



THE DEAD – AND THE WALKING DEAD



High cost and low benefits sent some water projects to their grave – others should be axed, too



DEAD (FOR THE TIME BEING)

Proposed Project	Cost Estimate	Claimed increase to CA Water Supply ¹	Cause of Death
Pacheco Dam (Santa Clara Valley Water District)	\$3.2 billion (2025) \$2.5 billion (2020)	1/50th of 1% 8,300 acre-feet in critical years	Not affordable , no cost-sharing partners, federal agreements failed
Los Vaqueros Expansion (Contra Cost Water District)	\$1.6 billion (2025)	1/5th of 1% 83,000 acre-feet	Not affordable , no partners
Temperance Flat Dam (U.S. Bureau of Reclamation)	\$3.2 billion (2020)	1/6th of 1% 70,000 acre-feet	Not financeable , no water rights available
Auburn Dam (U.S. Bureau of Reclamation)	\$6 – \$10 billion (2006)	1/2 of 1% 208,000 acre-feet	Seismic risk, cost-sharing requirements , 2008 loss of water rights

WALKING DEAD

Proposed Project	Original vs. Revised Cost Estimate		Claimed Increase to CA Water Supply ¹	Why it's ailing
Sites Reservoir Project (Sites Project Authority)	\$4.8 billion (2023)	\$6.8 billion (2025)	3/5th of 1% 250,000 acre-feet	Multi-billion dollar cost increase ; permit terms likely to reduce water
Delta Tunnel (Single Version) (CA Dept. of Water Resources)	\$15.9 billion (DWR, 2020)	\$60-100 billion (Independent estimate, 2025)	1.2% 500,000 acre-feet	Cost estimates wildly off , intense public opposition, more affordable water supply solutions exist
Shasta Dam Raise (U.S. Bureau of Reclamation)	\$2 billion (2019)	Not available	1/8th of 1% 51,000 acre-feet	Illegal under CA Wild & Scenic Rivers Act
TOTAL	\$68.8 billion		1.9% 801,000 acre-feet	

¹ Average annual applied urban and agricultural water use in California 2016-2020 = 40.5 million acre-feet, per California Water Plan Update 2023

