

2016 Genesee River Basin Summit Restoration Proposal Summary and Update

The final session of this Summit started with the concept of extrapolating to the whole Genesee River Basin the results of the meander analysis the Genesee RiverWatch conducted in 2015 in the Town of Caneadea. The following assumptions were made to complete that extrapolation:

- Some sections will need same degree of streambank stabilization as meander analysis section
- Some sections will need less
- Some sections will not need any
- 10 years to implement projects
- Detailed study needs to be done on rest of basin, including tributaries, to establish feasibility and scope
- One big program versus many small ones or regional/sub-watershed programs

The table below summarizes the results of that extrapolation.

Section	Length (Miles)	Cost		Projects	
		(\$/mile)	(\$)	(Number/mile)	(Number)
Headwaters to Wellsville	21	\$ 110,000	\$ 2,310,000	0.5	11
Wellsville to Belfast	20	\$ 333,000	\$ 6,660,000	1.4	28
Belfast to Caneadea WWTP	12	\$ 333,000	\$ 4,000,000	1.4	17
Caneadea WWTP to Portageville	16	\$ 333,000	\$ 5,328,000	1.4	22
Portageville to Mt. Morris	30	\$ -	\$ -	0.0	0
Mt. Morris to Rochester	40	\$ 220,000	\$ 8,800,000	0.9	36
City of Rochester	14	\$ -	\$ -	0.0	0
TOTAL:	153		\$ 27,098,000		114
		Contingency:	20%		
		TOTAL COST:	\$ 32,517,600		

Other costs extrapolated to whole basin over a 10 year period include:

- Loss of 328 acres of farmland - \$3,300,000
- Lost production on 328 acres of farmland – up to \$1,600,000
- 50% reduction in dredging costs at Port of Rochester - \$5,800,000
- 50% reduction in dredging at marinas - \$750,000
- 50% reduction in debris/sediment removal at Mt. Morris Dam - \$1,700,000

Those present at this last session of the Summit were asked to provide feedback on this proposal to design, permit and build the 114 streambank stabilization projects identified in the table above. The Genesee RiverWatch indicated that they will pursue federal and/or state funding to support a detailed study to define the feasibility and cost to complete such a program. Ultimately, Genesee RiverWatch plans to present the results of that study to federal and state officials (regulatory and elected officials) to solicit their support of a multi-year funded program to complete the restoration.

The results of the brainstorming exercise are provided below. They are not in any particular order than how they were written down during the session.

Brainstormed List of Issues Associated with “Proposal”

1. Ranking for whole watershed
2. Natural Heritage Foundation riparian buffer planting
3. Big project
4. Vision statement – economic, lower load
5. Work with permitting folks up front
6. Basin-wide permit – deminimus, below threshold – short form
7. Mapping – visualization
8. Make “typicals” available
9. Local laws – wetlands, buffers
10. Headwater protections
11. SWIP protection – inspections
12. Grassed waterways
13. Agricultural land
14. Not just SBS projects
15. Don’t know enough
16. Other ways to accomplish
17. Who is the “we”?
18. Partnerships are important – need sub-group to continue this dialog
19. Basin-wide costs not enough
20. Prioritized sites
21. Infrastructure impacts
22. Look at watershed as a whole
23. Suite of BMPs, not one size fits all
24. Nine-element plan (last page) in smaller HUC levels
25. Goal – reduce load – TSS and TP
26. Permit issues – “mussel” study (DEC)
27. Streamline permitting process
28. Endangered or threatened species – could slow things down
29. Basin-wide investigation of “issues”
30. Natural heritage issues
31. Access, aesthetics, improvement
32. Cost reduction
33. “Grand Plan” benefit – consistent effort, dedicated resources to get the job done
34. Jobs impact
35. \$1 spent on restoration project yields \$2.3 in economic benefit
36. Harbor reliability for large draft vessels – ESSROC and City of Rochester discussions with USACE
37. Information gap – “this room” versus others – education
38. Educational component like invasive species outreach
39. Goal – don’t shoot low

The results above were categorized as shown below to aid in determining the scope of this proposal.

Program Vision/Goal

- 3. Big project
- 4. Vision statement – economic, lower load
- 24. Nine-element plan (last page) in smaller HUC levels
- 25. Goal – reduce load – TSS and TP
- 33. “Grand Plan” benefit – consistent effort, dedicated resources to get the job done
- 36. Harbor reliability for large draft vessels – ESSROC and City of Rochester discussions with USACE
- 39. Goal – don’t shoot low

Considerations

- 7. Mapping – visualization
- 8. Make “typicals” available
- 20. Prioritized sites
- 21. Infrastructure impacts
- 12. Grassed waterways
- 14. Not just SBS projects
- 16. Other ways to accomplish
- 18. Partnerships are important – need sub-group to continue this dialog
- 23. Suite of BMPs, not one size fits all

Permitting

- 5. Work with permitting folks up front
- 6. Basin-wide permit – deminimus, below threshold – short form
- 9. Local laws – wetlands, buffers
- 11. SWIP protection – inspections
- 26. Permit issues – “mussel” study (DEC)
- 27. Streamline permitting process
- 28. Endangered or threatened species – could slow things down

Watershed Issues

- 1. Ranking for whole watershed
- 2. Natural Heritage Foundation riparian buffer planting
- 10. Headwater protections
- 13. Agricultural land
- 15. Don’t know enough
- 17. Who is the “we”?
- 22. Look at watershed as a whole
- 29. Basin-wide investigation of “issues”
- 30. Natural heritage issues

31. Access, aesthetics, improvement
37. Information gap – “this room” versus others – education
38. Educational component like invasive species outreach

Economics

19. Basin-wide costs not enough
32. Cost reduction
33. “Grand Plan” benefit – consistent effort, dedicated resources to get the job done
34. Jobs impact
35. \$1 spent on restoration project yields \$2 to \$3 in economic benefit
36. Harbor reliability for large draft vessels – ESSROC and City of Rochester discussions with USACE

PROJECT OUTCOME

Based upon the categorization above the Genesee RiverWatch prepared the following list of project outcomes for this effort:

1. Conduct an analysis of the extent and severity of streambank erosion in the entire Genesee River Basin;
2. Determine what could be done to restore the highest priority streambanks in sufficient detail to allow an evaluation of the efficacy of implementing such a program; and
3. Consider the impact on water quality improvement, habitat, increased boating/fishing access, soil loss, land protection, improved Port of Rochester harbor reliability, and private and public dredging costs.

ACTION ITEMS

The following action items for the Genesee RiverWatch were identified as a result of the brainstorming session:

1. Schedule several forums over the next 6 to 12 month to bring interested parties together to discuss and review the status of this effort.
2. Seek funding to complete the full-basin analysis. **NOTE:** Proposal submitted to the Great Lakes Protection Fund on July 22, 2016.