

## 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)	Common Components Only -Consistent with planning policy -Does not reduce growth potential compared to 2012 conditions	Common Components and Private Land Raising -Less consistent with planning policy -Development of properties are subject to UTRCA approval	Common Components, Additional Storage and new CN Culvert -Less consistent with planning policy -Does not reduce growth potential compared to 2012 conditions	Common Components, Private Land Raising, Additional Storage and new CN Culvert -Not consistent with planning policy -Includes land raising at properties in the subwatershed -Development of properties are subject to UTRCA approval
<b>Technical</b> (Flood risk extents, Construction scheduling, Geomorphology)	<b>First Place</b> -There is a net 7.1 ha increase in land affected by flooding in the 1,100 year event compared to the 2012 condition -Can be phased and has future flexibility -Includes geomorphological components to achieve improvements	<b>Scored Place</b> -There is a net 4.3 ha increase in land affected by flooding in the 1,100 year event compared to the 2012 condition -Can be phased and has future flexibility -Includes geomorphological components to achieve improvements	<b>Third Place</b> -There is a net 5.7 ha increase in land affected by flooding in the 1,100 year event compared to the 2012 condition -Not possible to phase, less future flexibility -Includes geomorphological components to achieve improvements	<b>Fourth Place</b> -There is a net 3.1 ha increase in land affected by flooding in the 1,100 year event compared to the 2012 condition -Not possible to phase, less future flexibility -Includes geomorphological components to achieve improvements
<b>Social/Cultural</b> (Cultural heritage, Public health, safety and service)	<b>Second Place</b> -No disruption to cultural heritage -Poor level of service at the culvert crossings -26% increase in risk to City infrastructure	<b>First Place</b> -No disruption to cultural heritage -Poor level of service at the culvert crossings -28% increase in risk to City infrastructure	<b>Third Place</b> -Potential disruption with extensive excavation -Poor level of service at the culvert crossings -8% increase in risk to City infrastructure	<b>Fourth Place</b> -Potential disruption with extensive excavation -Poor level of service at the culvert crossings -Access and egress limited
<b>Natural Environment</b> (Species at Risk, Terrestrial habitat, Aquatic habitat)	<b>Third Place</b> -No disruption to SAR -Disruption in upper reaches mitigated through design -Improvement in water quality	<b>Second Place</b> -No disruption to SAR -Disruption in upper reaches mitigated through design -Improvement in water quality	<b>First Place</b> -Disruption to SAR -Significant disruption to habitats in the middle reaches -Improvement in water quality	<b>Fourth Place</b> -Disruption to SAR -Significant disruption to habitats in the middle reaches -Improvement in water quality
<b>Economic</b> (Implementation and Maintenance Costs)	<b>First Place</b> -Lowest implementation cost -Continued maintenance cost	<b>Second Place</b> -Moderate implementation cost -Continued maintenance cost	<b>Third Place</b> -High implementation cost -Reduced maintenance cost	<b>Fourth Place</b> -Highest implementation cost -Reduced maintenance cost
<b>Ranking</b>	<b>First Place</b>	<b>Second Place</b>	<b>Third Place</b>	<b>Fourth Place</b>