

**Portage and Arcadia Creeks Watershed Transition/Implementation
Project Tracking Code: 2003-0028**

Table 4-1. Parameters for Scoring Water Quality Protection Potential (*Task 1.2*)

Several areas in the Portage-Arcadia Creek Watershed were recommended for preservation in Version I of the Watershed Management Plan as a means to protect water quality. Because the areas recommended for preservation were not expected to be improved nor was water quality expected to improve through preservation efforts, the “Water Quality Improvement Potential” was marked as 0 for these areas. However, a 0 score tended to negate the importance of preservation efforts. Therefore, a new “Water Quality Preservation Potential” was developed. The following table lists parameters suggested by the Technical Subcommittee for developing a preservation potential score. Those parameters marked as “yes” in the “Recommended for Use” column were used in the scoring process. Scores range from 0 to 3, with a score of 3 indicating the greatest need and/or ability to enact preservation efforts. Tabulated scores were included in the BMP Tables (Attachment 2).

Scoring Parameter	Ease of scoring	Method of Developing Score	Recommended for Use	How to Score	Notes
Is the area already formally preserved, well-known or not well-known?	Easy	Widely known	Yes	0 = formally preserved, but primarily urban grasses (park) 1 = formally preserved in native state 2 = not preserved, well known 3 = not preserved, not well known	Less well known areas may have a greater potential of being developed without public dissent, e.g., development at I-94 and Westledge Avenue
Is there a potential for the area to be developed and how would water quality change if it was developed?	Moderate	Review future zoning and proximity to current development	Yes	0 = will not be developed 1 = may be developed in next 10 years 2 = may be developed in next 5 years and adjacent to developed land 3 = development has been proposed	Score may be based on development trends of area and feasibility of development of property
Who are the property owners (multiple owners vs. single entities)?	Easy	Information already in BMP Table, mapping programs	Yes	3 = 1-2 publicly owned properties 2 = 1-2 privately owned properties 1 = publicly owned, more than 2 parcels, 0 = privately owned, more than 2 parcels	
Is there a possibility for a conservation easement?	Difficult	Discussions with property owner needed	No		

What is the current water quality at that stretch? (Headwater areas might have a greater priority than downstream because they influence more of the creek.)	Easy	Break each stream into three units. For Axtell and West Fork, break into two units and consider the main stem of Portage Creek as the third unit.	Yes, break stream into upper, middle, lower,	0 = noncontributing areas 1 = lower 2 = middle 3 = headwaters	Noncontributing areas may be scored higher if there is a potential to connect storm sewers to the area.
Is the area connected to or in close proximity to a preserved area?	Easy	Review maps, general knowledge	Yes	0 = more than 0.75 miles from any preserve 1 = 0.25 – 0.75 mile from preserve 2 < 0.25 miles from preserve 3 = connected to preserve	
Is the area a wildlife corridor or does it contain remnants of native species?	Difficult	Local knowledge of SC members and community	No		
Is it near a wellfield or in a recharge zone?	Moderate	Compare to identified well field locations, recharge areas identified by well head protection program	Yes	0 = more than 1 mile from a well field 1 = more than 0.5 miles from a recharge zone 2 = adjacent to a recharge zone 3 = within a recharge zone	

Scores for each parameter were averaged (for a maximum score of 3) to assure consistency with scores for “Water Quality Improvement Potential” and “Efficacy of Implementation”.