



Figure 2.2 Three Tiered Screening Process for Alternative Recharge Concepts

Tier 1: In the first tier, the Partnership considered the identified candidate water sources with variations in pathways into the MFL recharge area. Project alternatives that provided less than three MGD or that exhibited significantly higher unit conveyance costs than other alternatives were removed from consideration. The Partnership also identified sources that were either technically or institutionally infeasible.

Tier 2: The Partnership evaluated the remaining alternatives for conceptual costs and potential benefits. Conceptual costs included source development, treatment, conveyance, and recharge. Benefits were estimated based on *the expected combined flow benefit* at the two MFL sites, based on the volume of water expected to reach the sites from a target recharge area (see **Section 4.0**). Alternatives were sorted based on the capital cost to MFL benefit ratio. From this list, approximately ten alternatives were chosen based on their value, and with careful consideration for maintaining a broad array of source waters.

Tier 3: These ten short-listed projects were compared using a multi-criteria scorecard that combined both quantitative and qualitative features of each alternative. In this phase, conceptual cost estimates were further refined, MFL benefits were reported individually for the two sites, and a broad array of qualitative characteristics were examined (e.g., ancillary benefits, implementation ease, development time, operational complexity, reliability of source water, and potential for benefit to additional MFL water bodies). The project alternatives were discussed in their totality; through facilitated discussion, and the Partnership identified four projects to advance for more detailed feasibility assessments.