CALIFORNIA WATERFIX INFRASTRUCTURE

MODERNIZING THE SYSTEM

Board of Directors August 1, 2017





Topics

- SWP History
- Water Supply Reliability Issues
- Infrastructure
 Solutions

A Robust Solution is Needed

- Provide water supply reliability
- Enhance ecosystem habitat throughout Delta
- Allow flexible operations in dynamic fishery environment
- Improve water quality
- Reduce seismic risks
- Reduce climate change risks



State Water Project

History

- 1931 State Water Plan
- 1933 CVP Act
- 1971 First delivery
- 1994 Bay Delta Accord
- 2000 CALFED
- 2017 CA WaterFix
- Facilities
- 19 Dams & Reservoirs
- 20 Pumping Plants
- 10 Power Plants
- 662 Aqueduct Miles

Fishery Declines

Subsidence

Delta Risks

Seismic

Sea Level Rise

California's Delta



Delta Inflow

Sacramento River ~80% Inflow; good quality

East Side Rivers ~5% Inflow; good quality

Ocean/Tidal High salinity

San Joaquin River ~15% Inflow; poor quality

Delta Water Use

In-Delta

6%

18%

Sacramento

Stockton

Ocean 76%

Bay Area

Central Valley & Southern Cal



How Water Gets to Southern California

Sac River / West Delta Sac River
Delta Cross
Channel
Mokelumne River
Old & Middle Rivers

1150

Joaquin

Rive

SWP Pumps

CVP Pumps

SWP Susceptibility

Levee failures
Fish entrainment
Water quality/ salt water contamination

Bay-Delta Islands or Holes?



Land Subsidence Due to Farming & Peat Soil Oxidation

30 ft.

Subsidence - 1.5 ft. per decade - 30 ft. in some areas

Elevation Color Codes

- 30 feet

Oft.

ft.

O

Sea Level

Earthquake Induced Levee Failure



When Delta Levees Fail: The "Big Gulp"

1 million af of salt water flow into the Delta in first few days

Cost \$40 Billion



State & Federal Project Supplies History of Regulatory Restrictions



Four Decades of Analysis 21st Century Approach

1982 – Peripheral Canal 2017–CAWaterFix Above ground **Below ground** 21,800 cfs diversion 9,000 cfs diversion Mitigation plus Mitigation only CA EcoRestore program Regulatory only approach Science & adaptive management

California WaterFix - Overall Program



River Intake Locations



River Intakes



Designed to Protect Fish





Screen spacing – 1.75mm Flow approach velocity = 0.2 ft/sec

Intermediate Forebay





Main Tunnels

- Twin bore main tunnels
- 30 miles long each
- 150 ft below grade
- 2-foot thick concrete liner
- Pressurized face tunnel boring machine
 - ±45-ft excavated diameter
 - 40-ft internal diameter

Clifton Court Forebay – Expansion



Clifton Court Forebay – Pump Plants

Electrical Substation



North Clifton Court Forebay

Pump Plant Buildings



Clifton Court Forebay – Pump Plants



Project Modifications and Mitigation

 Minimized environmental footprint Reduced impacts to Delta communities Maximized use of public lands Reduced overall size of program Provided for gravity flow of diversions

Reduced Footprint - Cross Sections

Original Proposal – Open Canal



Current Proposal – Underground Tunnels



Review of Other Mega-Tunnel Projects

- The Eurasia Tunnel Turkey
- Lee Tunnel London
- Port of Miami Tunnel Florida
- East Side Access New York
- Blue Plains Tunnel Project District of Columbia
- Bay Tunnel San Francisco
- Willamette River Sewer Overflow Program Portland
- Gotthard Base Tunnel Swiss Alps
- SR-99 Alaskan Way Replacement Seattle
- Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link Hong Kong

Projects visited by program team

Tunnel Boring Machine



Large Diameter Tunnel Boring Machine Projects





Tunnel Shafts

- Launch/retrieve tunnel boring machines
- Construction maintenance access
- Long-term operational access

Program Schedule



Cost Estimate Preparation

- Multiple estimates prepared
- Class 3 estimates based on Conceptual Engineering Report
- Bottoms up contractor's estimate
- 2014 dollars

Program Estimate

	ITEM	AMOUNT (\$ billions)	
Со			
•	Program Management, construction management, and engineering	\$1.91	
•	Tunnel & shaft construction	\$6.82	
•	Remaining construction	\$2.68	
 Contingency (~36% for tunnels, shafts, remaining construction) 		\$3.38	
•	Land acquisition (includes 20% contingency)	\$0.15	
	Subtotal	\$14.94	
En	\$0.80		
0\	\$15.74		
Program Estimate in 2014 dollars			

Cost Estimate Comparison

ITEM	Estimate 1 5RMK Inc. (Billions) ^{1,2}	<u>Estimate 2</u> Jacobs Engineering (Billions) ^{1,2}	<u>Estimate 3</u> Risk Adjusted with Mitigation at 75% Confidence Interval (Billions) ^{1,3}
Construction	\$9.50	\$8.86	\$10.66
Contingency	\$3.38	\$3.15	
Subtotal	\$12.88	\$12.01	\$10.66
PM/CM/Eng	\$1.91	\$1.91	\$1.91
Land acquisition	\$0.15	\$0.15	\$0.15
Overall Total	\$14.94	\$14.07	\$12.72

- 1. Program estimates in 2014 dollars
- 2. ~36% contingency on construction for 5RMK and Jacob Engineering estimates
- 3. Based on risks known at time of assessment

Approach to Risk Management



Revise tunnel alignment to avoid sensitive features Probe ahead and grout to mitigate risk from faults Provide clear contractual baselines to allocate residual risk

Design and Construct Authority

- Single-purpose organization
- Under contract with State DWR
- Independent staffing
- World-class expertise and methods
- Sunsets at completion of project commissioning

Design and Construct Authority



