

## APPENDIX 'D'

Criteria	Alternative 1 Common Components Only	Alternative 2 Common Components and Private Land Raising	Alternative 3 Common Components, Additional Storage and new CN Culvert	Alternative 4 Common Components, Private Land Raising, Additional Storage and new CN Culvert
<b>Planning</b> (Consistency with planning policy and Growth potential)	<p>Common Components Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Consistent with planning policy</li> <li>-Does not reduce growth potential compared to 2012 conditions</li> </ul>	<p>Common Components and Private Land Raising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Less consistent with planning policy</li> <li>-Development of properties are subject to UTRCA approval</li> </ul>	<p>Common Components, Additional Storage and new CN Culvert</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Less consistent with planning policy</li> <li>-Does not reduce growth potential compared to 2012 conditions</li> </ul>	<p>Common Components, Private Land Raising, Additional Storage and new CN Culvert</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Not consistent with planning policy</li> <li>-Includes land raising at properties in the subwatershed</li> <li>-Development of properties are subject to UTRCA approval</li> </ul>
<b>Technical</b> (Flood risk extents, Construction scheduling, Geomorphology)	<p>First Place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-There is a net 7.1 ha increase in land affected by flooding in the 1,100 year event compared to the 2012 condition</li> <li>-Can be phased and has future flexibility</li> <li>-Includes geomorphological components to achieve improvements</li> </ul>	<p>Second Place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-There is a net 4.3 ha increase in land affected by flooding in the 1,100 year event compared to the 2012 condition</li> <li>-Can be phased and has future flexibility</li> <li>-Includes geomorphological components to achieve improvements</li> </ul>	<p>Third Place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-There is a net 5.7 ha increase in land affected by flooding in the 1,100 year event compared to the 2012 condition</li> <li>-Not possible to phase, less future flexibility</li> <li>-Includes geomorphological components to achieve improvements</li> </ul>	<p>Fourth Place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-There is a net 3.1 ha increase in land affected by flooding in the 1,100 year event compared to the 2012 condition</li> <li>-Not possible to phase, less future flexibility</li> <li>-Includes geomorphological components to achieve improvements</li> </ul>
<b>Social/Cultural</b> (Cultural heritage, Public health, safety and service)	<p>Second Place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-No disruption to cultural heritage</li> <li>-Poor level of service at the culvert crossings</li> <li>-26% increase in risk to City infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p>First Place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-No disruption to cultural heritage</li> <li>-Poor level of service at the culvert crossings</li> <li>-28% increase in risk to City infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p>Third Place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Potential disruption with extensive excavation</li> <li>-Poor level of service at the culvert crossings</li> <li>-8% increase in risk to City infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p>Fourth Place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Potential disruption with extensive excavation</li> <li>-Poor level of service at the culvert crossings</li> <li>-Access and egress limited</li> </ul>
<b>Natural Environment</b> (Species at Risk, Terrestrial habitat, Aquatic habitat)	<p>Third Place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-No disruption to SAR</li> <li>-Disruption in upper reaches mitigated through design</li> <li>-Improvement in water quality</li> </ul>	<p>Second Place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-No disruption to SAR</li> <li>-Disruption in upper reaches mitigated through design</li> <li>-Improvement in water quality</li> </ul>	<p>First Place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Disruption to SAR</li> <li>-Significant disruption to habitats in the middle reaches</li> <li>-Improvement in water quality</li> </ul>	<p>Fourth Place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Disruption to SAR</li> <li>-Significant disruption to habitats in the middle reaches</li> <li>-Improvement in water quality</li> </ul>
<b>Economic</b> (Implementation and Maintenance Costs)	<p>First Place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Lowest implementation cost</li> <li>-Continued maintenance cost</li> </ul>	<p>Second Place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Moderate implementation cost</li> <li>-Continued maintenance cost</li> </ul>	<p>Third Place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-High implementation cost</li> <li>-Reduced maintenance cost</li> </ul>	<p>Fourth Place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Highest implementation cost</li> <li>-Reduced maintenance cost</li> </ul>
<b>Ranking</b>	First Place	Second Place	Third Place	Fourth Place