

Potential for Regional Benefits

In recognition that there are additional MFLs under development in the same geographic area as the Ichetucknee and Santa Fe, the project was evaluated for potential to positively impact surrounding water bodies. Implementation of the project resulted in an average increase of approximately 1.2 cfs at the Suwannee River Ellaville gage.

Source Water Reliability

Source water for this project is categorized as fully reliable with minimal seasonal variations.

Planning Level Project Cost Estimating



Transmission Costs: The SJRWMD costing tool for rural pipeline projects was used to estimate the transmission costs for water from the WRF to the treatment wetland and from the treatment wetlands to a representative recharge location within the target recharge area. Total distance estimated for costing is 85 miles and utilizes public rights-of-way. The transmission cost estimate includes pipeline costs but does not include transmission pump stations. Pipeline costs are the dominant factor in calculating transmission costs.



Treatment Costs: The selected treatment method is highly dependent on the recharge method selected, which in turn is dependent upon specific site geology and the area of land available. Two treatment scenarios were costed to provide a range of treatment costs. The upper range scenario is based on the use of recharge wells, which would require treatment to drinking water standards using reverse osmosis (RO) with ultraviolet advanced oxidation procedures (UV-AOP). Alternatively, the lower range scenario is based on the use of RIBs and could allow for treatment using natural system wetlands. The upper range treatment costs are based on CDM Smith’s reverse osmosis cost curves. The lower range treatment costs are based on natural wetland removal of TN only. Costs for this option are based on wetland information provided by the SJRWMD costing tool.



Recharge Costs: This project provides the flexibility to recharge through multiple methods. For costing, two recharge scenarios were costed. The upper range scenario is based on the use of recharge wells. The lower range scenario is based on the use of RIBs. The SJRWMD costing tool was used to develop costs for both RIBs and recharge wells.

The tables below provide estimated capital and O&M costs for the two scenarios. No land acquisition costs are included in the above cost estimates.

Option	Transmission Cost (\$M)	Treatment Costs (\$M)	Recharge Costs (\$M)	Total Capital Costs (\$M)	O&M Costs (\$M)	Annualized Cost (\$M/yr)
Upper Range (Recharge Well)	340	430	60	830	16	57
Lower Range (Treatment Wetland)	340	165	185	690	6	41

Notes:

1. These are high level planning costs, developed by noted references and citations at the back of this fact sheet and do not include potential costs for potential unknowns related to Environmental Remediation, Real Estate, Permitting, Engineering.
2. O&M costs represent both variable O&M costs like electricity and process chemicals as well as fixed O&M costs incurred each year.
3. Annualized costs are based on capital costs annualized over a 30-year project life plus annual O&M costs.

Project Schedule

October 2024 - October 2027	July 2025 - July 2026	January 2026 - January 2031	January 2026 - January 2029	July 2026 - July 2029	July 2029 - January 2045
Wetland Pilot (Ongoing) Demonstration	Feasibility Study	Land Acquisition	Permitting	Design	Construction