

| Criterion: Community Values | |
|---|--|
| Attributes | Rating Scale |
| <p>Location of facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides adequate buffer from community, particularly residential developments and impacts to property values • consistency with existing land use/minimizes need for rezoning • minimizes need for rights-of-way acquisition <p>Ability to blend visually into to the surroundings</p> <p>Consistency with local standards</p> <p>Minimizes community impacts (construction and operation):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • public safety • traffic (avoids school traffic) • noise, dust, odor • lighting, aesthetics <p>Minimizes impacts to recreation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • boating, parks, trails <p>Avoids environmental/social justice concerns (siting that unfairly burdens poor and minority communities)</p> <p>Improvement to local economy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • job creation (construction and operation) • proximity to where the workforce resides • proximity to development that needs the water • attraction of tourists/visitors • support of local businesses <p>Prioritizes green initiatives, such as alternative energy/Consistency with green initiative priorities</p> | <p>1 = Acceptable to community (significantly improves public support)</p> <p>2 = Moderately acceptable to community</p> <p>3 = Neutral</p> <p>4 = Somewhat unacceptable to community</p> <p>5 = Unacceptable to community</p> |

| Criterion: Environmental Stewardship | |
|--|--|
| Attributes | Rating Scale |
| <p>Minimizes marine impacts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • concentrate disposal • threatened and endangered species • impingement/entrainment of sea life • impacts to marine life • commercial fishing and shrimping • impacts to navigation <p>Minimizes non-marine impacts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impacts to wildlife and their corridors • vegetation • threatened and endangered species • wetlands and coastal resources • water quality • groundwater • air quality • cultural/archeological resources • other natural features <p>Minimizes carbon footprint (energy usage and GHG emissions):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • raw water intake • concentrate discharge • treatment and distribution • transportation/traffic <p>Minimizes waste/residuals</p> | <p>1 = Improvement to existing environmental conditions</p> <p>2 = No impact to environmental conditions</p> <p>3 = No significant impact to environmental conditions</p> <p>4 = Impact to environment that can be mitigated both legally and socially</p> <p>5 = Impact to environment that cannot be mitigated legally or cannot be mitigated socially</p> |

| Criterion: Project Reliability | |
|---|---|
| Attributes | Rating Scale |
| <p>Parcel size:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • acreage, expansion potential • laydown area during construction (up to 3X project area) <p>Ability to accommodate pilot-testing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • early access to property • proximity to source/discharge • site work requirements <p>Vulnerability to natural hazards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • hurricanes • storm surge, flooding, sea level rise <p>Site access: roadways</p> <p>Ease of integration/proximity to existing water distribution network</p> <p>Power considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access to power (including auxiliary/standby power, fuel shipments if needed, and multiple power grid connectivity) • ability to accommodate alternative energy <p>Ability to sustain emergency operations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • chemical shipment accessibility • fuel shipments, power • transportation access <p>Reliability of raw water supply/access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • water quality reliability/consistency (e.g., impact of shipping lanes) <p>Reliability of conveyance to/from plant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • raw water, concentrate discharge • distribution access <p>Site security (vulnerability to terrorist threat)</p> <p>Project will operate 24/7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • buffer space needed • compatibility with adjacent land use | <p>1 = Favorable</p> <p>2 = Acceptable</p> <p>3 = Acceptable with work</p> <p>4 = Unfavorable</p> <p>5 = Fatal flaw</p> |

| Criterion: Permittability | |
|--|---|
| Attributes | Rating Scale |
| <p>Minimizes number of permits required</p> <p>Ability to obtain necessary permits and agency approvals</p> <p>Time required to obtain necessary permits and approvals (schedule impacts)</p> <p>Duration of permits required</p> <p>Adverse permit conditions</p> <p>Minimizes opportunity for permit protest</p> <p>Minimizes potential for litigation</p> | <p>1 = No impact on permitting or approval process</p> <p>2 = Permits or approvals can be secured ahead of project schedule</p> <p>3 = Permits or approvals can be secured within established project schedule</p> <p>4 = Permits or approvals can be secured, but likely to impact project schedule, siting, design, or operations</p> <p>5 = Permits or approvals difficult or unlikely to be secured</p> |

| Criterion: Risk | |
|---|--|
| Attributes | Rating Scale |
| Presence of wetlands, sensitive/protected habitat, etc. Vulnerability to natural hazards (e.g., hurricanes, tropical storms, storm surge, etc.) Compatibility with current/future land use Insurability (i.e., location in flood plain) Public perception Funding risk: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • jeopardizes potential for federal funding • jeopardizes investment funding (e.g., Citibank) Previous land uses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • presence of fuel UST, landfills, historical/archeological Associated costs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cost to relocate current site occupants • number of parcels/current owners/occupants • who currently owns it? owned by Supplier/Ex Officio? Property buffer Exposure to potential litigation; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential to invoke imminent domain Site geology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential for sinkholes • erosion (including erosion due to concentrate discharge) • suitability for construction • presence of Coquina formation (needed for well intakes) Potential for competing interests/alternative land use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • other potential property buyers, bidding war increases costs Access: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • right of way access, power, deliveries, roadways • impact of future DOT projects (+/-) Timing/site availability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ability to contract quickly • bidding war increases site costs • who will purchase it? Single vs. multiple parcels Alternative site uses/"Plan B" (if no desal plant, could land have alternative use) Big enough for additional uses (e.g., bottling plant, desal education center); ability of the site to accommodate a larger future facility Politics/control over land development process/current ownership (owned by current Supplier or Ex Officio?) | 1 = Favorable 2 = Acceptable 3 = Acceptable with work 4 = Unfavorable 5 = Fatal flaw |

| Criterion: Comparative Cost | |
|---|--|
| Attributes | Rating Scale |
| <p>Cost of property</p> <p>Cash flow/timing of funding/property availability</p> <p>Number of parcels/acquisitions</p> <p>Proximity to critical resources (distance and route):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • source/intake; concentrate discharge • distribution systems; power <p>Cumulative cost for site development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • site prep (fill, grading, de-watering) • protection from natural events (i.e., flood walls, berms, dikes) • access road improvements • power • re-zoning? • mitigation (wetlands, Gopher tortoise, species impact, etc.) • utility relocations • right-of-way access; no. of parcels • suitability for construction • roadways, etc. • reclamation/brownfields <p>Impact to operating costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • distance • elevation/pumping requirements <p>Note: Cost will be analyzed in dollars per thousand gallons, based on Net Present Value (expressed in 2011 dollars)</p> | <p>\$ per thousand gallons, based on Net Present Value (expressed in 2011 dollars)</p> |