Imperial IRWMP FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

What is an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP)?

An IRWMP is a comprehensive approach to determine an appropriate mix of demand and supply management options that provide a long-term, reliable water supply at the lowest reasonable cost and with the highest possible benefits to customers, economic development, environmental quality and other local objectives.

Why does the Imperial Region need an IRWMP?

An Imperial IRWMP will help local interests define how they will make the best use of the water supplies that are available locally and from the Colorado River. Developing the Imperial IRWMP will:

- Protect local water rights
- Sustain the local agricultural economy
- Promote economic development
- Qualify the Imperial Region for state bond funding (Propositions 1E, 50, & 84)
- Define a water supply portfolio
- Help the county, cities, and IID streamline the review and permitting process
- Resolve conflicts by providing an alternative to litigation
- Present a united political front to other Colorado River water users, Sacramento and Washington, D.C.

Gaining a consensus on project and program priorities will help the Imperial Region to develop other sources of state and federal funding.

Why Participate - What are the Benefits?

- Funding: IRWMP will provide access to State grant \$\$ for regional projects
- **Opportunity to work together**: Chance for stakeholders to be integral part of planning and establish roadmap for next 20/30 years
- Input: Chance for stakeholders to propose projects (wastewater, stormwater, grey water, others) & policies
- Increase Certainty: Coordination of land/water use in the Imperial Region
- **Final product**: Imperial IRWMP adopted by appropriate stakeholders (IID, Imperial County, Imperial Region Cities, others whoever wants state grant \$\$)

How will the Imperial IRWMP be prepared?

Imperial Irrigation District (IID) and Imperial County are sponsoring development of the Imperial IRWMP and coordinating the Water Forum. Membership in the Water Forum is open to representatives appointed from stakeholder groups, which are anticipated to include representatives appointed by the Cities in the Imperial Region, industrial and trade groups, state and federal government agencies, and other nongovernmental organizations. The Imperial Water Forum will

provide input into development of the Imperial IRWMP. Work groups to address specific topics will likely be formed. Meetings will be open to the public. An Imperial Region Water Management Group (RWMG) of elected leaders from IID, Imperial County and local cities will be involved in decision making.

What types of projects are contemplated?

The Imperial IRWMP will review a range of water management strategies, which include a wide array of approaches ranging from water supply capital projects to demand management measures. Projects and programs to be considered include, but are not limited to:

- Storage of Colorado River water in the groundwater basin
- Drinking water quality treatment
- Recycling and reuse of wastewater
- Development of local groundwater through desalination or blending with existing supplies
- Desalination of irrigation drain water
- Importation
- Water Conservation and demand management

Many of the cities in the Imperial Region are disadvantaged communities (DACs) and may get preference for planning and implementation grant funding.

What is the overall Goal and Purpose for the Imperial IRWMP?

The proposed goal will be established by the Water Forum. A preliminary or proposed goal for the Imperial IRWMP is:

"To provide a strategic road map that defines a portfolio of water projects intended to deliver a reliable water supply for municipal, commercial, and industrial water users over the planning horizon (2009 to 2047); and to seek local consensus for a course of action that anticipates and thus avoids conflicts over water within the IID service area."

From Imperial IRWMP Scope of Work (adopted by IID Board of Directors, March 16, 2010).

What are the objectives of the IRWMP process?

The Imperial IRWMP objectives will be developed by the Water Forum and may include:

- Diversify the Imperial Region's water portfolio
- Foster regional partnerships and resolve conflicts
- Integrate resources management decisions
- Reduce costs and maximize value
- Provide for sustainability
- Address water-related needs of disadvantaged communities
- Protect and improve water quality
- Resources stewardship

What is the relationship between the IID Plan and the Imperial IRWMP?

Imperial Irrigation District recently prepared a draft water resources plan that can be used as a foundation for development of the Imperial IRWMP¹.

What is the State's purpose for promoting Integrated Regional Water Management Plans?

The Legislative intent expressed in the California Water Code (CWC 10531) is to:

- Support local management and coordination of assets
- Make use of all available supplies in the region
- Improve local water supply reliability, water quality, and environmental stewardship to meet current and future needs
- Maximize use of state funds
- Consistency in state planning and local process; bottom up approach with state framework

What are the State's program preferences for project implementation grant funding and how can the Imperial Region be competitive?

Preference in funding will be given to Proposals that:

- Include regional projects or programs (CWC §10544).
- Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within the CDWRB Colorado River Hydrologic Region; the Colorado River Regional Water Quality Control Board area, or other in the Imperial Region as accepted by CDWR.
- Effectively resolve significant water-related conflicts within or between regions.
- Address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities within the region.
- Effectively integrate water management with land use planning.
- For eligible stormwater/flood water management funding projects which: a) are not receiving state funding for flood control or flood prevention projects pursuant to PRC §5096.824 or §75034 or b) provide multiple benefits, including, but not limited to, water quality improvements, ecosystem benefits, reduction of instream erosion and sedimentation, and groundwater recharge.
- Address statewide priorities.

From Guidelines, Integrated Regional Water Management Grant Program Funded by Proposition 84 and Proposition 1E (Draft, March 2010). PRC §75026(b) and CWC §10544.

¹ For IID Plan, visit <u>http://www.iid.com/Media/IID-IRP-DRAFT-FINAL-09-21-2009.pdf</u>

What are the State's requirements for Proposition 84 Implementation Grant Funding?

Proposition 84 IRWM Implementation Grant Funding requires that eligible projects must yield multiple benefits and include one or more of the following elements:

- Water supply reliability, water conservation and water use efficiency.
- Stormwater capture, storage, clean-up, treatment, and management.
- Removal of invasive non-native species, the creation and enhancement of wetlands, and the acquisition, protection, and restoration of open space and watershed lands
- Non-point source pollution reduction, management and monitoring.
- Groundwater recharge and management projects.
- Contaminant and salt removal through reclamation, desalting, and other treatment technologies and conveyance of reclaimed water for distribution to users.
- Water banking, exchange, reclamation and improvement of water quality.
- Planning and implementation of multipurpose flood management programs.
- Watershed protection and management.
- Drinking water treatment and distribution.
- Ecosystem and fisheries restoration and protection.

From Guidelines, Integrated Regional Water Management Grant Program Funded by Proposition 84 and Proposition 1E (Draft, March 2010). PRC § 75026(a).

What money is currently available from Proposition 84 for the Imperial Region?

CDWR's Colorado River Hydrologic Region, including the Imperial Region is slated for \$36 million. There are only two other and part of a third IRWMP regions that will be competing for this money.



Imperial IRWMP Work Plan Highlights

From Imperial IRWMP Scope of Work (adopted by IID board of Directors, March 16, 2010)

During Phase 1

- Water Forum meetings undertaken, and
- RWMG structure established.

Draft IID Plan will be used as a starting point to...

- Inform the Water Forum and RWMG Forum, and
- Bring stakeholder input into the process, presenting facts and identifying issues and analysis needs.
- The process is intended to both provide and elicit information.

The Project Management will move the RWMG and Water Forum participants through a...

- Carefully sequenced series of meetings with specific agendas crafted to...
- Seek consensus on the problems, purpose, need goals and objectives and water management strategies.

The outcome will be...

- Updated draft IID Plan Chapters 1-6 and related technical appendices,
- Project/program/policy evaluation ranking and screening criteria based on California Water Plan Resource Management Strategies², stakeholder input and on CDWR IRWMP Implementation Grant Funding proposal solicitation package requirements,
- A detailed scope of work for Phase 2, and
- Water Forum and RWMG consensus to move forward which is a key milestone.

During Phase 2

The Project Management Team will:

- Present the range of potential regional projects from the IID Plan,
- Entertain stakeholders' projects and support stakeholders in developing project scope and details needed for inclusion in the Imperial IRWMP,
- Address how the projects meet the needs of the Imperial Region disadvantaged communities,
- Revise project descriptions based on stakeholder input,
- Integrate, evaluate, and prioritize projects, and
- Coordinate discussion of non-structural management alternatives, including demand management and the policies that would serve to bring all of the pieces together.

² See California Water Plan Update 2009 Volume 2 - Resource Management Strategies online at <u>http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/cwpu2009/index.cfm</u>

Outcome is:

- A prioritized list of regional and stakeholder-sponsored projects,
- Consensus on policies for how water will be apportioned for future uses.
- Chapters 7 through 11 of the draft IID Plan will be updated with RWMG and Water Forum input. This will include the final governance and funding plan for long-term project/program implementation.
- Consensus on draft and final Imperial IRWMP.

In	nperial IRWMP Work Plar	n Scł	ned	ulea	and	Tas	ks					
Fro	om Imperial IRWMP Scope of Work (ado	pted k	by IID	Board	of Dir	ector	s, Mar	ch 16	, 2010))		
Fia	ure 1 Imperial Schedule						Month	<u> </u>				
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Pha	se 1- Inform, Discover, Scope IRWMP											
1	Phase 1 Project Management											
2	Phase 1 RWMG/Water Forum Coordination and Work Group Coordination and Support											
3	Update Purpose/Need & Goals/Objectives											
4	Review and Update Supply/Demand Analysis and Water Budget			r I	\Rightarrow							
5	Review and Update Water Management Strategies											
6	Review and Finalize Scope											
Pha	se 2 - Project and Program Definition; IRWN	IP Pro	ductio	n								
	Phase 2 Project Management											
8	Phase 2 RWMG/Water Forum Coordination and Work Group Coordination and Support											
9	Define Regional and Stakeholder Sponsored Capital Projects Alternatives											
10	Develop Demand Management Elements and Alternatives											
11	Review and Develop Policy Elements and Alternatives											
12	Develop Implementation Plan											
13	Draft and Final Imperial IRWMP (adopted)											

Potential Regional Projects (From *Draft IID Integrated Water Resources Management Plan* (IID Plan), Executive Summary (accepted by IID Board of Directors September 29, 2009).

GW 19 Soundwater Bending: East Mess Well Field Pumping to All- American Canal with Percolation Ponds \$ 48,605,555 \$ 243,000 \$ 30,054,000 \$ 1122 2500 WB 1 Coadhells Valley Groundwater Storage Project \$ 92,200,000 \$ 7,544,000 \$ 7,544,000 \$ 5,754,700 \$ 5,754,700 \$ 5,754,700 \$ 5,754,700 \$ 40,050,000 \$ 5,754,700 \$ 5,754,700 \$ 40,050,000 \$ 5,754,700 \$ 40,050,000 \$ 5,754,700 \$ 40,050,000 \$ 5,754,700 \$ 40,050,000 \$ 5,754,700 \$ 40,050,000 \$ 5,400 \$ 40,050,000 \$ 5,400 \$ 40,050,000 \$ 5,400 \$ 5,400 \$ 5,120,000 \$ 5,120,000 \$ 5,120,000 \$ 5,120,000 \$ 5,120,000 \$ 5,120,000 \$ 5,120,000 \$ 5,120,000 \$ 5,120,000 \$ 5,120,000 \$ 5,120,000 \$ 5,120,000 \$ 5,120,000 \$ 5,120,000 \$	able 1	- Projects Ranked by Cost								
SWD & Memcian Canal S 39,501,517 5 198,000 \$ 2,482,000 \$ 2,482,000 \$ 2,482,000 \$ 2,482,000 \$ 3,054,000 \$ 2,282,000 \$ 3,054,000 \$ 1,222 2500 WB1 Coachelle Valley Groundwarer Storage Project \$ 2,200,000 \$ 7,564,000 \$ 5,305,766 \$ 2,606 \$ 2,000,000 \$ 1,206,000 \$ 1,206,000 \$ 2,482,000 \$ 5,305,766 \$ 2,600 \$ 1,00,91,177 \$ 6,166,000 \$ 1,206,000 \$ 1,400 \$ 1,00,91,177 \$ 6,166,000 \$ 1,208,000 \$ 5,133 \$ 2,500 \$ 1,00,91,177 \$ 5,153,000 \$ 1,231,82,247 \$ 6,366,000 \$ 1,208,000 \$ 5,133 \$ 2,500 \$ 1,00,91,177 \$ 5,153,2001 \$ 3,24,849,901 \$ 4,77 \$ 5,000 \$ 1,231,82,424 \$ 6,366,000 \$ 1,208,000 \$ 5,133 \$ 2,000 \$ 5,133 \$ 1,208,000 \$ 5,133 \$ 5,133 \$ 5,133 \$ 5,133 \$ 5,133 \$ 5,000 \$ 1,208,000 \$ 5,133 \$ 5,000 \$ 5,000 \$ 5,000 \$ 5,000 \$ 5,000 \$ 5,000 \$ 5,000 \$ 5,000 \$ 5,000 \$ 5,000 \$ 5,000	Name	Description	Capital Cost		08M		Cost			
GW 13 American Canal with Percolation Prodes \$ 48,605,551 \$ 23,030,000 \$ 122 2500 WB1 Coachella Valley Groundwater Storage Project \$ 5 52,200,000 \$ 7,754,700 \$ 25,735,726 \$ 26 500 B5 32 SKAF East Brawley Desailination with Well Field and Groundwater \$ 10,0991,177 \$ 6,66,000 \$ 124,000,000 \$ 440,000 \$ 504 800 B5 32 KKAF Exptance Conservation Projects [2] \$ 512,737,743 51,533,901 \$ 22,849,901 \$ 477 5000 B5 SKAF Exptance Desailination with Alamo River Water and mutural Distribution \$ 112,318,224 \$ 513,537,901 \$ 22,649,901 \$ 493 5000 B51 South Salon Sea 50 KAF Desalination with Alamo River Water and Mut Distribution \$ 12,837,932 \$ 513,857,901 \$ 22,649,900 \$ 29,949,900 \$ 5000 \$ 5000 \$ 5000 \$ 513,857,901 \$ 22,643,901 \$ 513,930 \$ 22,849,900	GW 18		\$	39,501,517	\$ 198,000	\$ 2,482,000	\$ 99	25000		
DES 2 StAF Eat Brawney Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge 5 100.991.177 S 6.166000 S 440 2500 AWC1 System Conservation Projects (2) S 55.225.000 N/A S 4.068,000 S 540 800 DES East Mesa 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge S 112,318,224 S 6.336,000 S 540 S 54 30 KAF Keystone Desalination with Alam River Vater and Bouth Sation Sea 30 KAF Desalination with Alamo River Water and Recharge S 112,318,224 S 5.36,403,901 S 543 5000 52,446,4901 S 493 5000 DES 30 KAF Keystone Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge S 182,975,327 \$15,87,901 \$26,438,901 S 5.29 5000 DES 20 KAF Keystone Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge S 328,873 \$2,3383 \$2,033,801 \$38 5.000 5.000 7.8 \$29,489,001 \$5.500 5000 5.000 5.000 5.000 5.000 5.00	GW 19	- · · ·	\$	48,605,551	\$ 243,000	\$ 3,054,000	\$ 122	2 25000		
DES 8 STOUNDATER Recharge \$ 100.991.177 \$ 6.166.000 \$ 480 2500 AWC 1 Systems Conservation Projects (2) \$ 5.622.000 N/A \$ 4.068.000 \$ 504 800 DES 12 Rest Mess 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge \$ 112.318.224 \$ 6.336,000 \$ 5.13 2500 DES 14 South Salton Sea SD KAF Desalination with Alamo River Water and Industrial Distribution \$ 129,619.37 \$15.491.901 \$24.664,901 \$ 493 5000 DES 15 South Salton Sea SD KAF Desalination with Alamo River Water and MCI Distribution \$ 129,619.37 \$15.491.901 \$24.644,901 \$ 50.500 Rex Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water to IID Canal \$ 220.818,710 \$ \$29.489,000 \$ 500 500 RW 2 Bioinfeld Secondary Fifuent from Exoting Wasterwater \$ 28.28,794.88 \$ 48.6671 \$ 1.57.2702 \$ 118 1330 Disinfectod Secondary Fifuent from Exoting Wasterwater <	WB 1	Coachella Valley Groundwater Storage Project	\$	92,200,000	\$ 7,544,000	\$ 5,736,746	\$ 266	5 50000		
DES 12 East Mesa 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge S 112,318,224 \$ 6,336,000 \$ 51.3 2500 DES 12 Recharge \$ 112,318,224 \$ 6,336,000 \$ 51.3 2500 DES 15 SOKAF Keystone Desalination with ID Drainwater/Alamo River \$ 112,318,224 \$ 6,336,000 \$ 51.3 2500 DES 15 South Salton Sea 50 KAF Desalination with Alamo River Water and industrial Distribution \$ 112,318,227 \$15,491,901 \$24,664,901 \$ 493 5000 DES 15 Souk F Keystone Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater \$ \$129,975,327 \$15,857,901 \$22,648,900 \$ 590 5000 DES 16 Souk F Keystone Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater \$ \$22,99,463 \$13,158,000 \$23,489,001 \$ 590 5000 DES 16 Souk F Keystone Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater \$ \$12,772,02 \$ \$118 1330 W0 Disinfect d Secondary Fiffuent from Kusting Wastewater \$ <	DES 8		\$	100,991,177	\$ 6,166,000	\$12,006,000	\$ 480	25000		
DES 12 Recharge \$ 112,318,224 \$ 6,336,000 \$12,831,000 \$ 513 2500 DES 4 So KAF Keyatone Desalination with IID Drainwater/Alamo River \$ 167,437,743 \$15,323,201 \$23,849,901 \$ 477 5000 DES 14 South Salton Sea 50 KAF Desalination with Alamo River Water and Industrial Distribution \$ 158,619,378 \$15,491,901 \$24,664,901 \$ 493 5000 DES 15 South Salton Sea 50 KAF Desalination with Alamo River Water and Recharge \$ 128,975,327 \$15,857,901 \$26,438,901 \$ 5.90 5000 DES 15 South Salton Sea 50 KAF Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge \$ 128,795,885 \$48,671 \$ 1,572,702 \$ 118 308 RW 6 Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water to ID Canal \$ 102,748,84 \$ 2,800,493 \$ 488 1680 DES 1 Satt Mess 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 102,748,84 \$ 2,800,493 \$ 488 1680 DES 1 <td< td=""><td>AWC 1</td><td>Systems Conservation Projects (2)</td><td>\$</td><td>56,225,000</td><td>N/A</td><td>\$ 4,068,000</td><td>\$ 504</td><td>8000</td></td<>	AWC 1	Systems Conservation Projects (2)	\$	56,225,000	N/A	\$ 4,068,000	\$ 504	8000		
Biouth Salton Sea 50 KAF Desalination with Alamo River Water and Industrial Distribution 5 15, 619, 378 515, 649, 500 5 493 5000 DES 14 Industrial Distribution 5 158, 619, 378 \$15, 491, 901 \$24, 664, 901 \$493 5000 DES 15 South Salton Sea 50 KAF Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge \$128, 975, 327 \$15, 887, 901 \$26, 438, 901 \$529 5000 DES 2 Disinfected Secondary Effluent from Existing Water to ID Canal \$22, 399, 468 \$13, 158, 000 \$29, 489, 000 \$590 5000 RW 2 Disinfected Secondary Effluent from Existing Watewater Treatment Plants Applied to Adjacent Agriculture \$18, 779, 688 \$466, 671 \$1, 572, 702 \$118 1330 RW 3 Opsinfected Secondary Effluent from Existing Water to Local Service Area and IID \$102, 474, 854 \$2, 280, 145 \$8, 200, 493 \$488 1680 Canal System \$102, 474, 854 \$2, 280, 145 \$8, 200, 493 \$488 1680 DES 16 Ext Bravley 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$110, 446, 590 \$13, 1480, 000 \$17, 278, 000 \$589 5000 DES 16 Ext Bravley 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$24, 751, 185 </td <td>DES 12</td> <td></td> <td>\$</td> <td>112,318,224</td> <td>\$ 6,336,000</td> <td>\$12,831,000</td> <td>\$ 513</td> <td>25000</td>	DES 12		\$	112,318,224	\$ 6,336,000	\$12,831,000	\$ 513	25000		
Biouth Salton Sea 50 KAF Desalination with Alamo River Water and Industrial Distribution 5 15, 619, 378 515, 649, 500 5 493 5000 DES 14 Industrial Distribution 5 158, 619, 378 \$15, 491, 901 \$24, 664, 901 \$493 5000 DES 15 South Salton Sea 50 KAF Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge \$128, 975, 327 \$15, 887, 901 \$26, 438, 901 \$529 5000 DES 2 Disinfected Secondary Effluent from Existing Water to ID Canal \$22, 399, 468 \$13, 158, 000 \$29, 489, 000 \$590 5000 RW 2 Disinfected Secondary Effluent from Existing Watewater Treatment Plants Applied to Adjacent Agriculture \$18, 779, 688 \$466, 671 \$1, 572, 702 \$118 1330 RW 3 Opsinfected Secondary Effluent from Existing Water to Local Service Area and IID \$102, 474, 854 \$2, 280, 145 \$8, 200, 493 \$488 1680 Canal System \$102, 474, 854 \$2, 280, 145 \$8, 200, 493 \$488 1680 DES 16 Ext Bravley 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$110, 446, 590 \$13, 1480, 000 \$17, 278, 000 \$589 5000 DES 16 Ext Bravley 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$24, 751, 185 </td <td>DES 4</td> <td>50 KAF Keystone Desalination with IID Drainwater/Alamo River</td> <td>ć</td> <td>147 437 743</td> <td>\$ 15 222 901</td> <td>\$ 23 8/19 901</td> <td>\$ 475</td> <td>50000</td>	DES 4	50 KAF Keystone Desalination with IID Drainwater/Alamo River	ć	147 437 743	\$ 15 222 901	\$ 23 8/19 901	\$ 475	50000		
DES 15 South Salton Sea 50 KAF Desalination with Alamo River Water and MCI Distribution \$ 182,975,327 \$15,857,901 \$26,438,901 \$ 529 \$5000 DES 2 South Salton Sea 50 KAF Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge \$ 282,399,468 \$13,158,000 \$29,489,000 \$ 590 \$5000 RW 1 Disinfected Secondary Effluent Tom Existing Wastewater Treatment Plants Applied to Adjacent Agriculture \$ 18,779,688 \$ 486,671 \$ 1,572,702 \$ 118 1330 RW 3 Canal System \$ 500,531,216 \$ 2,992,257 \$ 7,498,347 \$ 562 1330 RW 6 Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water to Local Service Area and IID Canal System \$ 100,374,854 \$ 2,200,145 \$ 8,200,493 \$ 488 1680 DES 1 East Brawley 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 111,746,590 \$ 6,377,000 \$ 112,789,000 \$ 512 2500 DES 1 East Brawley 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 24,574,145 \$ 1,325,000 \$ 529 5000 DES 10 East Brawley 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 24,671,013 \$ 1,525,000 \$ 512 2500 DES 10 East Brawley 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 24,676,013 \$ 1,429,000		South Salton Sea 50 KAF Desalination with Alamo River Water and								
BES 2 S0 KAF Keystone Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge \$ 282,399,468 \$ 13,158,000 \$ 59,489,000 \$ 590 5000 RWS 5 Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water to IID Canal \$ 20,818,710 \$ 829,833 \$ 2,033,801 \$ 308 660 RW1 Disinfected Secondary Effluent from Existing Wastewater Treatment Plants Applied to Adjacent Agriculture \$ 18,779,688 \$ 486,671 \$ 1,572,702 \$ 118 1330 RW3 Canal System \$ 90,531,216 \$ 2,992,257 \$ 7,498,347 \$ 552 1330 RW3 Canal System \$ 90,531,216 \$ 2,992,257 \$ 7,498,347 \$ 552 1330 RW6 Canal System \$ 90,531,216 \$ 2,992,257 \$ 7,498,347 \$ 552 1330 DES 1 East Barakey 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 102,374,854 \$ 2,280,145 \$ 8,270,000 \$ 112,964,000 \$ 479 2200 DES 1 East Brawley 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 111,746,590 \$ 6,637,000 \$ 12,925,000 \$ 5,912 2500 DES 16 Keystone 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 13,177,056 \$ 7,061,000 \$ 3,330,000 \$ 664 2500	DES 15	South Salton Sea 50 KAF Desalination with Alamo River Water and								
RW 5 Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water to IID Canal \$ 20,818,710 \$ 829,853 \$ 2,033,801 \$ 308 660 RW 1 Treatment Plants Applied to Adjacent Agricolutize \$ 18,779,688 \$ 486,671 \$ 1,572,702 \$ 118 1330 RW 3 Upgrade Existing Plants to Tertiary and Deliver Effluent to IID \$ 90,531,216 \$ 2,992,257 \$ 7,498,347 \$ 562 1330 RW 6 Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water to Local Service Area and IID \$ 102,374,854 \$ 2,280,145 \$ 8,200,493 \$ 488 1680 DES 7 East Brawley 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 111,746,590 \$ 6,327,000 \$ 112,789,000 \$ 512,789,000 \$ 512,789,000 \$ 522,850,000 \$ 593 590 DES 1 Rystome 50 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 24,751,155 \$ 1,525,000 \$ 2,956,000 \$ 593 590 DES 10 East Brawley 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 26,827,000 \$ 1,2789,000 \$ 2,956,000 \$ 512 2500 DES 10 Fast Pasalination with Well Field \$ 2,958,93,56 \$ 2,476,000 \$ 3,358,000 \$ 641 500 DE 17 Heber 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 3,062,728	DES 2	50 KAF Keystone Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater				,				
NW 1 Disinfected Secondary Effluent from Existing Wastewater Treatment Plants Applied to Adjacent Agriculture \$ 18,779,688 \$ 466,671 \$ 1,572,702 \$ 118 1330 WW 3 Upgrade Existing Plants to Tertiary and Deliver Effluent to IID Canal System \$ 60,531,216 \$ 2,992,257 \$ 7,498,347 \$ 562 1330 RW 6 Canal System \$ 60,531,216 \$ 2,992,257 \$ 7,498,347 \$ 562 1330 RW 6 Canal System \$ 00,794,854 \$ 2,280,145 \$ 8,200,493 \$ 488 1680 DES 7 East Brawley 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 111,746,590 \$ 6,327,000 \$ 12,789,000 \$ 512 2500 DES 10 East Brawley 3 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 24,751,183 \$ 1,525,000 \$ 3,303,000 \$ 664 2500 DES 10 East Brawley 3 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 3,027,263 \$ 1,071,000 \$ 3,333,000 \$ 661 500 DES 15 DES 16 Sath Pasalination with Well Field \$ 3,027,263 \$ 1,971,000 \$ 3,538,000 \$ 712 900 DES 16 Sath Pasalination with Well Field \$ 62,177,056 \$ 1,971,000 \$ 5,567,000 \$ 1,113 500	RW 5		-			. , ,				
W3 Upgrade Existing Plants to Tertiary and Deliver Effluent to IID 5 90,531,216 \$ 2,992,257 \$ 7,498,367 \$ 562 1330 RW6 Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water to Local Service Area and IID \$ 102,374,854 \$ 2,280,145 \$ 8,200,493 \$ 488 1680 DES 7 East Brawley 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 102,474,854 \$ 2,280,145 \$ 8,200,493 \$ 488 1680 DES 1 East Mess 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 111,746,593 \$ 13,129,000 \$ 21,789,000 \$ 512 2500 DES 1 Exerstone 50 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 24,751,183 \$ 1,525,000 \$ 2,956,000 \$ 591 500 DES 1 Keystone 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 24,751,183 \$ 1,525,000 \$ 2,956,000 \$ 591 500 DES 1 Keystone 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 3,002,766 \$ 7,061,000 \$ 1,613,34,000 \$ 641 500 DES 16 South Salton Sea 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 3,002,7265 \$ 1,971,000 \$ 5,567,000 \$ 1,113 500 DES 3 Rest Brawley 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge and MCI Distribution \$ 306,357,788<		Disinfected Secondary Effluent from Existing Wastewater	T							
Regional Plant Serving Tertlary Water to Local Service Area and IID Canal S 102,374,854 \$2,280,145 \$8,820,493 \$\$488 1680 DES 7 East Brawley 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$\$111,746,590 \$6,327,000 \$11,278,000 \$512 2500 DES 11 East Mesa 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$\$281,817,834 \$13,149,000 \$29,447,000 \$589 5000 DES 10 East Brawley 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$\$24,751,815 \$1,525,000 \$2,956,000 \$512 2500 DES 16 Keystone 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$\$24,751,815 \$1,525,000 \$2,956,000 \$5,899,356 \$2,660,00 \$641 5000 DES 17 Heber 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$\$3,027,263 \$1,648,000 \$3,303,000 \$661 500 DES 13 East Mesa 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$\$62,57,766 \$7,7061,000 \$3,330,000 \$612 500 DES 3 Keystone Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater \$306,357,788 \$13,518,000 \$31,235,000 \$1,113 500 Market \$162,175,609 \$7,084,000 \$16,463,000 \$659 \$250	RW 3	Upgrade Existing Plants to Tertiary and Deliver Effluent to IID								
DES 7East Brawley 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field\$ 100,409,542\$ 6,157,000\$ 11,964,000\$ 4792500DES 11East Mesa 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field\$ 211,1746,590\$ 6,327,000\$ 12,789,000\$ 5122500DES 10East Brawley 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field\$ 241,817,834\$13,149,000\$ 2,9447,000\$ 5895000DES 10East Brawley 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field\$ 24,751,185\$ 1,525,000\$ 16,354,000\$ 16,354,000\$ 16,354,000\$ 16,354,000\$ 16,354,000\$ 16,354,000\$ 16,354,000\$ 16,354,000\$ 16,354,000\$ 16,354,000\$ 16,354,000\$ 16,354,000\$ 16,354,000\$ 16,354,000\$ 16,354,000\$ 16,354,000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 15,354,000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,133500\$ 12,133500\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 12,5000\$ 11,13500DES 13East Mesa 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge and MCI Distribution\$ 306,357,788\$ 13,518,000\$ 31,235,000\$ 51,223,000\$ 51,223,000\$ 51,6255000DES 5Recharge and MCI Distribution <td>RW 6</td> <td>Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water to Local Service Area and IID</td> <td>Ś</td> <td>102,374,854</td> <td>\$ 2,280,145</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	RW 6	Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water to Local Service Area and IID	Ś	102,374,854	\$ 2,280,145					
DES 1 Keystone 50 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 281,817,834 \$13,149,000 \$29,447,000 \$ 589 5000 DES 10 East Brawley 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 24,751,185 \$ 1,525,000 \$ 2,956,000 \$ 591 500 DES 17 Heber 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 160,695,766 \$ 7,061,000 \$ 6,64 2500 DES 17 Heber 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 95,899,356 \$ 2,476,000 \$ 6,64 2500 DES 13 tast Mesa 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 62,2177,056 \$ 1,048,000 \$ 3,558,000 \$ 7,12 500 DES 16 South Salton Sea 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge and MCI Distribution \$ 306,357,788 \$ 1,313,518,000 \$ 3,1,235,000 \$ 6,25 5000 DES 9 East Brawley 25 kAF Desalination with Well Field, Groundwater Recharge and MCI Distribution \$ 162,175,609 \$ 7,084,000 \$ 16,463,000 \$ 659 2500 RW 2 Upgrade Existing Plants to Tertiary and Deliver Effluent to a Local Market \$ 140,568,145 \$ 2,597,145 \$ 10,726,215 \$ 919 1170 RW 4 Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water Locally \$ 51,323,358 \$ 1,438,723 \$ 4,	DES 7	East Brawley 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field	\$	100,409,542	\$ 6,157,000	\$11,964,000	\$ 479	25000		
DES 10 East Brawley 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 24,751,185 \$ 1,525,000 \$ 2,956,000 \$ 591 500 DES 6 Keystone 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 160,695,766 \$ 7,061,000 \$ 163,354,000 \$ 654 2500 DES 17 Heber 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 95,899,356 \$ 2,476,000 \$ 3,303,000 \$ 661 500 DES 13 East Mesa 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 62,177,056 \$ 1,971,000 \$ 5,567,000 \$ 1,113 500 DES 3 Keystone Desalination 50 KAF with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge and MCI Distribution \$ 306,357,788 \$ 13,518,000 \$ 31,235,000 \$ 625 5000 DES 9 East Brawley 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field, Groundwater Recharge and MCI Distribution \$ 162,175,609 \$ 7,084,000 \$ 16,463,000 \$ 659 2500 RW 2 Upgrade Existing Plants to Tertiary and Deliver Effluent to a Local Market \$ 140,568,145 \$ 2,597,145 \$ 10,726,215 \$ 919 1170 Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water Locally \$ 372,088,101 \$ 10,232,000 \$ 31,750,000 \$ 1,270 2500 Project Alternatives were considered to have a lower priority - Unit cost > 5600/AF, and were not ranked (NR) in	DES 11	East Mesa 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field	\$	111,746,590	\$ 6,327,000	\$12,789,000	\$ 512	2 25000		
DES 6 keystone 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 160,695,766 \$ 7,061,000 \$16,354,000 \$ 654 2500 DES 17 Heber 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 95,899,356 \$ 2,476,000 \$ 3,303,000 \$ 661 500 DES 13 tast Mesa 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 33,027,263 \$ 1,648,000 \$ 3,358,000 \$ 7,12 500 DES 16 South Salton Sea 5 KAF East Desalination with Well Field \$ 62,177,056 \$ 1,971,000 \$ 5,567,000 \$ 1,113 500 DES 3 Keystone Desalination 50 KAF with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge and MCI Distribution \$ 306,357,788 \$13,518,000 \$ 31,235,000 \$ 625 5000 DES 9 East Brawley 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field, Groundwater Recharge and MCI Distribution \$ 162,175,609 \$ 7,084,000 \$ 16,463,000 \$ 659 2500 RW 2 Upgrade Existing Plants to Tertiary and Deliver Effluent to a Local Market \$ 140,568,145 \$ 2,597,145 \$ 10,726,215 \$ 919 1170 RW 4 Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water Locally \$ 51,323,358 \$ 1,438,723 \$ 4,406,758 \$ 938 470 DES 5 Recharge & Evaporation Ponds \$ 372,088,101 <t< td=""><td>DES 1</td><td>Keystone 50 KAF Desalination with Well Field</td><td>\$</td><td>281,817,834</td><td>\$13,149,000</td><td>\$29,447,000</td><td>\$ 589</td><td>50000</td></t<>	DES 1	Keystone 50 KAF Desalination with Well Field	\$	281,817,834	\$13,149,000	\$29,447,000	\$ 589	50000		
DES 17 Heber 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 95,899,356 \$ 2,476,000 \$ 3,303,000 \$ 661 500 DES 13 East Mesa 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 061,77,056 \$ 1,971,000 \$ 5,567,000 \$ 1,113 500 DES 3 Keystone Desalination 50 KAF with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge and MCI Distribution \$ 306,357,788 \$ 13,518,000 \$ 31,235,000 \$ 625 5000 DES 9 East Brawley 25 kAF Desalination with Well Field, Groundwater Recharge and MCI Distribution \$ 162,175,609 \$ 7,084,000 \$ 16,463,000 \$ 659 2500 Market \$ 140,568,145 \$ 2,597,145 \$ 10,726,215 \$ 919 1170 RW 4 Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Mater Locally \$ 51,323,358 \$ 1,438,723 \$ 4,406,758 \$ 938 470 DES 5 Keystone 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field, Groundwater Recharge & Evaporation Ponds \$ 372,088,101 \$ 10,232,000 \$ 31,750,000 \$ 1,270 2500 DES 5 Keystone 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field, Groundwater Recharge & Evaporation Ponds \$ 372,088,101 \$ 10,232,000 \$ 31,750,000 \$ 1,270 2500 DES 5 Keystone 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field, Groundwater Recharge & Evaporati	DES 10	East Brawley 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field		24,751,185	\$ 1,525,000	\$ 2,956,000	\$ 591	5000		
DES 14 tast Mesa 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field \$ 33,02/,263 \$ 1,648,000 \$ 3,558,000 \$ 712 500 DES 16 South Salton Sea 5 KAF East Desalination with Well Field \$ 62,177,056 \$ 1,971,000 \$ 5,567,000 \$ 1,113 500 DES 3 Keystone Desalination 50 KAF with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge and MCI Distribution \$ 306,357,788 \$13,518,000 \$ 31,235,000 \$ 625 5000 DES 9 East Brawley 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field, Groundwater Recharge and MCI Distribution \$ 162,175,609 \$ 7,084,000 \$16,463,000 \$ 659 2500 W2 2 Market \$ 140,568,145 \$ 2,597,145 \$10,726,215 \$ 919 1170 RW 4 Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water Locally \$ 51,323,358 \$ 1,438,723 \$ 4,406,758 \$ 938 470 DES 5 Keystone 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field, Groundwater Recharge & Evaporation Ponds \$ 372,088,101 \$10,232,000 \$31,270,000 \$ 1,270 2500 Project alternatives were considered to have a lower priority - Unit cost > \$600/AF , and were not ranked (NR) in the overall Alternatives Ranking Criteria Matrix Project Alternatives were considered to have a lower priority due to no groundwater banking/storage elements and not enough annual yield production < 5,000 AF,	DES 6	Keystone 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field	\$	160,695,766	\$ 7,061,000	\$16,354,000	\$ 654	25000		
DES 16 South Salton Sea 5 KAF East Desalination with Well Field \$ 62,177,056 \$ 1,971,000 \$ 5,567,000 \$ 1,113 500 DES 3 Keystone Desalination 50 KAF with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge and MCI Distribution \$ 306,357,788 \$ 13,518,000 \$ 31,235,000 \$ 625 5000 DES 9 East Brawley 25 kAF Desalination with Well Field, Groundwater Recharge and MCI Distribution \$ 162,175,609 \$ 7,084,000 \$ 16,463,000 \$ 659 2500 RW 2 Upgrade Existing Plants to Tertiary and Deliver Effluent to a Local Market \$ 140,568,145 \$ 2,597,145 \$ 10,726,215 \$ 919 1170 RW 4 Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water Locally \$ 51,323,358 \$ 1,438,723 \$ 4,406,758 \$ 938 470 DES 5 Keystone 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field, Groundwater Recharge & Evaporation Ponds \$ 372,088,101 \$ 10,232,000 \$ 31,750,000 \$ 1,270 2500 Project alternatives were considered to have a lower priority - Unit cost > \$600/AF, and were not ranked (NR) in the overall Alternatives Ranking Criteria Matrix Project Alternatives were considered to have a lower priority due to no groundwater banking/storage elements and not enough annual yield production < 5,000 AF, and were not ranked (NR) in the overall Alternatives Ranking Criteria Matrix.	DES 17	Heber 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field	Ŧ	95,899,356	\$ 2,476,000	\$ 3,303,000	\$ 661	5000		
DES 3 Keystone Desalination 50 KAF with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge and MCI Distribution \$ 306,357,788 \$13,518,000 \$31,235,000 \$ 625 5000 DES 9 East Brawley 25 kAF Desalination with Well Field, Groundwater Recharge and MCI Distribution \$ 162,175,609 \$ 7,084,000 \$16,463,000 \$ 659 2500 RW 2 Upgrade Existing Plants to Tertiary and Deliver Effluent to a Local Market \$ 140,568,145 \$ 2,597,145 \$10,726,215 \$ 919 1170 RW 4 Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water Locally \$ 51,323,358 \$ 1,438,723 \$ 4,406,758 \$ 938 470 DES 5 Keystone 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field, Groundwater Recharge & Evaporation Ponds \$ 372,088,101 \$ 10,232,000 \$ 31,750,000 \$ 1,270 2500 DES 5 Project alternatives were considered to have a lower priority - Unit cost > \$600/AF, and were not ranked (NR) in the overall Alternatives Ranking Criteria Matrix \$ 1,270 2500 Project Alternatives were considered to have a lower priority due to no groundwater banking/storage elements and not enough annual yield production < 5,000 AF, and were not ranked (NR) in the overall Alternatives Ranking Criteria Matrix	DES 13	East Mesa 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field		33,027,263	\$ 1,648,000	\$ 3,558,000				
DES 3 Recharge and MCI Distribution \$ 306,357,788 \$13,518,000 \$31,235,000 \$ 625 5000 DES 9 East Brawley 25 kAF Desalination with Well Field, Groundwater Recharge and MCI Distribution \$ 162,175,609 \$ 7,084,000 \$16,463,000 \$ 659 2500 RW 2 Upgrade Existing Plants to Tertiary and Deliver Effluent to a Local Market \$ 140,568,145 \$ 2,597,145 \$10,726,215 \$ 919 1170 RW 4 Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water Locally \$ 51,323,358 \$ 1,438,723 \$ 4,406,758 \$ 938 470 DES 5 Keystone 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field, Groundwater Recharge & Evaporation Ponds \$ 372,088,101 \$ 10,232,000 \$ 31,750,000 \$ 1,270 2500 Project alternatives were considered to have a lower priority – Unit cost > \$600/AF , and were not ranked (NR) in the overall Alternatives Ranking Criteria Matrix Project Alternatives were considered to have a lower priority due to no groundwater banking/storage elements and not enough annual yield production < 5,000 AF, and were not ranked (NR) in the overall Alternatives Ranking Criteria Matrix	DES 16		\$	62,177,056	\$ 1,971,000	\$ 5,567,000	\$ 1,113	3 5000		
DES 9 Recharge and MCI Distribution \$ 162,175,609 \$ 7,084,000 \$ 16,463,000 \$ 659 2500 RW 2 Market \$ 140,568,145 \$ 2,597,145 \$ 10,726,215 \$ 919 1170 RW 4 Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water Locally \$ 51,323,358 \$ 1,438,723 \$ 4,406,758 \$ 938 470 DES 5 Recharge & Evaporation Ponds \$ 372,088,101 \$ 10,232,000 \$ 31,750,000 \$ 1,270 2500 Project alternatives were considered to have a lower priority - Unit cost > \$600/AF , and were not ranked (NR) in the overall Alternatives Ranking Criteria Matrix V 2 2500 Project Alternatives were considered to have a lower priority - Unit cost > \$600/AF , and were not ranked (NR) in the overall Alternatives Ranking Criteria Matrix V 4 Project Alternatives were considered to have a lower priority due to no groundwater banking/storage elements and not enough annual yield production < 5,000 AF, and were not ranked (NR) in the overall Alternatives Ranking Criteria Matrix	DES 3	Recharge and MCI Distribution	\$	306,357,788	\$13,518,000	\$31,235,000	\$ 625	50000		
RW 2 Market \$ 140,568,145 \$ 2,597,145 \$10,726,215 \$ 919 1170 RW 4 Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water Locally \$ 51,323,358 \$ 1,438,723 \$ 4,406,758 \$ 938 470 DES 5 Keystone 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field, Groundwater Recharge & Evaporation Ponds \$ 372,088,101 \$ 10,232,000 \$ 31,750,000 \$ 1,270 2500 Project alternatives were considered to have a lower priority - Unit cost > \$600/AF , and were not ranked (NR) in the overall Alternatives Ranking Criteria Matrix Project Alternatives were considered to have a lower priority due to no groundwater banking/storage elements and not enough annual yield production < 5,000 AF, and were not ranked (NR) in the overall Alternatives Ranking Criteria Matrix		Recharge and MCI Distribution	\$	162,175,609	\$ 7,084,000	\$16,463,000	\$ 659	25000		
RW4 Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water Locally \$ \$ \$1,323,358 \$ 1,438,723 \$ 4,406,758 \$ 938 470 DES 5 Keystone 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field, Groundwater Recharge & Evaporation Ponds \$ 372,088,101 \$10,232,000 \$31,750,000 \$1,270 2500 Project alternatives were considered to have a lower priority - Unit cost > \$600/AF , and were not ranked (NR) in the overall Alternatives Ranking Criteria Matrix Project Alternatives were considered to have a lower priority due to no groundwater banking/storage elements and not enough annual yield production < 5,000 AF, and were not ranked (NR) in the overall Alternatives Ranking Criteria Matrix.	RW 2		Ś	140.568.145	\$ 2,597,145	\$10,726,215	\$ 919	11700		
DES 5 Recharge & Evaporation Ponds \$ 372,088,101 \$ 10,232,000 \$ 31,750,000 \$ 1,270 2500 Project alternatives were considered to have a lower priority - Unit cost > \$600/AF , and were not ranked (NR) in the overall Alternatives Ranking Criteria Matrix Project Alternatives were considered to have a lower priority due to no groundwater banking/storage elements and not enough annual yield production < 5,000 AF, and were not ranked (NR) in the overall Alternatives Ranking Criteria Matrix	RW 4	Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water Locally								
Alternatives Ranking Criteria Matrix Project Alternatives were considered to have a lower priority due to no groundwater banking/storage elements and not enough annual yield production < 5,000 AF, and were not ranked (NR) in the overall Alternatives Ranking Criteria Matrix	DES 5	Recharge & Evaporation Ponds								
annual yield production < 5,000 AF, and were not ranked (NR) in the overall Alternatives Ranking Criteria Matrix										
Project Alternatives were considered to have a lower priority due dependance on outside agency parternability, and were not ranked (NR) in the overall Alternatives Ranking Criteria Matrix. (1) Assumed 50 year lifespan, 5% interest. Other project used 30 yrs and 4%. Costs will be normalized in final report (2) Systems Conservation includes 24 projects, costs from \$398/AF to \$1169/AF, averaging \$504/AF (3) Source water collected from Imperial and proposed Keystone Development										
ranked (NR) in the overall Alternatives Ranking Criteria Matrix. (1) Assumed 50 year lifespan, 5% interest. Other project used 30 yrs and 4%. Costs will be normalized in final report (2) Systems Conservation includes 24 projects, costs from \$398/AF to \$1169/AF, averaging \$504/AF (3) Source water collected from Imperial and proposed Keystone Development										
 Assumed 50 year lifespan, 5% interest. Other project used 30 yrs and 4%. Costs will be normalized in final report Systems Conservation includes 24 projects, costs from \$398/AF to \$1169/AF, averaging \$504/AF Source water collected from Imperial and proposed Keystone Development 										
 (2) Systems Conservation includes 24 projects, costs from \$398/AF to \$1169/AF, averaging \$504/AF (3) Source water collected from Imperial and proposed Keystone Development 	(1)									
(3) Source water collected from Imperial and proposed Keystone Development										
(4) Source water collected from Imperial, Brawley, El Centro, Colexic and proposed Keystone Development	(3)	Source water collected from Imperial and proposed Keystone Deve	elop	ment						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(4)) Source water collected from Imperial, Brawley, El Centro, Colexic and proposed Keystone Development								

Table 1- Projects Ranked by Cost

Imperial Region Map

