

CHEHALIS BASIN BOARD

Presented by Sam Imperati, ICMresolutions

5/4/2023



Development of Long-Term Integrated Strategy Approach





Key Process Decisions and Why Decision-Making is Difficult

> Next Steps and Appendix



2

Big Picture

What are the key process decisions facing the Board?

- 1) What are the key upcoming substantive issues?
- 2) L-T Strategy Delivery Date?
- 3) What are you comparing and how?
- 4) What level of detail and information certainty is needed?
- 5) What is the target date for your PROCESS decision?

Let's begin exploring the options

No Decisions Today – We'll talk Offline Before Next Meeting

Why are "Tough" Decisions Difficult?

Common psychological traps and biases examples:

- Concession Aversion: We distort the value of an offer so as to overvalue the loss and undervalue the gain.
- Construal Biases: We think that others hold more extreme views than they do.
- Sunk Costs: We tend to "throw good money after bad," favoring alternatives for which we have already incurred substantial costs, even though these costs are gone and, therefore, the same for all alternatives.

There are no facts about the future!

Why are **<u>Group</u>** Decisions More Difficult?

- 1) Focus on two options: right or wrong
- 2) Focus on a few criteria
- 3) Focus on positions instead of interests
- 4) Desire to convince not explore
- 5) Rabbit Holes

5

- 6) Explaining decisions to constituencies not at the table
- 7) Disagreement over facts, risk, or the future
- 8) Not knowing how/when to reach a decision
- 9) Internal power dynamics
- 10) Concerns surrounding implementation

1) What are the Key Upcoming Substantive Issues?

- **LAND:** What are the next steps?
- **FRE:** What are the next steps?
- ASRP: What level of implementation over what timeline should the Board include in any comparative analyses, and how should non-habitat restoration actions (All-H, predation, etc.) be dealt with in the Chehalis Basin Strategy?
- **Skookumchuck Dam:** What are the next steps?
- North Shore Levee, CFAR, Local Projects, Erosion Management, Floodplain Acquisition: What specific elements of these programs should be included in every package for further analysis?

Issues, contd.

- Climate Change/Modeling: Does the Board want to update the projections for the basin with the new climate information that will be coming out in 2023? If yes, do climate change or EDT modeling assumptions need to change for ASRP? Modeling: H&H (Riverflow2D vs HecRas), climate change modeling (ensemble vs ranges), fish modeling (EDT and NOAA life cycle)?
- Benefit/Cost Analyses: Does the Board want a comparative benefit-cost and socioeconomic/E.J. evaluation of the LAND and FRE? Relative costs and flood benefits, or should it include modeled impacts to aquatic species through EDT and/or NOAA life cycle modeling, etc.? When?

2) L-T Strategy Delivery Date?

EIS Track

1) Before SEPA EIS?

- 2) Before FEIS?
- 3) After SEPA EIS?
- 4) After FEIS?
- 5) As Long as it Takes?

Budget Track

- 1) End of This Biennium?
- 2) During Next Biennium?
- 3) During Subsequent Biennium?
- 4) As Long as it Takes?



Where are We Going and When: Phased CBS Strategy



Mid-Term Action Implementation and Release of the Final Integrated Long-Term Strategy

Beginning with the 2023-25 biennium until all final elements of the Strategy have been decided on and long-term funding sources are identified, <mark>est. late 2025-2026</mark>

- Continued and scaled project implementation
- Advancement of scientific and technical information, exploratory analyses, and evaluation of options
- Board decisions (provisional as needed) on:
 - \circ Flood damage reduction approach
 - Appropriate long-term investment levels
 - $\circ\,$ Implementation prioritization and sequencing
 - Finalized outcomes measures
 - Identification of possible new governance structures
- Funding portfolio identified
- Continued program development

Integrated Strategy Full Implementation with Ongoing Monitoring and Adaptive Management

Late 2025-2026 (est.) until TBD

- Long-term funding portfolio secured
- Formation of new governance structures, as needed
- Scaled and accelerated implementation
- Monitoring and adaptive management
- Periodic reporting on the Strategy's performance
- Ongoing coordination with basin partners

Update Timeline





EIS Scheduling Notes

A **"what-if" discussion** designed to explore the **scheduling implications** if the FCZD provides a revised project submittal for the SEPA and NEPA EISs in early (Q1) 2024, followed by a revised mitigation submittal 2-4 months later.

Dates are **fluid and interdependent**

Hypothetical schedule – Nothing more

Discussion aid to begin scheduling discussions surrounding timing options for an integrated long-term strategy.

EIS Scheduling Update

- FCZD stated they will provide a revised project submittal in early (Q1) 2024, followed by a revised mitigation submittal 2-4 months later (Q2) 2024.
- Ecology generally assumes 12 months to get from Draft to Final i.e., early 2025, based on the above.

• Major Assumptions:

If new information requires new analysis, the timeline could be extended for new modeling or monitoring to determine impacts.
 Major aspects of the LAND are not at a stage to be included quantitatively, i.e., they don't have sponsors or funding.
 SEPA requires a SUPP EIS if there are substantial changes to a proposal that could result in significant adverse environmental impacts not addressed in the draft.

EIS Scheduling Update

- Corps is not currently able to make any timeline commitments.

 Additional modeling of proposed mitigation actions to incorporate ESA
 Section 7 and tribal treaty rights comments may be necessary before FEIS publication. The time for modeling and its analysis are not included above.
 - Note: Final NEPA EIS extended from 2 to 6 months. FEIS requires the issuance of a Section 7 Biological Opinion or Letter of Concurrence (BiOp/LOC) by both USFWS and NMFS.
 - Note: ROD extended from 3 months to 1 year. Issuance depends on the completion of Section 106 and tribal treaty rights determination.
- Overall schedule dependent upon timely discussions, coordination, and input from FCZD, Ecology, USACE, WDFW, USFWS, and NMFS, in addition to tribal consultation and coordination.

Board Discussion

What are the advantages and disadvantages of deciding on an integrated long-term flood damage reduction strategy before one or more EISs are issued?

3) What are Comparing and How?

- **a) Stay the Course:** Silo Approach with data and policy information separately
- **b)** Comparative Analyses: Packages and Decision Table Approach
- c) Other Approach?

<u>If</u> Comparative Analyses, What <u>Could</u> it Look Like

1. Agree on a **process** with Benefit-cost work.

- **a.** What is it that we are comparing, and at what level?
- b. Are we simply doing FRE vs LAND, or are we doing packages that include a combination of flood, fish, and dual-purpose actions?
- 2. At most, we would **be teeing up** alternatives for comparison, **not picking one.**
- 3. Facilitator creates draft exercises for Board to create **potential packages**.

Over Simplistic Package Concept

	Aquatic	Species		Flood [Damage Red	uction			Integrated P	Programs and	Projects
Element	Aquatic	Other	Aber-Hoq	FRE	LAND	CFAR	Flood	Skook	Erosion	Floodplain	Initiative for
	Species	Aquatic	North	and			Authority	Dam	Mgmt.	Acquisition	Working Riparian
	Restor.	Species	Shore	Airport			Work		Program	Program	Lands
	Plan	Actions	Levee	Levee							
Package											
	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do
0	Nothing	Nothing	Nothing	Nothing	Nothing	Nothing	Nothing	Nothing	Nothing	Nothing	Nothing
1								Fish			
								Passage			
								Only			
								Flood			
2								Storage			
								Only			
								Combo			
3								Fish-			
								Flood			
								Dam			
4								Removal			

Which elements will be included in all packages?

Comparative analyses, cont.

- 4. Facilitator, in consultation with staff and consultants, **refine exercises** with descriptions, ranges of actions, and a list of potential common elements.
- **5. Board does preliminary scoping exercises** at a regular meeting with aggravated results to Board to refine alternatives to further develop with additional data.
- 6. Information presented to Board at retreat/charette in order to create 2-3 packages for comparative evaluation.
- 7. Conduct **comparative analysis with benefit-cost work** in partnership with a CBB subcommittee.
- ³5. Preliminary Results to Board for analysis and next steps

Using Decision Tables to Evaluate Packages

- 1) Communication is **focused and structured**
- 2) Starts with **shared interests NOT positions** using the **Umbrella Question** to explore versus debate
- **3)** Board develops the process and vets the data
- 4) Visual (tables simplify complexity & boost collective thinking
- 5) Decision matrices allow for **quantitative and qualitative** evaluation (Likert Scales, or: 1) 2 3
- 6) "What-if" Analyses
- 7) Transparency and future success measures
- 8) Teeing up future Board discussions and refinement

Decision Table Example



1) What markets is the airport best suited to serve?

2) What are the primary development alternatives? 3) Are there environmental constraints that impact future alternatives?

4) Are there legal constraints that impact future alternatives?

What is the role of the Troutdale Airport in the future?

5) What are the financial impacts of these alternatives over the next 20 years? 6) What are the community economic impacts of the alternatives over the next 20 years? 7) How does the community feel about these alternatives? 8) What development alternatives will be recommended to the Port Executive Director?

TTD

PROPOSED RANGE OF ROLES



Basic Table

Evaluation Criteria

		Alignment with forecasts	Community economic beneîits	Community planning compatibility	Environmental impacts	Financial impacts	Fit with local airport system	Legal feasibility
/es	A: Maximum commercial / industrial							
lternativ	B : More commercial / industrial; less business aviation							
A	C : More business aviation; less commercial / industrial							
	D: Maximum aviation							

Select Evaluation Factors for Each Criterion

Weighted Evaluation Criteria

Alignment with forecasts	Community economic benefits	Community planning compatibility	Environmental impacts	Financial impacts	Fit with local airport system	Legal feasibility
Fit with aviation	Jobs at TTD	Surface / active	Air quality	20 year capital	Assessment	Compliance
and land use				expenditures	of airspace	With local,
the 50 th Perc		impacts		(ROI)	impacts	federal laws
	Average			Ability to fund	Delevuithin	Compliance
	Average wage of	Relationship to	water quality	Ability to lund	Role Within	
	JODS AT TID	IRIP		capital costs	Port system	FAA grants
	Business	Relationship to	Noise impacts	20 year	Role within	Contractual
	revenues at TTD	surrounding		operating costs	the regional	commitments
		land uses			airport	
					system	
	State /local taxes	Fit & Flexibility	Environmental	Expected	Assessment	
	for locals		improvement	operating	of FAA	
				revenues	NextGen	
	Economic		Compatibility	Private		
	impact to local		with enviro	investment		
	economy		assets			
	Education,		Natural			
	training, and		resources			
	workforce					
	development					

Scoring Alternatives

Assign a color to each alternative that describes how well the alternative aligns with each evaluation category compared to other alternatives.

Very favorable / well-aligned

2

Neutral / neither favorable nor unfavorable



Not favorable / not well-aligned

Data Example: Alignment with Forecasts

Alternative	Positives	Negatives	Color
A : Maximum commercial / industrial		Displaces all users.	
B : More commercial / industrial; less business aviation	 Accommodates recreational and flight training. 	 Does not accommodate business. Limited room for facility expansion. 	
C : More business aviation; less commercial / industrial	 Accommodates similar to existing. 	 Limited room for expansion. Limited chance of attracting more business. 	
D : Maximum aviation	 Meets needs of larger aircraft. 	 Larger than needed to meet demand. New separation standards will displace existing structures/parking. 	

Preliminary Results



C: More Business Aviation; Less Commercial/Industrial

D: Maximum Aviation

Sensitivity Analysis

Average Score and What-If

	Alignment With Forecast	Community Economic Benefit	Community Planning Compatibility	Environmental Impact	Financial Impact	Fit with Local Airport System	Legal Feasibility	Totals
Category Weight:	13%	14%	14%	13%	16%	15%	15%	100%
Alternative A Average	1.1	4.2	4.5	1.3	2.7	2.3	2.6	2.68
Alternative B Average:	4.3	4.7	4.7	3.0	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.30
Alternative C Average:	4.9	3.5	3.5	3.3	4.6	4.9	4.9	4.25
Alternative D Average:	2.7	1.3	1.5	3.7	1.1	1.5	2.8	2.06

Why This Approach Works

- Focuses on the **integrated** part of the strategy
- Combines **both policy and technical**
- Compares alternatives **systematically**
- Everyone's views are considered
- Iterative
- Thought process and analysis **documented**
- **Pros and Cons** for each alternative are **highlighted**
- Your team will be involved

Board Discussion: Advantages and Disadvantages



- 1. Stay the Course with the Current Silo approach
- Comparative Analyses with Packages and Decision Tables
- 3. Other Approaches?

4) What Level of Detail and Information Certainty is Needed?

- a) Less than EIS level
- b) Same as EIS level
- c) More than EIS level
- d) Other

5) What is the Target Date for Your PROCESS Decision?

a) June

b) July

c) Other: _____

Next Steps

We'll Discuss this Offline Before the Next Meeting

6/1/23 Meeting: Long-Term Strategy Preparation, Approach, and Timeline Discussion with Possible Decision

Please see the Appendix

for More Information

- A) 10 Steps Explained in Detail
- **B)** Video Explanation

C) Worksheets from Video

THANK YOU!





Appendix



Decision Table Ten Step Process

- 1) Identify the problem with an open-ended question
- 2) Preliminarily identify alternatives
- 3) Preliminarily identify evaluation criteria
- 4) Weigh evaluation criteria
- 5) Gather quantifiable data for each criterion
- 6) Evaluate each alternative against each criterion
- 7) Eliminate, refine & combine
- 8) Select the best alternative, create a conditional and adaptable implementation plan, and system for monitoring success
- 9) Monitor and reconvene
- 10) Celebrate success

1 Identify the problem with an open-ended question

- Decisions are often framed too narrowly: "Should we do this or that?" Instead, "What are we trying to achieve with this decision... the Umbrella Question?
- Agree on elements of high-level comparative analysis.
- What is it that we are comparing, at what level?
- Confirming that we would start pre-SEPA and NEPA FEIS?
- Focus only on teeing up alternatives for this high-level comparison, not on picking one

2 Preliminarily identify alternative

- List all possible solutions you can think of (creatively and realistically) focusing on the Umbrella Question.
- LAND vs. FRE or Packages that include a combination of flood, fish, and dual-purpose actions?
- Identify what common elements are included in each.
- Staff drafts an exercise to allow people to create packages
- Staff invites consultants to refine exercise, including descriptions and ranges of actions, perhaps High, Medium, and Low variations.
- Both develop a proposed list of common elements

Cont.

Preliminarily identify alternative

- Board does preliminary, offline (not at Board meeting) scoping exercise (voting and ex-officio, anonymously collected, aggregate results)
- Present results to Board at the next Board meeting to refine alternatives for further staff/consultant development, including additional data, including mitigation packages
- Board explores at charette in order to create 2-3 packages for comparative evaluation – <u>not</u> decision.
- Not constrained/burdened by benefit-cost
- Decide on Benefit-Cost Analysis (Preliminary high-level and/or
- ³⁹ Final Analysis)

3

Preliminarily identify evaluation criteria

What Factors Matter for Your Decision? Start with basic questions:

- What is important here?
- What are we looking for? What do we want?
- Make a long list with all potential criteria that come to mind when you go through those questions. Redundancy is OK at this stage
- Now, reduce your list to a small set of criteria to those that are most important, don't overlap, and cover important goal
- Add Climate Change: → Hydro (Riverflow 2D) → Fish (EDT or EDT/LCM)

Cont.

3 Preliminarily identify evaluation criteria

- Ask for purposes of moving forward, "Based on these criteria, are we willing to commit to the outcome of this process?" If No: what is still redundant or missing? Revise your criteria until everybody is on-board.
- Organize your work from Steps 2 and 3 in a matrix.
 - Fill in your own criteria as column headers (from most to least important)
 - Fill in your own alternatives as row headers

4 Weigh evaluation criteria

- Rank your criterion alphabetically
- Allocate 100 points between them

Gather quantifiable data for each criteria

 Make each of those criteria quantifiable. (Even subjective thoughts can be quantifiable, e.g. with a scale: 1 = Not Likely, 7 = Very Likely)

Evaluate each alternative against each criteria

 Assign a color to each alternative that describes how well the alternative aligns with each evaluation category compared to other alternatives.

GREEN: Very favorable / well-aligned with the category

VELLOW: Neutral / neither favorable nor unfavorable

QRED: Not favorable / not well-aligned with the category

Eliminate, refine, & combine

- Improve existing alternatives by asking:
 - What do you like about each of the high-scoring alternatives?
 - Is there a way to combine those strengths?
 - Is there a way to eliminate/improve the weaknesses?
 - List the new Alternatives and Re-Evaluate

8

Select the best alternative, create an implementation plan, and system for monitoring success

- Consider Benefit-Cost with EJ/Socio-Economic Analyses
- Add sequencing
- Select the optimal conditional package

Monitor and reconvene

- Implement decisions, monitor them, and have a plan to reengage if problems are encountered. Publish results and learn.
 What are some foreseeable problems you might encounter?
 - What are some foreseeable problems you might encounter?
 - How will you handle them?
 - When and where will you reconvene?

10 Celebrate success

• Select optimal design using consensus polling

Decision Table Explanation Video



<u>http://www.teuscher-coaching.com/how-to-</u> <u>make-better-group-decisions-video/</u>

Start at 4:04

Video Example

Choosing a Route for New Tillamook to Oceanside Transmission Line



AMO	Evaluator Information:													
	Name: Dat	e:	Select one: Member of the public Proper	rty Owner Property Ac	ldress:									
			Step 1: Weighting Evaluation Criteria											
Evaluation	Social		Land Use / Environmental		E	conomic								
Evaluation	A) Property Effects and Visual Impacts	B) Reliability	C) Impacts to Farm / Forest / Commercial	D) Environmental Impacts	E) Tillamook PUD Costs	F) Community Economics (Benefits / Impacts)								
Sample Measures	1) Number of unique land owners 2) Number of tax kots 3) Total acreage of privately-owned land within easement 4) Percentage of easement on privately-owned land 5) Number of private proporties that have a transmission structure on it 6) Percentage of route NOT co-located with existing electric lines 7) Number of buildings within 200° of transmission centerline 8) Cuantity of transmission structures (number of 1-pole, 2-pole, 3-pole) 9) Average pole height	Considerations: Frequency and duration of potential outages, cost to get back online, difficulty of getting back online, (e.g. accessibility, number of watlands, water crossings, soils, need for special equipment), etc.	1) Total acres of forestland within easement 2) Total acres of farmland within easement 3) Total acres of armmroid land within easement 4) Average percentage of easement on property 5) Largest percentage of easement on property 6) Average percentage of structure footprint on property 7) Largest percentage of structure footprint on property 8) Percentage of route in forestland NOT co-located with existing private access roads	1) Total acres of wetland within easement 2) Total number of streams that cross transmission line	1) Construction costs (Infrastructure, roads, etc.) 2) Operation & maintenance 3) Time to Construct	Considerations: Job creation, business revenue, property values, construction disruption, site development options, etc.								
-		Rating Instruction	s: Circle one number in each column to rate the importance of the evaluation factor.											
Extremely Important	10	10	10	10	10	10								
Very	9	9	9	9	9	9								
Important	8	8	8	8	8	8								
-	7	7	7	7	7	7								
Important	6	6	6	6	6	6								
Moderately	5	5	5	5	5	5								
Important	4	4	4	4	4	4								
Slightly	3	3	3	3	3	3								
Important	2	2	2	2	2	2								
Not at all Important	1	1	1	1	1	1								
		Step 2: S	coring Alternatives based on Evaluation Factors	·	and the second second									
	Rating instructions: Circle one con	or (Green, Yellow, Red) in each rating ce	Leaving any cell blank will result in a vote of 3 = "Neutral".	ven-alighed 🧿 = Neutral 🖣	= Poony-aligned									
Measures Guidance	Fewer unique property owners, smaller private acreage, lower Percentage private land, fewer number of private properties with structures, and lower Percentage of route NOT co-located with existing lines is better.	Lower frequency and duration of outages, cost, and difficulty to get back on line is better.	Fewer acres and lesser impact on practices is better.	Fewer acres of wetland and fewer number of stream crossings is better.	Lower costs of construction, operation & maintenance, and less time to construct is better.	Subjective valuation of the above considerations: Net between positive and negative factors.								
Evaluation Factors and Sample Measures	VOTE: Usual International Control of the State of the Sta	VOTE: I	VOTE: IN Communications of the second	VOTE: Intercts 2) Surgaring that coas 2) Surgaring that coas 1) Nuclear for the tail transmitter for the tail 1) Nuclear for the tail tail 1) Nuclear for the tail tail	Vote: Coasts Si Time to Construct 3) Time to Construct 3) Time to Construct 1) Estimated Arminal O.R.M 1) Estimated Arminal O.R.M 10 Estimated Arminal O.R.M 10 Estimated Arminal O.R.M 10 Estimated Arminal O.R.M	Votre: commutative Votre: commutative (Beanents (Impears) Your Notes: Your Notes:								
Fact	Route E1 11 27 15.8 56.1% 4 72.8% 26 31 (30,0,1) 71'	3 0 1 ~99%+	⑤ ○ ① 0 13 3.9 10.7% 33.2% <0.01% 0.1% N/A	5 1 4.8 5	3 3 1 ,300 6.5 3.5	9 0 0 9 0								
Section	Route E2 11 27 13 47.0% 5 57.7% 34 34, (33,0,1) 70'	5 <u>5</u> 1 ~99%+	ⓑ ○ ① 0 12.3 4.9 7.1% 52.9% < 0.01% 0.1% N/A	5 0 4 .7 4	3 1 ,500 7.5 4									
	Route E3 14 30 15.1 54.5% 8 68.7% 29 52 (31,0,1) 71*	99% +	● ● ● ● 0 13.5 3.8 11.0% 47.4% < 0.01% 0.1% N/A	9 9 6 .4 6	9 9 1 ,400 7.0 3									
Central	Route C1 11 21 26 84.2% 8 76.7% 3 24 (12,5,7) 75'	3 3 1 ~99%+	5 6 1 .9 12.6 0 3.7% 11.5% < 0.01% < 0.01% N/A	6 1 25.3 12	3 1 2,900 14.5 6	6 0 0								
Section	Route C2 11 17 19.5 72.3% 7 80.1% 3 20 (9,6,5) 76'	5 0 ~99%+	5 5 5 1.9 12.7 0 4.5% 10.1% < 0.01% < 0.01% N/A	5 <mark>0</mark> 21.5 12	3 3 12,600 13.0 5	5 0 1 6 0 1								
West	Route W1 2 7 45.6 100% 7 100% 0 36 (0,27.9) 54'	5 0 1 ~99%+	6 0 1 39.9 0 0 1.5% 2.5% < 0.01% < 0.01% 92.1%	5 0 1 0 20	3 1 ,400 7.0 5	6 0 0 6 0 0								
Section	Route W2 2 8 48.8 100% 7 100% 0 39 57'	5 0 -99%+	5 3 6 42.9 0 0 2.7% 7.6% < 0.01% 0.1% 85.8%	5 0 12 0 12	5 5 1,900	5 0 0								

JAMON						
	Name: Dat	e:	Select one: Member of the public Prope	rty Owner Property Ac	ldress:	
			Step 1: Weighting Evaluation Criteria			
Evaluation	Social		Land Use / Environmental		E	conomic
Evaluation	A) Property Effects and Visual Impacts	B) Reliability	C) Impacts to Farm / Forest / Commercial	D) Environmental Impacts	E) Tillamook PUD Costs	F) Community Economics (Benefits / Impacts)
Sample Measures	1) Number of unique land owners 2) Number of tax lots 3) Total acreage of privately-owned land within easement 4) Percentage of privately-owned land 5) Number of private propenties that have a transmission structure on it 6) Percentage of route NOT co-located with existing electric lines 7) Number of buildings within 200' of transmission centorline 8) Cuantity of transmission structures (number of 1-pole, 2-pole, 3-pole) 9) Average pole height	Considerations: Frequency and duration of potential outages, cost to get back online, difficulty of getting back online, (e.g. accessibility, number of wortlands, water crossings, soils, need for special equipment), etc.	1) Total acres of forestland within easement 2) Total acres of familand within easement 3) Total acres of formitand within easement 3) Total acres of commercial land within easement 4) Average percentage of easement on property 5) Largest percentage of assement on property 6) Average percentage of structure footprint on property 7) Largest percentage of structure footprint on property 8) Percentage of outle in forestland NOT co-located with existing private access roads	 Total acres of wetland within easement Total number of streams that cross transmission line 	1) Construction costs (Infrastructure, roads, etc.) 2) Operation & maintenance 3) Time to Construct	Considerations: Job creation, business revenue, property values, construction disruption, site development options, etc.
	1	Rating Instruction	s: Circle one number in each column to rate the importance of the evaluation factor.			
Extremely Important	10	10	10	10	10	10
Very	9	9	9	9	9	9
Important	8	8	8	8	8	8
Important	7	7	7	7	7	7
important	6	6	6	6	6	6
Moderately	5	5	5	5	5	5
Important	4	4	4	4	4	4
Slightly	3	3	3	3	3	3
Important	2	2	2	2	2	2
Not at all Important	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Refine Instructioner Circle one co	Step 2: S	Scoring Alternatives based on Evaluation Factors	Mall aligned"	1 - "Poorty aligned"	
	Nating instructions, circle one co	or (Green, Tenow, Red) in each failing ce	Leaving any cell blank will result in a vote of 3 = "Neutral".	neiraigneu 🥣 - Neutrai 🖣	- Poony-anglied	T
Measures Guidance	Fewer unique property owners, smaller private acreage, lower Percentage private land, fewer number of private properties with structures, and lower Percentage of route NOT co-located with existing loss	Lower frequency and duration of outages, cost, and difficulty to get	Fewer acres and lesser impact on practices is better.	Fewer acres of wetland and fewer number of stream crossings is better.	Lower costs of construction, operation & maintenance, and less time to construct is better.	Subjective valuation of the above considerations: Net between positive and negative factors.
Evaluation Factors and Sample Measures	List propose the second secon	d alternati	VOTE: I COMPARENT CONTRACT CONTRACT AND	VOTE: In Pacts 1) Surgesting that cross 1) Surgesting that cross 1) Networks until (a) 1) Networks until (a) 1) Networks until (a)	VOTE: Coats 3) Time to Construct 3) Time to Construct 3) Time to Construct 3) Time to Construct 4) Estimated Annual O & M 1) Estimated Annual O & M 1) Estimated Annual O & M 1) Estimated Annual O & M	Votte: Community Votte: Community Banents i Imperate Your Notes: Your Notes:
Fact	Route E1 11 27 15.8 56.1% 4 72.8% 26 31 (30,0.1) 71*	3 1 ~99%+	⑤ ○ ⑥ 0 13 3.9 10.7% 33.2% < 0.01% 0.1% №A	5 1 4.8 5	3 1 ,300 6 .5 3 .5	9 0 0 9 0
Section	Route E2 11 27 13 47.0% 5 57.7% 34 (33.0,1) (33.0,1) 70'	5 0 1 ~99%+	ⓑ ○ ① 0 12.3 4.9 7.1% 52.9% < 0.01% 0.1% N/A		5 1 1,500 7.5 4	
	Route E3 14 30 15.1 54.5% 8 68.7% 29 (31,0,1) 71'	~99%+	♥ ♥ 0 13.5 3.8 11.0% 47.4% < 0.01% 0.1% N/A	6.4 6	9 9 1 ,400 7.0 3	
Central	11 21 26 84.2% 8 76.7% 3 (12.57) (12.57) 75'	5 3 1 ~99%+	5 1 1.9 12.6 0 3.7% 11.5% < 0.01% < 0.01% N/A	3 0 1 25.3 12	3 1 2,900 14.5 6	
Section	Route C2 11 17 19.5 72.3% 7 80.1% 3 (9.6,5) 76'	•99%+	♥ ♥ 1.9 12.7 0 4.5% 10.1% < 0.01% < 0.01% N/A	21.5 12	2 ,600 13.0 5	
West	Route W1 2 7 45.6 100% 7 100% 0 (0,27,9)	5 <u>3</u> ~99%+	6 0 1 39.9 0 0 1.5% 2.5% < 0.01% < 0.01% 92.1%	5 0 0 20	3 1 ,400 7.0 5	
Section	Route W2 2 8 48.8 100% 7 100% 0 (0.21,18) 57"	🔮 💛 🖤 ~99%+	2 42.9 0 0 2.7% 7.6% 42.9 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	U 0 12	🔮 💛 😈 1,900 9.5 5	



AMO																Eva	aluator	r Infor	rmatio	1:																	
	Name:									Date	:			Seleo	ct one	:		Memt	ber of I	he pu	olic		Prope	ty Own	er	Property	Address	:									_
														Step 1:	Weig	ghtin	g Eva	aluat	tion C	riteri	a																
Evaluation							Soc	cial																									omi	•			
Evaluation Factors			A) Prop	erty Eff	ects an	d Visua	I Impac	ts			<			A	SS	ig	n	in	np	or	ta	nc	e v	ve	ig	hts	fo	r c	;ri	tei	ria					fits / Impac	cts)
Sample	1) Number of un 2) Number of tæ 3) Total acreage 4) Percentage ol	ique land c lots e of privat f easeme	owners ely-owner nt on priv	l land with ately-ow	thin ease ned land	ment					Considerati Frequency outages, co difficulty of	ons: and dur ist to ge getting l	ation of potential at back online, back online, (e.g.	2) Total acres 3) Total acres 4) Average p	of correction	mercial ge of ea	l land wit	hin eas	sement perty					2) Total n cross trar	umber o Ismissio	streams that line	it 2) Oper 3) Time	ation &	mainten struct	ance		JOD Crea construe	ation, bu ction dis	isiness re ruption, si	renue, propert te developmer	y values, nt options, etc	tc.
Measures	5) Number of er 6) Fincentage of 7) Nimber of bu 8) Chantity of tra 9) All grage pole	f route Na ildings wi ansmissic height	01 co-loc thin 200 n structu	ated with of transn res (num	i existing nission co ber of 1-	electric i enterline pole, 2-p	lines ole, 3-pol	e)			crossings, s equipment)	soils, ne , etc.	ed for special	6) Average p 7) Largest pe 8) Percentage roads	ercenta rcenta e of r	ge o stru a fore	ucture fo icture foo estland N	otprint otprint o VOT co	on prop on prope p-located	enty nty with ex	sting priv	vate acc	ess														
													Rating Instructio	ns: Circle one i	number	in each	column	to rate	the imp	ortance	of the ev	aluation	factor.														
Extremely Important					10								10					10	0						10				10						10		
Very Important	_				9								9					9							9		_		9						9		
	_	7											8					8	i ,						8				8						8		
Important	-	6											6					6							6				6						6		_
		6 5											5					5							5				5						5		
Important	5 4											4					4							4				4						4			
Slightly					3								3					3							3				3						3		
Important					2								2					2	:						2				2						2		
Not at all Important					1								1					1							1				1						1		
							Rating	netructio	ons: Circl	e one col	or (Green V	ollow 6	Step 2: S	Scoring A	Itern	ative	s bas	sed o	on Ev	aluatio	ion F	actor	S = "V	loll-aliano	d" 🙆	= "Noutral"	() = "F	Poorlu-a	ianed"								
							Raung	nstructio	ons. Girci	e one con	or (Green, T	enow, P	ted) in each rating of	Leaving any	cell bla	ank will	result i	n a vot	te of 3 =	"Neutra	d".		0-1	ren-angrie	u 🥑	- Neutrai		-oony-a	igned								
Measures Guidance	Fewer uniquiand, fewer nur	ue prope mber of	rty owne private p IOT co-l	ers, sma propertie ocated v	ller priva s with s with exis	ate acre tructure sting line	age, low s, and lo es is bett	ver Perce ower Per ter.	entage p rcentage	rivate of route	Lower fro outages, bac	equend cost, a ck on li	cy and duration of and difficulty to get ine is better.		Fewer	acres a	and less	ser imp	pact on	practice	es is bel	tter.		Fewer a fewer cros	icres of numbei ssings i	wetland an of stream better.	d Lo opera ti	tion & i me to c	sts of c mainter construc	onstruct nance, a ct is bet	tion, ind less ter.	Subjec Net	ctive va t betwe	luation o en positi	the above o ve and negat	onsideration	ins:
Evaluation Factors and Sample Measures	land, fewer number of private properties with structures. and lower Percentage NOT co-located with existing lines is better.					VOTE: F. Inthe & Visual Inthe & Visual Inthe	coperty Effects	Overall	VOTE.	I) Forestian easement lacreen	2) Farmland view	3) Community assembly	A) Aver percial land within	b) prue assembly	6) 1 Largest easement	warage structure	CU	5) of toresult extra tootprint	VOTE: 11:1 CONTENDE	Were law Farm!	transmissi easem	VOT. Imp.	oosts the oosts the te: Environmental	Lestimated Colling of Sh	2) Estimated Amore Single	3) Time to Co 3) Time to Co 1) (months) & M	NOTE: Costs	Tillamook PUD		Your Notes:	Benefits Imp.	OTE: Community					
East	Route E1	11	27	15.8	56.1%	4	72.8%	26	31 (30,0,1) 34	71'	60	0	~99%+	996	0	1	3 3	.9 1	10.7%	33.2%	< 0.01%	0.1%	N/A	6	0	4.8 5	0	0	1,300	6.5	3.5	9	0 0			30	0
Section	Route E2	11	27	13	47.0%	5	57.7% 68.7%	34 29	(33,0,1) 32	70'	60	0	~99%+		0	12	.3 4	.9	7.1%	52.9% 17.4%	< 0.01%	0.1%	N/A	6 0	0	4.7 4	6		1,500	7.5	4	6				60	0
	Baut: Of	44	00	10.1	04.0%	0	70.70	20	(31,0,1) 24	70	0.0	-	001						0.70	4.52	0.0170	0.176	1074	0		5 1 1	-		1,400	1.0	-					0.0	-
Central Section	Route C1	11	21 17	26 19.5	64.2% 72.3%	8 7	76.7% 80.1%	3	(12,5,7)	75'	60	0	~99%+		1.9	12		0	4.5%	10.1%	< 0.01%	< 0.01%	N/A	6	0	1.5 12	6		2,900	14.5	6 5	6				00	0
West	Route W1	2	7	45.6	100%	7	100%	0	(9,6,5) 36 (0.27.0)	54'	6 0	0	~99%+	6 0	39.9	9 0		0	1.5%	2.5%	< 0.01%	< 0.01%	92.1%	6	0	0 20	6	0	1,400	7.0	5	6	0 0			5 0	0
Section	Route W2	2	8	48.8	100%	7	100%	0	39 (0,21,18)	57'	6 3	0	~99%+	6 0	42.9	9 (0	2.7%	7.6%	< 0.01%	0.1%	85.8%	6	0	0 12	6	0 0	1,900	9.5	5	6	0 0			6 0	0

Evaluation Categories	Social	
Evaluation Factors	A) Property Effects and Visual Impacts	B) Reliability
Sample Measures	 Number of unique land owners Number of tax lots Total acreage of privately-owned land within easement Percentage of easement on privately-owned land Number of private properties that have a transmission structure on it Percentage of route NOT co-located with existing electric lines Number of buildings within 200' of transmission centerline Quantity of transmission structures (number of 1-pole, 2-pole, 3-pole) Average pole height 	Considerations: Frequency and duration of potential outages, cost to get back online, difficulty of getting back online, (e.g. accessibility, number of wetlands, water crossings, soils, need for special equipment), etc.
	Rating Instructions: Circle one number in each column to rate the importance of the eval	uation factor.
Extremely Important	10	10
Very	9	9
Important	8	8
Important	7	7
important	6	6
Moderately	5	5
Important	4	4
Slightly	3	3
Important	2	2
Not at all Important	1	1

Weighted Criteria Results



AMO	Evaluator Information:																													
Name: Date: Select one												ect one:		Me	ember o	of the p	oublic	Pro	opert	y Owner	Property A	ddress: _								
												Step 1	: Weig	hting	Evalu	ation	Crite	eria												
Evaluation Categories						Soci	al								Lar	nd Us	se / E	Enviro	nment	al						Econ	omic			
Evaluation Factors		A) Pro	perty Eff	ects an	d Visual	Impacts				B) F	Reliability		C) I	mpacts	s to Farn	n / Fores	st / Con	nmercial		C	D) Environme	ental Impacts	E) 1	fillamook Pl	UD Costs	F) Co	mmunity	/ Economi	cs (Benefit	s / Impacts)
Sample Measures	1) Number of unique 2) Number of tax lots 3) Total acreage of p 4) Percentage of eas 5) Number of private 6) Percentage of rout 7) Number of building 8) Quantity of transm 9) Average pole heig	ivately-own ement on pr properties the NOT co-k is within 200 ission struct	ed land wit ivately-own nat have a cated with l' of transn ures (num	thin ease ned land transmis existing nission co ber of 1-p	ment sion struc electric lir enterline pole, 2-pol	cture on it nes Ie, 3-pole)			Co Fre ou diff act or c eq	equency and d tages, cost to ficulty of gettin cessibility, nur ossings, soils, uipment), etc.	uration of potential get back online, g back online, (e.g. nber of watlands, water need for special	1) Total acm 2) Total acm 3) Total acm 4) Average 5) Largest p 6) Average 7) Largest p 8) Percenta roads	es of forest es of farmla es of comm percentage ercentage percentage ercentage ge of route	Iland with nercial la e of ease of easer e of struc of struct in fores	hin easem in easem and within ement on ment on p clure footp ture footp ture footp tland NO	nent easemer property property print on pro rint on pro T co-locat	nt roperty operty ted with	existing priv	ate access	1 2 0) Total acres oi asement) Total number ross transmissi	wetland within of streams that on line	1) Constru roads, 2) Operati 3) Time to	etion costs (In etc.) on & maintena Construct	frastructure,	Consid- Job cre constru	erations: eation, bus iction disri	iiness revenu uption, site d	ue, property a evelopment	values, options, etc.
Rating Instruction										s: Circle one	e number ir	n each o	olumn to	rate the ir	nportant	ce of the eva	aluation facto	or.												
Important				10							10					10					1	0		10				10)	
Very				9							9					9					9)		9				9		
mportant		8									8					8					1	5		8				8		
Important		7									7					7								7				7		
	6										6					6						i		6				6		
Moderately		5									5					5						5		5				5		
mportant				4							4					4					4	•		4				4		
Slightly				3							3					3						5		3				3		
Not at all				2							2					2						2		2				2		
Important				1						0			ah		4									1	-			1		
						Rating Ins	struction	5			onectia	acts	ap	ou	τp	roh	00	sea	alle			es								
	Fewer unique pr	operty owr	ers. sma	ller priva	ate acrea	ae. lower	r Percen	tage privat	e I	Lower freque	net a duration of									F	-ewer so	f wetland and	Low	er costs of co	instruction.	-			Sec.	
Guidance	land, fewer numbe	of private NOT co	propertie	s with s with exis	tructures ting lines	, and low s is better	er Perce	entage of ro	oute o	utages, co 	and difficulty to get line is better.		Fewer a	cres ar	lesser	impact o	on pract	tices is bet	ter.		fewer num crossings	r of stream is ter.	operatio time	n & mainten e to construc	ance, and les t is better.	s Subje	et betwee	n positive a	and negative	e factors.
Evaluation Factors and Sample Measures	2) Number 1) Unque land owners (#)	Ind, fewer number of private properties with structures, and lower Percentage NOT co-located with existing lines is better.					pole Ineight (ft.)	TE: 1 opensacts		Vote: N	1) Forent law	2) Farmla acresi	3) Com international agreement	perty (olo)	5) Larg peny (%)	6) Averag operty (98)	T) Larges operty (96)	Eores Allie Strathing	NOTE: Impaument	Harrs (main east	Note: Impact	The sum	2) Estime ands of \$) 2) Entropy of the construction	3) Time to construct	orte: Tillamook pub		Your Notes:	NOTEconomi Economiacts) (Benefits Impacts)	e: Community	
East	Route E1 1	1 7	15.8	56.1%	4	72.8%	26 (31 30,0,1) 7	1'	0 0	~99%+	6 0	0	13	3.9	10.7%	33.29	% < 0.01%	0.1% N	I/A	60	4.8 5	90	1,300	5 3.5	9	0			600
Section	Route E2 1	1 7	13	47.0%	5	57.7%	34 (3	34 33,0,1) 7	0'	00	~99%+	6 0	0	12.3	4.9	7.1%	52.9%	6 < 0.01%	0.1% N	I/A		4.7 4	10	1,500	5 4	6	0 0			000
	Route E3 1	4 0	15.1	54.5%	8	68.7%	29 (3	31,0,1) 7	1'		~99%+	00	0	13.5	3.8	11.0%	47.4%	6 < 0.01%	0.1%	I/A	000	6.4 6		1,400	0 3	•				000
Central	Route C1 1	1					0	20			~99%+	6 3	0		-					I/A		12			.5 6	5	0 0			300
Section	Route C2 1	1 17	19.5	72.3%	7	80.1%	3 (9,6,5) 7	6'	9 0 1	~99%+	5 5	1.9	12.7	0	4.5%	10.1%	6 < 0.01%	< 0.01% N	I/A	U O	21.5 12	00	2,600	13.0 5	5	0			000
West	Route W1 2	7	45.6	100%	7	100%	0 ((36 0,27,9) 5	4 (000	~99%+	6 0	39.9	0	0	1.5%	2.5%	< 0.01%	< 0.01% 92.	.1%	00	0 20	00	1,400	7.0 5	6	0 0			600
Section	Route W2 2	8	48.8	100%	7	100%	0 (0	21,18) 5	7	0 0	~99%+	5 3	42.9	0	0	2.7%	7.6%	< 0.01%	0.1% 85.	.8%	6 0	0 12	5 3	1,900	9.5 5	5	0			5 0

JAMON	Evaluator Information:													
	Name: Dal	e:	Select one: Member of the public Prope	rty Owner Property Ac	ldress:									
			Step 1: Weighting Evaluation Criteria											
Evaluation	Social		Land Use / Environmental		E	conomic								
Evaluation														
Factors	A) Property Effects and Visual Impacts	B) Reliability	C) Impacts to Farm / Forest / Commercial	D) Environmental Impacts	E) Tillamook PUD Costs	F) Community Economics (Benefits / Impacts)								
Sample Measures	1) Number of unique land owners 2) Number of tax lots 3) Total acreage of privately-owned land within easement 4) Percentage of easement on privately-owned land 5) Number of private properties that have a transmission structure on it 6) Percentage of route NOT co-located with existing electric lines 7) Number of buildings within 200° of transmission centerline 8) Quantity of transmission structures (number of 1-pole, 2-pole, 3-pole) 9) Average pole height	Considerations: Frequency and duration of potential outages, cost to get back online, (e.g. accessibility, number of workands, water crossings, soils, need for special equipment), etc.	1) Total acres of forestland within easement 2) Total acres of farmland within easement 3) Total acres of arminad within easement 4) Average percentage of easement on property 5) Largest percentage of assement on property 6) Average percentage of structure footprint on property 7) Largest percentage of structure footprint on property 8) Percentage of route in forestland NOT co-located with existing private access roads	 Total acres of wetland within easement Total number of streams that cross transmission line 	 Construction costs (Infrastructure, roads, etc.) Operation & maintenance Time to Construct 	Considerations: Job creation, business revenue, property values, construction disruption, site development options, etc.								
		Rating Instruction	s: Circle one number in each column to rate the importance of the evaluation factor.											
Extremely Important	10	10	10	10	10	10								
Verv	9	9	9	9	9	9								
Important	8	8	8	8	8	8								
an a	7	7	7	7	7	7								
Important	6	6	6	6	6	6								
Madavatabu	5	5	5	5	5	5								
Important	4	4	4	4	4	4								
Olishaha	3	3	3	3	3	3								
Important	2	2	2	2	2	2								
Not at all	1	1				1								
Important			Evaluate proposed alf	ternatives										
	Rating Instructions: Circle one co	lor (Green, Yellow, Red) in each c.	Leaving any centralem.											
Measures Guidance	Fewer unique property owners, smaller private acreage, lower Percentage private land, fewer number of private properties with structures, and lower Percentage of route NOT co-located with existing lines is better.	Lower frequency and duration of outages, cost, and difficulty to get back on line is better.	Fewer acres and esser impact on practices is better.	Fewer acres of patiand and fewer number or stream crossings is be er.	Lowe costs of construction, operation & pintenance, and less time to convert is better.	bjective valuation of the above considerations:								
Evaluation Factors and Sample Measures	NOTE: Usual III B. Viscage Pole Height (B.) (B. 1. rode - 2. rode - survey (B. 1. rode - 2. rode - survey (B. 1. rode - 2. rode - 3. rode) (B. 1. rode - 2. rode - 3. rode) (B. 1. rode - 2. rode - 3. rode) (B. 1. rode - 1. rode - 1. rode (B. 1. rode - 1. rode - 1. rode) (B. 1. rode - 1. rode - 1. rode (B. 1. rode - 1. rode - 1. rode) (B. 1. rode - 1. rode - 1. rode (B. 1. rode - 1. rode - 1. rode) (B. 1. rode - 1. rode - 1. rode (B. 1. rode - 1. rode - 1. rode) (B. 1. rode - 1. rode - 1. rode) (B. 1. rode - 1. rode - 1. rode - 1. rode - 1. rode (B. 1. rode - 1. ro	O HOT REAL	VO CENT Forest Structures Structu	ALLE: backs 1) Strategiese Inter (B) 1) Monart Market 1) Monart	Vote: osts Stringtonic Construct Stringtonic Construct Distances of Strington Distances of Strington Construction Nitronic Construction Nitronic Construct	Rear A for the second s								
Foot	Route E1 11 27 15.8 56.1% 4 72.8% 26 31 (30,0,1) 71'	3 1 ~99%+	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	5 1 4.8 5	3 1 ,300 6. 3.5	0 0 0 0								
Section	Route E2 11 27 13 47.0% 5 57.7% 34 34 (33,0,1) 70'	5 1 ~99%+	9 9 12.3 4.9 7.1% 52.9% < 0.01% 0.1% A	5 0 4.7 4	3 1 ,500 7. 4									
	Route E3 14 30 15.1 54.5% 8 68.7% 29 32 (31,0,1) 71'	5 1 ~99%+	13.5 3.8 11.0% 47.4% < 0.01% 0.1% A	5 6 .4 6	1,400 7. 3									
Central	Route C1 11 21 26 84.2% 8 76.7% 3 24 (12,5,7) 75'	3 ~99%+	9 12.6 0 3.7% 11.5% < 0.01% 0.01%	25.3	2,900 14									
Section	Route C2 11 17 19.5 72.3% 7 80.1% 3 20 (9,6,5) 76'	5 0 1 ~99%+	6 1.9 12.7 0 4.5% 10.1% < 0.01% × 0.01% N/A	5 1 21.5 1	3 3 1 2,600 13.0 5	6 0 1 6 0								
West	Route W1 2 7 45.6 100% 7 100% 0 36 54	5 0 1 ~99% +	S ○ ● 39.9 0 0 1.5% 2.5% < 0.01% < 0.01% 92.1%	5 0 0 20	3 3 1,400 7.0 5	600								
Section	Route W2 2 8 48.8 100% 7 100% 0 39 (0,21,18) 57"	5 3 ~99%+	6 0 1 42.9 0 0 2.7% 7.6% < 0.01% 0.1% 85.8%	5 0 0 12	3 📀 🚺 1,900 9.5 5	5 3 1 5 3 1								

Step 2: Scoring Alternatives based on Evaluation Factors													
Iternative satis	fies each evalu	ation fac	tor.	5 =	"Well-ali	gned"	3 = "	Neutral	0=	"Poorl	y-aligned	f"	
Measures Guidance		Fewer	acres and	d lesser ir	npact on	practices	s is better	r.		Few fe	ver acres wer num crossing	of wetlan ber of stre js is bette	id and eam er.
Evaluation Factors and Sample Measures	1) Netland within easement ransmission line (#) sorest i commercial property (%) forestand wither existing broperty (%) forestange structure kootomin broperty (%) forestange easement on f) Average easement on f) Average structure (%) forestangest easement on f) Largest easement on f) Average easement on f) Average structure (%) forestand within easement a) Average (%) forestand within easement f) Forestand within easement f) Forestand within easement f) Forestand within easement												of closs
Fact		0	13	3.9	10.7%	33.2%	< 0.01%	0.1%	N/A	5	3 0	4.8	5
Section		0	12.3	4.9	7.1%	52.9%	< 0.01%	0.1%	N/A	5	3 1	4.7	4
		0	13.5	3.8	11.0%	47.4%	< 0.01%	0.1%	N/A	5	3 1	6.4	6
Central		1.9	12.6	0	3.7%	11.5%	< 0.01%	< 0.01%	N/A	5	3 1	25.3	12
Section		1.9	12.7	0	4.5%	10.1%	< 0.01%	< 0.01%	N/A	5	3 1	21.5	12
West		39.9	0	0	1.5%	2.5%	< 0.01%	< 0.01%	92.1%	6	3 1	0	20
Section		42.9	0	0	2.7%	7.6%	< 0.01%	0.1%	85.8%	5	3 1	0	12

Preliminary Polling Results



Votes

Sensitivity Analysis

	Evaluation Factor:	Property Effects and Visual Impacts	Reliability	Impacts to Farm / Forest / Commercial	Environmental Impacts	TPUD Costs	Community Economic Benefit	Score	Ordinal
A L T E R N A T I V E S	Weight:	23.068	10.250	27.132	9.826	9.186	20.536		
	Route W2	3	3	2.5	3	3.5	2.5	2.808	1
	Route W1	3	2	3	2	2.5	2.5	2.651	2
	Route C2	2	2.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	2.5	2.015	2
	Route C1	2.5	2.5	2	2.5	3	3	2.513	1
	Route E3	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	4	3	3.443	1
	Route E2	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3	3.397	2
	Route E1	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	3	2.603	3