

## Appendices

---

Appendices A-I provide a thorough compilation of the detailed matrix evaluation input and results for each reach. There are five tables in each appendix, one for each criterion. These tables include the following for each subcriterion: the alternative ranking; the weighting; the model weight; and a summary of the scoring rationale used.

## **RWE Reach A**

Appendix A includes the detailed evaluation summary of RWE Reach A. The following five tables include the results from the SMART Method comparison completed using the matrix evaluation software. These five tables include the following items for each subcriterion:

- weighting and associated priority,
- the alternative ranking,
- the Matrix Weight, and
- a summary of the scoring rationale.

Table A1  
RWE Reach A – Operations (Weight 10, Priority 28.6)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Reliability (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 10, Priority 40.0)</b>				
A1,A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No apparent differences between the two corridors. Both alternatives are assumed to be similar.</li> </ul>	2	11.4	11.4
<b>Appurtenances (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 7.5, Priority 30.0)</b>				
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least appurtenances anticipated; approximately 16 valves.</li> </ul>	2	8.6	8.6
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most appurtenances anticipated; approximately 20 valves.</li> </ul>	1	8.6	4.3
<b>Long Term Accessibility (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 7.5, Priority 30.0)</b>				
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High accessibility. Mostly within paved roads.</li> </ul>	2	8.6	8.6
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good accessibility. Mostly within paved roads with slightly more cross country than Alternative A1.</li> </ul>	1	8.6	4.3

Table A2  
RWE Reach A - Environmental Considerations (Weight 7.5, Priority 21.4)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Special Status Species (SSS) Potential Habitat (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less impact. Corridor has the potential to impact some ponded areas adjacent to the roadway that are potential habitat to SSS.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	3.3
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact. Corridor goes through wetlands and is documented as potentially having raptor nests.</li> </ul>	1	3.3	1.6
<b>Potential Waters of the US (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less impact. Corridor has one canal and drainage crossing and traverses two nearby ponds.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	3.3
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact. Corridor has one canal and drainage crossing and crosses through wetlands in cross country section.</li> <li>Crossing of wetlands is a factor in the Federal permitting process.</li> </ul>	1	3.3	1.6
<b>Riparian Zones Likely Under CDFG (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less impact. Corridor crosses one canal and two drainage riparian zones; however these crossings will occur in or adjacent to the previously disturbed roadways.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	3.3
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact. Corridor crosses one canal and drainage riparian zone and crosses through wetlands in a cross country section.</li> </ul>	1	3.3	1.6
<b>Cultural Resource Sensitivity (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low impact. Corridor is mostly within already disturbed lands (7,372 feet).</li> <li>Few high sensitivity crossings. Mostly within medium sensitivity areas.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	3.3
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little impact. Corridor is mostly within already disturbed lands (6,083 feet).</li> <li>Slightly more high sensitivity crossings. Mostly within medium sensitivity areas.</li> </ul>	1	3.3	1.6
<b>Length Within Undisturbed Lands (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 7.5, Priority 11.5)</b>				
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impacts to undisturbed lands (0 feet).</li> </ul>	2	2.5	2.5
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impacts to undisturbed lands (1,600 feet).</li> </ul>	1	2.5	1.2
<b>Land Use Constraints (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 5, Priority 7.6)</b>				
A1,A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both alternatives have no land use constraints.</li> </ul>	2	1.6	1.6

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Approximate Relative Density of Trees (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 4, Priority 6.1)</b>				
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact to trees.</li> <li>Entire corridor is within paved and dirt roads (7,372 feet)</li> </ul>	2	1.3	1.3
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact to trees.</li> <li>Majority of the corridor is within roads (6,083 feet)</li> <li>Mostly moderate tree density, with some low tree density areas in cross country portions of the corridor (1,600 feet).</li> <li>Cross country portions of the corridor contain Blue Oaks.</li> </ul>	1	1.3	0.7
<b>Level of Noise Pollution (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 3, Priority 4.6)</b>				
A1,A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both the corridor alternatives have moderate noise impacts. These corridors are within close proximity of residences in quiet private neighborhood.</li> </ul>	2	1.0	1.0
<b>Level of Dust Pollution (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 3, Priority 4.6)</b>				
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less dust impacts. Corridor is mostly within paved roadways (about 4,874 feet).</li> </ul>	2	1.0	1.0
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More dust impacts. Corridor is mostly within paved roadways (4,585 feet).</li> <li>About 1,600 feet of the corridor is within cross country area.</li> </ul>	1	1.0	0.5
<b>Level of Traffic Impacts (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 3, Priority 4.6)</b>				
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less impact. No alternate access to Bear River Lane, but has less residences than Lake Valley Drive.</li> </ul>	2	1.0	1.0
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact. Lake Valley Drive is the only route to several residential areas to the east.</li> </ul>	1	1.0	0.5

Table A3  
RWE Reach A – Constructability (Weight 7.5, Priority 21.4)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Pipeline Length (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 10, Priority 25.0)</b>				
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shortest length of approximately 7,372 feet.</li> </ul>	2	5.4	5.4
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Longest length of approximately 7,683 feet.</li> </ul>	1	5.4	2.7
<b>Geotechnical Constraints (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 10, Priority 25.0)</b>				
A1,A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No apparent differences between the two corridors. Both alternatives are assumed to be geologically/geotechnically similar.</li> </ul>	2	5.4	5.4
<b>Accessibility (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 7.5, Priority 18.8)</b>				
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Higher level of accessibility. Majority of the corridor is within paved and dirt roads (6,083 feet).</li> </ul>	2	4.0	4.0
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lower level of accessibility. Less of the corridor is within existing paved and dirt roads (4,585 feet).</li> <li>Cross country sections are in low to moderate density tree areas (1,600 feet).</li> </ul>	1	4.0	2.0
<b>Potential to Negatively Impact Existing Facilities (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 7.5, Priority 18.8)</b>				
A1, A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both the corridor alternatives have minimal impacts. The alternatives both have a single crossing of Combie-Ophir Canal.</li> </ul>	2	4.0	4.0
<b>Work Space/ Construction Method Constraints (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 5, Priority 12.5)</b>				
A1, A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences between the two corridors. Both alternatives are along similar roadways or cross country areas.</li> </ul>	2	2.7	2.7

Table A4  
RWE Reach A – ROW (Weight 5, Priority 14.3)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Permanent Easement Acquisition (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 7.5, Priority 65.2)</b>				
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less permanent easement required approximately 2,498 feet.</li> </ul>	2	9.3	9.3
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More permanent easement required approximately 3,098 feet</li> </ul>	1	9.3	4.7
<b>Percent in Public ROW/PUE (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 4, Priority 34.8)</b>				
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately 66.1% in public ROW/PUE. Lake Valley Drive has a 50 foot wide road, drainage and private and public utility easement.</li> </ul>	2	5.0	5.0
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately 59.7% in public ROW/PUE. Bear River Lane and Lake Valley Drive have a 50 foot wide road, drainage, and private and public utility easement</li> </ul>	1	5.0	2.5

Table A5  
RWE Reach A - Public Impacts (Weight 5, Priority 14.3)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Potential for Opposition (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 10, Priority 66.7)</b>				
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some potential opposition. Corridor is in a private neighborhood.</li> <li>Moderate noise impacts. Corridor is within close proximity to residences in quiet private neighborhood.</li> <li>Little dust impacts. Corridor is mostly within paved roadways.</li> <li>Moderate traffic impacts. Corridor is in private lane which leads to more neighborhoods to the east.</li> <li>Lake Valley Drive is the only access road to Klein Ranch Road, Cedar Ridge Road, Sweetwater Drive, and Stoney Falls Drive.</li> </ul>	2	9.5	9.5
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More potential opposition. Corridor is in a private neighborhood and within close proximity to a residence in cross country portion (Segment 3).</li> <li>Moderate noise impacts. Corridor is within close proximity of residences in quiet private neighborhood.</li> <li>More dust impacts. Corridor is mostly within paved roadways, but more cross country than Alternative A1.</li> <li>Moderate traffic impacts. Corridor is within two private lanes.</li> </ul>	1	9.5	4.8
<b>Aesthetic Impacts (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 5, Priority 33.3)</b>				
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fewer impacts. Mostly within already disturbed lands.</li> </ul>	2	4.8	4.8
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impacts. Although, the corridor is mostly within already disturbed lands, it will likely require tree removal in the 900 LF cross country section adjacent to residence in Segment 3.</li> </ul>	1	4.8	2.4

## **RWE Reach B**

Appendix B includes the detailed evaluation summary of RWE Reach B. The following five tables include the results from the SMART Method comparison completed using the matrix evaluation software. These five tables include the following items for each subcriterion:

- weighting and associated priority,
- the alternative ranking,
- the Matrix Weight, and
- a summary of the scoring rationale.

Table B1  
RWE Reach B - Operations (Weight 10, Priority 28.6)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Reliability (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 10, Priority 40.0)</b>				
B1, B2, B3, B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No apparent differences between the four corridors. All alternatives are assumed to be similarly reliable.</li> </ul>	4	11.4	11.4
<b>Appurtenances (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 7.5, 30.0)</b>				
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least appurtenances anticipated; approximately 20 valves.</li> </ul>	4	8.6	8.6
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some appurtenances anticipated; approximately 29 valves.</li> </ul>	3	8.6	6.4
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More appurtenances anticipated; approximately 31 valves.</li> </ul>	2	8.6	4.3
B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most appurtenances anticipated; approximately 33 valves.</li> </ul>	1	8.6	2.1
<b>Long Term Accessibility (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 7.5, Priority 30.0)</b>				
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High accessibility. The corridor is mostly within paved and dirt roads.</li> <li>Cross country section is in open space area (646 feet).</li> </ul>	4	8.6	8.6
B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High accessibility. The corridor is primarily within existing paved and dirt roads.</li> <li>Cross country sections are in low to moderate tree dense areas (800 feet).</li> </ul>	3	8.6	6.4
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good accessibility. Majority of the corridor is within existing paved and dirt roads.</li> <li>Cross country sections are in moderate to high tree dense areas (3,076 feet).</li> <li>Some appurtenances within private property.</li> </ul>	2	8.6	4.3
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The least accessible. Majority of the corridor is within the least existing paved and dirt roads.</li> <li>Cross country sections are in moderate to high tree dense areas (3,965 feet).</li> <li>Some appurtenances within private property.</li> </ul>	1	8.6	2.1

Table B2  
RWE Reach B - Environmental Considerations (Weight 7.5, Priority 21.4)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Special Status Species (SSS) Potential Habitat (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Corridor crosses nearby the fewest ponded areas, which are potential habitat for protected frog species.</li> </ul>	4	3.3	3.3
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact. Corridor crosses nearby some ponded areas and is documented as potentially having raptor nests.</li> </ul>	3	3.3	2.5
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate Impact. Corridor crosses through areas documented as potentially having raptor nests and is nearby a large pond that is potential CA Red Legged Frog habitat.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	1.6
B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most Impact. Corridor crosses or is nearby several ponded areas, wetlands, and riparian zone of Orr Creek all of which have potential for SSS.</li> </ul>	1	3.3	0.8
<b>Potential Waters of the US (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Corridor crosses one intermittent stream which runs through a culvert.</li> </ul>	4	3.3	3.3
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact. Corridor crosses an intermittent stream and traverses a nearby large pond.</li> </ul>	3	3.3	2.5
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact. Corridor crosses an intermittent stream and traverses even closer to the large pond.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	1.6
B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Corridor crosses several wetlands and has two intermittent stream crossings.</li> </ul>	1	3.3	0.8

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Riparian Zones Likely Under CDFG (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Corridor crosses one intermittent stream riparian zone.</li> </ul>	4	3.3	3.3
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact. Corridor crosses an intermittent stream and traverses a nearby large pond riparian zones.</li> </ul>	3	3.3	2.5
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact. Corridor crosses an intermittent stream and traverses even closer to the large pond riparian zones.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	1.6
B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Corridor crosses several wetlands and crosses two intermittent stream riparian zones, and parallels Orr Creek riparian zone.</li> </ul>	1	3.3	0.8
<b>Cultural Resource Sensitivity (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact. Corridor is within medium sensitivity cultural areas.</li> <li>Two high sensitivity crossings.</li> </ul>	4	3.3	3.3
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate impact. Corridor is within medium sensitivity cultural areas.</li> <li>Three high sensitivity crossings and traverses within and adjacent to a high sensitivity area for approximately 2,250 feet.</li> </ul>	3	3.3	2.5
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High impact. Corridor is within medium sensitivity cultural areas.</li> <li>Three high sensitivity crossings and traverses within and adjacent to a high sensitivity area for approximately 2,300 feet.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	1.6
B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Corridor is partially within medium sensitivity areas with approximately one-third of the corridor in high sensitivity areas.</li> <li>Crosses through two documented cultural sites.</li> </ul>	1	3.3	0.8
<b>Length Within Undisturbed Lands (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 7.5, Priority 11.5)</b>				
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impacts to undisturbed lands (646 feet).</li> </ul>	4	2.5	2.5
B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimal impacts to undisturbed lands (800 feet).</li> </ul>	3	2.5	1.8
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate impacts to undisturbed lands (3,076 feet).</li> </ul>	2	2.5	1.2
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impacts to undisturbed lands (3,965 feet).</li> </ul>	1	2.2	0.6
<b>Land Use Constraints (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 5, Priority 7.6)</b>				
B1, B2, B3, B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All four alternatives have no land use constraints.</li> </ul>	4	1.6	1.6
<b>Approximate Relative Density of Trees (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 4, Priority 6.1)</b>				
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact to trees.</li> <li>Corridor is primarily within roads (10,235 feet).</li> <li>Low tree density within cross country portions of the corridor (646 feet).</li> </ul>	4	1.3	1.3
B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimal impact to trees.</li> <li>Majority of the corridor is within roads (13,974 feet).</li> <li>Low to moderate tree density in cross country portions of the corridor (800 feet).</li> </ul>	3	1.3	1.0
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate impact to trees.</li> <li>Mostly moderate tree density areas with some high tree density areas in cross country portions of the corridor (3,076 feet).</li> </ul>	2	1.3	0.7
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact to trees.</li> <li>Mostly high tree density in cross country portions of the corridor (3,965 feet).</li> </ul>	1	1.3	0.3

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Level of Noise Pollution (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 3, Priority 4.6)</b>				
B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Corridor is located in less developed areas with fewer residences.</li> </ul>	4	1.0	1.0
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate impact. Corridor is located within more residential areas.</li> </ul>	3	1.0	0.7
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate impact. Corridor is located within more residential areas.</li> </ul>	3	1.0	0.7
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High impact. Corridor is located within more residential areas.</li> <li>Traverses through Kanehl's Corner, a narrow drive in a private neighborhood.</li> </ul>	2	1.0	0.5
<b>Level of Dust Pollution (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 3, Priority 4.6)</b>				
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Corridor is located primarily within paved roads (8,550 feet).</li> <li>About 2,331 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads and cross country areas.</li> </ul>	4	1.0	1.0
B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate impact. About 6,301 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads and cross country areas.</li> </ul>	3	1.0	0.7
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate impact. About 6,825 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads and cross country areas.</li> </ul>	2	1.0	0.5
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. About 7,196 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads and cross country areas.</li> </ul>	1	1.0	0.2
<b>Level of Traffic Impacts (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 3, Priority 4.6)</b>				
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. About 5,544 feet of the corridor is within Lone Star Road which is accessible by Highway 49 or Bell Road.</li> <li>Residences along Segments 7 and 10 are accessible via Cramer Road to Fawnridge Road or by taking Lone Star Road to Lone Star Valley Road during construction.</li> <li>About 3,965 feet of the corridor is within cross country areas, thus omitting traffic impacts in these sections.</li> </ul>	4	1.0	1.0
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact. About 5,544 feet of the corridor is within Lone Star Road which is accessible by Highway 49 or Bell Road.</li> <li>Residences along Segments 7 and 8 are accessible via Cramer Road to Fawnridge Road or by taking Lone Star Road to Lone Star Valley Road during construction.</li> <li>3,076 feet of the corridor is within cross country areas, thus omitting traffic impacts in these sections.</li> </ul>	3	1.0	0.7
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate impact. 6,825 feet of the corridor is within Lone Star Road which is accessible by Highway 49 or Bell Road.</li> <li>Corridor traverses through Kanehl's Corner which is a narrow private lane accessed via Lone Star Road or Lone Star Valley Road (if gate on west side is open).</li> </ul>	2	1.0	0.5
B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. About 8,473 feet of the corridor is within Cramer Road which is a commonly used connector from Highway 49 to Bell Road.</li> <li>No alternate routes into residences and neighborhoods directly off of Cramer Road.</li> </ul>	1	1.0	0.2

Table B3  
**RWE Reach B - Constructability (Weight 7.5, Priority 21.4)**

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Pipeline Length (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 10, Priority 25.0)</b>				
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shortest length of approximately 10,881 feet.</li> </ul>	4	5.4	5.4
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Second shortest length of approximately 13,199 feet.</li> </ul>	3	5.4	4.0
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Third shortest length of approximately 14,604 feet.</li> </ul>	2	5.4	2.7
B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Longest length of approximately 14,774 feet.</li> </ul>	1	5.4	1.3
<b>Geotechnical Constraints (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 10, Priority 25.0)</b>				
B2, B3, B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low constraints.</li> </ul>	4	5.4	5.4
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some constraints. Tunneling or deep trenching is required at Kanehl's Corner; pipeline depth at 20 feet minimum.</li> </ul>	3	5.4	4.0
<b>Accessibility (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 7.5, Priority 18.8)</b>				
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most accessible. Majority of the corridor is within paved and dirt roads (10,235 feet).</li> <li>Cross country section is in open space area (646 feet).</li> </ul>	4	4.0	4.0
B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More accessible. Majority of the corridor is within existing paved and dirt roads (13,974 feet).</li> <li>Cross country sections are in low to moderate tree dense areas (800 feet).</li> </ul>	3	4.0	3.0
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accessible. Majority of the corridor is within existing paved and dirt roads (9,234 feet).</li> <li>Cross country sections are in moderate to high tree dense areas (3,965 feet).</li> </ul>	2	4.0	2.0
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least accessible. Majority of the corridor is within existing paved and dirt roads (11,528 feet).</li> <li>Cross country sections are in moderate to high tree dense areas (3,076 feet).</li> </ul>	1	4.0	1.0
<b>Potential to Negatively Impact Existing Facilities (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 7.5, Priority 18.8)</b>				
B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No potential impacts.</li> </ul>	4	4.0	4.0
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Few potential impacts. Single crossing of Lone Star Canal.</li> </ul>	3	4.0	3.0
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some potential impacts. Single crossing of Lone Star Canal and corridor parallels canal along Segment 7.</li> </ul>	2	4.0	2.0
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most potential impacts. Two crossings of Lone Star Canal and corridor parallels canal along Segment 7.</li> </ul>	1	4.0	1.0
<b>Work Space/ Construction Method Constraints (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 5, Priority 12.5)</b>				
B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimal Constraints. A little over half of the corridor is within Cramer Road with two 12 foot lanes (8,473 feet).</li> <li>The remaining corridor is within dirt roads (5,501 feet) and some cross country areas with open space (800 feet).</li> </ul>	4	2.7	2.7
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Few constraints. Almost half the corridor is within Lone Star Road with two 12 foot lanes (5,544 feet).</li> <li>The remaining corridor is within paved and dirt private roads (3,660 feet) and some cross country areas with moderate to high tree densities (3,965 feet).</li> </ul>	3	2.7	2.0
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate constraints. Almost half the corridor is within Lone Star Road with two 12 foot lanes (5,544 feet).</li> <li>The remaining corridor is within paved and dirt private roads (5,984 feet) and some cross country areas with moderate to high tree densities (3,076 feet).</li> </ul>	2	2.7	1.3
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most constraints. Almost half the corridor is within Lone Star Road with two 12 foot lanes (6,825 feet) and another 225 feet is within Lone Star Valley Road.</li> <li>The remaining corridor is within public paved and dirt private roads (3,185 feet) and some cross country areas with moderate to high tree densities (646 feet).</li> <li>Work space is confined within Kanehl's Corner, a narrow private drive with fence lines in close proximity of the road.</li> <li>Minimal space for staging areas within Kanehl's Corner, unless using private properties.</li> <li>Kanehl's Corner will require deep trenching or tunneling.</li> </ul>	1	2.7	0.7

Table B4  
RWE Reach B - ROW (Weight 5, Priority 14.3)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Permanent Easement Acquisition (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 7.5, Priority 65.2)</b>				
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shortest length of approximately 646 feet</li> </ul>	4	9.3	9.3
B2 and B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tied for the second shortest length of approximately 2,130 feet.</li> </ul>	3	9.3	7.0
B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Longest length of approximately 6,301 feet.</li> </ul>	2	9.3	4.7
<b>Percent in Public ROW/PUE (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 4, Priority 34.8)</b>				
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately 94.1% in public ROW/PUE. Lone Star Road and Kanehl's Corner have a 50 foot wide roadway, drainage and public utilities access easement.</li> </ul>	4	5.0	5.0
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately 85.4% in public ROW/PUE. Lone Star Road and Lonestar Valley Road have a 50 foot wide roadway, drainage and public utilities access easement. Fawnridge Road has 40 foot wide road and public utility easement.</li> </ul>	3	5.0	3.7
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately 83.9% in public ROW/PUE. Lone Star Road has a 50 foot wide roadway, drainage and public utilities access easement. Fawnridge Road has 40 foot wide road and public utility easement.</li> </ul>	2	5.0	2.5
B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately 57.4% in public ROW/PUE. Cramer Road has a 60 foot wide public utility and highway easement.</li> </ul>	1	5.0	1.2

Table B5  
RWE Reach B - Public Impacts (Weight 5, Priority 14.3)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Potential for Opposition (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 10, Priority 66.7)</b>				
B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least potential opposition. Corridor is within less developed area with fewer residences.</li> <li>Low noise impacts and moderate dust impacts.</li> <li>High traffic impacts since Cramer Road is common route connecting Highway 49 and Bell Road.</li> </ul>	4	9.5	9.5
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate potential opposition. Corridor is within more developed area with a greater number of residences.</li> <li>Moderate noise and dust impacts.</li> <li>Some traffic impacts.</li> </ul>	3	9.5	7.1
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More potential opposition. Corridor is within more developed area with a greater number of residences and traverses through private property within close proximity of residences.</li> <li>Moderate noise and dust impacts.</li> <li>Least traffic impacts.</li> </ul>	2	9.5	4.8
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most potential opposition. Corridor runs through Kanehl's Corner, a private neighborhood.</li> <li>High noise impacts since corridor is within close proximity of residences.</li> <li>Low dust impacts since corridor is mostly within paved road.</li> <li>Moderate traffic impacts due to Kanehl's Corner since there is limited access.</li> </ul>	1	9.5	2.4
<b>Aesthetic Impacts (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 5, Priority 33.3)</b>				
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fewest impacts. Corridor is mostly within already disturbed lands.</li> </ul>	4	4.8	4.8
B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impacts. Corridor is mostly within already disturbed lands.</li> <li>May require some tree removal within cross country sections in low to moderate tree density areas.</li> </ul>	3	4.8	3.6
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impacts. Corridor is mostly within already disturbed lands.</li> <li>May require some tree removal in cross country sections in moderate to high tree density areas.</li> </ul>	2	4.8	2.4
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impacts. Mostly within already disturbed lands.</li> <li>May require some tree removal within cross country sections in high tree density areas.</li> </ul>	1	4.8	1.2

## **RWE Reach C**

Appendix C includes the detailed evaluation summary of RWE Reach C. The following five tables include the results from the SMART Method comparison completed using the matrix evaluation software. These five tables include the following items for each subcriterion:

- weighting and associated priority,
- the alternative ranking,
- the Matrix Weight, and
- a summary of the scoring rationale.

Table C1  
RWE Reach C - Operations (Weight 10, Priority 28.6)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Reliability (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 40.0)</b>				
C1, C2, C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No apparent differences between the four corridors. All alternatives are assumed to be similar.</li> </ul>	3	11.4	11.4
<b>Appurtenances (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 7.5, Priority 30.0)</b>				
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least appurtenances anticipated; approximately 18 valves.</li> </ul>	3	8.6	8.6
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate appurtenances anticipated; approximately 20 valves.</li> </ul>	2	8.6	5.7
C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most appurtenances anticipated; approximately 40 valves.</li> </ul>	1	8.6	2.9
<b>Long Term Accessibility (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 7.5, Priority 30.0)</b>				
C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most accessible. Majority of the corridor is within paved and dirt roads (20,697 feet).</li> <li>Cross country section is in moderate tree density area (2,350 feet).</li> </ul>	3	8.6	8.6
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderately accessible. Approximately two thirds of the corridor is within existing paved and dirt roads (12,039 feet).</li> <li>Cross country sections are in low to moderate density tree areas (5,280 feet).</li> </ul>	2	8.6	5.7
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least accessible. Approximately half of the corridor is within existing paved and dirt roads (8,533 feet).</li> <li>Cross country section is in moderate density tree areas (9,056 feet).</li> </ul>	1	8.6	2.9

Table C2  
RWE Reach C - Environmental Considerations (Weight 7.5, Priority 21.4)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Special Status Species (SSS) Potential Habitat (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little impact. Corridor is within several hundred feet of four ponded areas that may be potential Ca Red Legged frog habitat.</li> </ul>	3	3.3	3.3
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact. Corridor is within several hundred feet of six ponded areas that may be potential Ca Red Legged frog habitat.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	2.2
C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Majority of the corridor runs along Camp Far West Canal with multiple related leaky ditch wetland areas which is potential Black Rail habitat, and multiple ponds at east end.</li> </ul>	1	3.3	1.1
<b>Potential Waters of the US (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Corridor crosses Lone Star Canal and a tributary of Bear River.</li> </ul>	3	3.3	3.3
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact. Corridor crosses Lone Star Canal and a tributary of Bear River, as well as two drainage channel crossings.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	2.2
C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Corridor crosses Lone Star Canal, a tributary and ephemeral drainages to Coon Creek, as well as paralleling Camp Far West Canal for approximately half the corridor which has multiple related leaky ditch wetland areas.</li> </ul>	1	3.3	1.1
<b>Riparian Zones Likely Under CDFG (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Corridor crosses Lone Star Canal and a tributary of Bear River riparian zones.</li> </ul>	3	3.3	3.3
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact. Corridor crosses Lone Star Canal and a tributary of Bear River and Coon Creek riparian zones.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	2.2
C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Corridor crosses Lone Star Canal and parallels Camp Far West Canal riparian zones for a majority of the corridor.</li> </ul>	1	3.3	1.1

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Cultural Resource Sensitivity (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Corridor is mostly within medium sensitivity cultural area.</li> <li>Two high sensitivity crossings and a few low sensitivity crossings.</li> </ul>	3	3.3	3.3
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact. Corridor is mostly within medium sensitivity cultural areas.</li> <li>Four high sensitivity crossings and a few low sensitivity crossings.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	2.2
C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Corridor is mostly within medium sensitivity cultural areas.</li> <li>Corridor crosses one cultural site and parallels and crosses several high sensitivity crossings.</li> </ul>	1	3.3	1.1
<b>Length Within Undisturbed Lands (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 7.5, Priority 11.5)</b>				
C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact to undisturbed lands (2,350 feet).</li> </ul>	3	2.5	2.5
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact to undisturbed lands (5,280 feet).</li> </ul>	2	2.5	1.6
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact to undisturbed lands (9,056 feet).</li> </ul>	1	2.5	0.8
<b>Land Use Constraints (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 5, Priority 7.6)</b>				
C1, C2, C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All three alternatives cross the conservation easement within Placer Land Trust property; however the pipe installations will be covered.</li> </ul>	3	1.6	1.6
<b>Approximate Relative Density of Trees (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 4, Priority 6.1)</b>				
C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact to trees.</li> <li>Corridor traverses primarily within paved and dirt roads for approximately 20,697 feet.</li> <li>Moderate tree density within cross country portions of the corridor for approximately 2,350 feet.</li> </ul>	3	1.3	1.3
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact to trees.</li> <li>Corridor is within paved and dirt roads for approximately 12,039 feet.</li> <li>Low to moderate tree density within cross country portions of the corridor for approximately 5,280 feet.</li> </ul>	2	1.3	0.9
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact to trees.</li> <li>Corridor is within paved and dirt roads for approximately 8,533 feet.</li> <li>Low to moderate tree density in cross country portions of the corridor for approximately 9,056 feet.</li> </ul>	1	1.3	0.4
<b>Level of Noise Pollution (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 3, Priority 4.6)</b>				
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little impact. Corridor is located mainly within rural areas with a few residences along Country Club Lane.</li> </ul>	3	1.0	1.0
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little impact. Corridor is located mainly within rural areas with a few residences along Country Club Lane.</li> </ul>	3	1.0	1.0
C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate impact. Corridor is paralleled by residences along Bell Road and Orr Creek Lane.</li> </ul>	2	1.0	0.7
<b>Level of Dust Pollution (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 3, Priority 4.6)</b>				
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Corridor is within paved roads for approximately 8,138 feet.</li> <li>About 9,181 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads and cross country areas.</li> </ul>	3	1.0	1.0
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact. Corridor is within paved roads for approximately 8,138 feet.</li> <li>About 9,451 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads and cross country areas.</li> </ul>	2	1.0	0.7
C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Corridor is within paved roads for approximately 8,740 feet.</li> <li>About 14,307 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads and cross country areas.</li> </ul>	1	1.0	0.3

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Level of Traffic Impacts (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 3, Priority 4.6)</b>				
C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Almost half the corridor is within paved public roads (8,740 feet).</li> <li>Residences along Bell Road corridor may be affected by traffic due to construction and closure of one or both lanes (if pipeline in roadway), especially those residences accessed solely from Bell Road.</li> <li>Orr Creek Lane access to residences may be impacted during construction. No alternative access to residences directly along Orr Creek Lane.</li> </ul>	3	1.0	1.0
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact. Corridor is located within Country Club Lane and Big Hill Road (a narrow dirt road).</li> <li>No alternative routes to residences along Country Club Lane and Big Hill Road.</li> <li>More of the corridor traverses cross country than Alternative C1.</li> </ul>	2	1.0	0.7
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Corridor is located within Country Club Lane and Big Hill Road (a narrow dirt road).</li> <li>No alternative routes to residences along Country Club Lane and Big Hill Road.</li> </ul>	1	1.0	0.3

Table C3  
RWE Reach C - Constructability (Weight 7.5, Priority 21.4)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Pipeline Length (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 25.0)</b>				
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shortest length of approximately 17,319 feet.</li> </ul>	3	5.4	5.4
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Second shortest length of approximately 17,589 feet.</li> </ul>	2	5.4	3.6
C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Longest of approximately 23,047 feet.</li> </ul>	1	5.4	1.8
<b>Geotechnical Constraints (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 25.0)</b>				
C1 and C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No apparent differences between these two corridors. These alternatives are assumed to be geologically/geotechnically less challenging than the terrain of Alternative C3.</li> </ul>	3	5.4	5.4
C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The most geotechnical constraints. There is evidence of rock and steep terrain along the corridor.</li> </ul>	2	5.4	3.6
<b>Accessibility (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 7.5, Priority 18.8)</b>				
C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most accessible. Majority of the corridor is within paved and dirt roads.</li> <li>Cross country section is in moderate tree density area (2,350 feet).</li> </ul>	3	4.0	4.0
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderately accessible. Approximately two thirds of the corridor is within existing paved and dirt roads.</li> <li>Cross country sections are in low to moderate density tree areas (5,280 feet).</li> </ul>	2	4.0	2.7
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least accessible. Approximately half of the corridor is within existing paved and dirt roads.</li> <li>Cross country section is in moderate density tree areas (9,056 feet).</li> </ul>	1	4.0	1.3
<b>Potential to Negatively Impact Existing Facilities (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 7.5, Priority 18.8)</b>				
C1 and C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Few potential impacts. Single crossing of Lone Star Canal.</li> </ul>	3	4.0	4.0
C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More potential impacts. Single crossing of Lone Star Canal and parallels Camp Far West within about 25 feet in some locations.</li> </ul>	2	4.0	2.7
<b>Work Space/ Construction Method Constraints (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 5, Priority 12.5)</b>				
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fewest constraints. Majority of the corridor is within rural roads or cross country areas (9,181 feet).</li> <li>Country Club Lane is a private road through a neighborhood.</li> </ul>	3	2.7	2.7
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimal constraints. Majority of the corridor is within rural roads or cross country areas (9,451 feet).</li> <li>Country Club Lane is a private road through a neighborhood.</li> </ul>	2	2.7	1.8
C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most constraints. Approximately 8,740 feet of the corridor is within Bell Road and Orr Creek Lane.</li> </ul>	1	2.7	0.9

Table C4  
RWE Reach C - ROW (Weight 5, Priority 14.3)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Permanent Easement Acquisition (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 7.5, Priority 65.2)</b>				
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shortest length of approximately 10,240 feet.</li> </ul>	3	9.3	9.3
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Second shortest length of approximately 13,899 feet.</li> </ul>	2	9.3	6.2
C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Longest of approximately 14,307 feet.</li> </ul>	1	9.3	3.1
<b>Percent in Public ROW/PUE (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 4, Priority 34.8)</b>				
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately 40.9% in public ROW/PUE. Approximately 40.9% in public ROW/PUE. Country Club Lane has a 50 foot wide road and private and public utility easement.</li> </ul>	3	5.0	5.0
C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately 37.9% in public ROW/PUE. Bell Road has 60 foot wide highway and public utility easement, and Orr Creek Lane has a 50 foot wide County road and public utility easement.</li> </ul>	2	5.0	3.3
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately 21.0 % in public ROW/PUE. Country Club Lane has a 50 foot wide road and private and public utility easement.</li> </ul>	1	5.0	1.7

Table C5  
RWE Reach C - Public Impacts (Weight 5, Priority 14.3)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Potential for Opposition (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 66.7)</b>				
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least potential opposition for overall corridor. Corridor is mostly within rural locations away from residences.</li> <li>Potential for opposition from residents along Country Club Lane since private residential neighborhood.</li> <li>Some noise impact to residences along Country Club Lane.</li> <li>Some traffic impacts since no alternative route to residences along Country Club Lane and Big Hill Road. Alternative C2 has more cross country than Alternative C1.</li> </ul>	3	9.5	9.5
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some potential opposition for overall corridor. Corridor is mostly within rural locations away from residences.</li> <li>Potential for opposition from residents along Country Club Lane since private residential neighborhood.</li> <li>Some noise impact to residences along Country Club Lane.</li> <li>Some traffic impacts since no alternative route to residences along Country Club Lane and Big Hill Road.</li> </ul>	2	9.5	6.3
C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most potential opposition. Almost half the corridor is within Bell Road and Orr Creek Lane.</li> <li>Potential opposition from Bell Road and Orr Creek Lane residents.</li> <li>Moderate noise impacts and most dust impacts.</li> <li>Some traffic impacts. Orr Creek Lane access will be impacted during construction.</li> <li>Alternate access to Orr Creek Lane from south using Joeger Road and Bell Road.</li> <li>Residences along Bell Road corridor will be affected by traffic due to construction activities.</li> </ul>	1	9.5	3.2
<b>Aesthetic Impacts (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 5, Priority 33.3)</b>				
C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fewest impacts. Corridor mostly within already disturbed lands.</li> <li>Tree removal is likely required in cross country sections with low to moderate tree density.</li> </ul>	3	4.8	4.8
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimal impacts. Approximately two thirds of the corridor is within already disturbed lands.</li> <li>Tree removal is likely required in cross country sections with moderate tree density.</li> </ul>	2	4.8	3.2
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impacts. Approximately half of the corridor is within already disturbed lands.</li> <li>Tree removal is likely required in cross country sections with moderate tree density.</li> </ul>	1	4.8	1.6

## **RWW Reach A**

Appendix D includes the detailed evaluation summary of RWW Reach A. The following five tables include the results from the SMART Method comparison completed using the matrix evaluation software. These five tables include the following items for each subcriterion:

- weighting and associated priority,
- the alternative ranking,
- the Matrix Weight, and
- a summary of the scoring rationale.

Table D1  
RWW Reach A - Operations (Weight 10, Priority 28.6)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Reliability (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 10, Priority 40.0)</b>				
A1, A2, A3, A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No apparent differences between the four corridors. All alternatives are assumed to be similar.</li> </ul>	4	11.4	11.4
<b>Appurtenances (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 7.5, Priority 30.0)</b>				
A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least appurtenances anticipated; approximately 4 valves.</li> </ul>	4	8.6	8.6
A3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least appurtenances anticipated; approximately 15 valves.</li> </ul>	3	8.6	6.4
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More appurtenances anticipated; approximately 20 valves.</li> </ul>	2	8.6	4.3
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More appurtenances anticipated; approximately 21 valves.</li> </ul>	1	8.6	2.1
<b>Long Term Accessibility (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 7.5, Priority 30.0)</b>				
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most accessible. Approximately 8,435 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads.</li> <li>Cross country section is in moderate to high tree density area (1,516 feet).</li> </ul>	4	8.6	8.6
A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good accessibility. Approximately 2,136 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads.</li> <li>Cross country section is in moderate to high tree density area (1,634 feet).</li> </ul>	3	8.6	6.4
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less accessibility. Approximately 6,680 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads.</li> <li>Cross country sections are in low, moderate and high density tree areas (2,568 feet).</li> </ul>	2	8.6	4.3
A3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least accessible. Approximately 1,706 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads.</li> <li>Cross country section is in moderate to high density tree areas (2,965 feet).</li> </ul>	1	8.6	2.1

Table D2  
RWW Reach A - Environmental Considerations (Weight 7.5, Priority 21.4)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Special Status Species (SSS) Potential Habitat (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Tunnel is located under potential forested nesting areas, and traverses pasture land.</li> </ul>	4	3.3	3.3
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact. One area documented as having Clarkia sp. and traverses Blue Oak woodland nesting habitat.</li> </ul>	3	3.3	2.5
A3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact. One area documented as having Clarkia sp. and one ponded area which is potential frog habitat.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	1.6
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Two areas documented as having Clarkia sp. and one ponded area which is potential frog habitat. Also parallels a drainage with increased potential for raptors and sensitive plants.</li> </ul>	1	3.3	0.8
<b>Potential Waters of the US (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Corridor crosses Camp Far West Canal.</li> </ul>	4	3.3	3.3
A3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact. Corridor crosses Camp Far West Canal and a tributary of Coon Creek.</li> </ul>	3	3.3	2.5
A1 and A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Corridor crosses and parallels Camp Far West Canal and parallels and crosses an ephemeral drainage.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	1.6
<b>Riparian Zones Likely Under CDFG (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Corridor crosses Camp Far West Canal; however, based on field surveys this canal does not have an associated riparian zone.</li> </ul>	4	3.3	3.3
A3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact. Corridor crosses Camp Far West Canal and tributary of Coon creek riparian zones.</li> </ul>	3	3.3	2.5
A1 and A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Corridor crosses and parallels Camp Far West Canal and parallels and crosses an ephemeral drainage riparian zone.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	1.6

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Cultural Resource Sensitivity (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 10, 15.3)</b>				
A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Approximately 1,634 feet in undisturbed lands, but about 900 feet will be tunneled.</li> <li>Corridor is mostly within medium sensitivity cultural areas.</li> </ul>	4	3.3	3.3
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact. Least length of 1,516 feet in undisturbed lands.</li> <li>Corridor is mostly within medium sensitivity cultural areas.</li> <li>Some low sensitivity crossings, one high sensitivity crossing, and approximately 850 feet in cultural site area.</li> </ul>	3	3.3	2.5
A3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate impact. Approximately 2,965 feet in undisturbed lands, but about 900 feet will be tunneled.</li> <li>Corridor is mostly within medium sensitivity cultural areas.</li> <li>One high sensitivity crossing and approximately 850 feet in cultural site area.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	1.6
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Approximately 2,568 feet in undisturbed lands.</li> <li>Corridor is mostly within medium sensitivity cultural areas.</li> <li>One high sensitivity crossing and approximately 850 feet in cultural site area.</li> </ul>	1	3.3	0.8
<b>Length Within Undisturbed Lands (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 7.5, Priority 11.5)</b>				
A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact to undisturbed lands (1,634 feet).</li> <li>Approximately 900 feet of the undisturbed lands will be tunneled, therefore minimizing impacts.</li> </ul>	4	2.5	2.5
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact to undisturbed lands (1,516 feet).</li> </ul>	3	2.5	1.8
A3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate impact to undisturbed lands (2,965 feet).</li> <li>Approximately 900 feet of the undisturbed lands will be tunneled, therefore minimizing impacts.</li> </ul>	2	2.5	1.2
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact to undisturbed lands (2,568 feet).</li> </ul>	1	2.5	0.6
<b>Land Use Constraints (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 5, Priority 7.6)</b>				
A1, A2, A3, A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All four alternatives have no land use constraints.</li> </ul>	4	1.6	1.6
<b>Approximate Relative Density of Trees (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 4, Priority 6.1)</b>				
A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact to trees.</li> <li>Approximately 900 feet of tunneled section in cross country portion of the corridor.</li> <li>Moderate to high tree density in cross country portion of the corridor for approximately 734 feet.</li> </ul>	4	1.3	1.3
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact to trees.</li> <li>Moderate to high tree density in cross country portion of the corridor for approximately 1,516 feet.</li> </ul>	3	1.3	1.0
A3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate impact to trees.</li> <li>Approximately 900 feet of tunneled section in cross country portion of the corridor.</li> <li>Moderate to high tree density in cross country areas for approximately 2,065 feet.</li> </ul>	2	1.3	0.7
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact to trees.</li> <li>Low, moderate and high tree density in cross country portion of the corridor for approximately 2,568 feet.</li> </ul>	1	1.3	0.3
<b>Level of Noise Pollution (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 3, Priority 4.6)</b>				
A3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. The corridor is located within a rural area furthest from any inhabited residences.</li> </ul>	4	1.0	1.0
A1, A2, A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact. No apparent difference between the three corridors. The three corridors are located within a rural area in the vicinity of two residences and a workshop.</li> </ul>	3	1.0	0.7

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Level of Dust Pollution (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 3, Priority 4.6)</b>				
A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Shortest corridor that is entirely within dirt roads or cross country areas (3,770 feet) with approximately 900 feet of cross country portion being tunneled.</li> </ul>	4	1.0	1.0
A3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate impact. Second shortest corridor that is entirely within dirt roads or cross country areas (4,671 feet) with approximately 900 feet of the cross country portion being tunneled.</li> </ul>	3	1.0	0.7
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact. Entire corridor is within dirt roads or cross country areas (9,613 feet).</li> </ul>	2	1.0	0.5
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Entire corridor is within dirt roads or cross country areas (9,951 feet).</li> </ul>	1	1.0	0.2
<b>Level of Traffic Impacts (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 3, Priority 4.6)</b>				
A3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Corridor traverses mostly within cross country areas with approximately 1,706 feet within dirt road entering Hidden Falls Regional Park.</li> </ul>	4	1.0	1.0
A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact. Corridor traverses mostly within cross country areas with approximately 2,136 feet within dirt road.</li> </ul>	3	1.0	0.7
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact. About 6,680 feet of the corridor is within private or Hidden Falls Regional Park dirt roads.</li> </ul>	2	1.0	0.5
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. About 8,435 feet of the corridor is within private or Hidden Falls Regional Park dirt roads</li> </ul>	1	1.0	0.2

Table D3  
RWW Reach A - Constructability (Weight 7.5, Priority 21.4)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Pipeline Length (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 10, Priority 25.0)</b>				
A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shortest length of approximately 3,771 feet.</li> </ul>	4	5.4	5.4
A3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Second shortest length of approximately 4,671 feet.</li> </ul>	3	5.4	4.0
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Third shortest length of approximately 9,248 feet.</li> </ul>	2	5.4	2.7
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Longest length of approximately 9,951 feet.</li> </ul>	1	5.4	1.3
<b>Geotech Constraints (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 10, Priority 25.0)</b>				
A3 and A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least constraints. Deep tunnel from Big Hill Reservoir to other side of ridge requiring special tunneling techniques due to rock. However, this is less geotechnically challenging than the unstable soils of A1 and A2.</li> </ul>	4	5.4	5.4
A1 and A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most constraints. Stability issues along Camp Far West Canal.</li> </ul>	3	5.4	4.0
<b>Accessibility (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 7.5, Priority 18.8)</b>				
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most accessible. Approximately 8,435 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads.</li> <li>Cross country section is in moderate to high tree density area (1,516 feet).</li> </ul>	4	4.0	4.0
A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good accessibility. Approximately 2,136 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads.</li> <li>Cross country section is in moderate to high tree density area (1,634 feet).</li> </ul>	3	4.0	3.0
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good accessibility. Approximately 6,680 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads.</li> <li>Cross country sections are in low, moderate and high density tree areas (2,568 feet).</li> </ul>	2	4.0	2.0
A3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least accessible. Approximately 1,706 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads.</li> <li>Cross country section is in moderate to high density tree areas (2,965 feet).</li> </ul>	1	4.0	1.0

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Potential to Negatively Impact Existing Facilities (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 7.5, Priority 18.8)</b>				
A3 and A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fewest potential impacts. Single crossing of Camp Far West Canal.</li> </ul>	4	4.0	4.0
A1 and A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highest potential impacts. Single crossing of Camp Far West Canal.</li> <li>Corridor parallels Camp Far West Canal for approximately 1,400 feet. This section of the canal may be encased.</li> </ul>	3	4.0	3.0
<b>Work Space Constraints/ Construction Method (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 5, Priority 12.5)</b>				
A3 and A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least constraints. Approximately 900 feet of the cross country section in high density trees will be tunneled.</li> </ul>	4	2.7	2.7
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some constraints. Approximately 8,435 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads.</li> <li>Corridor along Camp Far West Canal is narrow with steep hillsides adjacent to the dirt road.</li> </ul>	3	2.7	2.0
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most constraints. Approximately 6,680 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads.</li> <li>Corridor along Camp Far West Canal is narrow with steep hillsides adjacent to the dirt road.</li> </ul>	2	2.7	1.3

Table D4

**RWW Reach A - ROW (Weight 5, Priority 14.3)**

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Permanent Easement Acquisition (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 7.5, Priority 65.2)</b>				
A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shortest length of approximately 3,771 feet.</li> </ul>	4	9.3	9.3
A3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Second shortest length of approximately 4,671 feet.</li> </ul>	3	9.3	7.0
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Third shortest length of approximately 9,248 feet.</li> </ul>	2	9.3	4.7
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Longest length of approximately 9,951 feet.</li> </ul>	1	9.3	2.3
<b>Percent in Public ROW/PUE (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 4, Priority 34.8)</b>				
A1, A2, A3, A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All four alternatives are not within public ROW/PUE.</li> </ul>	4	5.0	5.0

Table D5  
**RWW Reach A - Public Impacts (Weight 5, Priority 14.3)**

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Potential for Opposition (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 10, Priority 66.7)</b>				
A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least potential opposition. Approximately 1,634 feet of the corridor is within cross country areas with about 900 feet of tunneled section. Non-tunneled portions will likely require removal of trees in moderate density area.</li> <li>Corridor is not near any residences.</li> </ul>	4	9.5	9.5
A3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some potential opposition. Approximately 2,965 feet of the corridor is within cross country areas with about 900 feet of tunneled section. Non-tunneled portions will likely require removal of trees in moderate density area.</li> <li>Corridor is not near any residences.</li> </ul>	3	9.5	7.1
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More potential opposition. Approximately 1,516 feet of the corridor is within cross country areas.</li> <li>Potential property owner conflicts near Camp Far West Canal segment.</li> <li>Corridor is not near any residences.</li> <li>Some of the corridor is within Hidden Falls Regional Park and the Park is more agreeable to this alternative corridor.</li> </ul>	2	9.5	4.8
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most potential opposition. Approximately 2,568 feet of the corridor is within cross country areas.</li> <li>Potential property owner conflicts near Camp Far West Canal segment.</li> <li>Corridor is not near any residences.</li> <li>Some of the corridor is within Hidden Falls Regional Park.</li> </ul>	1	9.5	2.4
<b>Aesthetic Impacts (Rank 1 to 4, Weight 5, Priority 33.3)</b>				
A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impacts. Approximately 2,136 feet of the corridor is within already disturbed lands.</li> <li>Little tree removal likely required, since the moderate to high tree density areas would be avoided by using a tunnel (734 feet)</li> </ul>	4	4.8	4.8
A3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impacts. Approximately 1,706 feet of the corridor is within already disturbed lands.</li> <li>Little tree removal likely required, since the moderate to high tree density areas would be avoided by using a tunnel (2,065 feet)</li> </ul>	3	4.8	3.6
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impacts. Approximately 8,435 feet of the corridor is within already disturbed lands.</li> <li>Some anticipated tree removal likely required in cross country sections with moderate to high tree density (1,516 feet), but most of it avoided by staying within the Park dirt road. This route is also preferred by the Park officials.</li> <li>Corridor could impact waterfall within private property downstream of Big Hill Reservoir.</li> </ul>	2	4.8	2.4
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impacts. Approximately 6,680 feet of the corridor is within already disturbed lands.</li> <li>Some tree removal likely required in cross country sections within private property with low, moderate, and high tree density areas (2,568 feet). Private ownership more likely to resist aesthetic impacts.</li> <li>Corridor could impact waterfall within private property downstream of Big Hill Reservoir.</li> </ul>	1	4.8	1.2

## **RWW Reach B**

Appendix E includes the detailed evaluation summary of RWW Reach B. The following five tables include the results from the SMART Method comparison completed using the matrix evaluation software. These five tables include the following items for each subcriterion:

- weighting and associated priority,
- the alternative ranking,
- the Matrix Weight, and
- a summary of the scoring rationale.

Table E1  
**RWW Reach B - Operations (Weight 10, Priority 28.6)**

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Reliability (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 40.0)</b>				
B1, B2, B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No apparent differences between the three corridors. The three alternatives are assumed to be similar.</li> </ul>	3	11.4	11.4
<b>Appurtenances (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 7.5, Priority 30.0)</b>				
B1, B2, B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No apparent differences between the two corridors. Both the alternatives will require approximately 15 valves.</li> </ul>	3	8.6	8.6
<b>Long Term Accessibility (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 7.5, Priority 30.0)</b>				
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most accessible. Corridor will be within future Hidden Falls Regional Park roadway for most the pipeline length.</li> </ul>	3	8.6	8.6
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good accessibility. Corridor is mostly within dirt roads with access from Garden Bar Road (8,048 feet).</li> </ul>	2	8.6	5.7
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least accessible. Approximately 2,189 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads.</li> <li>Cross country sections are in high tree density areas (6,283 feet).</li> </ul>	1	8.6	2.9

Table E2  
**RWW Reach B – Environmental Considerations (Weight 7.5, Priority 21.4)**

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Special Status Species (SSS) Potential Habitat (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fewest Impacts. Corridor crosses Coon Creek, a designated critical habitat to Steelhead, only once.</li> <li>Northwestern pond turtle where observed in slow moving sections of Coon Creek during Spring 2008 surveys.</li> <li>Corridor traverses extensive woodland which is potential nesting habitat.</li> </ul>	3	3.3	3.3
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fewest impacts. Corridor crosses Coon Creek, a designated critical habitat to Steelhead, only once.</li> <li>Corridor nears three ponded areas that are potential CRL frog habitats. No CRL frogs were observed during Spring 2008 surveys.</li> <li>One area documented as having Clarkia sp.</li> <li>Preferred route in the Environmental Constraints TM.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	2.2
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Corridor crosses Coon Creek twice and traverses along Coon Creek within approximately 50 to 250 feet of a designated critical habitat to Steelhead.</li> <li>Northwestern pond turtle where observed in slow moving sections of Coon Creek during Spring 2008 surveys.</li> <li>One area documented as having Clarkia sp.</li> <li>Corridor parallels extensive riparian corridor which is potential nesting habitat.</li> </ul>	1	3.3	1.1
<b>Potential Waters of the US (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Crosses Coon Creek and four ephemeral drainages.</li> </ul>	3	3.3	3.3
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact. Crosses Coon Creek and four tributaries of Coon Creek (two ephemeral crossings).</li> </ul>	2	3.3	2.2
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Crosses Coon Creek twice and five tributaries of Coon Creek, paralleling one of them.</li> </ul>	1	3.3	1.1

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Riparian Zones Likely Under CDFG (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least Impact. Crosses two riparian zones.</li> </ul>	3	3.3	3.3
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact. Crosses four riparian zones.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	2.2
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Crosses Coon Creek twice, Coon Creek tributary and traverses along Coon Creek riparian zone for most of the corridor.</li> </ul>	1	3.3	1.1
<b>Cultural Resource Sensitivity (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, 15.3)</b>				
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Majority of the corridor is within medium sensitivity with a few low sensitivity crossings.</li> <li>Part of the corridor is adjacent to and crosses a cultural site area.</li> </ul>	3	3.3	3.3
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact. Majority of the corridor is within cultural site area with remainder of the corridor within moderate sensitivity area.</li> <li>Single high sensitivity cultural crossing.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	2.2
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Corridor traverses along mostly high sensitivity cultural area.</li> <li>Three cultural sites along corridor and within a cultural site area for part of the corridor.</li> <li>Single high sensitivity cultural crossing.</li> </ul>	1	3.3	1.1
<b>Length Within Undisturbed Lands (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 7.5, Priority 11.5)</b>				
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impacts to undisturbed lands (3,742 feet).</li> </ul>	3	2.5	2.5
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impacts to undisturbed lands (4,205 feet).</li> </ul>	2	2.5	1.6
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impacts to undisturbed lands (6,283 feet).</li> </ul>	1	2.5	0.8
<b>Land Use Constraints (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 5, Priority 7.6)</b>				
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Corridor avoids Hidden Falls Regional Park; a Placer County public land.</li> </ul>	3	1.6	1.6
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impact. Corridor is within the Hidden Falls Regional Park; however, it traverses along park roadways and is the County's preferred route through the park.</li> </ul>	2	1.6	1.1
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Corridor is within the Hidden Falls Regional Park and is not the County's preferred route through the park.</li> </ul>	3	1.6	0.5
<b>Approximate Relative Density of Trees (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 4, Priority 6.1)</b>				
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less impact to trees.</li> <li>Corridor traverses within more defined dirt roads.</li> <li>Cross country portion in moderate tree density area (3,742 feet).</li> </ul>	3	1.3	1.3
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact to trees.</li> <li>Corridor traverses within less defined dirt roads.</li> <li>Cross country portion in moderate to high tree density area (4,205 feet).</li> </ul>	2	1.3	0.9
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact to trees.</li> <li>Cross country portion in high density tree areas (6,283 feet).</li> </ul>	1	1.3	0.4
<b>Level of Noise Pollution (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 3, Priority 4.6)</b>				
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Single residence within the vicinity of the corridor.</li> </ul>	3	1.0	1.0
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact. None to few residences along the corridor; however, corridor is within the Park where there is potential for hikers and tourists.</li> </ul>	2	1.0	0.7
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. No residences within the vicinity of the corridor; however, corridor crosses near Coon Creek where there is high potential for raptors and it is in the Park where there is potential for hikers and tourists.</li> </ul>	1	1.0	0.3
<b>Level of Dust Pollution (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 3, Priority 4.6)</b>				
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less impact. Approximately 8,147 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads and cross country areas with a single residence in the vicinity.</li> </ul>	3	1.0	1.0
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Approximately 12,054 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads and cross country areas; however, potential for outdoor sensitive receptors, such as hikers within the park.</li> </ul>	2	1.0	0.7
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact. Approximately 11,465 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads and cross country areas. Corridor runs along riparian area with potential sensitive receptors, such</li> </ul>	1	1.0	0.3

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
	as nesting raptors and hikers.			
<b>Level of Traffic Impacts (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 3, Priority 4.6)</b>				
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impact.</li> <li>No residences along corridor traversing Superior Town Road.</li> <li>Remainder of the corridor is within cross country areas.</li> </ul>	3	1.0	1.0
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impact.</li> <li>Few residences along B1 corridor, and they access their residences from Orr Creek Lane, not through the Park. The park road is not the main entrance for the residents.</li> </ul>	2	1.0	0.7
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impact.</li> <li>No residences along B2 corridor.</li> <li>Most the corridor is within more defined dirt roads in Placer Legacy parcels (Hidden Falls Regional Park).</li> </ul>	1	1.0	0.3

Table E3  
RWW Reach B - Constructability (Weight 7.5, Priority 21.4)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Pipeline Length (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 25.0)</b>				
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shortest length of approximately 8,472 feet.</li> </ul>	3	5.4	5.4
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Second shortest length of approximately 11,767 feet.</li> </ul>	2	5.4	3.6
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Longest length of approximately 12,379 feet.</li> </ul>	1	5.4	1.8
<b>Geotech Constraints (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 25.0)</b>				
B1, B2, B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No apparent differences between the three corridors. The three alternatives are assumed to be geologically/geotechnically similar.</li> </ul>	3	5.4	5.4
<b>Accessibility (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 7.5, Priority 18.8)</b>				
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most accessible. Corridor will be within future Hidden Falls Regional Park roadway for most the pipeline length.</li> </ul>	3	4.0	4.0
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good accessibility. Corridor is mostly within dirt roads with access from Garden Bar Road (8,048 feet).</li> </ul>	2	4.0	2.7
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least accessible. Approximately 2,189 feet of the corridor is within dirt roads and Garden Bar Road.</li> <li>Cross country sections are in high tree density areas (6,283 feet).</li> </ul>	1	4.0	1.3
<b>Potential to Negatively Impact Existing Facilities (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 7.5, Priority 18.8)</b>				
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impacts. No existing facilities within corridor.</li> </ul>	3	4.0	4.0
B1, B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some impacts. Backup water supply connection to Whiskey Diggins Canal.</li> </ul>	2	4.0	2.7
<b>Work Space/ Construction Method Constraints (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 5, Priority 12.5)</b>				
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimal Constraints. Most of the corridor is within well defined dirt road (7,848 feet).</li> <li>One creek crossing requiring a diversion operation at Coon Creek or bore and jack construction.</li> </ul>	3	2.7	2.7
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some Constraints. Most the corridor is within less defined dirt road (7,723 feet).</li> <li>Two creek crossings requiring a diversion operation at Coon Creek or bore and jack construction.</li> </ul>	2	2.7	1.8
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most constraints. Most the corridor is within cross country area with high tree density (6,283 feet).</li> <li>One creek crossing requiring a diversion operation at Coon Creek or bore and jack construction.</li> </ul>	1	2.7	0.9

Table E4  
RWW Reach B - ROW (Weight 5, Priority 14.3)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Permanent Easement Acquisition (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 7.5, Priority 65.2)</b>				
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Likely, less costly.</li> <li>Although this alternative will require more acquisition of permanent easement, the permanent easement will likely be easier to acquire, since a majority of the corridor is within the Hidden Falls Regional Park and this corridor is preferred by the Park officials.</li> <li>Longer length of approximately 12,379 feet.</li> </ul>	3	9.3	9.3
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Likely more costly.</li> <li>A majority of the corridor is within the Park. However, since it is not along the corridor preferred by the Park, acquiring the right-of-way will likely be more difficult and potentially more costly.</li> <li>Shorter length of approximately 11,767 feet.</li> </ul>	2	9.3	6.2
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Likely most costly.</li> <li>A majority of the corridor is within cross country areas.</li> <li>Corridor length within roadways is within private roads.</li> <li>Shortest length of approximately 8,472 feet, but likely more difficult to acquire permanent easement since corridor crosses four private property parcels.</li> </ul>	1	9.3	3.1
<b>Percent in Public ROW/PUE (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 4, Priority 34.8)</b>				
B1, B2, B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>325 feet in public ROW.</li> </ul>	3	5.0	5.0

Table E5  
RWW Reach B - Public Impacts (Weight 5, Priority 14.3)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Potential for Opposition (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 66.7)</b>				
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less potential for opposition. Corridor is located in future Hidden Falls Regional Park roadway and is the preferred corridor by Placer Legacy.</li> </ul>	3	9.5	9.5
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More potential opposition for overall corridor. The Park is not in favor of this corridor.</li> <li>No residences along the corridor.</li> </ul>	2	9.5	6.3
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most potential opposition for overall corridor.</li> <li>Corridor is mostly within high tree density cross country area likely requiring tree removal.</li> <li>Single residence adjacent high tree density area.</li> </ul>	1	9.5	3.2
<b>Aesthetic Impacts (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 5, Priority 33.3)</b>				
B1, B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some similar tree removal is likely inevitable along cross country areas of both corridors.</li> </ul>	3	4.8	4.8
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Corridor is mostly within high tree density cross country area likely requiring tree removal.</li> <li>More cross country area than Alternatives B1 and B2.</li> </ul>	2	4.8	3.2

## **RWW Reach C**

Appendix F includes the detailed evaluation summary of RWW Reach C. The following five tables include the results from the SMART Method comparison completed using the matrix evaluation software. These five tables include the following items for each subcriterion:

- weighting and associated priority,
- the alternative ranking,
- the Matrix Weight, and
- a summary of the scoring rationale.

Table F1  
RWW Reach C - Operations (Weight 10, Priority 28.6)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Reliability (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 10, Priority 40.0)</b>				
C1, C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good reliability.</li> </ul>	2	11.4	11.4
<b>Appurtenances (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 7.5, Priority 30.0)</b>				
C1, C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some appurtenances anticipated; Approximately 11 valves.</li> </ul>	2	8.6	8.6
<b>Long Term Accessibility (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 7.5, Priority 30.0)</b>				
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some accessibility. Most the corridor is within cross country (7,527 feet).</li> <li>Approximately 1,210 feet is within dirt road and about 1,800 feet is within Garden Bar Road.</li> </ul>	2	8.6	8.6
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited accessibility. Most the corridor is within cross country (9,282 feet).</li> <li>Approximately 1,210 feet is within dirt road.</li> </ul>	1	8.6	4.3

Table F2  
RWW Reach C – Environmental Considerations (Weight 7.5, Priority 21.4)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Special Status Species (SSS) Potential Habitat (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
C1, C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No apparent differences between the two corridors. Corridors traverse near raptors nests and two ponded areas on Whisky Run.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	3.3
<b>Potential Waters of the US (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
C1, C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No apparent differences between the two corridors.</li> <li>Some impact. Corridors cross Whisky Run, and parallels Valley View Reservoir and a few hundred feet of the Valley View Canal.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	3.3
<b>Riparian Zones Likely Under CDFG (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
C1, C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No apparent differences between the two corridors.</li> <li>Some impact. Corridors parallel riparian zone leading into Valley View Reservoir for approximately 600 feet and crosses Whisky Run riparian zone.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	3.3
<b>Cultural Resource Sensitivity (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less impact. Most of the cross country sections are within medium sensitivity area (6,527 feet) and approximately 1,000 feet in high sensitivity area.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	3.3
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact. Most of the cross country sections are within medium sensitivity area (8,282 feet) and approximately 1,000 feet in high sensitivity area.</li> </ul>	1	3.3	1.6
<b>Length Within Undisturbed Lands (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 7.5, Priority 11.5)</b>				
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less impact to undisturbed lands (7,527 feet).</li> </ul>	2	2.5	2.5
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact to undisturbed lands (9,282 feet). Approximately 1,210 feet of the cross country section will be tunneled.</li> </ul>	1	2.5	1.2
<b>Land Use Constraints (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 5, Priority 7.6)</b>				
C1, C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No land use constraints.</li> </ul>	2	1.6	1.6

<b>Approximate Relative Density of Trees (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 4, Priority 6.1)</b>				
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less impact to trees.</li> <li>Most the corridor traverses cross country (7,527 feet) in moderate tree density with approximately 660 feet in high density area.</li> </ul>	2	1.3	1.3
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact to trees.</li> <li>Most the corridor traverses cross country (9,282 feet) in moderate tree density with approximately 660 feet in high density area.</li> <li>Approximately 1,350 feet of the cross country section will be tunneled.</li> </ul>	1	1.3	0.7
<b>Level of Noise Pollution (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 3, Priority 4.6)</b>				
C1, C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No apparent difference between the two corridors.</li> <li>Low impact. Few residences near corridor in Valley View Reservoir vicinity.</li> </ul>	2	1.0	1.0
<b>Level of Dust Pollution (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 3, Priority 4.6)</b>				
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less impact. Corridor traverses mostly within cross country and dirt roads (8,737 feet).</li> <li>Approximately 1,800 feet of the corridor traverses along Garden bar Road (paved road).</li> </ul>	2	1.0	1.0
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact. Entire corridor traverses cross country and in dirt road (10,492 feet).</li> </ul>	1	1.0	0.5
<b>Level of Traffic Impacts (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 3, Priority 4.6)</b>				
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No traffic impacts.</li> </ul>	2	1.0	1.0
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little traffic impacts. Corridor traverses Garden Bar Road for approximately 1,800 feet.</li> </ul>	1	1.0	0.5

Table F3  
RWW Reach C - Constructability (Weight 7.5, Priority 21.4)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Pipeline Length (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 10, Priority 25.0)</b>				
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Length of approximately 10,492 LF.</li> </ul>	2	5.4	5.4
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Length of approximately 10,537 LF.</li> </ul>	1	5.4	2.7
<b>Geotech Constraints (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 10, Priority 25.0)</b>				
C1, C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No apparent differences between the two corridors. Low constraints.</li> </ul>	2	5.4	5.4
<b>Accessibility (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 7.5, Priority 18.8)</b>				
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some accessibility. Most the corridor is within cross country (7,527 feet).</li> <li>Approximately 1,210 feet is within dirt road and about 1,800 feet is within Garden Bar Road.</li> </ul>	2	4.0	4.0
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited accessibility. Most the corridor is within cross country (9,282 feet).</li> <li>Approximately 1,210 feet is within dirt road.</li> </ul>	1	4.0	2.0
<b>Potential to Negatively Impact Existing Facilities (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 7.5, Priority 18.8)</b>				
C1, C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No apparent differences between the two corridors.</li> <li>Few impacts. Parallels Valley View Canal for few hundred feet.</li> </ul>	2	4.0	4.0
<b>Work Space/ Construction Method Constraints (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 5, Priority 12.5)</b>				
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less work constraints. Corridor is within cross country (7,527 feet) with moderate tree density areas.</li> <li>Approximately 3,010 feet of the corridor is within dirt and paved roads.</li> </ul>	2	2.7	2.7
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More work constraints. Corridor is mostly within cross country (9,282 feet) with moderate tree density areas.</li> </ul>	1	2.7	1.3

Table F4  
RWW Reach C - ROW (Weight 5, Priority 14.3)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Permanent Easement Acquisition (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 7.5, Priority 65.2)</b>				
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Majority of the length of approximately 8,737 feet.</li> </ul>	2	9.3	9.3
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Entire length of approximately 10,492 feet.</li> </ul>	1	9.3	4.7
<b>Percent in Public ROW/PUE (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 4, Priority 34.8)</b>				
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately 1,800 feet is within Garden Bar Road.</li> </ul>	2	5.0	5.0
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not within public ROW/PUE.</li> </ul>	1	5.0	2.5

Table F5  
RWW Reach C - Public Impacts (Weight 5, Priority 12.8)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Potential for Opposition (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 10, Priority 66.7)</b>				
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little potential public opposition. Few residences near Valley View Reservoir vicinity. May be some opposition from these property owners.</li> </ul>	2	9.5	9.5
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slightly more potential public opposition.</li> <li>Approximately 1,800 feet of the corridor is within Garden Bar Road (a rural, paved road used to access residences).</li> <li>Few residences near Valley View Reservoir vicinity. May be some opposition from these property owners.</li> </ul>	1	9.5	4.8
<b>Aesthetic Impacts (Rank 1 to 2, Weight 5, Priority 33.3)</b>				
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less impacts.</li> <li>Some tree removal likely anticipated in cross country sections (9,282 feet) with approximately 1,350 feet of cross country section tunneled.</li> <li>Project has the potential to provide a reservoir along Whisky Run increasing aesthetics in that area.</li> </ul>	2	4.8	4.8
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimum impacts.</li> <li>Some tree removal likely anticipated in cross country sections (7,527 feet).</li> <li>Project has the potential to provide a reservoir along Whisky Run increasing aesthetics in that area.</li> </ul>	1	4.8	2.4

---

## TW Reach T

Appendix G includes the detailed evaluation summary of TW Reach T. The following five tables include the results from the SMART Method comparison completed using the matrix evaluation software. These five tables include the following items for each subcriterion:

- weighting and associated priority,
- the alternative ranking,
- the Matrix Weight, and
- a summary of the scoring rationale.

**Table G1  
Treated Water – Operations (Weight 10, Priority 28.6)**

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Reliability (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 40.0)</b>				
T1, T2, T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No apparent differences between the three corridors. The three alternatives are assumed to be similar.</li> </ul>	3	11.4	11.4
<b>Appurtenances (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 7.5, Priority 30.0)</b>				
T1, T2, T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All three alternatives have few appurtenances anticipated.</li> </ul>	3	8.6	8.6
<b>Long Term Accessibility (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 7.5, Priority 30.0)</b>				
T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most accessible. Most of the corridor is within existing paved roads (17,182 feet).</li> <li>Cross country sections are in moderate tree density areas (3,972 feet). However, a majority of the pipeline corridor will be in the new WTP access roadway, which will be constructed prior to the pipeline, eliminating most of the cross country length.</li> </ul>	3	8.6	8.6
T1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less accessible. Less of the corridor is within paved roads (17,481 feet).</li> <li>Cross country sections are in moderate tree density areas (3,972 feet). However, a majority of the pipeline corridor will be in the new WTP access roadway, which will be constructed prior to the pipeline, eliminating most of the cross country length.</li> </ul>	2	8.6	5.7
T2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least accessible. More of the corridor is within existing paved roads (20,260 feet).</li> <li>Cross country sections are in moderate tree density areas (1,456 feet).</li> </ul>	1	8.6	2.9

**Table G2  
Treated Water - Environmental Considerations (Weight 7.5, Priority 21.4)**

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Special Status Species (SSS) Potential Habitat (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
T2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Corridor traverses through or nearby seven ponded areas.</li> <li>Crosses Doty Ravine Creek, which is a Salmon habitat.</li> </ul>	3	3.3	3.3
T1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact. Corridor traverses through or nearby nine ponded areas</li> <li>Crosses Doty Ravine Creek which is a Salmon habitat.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	2.2
T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Corridor traverses through or nearby ten ponded areas</li> <li>Crosses Doty Ravine Creek which is a Salmon habitat.</li> </ul>	1	3.3	1.1
<b>Potential Waters of the US (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
T1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Corridor has two canal crossings (Doty Ravine North and the Doty South Extension), one stream crossing (Doty Ravine Creek), and traverses nearby a potential water body of the US.</li> </ul>	3	3.3	3.3
T2 and T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Corridor has four canal crossings (Doty Ravine North, Clark Jordan Canal in two locations, and Doty South Canal), one stream crossing (Doty Ravine Creek), and parallels Doty South Canal for approximately 1,150 feet.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	2.2
<b>Riparian Zones Likely Under CDFG (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
T1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Corridor crosses four riparian zones and has one stream crossing.</li> </ul>	3	3.3	3.3
T2 and T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact. Corridor crosses six riparian zones and parallels riparian zone for approximately 1,150 feet and has three stream crossings.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	2.2

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Cultural Resource Sensitivity (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 15.3)</b>				
T1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less impact.</li> <li>Majority of the corridor is within existing roads (18,811 feet).</li> <li>Mostly within medium sensitivity areas with four high sensitivity crossings.</li> </ul>	3	3.3	3.3
T2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact. Parallels high sensitivity area for approximately 1,150 feet and is within cultural site area for approximately one half mile.</li> <li>Majority of the corridor is within existing roads (20,260 feet).</li> <li>Mostly within medium sensitivity areas with three high sensitivity crossings.</li> </ul>	2	3.3	2.2
T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Parallels high sensitivity area for approximately 1,150 feet and is within cultural site area for approximately one half mile.</li> <li>Majority of the corridor is within existing roads (18,512 feet).</li> <li>Mostly within medium sensitivity areas with four high sensitivity crossings.</li> </ul>	1	3.3	1.1
<b>Length Within Undisturbed Lands (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 7.5, Priority 11.5)</b>				
T1 and T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less impact to undisturbed lands (3,972 feet). However, a majority of the pipeline corridor will be in the new WTP access roadway, which will be constructed prior to the pipeline, eliminating most of the cross country length.</li> </ul>	3	2.5	2.5
T2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact to undisturbed lands (1,456 feet).</li> </ul>	2	2.5	1.6
<b>Land Use Constraints (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 5, Priority 7.6)</b>				
T1, T2, T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both alternatives have no land use constraints.</li> </ul>	3	1.6	1.6
<b>Approximate Relative Density of Trees (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 4, Priority 6.1)</b>				
T1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact to trees.</li> <li>Moderate to high tree density in cross country portion of the corridor (about 3,972 feet). However, a majority of the pipeline corridor will be in the new WTP access roadway, which will be constructed prior to the pipeline, eliminating most of the cross country length.</li> <li>Majority of corridor is within roads (18,811 feet).</li> </ul>	3	1.3	1.3
T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact to trees.</li> <li>Moderate to high tree density in cross country portion of the corridor (about 3,972 feet). However, a majority of the pipeline corridor will be in the new WTP access roadway, which will be constructed prior to the pipeline, eliminating most of the cross country length.</li> <li>Majority of corridor is within roads (18,512 feet).</li> </ul>	3	1.3	1.3
T2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact to trees.</li> <li>Moderate tree density in cross country portion of the corridor (about 1,456 feet).</li> <li>Corridor traverses primarily within roads (about 20,260 feet).</li> </ul>	2	1.3	0.9
<b>Level of Noise Pollution (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 3, Priority 4.6)</b>				
T2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least noise impacts. Corridor traverses nearby residences along Little Ben Road, Big Ben Road, McCourtney Road, and Wise Road.</li> <li>Traverses along less residences than Alternatives T1 and T3.</li> </ul>	3	1.0	1.0
T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More noise impacts. Corridor traverses nearby residences along Big Ben Road, McCourtney Road, and Wise Road.</li> <li>Traverses along more residences than Alternative T2 because of the increased length within Big Ben Road (segment C).</li> </ul>	2	1.0	0.7
T1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most noise impacts. Corridor traverses near residences along Big Ben Road, Crosby Herold Road, and Wise Road.</li> <li>Traverses along more residences than Alternative T2 and T3 because Wise Road has the most housing nearby the corridor.</li> </ul>	1	1.0	0.3

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Level of Dust Pollution (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 3, Priority 4.6)</b>				
T1 and T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less dust impacts. Corridor is mostly within paved roadways (17,481 feet and 18,512 feet).</li> <li>About 3,972 feet of the corridor is within cross country areas. However, a majority of the pipeline corridor will be in the new paved WTP access roadway, which will be constructed prior to the pipeline, eliminating most of the cross country length.</li> </ul>	3	1.0	1.0
T2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More dust impacts. Corridor is mostly within paved roadways (20,260 feet).</li> <li>About 1,456 feet of the corridor is within cross country areas.</li> </ul>	2	1.0	0.7
<b>Level of Traffic Impacts (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 3, Priority 4.6)</b>				
T1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least impact. Corridor traverses within Big Ben Road, Crosby Herold Road, and Wise Road for about 17,481 feet.</li> </ul>	3	1.0	1.0
T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact. Corridor traverse within Big Ben Road, McCourtney Road, and Wise Road for about 18,512 feet.</li> </ul>	2	1.0	0.7
T2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most impact. Corridor traverses within Little Ben Road (a narrow, private road) fo approximately 5,746 feet.</li> <li>Corridor traverses within Big Ben Road, McCourtney Road, and Wise Road for approximately 14,514 feet.</li> </ul>	1	1.0	0.3

Table G3  
Treated Water – Constructability (Weight 7.5, Priority 21.4)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Pipeline Length (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 25.0)</b>				
T2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shortest length of approximately 21,716 feet.</li> </ul>	3	5.4	5.4
T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Second shortest length of approximately 22,483 feet.</li> </ul>	2	5.4	3.6
T1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Longest length of approximately 22,782 feet.</li> </ul>	1	5.4	1.8
<b>Geotech Constraints (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 25.0)</b>				
T1, T2, T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No apparent differences between the three corridors. All three alternatives are assumed to be geologically/geotechnically similar</li> </ul>	3	5.4	5.4
<b>Accessibility (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 7.5, Priority 18.8)</b>				
T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most accessible. Most of the corridor is within existing paved roads (18,512 feet).</li> <li>Cross country sections are in moderate tree density areas (3,972 feet). However, a majority of the pipeline corridor will be in the new WTP access roadway, which will be constructed prior to the pipeline, eliminating most of the cross country length.</li> </ul>	3	4.0	4.0
T1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less accessible. Less of the corridor is within paved roads (17,481 feet).</li> <li>Cross country sections are in moderate tree density areas (3,972 feet). However, a majority of the pipeline corridor will be in the new WTP access roadway, which will be constructed prior to the pipeline, eliminating most of the cross country length.</li> </ul>	2	4.0	2.7
T2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least accessible. More of the corridor is within existing paved roads (20,260 feet).</li> <li>Cross country sections are in moderate tree density areas (1,456 feet).</li> </ul>	1	4.0	1.3
<b>Potential to Negatively Impact Existing Facilities (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 7.5, Priority 18.8)</b>				
T1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less impact. Corridor has two canal crossings (Doty Ravine North and the Doty South Extension).</li> </ul>	3	4.0	4.0
T2 and T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More impact. Corridor has four canal crossings (Doty Ravine North, Clark Jordan Canal in two locations, and Doty South Canal).</li> </ul>	2	4.0	2.7

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Work Space/ Construction Method Constraints (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 5, Priority 12.5)</b>				
T1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Few constraints. Most the corridor is within paved and dirt roads (18,811 feet) with some cross country areas (3,972 feet). However, a majority of the pipeline corridor will be in the new WTP access roadway, which will be constructed prior to the pipeline, eliminating most of the cross country length.</li> </ul>	3	2.7	2.7
T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More constraints. Most the corridor is within paved and dirt roads (18,512 feet) with some cross country areas (3,972 feet). However, a majority of the pipeline corridor will be in the new WTP access roadway, which will be constructed prior to the pipeline, eliminating most of the cross country length.</li> <li>More stream and canal crossings that may require bore and jacking procedures than Alternative A1.</li> </ul>	2	2.7	1.8
T2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most constraints. Most the corridor is within paved roads (20,260 feet) with some cross country areas (1,456 feet).</li> <li>Approximately 5,746 feet of the corridor is within a narrow, private paved road.</li> <li>More stream and canal crossings that may require bore and jacking procedures than Alternative A1.</li> </ul>	1	2.7	0.9

Table G4  
Treated Water – ROW (Weight 5, Priority 14.3)

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Permanent Easement Acquisition (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 7.5, Priority 65.2)</b>				
T1 and T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shortest lengths of approximately 5,301 feet minus the length of the new WTP access road.</li> </ul>	3	9.3	9.3
T2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Longest length of approximately 7,202 feet.</li> </ul>	2	9.3	6.2
<b>Percent in Public ROW/PUE (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 4, Priority 34.8)</b>				
T1 and T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately 76.7% and 76.4% in public ROW currently, in addition to the future WTP public access road.</li> </ul>	3	5.0	5.0
T2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately 66.8% in public ROW.</li> </ul>	2	5.0	3.3

Table G5  
**Treated Water - Public Impacts (Weight 5, Priority 14.3)**

Alternative	Scoring Rationale	Rank	Matrix Weight	Subcriteria Score
<b>Potential for Opposition (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 10, Priority 66.7)</b>				
T1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower potential for opposition.</li> <li>• Most noise impacts. Corridor traverses nearby more residences along Big Ben Road, Crosby Herold Road, and Wise Road.</li> <li>• Traverses nearby more residences than Alternative A2 due to Wise Road.</li> <li>• Less dust impacts. Corridor is mostly within paved roadways for about 17,481 feet with less cross country than Alternative T2 due to the new WTP access road within most of the cross country portion.</li> <li>• Least traffic impacts. Corridor traverses within Big Ben Road, McCourtney Road, and Wise Road for about 17,481 feet.</li> </ul>	3	9.5	9.5
T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some potential for opposition.</li> <li>• More noise impacts. Corridor traverses near residences along Little Ben Road, Big Ben Road, McCourtney Road and Wise Road.</li> <li>• Traverses nearby less residences than Alternative T1.</li> <li>• Less dust impacts. Corridor is mostly within paved roadways for about 17,182 feet with less cross country than Alternative T2 due to the new WTP access road within most of the cross country portion.</li> <li>• More traffic impacts. Corridor traverses within Big Ben Road, McCourtney Road, and Wise Road for about 17,182 feet.</li> </ul>	2	9.5	6.3
T2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher potential for opposition. Cross country section of the corridor traverses within private property that will likely receive opposition from property owner and traverse within Little Ben Road (a narrow, private road).</li> <li>• Least noise impacts. Corridor traverses near residences along Big Ben Road, McCourtney Road and Wise Road.</li> <li>• Traverses nearby less residences than Alternative T1.</li> <li>• More dust impacts. Corridor is mostly within paved roadways for about 20,260 feet with more cross country than Alternative T1 and T3.</li> <li>• Most traffic impacts. Corridor traverses within Little Ben Road (a narrow, private road) for approximately 5,746 feet and within Big Ben Road, McCourtney Road, and Wise Road for about 14,514 feet.</li> </ul>	1	9.5	3.2
<b>Aesthetic Impacts (Rank 1 to 3, Weight 5, Priority 33.3)</b>				
T1 and T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum impacts. Mostly within already disturbed lands. Corridor is not near residences in cross country section.</li> </ul>	3	4.8	4.8
T2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum impacts. Mostly within already disturbed lands. Corridor is nearby few residences in cross country section.</li> </ul>	2	4.8	3.2

---

# Rejected Potential Corridors

Appendix H includes the detailed evaluation summary of the rejected potential corridors analyzed during the initial investigation process.

Table H1  
Rejected Potential Corridors

Segment	Why selected	Screening Criteria Not Passed	Why Rejected
A	Trying to follow 1500 foot contour line to maintain available head.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact to trees. Traverses within cross country area with moderate tree density.</li> </ul>
B	Trying to follow 1500 foot contour line to maintain available head. Used in conjunction with segment A.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact to trees. Traverses within cross country area with moderate tree density.</li> <li>Parallels and has single crossing of Combie Ophir Canal</li> <li>Only conducive if using potential corridor A, therefore eliminated.</li> </ul>
C	Part of the alignment is within open space, cross country area. Used in conjunction with segment A.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field visit identified dirt road to the west.</li> <li>Alignment enters Lake Valley Drive within close proximity of residences and across private property.</li> <li>Crosses Combie Ophir Canal.</li> <li>Only conducive if using potential corridor A, therefore eliminated.</li> </ul>
D	Thought we were following existing dirt road.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field visit identified dirt road to the east.</li> <li>Impact to trees. Traverses within cross country area with moderate tree density.</li> </ul>
E	Follows property lines. Used in conjunction with segment A.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only conducive if using potential corridor A, therefore eliminated.</li> <li>Crosses canal.</li> </ul>
F	Follows property line.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field visit identified existing dirt road within close proximity of the property line.</li> <li>Impact to trees. Traverses within cross country area with low tree density.</li> </ul>
G	Adjacent to Highway 49 following highway R-O-W boundaries.	A, B, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires more extensive Caltrans Encroachment Permit.</li> <li>Safety issues during construction since along major highway.</li> <li>Traverses nearby residences in a few locations.</li> </ul>
H	Connects to south alternative. Follows property line.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts to private property. There are several roads that connect Lone Star Road to Cramer Road, but are less direct.</li> <li>Requires crossing of Lonestar Canal to the north.</li> </ul>
I	Connects to south alternative. Follows property line.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts to private property. There are several roads that connect Lone Star Road to Cramer Road, but are less direct.</li> <li>Requires crossing of Lonestar Canal to the north.</li> </ul>
J	Alternative to Kanehls Corner and south alternative. Avoids going around Oak Knoll – goes through draw. Crosses private properties in location away from residences.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field visit identified Fawnridge Road is within close proximity of the potential corridor. Use Fawnridge Road instead to minimize environmental and private property impacts.</li> </ul>
K	Alternative to Kanehls Corner and south	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field visit identified Fawnridge Road is within</li> </ul>

	alternative. Avoids going around Oak Knoll – goes through draw. Follows 1400 foot contour line to maintain available head.		close proximity of the potential corridor. Use Fawnridge Road instead to minimize environmental and private property impacts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within close proximity of residence.</li> <li>• Eliminate jog in pipe.</li> </ul>
L	Alternative to Kanehls Corner. Follows property line.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fawnridge Road is within close proximity of the potential corridor. Use Fawnridge Road instead to minimize environmental and private property impacts.</li> </ul>
M	Alternative to Kanehls Corner. Follows property line.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fawnridge Road is within close proximity of the potential corridor. Use Fawnridge Road instead to minimize environmental and private property impacts.</li> </ul>
N	Connects to south alternative. Follows property line. Mostly within Cinderella Lane.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paved road versus Fawnridge Road which is a dirt road. Less expensive to construct in Fawnridge Road.</li> </ul>
O	Follows property lines.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within close proximity to several residences.</li> <li>• Increases pipe length if using northern corridor.</li> <li>• Impact to trees. Traverses within cross country area with low tree density</li> </ul>
P	Remains within Big Hill Road for greater distance, less trees, along property line.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adds length to pipeline.</li> <li>• Field visit identified a dirt road option reducing the cross country area traversed.</li> </ul>
Q	Goes around 1300 foot contour, less trees.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field visit identified a dirt road option reducing the cross country area traversed.</li> <li>• Crosses drainage.</li> </ul>
R	Mostly follows 1100 foot contour line to maintain available head and is more direct route to Big Hill Reservoir from the Southern Corridor.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traverses within cross country area in moderate tree density.</li> <li>• Alternative corridor follows the existing dirt road which lessens the environmental and private property impacts.</li> </ul>
S	Follows 900 foot contour line to maintain available head.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact to trees. Traverses within cross country area in moderate tree density.</li> </ul>
T	More direct route.	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to existing NID facilities and other constructability issues.</li> <li>• Field visit identified alternate route.</li> </ul>
U	Reduces length of pipeline and avoids knoll.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact to trees. Traverses within cross country area in low, moderate and high tree density.</li> </ul>
V	Camp Far West Canal Turnout alternative, avoids tunnel, conserves head.	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similar alignment getting added back in.</li> </ul>
W	Direct route and mostly avoids high contours.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to public lands. Majority of the alignment is within Hidden Falls Regional Park (Park).</li> <li>• Park prefers pipeline corridor within existing park road.</li> <li>• Little accessibility.</li> <li>• Poor constructability due to access and undulated terrain.</li> <li>• Impact to trees. Traverses within cross country area with moderate tree density.</li> <li>• Crosses 800 foot contour for short duration requiring deep excavation/possible tunnel/pumping.</li> </ul>

X	Follows property lines.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts to public lands. Majority of the alignment is within Hidden Falls Regional Park (Park).</li> <li>Park prefers pipeline corridor within existing park road.</li> <li>Little accessibility.</li> <li>Poor constructability due to access and undulated terrain.</li> <li>Impact to trees. Traverses within cross country area with moderate tree density.</li> <li>Crosses 800 foot contour for short duration requiring deep excavation/possible tunnel/pumping.</li> </ul>
Y	Basically the same as 46 and 46A, we just drew it in the wrong place to start? I think we thought we were following the road.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moved to where road actually was, I think.</li> </ul>
Z	Follows existing dirt road across Coon Creek. Provides alternate crossing.	A, C, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional crossing of Coon Creek.</li> <li>Additional construction cost due to Creek diversion or bore and jack operations.</li> </ul>
AA	Less trees.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dirt road within close proximity of this potential corridor. Less environmental impacts if stay within already disturbed lands.</li> </ul>
BB	Access to Potential Whiskey Run Reservoir B	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Whiskey Run Reservoir B location was adjusted during further analysis, and therefore eliminated this potential corridor</li> </ul>
CC	Access to Potential Whiskey Run Reservoir A	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further analysis eliminated the Whiskey Run Reservoir A as a viable option, and therefore eliminated this potential corridor.</li> </ul>
DD	Follows 500 foot contour line to maintain available head.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential corridor is not conducive with new location of the Whiskey Run Reservoir.</li> <li>Impact to trees. Traverses within high tree density area.</li> <li>Increases pipeline length.</li> <li>Crosses Whiskey Run Creek.</li> <li>Additional construction cost due to Creek diversion or bore and jack operations.</li> </ul>
EE	Straight line from end of potential corridor "EE" to the Valley View WTP with very little gain in elevation.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only conducive if using potential corridor labeled "EE".</li> <li>Increases pipeline length.</li> </ul>
FF	Trying to avoid higher contours.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only conducive if using potential corridor labeled "EE".</li> <li>Increases pipeline length.</li> </ul>
GG	Connects potential corridor "GG" to Braik WTP site.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further analysis eliminated the Braik WTP as the proposed site location, therefore eliminating this potential corridor.</li> </ul>
HH	Follows contour line 440 foot contour line to maintain available head into the Braik WTP site.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further analysis eliminated the Braik WTP as the proposed site location, therefore eliminating this potential corridor.</li> </ul>
II	Alternate route for treated water pipeline from Valley View WTP site	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Treated water line is not conducive with treated water storage tank locations.</li> </ul>
JJ	More direct route to Braik	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further analysis eliminated the Braik WTP as the</li> </ul>

	WTP.		proposed site location, therefore eliminating this potential corridor.
KK	Partially follows Garden Bar Road, traverses along property lines to Braik and Valley View WTP sites.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further analysis eliminated the Braik WTP as the proposed site location, therefore eliminating this potential corridor.</li> <li>• Increases length of pipeline if connecting to the Valley View WTP site.</li> </ul>
LL	Shortens potential corridor following the Valley View Canal with little elevation gain.	A, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further analysis eliminated the Braik WTP as the proposed site location, therefore eliminating this potential corridor.</li> </ul>

Appendix I

---

# Rejected Preliminary Corridors

Appendix I includes the detailed evaluation summary of the rejected preliminary corridors analyzed during the initial investigation process.

Table I1  
Rejected Preliminary Corridors

Segment	Why selected	Screening Criteria Not Passed	Why Rejected
58	Used to access Garden Bar Reservoir. More than half the alternative traverses along Garden Bar Road and then in open space, cross country area.	A,C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further analysis eliminated the Garden Bar Reservoir as a proposed site location, therefore eliminating this preliminary corridor.</li> <li>This option requires pumping which is not desired.</li> </ul>
59	Used to connect South Coon Creek corridor to the Garden Bar Reservoir. Mostly follows property lines.	A,C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further analysis eliminated the Garden Bar Reservoir as a proposed site location, therefore eliminating this preliminary corridor.</li> <li>This option requires pumping which is not desired.</li> </ul>
60	Used to connect the pipeline corridor from the Whisky Run Reservoir to the Magonigal WTP site.	A,C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further analysis eliminated the Magonigal WTP site as the proposed site location, therefore eliminating this preliminary corridor.</li> </ul>
61	Used to connect the main pipeline corridor to the Garden Bar Reservoir.	A,C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further analysis eliminated the Garden Bar Reservoir as a proposed site location, therefore eliminating this preliminary corridor.</li> <li>This option requires a second tunnel approximately 1,575 feet in length over the ridge into Garden Bar Reservoir.</li> </ul>
66	Pipeline corridor goes through the proposed Garden Bar Reservoir site in case not constructed to reach the Valley View WTP site.	A,C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project goals include a raw water storage reservoir, preferably within close proximity of the WTP site.</li> <li>This option requires pumping which is not desired.</li> </ul>
67	Alternative to segment 58. Added when alternate Garden Bar Road R-O-W was discovered using an existing dirt road which is the true Garden Bar Road R-O-W. Used to connect to the Garden Bar Reservoir, and Magonigal or Braik WTP sites.	A,C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further analysis eliminated the Garden Bar Reservoir, Magonigal and Braik WTP sites as a proposed site location, therefore eliminating this preliminary corridor.</li> </ul>
68	Used to connect the pipeline corridor from the Whisky Run Reservoir to the Braik WTP site.	A,C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further analysis eliminated the Garden Bar Reservoir, Magonigal and Braik WTP sites as a proposed site location, therefore eliminating this preliminary corridor.</li> <li>Requires pumping.</li> </ul>
69	Used to connect the Garden Bar Reservoir to the Magonigal WTP site.	A,C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further analysis eliminated the Magonigal WTP site as the proposed site location, therefore eliminating this preliminary corridor.</li> </ul>
70	Used in conjunction with the Garden Bar Reservoir to connect to the Valley View WTP Site.	A,C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further analysis eliminated the Garden Bar Reservoir as a proposed site location, therefore eliminating this preliminary corridor.</li> </ul>
71	Used in conjunction with segments 62, 63, and 65 when leaving the Whisky Run Reservoir to connect to the Braik WTP site.	A,C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further analysis eliminated the Braik WTP site as the proposed site location, therefore eliminating this preliminary corridor.</li> </ul>