## Chapter 11 Financial Costs

The financial cost of a project is defined as the "out of pocket cost" to finance, build, operate, and maintain the project. This chapter identifies the financial costs associated with the proposed action. The costs are given as a total annual cost per acre-foot of delivery capacity. The "Economic Costs of Alternatives" in Chapter 7 discusses the difference between financial and economic costs.

Santa Ynez Extension costs are included only as representative of costs that a local distribution might be if it was constructed by local entities.

Construction costs, shown in table 11-1, are based on July 1990 prices and include right-of-way acquisition, mitigation, design, and construction supervision, costs. The right-of-way costs are based on permanent easements for the pipeline and purchase of the land in fee at the pumping and power plants, and tank sites.

| Table 11-1. Construction, Right-of-Way, and Mitigation Costs |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Coastal Branch | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Mission Hills } \\ \text { Extension } \end{gathered}$ | Santa Ynez Extension |
| SWP Water 52,723 AF/YR |  |  |
| \$239,300,000 | \$31,700,000 | - |
| SWP Water 70,486 AF/YR |  |  |
| \$277,800,000 | \$45,100,000 | \$55,800,000 |
| SWP Water 82,700 AF/YR |  |  |
| \$299,000,000 | \$49,100,000 | \$61,300,000 |

Phase II and the two local extensions were divided into repayment reaches. Phase II reaches used in this study are those specified in the current SWP water supply contracts plus a reach for the Santa Maria River crossing. The Mission Hills and Santa Ynez Extension reaches were determined by such major features as pumping plants. The actual number of reaches used and their boundaries will be determined before the project is completed.

There are three repayment reaches for the Coastal Branch and two each for the Mission Hills and Santa Ynez Extensions. Table 11-2 describes each reach.

The estimated unit costs of water for each repayment reach are based on costs of construction, mitigation, operation and maintenance, interest during construction,
electrical energy, repayment of bonds, and SWP existing facilities cost. The electrical energy cost was based on $\$ 0.045$ per kilowatt hour (kwh) for the Coastal Branch and $\$ 0.080$ per kwh for the local distribution facilities. The annual operation and maintenance costs were estimated at 1 percent of construction costs. These unit costs assume the full entitlement will be taken starting the first year of operation of the project.

| Table 11-2. Repayment Reach Description |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reach | Length | Starts | Ends |
| Coastal Branch |  |  |  |
| 33A | 62 | Devils Den | San Luis Power <br> Plant |
| 34 | 8 | San Luis Power Plant | Lopez Turnout |
| 35 | 17 | Lopez Turnout | Santa Maria River |
| Mission Hills Extension |  |  |  |
| 1 | 10 | Santa Maria River | Casmalia Pumping Plant |
| 2 | 13 | Casmalia Pumping Plant | Mission Hills Taink Site |
| Santa Ynez Extension |  |  |  |
| 1 | 24 | Mission Hills | Santa Ynez Pumping Plant |
| 2 | 8 | Santa Ynez Pumping Plant | Lake Cachuma |

For the aqueduct's capital costs, the annual bond repayment charges would be repaid in two elements. The first element is the repayment of capital costs and interest, calculated through 2035 at the current Project Interest Rate of 4.713 percent. The project interest rate is the melded rate paid on securities issued to finance the SWP. This element is paid entirely by the two agencies in proportion to their share of the capital costs.

The second element is the difference between the total annual charges of the first element at 4.713 percent and the actual annual financing cost of bonds to be sold at an anticipated interest rate of 7.5 percent. This difference or surcharge is paid by all SWP contractors. San Luis Obispo's portion of this surcharge is 1.1 percent and Santa Barbara's share is $\mathbf{2 . 2}$ percent.

The annual bond repayment for the two local extensions was calculated by using an assumed interest rate of 8 percent for 35 years.

Unit costs of water for the down-sized aqueduct ( 52,723 AF/YR) are higher than the full-sized aqueduct $(70,486$ AF/YR). The cost of the down-sized facilities would be only slightly lower than the full-sized facilities but substantially less water is delivered by the down-sized system. This raises the cost per acre-foot of water for the down-sized project substantially above that of the fullsized. Since the down-sized aqueduct is intended to be built in conjunction with the Bradbury Dam enlargement (Lake Cachuma), use of SWP funding to enlarge Bradbury Dam requires that DWR's Local Project Guidelines be satisfied. These guidelines state "The Local Project must not adversely affect either the costs or water deliveries to SWP Water Supply Contractors other than the sponsoring contractor." Annual costs to Cachuma water users have been increased so that San Luis Obispo County's unit water rates for the down-sized aqueduct will be the same as the costs for the full-sized aqueduct. Without the enlarged Lake Cachuma project, San Luis Obispo County's unit cost of water would increase by about $\$ 30$ per AF for Reaches 33A and 34 and by about $\$ 50$ per AF for Reach $\mathbf{3 5}$ since there would be no "local project" redistribution of costs.

Tables 11-3, 11-4, and 11-5 show the estimated cost of the water by repayment reach for the three levels of water delivery from the proposed Coastal Branch. These costs are based on a tentative allocation of water to the local entities. The final allocation will be made by SLOCFCWCD and SBCFCWCD. Water treatment and local distribution costs were estimated from information furnished by the two counties and are included. The local distribution line cost shown for reach 33A is for two lines. One goes north from the San Margarita turnout to the Atascadero-Paso Robles area. The other line goes west from the Chorro turnout to the Morro Bay area. SWP costs for reach 34 are reduced by credits for power generated at the San Luis Powerplant.

The unit costs include charges for SLOCFCWCD and SBCFCWCD's share of existing SWP conservation and transportation facilities. Planned future SWP facilities of Kern Water Bank, Los Banos Grandes Reservoir, and Delta facilities would increase the cost of water to the two counties by about $\$ 50$ per acre-foot. This cost is not included in these tables.

| Table 11-3. Cost Per AF of SWP Water from the |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Coastal Branch, Phase $\boldsymbol{\Pi}$ |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ Includes $\$ 56$ AF/YR for SB County and $\$ 54$ for SLO's share of the existing SWP conservation and transportation facilities costs.
${ }^{2}$ Cost of treating the water at the proposed Polonio Pass Regional Plant.

| Table 11-4. Cost Per AF of SWP Water from |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mission Hills Extension |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ Includes $\$ 56$ AF/YR for SB County and $\$ 54$ for SLO's share of the existing SWP conservation and transportation facilities costs.
${ }^{2}$ Cost of treating the water at the proposed Polonio Pass Regional Plant.

| Table 11-5. Cost Per AF of SWP Water from Santa Ynez Extension |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RepaymentReach | Delivery Options ${ }^{1}$ |  | Treatment ${ }^{3}$ |
|  | Full-sized | Up-sized |  |
| 1 | \$860 | \$770 | \$110 |
| 2 | 1,000 | 880 | 110 |
| ${ }^{1}$ Includes $\$ 56$ AF/YR for SB County and $\$ 54$ for SLO's share of the existing SWP conservation and transportation facilities costs. <br> ${ }^{2}$ Cost of treating the water at the proposed Polonio Pass Regional Plant. |  |  |  |

As discussed in Chapter 3, the Santa Barbara Water Purveyors Agency has requested that the terminus of the Coastal Branch, Phase II, be moved from the Santa Maria River to but not including Casmalia Pumping Plant. The effect of this change would be to make this section a State Water Project facility instead of a local project. This would result in cost savings to the Santa Barbara Water

Purveyors Agency since the capital costs of this portion would be repaid at the SWP project interest rate instead of market municipal bond rates. This would not affect the cost of water to San Luis Obispo County. Tables 11-6 and 11-7 show the unit water costs if the terminus is at the Casmalia Pumping Plant.

| Table 11-6. Cost Per AF of SWP Water if Coastal Branch Terminus is Extended to Casmalia Pumping Plant Mission Hills Extension |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delivery Options ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Local } \\ & \text { Costs } \end{aligned}$ |
| Repayment Reach | Downsized | Fullsized | Up-sized | Treatment ${ }^{3}$ |
| 1 | \$510 | 5450 | \$410 | \$110 |
| 2 | 720 | 590 | 550 | 110 |
| ${ }^{1}$ Includes $\$ 56$ AF/YR for SB County and $\$ 54$ for SLO's share of the existing SWP conservation and transportation facilities costs. <br> ${ }^{2}$ Cost of treating the water at the proposed Polonio Pass Regional Plant. |  |  |  |  |


| Table 11-7. Cost Per AF of SWP Water if <br> Coastal Branch Terminu is Extended to <br> Casmalia Pumping Plant <br> Santa Ynez Extension |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Repayment <br> Reach | Delivery Options ${ }^{1}$ |  | Local Costs |
|  | Full-sized | Up-sized | Treatment ${ }^{2}$ |
|  | $\$ 840$ | $\mathbf{\$ 7 4 0}$ | $\$ 110$ |
| 2 | 970 | 860 | 110 |
| 2 |  |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ Includes $\$ 56$ AF/YR for SB County and $\$ 54$ for SLO's share of the existing SWP conservation and transportation facilities costs.
${ }^{2}$ Cost of treating the water al the proposed Polonio Pass Region-
al Plant.
Tables 11-8 and 11-9 list the agencies, amount of SWP water each has subscribed to, and the reach it is in. The amounts and reaches are preliminary and will likely be revised once the project is authorized.

| Table 11-8. Allocation of Water by Agency <br> and Repayment Reach |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| San Luis Obispo County |  | AF/VR |
| Reach |  |  |
| Shandon Co. Water Service Area 16-1 | 230 | 33 A |
| City of Paso Robles | 1,930 | 33 A |
| Templeton Co. Services Dist. | 900 | 33 A |
| Atascadero Mutiral Water Company | 1,420 | 33 A |
| Santa Margarita (WWD 6) | 100 | 33 A |
| Morro Bay | 1,310 | 33 A |
| Los Osos (CSA 9) | 1,620 | 33 A |
| Cayucor Purveyors | 280 | 33 A |
| Cuesta College | 200 | 33 A |
| County Operation Center/Park | 430 | 33 A |
| California Mens Colony | 600 | 33 A |
| City of San Luis Obispo | 2,250 | 33 A |
| City of San Luis Obispo | 750 | 34 |
| Arroyo Grande | 4,000 | 34 |
| Grover City | 2,000 | 34 |
| Oceano Community Service Dist. | 750 | 34 |
| Pismo Beach | 2,000 | 34 |
| Avila Co. Water Dist. | 130 | 34 |
| Port of San Luis | 100 | 34 |
| Nipomo Community Service Dist. | 3,500 | 35 |
| Southern California Water Company | 500 | 35 |
| Total | 25,000 |  |


| Table 11-9. Allocation of Water by Agency and Repayment Reach |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Santa Barbara County |  |  |  |  |
| Agency | AF/YR |  |  | Reach |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Down- } \\ & \text { sized } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Full- } \\ & \text { sized } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|} \text { Up- } \\ \text { sized } \end{array}$ |  |
| City of Santa Maria | 11,300 | 11,300 | 16,200 | MH1 |
| Guadelupe | 300 | 300 | 300 | MH1 |
| So. Ca. Water <br> Company (Orcutt) | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | MH1 |
| Casmalia <br> Community Service <br> Dist. | 20 | 20 | 20 | MH2 |
| Vandenberg AFB | 8,000 | 8,000 | 8,000 | MH2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Vandenberg Village } \\ & \text { CSD } \end{aligned}$ | 600 | 600 | 600 | MH2 |
| Mission Hills CSD | 500 | 500 | 500 | MH2 |
| City of Lompoc | 4,000 | 4,000 | 4,000 | MH2 |
| Buellton Community Water Dist. |  | 580 | 1,000 | SY1 |
| Santa Ynez Water Consvation Dist. |  | 2,000 | 3,000 | SY1 |
| Carpinteria Co. Service Dist. |  | 2,700 | 2,700 | SY2 |
| Goleta Water Dist. |  | 4,500 | 4,500 | SY2 |
| La Cumbre Mutual Water Company |  | 1,000 | 1,000 | SY2 |
| Montecito Water Dist. |  | 2,200 | 2,700 | SY2 |
| Morehart Land Company |  | 200 | 200 | SY2 |
| City of Santa Barbara |  | 3,000 | 6,000 | SY2 |
| Santa Barbara Research Center |  | 50 | 200 | SY2 |
| Summerland County Water Dist. |  | 300 | 300 | SY2 |
| Reserved SWP Entitlement | 1,150 | 1,150 | 3,000 | SY2 |
| Total | 28,870 | 45,400 | 57,620 |  |

