



Appendix H

CIP Prioritization Criteria

STORMWATER PROJECT CRITERIA

Supporting Kirkland Comprehensive Plan Goals:

Goal NE-6: "Protect life and property from the damages of floods and erosion."

Goal NE-5: "Preserve and enhance the water quality of streams and lakes in Greater Kirkland."

Goal U-4: "Provide storm water management facilities that preserve and enhance the water quality of streams, lakes, and wetlands and protect life and property from floods and erosion."

Goal CF-1: "Contribute to the quality of life in Kirkland through the planned provision of public capital facilities and utilities."

Goal CF-5: "Provide needed public facilities that are within the ability of the City to fund or within the City's authority to require others to provide."

The Endangered Species Act:

Chinook salmon has been listed as a Threatened species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). In the near future, the National Marine Fisheries Service, which enforces ESA, will be issuing a rule defining actions that municipalities and private property owners must take to protect Chinook salmon. Depending on the content of the rule, CIP criteria may need to be refined to further address fish habitat concerns.

The Tri-County Assembly (officials from King Pierce and Snohomish Counties that have gathered to respond to the ESA listing) has recommended the following approach for management and preservation of salmon habitat:

- 1. First, do no harm: Reduce and prevent harm by abandoning, modifying, or mitigating existing programs, projects, and activities.*
- 2. Conservation: Protect key watersheds, landscapes, and habitats by acquisition, regulation or voluntary action.*
- 3. Remediation: Restore, rehabilitate and enhance damaged habitats to complement conservation actions.*
- 4. Research: Fill critical gaps in scientific and institutional information.*

STORMWATER PROJECT CRITERIA

Initial Project Screening:

Does the project conflict with any specific policy provision of the Comprehensive Plan?

- Yes: Project eliminated from consideration, list goal _____
No: Project ranked using following criteria

PROJECT VALUES

- **FACILITIES:**

Flooding Frequency	5	
Flooding Impact	10	
Condition Assessment	10	
Accessibility	5	
Subtotal		30

- **ENVIRONMENTAL:**

Water Quality	10	
Fish Habitat	10	
Other Benefits	10	
Subtotal		30

- **FISCAL:**

Coordination/Opportunity funding	10	
Cost/Benefit Index	5	
Maintenance Needs	10	
Subtotal		25

- **Public Support and Plan Consistency:**

Public Support/Opposition	5	
Plan Consistency	10	
Subtotal		15

TOTAL: 100

FACILITIES

_____ (5)	1.	What is the current flooding frequency?	
		None or not applicable	0
		Low - once every 5-10 years (>100 year event)	1
		Medium - once every 2 years (>25-100 year event)	3
		High - 3-4 times per year (> 10 year event)	5
_____ (10)	2.	What is the current flooding impact in terms of injury, private property or public infrastructure?	
		None	0
		Minimal (minor road ponding, flooding of landscaping, other inconveniences)	3
		Moderate (impact to crawl spaces, extended road flooding)	6
		Extreme (large area impacted with personal injury or heavy property damage)	10
_____ (10)	3.	What are the conditions of the existing facility? Chose either constructed facility OR natural environment.	
		<u>Constructed Facility</u>	
		No constructed system involved	0
		Existing infrastructure (pipes, manholes, catch basins, retaining walls) are in excellent state	3
		Infrastructure is in fair condition, minor defects have been observed	5
		Infrastructure is in disrepair; needs constant maintenance to insure ongoing usage. Structural failure.	10
		<u>Natural Environment</u>	
		No natural system involved	0
		Minor degradation (bank erosion, downcutting, sediment deposition, etc.)	3
		Moderate threat of bank undercutting	5
		Extreme degradation (structures threatened, undermining of banks, severe downcutting)	10
_____ (5)	4.	How accessible is the existing facility for maintenance crews?	
		Satisfactory access; personnel and equipment may access from existing public road or right of way or N/A	0
		Marginal access (set-up time greater than one hour)	1
		Limited access (inspection only)	3
		No access possible for maintenance or inspection	5

_____ (30 max)

ENVIRONMENTAL

- _____ (10) 1. What is the proposed project's ability to improve existing water quality or protect/improve natural hydrology?
- | | |
|---|----|
| N/A | 0 |
| Low (minimal improvement, degradation may continue) | 3 |
| Medium (maintains beneficial use, slight improvement) | 6 |
| High (significant improvement) | 10 |
-
- _____ (10) 2. How will the proposed project impact fish habitat restoration/preservation or potential fish productivity in terms of habitat, stream connectivity or stream/lake characteristics? Does the project comply with the intent of the Endangered Species Act listing of Chinook salmon as a threatened species?
- | | |
|--|----|
| N/A (Not a fish habitat project) | 0 |
| Small Improvement | 3 |
| Moderate improvement | 5 |
| Significant improvement or Protects Existing | 10 |
-
- _____ (10) 4.. To what degree does the proposed project provide other benefits including education, recreation, open space, wildlife habitat and community livability?
- | | |
|---|---------|
| Does not include any other benefits | 0 |
| Conflicts with one of the above existing community amenities | minus 5 |
| Includes other benefits but of lesser value to the community, including at least one of the benefits listed above | 5 |
| Includes benefits of substantial value to the community including at least two of the above | 10 |

(30 max)

FISCAL

- _____ (10) 1. What is the possibility for coordination/opportunity funding with other projects? Would it be possible to add fish habitat features to this project?
- | | | |
|--|--|----|
| N/A - No link to other projects, non-City funds are not available to perform improvement | | 0 |
| Low development activity or potential to integrate with other projects, outside funds not probable | | 3 |
| Links indirectly with other programs or projects; moderate chance of leveraging other funding | | 6 |
| Link directly with other project(s) or programs, compounding their effectiveness or certain to leverage substantial amounts (percentage-wise) of other funding habitat will be lost if project not done soon | | 10 |
-
- _____ (5) 2. Is the cost/benefit index low or high for this project?
Ranking from all except this X 100 = Cost Benefit Index
 Cost of Project
- | | | |
|---------------------|--|---|
| N/A (grant funding) | | 0 |
| 0-10 | | 1 |
| 10-20 | | 3 |
| > 20 | | 5 |
-
- _____ (10) 3. How will the conceptual design of the project affect existing maintenance needs?
- | | | |
|-----------------------|--|----|
| Greater than existing | | 0 |
| Same as existing | | 5 |
| Less than existing | | 10 |

_____ (25 max)

Public Support and Plan Consistency

- _____ (5) 1. Have citizens within the area effected by the project expressed interest and acceptance of the project?
- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Public has expressed opposition | 0 |
| Public reaction is mixed | 1 |
| Moderate public support | 3 |
| Strong public support | 5 |
-
- _____ (10) 2. Is the project identified by the 20 year project list in the Capital Facilities Element of Kirkland’s Comprehensive Plan, or the Stormwater Master Plan?
- | | |
|--|----|
| Project is not in either plan | 0 |
| Project is identified as priority ** in the Surface Water Master Plan | 5 |
| Project is in the Comprehensive Plan, and is listed as priority ** in the Surface Water Master Plan, or is part of the City’s ESA response | 10 |

(15 max)

SUMMARY

FACILITIES	_____ (30)
ENVIRONMENTAL	_____ (30)
FISCAL	_____ (25)
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT	_____ (15)
TOTAL PROJECT POINTS	===== (100)