

5.3.2 Scorecard Evaluation

The final tier of screening evaluated the ten short-listed alternatives with a series of predetermined criteria from earlier workshops. This included refinement of cost and benefits from earlier phases, and evaluation of more subjective characteristics of each alternative. The alternatives were not ranked but compared for individual and collective merits toward the goal of achieving overall recovery and prevention goals. The Partnership members recognized that ultimately, the most effective strategy may be one large project, or a phased portfolio of several projects.

Table 5.4 describes the criteria that were developed and employed by the Partnership to compare and contrast the short-listed alternatives to identify a suite of projects recommended for further feasibility assessments, either on individual merits or on their potential value in tandem with another project on the final recommended list.

Table 5.4 Scorecard Criteria (Interpretation of Scorecard Columns)

PROJECT DEFINITIONS	Source		Origination of water supply		
	Volume (MGD)		Average annual available water for recharge		
	MFL Benefits		Expected CFS at the Ichetucknee and Santa Fe Gages		
	Total Cost	Capital Cost High (\$M)	Costs associated with most aggressive treatment (given uncertainty in regulatory environment)		
		O&M Cost High (\$M/yr)			
Capital Cost Low (\$M)		Costs associated with most optimistic treatment (given uncertainty in regulatory environment)			
O&M Cost Low (\$M/yr)					
QUALITATIVE FACTORS	Ancillary Benefits: - SB-64 - WQ/BMAP - Recreation - Ecosystem Restoration		SB-64, WQ, +	SB-64 or WQ	No Ancillary Benefits Identified
	Implementation Ease: - Permitting Complexity - Political/Public Opinion - Land Acquisition - Conveyance Obstacles		Low to Moderate in all categories	Moderate in most categories	Moderate to High in all categories (known obstacles or significant unknowns)
	Project Development Time		Up to 10 Years	10–20 Years	20+ Years
	Operational Flexibility: - Governance - Level of Monitoring - Level of Training		Low to Moderate in all categories	Moderate in most (acceptable risk)	Moderate to High in all (known obstacles or significant unknowns)
	Source Water Reliability		90%–100%	80%–90%	< 80%
Potential for Regional Benefit as estimated at the Ellaville gage on the Suwannee River (cfs)		> 1.0 cfs	0.5-1.0 cfs	< 0.5 cfs	

The full scorecard for the Tier 3 projects is provided in **Figure 5.6**. Recommendations from the scorecard analysis are presented in **Section 6.0**.