

DRAFT Table 8-2b
Screening of Yield Enhancement Projects

Project ID	Project	Management Zone	Capital Cost	Annualized Capital Cost (\$)	Annual O&M Cost (\$)	Total Annual Cost (\$)	New Yield	Recycled Water	Unit Cost	Water Quality Challenges	Institutional Challenges
1	Montclair Basins	1	\$ 5,450,000	\$ 354,500	\$ 2,644	\$ 357,144	71	0	\$ 4,997		c
1a	Montclair Basins	1	\$ 5,050,000	\$ 328,500	\$ 2,644	\$ 331,144	71	0	\$ 4,634		c
2	Montclair Basins	1	\$ 1,440,000	\$ 93,700	\$ 9,176	\$ 102,876	248	0	\$ 415		c
3	Montclair Basins	1	\$ 50,000	\$ 3,300	\$ -	\$ 3,300	0	0	--		c
4	Montclair Basins	1	\$ 790,000	\$ 51,400	\$ -	\$ 51,400	0	0	--		c
5	North West Upland Basin	1	\$ 5,490,000	\$ 357,100	\$ 3,458	\$ 360,558	93	0	\$ 3,858		c, g
5a	North West Upland Basin	1	\$ 4,640,000	\$ 301,800	\$ 3,458	\$ 305,258	93	0	\$ 3,267		c, g
6	Princeton Basin	2	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	--		c
7	San Sevaine Basins	2	\$ 1,775,000	\$ 115,500	\$ 23,756	\$ 139,256	642	1,911	\$ 217		c, e, f
8	San Sevaine Basins	2	\$ 2,620,000	\$ 170,400	\$ 12,781	\$ 183,181	345	1,911	\$ 530		c, e
9	San Sevaine Basins	2	\$ 300,000	\$ 19,500	\$ -	\$ 19,500	0	0	--		c
10	San Sevaine Basins	2	\$ 1,980,000	\$ 128,800	\$ -	\$ 128,800	0	0	--		c
11	Victoria Basin	2	\$ 75,000	\$ 4,900	\$ 1,584	\$ 6,484	43	120	\$ 151		c, e, f
12	Lower Day Basin (2010 RMPU)	2	\$ 2,480,000	\$ 161,300	\$ 29,182	\$ 190,482	789	0	\$ 242		c
13	Lower Day Basin	2	\$ 600,000	\$ 39,000	\$ 2,791	\$ 41,791	75	0	\$ 554		c
14	Turner Basin	2	\$ 890,000	\$ 57,900	\$ 2,438	\$ 60,338	66	0	\$ 916		c
15	Ely Basin	2	\$ 9,120,000	\$ 593,300	\$ 8,162	\$ 601,462	221	0	\$ 2,727	b	
15a	Ely Basin	2	\$ 3,200,000	\$ 208,200	\$ 8,162	\$ 216,362	221	0	\$ 981	b	
16	Ontario Bioswale Project	2	\$ 650,000	\$ 42,300	\$ 279	\$ 42,579	8	0	\$ 5,652		
17	Lower San Sevaine Basin (2010 RMPU)	2	\$ 45,430,000	\$ 2,955,300	\$ 45,165	\$ 3,000,465	1,221	500	\$ 2,458		d, e
17a	Lower San Sevaine Basin (2010 RMPU)	2	\$ 22,550,000	\$ 1,466,900	\$ 45,165	\$ 1,512,065	1,221	500	\$ 1,239		d, e
18	CSI Storm Water Basin	3	\$ 900,000	\$ 58,500	\$ 3,012	\$ 61,512	81	0	\$ 756	b	g
18a	CSI Storm Water Basin	3	\$ 440,000	\$ 28,600	\$ 3,012	\$ 31,612	81	0	\$ 388	b	g
19	Wineville Basin (2010 RMPU)	3	\$ 6,280,000	\$ 408,500	\$ 79,824	\$ 488,324	2,157	630	\$ 226	b	
19a	Wineville Basin (2010 RMPU)	3	\$ 4,890,000	\$ 318,100	\$ 79,824	\$ 397,924	2,157	630	\$ 184	b	
20	Jurupa Basin	3	\$ 2,150,000	\$ 139,900	\$ 15,591	\$ 155,491	421	0	\$ 369		
21	RP3 Basin Improvements (2010 RMPU)	3	\$ 22,044,000	\$ 1,434,000	\$ 15,004	\$ 1,449,004	406	0	\$ 3,573		
21a	RP3 Basin Improvements (2010 RMPU)	3	\$ 13,464,000	\$ 875,900	\$ 15,004	\$ 890,904	406	0	\$ 2,197		
22	RP3 Basin Improvements (2013 RMPU)	3	\$ 2,645,000	\$ 172,100	\$ 5,087	\$ 177,187	137	2,905	\$ 1,289		f
22a	RP3 Basin Improvements (2013 RMPU)	3	\$ 1,855,000	\$ 120,700	\$ 5,087	\$ 125,787	137	2,905	\$ 915		f
23	2013 RMPU Proposed Wineville PS to Jurupa, Expanded Jurupa PS to RP3 Basin with 2013 Proposed RP3 Improvements	3	\$ 23,324,000	\$ 1,517,300	\$ 311,014	\$ 1,828,314	3,166	3,535	\$ 577		d, e
23a	2013 RMPU Proposed Wineville PS to Jurupa, Expanded Jurupa PS to RP3 Basin with 2013 Proposed RP3 Improvements	3	\$ 21,314,000	\$ 1,386,500	\$ 311,014	\$ 1,697,514	3,166	3,535	\$ 536		d, e
24	Vulcan Pit	3	\$ 27,700,000	\$ 1,801,900	\$ 31,701	\$ 1,833,601	857	840	\$ 2,140	b	d, e, g
25	Sierra	3	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 65,100	\$ 2,362	\$ 67,462	64	0	\$ 1,057		g
25a	Sierra	3	\$ 490,000	\$ 31,900	\$ 2,362	\$ 34,262	64	0	\$ 537		g
26	Sultana Avenue	3	\$ 1,026,200	\$ 66,800	\$ 260	\$ 67,060	7	0	\$ 9,556		g
26a	Sultana Avenue	3	\$ 502,200	\$ 32,700	\$ 260	\$ 32,960	7	0	\$ 4,697		g
27	Declerz Basin	3	\$ 4,070,000	\$ 264,800	\$ 8,920	\$ 273,720	241	0	\$ 1,135		
28	Banana Basin (annual cleaning)	3					11	130	\$ 294		
29	Banana Basin (semiannual cleanings)	3					31	155	\$ 495		
30	Declerz Basin (annual cleaning)	3					16	178	\$ 409		
31	Declerz Basin (semiannual cleanings)	3					47	210	\$ 701		
32	Ely Basin (annual cleaning)	2					44	217	\$ 668	b	
33	Ely Basin (semiannual cleanings)	2					128	258	\$ 997	b	
34	Hickory Basin (annual cleaning)	2					7	148	\$ 518		
35	Hickory Basin (semiannual cleanings)	2					20	175	\$ 877		

a - Project ID no.'s with an "a" extension indicate that the project includes excavation and haul-off costs, and the capital cost shown assumes that the project's excavation and haul-off costs are reduced by 90 percent with the excavated materials being used in another construction project.

Key to Water Quality Challenges

b - A potential water quality challenge has been identified with this project.

Key to Institutional Challenges

c - An agreement will be required with the property owner to construct and operate stormwater recharge facilities. Other agreements with resource agencies may also be required. The time required to negotiate and approve these agreements could range from one to two years.

d - This basin is not currently included in the Watermaster/IEUA recharge permit. Therefore, the existing permit will need to be amended to include recycled water at this basin. The time required to prepare the Title 22 engineering report and regulatory process is about two years.

e - The project includes a recycled water recharge component. The IEUA has discretion as to whether to participate or not in this project.

f - At the July 18, 2013 Steering Committee Meeting, Ryan Shaw (IEUA) indicated that Project IDs 7, 11, and 22a are being recommended to be cost shared. The capital cost shown assumes a 50/50 split of the capital cost per Peace II Agreement Article VIII.

g - The Watermaster will have to submit a Petition for Change with the State Water Resources Control Board for the project because it is not included in the Watermaster's current diversion permits.