

Evaluation Element	Alternative 1 -- No Action	Alternative 2 -- ODFW Concept	Alternative 3 -- Third Party Alternative	Alternative 4 -- TT Alternative
Hydrology				
Does not raise 100-year flood elevation	Yes	TBD, will be designed to not raise 100-year elevation	TBD, will be designed to not raise 100-year elevation	TBD, will be designed to not raise 100-year elevation
Does not raise groundwater levels on adjacent properties	Yes	0.3 feet or less	Yes	0.3 feet or less
Allows continued operations by BSDD to drain Units 1 and 3 in springtime	Yes -- but tide gate structure is failing	Yes	Yes	Yes
Biology				
Allows fish access into tidal floodplain	No	Yes, allows access throughout winter and spring, and summer and fall; allows access to 4.6 miles of channel and all of site in winter and 255 acres of site during summer/fall	Yes, but only via existing canals and during overtopping during winter; limited access in summer/fall; allows access to 2.8 miles of channel and all of site in winter, and approximately 33 acres of channels during summer/fall	Yes, allows access throughout winter and spring, and summer and fall; allows access to 3.7 miles of channel and all of site in winter and 261 acres of site during summer/fall
Provides suitable coho over-wintering habitat	No	Yes, would allow nearly unhindered access throughout 400 acre project site all winter and pathways out as river elevation declines in spring	Once whole area overtops, would allow fish access from existing floodplain pathways and canals and improved pathways out as spring drain-out occurs	Yes, would allow nearly unhindered access throughout 400 acre project site all winter and pathways out as river elevation declines in spring
Improves water quality conditions	No	River flow from tides through project site will provide good water quality in Unit 2, increased frequency of flushing on main canals	Increased frequency of flushing of main canals; same water from canals would go onto Unit 2	River flow from tides, plus cold spring water through project site will provide good water quality in Unit 2; increased frequency of flushing on main canals
Enhances habitat for multiple species including waterfowl	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does not increase mosquito populations	Yes	Yes, with daily tidal exchange	Yes, although less tidal exchange than ODFW and TT alternatives	Yes, with daily tidal exchange
Cost and O&M				
Is cost-effective	No, because existing tide gate structure is failing and all costs would be borne by BSDD members	Yes, optimize grading quantities during design	No, would not likely meet funding agencies considerations for restoration funding, thus tide gate costs would be borne by BSDD members	Yes, optimize grading quantities during design
Allows access for maintenance	Yes, but current berms are eroded and require annual maintenance	Yes	Yes	Yes
Provides stability of berms	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Permitting				
Meets agency permit requirements for fish passage	No	Yes	Only at tide gates, does not meet project objective for access into Unit 2	Yes
Minimizes fill in the floodplain	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes
Minimizes impacts to wetlands, cultural resources, zoning	N/A	Yes, further details tbd in desgn	Yes, further details tbd in design	Yes, further details tbd in design