

Appendix B
Public Participation

Public Forums

Introduction

One of the four main components of the Cayuga Lake Watershed Restoration & Protection Plan process has been public outreach and participation. There have been several opportunities for public participation over the last four years that have led to significant input into the Cayuga Lake Watershed Restoration & Protection Plan process. These include the following:

- 1997 Finger Lakes-Lake Ontario Watershed Protection Alliance (FL-LOWPA) Conference
- 1997 Neighbors Around Cayuga Lake Watershed Mini-Conference I
- 1998 Cayuga Lake Watershed Network Stakeholders Survey
- 1998 Neighbors Around Cayuga Lake Watershed Mini-Conference II/Cayuga Lake Watershed RPP Public Forum I
- 1999 Intermunicipal Organization Water Quality Issues Identification
- 2000 Cayuga Lake Draft Preliminary Watershed Characterization, RPP Public Forum II
- 2001 Watershed Issues and Strategies, RPP Public Forum III
- 2001 Draft Restoration & Protection Plan Input, RPP Public Forum IV

1997 Finger Lakes-Lake Ontario Watershed Protection Alliance (FL-LOWPA) Conference

NYS Department of Environmental Conservation staff facilitated a session at the Finger Lakes - Lake Ontario Water Planning Alliance (FL-LOWPA) Conference on Visioning for the Future of Cayuga Lake. Developing a vision meant to take a long-term, seventh generation approach to looking at the watershed. The objective was to get people to share their view of what the watershed should be in the future; the overall goal or vision. The process used to develop this vision included: an overview of the Ecosystem Approach to Watershed Management; individual time to brainstorm elements of the vision; round robin responses from the participants; an opportunity to clarify, combine and evaluate responses, developing the vision (vision statement); determining next steps; and a process check.

Since time was limited and there were over fifty people participating, the process ended at the "clarify, combine and evaluate responses" step, and no vision statement was developed. The combined, clarified categories for developing the vision were completed and are as follows:

- land use planning
- quality of water/natural resources
- fisheries/habitat
- environmentally aware and responsible public
- quality of life

- effective, inclusive community decision-making
- quantity of water
- economic revitalization and sustainability
- cultural diversity

All the above categories were to be included in some manner in a future vision statement for the Cayuga Lake Watershed.

Neighbors Around Cayuga Lake Watershed Mini-Conference I

Building on the information and the process used at the FL-LOWPA Conference, further visioning was done at the first Neighbors Around Cayuga Lake Watershed Mini-conference held at Cayuga Nature Center in 1997. This was a gathering of over 100 individuals who had interests in the Cayuga Lake Watershed either as property owners, businesses, agencies and organizations, and/or other interested parties.

Groups worked through a visioning process that resulted in several proposed vision statements and at least, components of a vision statement. Many of the mini-conference attendees had not participated in the visioning session at the FL-LOWPA conference and required time to discuss the future of the watershed. Proposed draft vision statements and components for visions included:

"Create a long-term dynamic vision through a continuing process of public involvement that guides

-land use planning

-public education and involvement

-environmental management decisions

-economic development

on a cooperative, intermunicipal basis throughout the watershed; in order to protect and enhance the natural, social, cultural and economic environments of the Cayuga Lake Watershed on a sustainable basis."

"We seek:

A lake as aesthetic resource for mental and spiritual health; cohesive and consistent land use planning and management; individually and politically healthy watershed ecosystem; public awareness education; access to lake; awareness of impact of watershed on lake ecosystem; environmentally sensitive commercial and agricultural operations."

Other Vision components

-Water quality standards

-Safe drinking water

-Educated public

-Protected "viewsheds"

-Waste water management

-Positive tax incentives to preserve water quality

-Tourism and other economic development

-Organizing effort to deal with lake issues (education, communication, and collaboration)

- Support for multiple uses of lake (supply, recreation, access, agriculture, etc.)
- Public awareness and involvement
- Zero impact from new development on water quality
- Maintain and improve the quality of life in the watershed (economic, environmental, social)

Cayuga Lake Watershed Network Stakeholders Survey

During the fall of 1998, a phone and written survey was conducted at the request of the Cayuga Lake Watershed Network and funded by FL-LOWPA, to determine what issues were of importance to a variety of stake holders in the Cayuga Lake watershed. The survey was undertaken, in order to discover priorities and concerns of the various constituencies and geographic areas within the watershed. Approximately 300 individuals, in a weighted sample answered questions from the perspective of the entity they were representing and then as individuals. The most relevant issues concerning the watershed as identified by watershed stakeholders in **rank** order were:

Responding as Representatives

- 1) Water quality
- 2) Public Health Issues
- 3) Land Use and Development
- 4) Tourism
- 5) Preservation of Open Space
- 6) Invasive Plants and animals
- 7) Economic Development
- 8) Access to the lake
- 9) Lake water levels
- 10) Motorized recreational vehicles
- 11) Recreational activities

Responding as Individuals

- 1) Water quality
- 2) Public Health Issues
- 3) Preservation of Open Space
- 4) Land use and development
- 5) Invasive plants and animals
- 6) Economic development
- 7) Tourism
- 8) Access to the lake
- 9) Lake water levels
- 10) Motorized recreational vehicles
- 11) Recreational activities

Neighbors Around Cayuga Lake Mini-Conference II/Cayuga Lake Watershed Management Plan Project Public Forum I

As part of the Neighbors Around Cayuga Lake Mini-Conference II, held in November 1998, Cayuga Lake Watershed residents participated in a session to provide input on the Cayuga Lake Watershed Management Plan and planning process. Participants were provided with information from a panel representing the Town of Ledyard, Central New York Regional Planning and Development Board, Genesee/Finger Lakes Regional Planning Council, and the Cayuga Lakes Watershed Network about the Cayuga Lake Watershed Management Plan project, timeline, process, and partners. Written materials about the management plan and process were also provided to participants.

In small groups, participants were asked to individually identify and write down any (and all) issues, concerns, interests and passions they had regarding the Cayuga Lake Watershed. They were then asked to identify their top three issues. Participants shared their issues/interests within their small groups until all issues were recorded. Only unique issues were recorded and all issues, concerns, interests and passions were recorded even if not identified as a top three on a persons list (the overall group list was exhaustive of all individual lists in group). Since only unique issues were recorded, the subtle differences of wording or meaning were not necessarily recorded. Forty-three watershed residents provided input. Categories for responses were created post facto from all group lists to assist in organizing responses and clarifying narrative.

The issues were not prioritized or ranked in any manner for each person had their own concerns and interests, and the object of this session was to help identify issues in the watershed so they could be addressed in the Cayuga Lake Watershed Characterization and ultimately in the Management Plan. The public has many other opportunities throughout the process to prioritize issues within the watershed; at future public participation sessions, when reviewing drafts of the Characterization and Plan, and locally within their municipality.

Issues identified by individuals at the Neighbors Around Cayuga Lake Watershed public participation session as important to them:

Land Use Issues

A range of issues of concern surfaced in the area of land use including urban and rural sprawl, unplanned development, changes in the natural environment (specifically diminishing forests and wetlands), decrease in farm land, need for changes in land use planning, and others. People suggested that there needs to be changes in the way planning occurs for land use in the future. Specifically, of concern was: the need for model land use planning; land use planning to protect the environment and the rural communities; small municipalities needing help in planning; planning for open space, natural areas, and habitat protection; concern that there be smart land use and growth control within the watershed in the future; and that planning be based on science.

Water Management Issues

A wide variety of issues focused on the actual management of water within the watershed. These included everything from various water permitting processes and agencies, to methods used to manage stormwater runoff. Specific named issues included: concerns about water permitting processes looking individually (case by case) and not cumulatively; the need for taking into account total daily maximums; there needs to be a watershed view for permitting; urban and rural stormwater management; use of traditional engineering methods instead of other methods for water management; the limitation of the lake to dilute pollutants; issues over regulations that affect business and individual property owners within the watershed; shoreline and riparian corridor protection; implementation of best management practices for water management; and watershed-wide regulation and enforcement.

Erosion and Siltation

Participants had concerns about erosion control in the Cayuga Lake tributaries. Siltation, especially at the South end of Cayuga Lake was a big issue. Erosion associated with stormwater runoff and the resulting sedimentation were identified as concerns in the watershed. How issues of erosion, siltation, sedimentation and stormwater runoff were addressed was also of concern to the public. Using traditional engineering methods only and not looking holistically at these issues was much discussed. The need for other methods to control erosion was of interest to participants.

IO Water Quality Issues Identification, March 1999

Part 1: Visioning

Participants were asked imagine that they return to the Cayuga Lake watershed after an absence of 20 years. The watershed management plan is in place. Each person was asked to name three specific attributes of the lake or watershed (water quality related) that they would like to see. Responses were clustered into broad categories (human uses, lake ecology, control of inputs, and tools).

Each respondent was asked to rank the issues as Priority 1, 2 or 3. The data summary includes a total score for each comment based on the priorities. Priority 1 was assigned 3 points, Priority 2, 2 points and Priority 3, 1 point. These results are included in the “weighted rank” column next to each specific comment.

From the rankings, it is clear that protection and improvement of the lake as a recreational resource (swimming and aesthetic) and a source of high quality drinking water are the highest priorities. Public access to the lake is also a high priority.

Part 2: Specific Issues, Impairments, and Sources of Data

As the second exercise, each of the four tables (southern lake and watershed, mid-lake and watershed, northern lake and watershed, and lake-wide, watershed-wide) focused on identifying specific water quality issues. Guided by a facilitator at each table, the groups created a matrix of sources of pollution, type of pollutant, water quality impacts, uses affected, and any data sources for documentation.

Whenever possible, the group identified the specific location in the lake or watershed where the pollution source was an issue. Maps of the specific lake and watershed segments were marked with numbered dots. The numbers correspond to the numbered responses presented in the tables.

The following series of tables records the specific responses provided during the meeting.

Part 1: Visioning

| Category | Subcategory | Weighted Rank | Comment |
|---|---|------------------------------|--|
| Human uses: Recreational <i>(total 63 points)</i> | Swimming 17 | 11 | Swimming at Stewart park in Ithaca |
| | | 1 | Clean safe swimming at the south end of the lake |
| | | 2 | Swimming everywhere in Cayuga Lake |
| | | 3 | Swimming at Stewart Park and other public beaches |
| | Recreation 4 | 2 | More recreational use available in watershed |
| | | 2 | Health condition of lake for recreation |
| | Access 19 | 15 | Improved public access |
| | | 2 | Development of access with sensitivity to fragile systems |
| | | 2 | Unrestricted access for all recreational needs (i.e. access to lake and minimal growth of weeds) |
| | Aesthetic 12 | 3 | Reduced algae blooms |
| | | 3 | Much less weed growth for all recreational uses |
| | | 2 | Increased post-storm transparency |
| | | 2 | Preservation of aesthetics/scenic beauty |
| | | 2 | Aesthetic beauty of lake preserved, including tranquility |
| | Noise 5 | 2 | Less noise from watercraft |
| | | 3 | Noise pollution from jet skis for example |
| | Fishing 6 | 3 | Excellent fishing opportunities |
| | | 1 | Pan fishing with public access (for children etc) |
| | | 2 | Fish at Fall Creek |
| | Human uses: Water supply <i>(total 23 points)</i> | Drinking water quality 23 | 19 |
| 2 | | | Less sediment in lake for municipal water use |
| 2 | | | Protection of public drinking water sources |
| Human Uses: Economics <i>(total 8 points)</i> | Economics 7 | 3 | Sustainable economics |
| | | 2 | Economic development: develop a plan to help use the lake to improve the economy |
| | | 2 | Quality of life among agricultural and urban sector |
| | Land ownership 1 | 1 | Native Americans don't get control of 64000 acres around north end of Cayuga Lake |

Part 1: Visioning

| Category | Subcategory | Weighted Rank | Comment |
|--|--|---|--|
| Lake Ecology <i>(total 50 points)</i> | Water Quality (not specific to any use) 18 | 5 | Lake quality maintained as it is now, no degradation |
| | | 7 | Improved water quality |
| | | 1 | Find no pollution in Cayuga Lake basin |
| | | 2 | Improved protection of ground and surface water |
| | | 3 | Lake in near pristine condition |
| | Natural resources 17 | 3 | Natural resource for all |
| | | 3 | Clean water providing healthy watershed dependent ecosystems and good human drinking water |
| | | 2 | The ecosystem within the lake is healthy |
| | | 2 | Cleaner environment |
| | | 1 | Healthy lake for flora and fauna |
| | | 2 | The ecosystem within the lake is healthy |
| | | 3 | All tributaries healthy |
| | | 1 | Beaver control |
| | Control of weeds 7 | 3 | Reduce/eliminate the seaweed in the lake |
| | | 2 | Reduced algae and other weeds in the lake and good fishing |
| | | 2 | Clean water and fewer weeds |
| | Exotic species 3 | 2 | Elimination of exotic species such as milfoil and control of vegetation in general |
| | | 1 | No new non-native species and a noticeable reduction in previously established ones |
| | Fish community 5 | 1 | Re-appearance of the sturgeon in deep water |
| | | 1 | A healthy fishery and ecosystem |
| | | 2 | Salmon fishing in Salmon Creek |
| | | 1 | Fish spawning in Fall Creek and Cayuga Inlet |
| | Tools for Preservation <i>(total 12 points)</i> | Open space and scenic vistas 12 | 5 |
| 3 | | | Maintain scenic vistas via land use regulation, planning |
| 1 | | Aesthetics of more open areas for the general public | |
| 3 | | Significant tracts of open space in the full variety of habitats are preserved, both in the watershed and along the majority of the lake shore. | |

Part 1: Visioning

| Category | Subcategory | Weighted Rank | Comment | |
|---|--|---------------|--|--|
| Management and regulatory tools <i>(total 17 points)</i> | Water level and flooding 7 | 1 | Flood control (water level management) to help reduce erosion | |
| | | 1 | Manage lake levels appropriately for recreational use | |
| | | 2 | Flood-prone areas are under better control | |
| | | 3 | Water supply systems improved to allow better water level management | |
| | Regulation of shoreline construction 1 | 1 | No further construction on the lake perimeter and some buildings gone. | |
| | Implementation funding 1 | 1 | \$ to implement plan | |
| | Land use planning 8 | 3 | 3 | Controls on development |
| | | | 1 | Better land management |
| | | | 2 | Balanced management plan |
| | | 1 | 1 | Zoning and health laws enforced, septic systems etc. |
| | | | 1 | Use of best management practices and land use planning that considers and protects the environment long-term |
| <i>Control of Inputs</i> <i>(total 28 points)</i> | Wastewater management 11 | 3 | Properly running wastewater treatment plants | |
| | | 2 | Programs for residual sewage | |
| | | 2 | Municipal water system and sewer around the lake | |
| | | 1 | Control of wastewater discharges from public or private sources (no pathogens) | |
| | | 2 | No lake-related industry potentially damaging to the lake | |
| | | 1 | Regional wastewater treatment programs | |
| | Agricultural 5 | 3 | 3 | Agriculture thriving in the southern basin, with reduced sediment and nutrients |
| | | | 1 | Progress for agricultural runoff |
| | | | 1 | Preservation of agricultural economy with controlled erosion and sedimentation |
| | Erosion and sedimentation 11 | 3 | 3 | Less sedimentation pollution of south end |
| | | | 2 | Control erosion |
| | | | 3 | Beach areas no longer eroded |
| | | 1 | 1 | Reduced sedimentation |
| | | | 2 | Sediment control from runoff |
| | Nonpoint sources 1 | 1 | Lawn care, fertilizer, herbicides | |

Part 2: Specific Water Quality Issues
Group 1: North basin, Northern watershed

| SOURCE | TYPE | ISSUE | USE | DATA |
|--|------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (1) Nonpoint source of TCE | Volatile organic compound | Drinking water | Drinking water | County health and DEC |
| (2) Water level drawdown | Water level management | Biotic habitat | Habitat alteration | DEC, DOT |
| (3) Inadequately treated domestic sewage | Nutrients, bacteria, oxygen demand | Smell and bacteria | Aesthetic Water supply | Bridgeport |
| (4) Canoga Creek area | Sediment | Turbidity | Water supply | Treatment plant reports |
| (5) Agriculture and residential runoff | Nutrients in water | Weeds, water clarity | Boating, drinking water | |
| (6) Exotic species (rudd and zebra mussel) | Transplanting | Water quality and filtration of microorganisms | Food chain | Dave McNeil at Brockport |
| (7) Septic systems | Nutrients, bacteria, oxygen demand | Water quality, algae, aquatic vegetation | Navigation | Ray Oglesby |
| (8) Marinas | Organic chemicals gas/oil etc. | Toxic substances | Water quality drinking swimming | Visual observation |
| (9) Stormwater runoff | Road-side ditches | Turbidity | Water quality drinking swimming | Visual observation |

Part 2: Specific Water Quality Issues
Group 2: Mid-lake, Mid-watershed

| SOURCE | TYPE | ISSUE | USE | DATA |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|-------------|
| (1) Stewart Park | Runoff from Fall Creek | Water is filthy and polluted | Swimming | |
| (2) Sewage treatment plant | Effluent running to lake | Affects aquatic life in streams | Aquatic life | DEC |
| (3) North end | Nutrients and possibly pathogens | Water fowl | Drinking and recreation | none |
| (4) Hog farms | Nutrients (nitrogen), odors | Nutrient loading and aquifer | Recreation and drinking water | none |
| (5) Building marina | Scenic, safety | More cars, sewage | Neighboring properties, cove | |
| (6) Deans Cove Stream | Sediment | Sediment loading | Recreation and drinking | |
| (7) Milfoil | Introduction of exotic species | Recreational use, disruption of ecosystem | Swimming, boating | |
| (8) Zebra mussels | Introduction of exotic species | Drinking water intakes | Drinking water, recreation | |
| (9) Lamprey eels | Depletion of fish supply | Fish community | Fishing, recreation | |

Part 2: Specific Water Quality Issues
Group 3: Southern Lake, Southern Watershed

| SOURCE | TYPE | ISSUE | USE | DATA |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------|
| (1) Rapid storm runoff | Sediments and nutrients | Lack of transparency, lack of infiltration, increased sedimentation, aesthetics (smelly) | Swimming Boating Drinking Fishing | USGS Cornell LSC Milliken |
| (2) Wastewater treatment plants | Biochemical oxygen demand. Phosphorus and nitrogen, pathogens | Algae blooms Transparency Weed growth | Fishing Recreation Drinking water | |
| (3) Oil spills (Jacksonville leak, Fall Creek and Inlet spills) | Petroleum products | Ground and surface water quality, ecosystem degradation, fish productivity, general ecosystem health | Fishing Recreation Drinking water | |
| (4) Private septic systems | Bacteria Nutrients Chemicals Pathogens | Groundwater pollution | Drinking water | |
| (5) Abandoned landfills (Trumansburg area, Cornell low-level radioactive, etc.) | Heavy metals, petroleum | Surface water and groundwater (localized in watershed), wildlife | Drinking water General water quality, Environmental health | |
| (6) Lawn and garden overuse of pesticides and fertilizers | Pesticides and fertilizers | Water quality Turbidity Wildlife | Drinking water Recreation Wildlife | |

Part 2: Specific Water Quality Issues
Group 4: Lake-wide, Watershed -Wide

| SOURCE | TYPE | ISSUE | USE | DATA |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| (1) Sediment streams and agricultural runoff (south end) | Nutrients Pathogens Pesticides Sediment./ fill-in | Degraded water quality Clarity decrease | Recreational use Human health Drinking water Fishing | USGS Health depts. |
| (2) Treatment plant | Phosphorus Nitrogen Metals Coliform Giardia and Cryptosporidia Viruses Pathogens | Drinking water source Recreational use Metals in fish | Drinking Swimming Recreational use | Special project (Coliform data not that great) Treatment plant (age and efficiency) |
| (3) Lake level | Erosion and sedimentation Inundated septic systems Water supply systems Salt water Concentrate contaminants Mosquitoes | Increased turbidity Affect water supply issues (including algae due to septic) Recreational use Access to homes | Recreation Navigation Drinking water Fish population | Canal Corp Citizens around the lake |
| (4) Camps in floodway with unregulated septic systems | Pathogens Nitrogen Phosphorus Coliform | Similar to wastewater treatment plants | Swimming Boating Drinking water Public health Insects | Cayuga County DOH Other health departments? Smaller political subdivisions (code enforcement people?) |
| (5) Commercial and residential development around the lake | Runoff Impervious surfaces Infrastructure (bring in water and sewer) Erosion | Degraded water quality in lake Loss of natural infiltration Loss of open space | Open space Lack of public access Increased noise pollution General water quality Decreased | Building permits Zoning boards Home Builders Associations Remote sensing Aerial photos (historical) |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|-------------|--|
| | | | agriculture | |
|--|--|--|-------------|--|

Cayuga Lake Preliminary Watershed Characterization/Cayuga Lake Watershed Management Plan Project Public Forum II

Public participation meetings were held in January and early February 2000 (see announcement below). 155 people attended the meetings to discuss the Draft Cayuga Lake Watershed Preliminary Watershed Characterization and anything else relating to the watershed.

January 11, 2000 - Mynderse Academy, Troy Street, Seneca Falls

January 13, 2000 - Southern Cayuga High School, Rt. 34B, Poplar Ridge

January 19, 2000 - Boynton Middle School, N. Cayuga St., Ithaca

Forum Comments and Response Document (see <http://www.gflrpc.org/caycharcomments.htm>)

Public Forum III

The management planning process continued with public meetings to discuss strategies for addressing watershed issues. The meetings took place at four locations around the watershed in February 2001. The following are the dates and locations of the forums with the notes from the small breakout groups:

February 6 : Seneca Falls at Mynderse Academy

Small Group I

Additional dollars for Environmental Protection Fund

Support agriculture so they can remain viable as they protect water quality

More education – especially youth programs through schools, 4-H, etc..

Voluntary incentive based programs

Beef up funding, ID funding

Information on what has worked

 Tax incentives to develop along sewer lines

Small Group II

On-site waste water treatment

 Sewers?

 Inspections?

Runoff

 Pesticides

 Sediment

Cooperation with agricultural interests

Small Group III

Need to know more about water resources & existing efforts

Need more focus (in the plan) on preventing industrial pollution

Need to help agriculture by not placing additional financial burdens
Failed septic in Fayette
Salt on roads in Seneca Falls and State highways
Need education & pick-up on household hazardous waste
Education & work on point and non-point source problems
Abandoned wells

Small Group IV

Concerns

- Canal corridor and the Town of Tyre
- Seneca Meadows
- Natural springs – who tests if at all?
- Septic tanks (Canoga?)
- Where does septic tank pumping go?
- Ground water flow / contaminant possibilities

What can we do?

- Get more people involved!
- Education – link public health
- Press releases to daily newspaper
- Advantages pointed out to be involved
- Link from newspapers to IO website
- Focus on youth education

Small Group V

What Communities Are Doing!

- Springport – sewer system on shore
- Cayuga County – septic system inspection & new sewer approval

Examples: models?

- Casanovia has a citizens advisory board
 - Good rep work with zoning and town board
- Rochester is buying parts of the watershed to conservation
 - Work with the local Land Trust – conservation easements

What could be done?

- Education via Town/ Village/ school newsletters
- Hedge rows help prevent soil loss (both ag and residential)
 - Hedge row trimmer is bought by SWCD and shared with farmers
- Road ditch detention basins and wetlands

Focus on Education

- Education is where people are – malls, schools, churches
- City of Syracuse sewage sludge is spread on Cayuga Lake Watershed (out or region sludge is brought into watershed)

February 8 : Poplar Ridge at South Cayuga High School

Small Group I

Our concerns are

- Transport mechanisms: sediment
- Cayuga – Seneca canal as part of the NY (Cayuga) watershed
- Falling property values for homes near factory farms
- What are we doing to help farmers improve manure & chemical use practices
- What are the water safety implications of liquid manure, both for surface run-off & filtration as well as for air quality from spraying
- How much atrazine & roundup is in our water
- Manure slurries, (lakes) are unlined, concern about run-off, overflows into creeks
- What about notification of pesticide application for surrounding property owners/families
- Can Cayuga County get a permanent site for receiving household hazardous waste?
- Aurelius situation in a concern – the chemical contamination from industry? How concerned should I be about frequency of testing, buried barrels of chemicals, etc..
- Golf course use of herbicides, pesticides, fertilizers. Over use of these chemicals is a concern. Also, homeowners discarding of chemical wastes – unregulated, undetected
- Well water located near to factory farm operations, contamination from high-pressure spraying of manure, spills that aren't properly cleaned-up, well water that gets contaminated. Need a well testing program county-wide

Small Group II

Concerns

- Lack of awareness
- Fall Creek watershed etc.. separate projects
- Hesitancy to tackle the hard problems. Afraid of pointing fingers
- Grade-school environmental education
 - No deep pocket – big municipality
 - Citizen activism
 - Lots of info available
- Proactive planning on water quality Issues the long-term view
- Represent IO participation by land area rather than name of municipality. 600/700 sounds better than 31/50

Small Group III

Concerns

- Agriculture
 - Education
 - Increasing size
- Septic systems
 - Cayuga county inspects septic systems
 - 6 years too long
 - Tompkins County starting program
- Sewer treatment plants

Ideas

- Monitoring / inspection for septic systems
- Education of
 - Waste disposal on land from
 - Septic tanks
 - Animal waste
- Importance of implementation of plan
 - To gain funding
- Private well testing

Small Group IV

Farming

- Manure spreading
 - Lagoons
 - blue clay?
- Should follow BMPs
- Re-examination of regulations
- Waste (manure) management
 - Limitation/elimination/mitigation of liquid manure
- Pesticides/herbicides
- Timing of fertilization
 - Deep plowing
- Irrigation
 - Dry creeks
 - Issues of scale
 - Dairy operations
- Riparian buffers
- Pathogens
 - New/enforcement of regulations
- Water quality
 - Well testing
 - surface and ground water
- Wildlife decrease?
 - monitoring – bird survey

Ditches

- Erosion
- Human safety
- Loss of buffers/ ag runoff
 - Paving issues
 - Pesticide use
- Sedimentation (loading)

Septic Systems

- Testing
- Costs
- Lakeside systems

Small Group V

What is your community doing?

- Springport

 - Sewers

 - Scrubbers

- Aurora

 - Waste water treatment

Models

- Fall Creek training programs

 - Volunteer monitoring

- Agriculture

 - Best management practices

Needed

- Education

- Sewer systems around the lake (i.e. Genoa – no waste water treatment plant)

What IO can do?

- Respond to requests from individuals

 - Develop funding

 - Get through paperwork

- Back up community groups

Small Group VI

Concerns

- Water quality

 - Drinking water

- Animal manures

- Agricultural practices

- Need accurate facts & information

- Questions about lakeshore property septic tanks (requirements, etc..)

- Municipal waste water overflow

What can be done?

- More education/public awareness

- Education about agricultural practices

- Education of farmers about what the public is thinking

- Working together

- Homeowner practices

- Economic feasibility of making changes

- Fixes are expensive – solutions have huge costs

- Unknown solution – need to think creatively

Small Group VII

Concerns

- Spreading of liquid manure (Salmon Creek)

 - Contaminated wells (i.e. Genoa, Venice Ctr)

- Streambank erosion

- Chemical pollution in aquifer (Aurelius, Springport)

- Organizational structure & purpose (IO/CLWN)

- Spreading manure on frozen fields
- Not all municipalities involved
- Lack of funding (e.g. for monitoring, incentives)
- Strategies to protect water
 - Personal incentives – good/responsible neighbors
 - Financial incentives
 - Monitoring (water quality, BMPs)
- How can the IO help
 - Education (presentations, handouts)
 - Organize/sponsor surveys/ inventories
 - Identify major priorities for action
 - Re-evaluate problems within the watershed on an annual basis

Small Group VIII

Role of Watershed Steward

Ag runoff

- Quantify locally
- Monitoring
- Enacting legislation – put teeth in BMPs

Wetlands conservation

- Incentives (\$)
- Awareness

Education – heightens awareness

Roadbank erosion

Re-establishing hedge rows

- Using natural resources to attract tourists

Zoning in floodplains

Cayuga County's septic system inspection program is a success

Public involvement

Perennial streams are drying up

February 12 : Interlaken at Interlaken Baptist Church

Small Group I

What is being done locally:

- SWCD are perceived (are) the only ones doing anything.

How did it start

Need education

- "Not a problem, why bother?"
- Need varied methods
 - Newspaper (Pennysaver)
 - More "Lakefests"

It is tough

Small Group II

Actions

- Citizen participation
- Education Programs
- Working with youth through schools & other groups
- Schools as partners
- Teacher workshops
- Citizens (volunteers) into schools w/ watershed lessons
- Education about agriculture practices for "neighbors"

Small Group III

Issues, Concerns or Questions

- Siltation & sedimentation

 - South end

 - from tributaries

- Swimming in the Lake(s)

- Roadside ditches – cleaning in Spring

- Algae/ aquatic vegetation

- Odors

 - animal manures

 - chemical fertilizers

- Private septic systems on lake

- Chemicals from vineyards runoff

- Ithaca wastewater treatment plant expansion

- Cornell Expertise incorporated into the management plan (needs coordination)

- Data sharing from around the watershed

- Zebra mussels & other exotics

Small Group IV

What would you like to see done or do?

- Monitoring of run-off & see the outcomes/ interpretation

- Erosion control by local government

- SC lend name & public support – increase public awareness

- Public water supply

- Working with Farm Bureau & local farmers to use "watershed friendly" BMPs

- Homeowner education about using septic systems & water quality practices

Challenge:

- Year-round & seasonal property owners are a diverse community with many interests

- Large watershed

Small Group V

General Concerns

- Increase in the amount of weeds in the lake

 - What is the cause- Nutrients?

- Drinking water from Cayuga Lake

- Paying property taxes – not getting services

- Quality of info on quality of the water

 - Availability of water

What can be done?

- Education – drinking water filtration

- Municipalities

- Help pay for testing & improving septic systems

 - i.e. tax credit

 - spot checking mouth of each creek/river to track non-point sources

Small Group IV

Issues

- Agriculture

- Development / random?

- Lakeshore septic systems

- Groundwater quality

- Preserve quality- aesthetics – development

- Roadside ditches

 - Channel water

 - Erosion

- Old habits!

- Extremists – counterproductive

Opportunities

- IO-education and cooperation

- Show benefits

Examples

- No-till farming

Need: Tools

- Information – popular science writer for executive summary

- Homeowners – informative brochures.

February 14 : Ithaca at Boynton Middle School

What is your community doing?

- Monitor stream bank erosion (Caroline)

- Newfield hooking up to waterline

- What can be done to hook up to sewer line (Newfield)

- High cost of new septic systems

 - Not enough room

 - Poor drainage

- Small scale waste water treatment (can be done)

- Pump out on septics – seems to be all going into the lake

Tompkins County Water Resources Council

- Water quality strategy

- Working with watershed groups

- Fall Creek WS Group/committee

- Caroline group

- Actual membership/ establish assoc membership

Aquifer study
Grants committee
Waste Water Treatment Plant (IAWWF)
25 mil Improvement Plan
Newfield should contact com.
Testing OK landfill
Now need to clean up
What would you like to see happening in the RPP?
Labeling of streets and sewers – Keep Out Materials
In 3 years Ithaca needs a plan to deal with Phase II regulations
Steward Program (relates to a.)
Ice Ban – heavy in BOD,
Nutrients
Need a print-out/ fact sheet
Ground water education
When to worry
Measures to avoid problems
People need to buy into process
Outreach
Well drillers Assoc
Home owner / builders Assoc
Ag must increase livestock/acres but this can work against water quality
Houses with septic systems 30' from creeks
Mines & wells can effect aquifers
How aquifers are being used & how are they effected
Clean up some of the polluted sites NOW
Give guidelines and inform about what individuals can do
Ithaca Falls – site needs to be cleaned up because of lead contamination
Road side ditching
Education
Hydroseeding
Make polluters pay. There are laws already – enforce them!
Devote money for enforcement
Rift between municipalities and citizens
Lake Source Cooling
Reactive P seems high in relation to ambient water
Seems to be creating algae problems
Will there be a threshold?
Recognition of nutrient management
Establish benchmarks
Educate on benchmarks
RPP should include benchmarks
Objective of management plan
Prioritize where limited resources should go
LBs of P thru AES Cayuga
Antibiotics in water

Are we monitoring / testing the right tributaries
How to handle political barriers
The problem with cost benefit analysis
 Look at benefits
Aquifer recharge & projections
Education on what