

University  
VCSC - History

# Council-Commission Discuss University Water Proposals

1/9/63

Proposals for servicing water of the University of California campus and environs were discussed by Santa Cruz councilmen and water commissioners Monday night.

No action was taken.

Consulting engineers Brown and Caldwell have put a \$530,000 price tag on a system to supply the university area needs to 1990.

However, water Director Weston Webber said this can be cut by about \$160,000 as far as the city is concerned if existing pipe is renewed instead of replaced and if the university picks up extra costs (\$92,000 estimated) involved in change in its campus "core" area.

Councilmen indicated Monday night they feel no responsibility for the \$92,000.

Original water service agreements with the university were based on the "core" of offices and classrooms being at the lower (High street) side of the 2000-acre campus.

Regents January 17 are expected to give final approval to a revised plan, with the "core" farther to the north and away from existing mains.

The university has requested a meeting with city officials January 22 to discuss water service, which they want by the fall of 1964.

The Brown and Caldwell report makes recommendations on the design and cost of an expanded water system to meet the needs of the university, its surrounding residential area, as well as the growing needs of the city itself.

## PUBLIC NOTICE

Although the meeting was to consider an appropriate water system "in the best engineering practice" to fulfill the city's contractual obligations to the university, councilmen present quickly established that "there is much more to this than just water."

The councilmen seemed agreed on limiting their commitments to the university to the letter of the agreement and to the capabilities of the city, as they see it.

The attitude of the water commission and of the engineers was expressed by Webber when he pointed out three points:

1. The water system will provide a service which will be paid for by its "customers," not by the taxpayers. Water income, not taxes, will pay for the water system.

2. The university "will be a big water customer" and the money to be spent is the same type of investment any utility would have to make to provide service to its "customers." It will ultimately be repaid by the income from water sales.

Webber estimated that within a period of five years the expanded water system will be operating in the black, meeting all amortized capital expenditures out of current income.

3. Even if there were no university, the water system is due for an overhaul. Many old pipelines eventually have to be replaced, and new facilities will have to be added in any case to serve a predicted increase in Santa Cruz population.

L. B. Dunlap and L. N. Hoag, Brown and Caldwell engineers who presented the report, emphasized that their over-all approach was for a unified water system to meet all estimated needs of the city for a complete water system. This would serve not only the university, but its surrounding residential area, and the increased demand of a city predicted to be facing population growth.

"We have designed a system consistent with good engineering practice," said Hoag. "We have combined efficient design with sound economics, but without going into 'who' pays for 'what'."

They recommended a system to supply a projected water demand of some 6.5 million gallons daily, to be divided into two stages of construction. The first stage, which would adequately provide until 1990, would cost an estimated \$530,000.

Webber said this could be substantially trimmed by a \$67,000 savings realized from renewing rather than replacing a current water line. He also indicated that the university should contribute \$92,000 as the difference between amounts necessitated by their move of the "core."

Webber has presented to the water commission a recommendation for a \$1.2 million bond issue, which would amortize the cost of expansion and renovation of the water system over a period of 30 years, and which "can easily be paid for out of water revenues, with no burden on the taxpayer."