

Imperial Integrated Regional Water Management Plan  
Chapter 12. Review of Project, Program/Policy and Funding Alternatives

**Table 12-5. IID Capital Projects Alternatives and Cost**

Name	Description	Capital Cost	O&M	Equivalent Annual Cost	Unit Cost (\$/AF)	Yield (AF)
GW 18	Groundwater Blending- East Mesa Well Field Pumping to All-American Canal	\$ 39,501,517	\$ 198,000	\$ 2,482,000	\$ 99	25,000
GW 19	Groundwater Blending- East Mesa Well Field Pumping to All-American Canal with Percolation Ponds	\$ 48,605,551	\$ 243,000	\$ 3,054,000	\$ 122	25,000
WB 1	Coachella Valley Groundwater Storage Project	\$ 92,200,000	\$ 7,544,000	\$ 5,736,746	\$ 266	50,000
DES 8	25 KAF East Brawley Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge	\$ 100,991,177	\$ 6,166,000	\$ 12,006,000	\$ 480	25,000
AWC 1	Systems Conservation Projects (2)	\$ 56,225,000	N/A	\$ 4,068,000	\$ 504	8,000
DES 12	East Mesa 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge	\$ 112,318,224	\$ 6,336,000	\$ 12,831,000	\$ 513	25,000
DES 4	50 KAF Keystone Desalination with IID Drainwater/Alamo River	\$ 147,437,743	\$ 15,323,901	\$ 23,849,901	\$ 477	50,000
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	50,000
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	50,000
DES 2	50 KAF Keystone Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge	\$ 282,399,468	\$ 13,158,000	\$ 29,489,000	\$ 590	50,000
RW 5	Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water to IID Canal	\$ 20,818,710	\$ 829,853	\$ 2,033,801	\$ 308	6,600
RW 1	Disinfected Secondary Effluent from Existing Wastewater Treatment Plants Applied to Adjacent Agriculture	\$ 18,779,688	\$ 486,671	\$ 1,572,702	\$ 118	13,300
RW 3	Upgrade Existing Plants to Tertiary and Deliver Effluent to IID Canal System	\$ 90,531,216	\$ 2,992,257	\$ 7,498,347	\$ 562	13,300
RW 6	Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water to Local Service Area and IID Canal	\$ 102,374,854	\$ 2,280,145	\$ 8,200,493	\$ 488	16,800
DES 7	East Brawley 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field	\$ 100,409,542	\$ 6,157,000	\$ 11,964,000	\$ 479	25,000
DES 11	East Mesa 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field	\$ 111,746,590	\$ 6,327,000	\$ 12,789,000	\$ 512	25,000
DES 1	Keystone 50 KAF Desalination with Well Field	\$ 281,817,834	\$ 13,149,000	\$ 29,447,000	\$ 589	50,000
DES 10	East Brawley 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field	\$ 24,751,185	\$ 1,525,000	\$ 2,956,000	\$ 591	5,000
DES 6	Keystone 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field	\$ 160,695,766	\$ 7,061,000	\$ 16,354,000	\$ 654	25,000
DES 17	Heber 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field	\$ 95,899,356	\$ 2,476,000	\$ 3,303,000	\$ 661	5,000
DES 13	East Mesa 5 KAF Desalination with Well Field	\$ 33,027,263	\$ 1,648,000	\$ 3,558,000	\$ 712	5,000
DES 16	South Salton Sea 5 KAF East Desalination with Well Field	\$ 62,177,056	\$ 1,971,000	\$ 5,567,000	\$ 1,113	5,000
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	50,000
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	25,000
RW 2	Upgrade Existing Plants to Tertiary and Deliver Effluent to a Local Market	\$ 140,568,145	\$ 2,597,145	\$ 10,726,215	\$ 919	11,700
RW 4	Regional Plant Serving Tertiary Water Locally	\$ 51,323,358	\$ 1,438,723	\$ 4,406,758	\$ 938	4,700
DES 5	Keystone 25 KAF Desalination with Well Field, Groundwater Recharge & Evaporation Ponds	\$ 372,088,101	\$ 10,232,000	\$ 31,750,000	\$ 1,270	25,000
	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					
	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)	System Conservation includes 24 projects, costs from \$398/AF to \$1169/AF, averaging \$504/AF					
(3)	Source water collected from Imperial and proposed Keystone Development					
(4)	Source water collected from Imperial, Brawley, El Centro, Colexic and proposed Keystone Development					