

Appendix A - Non-Potable Demand Assessment Methodology

Appendix A: Non-Potable Demand Assessment

Landscape Irrigation

Landscape irrigation demands were the primary recycled water use identified within the study area. In developing these demands, each customer’s landscaped area was estimated using recent aerial imagery from Google Earth, as well as GIS-compatible aerial imagery. From the aerial review, the percentage of each customer’s site that is landscaped was estimated and applied this percentage to the total parcel area. In addition, recent aerial imagery was used to check that each site’s perceived irrigated space did not include artificial turf. Parcel areas that had artificial turf fields were removed from the total irrigated acreage.

In order to calculate demand, an annual average irrigation factor of 3.4 acre-feet per year (AFY) per acre of landscaped area was applied based on: annual evapotranspiration (ET_o) of 44.8 inches; total annual precipitation of 15.3 inches; and effective precipitation (Eppt) of 25% of total annual precipitation:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Annual Average Irrigation Demand} \left[\frac{\text{AFY}}{\text{acre}} \right] &= \frac{ET_o \left[\frac{\text{in}}{\text{yr}} \right] - Eppt \left[\frac{\text{in}}{\text{yr}} \right]}{12 \left[\frac{\text{in}}{\text{ft}} \right]} \\
 &= \frac{44.8 \frac{\text{in}}{\text{yr}} - 0.25 \times 15.3 \frac{\text{in}}{\text{yr}}}{12 \frac{\text{in}}{\text{ft}}} \\
 &= 3.4 \frac{\text{AFY}}{\text{acre}}
 \end{aligned}$$

The ET_o and precipitation values are taken from the climate data presented in Palo Alto’s 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) and summarized below in Table 1.

Table 1: City of Palo Alto Climate Data

| | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Total |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Standard Monthly Average ET _o ¹ | 1.4 | 1.9 | 3.4 | 4.4 | 5.5 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 5.5 | 4.4 | 3.1 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 44.8 |
| Average Rainfall ² (in) | 3.2 | 2.9 | 2.3 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 15.3 |

Source: City of Palo Alto 2015 Urban Water Management Plan

Notes:

1. Average ET_o data for closest active station (Hayward) reported by CIMIS website <http://www.cimis.water.ca.gov/>
2. Average rainfall data for Palo Alto reported by NOAA website <http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/>

July is the maximum demand month for landscape irrigation, with a maximum day peaking factor of 1.7. This maximum day peaking factor was applied for all landscape irrigation demands throughout the study area. The peak hour landscape irrigation demands were calculated using an hourly peaking factor of 3.0 assuming an 8-hour irrigation window at night. These peaking factors are summarized in Table 5.

Dual Plumbing

The first step to determining dual-plumbing demands was to estimate the total building square footage. For future developments where site-specific details were not yet known, information was gathered on anticipated building density from developers and architects. If this information was not available, the likely building density was estimated using allowable floor area ratios (FARs) in the development's respective zoning code. The estimated total building square footage was found with the following calculation:

$$\text{Total Building Area [Sq Ft]} = \text{Total Parcel Area [Sq Ft]} * \text{FAR} * \text{FAR Reduction Factor}$$

It was assumed that not all buildings would be calculated to the maximum FAR over the entire parcel area, so a FAR reduction factor of 0.75 was applied to find the most likely building density. Any comments from developers on likely development density were incorporated into the estimate.

After determining total building square footage, the total potential daily water demand for urinal and toilet fixtures was determined using the following calculation:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Total Daily Water Demand} \left[\frac{\text{Gallons}}{\text{Day}} \right] &= \text{Flow Rate} \left[\frac{\text{Gallons}}{\text{Flush}} \right] * \text{Duration [Flush]} * \text{Average Daily Use} * \text{No. of FTEs} \\ &+ \text{Flow Rate} \left[\frac{\text{Gallons}}{\text{Flush}} \right] * \text{Duration [Flush]} * \text{Average Transient Daily Use} * \text{No. of Transient FTEs} \end{aligned}$$

Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) are defined as the occupants who spend at least 40 hours per week (8 hours per day) in the building. Transient FTEs represent occupants that do not utilize the building services on a regular basis, such as visitors, customers, or delivery persons. The number of FTEs and Transient FTEs were estimated from the total building footprint square footage and the space type metrics outlined in Table 2. Space types for existing buildings were determined based on known information about the site. Future developments were categorized as "General Office," "Service," "R&D or Laboratory," "Hotel," or "Mixed Use High" based on developer input and zoning descriptions.

Table 2: Space Type Default Occupancy Numbers

| Space Type | Gross Square Feet per Occupant – FTE | Gross Square Feet Per Occupant – Transient FTE |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| General Office | 250 | 0 |
| Retail, general | 550 | 130 |
| Service (e.g. financial, auto) | 600 | 130 |
| Restaurant | 435 | 95 |
| Grocery Store | 550 | 115 |
| Medical Office | 225 | 330 |
| R&D or Laboratory | 400 | 0 |
| Warehouse, distribution | 2500 | 0 |
| Warehouse, storage | 20000 | 0 |
| Hotel | 1500 | 700 |
| Education, daycare | 630 | 105 |
| Educational, K–12 | 1300 | 140 |
| Education, postsecondary | 2100 | 150 |
| Mixed Use Corridor ¹ | 480 | 90 |
| Mixed Use High ² | 460 | 80 |

Source: LEED Reference for Building Operations and Maintenance, Version 4 **Error! Reference source not found.** Appendix 2-Table 1. Default Occupancy Numbers.

Notes:

1. Developed based on zoning description, which averages General Office, Retail, Service, Restaurant, and Grocery Store occupancy numbers.
2. Developed based on zoning description, which averages General Office, Retail, Service, Restaurant, Grocery Store, and R&D/Laboratory occupancy numbers.

Water fixture metrics that were used for flow rate, duration and average daily use are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Water Fixture Metrics

| Fixture Type | Flow Rate ¹ (gallons/flush) | Duration (flush) | Avg Daily Use – FTE ¹ | Avg Daily Use – Transient FTE ² |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Urinals | 0.5 | 1 | 2 | 0.4 |
| Toilet (Water Closet) | 1.28 | 1 | 2 | 0.5 |

Notes:

1. Source: 2011 CalGreen Green Building Requirements. (Table 13C.5.303.2.2).
2. Source: LEED 2009 Water Use Reduction Additional Guidance (Version 7). Table 1. Non-residential Default Fixture Uses.

IKEA and the Mitchell Park Library and Community Center are the two customers in the service area known to have dual plumbing. Since IKEA's site-specific meter data was not available, its demands were estimated using the methodology outlined above. For the Mitchell Park facilities, the demand was taken

from the Phase 3 Business Plan in which it was assumed that 30% of the water measured by the site's W4 meter is used for toilet flushing that could be converted to recycled water.

In order to adjust each site's total daily water demand to an annual average demand, the daily demand was multiplied by the customer's assumed number of days of operation. The values used for days of operation for different customer types are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4: Days of Operation

| Space Type | Days of Operation |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| Retail, general | 365 |
| Hotel | 365 |
| Mixed Use High | 365 |
| General Office | 260 |
| Service (e.g. financial, auto) | 260 |
| R&D or Laboratory | 260 |

The peak hour dual-plumbing demands were calculated using an hourly peaking factor of 2.0, assuming the average occupancy of the buildings is 12 hours during the day. Peaking factors are summarized in Table 5.

Cooling Towers

Demands for cooling towers included customers previously identified as having cooling towers and customers assumed to have cooling towers through review of building characteristics. In addition, certain future developments were identified as potential cooling tower users through specific conversations with developers and architects.

The magnitude of cooling tower demand was determined using the following equation:

$$\text{Cooling Tower Demand (AFY)} = \frac{\text{Total Building Area [Sq Ft]}}{330 \left[\frac{\text{Sq Ft}}{\text{Ton of Load}} \right] * 4.1} * 0.02 \left[\frac{\text{AFY}}{\text{Ton of Load}} \right]$$

This demand calculation was based on historical cooling tower use data from southern California, adjusted for the climate in Palo Alto. The historical data from several office buildings in Burbank, California showed about 330 square feet per ton of cooling tower load and about .02 AF of water use per ton of cooling tower load. This resulted in an average cooling tower water demand of 0.073 AF per 1,000 square feet of building area. This demand metric was then adjusted to Palo Alto's climate using Cooling Degree Days – the number of degrees that a day's average temperature is above 65°F (which is assumed to be when air conditioning is needed), summed over an entire year. Since Burbank has approximately 4.1 times as many CDDs as Palo Alto, the Burbank cooling tower use factor was divided by 4.1 to yield a cooling tower use factor of 0.018 AF per 1,000 square feet for the Palo Alto area. This factor was applied to all developments assumed to have cooling towers in the service area.

Based on the total number of cooling degree days per month in Palo Alto, August is the maximum demand month for cooling tower demands, with a maximum day peaking factor of 2.7. The peak hour cooling tower

demands were calculated using an hourly peaking factor of 2.0, assuming the average occupancy of the buildings is 12 hours during the day.

These peaking factors are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5: Demand Peaking Factors

| Demand Type | Peaking Factor |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Maximum Day</i> | |
| Irrigation | 1.7 |
| Cooling Tower | 2.7 |
| <i>Hourly</i> | |
| Irrigation | 3.0 |
| Dual Plumbing | 2.0 |
| Cooling Tower | 2.0 |

**Appendix B - Recycled Water Customers and Demand
Estimates [Confidential – Not Included]**

Appendix C - Potential Uses Considered but Not Included

Appendix C: Users Considered but Eliminated

Appendix A identifies potential non-potable recycled water customers throughout the Strategic Plan study area whereas this appendix identifies customers that were considered but not included in the study.

The 1992 Palo Alto Recycled Water Master Plan (RWMP) was used as the starting point for identifying potential recycled water demands. Additional uses were then identified through review of available recycled water feasibility studies, Urban Water Management Plans, General and Specific Plans and aerials of the study area. The City and District then reached out to the Regional Water Quality Control Plan (RWQCP) Partner Agencies and other stakeholders to verify if the customers identified in their areas could realistically be expected to accept recycled water and whether additional customers should be considered.

Customers from the 1992 RWMP that are not included in this Strategic Plan include:

- East Palo Alto Greenhouses – In the 1990s there were a number of functioning greenhouses in East Palo Alto, but now there are not many greenhouses known to be operating in the area. Those that are still operating are not anticipated to have significant demand.
- Medians and Streetscapes – The State Water Resources Control Board has proposed regulations prohibiting the irrigation of ornamental turf in publicly owned medians and streetscapes (i.e. the landscaped area between the street and sidewalk). The prohibition includes recycled water irrigation systems unless the system was installed prior to 2018. While irrigation of trees within medians and streetscapes are exempt from the proposed regulation, the default assumption for the Strategic Plan was not to include medians and streetscapes unless stakeholders provided information confirming the type of vegetation and associated water use for specific areas.

Stakeholders suggested that medians along Foothill Expressway be considered. However, through field investigations, Palo Alto determined that the portion of Foothill Expressway in its service area is not irrigated and verification of irrigation of the portion within Los Altos could not be obtained. As such, Foothill Expressway was dropped from further consideration.

- Gate of Heaven Cemetery – This customer, though previously identified as a potential customer in Los Altos's service area, was found to be within Cupertino's service area.

Additional customers considered but not included:

- Cooley Landing Park – Recycled water is currently being trucked to this East Palo Alto park to support the establishment period for new native landscaping. Following the establishment period there will be no irrigation demand.
- East Bayshore Redevelopment - East Palo Alto staff noted that the area along East Bayshore has potential for significant multi-family residential redevelopment. However, there were no specific redevelopment plans, and the City indicated it would probably not pursue dual-plumbing for residential use.
- East Palo Alto Neighborhood Gardens and Sports Fields – Through review of aerials of East Palo Alto, a number of sizeable gardens and what looked like communal sports fields in between

residences were identified. East Palo Alto city staff indicated that these are temporary uses that sprung up on vacant lots. When the building moratorium in East Palo Alto is lifted, the City expects that these sites will be developed.

- Edith Park – This park in Los Altos Hills was recently redone to minimize irrigation needs.
- Gateway District Retail Center Redevelopment – This potential redevelopment area was in review in East Palo Alto’s General Plan, but East Palo Alto city staff noted there are no specific plans for redevelopment of this area.
- Los Altos Redevelopment along El Camino – The majority of redevelopment will occur in the next few years. Because the City currently does not require installation of recycled water infrastructure for new developments, incorporating recycled water use within these buildings seems unlikely.
- Ravenswood Family Health Center – This facility in East Palo Alto is dual-plumbed. However, review of the facility’s plans showed that the dual-plumbing was for on-site rain capture and not designed to have recycled water incorporated.
- San Antonio Redevelopment – This redevelopment area in Mountain View received conditions of approval prior to Mountain View’s dual-plumbing ordinance and, as a result, is not dual-plumbed for recycled water.
- Single Family Residences – Los Altos Hills and Purissima Hills Water District (PHWD) indicated interest in working with large residential irrigators in Los Altos Hills to convert to recycled water use. Review of potential residences focused on parcels along Purissima Road and Fremont Road where PHWD identified the potential to repurpose abandoned or soon to be abandoned potable water pipelines for recycled water distribution. In these areas the residences averaged less than 1 acre-foot per year (AFY) of total water consumption. These volumes are not considered significant enough for residences to willingly undertake conversion of their irrigation systems plus the regulatory complexity involved with using recycled water at single family residences.
- Sobrato Phase I – Construction for this site in East Palo Alto, which is also known as Amazon I, was already underway at the time of the demand assessment and was determined not to include purple pipe for recycled water.
- Stanford Shopping Center – The General Manager of Stanford Shopping Center contacted the City at the start of the Strategic Planning process inquiring about the possibility of extending recycled water infrastructure to the shopping center. Through subsequent discussions, the shopping center indicated potential for both irrigation use as well as dual-plumbing use in future buildings. However, estimated demands were not provided.

Appendix D - Opinions of Probable Costs

| A1 | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--------------|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| Capital Costs | | | | | |
| General Requirements | | | | | |
| | Mobilization | | Applied to all capital costs | 10% | \$2,265,933 |
| | Traffic Control | | Applied to all capital costs | 4% | \$906,373 |
| Treatment | | | | | |
| MBR | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 17,200,000 | \$0 |
| Ozone | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 360,000 | \$0 |
| BAC | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 323,000 | \$0 |
| MF/UF system | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,317,000 | \$0 |
| RO System | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,586,000 | \$0 |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,510,000 | \$0 |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 470,000 | \$0 |
| Free Chlorine | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 271,000 | \$0 |
| Chemicals (Storage and Use) | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 134,000 | \$0 |
| Sitework/Piping/Structures | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 3,427,000 | \$0 |
| Conveyance | | | | | |
| High-Density Urban Pipeline, HDPE | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 186 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 18,494 | LF | \$ 200 | \$3,699,008 |
| 10 Inch | | 9,029 | LF | \$ 212 | \$1,914,318 |
| 12 Inch | | 6,873 | LF | \$ 254 | \$1,747,873 |
| 16 Inch | | 22,301 | LF | \$ 277 | \$6,178,938 |
| 18 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 290 | \$0 |
| 20 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 334 | \$0 |
| 24 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 381 | \$0 |
| 30 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 462 | \$0 |
| Repurposing Pipe | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 55 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 66 | \$0 |
| Sheeting and Shoring (Open Cut) | | 3% of Open Cut Pipeline Cost | | 3% | \$406,204 |
| Microtunneling | | | | | |
| Tunnel and Casing (36") | | 800 | LF | \$ 1,728 | \$1,382,400 |
| Jacking Shaft | | 3 | EA | \$ 300,000 | \$900,000 |
| Receiving Shaft | | 3 | EA | \$ 150,000 | \$450,000 |
| Horizontal Directional Drilling | | | | | |
| 24 Inch Bore Diameter | | 350 | LF | \$ 528 | \$184,800 |
| PTGAB | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 375 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 500 | \$0 |
| 10 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 625 | \$0 |
| 12 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 750 | \$0 |
| 16 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,000 | \$0 |
| 20 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,250 | \$0 |
| Jacking Shafts | | 0 | EA | \$ 258,000 | \$0 |
| Receiving Shafts | | 0 | EA | \$ 148,000 | \$0 |
| Pipe Bridge | | | | | |
| Pipe Bridge Support | | 8 | LF | \$ 5,000 | \$40,000 |
| Pipe Bridge Pipe | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 66 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 86 | \$0 |
| 10 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 108 | \$0 |
| 12 Inch | | 65 | LF | \$ 139 | \$9,049 |
| 16 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 175 | \$0 |
| Potholing | | 579 | EA | \$ 500 | \$289,560 |
| Cathodic Protection | | 3% of Pipeline Installation Cost | | 3% | \$506,178 |
| Customer Services (no meter replacement) | | 62 | EA | \$ 10,000 | \$620,000 |
| Customer Services (with meter replacement) | | 132 | EA | \$ 15,000 | \$1,980,000 |
| Planter Box (Housing Pipe on Bridge Sidewalk) | | 6 | CY | \$ 2,000 | \$12,000 |
| Planter Box (Installation Labor) | | 8 | Day | \$ 4,000 | \$32,000 |
| Pump Stations | | | | | |
| Pump Station #1 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #2 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #3 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #4 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #5 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | 1 | LS | \$ 1,389,000 | \$1,389,000 |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 1 | LS | \$ 918,000 | \$918,000 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #1 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #2 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #3 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #4 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #5 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Storage Tank | | | | | |
| Storage Tank | 0.0 | | MG | \$ 1,500,000 | \$0 |
| Underground Construction | | 0.0 | LS | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Injection Well | | | | | |
| | | 0 | EA | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Extraction Wellhead Treatment | | | | | |
| Hale | | 0 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$0 |
| Rinconada | | 0 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$0 |
| Peers | | 0 | AFY | \$ 3,353 | \$0 |
| El Camino | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Eleanor | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Library | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | |
| | | 0 | LS | \$ 3,326,000 | \$0 |
| Subtotal | | | | | |
| | | | | | \$25,832,000 |
| Sales Tax | | | | 9% | \$1,020,000 |
| Construction Cost Subtotal | | | | | \$26,852,000 |
| Market Adjustment Factor | | | | 10% | \$2,685,000 |
| Construction Contingency | | | | 40% | \$10,741,000 |
| Construction Cost Total | | | | | \$40,300,000 |
| Engineering and Admin Services (Design) | | | | 15% | \$4,028,000 |
| Construction Management | | | | 10% | \$2,685,000 |
| Engineering Services During Construction | | | | 3% | \$806,000 |
| Property Acquisition (Property Only) | | | | | |
| Property Acquisition (Property Only) | | 0 | SQ FT | \$ 500 | \$0 |
| Property Acquisition (House on Property) | | 0 | SQ FT | \$ 1,000 | \$0 |
| Rinconada Land Cost | | 0 | LS | \$ 4,500,000 | \$0 |
| Peers Land Cost | | 0 | LS | \$ 7,000,000 | \$0 |
| On-Time Fee | | 0 | LS | \$ 75,000 | \$0 |
| Total Capital Cost | | | | | \$47,800,000 |

| A1 | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|---|------|--|---------------|--|--------------------|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| O&M Costs (Annual) | | | | | |
| Advanced Water Treatment | | | | | |
| MBR | 0 | | MGD | \$ 560,000 | \$0 |
| Ozone | 0 | | MGD | \$ 93,000 | \$0 |
| BAC | 0 | | MGD | \$ 131,000 | \$0 |
| MF/UF system | 0 | | MGD | \$ 342,000 | \$0 |
| RO System | 0 | | MGD | \$ 574,000 | \$0 |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 0 | | MGD | \$ 226,000 | \$0 |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 0 | | MGD | \$ 73,000 | \$0 |
| Free Chlorine | 0 | | MGD | \$ 32,000 | \$0 |
| Chemicals | 0 | | MGD | \$ 121,000 | \$0 |
| Labor for Treatment (no MBR) | 0 | 1,040 | hrs/MGD | \$ 100 | \$0 |
| Labor for MBR | 0 | 1,040 | hrs/year | \$ 100 | \$0 |
| Monitoring | | 0 | \$/year | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Conveyance | | | | | |
| Annual Inspection and Maintenance of Pipeline - Average Annual Operator Hours per | | | LF | \$0.78 | \$44,942 |
| Pump Stations | | | | | |
| Consumables | | | | | |
| Equipment | | | | 1% | \$0 |
| Mechanical | | | | 1% | \$0 |
| Electrical/Instrumentation | | | | 1% | \$0 |
| Electricity Requirement | | | | | |
| Energy Charge | | 444,385 | kWh/year | \$ 0.15 | \$66,658 |
| Labor Costs | | | | | |
| Total No. Operators | | 0 | No. | | |
| Average Annual Operator Hours per Year | | 520 | Hours | | |
| Total Operator Hours per Year | | 0 | Hours | \$ 99.81 | \$0 |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | 1 | LS | \$ 96,000 | \$96,000 |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 1 | LS | \$ 81,000 | \$81,000 |
| Storage Tanks | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | | | 1% | \$0 |
| Injection Wells | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | 0 | EA | \$ 15,000 | \$0 |
| Extraction Wells | | | | | |
| Groundwater Pumping Charge | | 0 | AFY | \$ 1,960 | \$0 |
| Hale Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 265 | \$0 |
| Rinconada Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 263 | \$0 |
| Peers Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 224 | \$0 |
| El Camino Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$0 |
| Eleanor Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$0 |
| Library Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 242 | \$0 |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | |
| | | 0 | LS | \$ 100,000 | \$0 |
| Total O&M Costs (\$/yr) | | | | | \$290,000 |
| Annualized Costs (\$ / Year) | | | | | |
| Annualized Capital Costs (\$/Year) | | One payment per year, spread over Project Life | | | \$2,439,000 |
| Annual O&M Costs | | | | | \$290,000 |
| Total Annualized Cost | | | | | \$2,729,000 |
| Deliveries of Recycled Water | | 800 AFY | | | |
| Estimated Unit Cost (\$/AF) | | | | | \$3,400 |

| A2 | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|---|-----------------|----------|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| Capital Costs | | | | | |
| General Requirements | | | | | |
| | Mobilization | | Applied to all capital costs | 10% | \$2,987,744 |
| | Traffic Control | | Applied to all capital costs | 4% | \$1,195,097 |
| Treatment | | | | | |
| MBR | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 17,200,000 | \$0 |
| Ozone | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 360,000 | \$0 |
| BAC | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 323,000 | \$0 |
| MF/UF system | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,317,000 | \$0 |
| RO System | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,586,000 | \$0 |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,510,000 | \$0 |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 470,000 | \$0 |
| Free Chlorine | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 271,000 | \$0 |
| Chemicals (Storage and Use) | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 134,000 | \$0 |
| Sitework/Piping/Structures | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 3,427,000 | \$0 |
| Conveyance | | | | | |
| High-Density Urban Pipeline, HDPE | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 186 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 50,383 | LF | \$ 200 | \$10,077,166 |
| 10 Inch | | 8,600 | LF | \$ 212 | \$1,823,362 |
| 12 Inch | | 5,500 | LF | \$ 254 | \$1,398,705 |
| 16 Inch | | 1,000 | LF | \$ 277 | \$277,070 |
| 18 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 290 | \$0 |
| 20 Inch | | 7,115 | LF | \$ 334 | \$2,375,058 |
| 24 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 381 | \$0 |
| 30 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 462 | \$0 |
| Repurposing Pipe | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 2,200 | LF | \$ 55 | \$120,839 |
| 8 Inch | | 1,850 | LF | \$ 66 | \$121,540 |
| Sheeting and Shoring (Open Cut) 3% of Open Cut Pipeline Cost 3% \$478,541 | | | | | |
| Microtunneling | | | | | |
| Tunnel and Casing (36") | | 820 | LF | \$ 1,728 | \$1,416,960 |
| Jacking Shaft | | 3 | EA | \$ 300,000 | \$900,000 |
| Receiving Shaft | | 3 | EA | \$ 150,000 | \$450,000 |
| Horizontal Directional Drilling | | | | | |
| 24 Inch Bore Diameter | | 350 | LF | \$ 528 | \$184,800 |
| PTGAB | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 375 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 236 | LF | \$ 500 | \$118,025 |
| 10 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 625 | \$0 |
| 12 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 750 | \$0 |
| 16 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,000 | \$0 |
| 20 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,250 | \$0 |
| Jacking Shafts | | 2 | EA | \$ 258,000 | \$516,000 |
| Receiving Shafts | | 2 | EA | \$ 148,000 | \$296,000 |
| Pipe Bridge | | | | | |
| Pipe Bridge Support | | 56 | LF | \$ 5,000 | \$280,000 |
| Pipe Bridge Pipe | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 431 | LF | \$ 66 | \$28,252 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 86 | \$0 |
| 10 Inch | | 50 | LF | \$ 108 | \$5,424 |
| 12 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 139 | \$0 |
| 16 Inch | | 65 | LF | \$ 175 | \$11,387 |
| Potholing | | 746 | EA | \$ 500 | \$372,750 |
| Cathodic Protection 3% of Pipeline Installation Cost 3% \$593,614 | | | | | |
| Customer Services (no meter replacement) EA \$ 10,000 \$620,000 | | | | | |
| Customer Services (with meter replacement) EA \$ 15,000 \$2,055,000 | | | | | |
| Planter Box (Housing Pipe on Bridge Sidewalk) CY \$ 2,000 \$12,000 | | | | | |
| Planter Box (Installation Labor) Day \$ 4,000 \$32,000 | | | | | |
| Pump Stations | | | | | |
| Pump Station #1 | 200 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ 7,444 | \$1,488,839 |
| Pump Station #2 | 300 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ 6,433 | \$1,929,951 |
| Pump Station #3 | 40 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ 13,288 | \$531,505 |
| Pump Station #4 | 60 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ 11,483 | \$688,978 |
| Pump Station #5 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | | | | |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 0 | LS | \$ 1,389,000 | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #1 | 9,100 | | Gal | \$ 29 | \$266,555 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #2 | 8,500 | | Gal | \$ 30 | \$258,258 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #3 | 2,900 | | Gal | \$ 41 | \$117,657 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #4 | 700 | | Gal | \$ 45 | \$31,202 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #5 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Storage Tank | | | | | |
| Storage Tank | 0.0 | | MG | \$ 1,500,000 | \$0 |
| Underground Construction | | | | | |
| Injection Well | | 0 | EA | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Extraction Wellhead Treatment | | | | | |
| Hale | | 0 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$0 |
| Rinconada | | 0 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$0 |
| Peers | | 0 | AFY | \$ 3,353 | \$0 |
| El Camino | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Eleanor | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Library | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | |
| | | 0 | LS | \$ 3,326,000 | \$0 |
| Subtotal | | | | | |
| Sales Tax | | | | 9% | \$1,344,000 |
| Construction Cost Subtotal | | | | | \$35,404,000 |
| Market Adjustment Factor 10% \$3,540,000 | | | | | |
| Construction Contingency 40% \$14,162,000 | | | | | |
| Construction Cost Total | | | | | |
| \$53,200,000 | | | | | |
| Engineering and Admin Services (Design) 15% \$5,311,000 | | | | | |
| Construction Management 10% \$3,540,000 | | | | | |
| Engineering Services During Construction 3% \$1,062,000 | | | | | |
| Property Acquisition (Property Only) | | | | | |
| Property Acquisition (House on Property) | | 0 | SQ FT | \$ 500 | \$0 |
| Rinconada Land Cost | | 0 | LS | \$ 4,500,000 | \$0 |
| Peers Land Cost | | 0 | LS | \$ 7,000,000 | \$0 |
| On-Time Fee | | 0 | LS | \$ 75,000 | \$0 |
| Total Capital Cost | | | | | \$63,000,000 |

| A2 | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|---|------|--|---------------|--|--------------------|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| O&M Costs (Annual) | | | | | |
| Advanced Water Treatment | | | | | |
| MBR | 0 | | MGD | \$ 560,000 | \$0 |
| Ozone | 0 | | MGD | \$ 93,000 | \$0 |
| BAC | 0 | | MGD | \$ 131,000 | \$0 |
| MF/UF system | 0 | | MGD | \$ 342,000 | \$0 |
| RO System | 0 | | MGD | \$ 574,000 | \$0 |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 0 | | MGD | \$ 226,000 | \$0 |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 0 | | MGD | \$ 73,000 | \$0 |
| Free Chlorine | 0 | | MGD | \$ 32,000 | \$0 |
| Chemicals | 0 | | MGD | \$ 121,000 | \$0 |
| Labor for Treatment (no MBR) | 0 | 1,040 | hrs/MGD | \$ 100 | \$0 |
| Labor for MBR | 0 | 1,040 | hrs/year | \$ 100 | \$0 |
| Monitoring | | 0 | \$/year | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Conveyance | | | | | |
| Annual Inspection and Maintenance of Pipeline - Average Annual Operator Hours per | | | LF | \$0.78 | \$58,100 |
| Pump Stations | | | | | |
| Consumables | | | | | |
| Equipment | | | | 1% | \$46,393 |
| Mechanical | | | | 1% | \$46,393 |
| Electrical/Instrumentation | | | | 1% | \$46,393 |
| Electricity Requirement | | | | | |
| Energy Charge | | 794,111 | kWh/year | \$ 0.15 | \$119,117 |
| Labor Costs | | | | | |
| Total No. Operators | | 4 | No. | | |
| Average Annual Operator Hours per Year | | 520 | Hours | | |
| Total Operator Hours per Year | | 2,080 | Hours | \$ 99.81 | \$207,610 |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | 0 | LS | \$ 96,000 | \$0 |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 0 | LS | \$ 81,000 | \$0 |
| Storage Tanks | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | | | 1% | \$0 |
| Injection Wells | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | 0 | EA | \$ 15,000 | \$0 |
| Extraction Wells | | | | | |
| Groundwater Pumping Charge | | 0 | AFY | \$ 1,960 | \$0 |
| Hale Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 265 | \$0 |
| Rinconada Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 263 | \$0 |
| Peers Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 224 | \$0 |
| El Camino Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$0 |
| Eleanor Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$0 |
| Library Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 242 | \$0 |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | |
| | | 0 | LS | \$ 100,000 | \$0 |
| Total O&M Costs (\$/yr) | | | | | \$520,000 |
| Annualized Costs (\$ / Year) | | | | | |
| Annualized Capital Costs (\$/Year) | | One payment per year, spread over Project Life | | | \$3,214,000 |
| Annual O&M Costs | | | | | \$520,000 |
| Total Annualized Cost | | | | | \$3,734,000 |
| Deliveries of Recycled Water | | 1,100 AFY | | | |
| Estimated Unit Cost (\$/AF) | | | | | \$3,400 |

| A3 | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--------------|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| Capital Costs | | | | | |
| General Requirements | | | | | |
| | Mobilization | | Applied to all capital costs | 10% | \$4,033,005 |
| | Traffic Control | | Applied to all capital costs | 4% | \$1,613,202 |
| Treatment | | | | | |
| MBR | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 17,200,000 | \$0 |
| Ozone | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 360,000 | \$0 |
| BAC | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 323,000 | \$0 |
| MF/UF system | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,317,000 | \$0 |
| RO System | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,586,000 | \$0 |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,510,000 | \$0 |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 470,000 | \$0 |
| Free Chlorine | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 271,000 | \$0 |
| Chemicals (Storage and Use) | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 134,000 | \$0 |
| Sitework/Piping/Structures | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 3,427,000 | \$0 |
| Conveyance | | | | | |
| High-Density Urban Pipeline, HDPE | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 186 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 60,148 | LF | \$ 200 | \$12,030,275 |
| 10 Inch | | 32,577 | LF | \$ 212 | \$6,906,936 |
| 12 Inch | | 3,550 | LF | \$ 254 | \$902,801 |
| 16 Inch | | 5,500 | LF | \$ 277 | \$1,523,885 |
| 18 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 290 | \$0 |
| 20 Inch | | 8,115 | LF | \$ 334 | \$2,708,868 |
| 24 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 381 | \$0 |
| 30 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 462 | \$0 |
| Repurposing Pipe | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 2,200 | LF | \$ 55 | \$120,839 |
| 8 Inch | | 1,850 | LF | \$ 66 | \$121,540 |
| Sheeting and Shoring (Open Cut) | | 3% of Open Cut Pipeline Cost | | 3% | \$722,183 |
| Microtunneling | | | | | |
| Tunnel and Casing (36") | | 820 | LF | \$ 1,728 | \$1,416,960 |
| Jacking Shaft | | 3 | EA | \$ 300,000 | \$900,000 |
| Receiving Shaft | | 3 | EA | \$ 150,000 | \$450,000 |
| Horizontal Directional Drilling | | | | | |
| 24 Inch Bore Diameter | | 350 | LF | \$ 528 | \$184,800 |
| PTGAB | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 375 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 236 | LF | \$ 500 | \$118,025 |
| 10 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 625 | \$0 |
| 12 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 750 | \$0 |
| 16 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,000 | \$0 |
| 20 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,250 | \$0 |
| Jacking Shafts | | 2 | EA | \$ 258,000 | \$516,000 |
| Receiving Shafts | | 2 | EA | \$ 148,000 | \$296,000 |
| Pipe Bridge | | | | | |
| Pipe Bridge Support | | 87 | LF | \$ 5,000 | \$435,000 |
| Pipe Bridge Pipe | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 566 | LF | \$ 66 | \$37,101 |
| 8 Inch | | 123 | LF | \$ 86 | \$10,631 |
| 10 Inch | | 50 | LF | \$ 108 | \$5,424 |
| 12 Inch | | 50 | LF | \$ 139 | \$6,961 |
| 16 Inch | | 65 | LF | \$ 175 | \$11,387 |
| Potholing | | 1,122 | EA | \$ 500 | \$560,750 |
| Cathodic Protection | | 3% of Pipeline Installation Cost | | 3% | \$845,358 |
| Customer Services (no meter replacement) | | 62 | EA | \$ 10,000 | \$620,000 |
| Customer Services (with meter replacement) | | 147 | EA | \$ 15,000 | \$2,205,000 |
| Planter Box (Housing Pipe on Bridge Sidewalk) | | 6 | CY | \$ 2,000 | \$12,000 |
| Planter Box (Installation Labor) | | 8 | Day | \$ 4,000 | \$32,000 |
| Pump Stations | | | | | |
| Pump Station #1 | 300 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ 6,433 | \$1,929,951 |
| Pump Station #2 | 300 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ 6,433 | \$1,929,951 |
| Pump Station #3 | 40 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ 13,288 | \$531,505 |
| Pump Station #4 | 60 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ 11,483 | \$688,978 |
| Pump Station #5 | 69 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ 10,920 | \$753,446 |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | 0 | LS | \$ 1,389,000 | \$0 |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 0 | LS | \$ 918,000 | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #1 | 11,200 | | Gal | \$ 25 | \$285,278 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #2 | 10,500 | | Gal | \$ 27 | \$280,820 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #3 | 2,900 | | Gal | \$ 41 | \$117,657 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #4 | 700 | | Gal | \$ 45 | \$31,202 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #5 | 1,900 | | Gal | \$ 42 | \$80,542 |
| Storage Tank | | | | | |
| Storage Tank | 0.0 | | MG | \$ 1,500,000 | \$0 |
| Underground Construction | | 0.0 | LS | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Injection Well | | | | | |
| | | 0 | EA | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Extraction Wellhead Treatment | | | | | |
| Hale | | 0 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$0 |
| Rinconada | | 0 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$0 |
| Peers | | 0 | AFY | \$ 3,353 | \$0 |
| El Camino | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Eleanor | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Library | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | |
| | | 0 | LS | \$ 3,326,000 | \$0 |
| Subtotal | | | | | |
| | | | | | \$45,976,000 |
| Sales Tax | | | | 9% | \$1,815,000 |
| Construction Cost Subtotal | | | | | \$47,791,000 |
| Market Adjustment Factor | | | | 10% | \$4,779,000 |
| Construction Contingency | | | | 40% | \$19,116,000 |
| Construction Cost Total | | | | | \$71,700,000 |
| Engineering and Admin Services (Design) | | | | 15% | \$7,169,000 |
| Construction Management | | | | 10% | \$4,779,000 |
| Engineering Services During Construction | | | | 3% | \$1,434,000 |
| Property Acquisition (Property Only) | | | | | |
| Property Acquisition (Property Only) | | 0 | SQ FT | \$ 500 | \$0 |
| Property Acquisition (House on Property) | | 0 | SQ FT | \$ 1,000 | \$0 |
| Rinconada Land Cost | | 0 | LS | \$ 4,500,000 | \$0 |
| Peers Land Cost | | 0 | LS | \$ 7,000,000 | \$0 |
| On-Time Fee | | 0 | LS | \$ 75,000 | \$0 |
| Total Capital Cost | | | | | \$85,100,000 |

| A3 | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|---|------|--|---------------|--|--------------------|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| O&M Costs (Annual) | | | | | |
| Advanced Water Treatment | | | | | |
| MBR | 0 | | MGD | \$ 560,000 | \$0 |
| Ozone | 0 | | MGD | \$ 93,000 | \$0 |
| BAC | 0 | | MGD | \$ 131,000 | \$0 |
| MF/UF system | 0 | | MGD | \$ 342,000 | \$0 |
| RO System | 0 | | MGD | \$ 574,000 | \$0 |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 0 | | MGD | \$ 226,000 | \$0 |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 0 | | MGD | \$ 73,000 | \$0 |
| Free Chlorine | 0 | | MGD | \$ 32,000 | \$0 |
| Chemicals | 0 | | MGD | \$ 121,000 | \$0 |
| Labor for Treatment (no MBR) | 0 | 1,040 | hrs/MGD | \$ 100 | \$0 |
| Labor for MBR | 0 | 1,040 | hrs/year | \$ 100 | \$0 |
| Monitoring | | 0 | \$/year | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Conveyance | | | | | |
| Annual Inspection and Maintenance of Pipeline - Average Annual Operator Hours per | | | LF | \$0.78 | \$87,864 |
| Pump Stations | | | | | |
| Consumables | | | | | |
| Equipment | | | | 1% | \$58,338 |
| Mechanical | | | | 1% | \$58,338 |
| Electrical/Instrumentation | | | | 1% | \$58,338 |
| Electricity Requirement | | | | | |
| Energy Charge | | 1,040,732 | kWh/year | \$ 0.15 | \$156,110 |
| Labor Costs | | | | | |
| Total No. Operators | | 5 | No. | | |
| Average Annual Operator Hours per Year | | 520 | Hours | | |
| Total Operator Hours per Year | | 2,600 | Hours | \$ 99.81 | \$259,513 |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | 0 | LS | \$ 96,000 | \$0 |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 0 | LS | \$ 81,000 | \$0 |
| Storage Tanks | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | | | 1% | \$0 |
| Injection Wells | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | 0 | EA | \$ 15,000 | \$0 |
| Extraction Wells | | | | | |
| Groundwater Pumping Charge | | 0 | AFY | \$ 1,960 | \$0 |
| Hale Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 265 | \$0 |
| Rinconada Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 263 | \$0 |
| Peers Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 224 | \$0 |
| El Camino Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$0 |
| Eleanor Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$0 |
| Library Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 242 | \$0 |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | |
| | | 0 | LS | \$ 100,000 | \$0 |
| Total O&M Costs (\$/yr) | | | | | \$680,000 |
| Annualized Costs (\$ / Year) | | | | | |
| Annualized Capital Costs (\$/Year) | | One payment per year, spread over Project Life | | | \$4,342,000 |
| Annual O&M Costs | | | | | \$680,000 |
| Total Annualized Cost | | | | | \$5,022,000 |
| Deliveries of Recycled Water | | 1,250 AFY | | | |
| Estimated Unit Cost (\$/AF) | | | | | \$4,000 |

| A4 | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| Capital Costs | | | | | |
| General Requirements | | | | | |
| | Mobilization | | Applied to all capital costs | 10% | \$0 |
| | Traffic Control | | Applied to all capital costs | 4% | \$0 |
| Treatment | | | | | |
| MBR | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 17,200,000 | \$0 |
| Ozone | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 360,000 | \$0 |
| BAC | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 323,000 | \$0 |
| MF/UF system | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,317,000 | \$0 |
| RO System | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,586,000 | \$0 |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,510,000 | \$0 |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 470,000 | \$0 |
| Free Chlorine | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 271,000 | \$0 |
| Chemicals (Storage and Use) | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 134,000 | \$0 |
| Sitework/Piping/Structures | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 3,427,000 | \$0 |
| Conveyance | | | | | |
| High-Density Urban Pipeline, HDPE | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 186 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 200 | \$0 |
| 10 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 212 | \$0 |
| 12 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 254 | \$0 |
| 16 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 277 | \$0 |
| 18 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 290 | \$0 |
| 20 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 334 | \$0 |
| 24 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 381 | \$0 |
| 30 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 462 | \$0 |
| Repurposing Pipe | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 55 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 66 | \$0 |
| Sheeting and Shoring (Open Cut) | | 3% of Open Cut Pipeline Cost | | 3% | \$0 |
| Microtunneling | | | | | |
| Tunnel and Casing (36") | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,728 | \$0 |
| Jacking Shaft | | 0 | EA | \$ 300,000 | \$0 |
| Receiving Shaft | | 0 | EA | \$ 150,000 | \$0 |
| Horizontal Directional Drilling | | 0 | LF | \$ 528 | \$0 |
| 24 Inch Bore Diameter | | 0 | | | \$0 |
| PTGAB | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 375 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 500 | \$0 |
| 10 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 625 | \$0 |
| 12 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 750 | \$0 |
| 16 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,000 | \$0 |
| 20 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,250 | \$0 |
| Jacking Shafts | | 0 | EA | \$ 258,000 | \$0 |
| Receiving Shafts | | 0 | EA | \$ 148,000 | \$0 |
| Pipe Bridge | | | | | |
| Pipe Bridge Support | | 0 | LF | \$ 5,000 | \$0 |
| Pipe Bridge Pipe | | 0 | | | \$0 |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 66 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 86 | \$0 |
| 10 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 108 | \$0 |
| 12 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 139 | \$0 |
| 16 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 175 | \$0 |
| Potholing | | 0 | EA | \$ 500 | \$0 |
| Cathodic Protection | | 3% of Pipeline Installation Cost | | 3% | \$0 |
| Customer Services (no meter replacement) | | 0 | EA | \$ 10,000 | \$0 |
| Customer Services (with meter replacement) | | 0 | EA | \$ 15,000 | \$0 |
| Planter Box (Housing Pipe on Bridge Sidewalk) | | 0 | CY | \$ 2,000 | \$0 |
| Planter Box (Installation Labor) | | 0 | Day | \$ 4,000 | \$0 |
| Pump Stations | | | | | |
| Pump Station #1 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #2 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #3 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #4 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #5 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | 0 | LS | \$ 1,389,000 | \$0 |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 0 | LS | \$ 918,000 | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #1 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #2 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #3 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #4 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #5 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Storage Tank | | | | | |
| Storage Tank | 0.0 | | MG | \$ 1,500,000 | \$0 |
| Underground Construction | | 0.0 | LS | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Injection Well | | | | | |
| | | 0 | EA | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Extraction Wellhead Treatment | | | | | |
| Hale | | 0 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$0 |
| Rinconada | | 0 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$0 |
| Peers | | 0 | AFY | \$ 3,353 | \$0 |
| El Camino | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Eleanor | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Library | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | |
| | | 1 | LS | \$ 3,326,000 | \$3,326,000 |
| Subtotal | | | | | \$3,326,000 |
| Sales Tax | | | | 9% | \$150,000 |
| Construction Cost Subtotal | | | | | \$3,476,000 |
| Market Adjustment Factor | | | | 10% | \$348,000 |
| Construction Contingency | | | | 40% | \$1,390,000 |
| Construction Cost Total | | | | | \$5,300,000 |
| Engineering and Admin Services (Design) | | | | 15% | \$521,000 |
| Construction Management | | | | 10% | \$348,000 |
| Engineering Services During Construction | | | | 3% | \$104,000 |
| Property Acquisition (Property Only) | | | | | |
| Property Acquisition (Property Only) | | 0 | SQ FT | \$ 500 | \$0 |
| Property Acquisition (House on Property) | | 0 | SQ FT | \$ 1,000 | \$0 |
| Rinconada Land Cost | | 0 | LS | \$ 4,500,000 | \$0 |
| Peers Land Cost | | 0 | LS | \$ 7,000,000 | \$0 |
| On-Time Fee | | 0 | LS | \$ 75,000 | \$0 |
| Total Capital Cost | | | | | \$6,200,000 |

| A4 | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|---|--|----------|---------------|--|------------------|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| O&M Costs (Annual) | | | | | |
| Advanced Water Treatment | | | | | |
| MBR | 0 | | MGD | \$ 560,000 | \$0 |
| Ozone | 0 | | MGD | \$ 93,000 | \$0 |
| BAC | 0 | | MGD | \$ 131,000 | \$0 |
| MF/UF system | 0 | | MGD | \$ 342,000 | \$0 |
| RO System | 0 | | MGD | \$ 574,000 | \$0 |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 0 | | MGD | \$ 226,000 | \$0 |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 0 | | MGD | \$ 73,000 | \$0 |
| Free Chlorine | 0 | | MGD | \$ 32,000 | \$0 |
| Chemicals | 0 | | MGD | \$ 121,000 | \$0 |
| Labor for Treatment (no MBR) | 0 | 1,040 | hrs/MGD | \$ 100 | \$0 |
| Labor for MBR | 0 | 1,040 | hrs/year | \$ 100 | \$0 |
| Monitoring | | 0 | \$/year | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Conveyance | | | | | |
| Annual Inspection and Maintenance of Pipeline - Average Annual Operator Hours per | | | LF | \$0.78 | \$0 |
| Pump Stations | | | | | |
| Consumables | | | | | |
| Equipment | | | | 1% | \$0 |
| Mechanical | | | | 1% | \$0 |
| Electrical/Instrumentation | | | | 1% | \$0 |
| Electricity Requirement | | | | | |
| Energy Charge | | - | kWh/year | \$ 0.15 | \$0 |
| Labor Costs | | | | | |
| Total No. Operators | | 0 | No. | | \$0 |
| Average Annual Operator Hours per Year | | 520 | Hours | | \$0 |
| Total Operator Hours per Year | | 0 | Hours | \$ 99.81 | \$0 |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | 0 | LS | \$ 96,000 | \$0 |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 0 | LS | \$ 81,000 | \$0 |
| Storage Tanks | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | | | 1% | \$0 |
| Injection Wells | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | 0 | EA | \$ 15,000 | \$0 |
| Extraction Wells | | | | | |
| Groundwater Pumping Charge | | 0 | AFY | \$ 1,960 | \$0 |
| Hale Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 265 | \$0 |
| Rinconada Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 263 | \$0 |
| Peers Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 224 | \$0 |
| El Camino Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$0 |
| Eleanor Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$0 |
| Library Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 242 | \$0 |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | |
| | | 1 | LS | \$ 100,000 | \$100,000 |
| Total O&M Costs (\$/yr) | | | | | \$100,000 |
| Annualized Costs (\$ / Year) | | | | | |
| Annualized Capital Costs (\$/Year) | One payment per year, spread over Project Life | | | | \$316,000 |
| Annual O&M Costs | | | | | \$100,000 |
| Total Annualized Cost | | | | | \$416,000 |
| Deliveries of Recycled Water | 200 AFY | | | | |
| Estimated Unit Cost (\$/AF) | | | | | \$2,100 |

| A5 | | | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life | | |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years | | |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost | | |
| Capital Costs | | | | | | | |
| General Requirements | | | | | | | |
| | Mobilization | | Applied to all capital costs | 10% | \$3,443,427 | | |
| | Traffic Control | | Applied to all capital costs | 4% | \$1,377,371 | | |
| Treatment | | | | | | | |
| MBR | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 17,200,000 | \$0 | | |
| Ozone | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 360,000 | \$0 | | |
| BAC | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 323,000 | \$0 | | |
| MF/UF system | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,317,000 | \$0 | | |
| RO System | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,586,000 | \$0 | | |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,510,000 | \$0 | | |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 470,000 | \$0 | | |
| Free Chlorine | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 271,000 | \$0 | | |
| Chemicals (Storage and Use) | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 134,000 | \$0 | | |
| Sitework/Piping/Structures | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 3,427,000 | \$0 | | |
| Conveyance | | | | | | | |
| High-Density Urban Pipeline, HDPE | | | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 186 | \$0 | | |
| 8 Inch | | 21,500 | LF | \$ 200 | \$4,300,241 | | |
| 10 Inch | | 14,500 | LF | \$ 212 | \$3,074,272 | | |
| 12 Inch | | 5,500 | LF | \$ 254 | \$1,398,705 | | |
| 16 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 277 | \$0 | | |
| 18 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 290 | \$0 | | |
| 20 Inch | | 44,714 | LF | \$ 334 | \$14,925,980 | | |
| 24 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 381 | \$0 | | |
| 30 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 462 | \$0 | | |
| Repurposing Pipe | | | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 55 | \$0 | | |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 66 | \$0 | | |
| Sheeting and Shoring (Open Cut) | | 3% of Open Cut Pipeline Cost | | 3% | \$710,976 | | |
| Microtunneling | | | | | | | |
| Tunnel and Casing (36") | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,728 | \$0 | | |
| Jacking Shaft | | 0 | EA | \$ 300,000 | \$0 | | |
| Receiving Shaft | | 0 | EA | \$ 150,000 | \$0 | | |
| Horizontal Directional Drilling | | 0 | LF | \$ 528 | \$0 | | |
| 24 Inch Bore Diameter | | | | | | | |
| PTGAB | | | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 375 | \$0 | | |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 500 | \$0 | | |
| 10 Inch | | 122 | LF | \$ 625 | \$76,266 | | |
| 12 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 750 | \$0 | | |
| 16 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,000 | \$0 | | |
| 20 Inch | | 114 | LF | \$ 1,250 | \$142,530 | | |
| Jacking Shafts | | 2 | EA | \$ 258,000 | \$516,000 | | |
| Receiving Shafts | | 2 | EA | \$ 148,000 | \$296,000 | | |
| Pipe Bridge | | | | | | | |
| Pipe Bridge Support | | 61 | LF | \$ 5,000 | \$305,000 | | |
| Pipe Bridge Pipe | | | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 92 | LF | \$ 66 | \$6,031 | | |
| 8 Inch | | 240 | LF | \$ 86 | \$20,744 | | |
| 10 Inch | | 91 | LF | \$ 108 | \$9,871 | | |
| 12 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 139 | \$0 | | |
| 16 Inch | | 172 | LF | \$ 175 | \$30,132 | | |
| Potholing | | 870 | EA | \$ 500 | \$435,225 | | |
| Cathodic Protection | | 3% of Pipeline Installation Cost | | 3% | \$736,597 | | |
| Customer Services (no meter replacement) | | 0 | EA | \$ 10,000 | \$0 | | |
| Customer Services (with meter replacement) | | 106 | EA | \$ 15,000 | \$1,590,000 | | |
| Planter Box (Housing Pipe on Bridge Sidewalk) | | 0 | CY | \$ 2,000 | \$0 | | |
| Planter Box (Installation Labor) | | 0 | Day | \$ 4,000 | \$0 | | |
| Pump Stations | | | | | | | |
| Pump Station #1 | 300 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ 6,433 | \$1,929,951 | | |
| Pump Station #2 | 225 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ 7,135 | \$1,605,408 | | |
| Pump Station #3 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 | | |
| Pump Station #4 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 | | |
| Pump Station #5 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 | | |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | 0 | LS | \$ 1,389,000 | \$0 | | |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 0 | LS | \$ 918,000 | \$0 | | |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #1 | 12,200 | | Gal | \$ 24 | \$288,554 | | |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #2 | 7,200 | | Gal | \$ 33 | \$235,789 | | |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #3 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 | | |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #4 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 | | |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #5 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 | | |
| Storage Tank | | | | | | | |
| Storage Tank | 1.2 | | MG | \$ 1,500,000 | \$1,800,000 | | |
| Underground Construction | | 0.0 | LS | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 | | |
| Injection Well | | | | | | | |
| | | 0 | EA | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 | | |
| Extraction Wellhead Treatment | | | | | | | |
| Hale | | 0 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$0 | | |
| Rinconada | | 0 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$0 | | |
| Peers | | 0 | AFY | \$ 3,353 | \$0 | | |
| El Camino | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 | | |
| Eleanor | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 | | |
| Library | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 | | |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | | | |
| | | 0 | LS | \$ 3,326,000 | \$0 | | |
| Subtotal | | | | | \$39,255,000 | | |
| Sales Tax | | | | 9% | \$1,550,000 | | |
| Construction Cost Subtotal | | | | | \$40,805,000 | | |
| Market Adjustment Factor | | | | 10% | \$4,081,000 | | |
| Construction Contingency | | | | 40% | \$16,322,000 | | |
| Construction Cost Total | | | | | \$61,308,000 | | |
| Engineering and Admin Services (Design) | | | | 15% | \$6,121,000 | | |
| Construction Management | | | | 10% | \$4,081,000 | | |
| Engineering Services During Construction | | | | 3% | \$1,224,000 | | |
| Property Acquisition (Property Only) | | | | | | | |
| Property Acquisition (Property Only) | | 0 | SQ FT | \$ 500 | \$0 | | |
| Property Acquisition (House on Property) | | 0 | SQ FT | \$ 1,000 | \$0 | | |
| Rinconada Land Cost | | 0 | LS | \$ 4,500,000 | \$0 | | |
| Peers Land Cost | | 0 | LS | \$ 7,000,000 | \$0 | | |
| On-Time Fee | | 0 | LS | \$ 75,000 | \$0 | | |
| Total Capital Cost | | | | | \$72,600,000 | | |

| A5 | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|---|--|----------|---------------|--|--------------------|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| O&M Costs (Annual) | | | | | |
| Advanced Water Treatment | | | | | |
| MBR | 0 | | MGD | \$ 560,000 | \$0 |
| Ozone | 0 | | MGD | \$ 93,000 | \$0 |
| BAC | 0 | | MGD | \$ 131,000 | \$0 |
| MF/UF system | 0 | | MGD | \$ 342,000 | \$0 |
| RO System | 0 | | MGD | \$ 574,000 | \$0 |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 0 | | MGD | \$ 226,000 | \$0 |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 0 | | MGD | \$ 73,000 | \$0 |
| Free Chlorine | 0 | | MGD | \$ 32,000 | \$0 |
| Chemicals | 0 | | MGD | \$ 121,000 | \$0 |
| Labor for Treatment (no MBR) | 0 | 1,040 | hrs/MGD | \$ 100 | \$0 |
| Labor for MBR | 0 | 1,040 | hrs/year | \$ 100 | \$0 |
| Monitoring | | 0 | \$/year | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Conveyance | | | | | |
| Annual Inspection and Maintenance of Pipeline - Average Annual Operator Hours per | | | LF | \$0.78 | \$68,908 |
| Pump Stations | | | | | |
| Consumables | | | | | |
| Equipment | | | | 1% | \$35,354 |
| Mechanical | | | | 1% | \$35,354 |
| Electrical/Instrumentation | | | | 1% | \$35,354 |
| Electricity Requirement | | | | | |
| Energy Charge | | 668,276 | kWh/year | \$ 0.15 | \$100,241 |
| Labor Costs | | | | | |
| Total No. Operators | | 2 | No. | | |
| Average Annual Operator Hours per Year | | 520 | Hours | | |
| Total Operator Hours per Year | | 1,040 | Hours | \$ 99.81 | \$103,805 |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | 0 | LS | \$ 96,000 | \$0 |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 0 | LS | \$ 81,000 | \$0 |
| Storage Tanks | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | | | 1% | \$18,000 |
| Injection Wells | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | 0 | EA | \$ 15,000 | \$0 |
| Extraction Wells | | | | | |
| Groundwater Pumping Charge | | 0 | AFY | \$ 1,960 | \$0 |
| Hale Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 265 | \$0 |
| Rinconada Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 263 | \$0 |
| Peers Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 224 | \$0 |
| El Camino Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$0 |
| Eleanor Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$0 |
| Library Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 242 | \$0 |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | |
| | | 0 | LS | \$ 100,000 | \$0 |
| Total O&M Costs (\$/yr) | | | | | \$400,000 |
| Annualized Costs (\$ / Year) | | | | | |
| Annualized Capital Costs (\$/Year) | One payment per year, spread over Project Life | | | | \$3,704,000 |
| Annual O&M Costs | | | | | \$400,000 |
| Total Annualized Cost | | | | | \$4,104,000 |
| Deliveries of Recycled Water | 900 AFY | | | | |
| Estimated Unit Cost (\$/AF) | | | | | \$4,600 |

| A6 | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--------------|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| Capital Costs | | | | | |
| General Requirements | | | | | |
| | Mobilization | | Applied to all capital costs | 10% | \$980,415 |
| | Traffic Control | | Applied to all capital costs | 4% | \$392,166 |
| Treatment | | | | | |
| MBR | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 17,200,000 | \$0 |
| Ozone | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 360,000 | \$0 |
| BAC | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 323,000 | \$0 |
| MF/UF system | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,317,000 | \$0 |
| RO System | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,586,000 | \$0 |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,510,000 | \$0 |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 470,000 | \$0 |
| Free Chlorine | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 271,000 | \$0 |
| Chemicals (Storage and Use) | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 134,000 | \$0 |
| Sitework/Piping/Structures | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 3,427,000 | \$0 |
| Conveyance | | | | | |
| High-Density Urban Pipeline, HDPE | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 186 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 14,100 | LF | \$ 200 | \$2,820,158 |
| 10 Inch | | 10,200 | LF | \$ 212 | \$2,162,592 |
| 12 Inch | | 10,000 | LF | \$ 254 | \$2,543,100 |
| 16 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 277 | \$0 |
| 18 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 290 | \$0 |
| 20 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 334 | \$0 |
| 24 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 381 | \$0 |
| 30 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 462 | \$0 |
| Repurposing Pipe | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 55 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 66 | \$0 |
| Sheeting and Shoring (Open Cut) | | 3% of Open Cut Pipeline Cost | | 3% | \$225,775 |
| Microtunneling | | | | | |
| Tunnel and Casing (36") | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,728 | \$0 |
| Jacking Shaft | | 0 | EA | \$ 300,000 | \$0 |
| Receiving Shaft | | 0 | EA | \$ 150,000 | \$0 |
| Horizontal Directional Drilling | | | | | |
| 24 Inch Bore Diameter | | 0 | LF | \$ 528 | \$0 |
| PTGAB | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 375 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 500 | \$0 |
| 10 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 625 | \$0 |
| 12 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 750 | \$0 |
| 16 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,000 | \$0 |
| 20 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,250 | \$0 |
| Jacking Shafts | | 0 | EA | \$ 258,000 | \$0 |
| Receiving Shafts | | 0 | EA | \$ 148,000 | \$0 |
| Pipe Bridge | | | | | |
| Pipe Bridge Support | | 0 | LF | \$ 5,000 | \$0 |
| Pipe Bridge Pipe | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 66 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 86 | \$0 |
| 10 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 108 | \$0 |
| 12 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 139 | \$0 |
| 16 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 175 | \$0 |
| Potholing | | 343 | EA | \$ 500 | \$171,500 |
| Cathodic Protection | | 3% of Pipeline Installation Cost | | 3% | \$232,549 |
| Customer Services (no meter replacement) | | 17 | EA | \$ 10,000 | \$170,000 |
| Customer Services (with meter replacement) | | 16 | EA | \$ 15,000 | \$240,000 |
| Planter Box (Housing Pipe on Bridge Sidewalk) | | 0 | CY | \$ 2,000 | \$0 |
| Planter Box (Installation Labor) | | 0 | Day | \$ 4,000 | \$0 |
| Pump Stations | | | | | |
| Pump Station #1 | 150 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ 8,256 | \$1,238,474 |
| Pump Station #2 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #3 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #4 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #5 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | 0 | LS | \$ 1,389,000 | \$0 |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 0 | LS | \$ 918,000 | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #1 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #2 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #3 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #4 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #5 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Storage Tank | | | | | |
| Storage Tank | 0.0 | | MG | \$ 1,500,000 | \$0 |
| Underground Construction | | 0.0 | LS | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Injection Well | | | | | |
| | | 0 | EA | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Extraction Wellhead Treatment | | | | | |
| Hale | | 0 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$0 |
| Rinconada | | 0 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$0 |
| Peers | | 0 | AFY | \$ 3,353 | \$0 |
| El Camino | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Eleanor | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Library | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | |
| | | 0 | LS | \$ 3,326,000 | \$0 |
| Subtotal | | | | | |
| | | | | | \$11,177,000 |
| Sales Tax | | | | 9% | \$441,000 |
| Construction Cost Subtotal | | | | | \$11,618,000 |
| Market Adjustment Factor | | | | | |
| Market Adjustment Factor | | | | 10% | \$1,162,000 |
| Construction Contingency | | | | 40% | \$4,647,000 |
| Construction Cost Total | | | | | \$17,500,000 |
| Engineering and Admin Services (Design) | | | | | |
| Engineering and Admin Services (Design) | | | | 15% | \$1,743,000 |
| Construction Management | | | | | |
| Construction Management | | | | 10% | \$1,162,000 |
| Engineering Services During Construction | | | | 3% | \$349,000 |
| Property Acquisition (Property Only) | | | | | |
| Property Acquisition (Property Only) | | | | | \$0 |
| Property Acquisition (House on Property) | | | | | \$0 |
| Rinconada Land Cost | | | | | \$0 |
| Peers Land Cost | | | | | \$0 |
| On-Time Fee | | | | | \$0 |
| Total Capital Cost | | | | | \$20,700,000 |

| A6 | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|---|------|--|---------------|--|--------------------|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| O&M Costs (Annual) | | | | | |
| Advanced Water Treatment | | | | | |
| MBR | 0 | | MGD | \$ 560,000 | \$0 |
| Ozone | 0 | | MGD | \$ 93,000 | \$0 |
| BAC | 0 | | MGD | \$ 131,000 | \$0 |
| MF/UF system | 0 | | MGD | \$ 342,000 | \$0 |
| RO System | 0 | | MGD | \$ 574,000 | \$0 |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 0 | | MGD | \$ 226,000 | \$0 |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 0 | | MGD | \$ 73,000 | \$0 |
| Free Chlorine | 0 | | MGD | \$ 32,000 | \$0 |
| Chemicals | 0 | | MGD | \$ 121,000 | \$0 |
| Labor for Treatment (no MBR) | 0 | 1,040 | hrs/MGD | \$ 100 | \$0 |
| Labor for MBR | 0 | 1,040 | hrs/year | \$ 100 | \$0 |
| Monitoring | | 0 | \$/year | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Conveyance | | | | | |
| Annual Inspection and Maintenance of Pipeline - Average Annual Operator Hours per | | | LF | \$0.78 | \$27,152 |
| Pump Stations | | | | | |
| Consumables | | | | | |
| Equipment | | | | 1% | \$12,385 |
| Mechanical | | | | 1% | \$12,385 |
| Electrical/Instrumentation | | | | 1% | \$12,385 |
| Electricity Requirement | | | | | |
| Energy Charge | | 201,615 | kWh/year | \$ 0.15 | \$30,242 |
| Labor Costs | | | | | |
| Total No. Operators | | 1 | No. | | |
| Average Annual Operator Hours per Year | | 520 | Hours | | |
| Total Operator Hours per Year | | 520 | Hours | \$ 99.81 | \$51,903 |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | 0 | LS | \$ 96,000 | \$0 |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 0 | LS | \$ 81,000 | \$0 |
| Storage Tanks | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | | | 1% | \$0 |
| Injection Wells | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | 0 | EA | \$ 15,000 | \$0 |
| Extraction Wells | | | | | |
| Groundwater Pumping Charge | | 0 | AFY | \$ 1,960 | \$0 |
| Hale Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 265 | \$0 |
| Rinconada Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 263 | \$0 |
| Peers Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 224 | \$0 |
| El Camino Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$0 |
| Eleanor Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$0 |
| Library Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 242 | \$0 |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | |
| | | 0 | LS | \$ 100,000 | \$0 |
| Total O&M Costs (\$/yr) | | | | | \$150,000 |
| Annualized Costs (\$ / Year) | | | | | |
| Annualized Capital Costs (\$/Year) | | One payment per year, spread over Project Life | | | \$1,056,000 |
| Annual O&M Costs | | | | | \$150,000 |
| Total Annualized Cost | | | | | \$1,206,000 |
| Deliveries of Recycled Water | | 500 AFY | | | |
| Estimated Unit Cost (\$/AF) | | | | | \$2,400 |

| B1 | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| Capital Costs | | | | | |
| General Requirements | | | | | |
| | Mobilization | | Applied to all capital costs | 10% | \$4,956,940 |
| | Traffic Control | | Applied to all capital costs | 4% | \$1,982,776 |
| Treatment | | | | | |
| MBR | 1.5 | | MGD | \$ 16,125,000 | \$24,000,000 |
| Ozone | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 360,000 | \$0 |
| BAC | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 323,000 | \$0 |
| MF/UF system | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,317,000 | \$0 |
| RO System | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,586,000 | \$0 |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,510,000 | \$0 |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 470,000 | \$0 |
| Free Chlorine | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 271,000 | \$0 |
| Chemicals (Storage and Use) | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 134,000 | \$0 |
| Sitework/Piping/Structures | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 3,427,000 | \$0 |
| Conveyance | | | | | |
| High-Density Urban Pipeline, HDPE | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 186 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 39,500 | LF | \$ 200 | \$7,900,443 |
| 10 Inch | | 4,000 | LF | \$ 212 | \$848,075 |
| 12 Inch | | 6,000 | LF | \$ 254 | \$1,525,860 |
| 16 Inch | | 11,500 | LF | \$ 277 | \$3,186,305 |
| 18 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 290 | \$0 |
| 20 Inch | | 6,000 | LF | \$ 334 | \$2,002,860 |
| 24 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 381 | \$0 |
| 30 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 462 | \$0 |
| Repurposing Pipe | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 55 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 66 | \$0 |
| Sheeting and Shoring (Open Cut) | | 3% of Open Cut Pipeline Cost | | 3% | \$463,906 |
| Microtunneling | | | | | |
| Tunnel and Casing (36") | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,728 | \$0 |
| Jacking Shaft | | 0 | EA | \$ 300,000 | \$0 |
| Receiving Shaft | | 0 | EA | \$ 150,000 | \$0 |
| Horizontal Directional Drilling | | | | | |
| 24 Inch Bore Diameter | | 350 | LF | \$ 528 | \$184,800 |
| PTGAB | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 375 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 179 | LF | \$ 500 | \$89,519 |
| 10 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 625 | \$0 |
| 12 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 750 | \$0 |
| 16 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,000 | \$0 |
| 20 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,250 | \$0 |
| Jacking Shafts | | 0 | EA | \$ 258,000 | \$0 |
| Receiving Shafts | | 0 | EA | \$ 148,000 | \$0 |
| Pipe Bridge | | | | | |
| Pipe Bridge Support | | 14 | LF | \$ 5,000 | \$70,000 |
| Pipe Bridge Pipe | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 123 | LF | \$ 66 | \$8,063 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 86 | \$0 |
| 10 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 108 | \$0 |
| 12 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 139 | \$0 |
| 16 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 175 | \$0 |
| Potholing | | 677 | EA | \$ 500 | \$338,260 |
| Cathodic Protection | | 3% of Pipeline Installation Cost | | 3% | \$486,295 |
| Customer Services (no meter replacement) | | 62 | EA | \$ 10,000 | \$620,000 |
| Customer Services (with meter replacement) | | 139 | EA | \$ 15,000 | \$2,085,000 |
| Planter Box (Housing Pipe on Bridge Sidewalk) | | 0 | CY | \$ 2,000 | \$0 |
| Planter Box (Installation Labor) | | 0 | Day | \$ 4,000 | \$0 |
| Pump Stations | | | | | |
| Pump Station #1 | 200 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ 7,444 | \$1,488,839 |
| Pump Station #2 | 60 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ 11,483 | \$688,978 |
| Pump Station #3 | 60 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ 11,483 | \$688,978 |
| Pump Station #4 | 6 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ 26,306 | \$157,836 |
| Pump Station #5 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | 0 | LS | \$ 1,389,000 | \$0 |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 0 | LS | \$ 918,000 | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #1 | 6,800 | | Gal | \$ 33 | \$227,638 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #2 | 5,500 | | Gal | \$ 36 | \$197,127 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #3 | 1,400 | | Gal | \$ 43 | \$60,621 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #4 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #5 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Storage Tank | | | | | |
| Storage Tank | 1.5 | | MG | \$ 1,500,000 | \$2,250,000 |
| Underground Construction | | 0.0 | LS | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Injection Well | | | | | |
| | | 0 | EA | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Extraction Wellhead Treatment | | | | | |
| Hale | | 0 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$0 |
| Rinconada | | 0 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$0 |
| Peers | | 0 | AFY | \$ 3,353 | \$0 |
| El Camino | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Eleanor | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Library | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | |
| | | 0 | LS | \$ 3,326,000 | \$0 |
| Subtotal | | | | | |
| Sales Tax | | | | 9% | \$2,231,000 |
| Construction Cost Subtotal | | | | | \$58,740,000 |
| Market Adjustment Factor | | | | | |
| Construction Contingency | | | | 40% | \$23,495,000 |
| Construction Cost Total | | | | | \$88,200,000 |
| Engineering and Admin Services (Design) | | | | | |
| Engineering Services During Construction | | | | 15% | \$8,811,000 |
| Construction Management | | | | 10% | \$5,874,000 |
| Engineering Services During Construction | | | | 3% | \$1,762,000 |
| Property Acquisition (Property Only) | | | | | |
| Property Acquisition (House on Property) | | 50,000 | SQ FT | \$ 500 | \$25,000,000 |
| Rinconada Land Cost | | 0 | SQ FT | \$ 1,000 | \$0 |
| Peers Land Cost | | 0 | LS | \$ 4,500,000 | \$0 |
| On-Time Fee | | 0 | LS | \$ 7,000,000 | \$0 |
| | | 0 | LS | \$ 75,000 | \$0 |
| Total Capital Cost | | | | | \$129,600,000 |

| B1 | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|---|--|----------|---------------|--|--------------------|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| O&M Costs (Annual) | | | | | |
| Advanced Water Treatment | | | | | |
| MBR | 2 | | MGD | \$ 540,000 | \$810,000 |
| Ozone | 0 | | MGD | \$ 93,000 | \$0 |
| BAC | 0 | | MGD | \$ 131,000 | \$0 |
| MF/UF system | 0 | | MGD | \$ 342,000 | \$0 |
| RO System | 0 | | MGD | \$ 574,000 | \$0 |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 0 | | MGD | \$ 226,000 | \$0 |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 0 | | MGD | \$ 73,000 | \$0 |
| Free Chlorine | 0 | | MGD | \$ 32,000 | \$0 |
| Chemicals | 0 | | MGD | \$ 121,000 | \$0 |
| Labor for Treatment (no MBR) | 0 | 1,040 | hrs/MGD | \$ 100 | \$0 |
| Labor for MBR | 2 | 1,040 | hrs/year | \$ 100 | \$104,000 |
| Monitoring | | 0 | \$/year | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Conveyance | | | | | |
| Annual Inspection and Maintenance of Pipeline - Average Annual Operator Hours per | | | LF | \$0.78 | \$53,279 |
| Pump Stations | | | | | |
| Consumables | | | | | |
| Equipment | | | | 1% | \$30,246 |
| Mechanical | | | | 1% | \$30,246 |
| Electrical/Instrumentation | | | | 1% | \$30,246 |
| Electricity Requirement | | | | | |
| Energy Charge | | 550,080 | kWh/year | \$ 0.15 | \$82,512 |
| Labor Costs | | | | | |
| Total No. Operators | | 4 | No. | | |
| Average Annual Operator Hours per Year | | 520 | Hours | | |
| Total Operator Hours per Year | | 2,080 | Hours | \$ 99.81 | \$207,610 |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | 0 | LS | \$ 96,000 | \$0 |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 0 | LS | \$ 81,000 | \$0 |
| Storage Tanks | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | | | 1% | \$22,500 |
| Injection Wells | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | 0 | EA | \$ 15,000 | \$0 |
| Extraction Wells | | | | | |
| Groundwater Pumping Charge | | 0 | AFY | \$ 1,960 | \$0 |
| Hale Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 265 | \$0 |
| Rinconada Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 263 | \$0 |
| Peers Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 224 | \$0 |
| El Camino Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$0 |
| Eleanor Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$0 |
| Library Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 242 | \$0 |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | |
| | | 0 | LS | \$ 100,000 | \$0 |
| Total O&M Costs (\$/yr) | | | | | \$1,370,000 |
| Annualized Costs (\$ / Year) | | | | | |
| Annualized Capital Costs (\$/Year) | One payment per year, spread over Project Life | | | | \$6,612,000 |
| Annual O&M Costs | | | | | \$1,370,000 |
| Total Annualized Cost | | | | | \$7,982,000 |
| Deliveries of Recycled Water | 900 AFY | | | | |
| Estimated Unit Cost (\$/AF) | | | | | \$8,900 |

| C1 | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| Capital Costs | | | | | |
| General Requirements | | | | | |
| | Mobilization | | Applied to all capital costs | 10% | \$3,353,169 |
| | Traffic Control | | Applied to all capital costs | 4% | \$1,341,268 |
| Treatment | | | | | |
| MBR | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 17,200,000 | \$0 |
| Ozone | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 360,000 | \$0 |
| BAC | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 323,000 | \$0 |
| MF/UF system | 2.5 | | MGD | \$ 1,317,000 | \$3,300,000 |
| RO System | 2.5 | | MGD | \$ 1,586,000 | \$4,000,000 |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,510,000 | \$0 |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 2.5 | | MGD | \$ 470,000 | \$1,200,000 |
| Free Chlorine | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 271,000 | \$0 |
| Chemicals (Storage and Use) | 2.5 | | MGD | \$ 134,000 | \$340,000 |
| Sitework/Piping/Structures | 2.5 | | MGD | \$ 3,427,000 | \$8,600,000 |
| Conveyance | | | | | |
| High-Density Urban Pipeline, HDPE | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 186 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 2,000 | LF | \$ 200 | \$400,023 |
| 10 Inch | | 1,500 | LF | \$ 212 | \$318,028 |
| 12 Inch | | 5,000 | LF | \$ 254 | \$1,271,550 |
| 16 Inch | | 20,500 | LF | \$ 277 | \$5,679,935 |
| 18 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 290 | \$0 |
| 20 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 334 | \$0 |
| 24 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 381 | \$0 |
| 30 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 462 | \$0 |
| Repurposing Pipe | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 55 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 66 | \$0 |
| Sheeting and Shoring (Open Cut) | | 3% of Open Cut Pipeline Cost | | 3% | \$230,086 |
| Microtunneling | | | | | |
| Tunnel and Casing (36") | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,728 | \$0 |
| Jacking Shaft | | 0 | EA | \$ 300,000 | \$0 |
| Receiving Shaft | | 0 | EA | \$ 150,000 | \$0 |
| Horizontal Directional Drilling | | | | | |
| 24 Inch Bore Diameter | | 0 | LF | \$ 528 | \$0 |
| PTGAB | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 375 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 500 | \$0 |
| 10 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 625 | \$0 |
| 12 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 750 | \$0 |
| 16 Inch | | 458 | LF | \$ 1,000 | \$458,096 |
| 20 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,250 | \$0 |
| Jacking Shafts | | 1 | EA | \$ 258,000 | \$258,000 |
| Receiving Shafts | | 1 | EA | \$ 148,000 | \$148,000 |
| Pipe Bridge | | | | | |
| Pipe Bridge Support | | 0 | LF | \$ 5,000 | \$0 |
| Pipe Bridge Pipe | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 66 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 86 | \$0 |
| 10 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 108 | \$0 |
| 12 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 139 | \$0 |
| 16 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 175 | \$0 |
| Potholing | | 295 | EA | \$ 500 | \$147,290 |
| Cathodic Protection | | 3% of Pipeline Installation Cost | | 3% | \$250,732 |
| Customer Services (no meter replacement) | | 0 | EA | \$ 10,000 | \$0 |
| Customer Services (with meter replacement) | | 0 | EA | \$ 15,000 | \$0 |
| Planter Box (Housing Pipe on Bridge Sidewalk) | | 0 | CY | \$ 2,000 | \$0 |
| Planter Box (Installation Labor) | | 0 | Day | \$ 4,000 | \$0 |
| Pump Stations | | | | | |
| Pump Station #1 | 300 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ 6,433 | \$1,929,951 |
| Pump Station #2 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #3 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #4 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #5 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | 0 | LS | \$ 1,389,000 | \$0 |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 0 | LS | \$ 918,000 | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #1 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #2 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #3 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #4 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #5 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Storage Tank | | | | | |
| Storage Tank | 0.0 | | MG | \$ 1,500,000 | \$0 |
| Underground Construction | | 0.0 | LS | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Injection Well | | | | | |
| | | 5 | EA | \$ 1,000,000 | \$5,000,000 |
| Extraction Wellhead Treatment | | | | | |
| Hale | | 0 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$0 |
| Rinconada | | 0 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$0 |
| Peers | | 0 | AFY | \$ 3,353 | \$0 |
| El Camino | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Eleanor | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Library | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | |
| | | 0 | LS | \$ 3,326,000 | \$0 |
| Subtotal | | | | | \$38,226,000 |
| Sales Tax | | | | 9% | \$1,509,000 |
| Construction Cost Subtotal | | | | | \$39,735,000 |
| Market Adjustment Factor | | | | 10% | \$3,974,000 |
| Construction Contingency | | | | 40% | \$15,894,000 |
| Construction Cost Total | | | | | \$59,700,000 |
| Engineering and Admin Services (Design) | | | | 15% | \$5,960,000 |
| Construction Management | | | | 10% | \$3,974,000 |
| Engineering Services During Construction | | | | 3% | \$1,192,000 |
| Property Acquisition (Property Only) | | 20,000 | SQ FT | \$ 500 | \$10,000,000 |
| Property Acquisition (House on Property) | | 0 | SQ FT | \$ 1,000 | \$0 |
| Rinconada Land Cost | | 1 | LS | \$ 4,500,000 | \$4,500,000 |
| Peers Land Cost | | 1 | LS | \$ 7,000,000 | \$7,000,000 |
| On-Time Fee | | 0 | LS | \$ 75,000 | \$75,000 |
| Total Capital Cost | | | | | \$92,200,000 |

| C1 | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|---|------|--|---------------|--|---------------------|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| O&M Costs (Annual) | | | | | |
| Advanced Water Treatment | | | | | |
| MBR | 0 | | MGD | \$ 560,000 | \$0 |
| Ozone | 0 | | MGD | \$ 93,000 | \$0 |
| BAC | 0 | | MGD | \$ 131,000 | \$0 |
| MF/UF system | 3 | | MGD | \$ 342,000 | \$860,000 |
| RO System | 3 | | MGD | \$ 574,000 | \$1,400,000 |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 0 | | MGD | \$ 226,000 | \$0 |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 3 | | MGD | \$ 73,000 | \$180,000 |
| Free Chlorine | 0 | | MGD | \$ 32,000 | \$0 |
| Chemicals | 3 | | MGD | \$ 121,000 | \$300,000 |
| Labor for Treatment (no MBR) | 3 | 1,040 | hrs/MGD | \$ 100 | \$260,000 |
| Labor for MBR | 0 | 1,040 | hrs/year | \$ 100 | \$0 |
| Monitoring | | 0 | \$/year | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Conveyance | | | | | |
| Annual Inspection and Maintenance of Pipeline - Average Annual Operator Hours per | | | LF | \$0.78 | \$23,320 |
| Pump Stations | | | | | |
| Consumables | | | | | |
| Equipment | | | | 1% | \$19,300 |
| Mechanical | | | | 1% | \$19,300 |
| Electrical/Instrumentation | | | | 1% | \$19,300 |
| Electricity Requirement | | | | | |
| Energy Charge | | 342,958 | kWh/year | \$ 0.15 | \$51,444 |
| Labor Costs | | | | | |
| Total No. Operators | | 1 | No. | | |
| Average Annual Operator Hours per Year | | 520 | Hours | | |
| Total Operator Hours per Year | | 520 | Hours | \$ 99.81 | \$51,903 |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | 0 | LS | \$ 96,000 | \$0 |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 0 | LS | \$ 81,000 | \$0 |
| Storage Tanks | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | | | 1% | \$0 |
| Injection Wells | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | 5 | EA | \$ 15,000 | \$75,000 |
| Extraction Wells | | | | | |
| Groundwater Pumping Charge | | 5,900 | AFY | \$ 1,960 | \$11,564,000 |
| Hale Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 265 | \$0 |
| Rinconada Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 263 | \$0 |
| Peers Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 224 | \$0 |
| El Camino Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$0 |
| Eleanor Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$0 |
| Library Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 242 | \$0 |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | |
| | | 0 | LS | \$ 100,000 | \$0 |
| Total O&M Costs (\$/yr) | | | | | \$14,820,000 |
| Annualized Costs (\$ / Year) | | | | | |
| Annualized Capital Costs (\$/Year) | | One payment per year, spread over Project Life | | | \$4,704,000 |
| Annual O&M Costs | | | | | \$14,820,000 |
| Total Annualized Cost | | | | | \$19,524,000 |
| Deliveries of Recycled Water | | 5,900 AFY | | | |
| Estimated Unit Cost (\$/AF) | | | | | \$3,300 |

| C2 | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| Capital Costs | | | | | |
| General Requirements | | | | | |
| | Mobilization | | Applied to all capital costs | 10% | \$4,213,006 |
| | Traffic Control | | Applied to all capital costs | 4% | \$1,685,202 |
| Treatment | | | | | |
| MBR | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 17,200,000 | \$0 |
| Ozone | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 360,000 | \$0 |
| BAC | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 323,000 | \$0 |
| MF/UF system | 2.8 | | MGD | \$ 1,317,000 | \$3,700,000 |
| RO System | 2.8 | | MGD | \$ 1,586,000 | \$4,400,000 |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 0.9 | | MGD | \$ 1,510,000 | \$1,400,000 |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 2.8 | | MGD | \$ 470,000 | \$1,300,000 |
| Free Chlorine | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 271,000 | \$0 |
| Chemicals (Storage and Use) | 2.8 | | MGD | \$ 134,000 | \$370,000 |
| Sitework/Piping/Structures | 2.8 | | MGD | \$ 3,427,000 | \$9,600,000 |
| Conveyance | | | | | |
| High-Density Urban Pipeline, HDPE | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 186 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 11,000 | LF | \$ 200 | \$2,200,124 |
| 10 Inch | | 5,500 | LF | \$ 212 | \$1,166,103 |
| 12 Inch | | 3,000 | LF | \$ 254 | \$762,930 |
| 16 Inch | | 2,500 | LF | \$ 277 | \$692,675 |
| 18 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 290 | \$0 |
| 20 Inch | | 18,500 | LF | \$ 334 | \$6,175,485 |
| 24 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 381 | \$0 |
| 30 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 462 | \$0 |
| Repurposing Pipe | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 55 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 66 | \$0 |
| Sheeting and Shoring (Open Cut) | | 3% of Open Cut Pipeline Cost | | 3% | \$329,920 |
| Microtunneling | | | | | |
| Tunnel and Casing (36") | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,728 | \$0 |
| Jacking Shaft | | 0 | EA | \$ 300,000 | \$0 |
| Receiving Shaft | | 0 | EA | \$ 150,000 | \$0 |
| Horizontal Directional Drilling | | | | | |
| 24 Inch Bore Diameter | | 0 | LF | \$ 528 | \$0 |
| PTGAB | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 375 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 160 | LF | \$ 500 | \$80,017 |
| 10 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 625 | \$0 |
| 12 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 750 | \$0 |
| 16 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,000 | \$0 |
| 20 Inch | | 619 | LF | \$ 1,250 | \$773,912 |
| Jacking Shafts | | 3 | EA | \$ 258,000 | \$774,000 |
| Receiving Shafts | | 3 | EA | \$ 148,000 | \$444,000 |
| Pipe Bridge | | | | | |
| Pipe Bridge Support | | 19 | LF | \$ 5,000 | \$95,000 |
| Pipe Bridge Pipe | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 170 | LF | \$ 66 | \$11,143 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 86 | \$0 |
| 10 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 108 | \$0 |
| 12 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 139 | \$0 |
| 16 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 175 | \$0 |
| Potholing | | 414 | EA | \$ 500 | \$207,245 |
| Cathodic Protection | | 3% of Pipeline Installation Cost | | 3% | \$342,552 |
| Customer Services (no meter replacement) | | 0 | EA | \$ 10,000 | \$0 |
| Customer Services (with meter replacement) | | 25 | EA | \$ 15,000 | \$375,000 |
| Planter Box (Housing Pipe on Bridge Sidewalk) | | 0 | CY | \$ 2,000 | \$0 |
| Planter Box (Installation Labor) | | 0 | Day | \$ 4,000 | \$0 |
| Pump Stations | | | | | |
| Pump Station #1 | 300 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ 6,433 | \$1,929,951 |
| Pump Station #2 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #3 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #4 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #5 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | 0 | LS | \$ 1,389,000 | \$0 |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 0 | LS | \$ 918,000 | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #1 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #2 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #3 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #4 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #5 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Storage Tank | | | | | |
| Storage Tank | 0.0 | | MG | \$ 1,500,000 | \$0 |
| Underground Construction | | 0.0 | LS | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Injection Well | | | | | |
| | | 5 | EA | \$ 1,000,000 | \$5,000,000 |
| Extraction Wellhead Treatment | | | | | |
| Hale | | 983 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$2,887,865 |
| Rinconada | | 983 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$2,887,865 |
| Peers | | 983 | AFY | \$ 3,353 | \$3,296,834 |
| El Camino | | 983 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$4,462,774 |
| Eleanor | | 983 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$4,462,774 |
| Library | | 983 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$4,462,774 |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | |
| | | 0 | LS | \$ 3,326,000 | \$0 |
| Subtotal | | | | | |
| | | | | | \$70,489,000 |
| Sales Tax | | | | 9% | \$2,907,000 |
| Construction Cost Subtotal | | | | | \$73,396,000 |
| Market Adjustment Factor | | | | 10% | \$7,340,000 |
| Construction Contingency | | | | 40% | \$29,358,000 |
| Construction Cost Total | | | | | \$110,100,000 |
| Engineering and Admin Services (Design) | | | | 15% | \$11,009,000 |
| Construction Management | | | | 10% | \$7,340,000 |
| Engineering Services During Construction | | | | 3% | \$2,202,000 |
| Property Acquisition (Property Only) | | | | | |
| Property Acquisition (Property Only) | | 20,000 | SQ FT | \$ 500 | \$10,000,000 |
| Property Acquisition (House on Property) | | 0 | SQ FT | \$ 1,000 | \$0 |
| Rinconada Land Cost | | 1 | LS | \$ 4,500,000 | \$4,500,000 |
| Peers Land Cost | | 1 | LS | \$ 7,000,000 | \$7,000,000 |
| On-Time Fee | | 0 | LS | \$ 75,000 | \$0 |
| Total Capital Cost | | | | | \$152,100,000 |

| C2 | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|--|------|-----------|---------------|--|---------------------|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| O&M Costs (Annual) | | | | | |
| Advanced Water Treatment | | | | | |
| MBR | 0 | | MGD | \$ 560,000 | \$0 |
| Ozone | 0 | | MGD | \$ 93,000 | \$0 |
| BAC | 0 | | MGD | \$ 131,000 | \$0 |
| MF/UF system | 3 | | MGD | \$ 342,000 | \$950,000 |
| RO System | 3 | | MGD | \$ 574,000 | \$1,600,000 |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 1 | | MGD | \$ 226,000 | \$210,000 |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 3 | | MGD | \$ 73,000 | \$200,000 |
| Free Chlorine | 0 | | MGD | \$ 32,000 | \$0 |
| Chemicals | 3 | | MGD | \$ 121,000 | \$340,000 |
| Labor for Treatment (no MBR) | 3 | 1,040 | hrs/MGD | \$ 100 | \$290,000 |
| Labor for MBR | 0 | 1,040 | hrs/year | \$ 100 | \$0 |
| Monitoring | | 0 | \$/year | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Conveyance | | | | | |
| Annual Inspection and Maintenance of Pipeline - Average Annual Operator Hours per | | | LF | \$0.78 | \$32,816 |
| Pump Stations | | | | | |
| Consumables | | | | | |
| Equipment | | | | 1% | \$19,300 |
| Mechanical | | | | 1% | \$19,300 |
| Electrical/Instrumentation | | | | 1% | \$19,300 |
| Electricity Requirement | | | | | |
| Energy Charge | | 453,458 | kWh/year | \$ 0.15 | \$68,019 |
| Labor Costs | | | | | |
| Total No. Operators | | 1 | No. | | |
| Average Annual Operator Hours per Year | | 520 | Hours | | |
| Total Operator Hours per Year | | 520 | Hours | \$ 99.81 | \$51,903 |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | 0 | LS | \$ 96,000 | \$0 |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 0 | LS | \$ 81,000 | \$0 |
| Storage Tanks | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | | | 1% | \$0 |
| Injection Wells | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | 5 | EA | \$ 15,000 | \$75,000 |
| Extraction Wells | | | | | |
| Groundwater Pumping Charge | | 5,900 | AFY | \$ 1,960 | \$11,564,000 |
| Hale Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 983 | AFY | \$ 265 | \$260,797 |
| Rinconada Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 983 | AFY | \$ 263 | \$258,689 |
| Peers Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 983 | AFY | \$ 224 | \$220,625 |
| El Camino Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 983 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$251,497 |
| Eleanor Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 983 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$251,783 |
| Library Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 983 | AFY | \$ 242 | \$238,429 |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | |
| | | 0 | LS | \$ 100,000 | \$0 |
| Total O&M Costs (\$/yr) | | | | | \$16,920,000 |
| Annualized Costs (\$ / Year) | | | | | |
| Annualized Capital Costs (\$/Year) <i>One payment per year, spread over Project Life</i> | | | | | \$7,760,000 |
| Annual O&M Costs | | | | | \$16,920,000 |
| Total Annualized Cost | | | | | \$24,680,000 |
| Deliveries of Recycled Water | | 6,100 AFY | | | |
| Estimated Unit Cost (\$/AF) | | | | | \$4,000 |

| C3 | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| Capital Costs | | | | | |
| General Requirements | | | | | |
| | Mobilization | | Applied to all capital costs | 10% | \$6,472,618 |
| | Traffic Control | | Applied to all capital costs | 4% | \$2,589,047 |
| Treatment | | | | | |
| MBR | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 17,200,000 | \$0 |
| Ozone | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 360,000 | \$0 |
| BAC | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 323,000 | \$0 |
| MF/UF system | 3.3 | | MGD | \$ 1,317,000 | \$4,400,000 |
| RO System | 3.3 | | MGD | \$ 1,586,000 | \$5,300,000 |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 1.0 | | MGD | \$ 1,510,000 | \$1,500,000 |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 3.3 | | MGD | \$ 470,000 | \$1,600,000 |
| Free Chlorine | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 271,000 | \$0 |
| Chemicals (Storage and Use) | 3.3 | | MGD | \$ 134,000 | \$440,000 |
| Sitework/Piping/Structures | 3.3 | | MGD | \$ 3,427,000 | \$11,000,000 |
| Conveyance | | | | | |
| High-Density Urban Pipeline, HDPE | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 186 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 19,994 | LF | \$ 200 | \$3,999,025 |
| 10 Inch | | 12,529 | LF | \$ 212 | \$2,656,383 |
| 12 Inch | | 9,873 | LF | \$ 254 | \$2,510,803 |
| 16 Inch | | 47,801 | LF | \$ 277 | \$13,244,223 |
| 18 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 290 | \$0 |
| 20 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 334 | \$0 |
| 24 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 381 | \$0 |
| 30 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 462 | \$0 |
| Repurposing Pipe | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 55 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 66 | \$0 |
| Sheeting and Shoring (Open Cut) | | 3% of Open Cut Pipeline Cost | | 3% | \$672,313 |
| Microtunneling | | | | | |
| Tunnel and Casing (36") | | 800 | LF | \$ 1,728 | \$1,382,400 |
| Jacking Shaft | | 3 | EA | \$ 300,000 | \$900,000 |
| Receiving Shaft | | 3 | EA | \$ 150,000 | \$450,000 |
| Horizontal Directional Drilling | | | | | |
| 24 Inch Bore Diameter | | 350 | LF | \$ 528 | \$184,800 |
| PTGAB | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 375 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 500 | \$0 |
| 10 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 625 | \$0 |
| 12 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 750 | \$0 |
| 16 Inch | | 160 | LF | \$ 1,000 | \$160,033 |
| 20 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,250 | \$0 |
| Jacking Shafts | | 1 | EA | \$ 258,000 | \$258,000 |
| Receiving Shafts | | 1 | EA | \$ 148,000 | \$148,000 |
| Pipe Bridge | | | | | |
| Pipe Bridge Support | | 8 | LF | \$ 5,000 | \$40,000 |
| Pipe Bridge Pipe | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 66 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 86 | \$0 |
| 10 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 108 | \$0 |
| 12 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 139 | \$0 |
| 16 Inch | | 65 | LF | \$ 175 | \$11,387 |
| Potholing | | 916 | EA | \$ 500 | \$457,860 |
| Cathodic Protection | | 3% of Pipeline Installation Cost | | 3% | \$785,141 |
| Customer Services (no meter replacement) | | 62 | EA | \$ 10,000 | \$620,000 |
| Customer Services (with meter replacement) | | 142 | EA | \$ 15,000 | \$2,130,000 |
| Planter Box (Housing Pipe on Bridge Sidewalk) | | 6 | CY | \$ 2,000 | \$12,000 |
| Planter Box (Installation Labor) | | 8 | Day | \$ 4,000 | \$32,000 |
| Pump Stations | | | | | |
| Pump Station #1 | 400 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ 5,800 | \$2,320,102 |
| Pump Station #2 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #3 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #4 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #5 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | 1 | LS | \$ 1,389,000 | \$1,389,000 |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 1 | LS | \$ 918,000 | \$918,000 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #1 | 5,800 | | Gal | \$ 35 | \$204,714 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #2 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #3 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #4 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #5 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Storage Tank | | | | | |
| Storage Tank | 0.0 | | MG | \$ 1,500,000 | \$0 |
| Underground Construction | | 0.0 | LS | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Injection Well | | | | | |
| | | 5 | EA | \$ 1,000,000 | \$5,000,000 |
| Extraction Wellhead Treatment | | | | | |
| Hale | | 833 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$2,447,343 |
| Rinconada | | 833 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$2,447,343 |
| Peers | | 833 | AFY | \$ 3,353 | \$2,793,927 |
| El Camino | | 833 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$3,782,012 |
| Eleanor | | 833 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$3,782,012 |
| Library | | 833 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$3,782,012 |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | |
| | | 0 | LS | \$ 3,326,000 | \$0 |
| Subtotal | | | | | |
| Sales Tax | | | | 9% | \$3,769,000 |
| Construction Cost Subtotal | | | | | \$96,591,000 |
| Market Adjustment Factor | | | | | |
| Construction Contingency | | | | 40% | \$38,636,000 |
| Construction Cost Total | | | | | \$144,900,000 |
| Engineering and Admin Services (Design) | | | | | |
| Construction Management | | | | 10% | \$9,659,000 |
| Engineering Services During Construction | | | | 3% | \$2,898,000 |
| Property Acquisition (Property Only) | | | | | |
| Property Acquisition (House on Property) | | 0 | SQ FT | \$ 1,000 | \$0 |
| Rinconada Land Cost | | 1 | LS | \$ 4,500,000 | \$4,500,000 |
| Peers Land Cost | | 1 | LS | \$ 7,000,000 | \$7,000,000 |
| On-Time Fee | | 0 | LS | \$ 75,000 | \$0 |
| Total Capital Cost | | | | | \$198,400,000 |

| C3 | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|---|------|--|---------------|--|---------------------|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| O&M Costs (Annual) | | | | | |
| Advanced Water Treatment | | | | | |
| MBR | 0 | | MGD | \$ 560,000 | \$0 |
| Ozone | 0 | | MGD | \$ 93,000 | \$0 |
| BAC | 0 | | MGD | \$ 131,000 | \$0 |
| MF/UF system | 3 | | MGD | \$ 342,000 | \$1,100,000 |
| RO System | 3 | | MGD | \$ 574,000 | \$1,900,000 |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 1 | | MGD | \$ 226,000 | \$220,000 |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 3 | | MGD | \$ 73,000 | \$240,000 |
| Free Chlorine | 0 | | MGD | \$ 32,000 | \$0 |
| Chemicals | 3 | | MGD | \$ 121,000 | \$400,000 |
| Labor for Treatment (no MBR) | 3 | 1,040 | hrs/MGD | \$ 100 | \$350,000 |
| Labor for MBR | 0 | 1,040 | hrs/year | \$ 100 | \$0 |
| Monitoring | | 0 | \$/year | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Conveyance | | | | | |
| Annual Inspection and Maintenance of Pipeline - Average Annual Operator Hours per | | | LF | \$0.78 | \$71,588 |
| Pump Stations | | | | | |
| Consumables | | | | | |
| Equipment | | | | 1% | \$23,201 |
| Mechanical | | | | 1% | \$23,201 |
| Electrical/Instrumentation | | | | 1% | \$23,201 |
| Electricity Requirement | | | | | |
| Energy Charge | | 466,792 | kWh/year | \$ 0.15 | \$70,019 |
| Labor Costs | | | | | |
| Total No. Operators | | 1 | No. | | |
| Average Annual Operator Hours per Year | | 520 | Hours | | |
| Total Operator Hours per Year | | 520 | Hours | \$ 99.81 | \$51,903 |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | 1 | LS | \$ 96,000 | \$96,000 |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 1 | LS | \$ 81,000 | \$81,000 |
| Storage Tanks | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | | | 1% | \$0 |
| Injection Wells | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | 5 | EA | \$ 15,000 | \$75,000 |
| Extraction Wells | | | | | |
| Groundwater Pumping Charge | | 5,000 | AFY | \$ 1,960 | \$9,800,000 |
| Hale Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 833 | AFY | \$ 265 | \$221,014 |
| Rinconada Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 833 | AFY | \$ 263 | \$219,228 |
| Peers Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 833 | AFY | \$ 224 | \$186,970 |
| El Camino Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 833 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$213,133 |
| Eleanor Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 833 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$213,376 |
| Library Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 833 | AFY | \$ 242 | \$202,059 |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | |
| | | 0 | LS | \$ 100,000 | \$0 |
| Total O&M Costs (\$/yr) | | | | | \$15,780,000 |
| Annualized Costs (\$ / Year) | | | | | |
| Annualized Capital Costs (\$/Year) | | One payment per year, spread over Project Life | | | \$10,122,000 |
| Annual O&M Costs | | | | | \$15,780,000 |
| Total Annualized Cost | | | | | \$25,902,000 |
| Deliveries of Recycled Water | | 5,900 AFY | | | |
| Estimated Unit Cost (\$/AF) | | | | | \$4,400 |

| D1 | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| Capital Costs | | | | | |
| General Requirements | | | | | |
| | Mobilization | | Applied to all capital costs | 10% | \$3,772,451 |
| | Traffic Control | | Applied to all capital costs | 4% | \$1,508,980 |
| Treatment | | | | | |
| MBR | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 17,200,000 | \$0 |
| Ozone | 4.7 | | MGD | \$ 360,000 | \$1,700,000 |
| BAC | 4.7 | | MGD | \$ 323,000 | \$1,500,000 |
| MF/UF system | 4.7 | | MGD | \$ 1,317,000 | \$6,200,000 |
| RO System | 4.7 | | MGD | \$ 1,586,000 | \$7,500,000 |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 1.2 | | MGD | \$ 1,510,000 | \$1,900,000 |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 4.7 | | MGD | \$ 470,000 | \$2,200,000 |
| Free Chlorine | 4.7 | | MGD | \$ 271,000 | \$1,300,000 |
| Chemicals (Storage and Use) | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 134,000 | \$0 |
| Sitework/Piping/Structures | 0.0 | | MGD | \$ 3,427,000 | \$0 |
| Conveyance | | | | | |
| High-Density Urban Pipeline, HDPE | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 186 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 200 | \$0 |
| 10 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 212 | \$0 |
| 12 Inch | | 5,000 | LF | \$ 254 | \$1,271,550 |
| 16 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 277 | \$0 |
| 18 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 290 | \$0 |
| 20 Inch | | 500 | LF | \$ 334 | \$166,905 |
| 24 Inch | | 1,400 | LF | \$ 381 | \$533,568 |
| 30 Inch | | 2,600 | LF | \$ 462 | \$1,202,422 |
| Repurposing Pipe | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 55 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 66 | \$0 |
| Sheeting and Shoring (Open Cut) | | 3% of Open Cut Pipeline Cost | | 3% | \$59,161 |
| Microtunneling | | | | | |
| Tunnel and Casing (36") | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,728 | \$0 |
| Jacking Shaft | | 0 | EA | \$ 300,000 | \$0 |
| Receiving Shaft | | 0 | EA | \$ 150,000 | \$0 |
| Horizontal Directional Drilling | | 0 | LF | \$ 528 | \$0 |
| 24 Inch Bore Diameter | | 0 | LF | \$ 528 | \$0 |
| PTGAB | | | | | |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 375 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 500 | \$0 |
| 10 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 625 | \$0 |
| 12 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 750 | \$0 |
| 16 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 1,000 | \$0 |
| 20 Inch | | 1,200 | LF | \$ 1,250 | \$1,500,313 |
| Jacking Shafts | | 1 | EA | \$ 258,000 | \$258,000 |
| Receiving Shafts | | 1 | EA | \$ 148,000 | \$148,000 |
| Pipe Bridge | | | | | |
| Pipe Bridge Support | | 0 | LF | \$ 5,000 | \$0 |
| Pipe Bridge Pipe | | 0 | LF | \$ 66 | \$0 |
| 6 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 86 | \$0 |
| 8 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 108 | \$0 |
| 10 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 139 | \$0 |
| 12 Inch | | 0 | LF | \$ 175 | \$0 |
| 16 Inch | | 107 | EA | \$ 500 | \$53,500 |
| Potholing | | 3% of Pipeline Installation Cost | | 3% | \$97,008 |
| Cathodic Protection | | 0 | EA | \$ 10,000 | \$0 |
| Customer Services (no meter replacement) | | 0 | EA | \$ 15,000 | \$0 |
| Customer Services (with meter replacement) | | 0 | CY | \$ 2,000 | \$0 |
| Planter Box (Housing Pipe on Bridge Sidewalk) | | 0 | Day | \$ 4,000 | \$0 |
| Planter Box (Installation Labor) | | 0 | Day | \$ 4,000 | \$0 |
| Pump Stations | | | | | |
| Pump Station #1 | 60 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ 11,483 | \$688,978 |
| Pump Station #2 | 400 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ 5,800 | \$2,320,102 |
| Pump Station #3 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #4 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Pump Station #5 | 0 | | Total installed HP, including standby | \$ - | \$0 |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | 0 | LS | \$ 1,389,000 | \$0 |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 0 | LS | \$ 918,000 | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #1 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #2 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #3 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #4 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Hydropneumatic Tank - Pump Station #5 | 0 | | Gal | \$ - | \$0 |
| Storage Tank | | | | | |
| Storage Tank | 4.8 | | MG | \$ 1,500,000 | \$7,125,000 |
| Underground Construction | | 1.0 | LS | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Injection Well | | | | | |
| | | 0 | EA | \$ 1,000,000 | \$0 |
| Extraction Wellhead Treatment | | | | | |
| Hale | | 0 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$0 |
| Rinconada | | 0 | AFY | \$ 2,937 | \$0 |
| Peers | | 0 | AFY | \$ 3,353 | \$0 |
| El Camino | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Eleanor | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Library | | 0 | AFY | \$ 4,538 | \$0 |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | |
| | | 0 | LS | \$ 3,326,000 | \$0 |
| Subtotal | | | | | \$43,006,000 |
| Sales Tax | | | | 9% | \$1,698,000 |
| Construction Cost Subtotal | | | | | \$44,704,000 |
| Market Adjustment Factor | | | | 10% | \$4,470,000 |
| Construction Contingency | | | | 40% | \$17,882,000 |
| Construction Cost Total | | | | | \$67,100,000 |
| Engineering and Admin Services (Design) | | | | 15% | \$6,705,000 |
| Construction Management | | | | 10% | \$4,470,000 |
| Engineering Services During Construction | | | | 3% | \$1,341,000 |
| Property Acquisition (Property Only) | | | | | \$25,000,000 |
| Property Acquisition (House on Property) | | | | | \$0 |
| Rinconada Land Cost | | | | | \$0 |
| Peers Land Cost | | | | | \$0 |
| On-Time Fee | | | | | \$0 |
| Total Capital Cost | | | | | \$104,600,000 |

| D1 | | | | Palo Alto Recycled Water Feasibility Study | |
|---|--|----------|---------------|--|---------------------|
| Last Updated: | | 4-Feb-19 | Discount Rate | | Project Life |
| Updated by: | | K. Howes | 3% | | 30 Years |
| CCI (SF, June 2018): 12014.72 | | | | | |
| Item | Size | Qty | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| O&M Costs (Annual) | | | | | |
| Advanced Water Treatment | | | | | |
| MBR | 0 | | MGD | \$ 560,000 | \$0 |
| Ozone | 5 | | MGD | \$ 93,000 | \$440,000 |
| BAC | 5 | | MGD | \$ 131,000 | \$620,000 |
| MF/UF system | 5 | | MGD | \$ 342,000 | \$1,600,000 |
| RO System | 5 | | MGD | \$ 574,000 | \$2,700,000 |
| RO Concentrate Treatment | 1 | | MGD | \$ 226,000 | \$280,000 |
| Advanced Oxidation and Disinfection | 5 | | MGD | \$ 73,000 | \$350,000 |
| Free Chlorine | 5 | | MGD | \$ 32,000 | \$150,000 |
| Chemicals | 0 | | MGD | \$ 121,000 | \$0 |
| Labor for Treatment (no MBR) | 5 | 1,040 | hrs/MGD | \$ 100 | \$490,000 |
| Labor for MBR | 0 | 1,040 | hrs/year | \$ 100 | \$0 |
| Monitoring | | 1 | \$/year | \$ 1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 |
| Conveyance | | | | | |
| Annual Inspection and Maintenance of Pipeline - Average Annual Operator Hours per | | | LF | \$0.78 | \$6,434 |
| Pump Stations | | | | | |
| Consumables | | | | | |
| Equipment | | | | 1% | \$30,091 |
| Mechanical | | | | 1% | \$30,091 |
| Electrical/Instrumentation | | | | 1% | \$30,091 |
| Electricity Requirement | | | | | |
| Energy Charge | | 718,547 | kWh/year | \$ 0.15 | \$107,782 |
| Labor Costs | | | | | |
| Total No. Operators | | 2 | No. | | |
| Average Annual Operator Hours per Year | | 520 | Hours | | |
| Total Operator Hours per Year | | 1,040 | Hours | \$ 99.81 | \$103,805 |
| Phase 3 RWQCP Pump Station Improvements | | 0 | LS | \$ 96,000 | \$0 |
| Phase 3 Booster Pump Station | | 0 | LS | \$ 81,000 | \$0 |
| Storage Tanks | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | | | 1% | \$71,250 |
| Injection Wells | | | | | |
| Annual O&M | | 0 | EA | \$ 15,000 | \$0 |
| Extraction Wells | | | | | |
| Groundwater Pumping Charge | | 0 | AFY | \$ 1,960 | \$0 |
| Hale Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 265 | \$0 |
| Rinconada Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 263 | \$0 |
| Peers Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 224 | \$0 |
| El Camino Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$0 |
| Eleanor Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 256 | \$0 |
| Library Extraction Well/Wellhead Treatment | | 0 | AFY | \$ 242 | \$0 |
| Mountain View Feasibility Study Long-Term Recommended Phase | | | | | |
| | | 0 | LS | \$ 100,000 | \$0 |
| Total O&M Costs (\$/yr) | | | | | \$8,010,000 |
| Annualized Costs (\$ / Year) | | | | | |
| Annualized Capital Costs (\$/Year) | One payment per year, spread over Project Life | | | | \$5,337,000 |
| Annual O&M Costs | | | | | \$8,010,000 |
| Total Annualized Cost | | | | | \$13,347,000 |
| Deliveries of Recycled Water | 5,300 AFY | | | | |
| Estimated Unit Cost (\$/AF) | | | | | \$2,500 |

**Appendix E - Concept Option Variations [Confidential – Not
Included]**

**Appendix F - Cost Per Unit of Water Analyses for Palo Alto,
Cal Water, Purissima Hills Water District and East
Palo Alto [Confidential – Not Included]**

Appendix G - Funding Matrix

Summary of Potential Recycled Water Funding Opportunities – Updated March 13, 2019

| Program | Administering Agency | Funding Type | CEQA/NEPA Required? | Program Purpose | Eligible Uses | Eligibility Requirements | Due Date & Future Rounds | Funding Amounts & Terms | Cost Share | Priority Determination / Critical Factors |
|---|--|--------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|---|----------------|--|
| Title XVI Water Reuse & Reclamation Grant Program - Construction | U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) | Grant | CEQA and NEPA | Construction of water recycling treatment and conveyance facilities. | Planning, design, construction (can include prior costs) | A Title XVI Feasibility Study must be submitted to Reclamation for review and approval prior to submitting a construction application. Project must receive congressional authorization in order to receive construction grant funding. | Most recent round was due in Summer 2018. Next round anticipated spring 2019 | The total amount of available funds varies each year. The 2018 FOA included \$34M for Title XVI. Historically, there has been a max of ~\$4M per applicant, though the new administration has favored funding fewer projects with larger awards per project. Maximum grant award of 25% of the total project costs or \$20 million, whichever is less. Grant funding is provided over multiple applications submitted on an annual basis until the project is complete or the total federal cost share has been provided. Typically limited to 3 years of costs per application. | 75% cost share | 1 Project must receive congressional approval. |
| Website | https://www.usbr.gov/watersmart/title/index.html | | | | | | | | | |
| Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation (WIIN) Subset of Title XVI | U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) | Grant | CEQA and NEPA | Construction of water recycling treatment and conveyance facilities for projects that have a Title XVI Feasibility Study completed, <i>but are not congressionally authorized.</i> | Similar to Title XVI: planning, design, construction (including prior costs) | A Title XVI Feasibility Study must have already been submitted to Reclamation for review and approval and the project must have a Determination of Feasibility from Reclamation | Reclamation appears to intend three rounds of funding – the first was in 2017, the second was in 2018, and a third to be released shortly after announcement of Round 2 awards – anticipated in spring 2019. | \$50M total has been allocated under WIIN. \$10M released in first FOA, \$20M released in second FOA, \$20M anticipated for third FOA. Maximum grant award of 25% of the total project costs. Typically limited to 3 years of costs per application. | 75% cost share | 1 Competitive program, but will only get more competitive as additional agencies submit their Feasibility Studies. Better to get money early and keep going back. |
| Website | A specific funding website has not been developed. For reference, visit: https://www.usbr.gov/watersmart/title/index.html | | | | | | | | | |

| Program | Administering Agency | Funding Type | CEQA/NEPA Required? | Program Purpose | Eligible Uses | Eligibility Requirements | Due Date & Future Rounds | Funding Amounts & Terms | Cost Share | Priority Determination / Critical Factors |
|--|---|--------------|---------------------|--|---|---|--|---|----------------|--|
| Drought Response Program – Drought Resiliency Projects | Reclamation | Grant | CEQA and NEPA | Increase the reliability of water supply; improve water management; implement systems to facilitate the voluntary sale, transfer or exchange of water; and provide benefits for fish, wildlife, and the environment to mitigate impacts caused by drought. | Construction, tool development to improve water management, installation of data collecting devices, improving habitat. Proposed resiliency project should improve ability of water managers to deliver water during a drought. | Based on most recent FOA, project cannot be part of a congressionally authorized Title XVI Project. Must demonstrate that project is supported by an existing drought contingency plan; quantify benefits during droughts; address urgent needs and severe drought impacts. | Anticipate FOA in December 2018, with applications due February 2019 | \$8.3M was awarded in 2018 FY2019 budget TBD Funding Group I: up to \$300,000 for projects that can be completed within 2 years Funding Group II: up to \$750,000 for larger projects that can be completed within 3 years | 50% cost share | 4 Competitiveness would be evaluated if and when another FOA is released based on project status and scoring criteria. Status of next round is unknown. |
| Website | https://www.usbr.gov/drought/ | | | | | | | | | |
| Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Implementation Grant Program | California Department of Water Resources (DWR) | Grant | CEQA Only | Identify and implement projects and programs that increase regional self-reliance, reduce conflict, and manage water to concurrently achieve social, environmental, and economic objectives. | Planning, design, land acquisition, legal fees, environmental documentation, environmental mitigation, construction/implementation, construction administration | Project must be included on the project list of an IRWM Region's IRWMP. Palo Alto is within the San Francisco Bay IRWM Region and thus, the project must be in its IRWMP. | Prop 1 – Round 1 is underway; local call for projects closed Nov. 16, 2018 FY20/21: Round 2 Implementation Grant Solicitation anticipated City submitted a project in Fall 2018 for Round 1; currently awaiting selection for inclusion in regional application. | \$58.5M for the 2 rounds of implementation funding in the SF Funding Area, which includes the entire SF Bay Area IRWM Region and a portion of the East Contra Costa IRWM Region. (\$65M is allocated to SF Funding Area, \$6.5M to be allocated to DAC Involvement.) \$22.75M anticipated available in each round for non-DAC implementation projects | 50% cost share | 3 Limited funding available for competitive area. Participate in SF Bay Area IRWM process. Ultimately, up to SF Bay Area project prioritization and selection process as to which projects are included in an application |
| Website | https://water.ca.gov/Work-With-Us/Grants-And-Loans/IRWM-Grant-Programs or Bay Area IRWM Program: http://bayairewmp.org/ | | | | | | | | | |

| Program | Administering Agency | Funding Type | CEQA/NEPA Required? | Program Purpose | Eligible Uses | Eligibility Requirements | Due Date & Future Rounds | Funding Amounts & Terms | Cost Share | Priority Determination / Critical Factors |
|--|---|---------------|--|--|--|--|---|--|------------|---|
| Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) loan program | State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) | Loan | CEQA+ (includes CEQA and select federal crosscutters, i.e., not full NEPA) | Construction of publicly-owned facilities including wastewater treatment, local sewers, sewer interceptors, water reclamation and distribution, stormwater treatment, and combined sewers. | Planning, design, construction, construction management, mitigation measures (can include prior planning/design costs). Construction costs incurred prior to executing funding agreement NOT eligible for reimbursement. | Must either provide proof of submitted UWMP, proof of CUWCC MOU, or copy of Water Conservation Program for State Board approval. Letter of 2015 UWMP approval from DWR required prior to executing financing agreement. | Applications are continuously accepted, though the State Board now implements a deadline of December 31 and a scoring system to be added to the Fundable List. Projects must first get on Fundable Project List before applications will be reviewed. May be as long as 2 years from application submittal to contract | Typically, there is \$200M-\$300M available; Water recycling projects are given priority. Interest rate is ½ of the General Obligation Rate at the time of award (SRF i=1.9% for this year). Financing term up to 30 years. There is no maximum financing amount for a project / agency. | 0% | 2 Program is very popular. Application review can be up to 12 months, so financial forecast could change by the time an application is prepared, submitted, and reviewed. Highest scoring projects will be “corrective”, or address drinking water or Delta water quality; help implement a climate change action plan or address multiple water quality issues; and those with both a complete application and at least 90% design/specs |
| Website | https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/srf/ | | | | | | | | | |
| Water Recycling Funding Program (WRFP) Construction Grants | SWRCB | Loans & Grant | CEQA+ (includes CEQA and select federal crosscutters, i.e., not full NEPA) | Promote beneficial use of recycled water to augment fresh water supplies in CA by supporting water recycling projects and research. | Planning, design and construction, including reasonable costs to provide emergency backup water supply for a recycled water system; pilot projects for new potable reuse (can include prior planning/design costs). Construction costs incurred prior to executing funding agreement NOT eligible for reimbursement. | Apply through CWSRF program. | Applications are continuously accepted, though the State Board now implements a deadline of December 31 and a scoring system to be added to the Fundable List. Projects must first get on Fundable Project List before applications will be reviewed. May be as long as 2 years from application submittal to contract | Prop 1 provided \$625M for planning and construction of water recycling projects; however, this funding has been exhausted. Future allocations to the WRFP are possible, though currently TBD. Project could receive \$15M or 35% of project costs for construction, whichever is less. Offers 1% financing for recycled water projects through CWSF | N/A | 2 By applying for CWSRF, the City will automatically be applying for any available grant funding under the umbrella CWSRF program. |
| Website | https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/water_recycling/ | | | | | | | | | |

| Program | Administering Agency | Funding Type | CEQA/NEPA Required? | Program Purpose | Eligible Uses | Eligibility Requirements | Due Date & Future Rounds | Funding Amounts & Terms | Cost Share | Priority Determination / Critical Factors |
|---|---|--------------|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| Infrastructure SRF (ISRF) Loan Program | California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank (I-Bank) | Loan | Application does not consist of environmental portion; however, CEQA would be required prior to construction | Construction and/or repair of publicly-owned wastewater collection and treatment systems. | Architectural, engineering, financial and legal services, plans, specifications, admin expenses, land acquisition, construction, machinery/equipment | Project complete construction within 2 years of financing approval. Must have applied for all required permits. | Applications are continuously accepted. Loans typically awarded three months after application submittal | ISRF Program funding is available in amounts ranging from \$50,000 to \$25M, with loan terms of up to 30 years. Pre-payment of loan not allowed until Year 13 of loan | N/A | 5 Projects must demonstrate job creation, though this is only a small piece of the application. Loan terms not as good as other programs, and there are penalties to early repayment |
| Website | http://www.ibank.ca.gov/infrastructure-state-revolving-fund-isrf-program/ | | | | | | | | | |
| Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (WIFIA) | USEPA | Loan | CEQA and NEPA | Construction of wastewater conveyance and treatment projects, drinking water treatment and distribution projects, desalination, and water recycling projects | Planning, preliminary engineering, design, environmental review, revenue forecasting, construction, land acquisition, capitalized interest | Federal assistance may not exceed 80% of project costs. | Letters of Interest accepted during selection periods. FY 2018 solicited letters of interest from April-July 2018. 62 Letters of Interest applied for \$9.1B; 39 projects selected to apply for \$5B in loans | \$5B was available in 2018. Minimum project size for large communities (population > 25,000) is \$20M; for small communities is \$5M. Interest rate greater or equal to U.S. Treasury rate of similar maturity, based on the weighted average life of the loan. Loans for 35 years or useful life of project, whichever is less. WIFIA received a 2-year \$100M reauthorization at end of 2018. | 51% non-WIFIA; (up to 80% of project costs can be covered by federal funds, using a combination of programs) | 6 Non-refundable application fees of \$25,000 (small communities) or \$100,000 (>25,000 people). Total fees: \$250K-\$500K plus possibly additional fees for administration of loan. Low funding amount available. National program. Better local/state options. |
| Website | https://www.epa.gov/wifia | | | | | | | | | |