

### Attachment 3: Summary of alternatives analysis

Option	Provide Safe, Clean Water							Other Considerations					Present Value of Incremental Cost <sup>1</sup>	
	1. Meets Annual Water Supply Targets	2. Maintains groundwater Storage	3. Maintains Semitropic Storage	4. Secures Existing Imported Water Supplies	5. Provides Locally Controlled Drought Supplies	6. Adapts to Climate Change	7. Improves Water Quality	8. Improves the Environment	9. Reduces Reliance on the Delta	10. Provides Statewide Benefits	11. Reduces Greenhouse Gas Emissions	12. Allows for Phased Implementation	13a. Cost per Acre Foot of potential project yield	13b. Cost per Acre Foot of portfolio yield
California WaterFix, High Outflow Scenario	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	\$295 - \$755	\$350 - \$1,005
Additional Potable Reuse	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	\$1,085	\$1,700
Increased Conservation	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	\$1,205	\$990
Additional Transfers	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	\$690	\$755
Additional Contract Supply	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	\$650	\$805

● Most effective

○ Moderately effective

■ Ineffective

Notes: A description of the criteria and how they were each rated is provided in Attachment 2. All five alternatives are evaluated on top of the future baseline which includes implementation of key elements of the 2012 Water Master Plan. Not all criteria are equally important; however, staff did not attempt to provide any weighting for this analysis.

<sup>1</sup> The unit cost in this table represents the incremental costs that are in addition to the cost of baseline projects.