

**Appendix 9**  
Comments Compendium

## **Stream Corridor Stewardship Plan** **Summary of Public Comments on Recommendations**

A total of thirteen comments were received. The recommendations were generally accepted and supported by the public. The necessity of all agencies working together was important to achieving the common goal of healthy streams with respect to the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP). There are some concerns about incentives for non-agricultural landowner's participation and it was suggested that there should be some sort of land tax easements for maintaining or improving stream characteristics. Another incentive suggestion was public recognition of good stewardship like a sign or plaque recognizing a family, town or village for maintaining their streambanks which would help get people interested in developing programs or partner groups such as watershed associations.

There was some controversy with streamlining the permitting systems. People generally thought it would be ideal to have all agencies work together to develop a simpler permitting process.

Gravel deposits were a big discussion during public meetings. People were concerned with gravel bar buildup in streams strongly felt they need to be addressed. A maintenance program was suggested to identify the problematic gravel bars and economically remove them to realistic stream channel dimensions. The public also feels that there should be funding for this program provided by New York City.

Financing stream projects is a big concern. One suggestion was that townships or municipalities could aid the process by budgeting for stream projects or to develop programs to make private citizens aware of situations near their homes and how they can help improve stream health with simple, inexpensive solutions.

| Name   | Recommendation #1   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Ron Frisbee/Landowner</b></p>  | <p>This integration is an absolute necessity. I would recommend that BMP's be developed locally to be applied to the Stream Stewardship Plans to maintain stability</p>   |
| <p><b>Jerry Fraine/NYS DEC</b></p>   | <p>Recommendation #1-4 are all good recommendation</p>  |
| <p><b>Tom O'Brien/WAC<br/>Executive Director</b></p>                           | <p>We fully support the integration of the Stream Corridor Management Program (SCMP) and Watershed Agricultural Program (WAP) as follows:<br/>Establishment of a stream maintenance component in the Whole Farm Planning process supported by the Environmental Review/Problem Diagnosis process. Training for WAP staff to identify stream related issues.</p>   |
| <p><b>Stub &amp; Marian<br/>Ploutz/Landowners</b></p>                          | <p>The Draft presented has some good areas: working with the whole farm plan should have been done as early as 1996, Working with the CWC, Plans for non-ag. Land , Helping Municipalities, Flood hazard mitigation &amp; flood recovery and Prioritizing of stream projects.</p>   |
| <p><b>Shelly Johnson/ Chief Planner<br/>Delaware County Planning Dept.</b></p> | <p>The recommendation lists partners to assist in meeting the goals of this recommendation. However, the Delaware County Agriculture and Farmland Protection Board (DC AFPB) is not included. In addition this recommendation does not seem to take the Delaware County Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan (DC AFPP) into consideration. The Plan should be evaluated to ensure the DC AFPP and the Stream Corridor Plan do not have contradictory goals. In addition the DC AFPB should be a partner to ensure the objectives of the Stream Corridor Plan are taken into consideration as they review actions on farmland in the county.</p> |

| Name  | Recommendation #2  |
|---|--|
| <b>Ron Frisbee/Landowner</b>                    | Yes! CREP will only be successful on a basin-wide scale if the unstable sites are fixed. There are negative public opinions out there amongst the riparian shareholders, when CREP monies are available to be applied to only stable sites and the river is allowed to claim the unstable sites.   |
| <b>Tom O'Brien/WAC<br/>Executive Director</b>   | We fully support the concept of SCMP technical assistance to WAP to stabilize stream banks and facilitate the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) at sites currently ineligible for CREP.  |
| <b>Agricultural Meeting<br/>Delhi 3/24/2005</b> | Any part of the program going to help already existing CREP ground that have been microburst or unavailable CREP grounds?<br>Established a buffer/CREP area: How can we get assistance to areas that are not working before we lose the whole thing? Can't afford to repair it and it is required to do it. (Existing CREP that are damaged) Is there any funding available? |

| <b>Name</b>                  | <b>Recommendation #3</b>                                    |
|------------------------------|---|
| <b>Ron Frisbee/Landowner</b> | A lot of potential here, especially in the area of funding. |

| Name                                | Recommendation #4   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <p><b>Ron Frisbee/Landowner</b></p> | <p>This is an excellent idea. Some sort of incentive program could be developed whereby membership in a West Branch Basin Streambank Owners Association would qualify the landowner for FREE Stream Corridor Management Plan similar to the Forestry management plans. The Streambank Owners Association will facilitate permitting under a Basin-wide permit (Army Corp) and educational and technical assistance to the landowners not eligible for the WAP.</p>  |
| <p><b>Ed Stammel</b></p>            | <p>Besides education what will encourage them to change... money! As a specific addition to Recommendation #4 tax easements by adding: Municipalities within the watershed should be encouraged to provide non-agricultural land owners with permanent tax easements for maintaining or improving stream characteristics. Similar easements should be granted to landowners who undertake activities which either enhance aquatic life or provide recreational access.</p> <p>Municipalities will resist any actions which reduce their tax dollars. If, on the other hand, they can be convinced that a well managed river with recreational opportunity will reduce flood damage to their roads and bridges and bring in the all-important tourist dollar. Why come to Delaware County if you are not allowed to enjoy the land? Government entities must be convinced that in the long run, the river is our best asset and any actions to enhance it will benefit all stakeholders in the valley.</p> |

| Name   | Recommendation #5   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Ron Frisbee/Landowner</b></p>  | <p>see above. Also recommend some sort of program to facilitate the removal of trees that have fallen in the channel and pose a threat to public safety and navigation AND/OR negatively effecting stream stability. NYC reimbursement to landowners with a Stream Corridor Management Plan?</p>  |
| <p><b>Willard and Lucile Frisbee/Landowners</b></p>  | <p>Must be a top priority for implementation. We heartily endorse all recommendations which allude to the permitting process. The current proposed (state) wetland legislation being discussed by the Board of Supervisors must be discouraged. Citizens should be alerted to be in touch with their Albany representatives! The State of New York has carried regulation much too far for too long, in our opinion. Good common sense in dealing with problems seems to elude officials in some of our agencies!</p> |
| <p><b>Lucinda C. Collins/Director Bureau of Program Resources and Flood Protection</b></p> | <p>The local communities should also be included in the working group, since they have jurisdiction over floodplain development in mapped special flood hard areas (SFHAs), as shown on their Flood Insurance Rat Maps (FIRMs). It is anticipated that new FIRMs will be developed for Delaware County over the next several years, which will include more detailed SFHAs especially in the West-of-Hustson watershed.</p>   |
| <p><b>Stub &amp; Marian Ploutz/Landowners</b></p>  | <p>The recommendation to Streamline the Permit process does not go far enough. There are too many organizations with their fingers in the process and it will never work. There should be one agency as the lead agency with the others signing off to that agency with the Permit application being more general than specific and only a few pages long. The permitting process should be followed up with the technical and design help and the SWCD as a support agency in implementing the projects.</p>         |
| <p><b>Public Meeting comments Walton 3/31/2005</b></p>                                     | <p>Do you think we can get them to work together instead of going to one to another agency? Are you going to get Army Corps of Engineers to cooperate?</p>  |
| <p><b>Public Meeting Walton 3/31/2005</b></p>  | <p>There are some private owners that would like to fund their own projects but the permitting is such a hassle. Is there going to be technical advice or help with permitting?</p>   |
| <p><b>Shelly Johnson/ Chief Planner Delaware County Planning Dept.</b></p>                 | <p>This should be an ideal way to do permits. Would this include the permits that the Delaware County Department of Public Works (DPW) must get prior to doing bridge work and/or other road improvements along a stream? If this is the case DPW should be involved in this process and should be included in any committee that would be used to re-write the regulations allowing for a more direct permitting process.</p>  |

| Name  | Recommendation #6  |
|---|--|
| <b>Ron Frisbee/Landowner</b>  | #6-#14 all very good ideas and should be implemented.  |
| <b>Jerry Fraine/NYS DEC</b>   | This would be a tremendous asset to the municipalities and to DEC also. The problem would likely come down to cost. Typically, if a town wants to replace a culvert, and we request one with a larger diameter than they are proposing they resist on the basis of cost. However, if we can get some to put in larger diameter culverts, and bed them in the stream, I think we'll have less problems with aggradation above the culvert and erosion of bed and banks below the culvert.   |
| <b>Lucinda C. Collins/Director<br/>Bureau of Program Resources<br/>and Flood Protection</b> | When considering culvert designs, the developer should review the effective FIRMs to see if the project falls within a mapped SFHA, and be aware of the requirements of the Local Law for Flood Damage Prevention in effect in that community. In general, development in the SFHA can have no adverse effects on adjoining properties, and if located within a regulatory floodway the project must not increase the base flood elevation (BFE).  |
| <b>Public Meeting<br/>Delhi 4/19/2005</b>   | How can people remove debris from culverts (regarding DEC permit issues)? Are SWCD permitting people to excavate gravel bars and remove debris?  |
| <b>Shelly Johnson/ Chief Planner<br/>Delaware County Planning Dept.</b>                     | <p>This technical assistance could be provided through recommendations made during the development of individual Town Highway Management Plans (HMPs). Then reconstruction can be incorporated with other highway maintenance programs. Therefore a more comprehensive look at the problem can be incorporated into the repairs, extending the life of the infrastructure.</p> <p>The Delaware County Planning Department (DCPD) along with DPW has committed significant time to the development of Town HMPs. The HMPs are intended to be a tool for municipalities to categorize and prioritize infrastructure improvements. DCPD has been very successful at getting funding to complete inventory and data collection for the HMPs. However, DCPD and DPW have struggled to get funding for the evaluation and assessment portions of the HMP development. This lack of funding has posed a significant hurdle to completing this task. The Management Plan appears to assume DPW can undertake this task, however, it has been our experience that the costs associated will require additional funding and there have been few funding streams available for this work.</p> |

| Name                 | Recommendation #7 |
|----------------------|-------------------|
| Jerry Fraine/NYS DEC | Good              |

| Name  | Recommendation #8  |
|---|--|
| <b>Jerry Fraine/NYS DEC</b>   | As I mentioned previously, I think this would be a very worthwhile endeavor.   |
| <b>Lucinda C. Collins/Director<br/>Bureau of Program Resources<br/>and Flood Protection</b> | It is anticipated that various education and outreach activities will be developed and performed as part of the floodplain remapping effort in the County. We look forward to working with the County and the Stream Corridor Management Program on these items.   |
| <b>Public Meeting<br/>Walton 3/31/2005</b>  | Do you have staff to go out and tutor home owners on how to properly steward their stream? You don't have staff enough to do this?   |
| <b>Shelly Johnson/ Chief Planner<br/>Delaware County Planning Dept.</b>                     | <p>This education and outreach should start with the local planning boards. When a planning board conducts a review for subdivision or a site plan evaluation they should be aware of the concerns of the Soil and Water Conservation District in regards to the impacts on streams in light of additional growth and development. The planning boards could then be used as a local engine to distribute information and they could host workshops for private property owners that are current stakeholders or adjoining property owners.</p> <p>The Delaware County Planning Department's Town Planning Advisory Service (TPAS) may be a tool that could assist in education and outreach to the communities. It may also be useful to approach the town planning boards about the development of watershed associations.</p> |

| Name   | Recommendation #9  |
|--|--|
| Jerry Fraine/NYS DEC   | Good   |
| <p><b>Lucinda C. Collins/Director<br/>Bureau of Program Resources<br/>and Flood Protection</b></p> | <p>Where BFEs and floodways are shown on the effective FIRMs (so called studies"), information is often available from this office that may help document past conditions along the stream. This information generally consists of hydraulic models, commonly developed using HEC-2, which include channel cross-sections, n-values and estimated flows.</p>   |
| <p><b>Public Meeting<br/>Walton 3/31/2005</b></p>  | <p>What should you do in this situation? (Referring to Recommendation #9 photo of the bridge with a gravel problem.)</p>   |
| <p><b>Shelly Johnson/ Chief Planner<br/>Delaware County Planning Dept.</b></p>                     | <p>Most projects require SEQRA and/or NEPA depending on the funding stream. If that were the case those bridges are already being evaluated as to the impacts to the stream in order to get a negative declaration. In addition, NYS DOT may do similar reviews depending on the size of the project they are doing. Design reports and environmental assessments are completed for the larger bridges before they are reconstructed and as part of that work SEQRA and sometimes, NEPA are done. Therefore, the Soil and Water Conservation District geomorphic assessment should be done as part of the environmental review process conducted during the design phase of a project. Delaware County Planning and DPW should use Soil and Water expertise for this specific review and assessment.</p> |

| Name   | Recommendation #10  |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Jerry Fraine/NYS DEC</b></p>   | <p>This is an excellent idea. Every year we get inquires from people that want to know what to do to stop their residences and out buildings from getting flooded. More often than not, when you visit the site they are in some small localized floodplain on a small tributary. Having these floodplains mapped would allow the towns to regulate development within these areas.</p> |
| <p><b>Public Meeting<br/>Walton 3/31/2005</b></p>                              | <p>Isn't the floodplain mapping a project that is a state initiative?</p>   |
| <p><b>Shelly Johnson/ Chief Planner<br/>Delaware County Planning Dept.</b></p> | <p>This recommendation describes a process in which Soil and Water should work with all other partners to complete the County Hazard Mitigation Plan and the FEMA studies and maps. In the text it includes SEMO, however they should also be listed in the recommendation rather than just the description.</p>  |

| Name                 | Recommendation #11 |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| Jerry Fraine/NYS DEC | Good               |

| Name                                       | Recommendation #12  |
|--|---|
| <b>Ron Frisbee/Landowner</b>               | Have FEMA by the property as they did in Schoharie and save us all a lot of money...apply those funds to the failing banks that are degrading water quality.  |
| <b>Phil Pierce/DPW</b>                     | I am surprised to see the two sites in Walton identified as one of the "recommendations". This implies that they are considered much more important than any other identified sites. It seems odd that they are singled out in this manner. |
| <b>Jerry Fraine/NYS DEC</b>                | Good.   |
| <b>Stub &amp; Marian Ploutz/Landowners</b> | Your plans to obtain funds one year, design the next year and the implementation the third year. If a business were run that way you would be out of business before you could get started.   |
| <b>Public Meeting<br/>Walton 3/31/2005</b> | You should start dumping rock over the bank that is what you should be doing to stop the water from hitting the bank.   |

| Name  | Recommendation #13   |
|---|--|
| Jerry Fraine/NYS DEC  | Good.  |
| Shelly Johnson/ Chief Planner<br>Delaware County Planning Dept. | None of the criteria discusses the needs of intervention based on surrounding land uses and future development pressure. This includes the potential for subdivision, the potential for development based on local zoning or other land use laws and the potential for development based on proximity to hamlet or village areas and their extension areas. All of these things have profound impact on the continued deterioration of stream banks and the potentials for contaminants into a stream. These should certainly be criteria for evaluating priority areas. |

| <b>Name</b>                 | <b>Recommendation #14</b>   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| <b>Jerry Fraine/NYS DEC</b> | This is of course a good idea. I thought it might be useful to include a time frame for the updates. Maybe every 5 years? |

| Name  | Recommendation #15<br>Gravel Bar Removal  |
|---|---|
| <b>Tom O'Brien/WAC<br/>Executive Director</b>   | We suggest that SCMP explore a maintenance program to identify and economically remove problematic gravel bars and debris from stream channels. This process should also include a component to expedite regulatory permitting.   |
| <b>James Eisel/Delaware County<br/>Board of Supervisors Chairman</b>                  | Gravel buildup in stream is a systemic problem that needs to be addressed. The Board and our constituents have strong feelings regarding this matter. Therefore, the Board moved that an additional recommendation be included in the Plan to implement a pilot program to scientifically remove problematic gravel bars to realistic stream channel dimensions and the New York City should assist with the funding this program as part of their Stream Management Program. |
| <b>Willard and Lucile<br/>Frisbee/Landowners</b>                                      | gravel deposits also cause serious erosion and should not be ignored  |
| <b>Stub &amp; Marian<br/>Ploutz/Landowners<br/>(Public meeting Walton, 3/31/2005)</b> | What about gravel bar removal? The channel is not as deep as it used to be... I think it is flooding out faster because of the change in channel depth. What can we do about this? Should we get a drag line and dredge the stream out?   |
| <b>Public Meeting<br/>Walton 3/31/2005</b>  | We need to take out some of these gravel bars. Town roads clean out the ditch and the sediment builds gravel bars in the river where I used to swim is now filled in.   |
| <b>Agricultural Meeting<br/>Delhi 3/24/2005</b>                                       | Previous to 1996 storm, 5 feet of top soils is lost each year and we were allowed to go into the river to remove gravel bars. Why are we not allowed to continue to get into the rivers to remove gravel bars again?<br>Gravel removal needs to be addressed! It is less money to remove gravel each year which is a temporary fix but it is the biggest bang for the buck.   |
| <b>Public Meeting<br/>Delhi 3/24/2005</b>   | Are SWCD permitting people to excavate gravel bars and remove debris?   |
| <b>Public Meeting<br/>Delhi 4/19/2005</b>   | How can people remove debris from culverts (regarding DEC permit issues)? Are SWCD permitting people to excavate gravel bars and remove debris?   |
| <b>Public Meeting<br/>Walton 3/31/2005</b>  | What should you do in this situation? (Referring to Recommendation #9 photo of the bridge with a gravel problem.)   |
| <b>Willard and Lucile<br/>Frisbee/Landowners</b>                                      | Removal of flood debris should be facilitate in a timely manner. (Our discussion concerns fallen trees, but gravel deposits also cause serious erosion and should not be ignored.) Dangerous blockage of the stream by trees can cause loss of life (canoeist/kayakers) plus the normal flow can be diverted to cause severe ongoing erosion and loss of cropland.  |

| Name  | General Comments  |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Ron Frisbee/Landowner</b></p>           | <p>Not sure where this fits, but the same philosophy that has been utilized by New York City in their Watershed Agriculture and Forestry Programs needs to be applied to the Stream Corridor Management Program in terms of cost-sharing. The Riparian landowner should not be responsible for the costs involved in the implementation of stabilization methodologies.</p> <p>A concerted effort should be made by the shareholders within the NYC Watershed to receive permission to "work in the wet". To continue to be restricted to a "no noticeable change in turbidity" standard for water quality in New York State will be too expensive to implement effective stabilization of streambanks on a Basin-wide scale. What funding is available would go much farther if work could be done "in the wet" as in Pennsylvania and other states. The Army Corp and NYC should move to get an exemption for the permitted work under this Program. As Rosgen did out West, the SCMP should gather turbidity data during natural events for comparison to turbidity generated by stabilization techniques.</p> <p>Overall, the recommendations are great. Keep up the good work!</p> |
| <p><b>Gail Hillriegel/Director of WAC</b></p> | <p>You asked me to send my comments on the Stream corridor Plan draft. I thought it was very good and covered considerable situations making it overall very useful and helpful.</p> <p>I know with any such work the next question is who is going to finance it? May I suggest that the townships of the county each give money toward implementing the plan. Possibly \$10,000 to start to get the ball rolling. My reason for suggesting the townships get involved is they tend to wait until there is a flood and then expect FEMA to bail them out. Why not do prevention work to help avoid serious damage to roads and bridges. It seems that it would have to make a difference. Private citizens could also be made aware of situations near their homes and farms that could help prevent flooding by sometimes just some simple, inexpensive solutions. I would hope as many of these a possible could be done as soon as the problem was identified and a solution decided.</p> <p>I would hope that if everyone worked together, WAC, DEP, Townships, NRCS, Soil and Water and individual citizens as well as the counties in the</p>                                    |
| <p><b>Dan Sanford/DPW</b></p>                 | <p>From what I read it looks good.</p>  |
| <p><b>Paula O'Brien</b></p>                   | <p>Great vision! Great recommendations. The teaming of agencies in the CREP, Stream Permitting, and DCAP is exactly what is needed.</p> <p>If I were to suggest anything it would be to encourage and incentive program for maintaining &amp; managing streambanks. A financial incentive (tax break, money) would be the best, but in lieu of money - recognition of good stewardship would be great. I was thinking along the lines of "Dairy of Distinction" - a sign or plaque recognizing a family, or town, or village for maintaining their streambanks would get people talking about it, get it in the paper every so often, and make it a source of pride.</p>  |

| Name   | General Comments   |
|--|--|
| <b>Ed Stammel</b>  | <p>As an increasing number of second-home owners displace dairy operations, the proportion of land in ag production is decreasing. Unlike a farmer who is protecting his fields and livestock by creating and maintaining stable waterways, the weekenders only want to enjoy his "country place". There is, at present, no financial incentive to practice conservation on their land. There are two areas which must be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Soil and water conservation along the river. The non-ag owner is interested primarily in the aesthetic and is prone to remove vegetation from the bank. In addition he tends to build structures on the bank for personal use. These activities have the potential to degrade the channel</li> <li>2. Recreational quality and access. The non-ag owner does not like to share his "piece of heaven". Thinking with a city/suburban perspective, they tend to fence and protect their land from trespass. They bar hunting, discourage fishing, and consider passing canoes and intrusion.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Phil Pierce/DPW</b>   | <p>It provides an excellent reference manual to help explain the relationships of the many and varied entities involved with this complex topic. Nice touch on the introductory quotation at the beginning of sections. Clearly there is relatively little text devoted directly to DPW issues - I think I found them. I suggest that work cited in Bovina Center and on Page Avenue (mentioned on Page 10 of 16, Section 4) be reworded to say it is nearing construction - not built yet. Nice job - you should be very proud of it. Hope money can be found to keep it a living document.</p>   |
| <b>Tom Hutson/Landowner</b>  | <p>It is real important that your program get everyone on board that is agencies, landowners, and public officials. We have gone far too long without a scientific based plan for the East and West branches of the Delaware River. As a lifetime resident &amp; farmer I am affected by this daily. We need an acting plan that allows us to deal with problems that need to be addressed in a timely and economically viable manner which taking into consideration all of our regions resources. They would include people, wildlife and loss of fertile river bottom soils.</p>  |
| <b>Tom O'Brien/WAC<br/>Executive Director</b>                        | <p>The plan as presented is a good starting document for the future of stream stewardship and management in the West Branch. Overall we support the plan recommendations and concepts for the future of integrated stream management in the West Branch Delaware River watershed.</p>  |
| <b>James Eisel/Delaware County<br/>Board of Supervisors Chairman</b> | <p>The plan was well thought out and presented and your concept of the plan as a starting document for the future of integrated stream stewardship and management was well received. For these reasons the Board adopted the Plan. The Board of Supervisors is committed to sound reasonable stewardship for our stream corridor and is fully supportive of the recommendations presented.</p>   |
| <b>Willard and Lucile<br/>Frisbee/Landowners</b>                     | <p>Removal of flood debris should be facilitate in a timely manner. (Our discussion concerns fallen trees, but gravel deposits also cause serious erosion and should not be ignored.) Dangerous blockage of the stream by trees can cause loss of life (canoeist/kayakers) plus the normal flow can be diverted to cause severe ongoing erosion and loss of cropland.</p>  |

| Name   | General Comments   |
|--|--|
| <p><b>Public Meeting<br/>Delhi 3/24/2005</b></p>                               | <p>Do we have a practical plan for establishing Watershed Associations and for getting money? (Funds needed vs. funds available) Don't fight for money, become "fund-raisers". The Plan should suggest ways to get funding. Towns should give tax incentives to non-ag. landowners to encourage them to take over stewardship being all our money goes to ag. land.</p>  |
| <p><b>Shelly Johnson/ Chief Planner<br/>Delaware County Planning Dept.</b></p> | <p>1.The commendations seemed difficult to understand until after reading the remainder of the document. By making them the first thing the reader sees, it is difficult to justify each recommendation and there is little understanding as to the importance of each recommendation. Often in planning documents an easy to read table or Action Plan can be a useful tool in assisting potential users of the plan by providing a quick reference which includes what the tasks are, who the responsible party for each task is, an anticipated time of completion for each task and potential funding sources for financing each task.</p> <p>2.Are the recommendations in order of priority? If so, how was the prioritization calculated and what are the time frames for anticipated completion of each recommendation?</p> |