

YOLO BYPASS DRAINAGE AND WATER INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT STUDY:

Prioritization Matrix – Draft

October 9, 2013



| PROJECT METRIC | | Recommended Project | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| Priority of Criteria | | RP-1 – Wallace Weir Improvements | RP-2 – Tule Canal Agricultural Crossings | RP-3 – Lisbon Weir Improvements | RP-4 – Conway Main Supply Canal Augmentation | RP-5 – Davis Wetlands Water Supply | RP-6 – South Davis Drain Input Configuration | RP-7 – YBWA Dual Function Canal Reconfiguration | RP-8 – YBWA Public and O&M Road Improvements | RP-9 – RD2068 Stormwater and Summer Tailwater Re-Use and Supply | RP-10 – Local Agricultural Crossing Improvements | RP-11 – Creation of Coordinated Maintenance and Improvement Reimbursement Program or Agency | RP-12 – Bypass Wide: West Side Tributary Monitoring | |
| | 1 | Agricultural benefit ¹ | M | M | H | H | L | H | H | H | H | H | H | H |
| | 1 | Migratory waterfowl or shorebird habitat benefit ² | M | No | H | H | M | H | H | H | H | H | H | H |
| | 2 | "Shovel readiness" ³ | No | No | No | No | L | M | M | H | L | M | No | M |
| | 2 | Ease of permitting ⁴ | M | H | M | M | M | M | M | H | H | H | M | H |
| | 2 | Potential for matching funding ⁵ | M | U | M | U | M | U | L | L | U | M | L | H |
| | 2 | Eligibility for grants ⁶ | H | H | M | L | M | U | M | H | U | H | U | H |
| | 2 | Estimated benefit acreage ⁷ | M | L | H | H | M | H | H | H | U | H | H | H |
| | 2 | Cost estimate ⁸ | M | M | M | M | M | M | L | M | M | H | M | M |
| | 2 | Flood benefit | L | L | L | L | M | H | H | No | M | M | H | H |
| | 3 | Listed species benefit | H | H | H | M | L | U | U | No | No | U | U | H |
| | 3 | Public benefit (hunting, education, access, etc) | No | H | H | M | M | H | H | H | M | H | H | H |
| | 3 | Local economy benefit | H | H | H | H | H | H | H | H | H | H | H | H |
| | 3 | Water quality benefit | L | L | No | L | M | No | No | L | No | No | U | H |
| 3 | Other environmental benefit | U | U | U | No | L | U | No | L | No | No | L | U | |
| | High (Good/Easy) | 3 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 11 | |
| | Medium | 6 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | |
| | Low (Bad/Hard) | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| | Unknown | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | |
| | No (Benefit) | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |

¹ Agricultural benefit is an overall subjective assessment of combination of several criteria that follow.

² Migratory waterfowl or shorebird habitat benefit is an overall subjective assessment of combination of several criteria that follow.

³ Low "shovel readiness" means that little preparatory work (feasibility or design) has been undertaken. High means that designs could quickly and easily be produced.

⁴ Ease of permitting relates to the overall anticipated complexity of obtaining the permits required to construct the project.

⁵ Low < 10%, 10% < Medium < 30%, High > 30%

⁶ Low < 10%, 10% < Medium < 30%, High > 30%

⁷ Low < 3,000 acres, 3,000 acres < Medium < 6,000 acres, High > 6,000 acres

⁸ For Cost Estimate evaluation criteria, H, or High (Good/Easy) means that the cost is low. L, or Low (Bad/Hard) means that the cost is high. Low > \$3,000,000 and \$3,000,000 > Medium > \$100,000 and High < \$100,000