

SSER Crossing Prioritization Worksheet

Crossing Location: Park Trail S/o Sylvan Road
 SSER Crossing #: 16

River/Stream: Carll's
 Total Score: 34

Scoring Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; ← Agree →							Score	
ECOLOGICAL Value Criteria		Category Total:					16	Comments
Fishery Resource Value	Removal/restoration of the crossing will have a high likelihood to <u>benefit</u> migratory and/or resident fish population.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Waterway Reach Condition	High quality fish habitat is available above the barrier crossing (in-field habitat assessment score).	1	2	3	4	5	3	
State Wild & Scenic River	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a State Wild & Scenic River.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Habitat Significance	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a Significant Coastal Fish & Wildlife Habitat.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Headwater Length Above Crossing	A significant length of reach above the crossing would be reintroduced to migratory fish populations.	1	2	3	4	5	1	Approximately 450 feet until next barrier crossing
Crossing Proximity to Mouth	The crossing is located at or near the mouth of the waterway.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
PROJECT FEASIBILITY Criteria – Total Points from below:		Category Total:					18	Comments
Access to the Crossing	Equipment can access the crossing with limited or no adverse impact to the surroundings.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Land Access Issues	Easements are <u>not likely to be required</u> to access the crossing for removal/restoration.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Short-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	3	modification of drop necessary
Long-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	5	No further action needed after modification

CATEGORY SUMMARY:

Determine the average points for each criteria category to allow for relational comparison among categories.

Category	Score	Average
Ecological Value	<u>16</u>	$\div 6 =$ <u>2.7</u>
Project Feasibility	<u>18</u>	$\div 4 =$ <u>4.5</u>

TOTAL SCORE 34

7 CUMULATIVE AVERAGE SCORE

SSER Crossing Prioritization Worksheet

Crossing Location: Grass Carp Gate at Belmont Park
 SSER Crossing #: 18.2

River/Stream: Carll's
 Total Score: 29

Scoring Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree;		← Agree →					Score	
ECOLOGICAL Value Criteria		Category Total:					16	Comments
Fishery Resource Value	Removal/restoration of the crossing will have a high likelihood to <u>benefit</u> migratory and/or resident fish population.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Waterway Reach Condition	High quality fish habitat is available above the barrier crossing (in-field habitat assessment score).	1	2	3	4	5	1	
State Wild & Scenic River	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a State Wild & Scenic River.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Habitat Significance	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a Significant Coastal Fish & Wildlife Habitat.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Headwater Length Above Crossing	A significant length of reach above the crossing would be reintroduced to migratory fish populations.	1	2	3	4	5	4	2,100 feet to next barrier crossing
Crossing Proximity to Mouth	The crossing is located at or near the mouth of the waterway.	1	2	3	4	5	4	2nd barrier crossing
PROJECT FEASIBILITY Criteria – Total Points from below:		Category Total:					13	Comments
Access to the Crossing	Equipment can access the crossing with limited or no adverse impact to the surroundings.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Land Access Issues	Easements are <u>not likely to be required</u> to access the crossing for removal/restoration.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Short-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	2	Only gate removal involved
Long-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	1	An alternative method for grass carp control would have to be studied/engineered

CATEGORY SUMMARY:

Determine the average points for each criteria category to allow for relational comparison among categories.

Category	Score	Average
Ecological Value	16	÷ 6 = 2.7
Project Feasibility	13	÷ 4 = 3.3

TOTAL SCORE 29

6 CUMULATIVE AVERAGE SCORE

SSER Crossing Prioritization Worksheet

Crossing Location: 550' S/o August Road
 SSER Crossing #: 18.3

River/Stream: Carll's
 Total Score: 34

Scoring Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree;		← Agree →					Score	
ECOLOGICAL Value Criteria		Category Total:					14	Comments
Fishery Resource Value	Removal/restoration of the crossing will have a high likelihood to <u>benefit</u> migratory and/or resident fish population.	1	2	3	4	5	4	Gate currently blocking passage for most fish
Waterway Reach Condition	High quality fish habitat is available above the barrier crossing (in-field habitat assessment score).	1	2	3	4	5	3	
State Wild & Scenic River	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a State Wild & Scenic River.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Habitat Significance	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a Significant Coastal Fish & Wildlife Habitat.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Headwater Length Above Crossing	A significant length of reach above the crossing would be reintroduced to migratory fish populations.	1	2	3	4	5	2	Approximately 1,000 feet to next barrier crossing
Crossing Proximity to Mouth	The crossing is located at or near the mouth of the waterway.	1	2	3	4	5	3	3rd barrier crossing
PROJECT FEASIBILITY Criteria - Total Points from below:		Category Total:					20	Comments
Access to the Crossing	Equipment can access the crossing with limited or no adverse impact to the surroundings.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Land Access Issues	Easements are <u>not likely to be required</u> to access the crossing for removal/restoration.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Short-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Only fence removal required
Long-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	5	No maintenance necessary if crossing is removed

CATEGORY SUMMARY:

Determine the average points for each criteria category to allow for relational comparison among categories.

Category	Score	Average
Ecological Value	<u>14</u>	<u>÷ 6 = 2.3</u>
Project Feasibility	<u>20</u>	<u>÷ 4 = 5.0</u>

TOTAL SCORE 34 **CUMULATIVE AVERAGE SCORE** 7

SSER Crossing Prioritization Worksheet

Crossing Location: August Road
 SSER Crossing #: 20

River/Stream: Carll's
 Total Score: 28

Scoring Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; ← Agree →							Score	
ECOLOGICAL Value Criteria		Category Total:					12	Comments
Fishery Resource Value	Removal/restoration of the crossing will have a high likelihood to <u>benefit</u> migratory and/or resident fish population.	1	2	3	4	5	1	Three culverts currently exist, two of which are passable
Waterway Reach Condition	High quality fish habitat is available above the barrier crossing (in-field habitat assessment score).	1	2	3	4	5	2	
State Wild & Scenic River	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a State Wild & Scenic River.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Habitat Significance	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a Significant Coastal Fish & Wildlife Habitat.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Headwater Length Above Crossing	A significant length of reach above the crossing would be reintroduced to migratory fish populations.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Approximately 5,500' to next barrier crossing
Crossing Proximity to Mouth	The crossing is located at or near the mouth of the waterway.	1	2	3	4	5	2	4th barrier crossing on Carll's
PROJECT FEASIBILITY Criteria – Total Points from below:		Category Total:					16	Comments
Access to the Crossing	Equipment can access the crossing with limited or no adverse impact to the surroundings.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Land Access Issues	Easements are <u>not likely to be required</u> to access the crossing for removal/restoration.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Short-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Long-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	1	Replacement of the clogged culvert necessary in the long term

CATEGORY SUMMARY:

Determine the average points for each criteria category to allow for relational comparison among categories.

Category	Score	Average
Ecological Value	<u>12</u>	$\div 6 =$ <u>2.0</u>
Project Feasibility	<u>16</u>	$\div 4 =$ <u>4.0</u>

TOTAL SCORE 28

6 CUMULATIVE AVERAGE SCORE

SSER Crossing Prioritization Worksheet

Crossing Location: North Wyandanch Park
 SSER Crossing #: 23

River/Stream: Carll's
 Total Score: 30

Scoring Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree;		← Agree →					Score	
ECOLOGICAL Value Criteria		Category Total:					13	Comments
Fishery Resource Value	Removal/restoration of the crossing will have a high likelihood to <u>benefit</u> migratory and/or resident fish population.	1	2	3	4	5	2	Siltation and Phragmites present; some larger fish may be able to pass
Waterway Reach Condition	High quality fish habitat is available above the barrier crossing (in-field habitat assessment score).	1	2	3	4	5	3	
State Wild & Scenic River	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a State Wild & Scenic River.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Habitat Significance	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a Significant Coastal Fish & Wildlife Habitat.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Headwater Length Above Crossing	A significant length of reach above the crossing would be reintroduced to migratory fish populations.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Final barrier crossing on Carll's River
Crossing Proximity to Mouth	The crossing is located at or near the mouth of the waterway.	1	2	3	4	5	1	Final barrier crossing on Carll's River
PROJECT FEASIBILITY Criteria – Total Points from below:		Category Total:					17	Comments
Access to the Crossing	Equipment can access the crossing with limited or no adverse impact to the surroundings.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Land Access Issues	Easements are <u>not likely to be required</u> to access the crossing for removal/restoration.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Short-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	3	Involves extensive Phragmites removal
Long-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	4	Annual Maintenance will be low

CATEGORY SUMMARY:

Determine the average points for each criteria category to allow for relational comparison among categories.

Category	Score	Average
Ecological Value	<u>13</u>	<u>÷ 6 = 2.2</u>
Project Feasibility	<u>17</u>	<u>÷ 4 = 4.3</u>

TOTAL SCORE 30

6 CUMULATIVE AVERAGE SCORE

SSER Crossing Prioritization Worksheet

Crossing Location: LIRR N/o Middle Road
 SSER Crossing #: 27

River/Stream: Brown's
 Total Score: 28

Scoring Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree;		← Agree →					Score	
ECOLOGICAL Value Criteria		Category Total:					15	Comments
Fishery Resource Value	Removal/restoration of the crossing will have a high likelihood to <u>benefit</u> migratory and/or resident fish population.	1	2	3	4	5	2	Log jam may allow for some fish to pass
Waterway Reach Condition	High quality fish habitat is available above the barrier crossing (in-field habitat assessment score).	1	2	3	4	5	4	
State Wild & Scenic River	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a State Wild & Scenic River.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Habitat Significance	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a Significant Coastal Fish & Wildlife Habitat.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Headwater Length Above Crossing	A significant length of reach above the crossing would be reintroduced to migratory fish populations.	1	2	3	4	5	2	Approximately 650' to next barrier crossing
Crossing Proximity to Mouth	The crossing is located at or near the mouth of the waterway.	1	2	3	4	5	5	1st barrier crossing on the Brown's River
PROJECT FEASIBILITY Criteria – Total Points from below:		Category Total:					13	Comments
Access to the Crossing	Equipment can access the crossing with limited or no adverse impact to the surroundings.	1	2	3	4	5	2	Stream walk required to access site
Land Access Issues	Easements are <u>not likely to be required</u> to access the crossing for removal/restoration.	1	2	3	4	5	1	Path to be constructed to access site
Short-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Log jam removal
Long-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Annual monitoring for log jams

CATEGORY SUMMARY:

Determine the average points for each criteria category to allow for relational comparison among categories.

Category	Score	Average
Ecological Value	<u>15</u>	<u>÷ 6 = 2.5</u>
Project Feasibility	<u>13</u>	<u>÷ 4 = 3.3</u>

TOTAL SCORE 28

6 CUMULATIVE AVERAGE SCORE

SSER Crossing Prioritization Worksheet

Crossing Location: Montauk Highway (West Branch)
 SSER Crossing #: 27.1

River/Stream: Brown's
 Total Score: 35

Scoring Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree;		← Agree →					Score	
ECOLOGICAL Value Criteria		Category Total:					20	Comments
Fishery Resource Value	Removal/restoration of the crossing will have a high likelihood to <u>benefit</u> migratory and/or resident fish population.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Current drops prevent fish passage
Waterway Reach Condition	High quality fish habitat is available above the barrier crossing (in-field habitat assessment score).	1	2	3	4	5	4	
State Wild & Scenic River	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a State Wild & Scenic River.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Habitat Significance	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a Significant Coastal Fish & Wildlife Habitat.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Headwater Length Above Crossing	A significant length of reach above the crossing would be reintroduced to migratory fish populations.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Final barrier crossing on west branch
Crossing Proximity to Mouth	The crossing is located at or near the mouth of the waterway.	1	2	3	4	5	4	2nd (and final) barrier crossing on west branch
PROJECT FEASIBILITY Criteria – Total Points from below:		Category Total:					15	Comments
Access to the Crossing	Equipment can access the crossing with limited or no adverse impact to the surroundings.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Land Access Issues	Easements are <u>not likely to be required</u> to access the crossing for removal/restoration.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Short-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	1	Culvert replacement/modification necessary
Long-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	4	Once culvert replaced/modified, maintenance should be low

CATEGORY SUMMARY:

Determine the average points for each criteria category to allow for relational comparison among categories.

Category	Score	Average
Ecological Value	<u>20</u>	$\div 6 =$ <u>3.3</u>
Project Feasibility	<u>15</u>	$\div 4 =$ <u>3.8</u>

TOTAL SCORE 35 7 **CUMULATIVE AVERAGE SCORE**

SSER Crossing Prioritization Worksheet

Crossing Location: LIRR
 SSER Crossing #: 32

River/Stream: Swan
 Total Score: 33

Scoring Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree;		← Agree →					Score	
ECOLOGICAL Value Criteria		Category Total:					21	Comments
Fishery Resource Value	Removal/restoration of the crossing will have a high likelihood to <u>benefit</u> migratory and/or resident fish population.	1	2	3	4	5	3	Some fish may be able to pass debris
Waterway Reach Condition	High quality fish habitat is available above the barrier crossing (in-field habitat assessment score).	1	2	3	4	5	5	
State Wild & Scenic River	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a State Wild & Scenic River.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Habitat Significance	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a Significant Coastal Fish & Wildlife Habitat.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Headwater Length Above Crossing	A significant length of reach above the crossing would be reintroduced to migratory fish populations.	1	2	3	4	5	2	Approximately 650' to next barrier crossing
Crossing Proximity to Mouth	The crossing is located at or near the mouth of the waterway.	1	2	3	4	5	5	1st Barrier crossing on Swan River
PROJECT FEASIBILITY Criteria – Total Points from below:		Category Total:					12	Comments
Access to the Crossing	Equipment can access the crossing with limited or no adverse impact to the surroundings.	1	2	3	4	5	1	Stream walk necessary to access
Land Access Issues	Easements are <u>not likely to be required</u> to access the crossing for removal/restoration.	1	2	3	4	5	1	No direct path to debris jam
Short-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Debris jam removal
Long-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Annual monitoring to prevent jam

CATEGORY SUMMARY:

Determine the average points for each criteria category to allow for relational comparison among categories.

Category	Score	Average
Ecological Value	<u>21</u>	÷ 6 = <u>3.5</u>
Project Feasibility	<u>12</u>	÷ 4 = <u>3.0</u>

TOTAL SCORE 33

7 CUMULATIVE AVERAGE SCORE

SSER Crossing Prioritization Worksheet

Crossing Location: Montauk Highway
 SSER Crossing #: 32.1

River/Stream: Swan
 Total Score: 37

Scoring Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree;		← Agree →					Score	
ECOLOGICAL Value Criteria		Category Total:					22	Comments
Fishery Resource Value	Removal/restoration of the crossing will have a high likelihood to <u>benefit</u> migratory and/or resident fish population.	1	2	3	4	5	5	High velocity and large inlet drop prevent fish passage
Waterway Reach Condition	High quality fish habitat is available above the barrier crossing (in-field habitat assessment score).	1	2	3	4	5	2	
State Wild & Scenic River	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a State Wild & Scenic River.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Habitat Significance	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a Significant Coastal Fish & Wildlife Habitat.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Headwater Length Above Crossing	A significant length of reach above the crossing would be reintroduced to migratory fish populations.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Approximately 4,500' to next barrier crossing
Crossing Proximity to Mouth	The crossing is located at or near the mouth of the waterway.	1	2	3	4	5	4	2nd barrier crossing on river
PROJECT FEASIBILITY Criteria – Total Points from below:		Category Total:					15	Comments
Access to the Crossing	Equipment can access the crossing with limited or no adverse impact to the surroundings.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Land Access Issues	Easements are <u>not likely to be required</u> to access the crossing for removal/restoration.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Short-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	1	Replacement/modification of culvert necessary
Long-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	4	Maintenance of improved culvert only necessary after replacement/modification

CATEGORY SUMMARY:

Determine the average points for each criteria category to allow for relational comparison among categories.

Category	Score	Average
Ecological Value	<u>22</u> ÷ 6 =	<u>3.7</u>
Project Feasibility	<u>15</u> ÷ 4 =	<u>3.8</u>
TOTAL SCORE	<u>37</u>	<u>7 CUMULATIVE AVERAGE SCORE</u>

SSER Crossing Prioritization Worksheet

Crossing Location: 300' S/o Sunrise Highway
 SSER Crossing #: 33

River/Stream: Swan
 Total Score: 27

Scoring Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree;		← Agree →					Score	
ECOLOGICAL Value Criteria		Category Total:					15	Comments
Fishery Resource Value	Removal/restoration of the crossing will have a high likelihood to <u>benefit</u> migratory and/or resident fish population.	1	2	3	4	5	1	Log jam may present a barrier to only some fish
Waterway Reach Condition	High quality fish habitat is available above the barrier crossing (in-field habitat assessment score).	1	2	3	4	5	4	
State Wild & Scenic River	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a State Wild & Scenic River.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Habitat Significance	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a Significant Coastal Fish & Wildlife Habitat.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Headwater Length Above Crossing	A significant length of reach above the crossing would be reintroduced to migratory fish populations.	1	2	3	4	5	1	Approximately 100' to next barrier crossing
Crossing Proximity to Mouth	The crossing is located at or near the mouth of the waterway.	1	2	3	4	5	3	3rd barrier crossing on river
PROJECT FEASIBILITY Criteria – Total Points from below:		Category Total:					12	Comments
Access to the Crossing	Equipment can access the crossing with limited or no adverse impact to the surroundings.	1	2	3	4	5	1	Stream walk necessary for access
Land Access Issues	Easements are <u>not likely to be required</u> to access the crossing for removal/restoration.	1	2	3	4	5	1	No direct path to log jam
Short-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Only log jam removal required
Long-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Annual stream walks for maintenance

CATEGORY SUMMARY:

Determine the average points for each criteria category to allow for relational comparison among categories.

Category	Score	Average
Ecological Value	<u>15</u>	<u>÷ 6 = 2.5</u>
Project Feasibility	<u>12</u>	<u>÷ 4 = 3.0</u>

TOTAL SCORE 27

6 CUMULATIVE AVERAGE SCORE

SSER Crossing Prioritization Worksheet

Crossing Location: 200' S/o Sunrise Highway
 SSER Crossing #: 34

River/Stream: Swan
 Total Score: 30

Scoring Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree;		← Agree →					Score	
ECOLOGICAL Value Criteria		Category Total:					18	Comments
Fishery Resource Value	Removal/restoration of the crossing will have a high likelihood to <u>benefit</u> migratory and/or resident fish population.	1	2	3	4	5	1	Log jam may present a barrier to only some fish
Waterway Reach Condition	High quality fish habitat is available above the barrier crossing (in-field habitat assessment score).	1	2	3	4	5	4	
State Wild & Scenic River	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a State Wild & Scenic River.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Habitat Significance	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a Significant Coastal Fish & Wildlife Habitat.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Headwater Length Above Crossing	A significant length of reach above the crossing would be reintroduced to migratory fish populations.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Approximately 3,000' to next barrier crossing
Crossing Proximity to Mouth	The crossing is located at or near the mouth of the waterway.	1	2	3	4	5	2	4th barrier crossing on river
PROJECT FEASIBILITY Criteria – Total Points from below:		Category Total:					12	Comments
Access to the Crossing	Equipment can access the crossing with limited or no adverse impact to the surroundings.	1	2	3	4	5	1	Stream walk necessary for access
Land Access Issues	Easements are <u>not likely to be required</u> to access the crossing for removal/restoration.	1	2	3	4	5	1	No direct path to log jam
Short-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Only log jam removal required
Long-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Annual stream walks for maintenance

CATEGORY SUMMARY:

Determine the average points for each criteria category to allow for relational comparison among categories.

Category	Score	Average
Ecological Value	<u>18</u>	<u>÷ 6 = 3.0</u>
Project Feasibility	<u>12</u>	<u>÷ 4 = 3.0</u>

TOTAL SCORE 30

6 CUMULATIVE AVERAGE SCORE

SSER Crossing Prioritization Worksheet

Crossing Location: 60' S/o Barton Road
 SSER Crossing #: 36

River/Stream: Swan
 Total Score: 27

Scoring Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree;		← Agree →					Score	
ECOLOGICAL Value Criteria		Category Total:					14	Comments
Fishery Resource Value	Removal/restoration of the crossing will have a high likelihood to <u>benefit</u> migratory and/or resident fish population.	1	2	3	4	5	2	Log and garbage jam may not prevent all fish passage
Waterway Reach Condition	High quality fish habitat is available above the barrier crossing (in-field habitat assessment score).	1	2	3	4	5	4	
State Wild & Scenic River	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a State Wild & Scenic River.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Habitat Significance	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a Significant Coastal Fish & Wildlife Habitat.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Headwater Length Above Crossing	A significant length of reach above the crossing would be reintroduced to migratory fish populations.	1	2	3	4	5	1	Approximately 150' to next barrier crossing
Crossing Proximity to Mouth	The crossing is located at or near the mouth of the waterway.	1	2	3	4	5	1	5th barrier crossing on river
PROJECT FEASIBILITY Criteria – Total Points from below:		Category Total:					13	Comments
Access to the Crossing	Equipment can access the crossing with limited or no adverse impact to the surroundings.	1	2	3	4	5	1	Stream walk required for access
Land Access Issues	Easements are <u>not likely to be required</u> to access the crossing for removal/restoration.	1	2	3	4	5	2	No direct path, but short distance from roadway
Short-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Only log jam removal
Long-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Annual stream walks for maintenance

CATEGORY SUMMARY:

Determine the average points for each criteria category to allow for relational comparison among categories.

Category	Score	Average
Ecological Value	<u>14</u>	$\div 6 =$ <u>2.3</u>
Project Feasibility	<u>13</u>	$\div 4 =$ <u>3.3</u>

TOTAL SCORE 27

6 CUMULATIVE AVERAGE SCORE

SSER Crossing Prioritization Worksheet

Crossing Location: Barton Road
 SSER Crossing #: 37

River/Stream: Swan
 Total Score: 34

Scoring Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree;		← Agree →					Score	
ECOLOGICAL Value Criteria		Category Total:					19	Comments
Fishery Resource Value	Removal/restoration of the crossing will have a high likelihood to <u>benefit</u> migratory and/or resident fish population.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Collapsed culvert currently prevents fish passage
Waterway Reach Condition	High quality fish habitat is available above the barrier crossing (in-field habitat assessment score).	1	2	3	4	5	2	
State Wild & Scenic River	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a State Wild & Scenic River.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Habitat Significance	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a Significant Coastal Fish & Wildlife Habitat.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Headwater Length Above Crossing	A significant length of reach above the crossing would be reintroduced to migratory fish populations.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Final barrier crossing on river
Crossing Proximity to Mouth	The crossing is located at or near the mouth of the waterway.	1	2	3	4	5	1	6th barrier crossing on river
PROJECT FEASIBILITY Criteria – Total Points from below:		Category Total:					15	Comments
Access to the Crossing	Equipment can access the crossing with limited or no adverse impact to the surroundings.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Land Access Issues	Easements are <u>not likely to be required</u> to access the crossing for removal/restoration.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Short-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	1	Culvert replacement needed
Long-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	4	Only culvert maintenance necessary after replacement

CATEGORY SUMMARY:

Determine the average points for each criteria category to allow for relational comparison among categories.

Category	Score	Average
Ecological Value	19	÷ 6 = 3.2
Project Feasibility	15	÷ 4 = 3.8

TOTAL SCORE 34 7 **CUMULATIVE AVERAGE SCORE**

SSER Crossing Prioritization Worksheet

Crossing Location: Gazzola Drive
 SSER Crossing #: 39.1

River/Stream: Mud
 Total Score: 33

Scoring Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree;		← Agree →					Score	
ECOLOGICAL Value Criteria		Category Total:					18	Comments
Fishery Resource Value	Removal/restoration of the crossing will have a high likelihood to <u>benefit</u> migratory and/or resident fish population.	1	2	3	4	5	4	Only small fish may be able to pass blocked culvert
Waterway Reach Condition	High quality fish habitat is available above the barrier crossing (in-field habitat assessment score).	1	2	3	4	5	2	
State Wild & Scenic River	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a State Wild & Scenic River.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Habitat Significance	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a Significant Coastal Fish & Wildlife Habitat.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Headwater Length Above Crossing	A significant length of reach above the crossing would be reintroduced to migratory fish populations.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Only barrier crossing on river
Crossing Proximity to Mouth	The crossing is located at or near the mouth of the waterway.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Only barrier crossing on river
PROJECT FEASIBILITY Criteria – Total Points from below:		Category Total:					15	Comments
Access to the Crossing	Equipment can access the crossing with limited or no adverse impact to the surroundings.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Land Access Issues	Easements are <u>not likely to be required</u> to access the crossing for removal/restoration.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Short-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	4	Cleaning of clogged culvert
Long-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	1	Replacement/modification of culvert necessary in future

CATEGORY SUMMARY:

Determine the average points for each criteria category to allow for relational comparison among categories.

Category	Score	Average
Ecological Value	<u>18</u>	$\div 6 =$ <u>3.0</u>
Project Feasibility	<u>15</u>	$\div 4 =$ <u>3.8</u>

TOTAL SCORE 33

7 CUMULATIVE AVERAGE SCORE

SSER Crossing Prioritization Worksheet

Crossing Location: 423 South Country Road
 SSER Crossing #: _____ 46

River/Stream: Beaver Dam
 Total Score: 34

Scoring Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; ← Agree →							Score	
ECOLOGICAL Value Criteria		Category Total:					18	Comments
Fishery Resource Value	Removal/restoration of the crossing will have a high likelihood to <u>benefit</u> migratory and/or resident fish population.	1	2	3	4	5	2	Some fish may be able to pass log jam
Waterway Reach Condition	High quality fish habitat is available above the barrier crossing (in-field habitat assessment score).	1	2	3	4	5	3	
State Wild & Scenic River	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a State Wild & Scenic River.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Habitat Significance	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a Significant Coastal Fish & Wildlife Habitat.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Headwater Length Above Crossing	A significant length of reach above the crossing would be reintroduced to migratory fish populations.	1	2	3	4	5	2	Approximately 650' to next barrier crossing
Crossing Proximity to Mouth	The crossing is located at or near the mouth of the waterway.	1	2	3	4	5	5	1st Barrier crossing on Beaver Dam Creek
PROJECT FEASIBILITY Criteria – Total Points from below:		Category Total:					16	Comments
Access to the Crossing	Equipment can access the crossing with limited or no adverse impact to the surroundings.	1	2	3	4	5	3	Access through private property
Land Access Issues	Easements are <u>not likely to be required</u> to access the crossing for removal/restoration.	1	2	3	4	5	3	Access through private property
Short-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Log jam removal only
Long-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Annual stream walks for maintenance

CATEGORY SUMMARY:

Determine the average points for each criteria category to allow for relational comparison among categories.

Category	Score	Average
Ecological Value	<u>18</u>	<u>÷ 6 = 3.0</u>
Project Feasibility	<u>16</u>	<u>÷ 4 = 4.0</u>

TOTAL SCORE 34

7 CUMULATIVE AVERAGE SCORE

SSER Crossing Prioritization Worksheet

Crossing Location: LIRR
 SSER Crossing #: 50

River/Stream: Beaver Dam
 Total Score: 29

Scoring Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; ← Agree →							Score	
ECOLOGICAL Value Criteria		Category Total:					18	Comments
Fishery Resource Value	Removal/restoration of the crossing will have a high likelihood to <u>benefit</u> migratory and/or resident fish population.	1	2	3	4	5	4	Small fish may be able to pass through culvert
Waterway Reach Condition	High quality fish habitat is available above the barrier crossing (in-field habitat assessment score).	1	2	3	4	5	3	
State Wild & Scenic River	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a State Wild & Scenic River.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Habitat Significance	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a Significant Coastal Fish & Wildlife Habitat.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Headwater Length Above Crossing	A significant length of reach above the crossing would be reintroduced to migratory fish populations.	1	2	3	4	5	1	Next barrier crossing 4' to the north
Crossing Proximity to Mouth	The crossing is located at or near the mouth of the waterway.	1	2	3	4	5	4	2nd Barrier crossing on Beaver Dam creek
PROJECT FEASIBILITY Criteria – Total Points from below:		Category Total:					11	Comments
Access to the Crossing	Equipment can access the crossing with limited or no adverse impact to the surroundings.	1	2	3	4	5	3	Access through private property
Land Access Issues	Easements are <u>not likely to be required</u> to access the crossing for removal/restoration.	1	2	3	4	5	3	Access through private property
Short-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	1	Culvert replacement necessary
Long-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	4	Only culvert maintenance necessary after replacement

CATEGORY SUMMARY:

Determine the average points for each criteria category to allow for relational comparison among categories.

Category	Score	Average
Ecological Value	<u>18</u>	<u>÷ 6 = 3.0</u>
Project Feasibility	<u>11</u>	<u>÷ 4 = 2.8</u>

TOTAL SCORE 29

6 CUMULATIVE AVERAGE SCORE

SSER Crossing Prioritization Worksheet

Crossing Location: 4' N/o LIRR
 SSER Crossing #: 51

River/Stream: Beaver Dam
 Total Score: 37

Scoring Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree;		← Agree →					Score	
ECOLOGICAL Value Criteria		Category Total:					21	Comments
Fishery Resource Value	Removal/restoration of the crossing will have a high likelihood to <u>benefit</u> migratory and/or resident fish population.	1	2	3	4	5	4	Small fish may be able to pass through fence
Waterway Reach Condition	High quality fish habitat is available above the barrier crossing (in-field habitat assessment score).	1	2	3	4	5	3	
State Wild & Scenic River	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a State Wild & Scenic River.	1	2	3	4	5	1	
Habitat Significance	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a Significant Coastal Fish & Wildlife Habitat.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Headwater Length Above Crossing	A significant length of reach above the crossing would be reintroduced to migratory fish populations.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Final barrier crossing on river
Crossing Proximity to Mouth	The crossing is located at or near the mouth of the waterway.	1	2	3	4	5	3	3rd Barrier crossing on Beaver Dam creek
PROJECT FEASIBILITY Criteria – Total Points from below:		Category Total:					16	Comments
Access to the Crossing	Equipment can access the crossing with limited or no adverse impact to the surroundings.	1	2	3	4	5	3	Access through private property
Land Access Issues	Easements are <u>not likely to be required</u> to access the crossing for removal/restoration.	1	2	3	4	5	3	Access through private property
Short-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Fence removal necessary
Long-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	5	No action needed following fence removal

CATEGORY SUMMARY:

Determine the average points for each criteria category to allow for relational comparison among categories.

Category	Score	Average
Ecological Value	<u>21</u>	<u>÷ 6 = 3.5</u>
Project Feasibility	<u>16</u>	<u>÷ 4 = 4.0</u>

TOTAL SCORE 37

8 CUMULATIVE AVERAGE SCORE

SSER Crossing Prioritization Worksheet

Crossing Location: Cathedral Pines Park Entrance
 SSER Crossing #: 63

River/Stream: Carman's
 Total Score: 42

Scoring Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree;		← Agree →					Score	
ECOLOGICAL Value Criteria		Category Total:					27	Comments
Fishery Resource Value	Removal/restoration of the crossing will have a high likelihood to <u>benefit</u> migratory and/or resident fish population.	1	2	3	4	5	3	Some fish may pass through the functioning culvert
Waterway Reach Condition	High quality fish habitat is available above the barrier crossing (in-field habitat assessment score).	1	2	3	4	5	4	
State Wild & Scenic River	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a State Wild & Scenic River.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Habitat Significance	The crossing is located on a waterway segment designated as a Significant Coastal Fish & Wildlife Habitat.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Headwater Length Above Crossing	A significant length of reach above the crossing would be reintroduced to migratory fish populations.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Only barrier crossing on Carman's, and last crossing on Carman's
Crossing Proximity to Mouth	The crossing is located at or near the mouth of the waterway.	1	2	3	4	5	5	Only barrier crossing on Carman's
PROJECT FEASIBILITY Criteria – Total Points from below:		Category Total:					15	Comments
Access to the Crossing	Equipment can access the crossing with limited or no adverse impact to the surroundings.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Land Access Issues	Easements are <u>not likely to be required</u> to access the crossing for removal/restoration.	1	2	3	4	5	5	
Short-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	1	Culvert replacement necessary
Long-term Project Cost	Cost to remove/restore the crossing will be low.	1	2	3	4	5	4	Only culvert maintenance necessary after replacement

CATEGORY SUMMARY:

Determine the average points for each criteria category to allow for relational comparison among categories.

Category	Score	Average
Ecological Value	<u>27</u>	<u>÷ 6 = 4.5</u>
Project Feasibility	<u>15</u>	<u>÷ 4 = 3.8</u>

TOTAL SCORE 42

8 CUMULATIVE AVERAGE SCORE