Public Comments

Comments were solicited during 2 public meetings, through an online submission tool, emails to the Watershed Program Manager, and meetings with stakeholder groups. The comments provided through the various avenues are included below.

Online Submissions through CLWC Website

The online submission form on the Canandaigua Lake Watershed Council’s website received 14 submissions from February 2022 through April 2023. The majority of comment were received in February 2022 after the first public meeting.

*Question 1. What are the three biggest priorities for protecting Canandaigua Lake?*

Some respondents selected more than 3 of the management plan categories. Wetlands and Floodplains and Harmful Algal Blooms were selected most (see Figure below).

*Question 2. What should be the goals of a 9E Addendum for our lake and watershed?*

|  |
| --- |
| Of course keeping the shoreline waste free is very important to keeping the lake clean but it can't be done without the support of the outlining areas |
| to put in place practical and implementable actions which will reduce non point source pollution such as establishing strong riparian buffer area, eliminating chemical pesticides, conserving undeveloped land and ensuring properly function of wastewater and septic systems. |
| Thin out development on the Lakeshore you're getting too crowded and little less road salt is way too much salt being used on these roads and it's not good for the environment |
| Water quality, ending HABs |
| To minimize the harmful effects of human land use, and manage the lake towards a state as close to natural as possible |
| Protect the lake thru regulation before it's too late. Why the marinas on the lake do not even participate in invasive species boat inspections and they make their livings from having a clean lake to boat on! |
| Controlling lake access by nonresidents for swimming and boating. Wastewater management and new development as well as deforestation must be examined together. We must stop residential expansion and work to retain the limited existing natural shorelines. |
| 9E should be a living document (accessible by public online) that describes NEW BMPs for nutrient reduction within clearly defined timelines and funding sources. Would also be helpful to know what measurable steps have been taken since 2014 WMP. |
| Focus on what is flowing into the Lake and the best methods to mitigate those flows using scientifically accepted methods to sample /monitor |
| Education  Think globally, act locally  Make all property owners in the watershed realize they are stakeholders; |

*Question 3. Do you have any specific comments or concerns on the current condition of the lake or watershed?*

|  |
| --- |
| We live on the lake and noticed a lot less zebra mussels toward the end of the summer - maybe it was just an overpopulation problem but definitely less mussels this past year (2021) than in the past summers |
| Something should have been done years ago about all this development up along the lake you getting too crowded too expensive for the average person so what do we have to say for |
| Lakes value seriously impacted by water quality issues. In the short term all we can control are nutrient inputs. Climate change and quagga mussels are here for now. Septic issues are not the bigger issue they once were. What’s left is the everything drains pretty directly into the lake and making land productive often means draining it and getting rid of its ability to detain and retain water by getting it into a ditch and in its way to the lake as quickly as possible |
| We would like to have a better understanding of who controls the lake levels and how the levels are decided appropriate. |
| Harmful algal blooms need to be stopped, but they are only a symptom of larger issues such as increased nutrient runoff among others |
| Get more pro-active before it's too late on this lake!! |
| The fishing is poor particularly for smaller species. The algae blooms seem to only increase. |
| We need to enforce stricter measures regarding these known detriments to our lake’s health. Stop development, limit lake access and stop deforestation. |
| I worry about the high summer traffic on the lake. I would like to see more into about if/how much boats are adding to pollution and problems. |
| Coordinated monitoring/research by DEC/USGS studying changes in aquatic ecology (mussels, fish, waterfowl) as anecdotal observations not productive. Adding nutrient sampling at shorelines might help determine why blooms occur where. |
| Suggest the lake is moving to a negative tipping point facing more severe issues; climate change, lack of awareness/action by many who benefit from the Lake, 100 year ran events every 5 years |
| Seasonal residents will talk my ear off about their slice of paradise, how much they paid for it, how much they pay for upkeep. Upkeep, in their minds, includes heavy fertilization of lawns. I see landscapers dump half a bag on postage stamp size waterfront lawns. The landscapers are local, know it’s wrong, either act sheepishly or get very aggressive, when I point out what they already know. The markup landscapers charge on a bag of fertilizer has got to be so delicious. |

*Question 4. Do you have any comments or suggestions on improvements to the lake or watershed, including specific best management practices?*

|  |
| --- |
| Love all that you're doing, great work! |
| Future looking precipitation and temperature models should be utilized. We are planning for a much altered environment that includes increased rain and water/ air temperature. Our models must acount for it and actions make up for it. |
| Maybe use a little less pesticides herbicides the yards don't need to be green year-round way too many chemicals being used by these multi-million dollar homes along the lake and yet all canandaigua residents. |
| Agricultural bmp’s and educating farmers about values of wetlands and buffers |
| Promote soil conservation through sustainable agriculture methods, and increase the number of wetlands and floodplains |
| 1) Excessive road salt application by towns and state; especially on the East side roads. 2) Towns and state highway depts.roadside drainage practices are lake adverse. |
| I don’t happen to know of any local efforts to educate property owners about the benefits of growing a naturalized lakefront. We don’t even have much naturalized lakefront’s at our parks. We’re missing entire shoreline ecosystems up and down the lake that could help these other issues such as algae blooms, invasive species, etc. We own a cottage in Canada and local college researchers did a shoreline study and education effort some years ago. It was really smart and helpful. |
| Who and how do we enforce stricter management of the above practices? |
| Watershed-wide regulations approved by all municipalities for consistent watercourse/streams/ditches management (wider buffers for buffers for clear-cutting/dumping, livestock grazing, pesticides/herbicide/fertilizer applications) and shoreline protection (consistent setbacks for patios/decks/sheds from shoreline, enforcement of no grading/adding stone to beaches & dark sky compliance for shoreline lighting |
| Move to control our financial destiny rather than the continued dependence on grants and related to address lake issues. Insure watershed manager has the staff to properly approach lake issues and is able to fully focus on lake issues |
| There is a lot of cheating going on. What do seasonal residents care if a bloom occurs when they are not utilizing their property? Seeing is believing. Party on dudes. |

*Question 5. Other comments/suggestions?*

|  |
| --- |
| Very informative presentation 2/18, thanks for the update |
| NYS should fund bmp’s directly so water quality measures will not impact ability of farmers to make a living. Some states like Maryland cover almost all the cost of cover crops, ny could fund construction of manure storage facility, my could also fund equipment purchases for soil and water that would allow shared use of equipment for manure incorporation and planting through cover crops. Fund what needs to be done to clean up the lake not hairbrained schemes to remove algae blooms once they happen |
| Thank you for all your work! |
| We don't need to re-invent the wheel for lake practices that work. Look east to the Adk. Park and Lake George, specifically park agencies that the NYS has set up to protect the lake and the many towns that have adopted lake-friendly regulations. Education alone does NOT work; people are free to ignore the best intended education. |
| Thank you for working to keep the lakes healthy. |
| Thank you for this survey. When is the next watershed meeting. I would like to help. |
| I am very impressed with all the committee is doing to try to protect our lake. Thanks! |
| Consistent stream monitoring to help pin-point pollution sources and subsequently creating measurable goals for reduction. |
| Change management structure with the Cty Plannig Dept. becoming the prime mover in lake management with the watershed manager reporting into that structure. They are our professional planners and play a pivotal role with other big issues facing the county |
| I don’t like HABs, cause  It’s the canary in our planet’s coal mine. It’s only the beginning of greater decline. |

Emails to 9E portal

*Email received February 27, 2022*

“Good morning Kevin,

I read this morning’s article in the D&C regarding the Canandaigua Watershed’s efforts on improving the “health” of the lake and I wanted to ask if there have been any conversations regarding restricting the immense boat traffic on the lake?

I am a resident and have witnessed the immense influx of boats over the years. I understand Skaneateles Lake is the cleanest of the Finger Lake I’m told it regulates the number of boats allowed on the lake at a given time. This sounds like a great idea for not only the health of the lake but for safety and well being of all living on and surrounding the lake. I’ve witnessed blatant disregard of boaters using the lake by using it as their toilet in the worst way you can imagine. Literally.

Just food for thought as you consider the lake’s health. It’s gotten way out of control.

Thank you for your continued efforts. I would be happy to assist this effort in any way I can. Please reach out if I can help.”

Public Presentation #1 – Zoom Chat

14:29:22 From Todd Walter : 2 more years of COVID and we'll all have figured out Zoom

14:54:15 From John Jablonski, Exec Dir, Chaut Watershed Conservancy : Will this presentation be archived and publicly available for viewing in coming days?

15:35:20 From Steve Lewandowski : Congratulations Kevin, these are real improvements.

15:40:51 From John Jablonski, Exec Dir, Chaut Watershed Conservancy : Did your onsite septic modeling take into account what percentage of lake area homes are seasonal and account for that?

15:41:52 From Steve to Kevin Olvany(Direct Message) : Kevin, did I understand that you mentioned that the DEC wants you to name specific areas for attention, as opposed to general type problem areas?

15:43:26 From Colton Ratey (he/they) : This might have been already discussed, but what is the benefit of having the model from cornell over sampling for the actual data

15:44:14 From Lynn Klotz : Very helpful; thank you! Is Allison’s presentation available to re-watch?

15:44:16 From Greg : Even though the conversion to LED flares is minimal, it represents a symbolic effort for awareness of all lake property owners

15:44:21 From bev : Can SWAT estimate the impact of management practices under various weather scenarios? Will we be able to say some management practices can perform better under more extreme weather events for example?

15:44:24 From Lois : Great presentation thank you. Please keep making accessories available via zoom for summer residents.

15:44:59 From Pauline Burnes to Kevin Olvany(Direct Message) : Please send me your email address. Thanks!

15:49:17 From Pauline Burnes to Kevin Olvany(Direct Message) : I found your contact info: Kevin.Olvany@canandaiguanewyork.gov

15:49:30 From Colton Ratey (he/they) : Thank you!

15:50:25 From Pauline Burnes to Kevin Olvany(Direct Message) : Great work Kevin. Thank you for the presentation.

15:51:54 From betsy : Thanks Kevin and panelists. Great info!

15:53:04 From bev : Great. Thank you!

15:54:00 From John Jablonski, Exec Dir, Chaut Watershed Conservancy : Great presentation! Excellent projects!

15:54:13 From Lynn Thurston : Excellent presentation. Thanks so much everyone!

Public Presentation #2

*Zoom Chat*

15:02:46 From Lynn Klotz to Everyone:

Are you recording this?

15:03:09 From Lynn Klotz to Everyone:

Reacted to "Are you recording th..." with 😃

15:03:55 From Ferris Hills to Everyone:

8 Ferris Hills residents are watching

15:09:06 From Lynn Klotz to Everyone:

Reacted to "8 Ferris Hills resid..." with 👍🏼

16:11:43 From Jack Kellogg to Everyone:

North of Ashton Place there are 2 drains that come from Ferris Hills retention ponds. Would a retention pond North of Ashton Place help slow down the brown water coming South & under Ashton Place?

16:16:41 From Greg Talomie to Everyone:

Are there any opportunities to reduce or mitigate the Quagmire mussels

16:20:13 From Lynn Klotz to Everyone:

Thank you Kevin & Kim, Tony too!

16:21:59 From Jack Kellogg to Everyone:

Thanks for you great work Kevin!

*Verbal comments provided during Zoom meeting*

These are available on the video of the presentation on the CLWC website.

Stakeholder Meetings

*Discussion Points - 9E, Submitted by CLWA on 2/6/2023*

1. The 9E Plan is really good. It's clear that a great deal of work has gone into it. The actions that are proposed cover an impressive range of initiatives that will require everyone's participation and support. Minor suggestion. As I was reading the plan, I noted that the section that documents estimates of phosphorus loading from septic systems and WWTP has a specific amount noted in each section, but the section entitled Landscape Nonpoint Source Phosphorus doesn't. Subsequent tables and paragraphs provide this information, but I wonder if it would help the reader if the amount was noted in the Landscape Source Phosphorus paragraph as well.
2. It would be helpful to name the sub-basin tributaries versus giving “Site” numbers.
3. Is it correct that inflows to the lake are estimated by using the outflow gauge at the “Lake Outlet” and that is the only location of a USGS gauge? Do we have estimates of flows at the 17 tributaries? Page 13 Modeling report
4. Please explain what is meant by, “The final analysis of the SWAT model calibration examined aggregated results by sites for the three water chemistry parameters. These data are summarized in Table 9. Note that the NSSE values for combined water quality data from all sites for each water quality variables are above the QAPP threshold for Total Phosphorus (TP) and Nitrogen (N) but not for Total Suspended Solids (TSS). The target NSE for TP is 0.25; the NSE for all sites combined is 0.33. The target NSE for N is 0.22; the NSE value for all sites combined is 0.5. The NSE for TSS from all sites combined is only 0.01, which falls well below target. However, the NSE for TSS is above zero, indicating that the model captures the central tendency of the TSS observations.”
5. Will you provide sub-basin names that correlate to these tributary numbers?
6. Why are P reductions so low compared to other lakes? Example Owasco model shows with a 20% reduction of TP loading results in 11% reduction in in-lake TP.
7. Plan doesn’t seem to account for different forms of P. Why?
8. 11.1 FLCC and Naples Creek restoration P reduction will be credited toward the 25% target reduction. How many pounds of the 11,461 pounds target reduction does this account for?
9. 13.1 Phosphorus target: in-lake concentration is based on June-September average though sampling will be conducted May-October. With May being a heavy fertilizer spreading period why does the average exclude May sampling results from the average?
10. Will there be any upstream and downstream sampling / before and after monitoring programs designed to evaluate effectiveness of installed BMPs? Plan seems to indicate target reductions will be estimated. “13.2 Phosphorus target: external load reduction The second target is a watershed-based load reduction target of 11,461 pounds or 25% of the modeled load of 45,843 pounds per year. Projects will be tracked from 2018- 2033 as determined through a combination of tools to estimate phosphorus reduction success.”
11. Plan does not seem to provide P load based on sub-watershed. How are sub-watersheds prioritized for action?
12. Plan seems to indicate P reductions are based on the watershed. Will there be target reductions for sub-watersheds?
13. Some lakes are targeting P and others chl-a ug/L. CLWC targets P at 5.5ug/L Why do some lakes target chl-a and others P? What are pros and cons?
14. Will comments to the 9E be shared on the Council website?
15. The objectives and goals look good, but there is concern that we have not fully identified actions that will get us there - by example, to entice farmers to plant cover crops - what specifically are we prepared to do?
16. There are many financial sources identified. Is there concern of our ability to win grant funding from these sources? This will take a lot of grant research/writing that will be necessary to provide funds on a timely basis...do we need the services of a grant writer to assure our success; should we start discussing a watershed residental fee?