Table 5.1 Candidate Projects from Tier 2 Screening

Source	Volume (MGD)	Estimated Capital Cost ($M)[1]	Estimated MFL Benefit Ichetucknee (cfs)	Estimated MFL Benefit Santa Fe (cfs)
Reclaimed Water from Buckman & Southwest WRFs	40	830	14	17
Reclaimed Water from GRU	3	90	0.9	1.1
Suwannee Bell	20 Target (8.6 Avg)	390	3.3[2]	4.0[2]
Suwannee Branford	20 Target (8.9 Avg)	340	3.4[2]	4.1[2]
Upper Suwannee	10[3]	260	3.9	4.6
NF Black Creek	5.2 Target (4.2 Avg)	210	1.6[2]	2.0[2]
Northside Power Desal	20	560	7.7	9.3
Gulf Coast Desal	40	2,800	15	19
Coquina Coast Desal	40	3,000	15	19
Desal Replacement Pumping (JEA, SJCUD, CCUA, and GRU) - Coquina Coast	182	12,000	4.7	21

1. Ranges of costs were evaluated based on uncertainties in source water quality, treatment needs, and recharge locations and methods. Presented in this table are the final values of the high range of costs (developed in subsequent Tier 3 analysis).
2. Estimated MFL benefits are based on annual average flows rather than target instantaneous flows
3. Upper Suwannee water availability was determined to be too low to provide consistent and reliable value. They were not assessed further.

5.3 Tier Three Screening

The Partnership compared multiple factors for each short-list alternative and made a consensus-based decision about which concepts to recommend for more detailed and site-specific feasibility assessment (see **Section 6.0**). The Tier 3 evaluation included both quantitative factors, such as cost and MFL benefits, as well as an array of qualitative factors pertaining to implementation feasibility and additional benefits to the region. The alternatives were not ranked or scored against each other; instead, each was evaluated for its own merits using a consistent scorecard approach. Alternatives were evaluated both as individual projects and a collective of ideas that could provide opportunities for portfolios to address both recovery targets and prevention targets for the two MFLs.

5.3.1 Additional Technical Analysis

Three additional technical assessments were performed to refine understanding of the recharge potential, limitations, and treatment needs of the short-listed alternatives:

- Hydrogeology of each candidate recharge site was evaluated to refine estimates of recharge efficiency based on soil properties.
- Intermittency of water availability from surface water bodies was estimated using ecologically based flow targets, precedents from prior projects, and regulatory guidelines.
- Source water quality was examined to better provide a range of potential treatment needs and potential costs based on conservative and optimistic interpretations of regulatory guidelines.