Table 1
Canal Ranking Scoring Sheet

Scoring Criteria for Potential Canal Restoration Sites		Canal Name:			
		Score	Weighting Factor	Total Score	Maximum Score
Canal Water Quality Ranking					
1) Water Quality (scored from 0 to + 5) Scoring is based on observed water quality degradation and monitoring conducted by the County.	If no monitoring data is available, or greater than 50 percent of the monitoring data exhibits DO saturation greater than 70 percent; the score is 0. If 1 to 10 monitoring events have been completed, and greater than 50 percent of the monitoring data exhibits a DO saturation between 42 - 70 %; the score is 1. If 1 to 10 monitoring events have been completed, and less than 50 percent of the monitoring data exhibits a DO saturation below 42 percent; the score is 2. If between 1 and 10 monitoring events have been completed, and greater than 50 percent of the monitoring data exhibits a DO saturation below 42 percent; the score is 3. If greater than 10 monitoring events have been completed, and greater than or equal to 3 monitoring events (or the allowable number pursuant to Table 1 of 62-303) exhibit a DO saturation less than 42 percent; the score is 5. If greater than 10 monitoring events have been completed, and less than 3 monitoring events (or the allowable number pursuant to Table 1 of 62-303) exhibit a DO saturation greater than 42 percent; the score is 0.	**0**	**10**	**0**	**50**
2) Evidence of Nutrient Accumulation (scored from 0 to +5) Scoring is based on the potential discharge of nutrient rich waters from the canals.	For canals that do not receive seaweed loads or do not exhibit elevated nutrient concentrations (evident through slime growth and reduced water clarity); the score is 0. For canals with moderate seaweed loading, moderate slime growth, moderate water clarity, or moderate reduction in fish habitat; the score is 3. For canals with heavy seaweed loading, significant visual degradation, and lack of fish habitat; the score is 5.	**0**	**3**	**0**	**15**
3) Likelihood of toxicity (scored from 0 to +5) Scoring is based on the likelihood of hydrogen sulfide production based on canal bathymetry.	For canals with an average depth less than 10 feet; the score is 0. For canals with an average depth between 10 feet and 20 feet; the score is 3. For canals with an average depth greater then 20 feet; the score is 5.	**0**	**3**	**0**	**15**
4) Connectivity to Nearshore Waters (scored from 0 to +5) Scoring is based on the potential of the canal to degrade the water quality in nearshore waters.	For canals that are connected to semi-enclosed waters such as harbors and inlets; the score is 0. For canals that are connected to open water, but are a sufficient distance away from high flow areas such as tidal channels; the score is 3. For canals that are connected to open water, and are close to high flow areas such as tidal channels; the score is 5.	**0**	**2**	**0**	**10**
5) Potential Nearshore Impact (scored from 0 to +5) The public benefit criterion is related to the number of users affected by the proposed project. A value of 0 means 0-9 users (parcels) would be positively affected by the project, a value of 1 means 10-44 users would be positively affected by the project, a value of 3 means 45-79 users would be positively affected by the project, +5 indicates that 80 or more users would be positively affected.		**0**	**2**	**0**	**10**
Subtotal				**0**	**100**

Table 1
Canal Ranking Scoring Sheet

Scoring Criteria for Potential Canal Restoration Sites		Canal Name:			
		Score	Weighting Factor	Total Score	Maximum Score
Canal Technology Ranking					
1) Restoration Technology (scored from 0 to +5) Scoring is based on the potential to implement a proven technology that is capable of complete canals restoration. The results are from the FIU evaluation of the demonstration technologies at improving water quality.	For canals that are only amenable to technologies that provide partial restoration (i.e. only air curtain or organic removal); the score is 0.	**0**	**3**	**0**	**15**
	For canals that are only amenable to an alternative technology, such as capping or an injection well, but it is expected that a complete restoration can be achieved; the score is 3.				
	For canals that are amenable to proven technologies, such as backfilling with or without organic sediment removal and culverts, that are expected to provide a complete restoration; the score is 5.				
2) Implementation Costs (scored from -125 to +5) A scoring value of -20 is associated with restoration projects that exceed $35M, and a scoring value of 5 is associated with restoration projects that can be completed for $1M or less.	For canals that have a restoration cost(including site restoration, mitigation and engineering/design/oversight fees) less than $1M, the score is 5	**0**	**5**	**0**	**-125 TO 25**
	For canals that have a restoration cost(including site restoration, mitigation and engineering/design/oversight fees) that between $1M-$2M, the score is 3				
	For canals that have a restoration cost(including site restoration, mitigation and engineering/design/oversight fees) that between $2M-$3M, the score is 1				
	For canals that have a restoration cost(including site restoration, mitigation and engineering/design/oversight fees) between $3M to $5M, the score is -5				
	For canals that have a restoration cost(including site restoration, mitigation and engineering/design/oversight fees) between $5M to $15M, the score is -10				
	For canals that have a restoration cost(including site restoration, mitigation and engineering/design/oversight fees) between $15M to $25M, the score is -15				
	For canals that have a restoration cost(including site restoration, mitigation and engineering/design/oversight fees) between $25M to $35M, the score is -20				
	For canals that have a restoration cost(including site restoration, mitigation and engineering/design/oversight fees) over $35M, the score is -25				
3) Project "implementability" (scored from -5 to 5) This criterion accounts for factors such as need for O&M, staging areas, complexity of permitting issues, mitigation requirements(mangroves and seagrass impacts), and potential complications with existing utilities or difficulty of access. Scoring ranges from -5 to +5, with -5 indicating very difficult to implement, 0 indicating significant difficulties in implementation, and 5 indicating relative ease of implementation.		**0**	**3**	**0**	**-15 TO 15**
4) Potential Resource Impacts (scored from -5 to 5) Scoring ranges from -5 to +5, with -5 indicating impacts to resources greater than 7,500 sq ft., with -4 indicating impacts to resources greater than 5,625 sq. ft but less than 7,500 sq. ft., with -3 indicating impacts to resources greater than 3,750 sq. ft but less than 5,625 sq. ft, with -2 indicating impacts to resources greater than 1,875 sq. ft but less than 3,750 sq. ft, with -1 indicating impacts to resources less than 1,875 sq. ft, with 5 indicating no impacts to resources.		**0**	**5**	**0**	**-25 TO 25**
Subtotal				**0**	**-165 TO 80**