

9. PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

The projects identified above represent a wide cross-section of issues and strategies to protect Illahee Creek. Success will be difficult without developing partnerships with state and local agencies, non-profits, other community groups and the business community. Concurrently, funding strategies will also need to be multi-faceted. Understanding that resources and volunteer energy will wax and wane over the years as this plan is implemented, the projects were prioritized using several criteria, including (1) likelihood of success at achieving the desired outcome, (2) degree to which project meets multiple objectives, (3) degree to which project alleviates threats to human life or property, and (4) cost. Table 9-1 lists the criteria and rank scores associated with a high, medium or low ranking for each criteria.

Table 9-1. Criteria and scoring for project prioritization

Criteria	Rank scores		
	High (5 pts)	Medium (3 pts)	Low (1 pt)
Likelihood of Success	Proven in other cases	Mixed results in other cases	Unproven
Number of Issues Addressed	More than three	Two to three	One
Protects human health or infrastructure	Protects both human health and infrastructure	Protects human health OR infrastructure	Protects neither
Cost Category	1 (< 200K)	2 (200K - 1 million)	3 (> 1 million)

In some cases, projects with a high likelihood of success for achieving ecological goals for the watershed are very costly, and therefore were ranked lower than projects that can more easily be implemented through grants or community partnerships because of their lower relative cost. In other words the “low hanging fruit” or projects that can be implemented with relative ease are given higher priority in this plan. The combined scores of individual criteria were ranked according to the following scores:

Low priority (6 – 8 total points)

Medium priority (10 – 12 total points)

High priority (over 12 total points)

Table 9-2 lists the strategies discussed in Section 5 and ranks them according to the criteria in Table 9-1.

Table 9-2 Prioritization of Strategies

		Prioritization Criteria							
Strategy	Project ID	Description	Likelihood of Success to meet Ecological Objectives	Issues Addressed	Protects human health or infrastructure	Cost	Score	Priority (1, 2, 3)	
Education	Ed-1	Low Impact Development Education	Low (1)	Med (3)	Aquifer recharge, stormwater flows	Low (1)	High (5)	10	2
	Ed-2	Water Conservation	Medium (3)	Low (1)	Aquifer recharge	Med (3)	High (5)	12	2
	Ed-3	Septic System Maintenance and Repair	Medium (3)	Med (3)	Aquifer recharge, water quality	High (5)	High (5)	16	1
	Ed-4	Rain Barrel Program	Low (1)	Low (1)	Stormwater flows	Low (1)	High (5)	8	3
Preservation	ND-3	Voluntary Rain Garden Program	Medium (3)	Med (3)	Stormwater flows, aquifer recharge	Low (1)	High (5)	12	2
	Pur-1	Purchase properties for inclusion in Forest Preserve	High (5)	High (5)	Aquifer recharge, stormwater flows, water quality, sedimentation	Low (1)	Low (1)	12	2
	Pur-2	Purchase Golf Course	Medium (3)	Med (3)	Stormwater flows, aquifer recharge	Low (1)	Low (1)	8	3
	Pur-3	Permanent Easements in Forest Preserve	High (5)	High (5)	Aquifer recharge, stormwater flows, water quality, sedimentation	Low (1)	Low (1)	12	2
	Eval-1	Resolve horizontal separation between infiltration and septic systems	Low (1)	Med (3)	Aquifer recharge, stormwater flows	Med (3)	Med (3)	10	2
	Eval-2	Feasibility of groundwater recharge in deeper injection wells	Medium (3)	Med (3)	Aquifer recharge, stormwater flows	Low (1)	Med (3)	10	2
Evaluation	NP-1	Investigate alternative for disposal of North Perry filter water	High (5)	Low (1)	Sedimentation	Med (3)	Med (3)	12	2

Table 9-2 Prioritization of Strategies (continued)

		Prioritization Criteria									
Strategy	Project ID	Description	Likelihood of Success to meet Ecological Objectives			Issues Addressed		Protects human health or infrastructure	Cost	Score	Priority (1, 2, 3)
Capital	ND-1	Upgrade Pond #288	Medium (3)	Low (1)	Stormwater flows	Low (1)	Stormwater flows	High (5)	10	2	
	ND-2	New Stormwater Pond in North Neighborhood	High (5)	Low (1)	Stormwater flows	Low (1)	Stormwater flows	Med (3)	10	2	
	GC-1	Retrofit existing golf course pond	Medium (3)	Low (1)	Stormwater flows	Low (1)	Stormwater flows	High (5)	10	2	
	GC-2	Retrofit existing golf course pond	Medium (3)	Low (1)	Stormwater flows	Low (1)	Stormwater flows	High (5)	10	2	
	GC-3	Stormwater detention under driving range	High (5)	Med (3)	Aquifer recharge, stormwater flows	Low (1)	Aquifer recharge, stormwater flows	Low (1)	10	2	
	GC-4	Golf course pervious parking lot	High (5)	Med (3)	Aquifer recharge, stormwater flows	Low (1)	Aquifer recharge, stormwater flows	Low (1)	10	2	
	GC-5a and GC-5b	Infiltration trenches	High (5)	High (5)	Aquifer recharge, stormwater flows, sedimentation	Low (1)	Aquifer recharge, stormwater flows, sedimentation	Low (1)	12	2	
	GC-6	New stormwater pond on east side of golf course	Medium (3)	Low (1)	Stormwater flows	Low (1)	Stormwater flows	High (5)	10	2	
	GC-7	Erosion control/slope stabilization on golf course	Medium (3)	Low (1)	Sedimentation	Low (1)	Sedimentation	High (5)	10	2	
	TL-1	Tightline runoff from Hicks Ave	High (5)	Low (1)	Sedimentation	Med (3)	Sedimentation	High (5)	14	1	
	TL-2	Tightline runoff from Riddell Road	High (5)	Low (1)	Sedimentation	Med (3)	Sedimentation	High (5)	14	1	

Table 9-2 Prioritization of Strategies (continued)

		Prioritization Criteria									
Strategy	Project ID	Description	Likelihood of Success to meet Ecological Objectives			Issues Addressed		Protects human health or infrastructure	Cost	Score	Priority (1, 2, 3)
			Medium (3)	Med (3)	Med (3)	Med (3)	Med (3)				
Regulatory and Planning	Reg-1	Critical Drainage Area designation	Medium (3)	Med (3)	Med (3)	Aquifer recharge, sedimentation, stormwater flows	Med (3)	High (5)	14	1	
	Reg-2	Create special drainage district	Medium (3)	Med (3)	Med (3)	Aquifer recharge, sedimentation, stormwater flows	Low (1)	High (5)	12	2	
	Reg-3	Allow stream flow augmentation	Low (1)	Low (1)	Low (1)	Baseflow	Low (1)	Med (3)	6	3	
	Reg-4	Transfer existing surface water rights into Ecology program	Low (1)	Low (1)	Low (1)	Baseflow	Low (1)	High (5)	8	3	
Monitoring	Pilot-1	Impervious surface cap and trade program	Medium (3)	Med (3)	Med (3)	Aquifer recharge, sedimentation, stormwater flows	Low (1)	High (5)	12	2	
	Mon-1	Spawning surveys									
	Mon-2	Channel conditions									
	Mon-3	Aquatic habitat conditions									
	Mon-4	Stream flow									
Mon-5	Sediment deposition near dock										
Not Prioritized											

9.1 TIMEFRAME TO BEGIN IMPLEMENTATION

The strategies outlined in this plan should be implemented as soon as feasible to begin reversing the trends of past stormwater practices. Understanding that availability of resources will be one of the main challenges in implementation, we recommend that the highest priority projects be implemented first within the next two years, followed by the medium priority projects in the two years after that and the lower priority projects last. As discussed above, some of the lower ranked priority projects are because of the high cost of implementation. In the years prior to implementation of these projects, we would recommend securing funding.