

Preliminary Strategy Evaluation Criteria

Cooperation			Weighting Factor (Low [1] - High [100]):	4
Description: Attributes quality to a project based on the potential for interaction with other entities.				
Scoring:				
Less Favorable 1	2	3	More Favorable 4	
Significant potential obstacles in working with other stakeholders to develop project	Potentially some obstacles in working with other stakeholders to develop project	Potentially some opportunity to develop project synergistically with other stakeholders	Significant opportunity to develop project synergistically with other stakeholders	

Cost			Weighting Factor (Low [1] - High [100]):	40
Description: Estimated cost of water for a project. This value will be based on preliminary estimates and regional planning-level data.				
Scoring:				
Less Favorable 1	2	3	More Favorable 4	
>\$1,000 per ac-ft	\$500 to \$1,000 per ac-ft	\$250 to \$500 per ac-ft	<\$250 per ac-ft	

Diversification			Weighting Factor (Low [1] - High [100]):	2
Description: Scoring based on how likely a project is to provide diversification to the existing SJRA water supply portfolio.				
Scoring:				
Less Favorable 1	2	3	More Favorable 4	
Supply originates from sources linked to existing SJRA supplies	Supply originates from sources linked to existing SJRA supplies but may be influenced by other factors	Supply developed from sources unrelated to existing SJRA supplies	Supply developed from a variety of water resource outside of current SJRA portfolio	

Environmental			Weighting Factor (Low [1] - High [100]):	6
Description: Describes the extent of environmental impacts required for implementation of the project.				
Scoring:				
Less Favorable 1	2	3	More Favorable 4	
Significant environmental impact is expected; significant environmental studies and mitigation may be required	Some notable environmental impact; uncertain course for studies and mitigation	Some notable environmental impact; routine process for permitting	Minor environmental impact; environmental studies have been completed on similar projects	

Funding			Weighting Factor (Low [1] - High [100]):	4
Description: Related to the ease at which alternative funding may be obtained for the project and if special incentives may be available for project development.				
Scoring:				
Less Favorable 1	2	3	More Favorable 4	
No obvious potential opportunities for funding	Common funding mechanisms may be utilized; project will compete equally with other competing projects	Specialized funding mechanisms exist	Project will receive beneficial consideration in a funding program due to type of project or source of water	

Land Acquisition			Weighting Factor (Low [1] - High [100]):	4
Description: Refers to the number of land acres that must be acquired in order to implement the project.				
Scoring:				
Less Favorable 1	2	3	More Favorable 4	
Significant land impact (>1,000 ac)	100-1,000 ac	5-100 ac	Minimal land impact (<5 ac)	

Legal			Weighting Factor (Low [1] - High [100]):	6
Description: Defines the level of legal obstacles that must be overcome in implementing the project.				
Scoring:				
Less Favorable 1	2	3	More Favorable 4	
Significant permitting required; extensive contracting	Moderate level of permitting and contracting; several unknowns	Moderate level of permitting and contracting; few unknowns	Minimal permitting required; simple contracting	

Location			Weighting Factor (Low [1] - High [100]):	6
Description: Related to the location of the developed supply and proximity to potential demands served.				
Scoring:				
Less Favorable 1	2	3	More Favorable 4	
IBT required, long distance from SJRA service area	major conveyance required to meet the majority of identified needs	Some conveyance required to meet identified demands	Limited conveyance needs	

Preliminary Strategy Evaluation Criteria

Magnitude			Weighting Factor (Low [1] - High [100]):	4
Description: Describes the potential yield of a strategy. Values is based on maximum potential without regard for "right-sizing" to meet identified demands.				
Scoring:				
Less Favorable 1	2	3	More Favorable 4	
<5,000 ac-ft per year	5,000 to 25,000 ac-ft per year	25,000 to 50,000 ac-ft/yr	>50,000 ac-ft per year	

Other Supplies			Weighting Factor (Low [1] - High [100]):	2
Description: Defines how the project interacts with other projects or existing supplies in either preventing the development of other alternatives or enhancing the yield of existing or future supplies.				
Scoring:				
Less Favorable 1	2	3	More Favorable 4	
Negative impacts to existing and other potential supplies	Negative impacts to other potential projects	Opportunity to enhance other potential projects	Opportunity to enhance existing supplies and other potential supplies	

Public			Weighting Factor (Low [1] - High [100]):	6
Description: Describes public support or potential opposition for a project concept. This is considered from an overall perspective, noting projects are likely to receive both positive and negative support from various sections of the public.				
Scoring:				
Less Favorable 1	2	3	More Favorable 4	
No local support; significant opposition	Minimal local support; some opposition	Local support; minimal opposition	Widespread local support; opportunity for ancillary community benefits	

Scalability			Weighting Factor (Low [1] - High [100]):	4
Description: Defines the ability of a project to be implemented by smaller stakeholders in partnership with SJRA.				
Scoring:				
Less Favorable 1	2	3	More Favorable 4	
Project requires significant infrastructure and development by a major sponsor	Project may be implemented by a small number of larger entities	Project may be implemented by most existing and potential entities	Project can be implemented by entities of all sizes	

Schedule			Weighting Factor (Low [1] - High [100]):	6
Description: Defines the anticipated schedule for the development of a project. Projects with shorter lead-times are preferred.				
Scoring:				
Less Favorable 1	2	3	More Favorable 4	
>30 years	15-30 years	5 to 15 years	0 to 5 years	

Yield Risk			Weighting Factor (Low [1] - High [100]):	6
Description: Determined by the risk associated with a potential project's yield being reduced due to regulatory or environmental issues.				
Scoring:				
Less Favorable 1	2	3	More Favorable 4	
High level of uncertainty that project yield can be developed or will be maintained in the long term. High risk of supply availability	Moderate risk that a project's yield cannot be realized or will diminish over time. Moderate risk of supply availability	Some risk that project yield will not be realized or will be reduce over time. Some risk of supply availability	Virtually no risk of project yield cannot ba achieved or will be reduced over time. No potential risk of supply availability	

Highlands System Projects (Sorted)

Number	Score	Rank	Name	Sub-Type
1	328	1	Lake Livingston Transfer	
2	326	2	Purchase Surface Water	TRA
3	324	3	Trinity Return Flows	
4	316	4	Regional Return Flows	Lake Houston
5	286	5	Purchase Surface Water	CLCND
6	254	6	Purchase Groundwater	Purchase from Eastern Basins
7	254	6	Purchase Groundwater	Purchase from Western Basins
8	242	8	East Texas Water Transfer	Neches Basin
9	242	8	East Texas Water Transfer	Sabine Basin
10	234	10	Seawater Desalination	
11	220	11	Lake Creek Reservoir	
12	212	12	Bedias Reservoir	
13	204	13	Brazos River Supplies	

Montgomery System Projects (Sorted)				
Number	Score	Rank	Name	Sub-Type
1	364	1	Conservation	TWDB Baseline
2	344	2	Catahoula Aquifer Supplies	Developed by SJRA Customers (Blended)
3	338	3	Conservation	SJRA Water Conservation Plan
4	304	4	Regional Return Flows	Lake Conroe
5	302	5	Direct Reuse, Non-Potable	GRP Participants
6	300	6	Direct Reuse, Non-Potable	Woodlands
7	274	7	Catahoula Aquifer Supplies	Developed by SJRA (Lake Conroe)
8	270	8	Catahoula Aquifer Supplies	Developed by SJRA Customers (Treated)
9	268	9	Catahoula Aquifer Supplies	Developed by SJRA (Blended)
10	262	10	Lake Livingston Transfer	Livingston to Conroe
11	262	10	Purchase Surface Water	TRA
12	258	12	Aquifer Storage and Recovery	Developed by SJRA Customers
13	254	13	Purchase Groundwater	Purchase from Eastern Basins
14	254	13	Purchase Groundwater	Purchase from Western Basins
15	234	15	Aquifer Storage and Recovery	Developed by SJRA (Mildly Treated)
16	234	15	Catahoula Aquifer Supplies	Developed by SJRA (Treated)
17	230	17	Aquifer Storage and Recovery	Developed by SJRA (GRP Treated)
18	228	18	Lake Creek Scalping	Storage in Lake Conroe
19	224	19	Lake Creek Scalping	Run-of-River Diversion
20	224	19	Lake Creek Scalping	Dedicated Storage
21	214	21	Lake Creek Reservoir	
22	214	21	Regional Return Flows	Lake Houston w/ South Plant
23	204	23	Brazos River Supplies	
24	202	24	East Texas Water Transfer	Neches Basin
25	202	24	East Texas Water Transfer	Sabine Basin
26	200	26	Increase Lake Conroe Conservation Pool	
27	172	27	Bedias Reservoir	
28	172	27	Seawater Desalination	

Workshop adopted Weighting Factors

Weighting Factors Summary		
Number	Factor	Weight
1	Cooperation	4
2	Cost	40
3	Diversification	2
4	Environmental	6
5	Funding	4
6	Land Acquisition	4
7	Legal	6
8	Location	6
9	Magnitude	4
10	Other Supplies	2
11	Public	6
12	Scalability	4
13	Schedule	6
14	Yield Risk	6
TOTAL		100

Table A.11 - Strategy Evaluation Summary Sheet for Conservation (Texas Water Development Board - Baseline)

Strategy Name:		Conservation			
Strategy Sub-Type:		TWDB Baseline			
		Highlands System		Montgomery County	
		Criteria Score	Explanation	Criteria Score	Explanation
Cooperation				3	Potentially some opportunity to develop project synergistically with other stakeholders RWP 2016: Requires coordination between small systems on conservation plans and attitudes.
Cost				4	<\$250 per ac-ft 2016 RWP: Based on anticipated installation of efficient plumbing fixtures and appliances (no cost) ; Water conservation approaches consistently achieve high scores related to cost.
Diversification				3	Supply developed from sources unrelated to existing SJRA supplies 2016 RWP: Does not add another source of water, but instead decreases demand and reliance on existing sources.
Environmental				4	Minor environmental impact; environmental studies have been completed on similar projects 2016 RWP: Generally, there are no significant negative environmental impacts associated with the conservation projects or that may result from implementation of the conservation management project.
Funding				4	Project will receive beneficial consideration in a funding program due to type of project or source of water 2016 RWP: Although sponsors are identified, commitment to implementation varies considerably. Dedicated SWIFT funds are available through the TWDB funding program.
Land Acquisition				4	Minimal land impact (<5 ac) No applicable cost.
Legal				3	Moderate level of permitting and contracting; few unknowns 2016 RWP: Requires identifying utility to manage conservations measures.
Location				4	Limited conveyance needs n/a
Magnitude				2	5,000 to 25,000 ac-ft per year 2016 RWP:6,000 (2020)- 30,000 (2070) ac-ft/yr;
Other Supplies				2	Negative impacts to other potential projects 2016 RWP: Conservation may negatively impact the availability of return flows for development into indirect reuse projects.
Public				4	Widespread local support; opportunity for ancillary community benefits 2016 RWP: No opposition to conservation efforts. Local support to initiatives
Scalability				4	Project can be implemented by entities of all sizes 2016 RWP: Can be implemented at every level.
Schedule				3	5 to 15 years 2016 RWP: 2020 with ongoing annual expenditures; Conservation programs can be implemented in a relatively short period of time.
Yield Risk				3	Some risk that project yield will not be realized or will be reduce over time. Some risk of supply availability Uncertain near and long-term efficiency.
		N/A	Highlands System Score	364.00	Montgomery County Score

Name	Sub-Type	Highlands?	Montgomery?
Aquifer Storage and Recovery	Developed by SJRA Customers		Y
	Developed by SJRA (GRP Treated)		Y
	Developed by SJRA (Mildly Treated)		Y
Bedias Reservoir		Y	Y
Brazos River Supplies		Y	Y
Catahoula Aquifer Supplies	Developed by SJRA Customers (Treated)		Y
	Developed by SJRA Customers (Blended)		Y
	Developed by SJRA (Lake Conroe)		Y
	Developed by SJRA (Treated)		Y
	Developed by SJRA (Blended)		Y
Conservation	TWDB Baseline		Y
	SJRA Recommendations		Y
Direct Reuse	GRP Participants		Y
	Woodlands		Y
East Texas Water Transfer	Neches Basin	Y	Y
	Sabine Basin	Y	Y
Lake Creek Reservoir		Y	Y
Lake Creek Scalping	Run-of-River Diversion		Y
	Storage in Lake Conroe	Y	Y
	Dedicated Storage	Y	Y
Lake Livingston Transfer	Livingston to Conroe		Y
	Livingston to Highlands	Y	
Purchase Groundwater	Purchase from Eastern Basins	Y	Y
	Purchase from Western Basins	Y	Y
Purchase Surface Water	TRA	Y	Y
	CLCND	Y	
Regional Return Flows	Lake Conroe		Y
	Lake Houston	Y	
	Lake Houston w/ South Plant		Y
Seawater Desalination		Y	Y
Increase Lake Conroe Conservation Pool			Y
Trinity Return Flows		Y	Y