North Florida Regional Water Supply Plan

ALTERNATIVES SCORECARD

NOTE: This information is not used for ranking. The alternatives are not listed in any preferred sequence.

SB-64, WQ, +	Low-Mod in all	Up to 10 Years	Low-Mod in all	90-100%	> 1 cfs
SB-64 or WQ	Mod in most	10-20 Years	Moderate in most (acceptable risk)	80-90%	0.5 - 1 cfs
No Goals	"Mod-High in all (Known obstacles or significant unknowns)"	20+ Years	"Mod-High in all (Known obstacles or significant unknowns)"	< 80%	< 0.5 cfs

DEFINITIONS OF ALTERNATIVES					PRINCIPAL QUANTITATIVE FACTORS				QUALITATIVE FACTORS			OTHER QUANTITATIVE FACTORS			
					Recovery + Prevention Target Recovery Target Alternative Performance Estimate		TOTAL COST (Source Development, Treatment, Conveyance, Recharge)								
ID#	Source	Volume (MGD)	MFL Benefit Ichetucknee (CFS)	MFL Benefit Sante Fe (CFS)	MFL Benefit Ichetucknee (CFS)	MFL Benefit Sante Fe (CFS)	Capital Cost Low-High	O&M Cost Low-High Annual	Ancillary Benefits	Implementation Ease	Alternative Development Time	Operational Complexity	Source Water Reliability	Potential For Regional Benefits (CFS)	Other Considerations
1	Buckman + Southwest	40	14	17			$690M – $830M	$6M – $16M	• SB 64 • Recreation • Ecosystem restoration • Water quality improvement	• Permitting (H) • Public/political (L) • Land acquisition (H) • Conveyance (H)	10–20 Years	• Governance (H) • Monitoring (H) • Training (M)	100%	1.2	Treatment wetland option is based on JEA Peterson Tract (1200 acres). Due to the large volume of water, multiple recharge sites and methods my be required. Treatment method would be highly dependent on recharge method.
2	GRU WWTF Transfer	3	0.9	1.1			$60M – $90M	$0M – $3M	• Recreation • Ecosystem restoration • Water quality improvement	• Permitting (M) • Public/political (L) • Land acquisition (M) • Conveyance (M)	Up to 10 Years	• Governance (M) • Monitoring (M) • Training (L)	100%	0.1	Locations exist within the target recharge area that have more favorable influence on the MFL sites, and because the volume is low, there shoud be many available sites.
3	Suwannee River – Suwannee Bell	8.6 Avg (20 Max)	3.3	4.0			$290M – $390M	$5M – $11M	None	• Permitting (H) • Public/political (H) • Land acquisition (M) • Conveyance (L)	10–20 Years	• Governance (M) • Monitoring (H) • Training (M)	Able to withdraw **40%** of time while meeting ecological flow needs	0.3	Reflects maintenance of instream flows to protect sturgeon and manatee populations. More detailed hydrologic and ecological evaluation will be required.
4	Suwannee River – Suwannee Branford	8.9 Avg (20 Max)	3.4	4.1			$250M – $340M	$5M – $11M	None	• Permitting (H) • Public/political (H) • Land acquisition (M) • Conveyance (L)	10–20 Years	• Governance (M) • Monitoring (H) • Training (M)	Able to withdraw **45%** of time while meeting ecological flow needs	0.3	
5	Suwannee River – Upper Suwannee	10	3.9	4.6			$180M – $260M	$3M – $7M	None	• Permitting (H) • Public/political (H) • Land acquisition (H) • Conveyance (L)	10–20 Years	• Governance (M) • Monitoring (H) • Training (M)	Flow values too low to offer consistent and reliable value - not analyzed further.	0.5	Upper Suwannee withdrawls could have substantial impacts on flow rregimes even above low flows. For this reason, Upper Suwannee alternatives were not considered further.
6	NF Black Creek	4.2 Avg (5.2 Max)	1.6	2.0			$170M – $210M	$2M – $5M	None	• Permitting (M) • Public/political (M) • Land acquisition (L) • Conveyance (M)	10-20 Years	• Governance (M) • Monitoring (H) • Training (H)	Able to withdraw **80%** of time while meeting ecological flow needs	0.2	
7	Northside Power Desal	20	7.7	9.3			$560M	$14M	• SB 64	• Permitting (L) • Public/political (L) • Land acquisition (L) • Conveyance (H)	20+ Years	• Governance (H) • Monitoring (H) • Training (H)	50%	1.0	The future of this source water is uncertain and may not be available as a viable consistent source water under future conditions.
8	Gulf Coast Desal	40	15	19			$1,400M – $2,800M	$61M	None	• Permitting (H) • Public/political (M) • Land acquisition (L) • Conveyance (L)	20+ Years	• Governance (M) • Monitoring (M) • Training (H)	100%	2.0	
9	Coquina Coast Desal	40	15	19			$1,500M – $3,000M	$61M	None	• Permitting (H) • Public/political (M) • Land acquisition (L) • Conveyance (H)	20+ Years	• Governance (M) • Monitoring (M) • Training (H)	100%	2.0	
10	Desal Replacement Pumping (JEA, SJCUD, CCUA, and GRU) - Coquina Coast	181.9	4.7	21			$3,800M – $12,000M	$250M	None	• Permitting (H) • Public/political (M) • Land acquisition (L) • Conveyance (H)	20+ Years	• Governance (H) • Monitoring (H) • Training (H)	100%	Would require modeling of no pumping at all four utilities and impact at Ellaville.	

Note: MFL benefits for line 1 assume a 90% recharge efficiency for RIBs. MFL benefits for line 2 assume an 80% recharge efficiency for recharge wetlands.
MFL benefits for lines 3-10 assume a 100% recharge efficiency for recharge wells.