li>b. Projected longevity of pollutant rem</li> </ul>	oval 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 Storm	water Reduction Benefits (Weight 15%	)					
Quantified Erosion & Sediment Reductions:		,					
	tureland, unvegetated critical erosion a	reas)					
☐ Gully erosion							
☐ Road ditch erosion							
☐ Streambank or shoreline erosion							
OR Quantified Stormwater Reductions:	al ata a						
☐ Increase in permeability of develope							
☐ Reduced peak flow in stormwater ru	INOTT						
☐ Flood plain mitigation	live my experience directions.						
a. Amount of erosion and sediment de	•						
None = 0, Very Low = 1, Low = 2, Medium = 3, High = 4, Very High = 5							
b. Projected longevity of E & S or storn	nwater benefits with required						
maintenance:	10a. 2. 10.15a. 4. Mara						
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 imple	mantad avar project langth:						
None = 0, 1-5' = 1, 6-10' = 2, 11-20'							
	f native woody plants, and the species						
are specified:	i flative woody plants, and the species						
Grass & legume only = 0, 1 species =	1.2  species = 2.3  species = 3.4						
species = 4, 5 species = 5	1, 2 species – 2, 3 species – 3, 4						
4. Recreational and Educational Benefits (	Weight 5%)						
Specifically identified recreational and educational benefits that the applicant commits to carry out:							
☐ Demonstration site development	seriejite that the applicant comm	to carry out.					
☐ Citizen involvement activities							
☐ Web site development							

☐ Active outdoor classroom installation					
☐ Quantified fishing enhancements					
☐ Quantified boating improvements					
☐ Public workshops and meetings					
☐ Pamphlet preparation					
☐ Interpretive exhibit/kiosk development					
a. Education and outreach activities:					
None = 0, Very Low = 1, Low = 2, Medium = 3, High = 4, Very High = 5					
b. Recreational opportunity enhancements:					
None = 0, Very Low = 1, Low = 2, Medium = 3, High = 4, Very High = 5					
5. Ecological Benefits (Weight 15%)					
Quantified effects of the project on NYS or Federally recognized resources:					
Reference <a href="http://www.dec.ny.gov/gis/erm/">http://www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/367</a>	30.html:				
http://www.dec.ny.gov/animals/7494.html; https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/N					
□ Protected stream					
☐ Protected freshwater wetlands					
☐ Rare plants or animals					
☐ Significant natural communities					
☐ Water bodies with recognized issues on PWL					
☐ 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					
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 15%)					
Evaluation Factors:					
□ Application complete:					
<ul> <li>Verbiage clear, does not exceed limits</li> </ul>					
<ul> <li>Site photos (not to exceed 6)</li> </ul>					
Location map					
<ul> <li>Designs contain the following details, including relative elevations:</li> </ul>	nlan view, cross-				
sections, profile	pian view, cross				
☐ 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					

k	).	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. F	Par	tnerships and Project Leveraging (Weight 15%)		
Evalu	ıat	tion 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	
ā	Э.	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		
k	).	Number of contributing partners submitting letters of commitment:		
		0=0, 1=1, 2=2, 3=3, 4=4, 5=5		
8. (	Oth	ner Benefits (Weight 10%)		
Evalu	ıat	tion Factors:		
		Project contributes toward the implementation of an existing watershed im	plementation 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		
ā	Э.	Reviewer's assessment of other benefits:	_	
1	None = $0 \text{ Very Low} = 1 \text{ Low} = 3 \text{ Medium} = 5 \text{ High} = 8 \text{ Very High} = 10$			

## **Rating Summary:**

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