

## **Rank and prioritize the Identified Issues.**

Each issue was rated based upon the 12 criteria listed below. This criteria was selected because it reflected our community's values. Use the same 12 criteria for each issue. After reviewing the data available or having knowledge of each of the issues:

Rate each criteria for "relative importance" on a scale of 1-5:

5-Very important and critical to prioritizing key environmental health issues

4-Important and useful

3-Neutral

2-Not very important and has limited use for decision making

1-Low importance; may not be relevant

Mark an "X" in the numbered box that reflects your choice

Rank the issue using all 12 criteria.

Ranking Criteria	1-low importance	2-limited usefulness	3-neutral	4-important	5-very important
Aesthetics					
Economic impact					
Fairness					
Future generations					
Health effects					
Peace of mind					
Ecological effects					
Scale (geographical)					
Recreation					
Sustainability					
Ethical/ Moral/ Social/ responsibility					
Sense of Community					

NEXT steps: Total the points for each of the criteria. Divide each of the criteria's total point score by the number of committee members who filled out the form. There will be a total number for each criteria. Then place the number that you came up with in the score column in the ranking worksheet listed below for each of the criteria listed.

### Ranking Worksheet

For the ranking worksheet, use these same 12 criteria and determine if the issue is a 1, 2, or 3. Then multiply the result (1,2, or 3) by the score from the "relative importance" table. This number represents the weight. The ranking worksheet needs to be done for each issue. Last, the weight for each of the 12 criteria is added together. The issue with the highest weight is the priority issue.

<b>Ranking Worksheet</b> <b>Circle 1, 2, or 3 for each criteria:</b> <b>Aesthetics</b> Reduced visibility, and noise, dust or other unpleasant sensations; and visual impact from degradation of natural landscapes. 1-the community &/or family is not significantly effected by community aesthetics 2-the community &/or family is mildly effected by community aesthetics 3-the community &/or family very disturbed by community aesthetics	Score	Weight
<b>Economic Impact</b> Higher expenses to fix, replace, or buy items or services because of environmental problems; lower income higher taxes paid, or net jobs lost because of environmental problems; lost of productivity; lower property values, health care costs due to environmental problems; and costs associated with loss of species that might, in the future, provide valuable resources. 1-the community &/or family is not significantly financially impacted 2-the community &/or family may bear a short term financial burden 3-the community &/or family may bear a long term financial burden		
<b>Fairness</b> Unequal distribution of costs and benefits, both economic and non-economic. Includes notion of environmental justice and effects of sub-populations, such as elders, children, pregnant women and the chronically ill. 1-the environmental issue does not significantly effected sub-populations 2-the environmental issue moderately effects sub-populations 3-the environmental issue significantly effects sub-populations		
<b>Future Generation</b> Environmental management decisions made today that would effect the environment of future generations. 1-environmental decision does not significantly effect our future generations 2-environmental decision moderately effects our future generations 3-environmental decision significantly effects our future generations		
<b>Health Effects</b> Population exposed; severity of health outcome; degree of toxicity of stressor; length of exposure; impacts to special populations; exposure pathways 1-environmental issue does not significantly impact our health outcome 2-environmental issue moderately impacts our health outcome 3-environmental issue significantly impacts our health outcome		
<b>Peace of Mind</b> Feeling threatened by possible environmental hazards, such as impure drinking water, or potentially risky structures or facilities (for example, waste sites, power lines); heightened stress caused by urbanization, traffic, etc. Also includes deep-rooted sense of loss from depletion/extinction of natural resources; and erosion of the expectation that natural environment will be here for our family 1-environmental issue does not threaten our well-being 2-environmental issue moderately threatens our well-being 3-environmenteant issue significantly adds stress to our life		
<b>Ecological Effects</b> Describes types and magnitude of effects, including severity, reversibility, and trends 1-environmental issue has no effect on ecosystem's health 2-environmental issue moderately impacts the ecosystem's health 3-environmental issue significantly impacts the life of the ecosystem		

<b>Scale</b> Geographical distribution of the effect 1-environmental issue impacts less than 1% of the population 2-environmental issue impacts more than 1% to 25% of the population 3-environmental issue impacts above 25% of the population(widespread)	Score	Weight
<b>Recreation</b> Loss of access to public and private recreational lands, such as beaches, lakes, and forests, and degraded quality and aesthetics of recreation experience (for example, fished out streams, spoiled wilderness, fish kills.) 1-environmental issue has no effect on the recreation quality 2-environmental issue has moderate effect on the recreation quality 3-environmental issue has significant effect on the recreation quality		
<b>Sustainability</b> The level at which impacts to the environment and human health are too much for the system to bear over the long term. Shifting economic costs, health risks, and environmental damage of today's activities to people not yet able to vote or not yet born. 1-environmental decisions produce sustainable environment 2-environmental decisions moderately impact the sustainability of the environment 3-environmental decisions significantly impact the sustainability of the environment		
<b>Ethic/Moral/Social Responsibility</b> Responsible environmental management decisions reflecting the greater good of the community and an improved or sustained environment instead of immediate financial gains 1-environmental decisions are ethical/moral correct 2-environmental decisions are moderately in conflict with ethics/morals 3-environmental decisions create high ethical/moral conflicts		
<b>Sense of Community</b> Growth of population or development that changes and the appearances and feel of a community; loss of mutual respect, cooperation, willingness to share and accept responsibility, attachment and pride in one's community; loss of degradation of special natural features that define a community, such as a beach, forest, or trees; isolation or fragmentation of a community. Includes the loss of attachment for or meaning in one's surroundings. 1-environmental decisions promote community attachment 2-environmental decisions moderately fragment community attachment 3-environmental decisions seriously fragment community attachment		