Optimum Fresh Water Price at TITAB Reservoir, Bali Province of Indonesia  

Ussy Andawayanti1,*, Rispiningtati1, and I Gusti Ngurah Antariza2  

1Department of Water Resources, Faculty of Engineering, University of Brawijaya, Malang of Indonesia  
2Master Program of Water Resources, Faculty of Engineering, University of Brawijaya, Malang of Indonesia

ABSTRACT

The watershed at Titab dam of Buleleng regency at Bali Proince was approximately 69.54 km² with river length of 25 km. The project of Titab Dam was functioned to supply water irrigation at Saba and Puluran with each number area of 1396.40 ha and 398.42 ha; drinking water and hydro electrical power of 3.15 MW. This paper studied the fresh water price at Titab Dam due to the rule and human need after building the reservoir. The research method was consisted of simulation and optimization due to Benefit-Cost Ratio. Result showed that population of Buleleng Regency in the year of 2025 was predicted as 2,343,380 persons and it was used as the basic of analysis. Net benefit of water need in the year of 2025 was Rp. 130,680,082.750. It was based on Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) with Internal Rate of Return was 12%. The optimization result presented that existing drinking water price was Rp. 800.-/m³ and the maximum price was Rp. 5,500.-/m³, but simulation result showed that existing drinking water price was Rp. 982.-/m³ and the maximum price was Rp. 5,695.-/m³. The result was used as the consideration for decision maker on determining water price at study location so that ratio of benefit and cost was more than one.
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INTRODUCTION

Million of people in the world were directly functionong watersheds which provided such as drinking water, energy, irrigation, and fishery. Mistakes in determinning the priority and plan of watershed could had great and serious ramification [1]. The challenge of how to plan and manage water resources was one of the greatest on our time. To increase demand for multiple users of water, recognition of flow requirements, and an interval of other values were added to the challenge [2]. Tools that combined analytical and deliberative capacities were used in the process of water planning and management in various parts. Some countries were moving towards water sector reforms. Hence, practical issues of how water management institutions could give better regulation and allocation of water rights had emerged [3]. The reliability of access or equivalent with the uncertainty which associated with water availability at their diversion point became a parameter that was similarly to influence the application by users for water licenses, as well as their willingness to pay for licensed used [4][5]. Water was also become as an international traded commodity[6], in which international tradeoffs were observed and maintained through country commitments as regards the global commitment to sustainable development [7].

Models of water distribution could developed using either an optimization or a simulation approach. Many systems which studied water resources management, was focussed on the global policy results of large-scale systems However, the tendency of current research was specifically modelling the systems, with more emphasis on quantitative results. Some researchers formulated an appropriate strategy that stroke a balance between mitigating of water shortages and limit total of financial costs.

The objective of this study was to determine fresh water price at Titab Dam due to the rule and human need after building the reservoir. Simulation and optimization due to Benefit-Cost Ratio was used to analyze this research. Result was hoped as the consideration for decision maker on determining water price at study location.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Titab reservoir was located at Sub unit of River Basins (Sub SWS) of Bali Penida, Buleleng Regency and it was administratively concluded 4 villages including Telaga, Ularan, Busungbiu, and Ringdikit. The number area of watershed at dam location was 69.54 km² with river length of 25 km. Titab Dam was functioned as 1) Water irrigation supply at Saba with number area of 1,396.40 ha and Puluran with number area of 398.42 ha; and 2) drinking water supply and hydro electrical power of 398.42 ha. Map of location was as in Figure 1 below.
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Based on the objective of water demand as described above, the dam was designed with the height of 59.8 m from river bed, effective storage of 10.37 millions m$^3$ that was between High Water Level (HWL) at elevation of 156.00 m and Low Water Level (LWL) at elevation of 131.20 m. The condition of water supply at North and East of Bali was not good compared with at West and Centre of Bali. It caused rice field at North of Bali was dependent on rain and traditional irrigation. On the other hand it was demanded to optimize the potency of water resources due to that some population had saved their income from agriculture and plantation.

Nowadays, fresh water demand at Buleleng was needed for fulfilling the needs of domestic and industry that was 15 m$^3$/s. This data was recorded by Regional Company of Drinking Water (PDAM) at Buleleng Regency. It was predicted continuously increasing in the future as well as the development of Buleleng Regency. There was alternative effort to anticipate this cases that was to function groove of Tukad Saba as long storage for fresh water storage. This long storage was made by building Titab reservoir at the downstream of Tukad Saba river.

Some data were needed in this study those were 1) technical data of Titab reservoir and the facility of water management; 2) data of construction cost and life time of structure; 3) data of rainfall at Tukad Saba watershed; 4) data of irrigation number area at Tukad Saba watershed; 5) data of cropping pattern at Tukad Saba watershed; 6) data of river discharge at Tukad Saba from the year of 2005 until 2010; 7) population of Buleleng Regency from the year of 2005 to 2010; and 8) number of industry at Buleleng Regency from the year of 2005 to 2010. The procedure on obtaining fresh water price in this study were as follow:

1. To calculate construction cost based on technical data of Titab reservoir.
2. To analyze cost based on construction cost, operation and maintenance cost, and life time of structure.
3. To predict the projection of population in the year of 2025.
4. To analyze fresh water demand based on the projection of population.
5. To analyze fresh water demand due to existing water source for detecting what the source could be enough or not for supplying until the year of 2025.
6. To analyze water production from water usage level of Binangun District so that was obtained benefit value.
7. To determine net water price according to the result of economical analysis.
8. Public Electrical Company (PLN) carried out analysis on system of electrical interconnection and electrical price of PLN at Buleleng Regency.

Water price of irrigation in this study was determined by following the procedure as follow: 1) To calculate total cost of Titab Reservoir Project based on the cost of construction, operation and maintenance; 2) To analyze net benefit during economical age of project; 3) To analyze ratio of benefit-cost (B/C ratio), Internal Rate of Return (IRR), and sensitivity analysis; and 4) To analyze water price of irrigation. Simulation and optimization of water price in this study could be carried out too after finishing these analysis as above.

**Simulation of Reservoir Operation**

Mass storage equation was used to simulate the reservoir operation. The formula was as follow [8]:

\[ Z_{t+1} = Z_t + Q_t - D_t - E_t - I_t \]

(subject to \( 0 \leq Z_{t+1} \leq C \))
Note;
\[ Z_{t+1} = \text{storage volume at the end of t period (initial storage at (t-1) period} \]
\[ Z_t = \text{initial storage at t period} \]
\[ Q_t = \text{inflow during t period} \]
\[ D_t = \text{release during t period} \]
\[ E_t = \text{losses of net reservoir evaporation during t period} \]
\[ L_t = \text{other losses} \]
\[ C = \text{active storage capacity} \]

Usage age of reservoir
Usage age of reservoir was determined by the formula as follow [8]:
\[ T = \frac{V}{L_j} \]
\[ T = \text{usage age of reservoir (year)} \]
\[ V = \text{reservoir capacity (m³)} \]
\[ L_j = \text{sediment rate (m³/year)} \]

Hydro electrical power
Generated power of hydro electrical power was analysis using the formula as follow [9]:
\[ P = 9.81 \times Q \times H_{\text{eff}} \times \text{Eff} \]
\[ P = \text{generated power (kW)} \]
\[ H = \text{effective head (m)} \]
\[ H_{\text{eff}} = \text{electrical generated discharge (m³/s)} \]

Time value of money
a. Future value factor
\[ F = P_{0}(1+i)^n \]
\[ F = \text{future value factor (F/P), so the formula was written as:} \]
\[ F = P_{0} (F/P, i\%, n) \]
b. Annual payment
\[ A = F (F/A, i\%, n) \]
c. Sinking Fund Factor
\[ A = F (P/F, i\%, n) \]
d. Present Value Factor
\[ P = F (P/F, i\%, n) \]
e. Present value of annuity Factor
\[ P = A (P/A, i\%, n) \]
f. Capital Recovery Factor
\[ A = P (A/P, i\%, n) \]

Indicator of feasibility economy
Indicator of feasibility economy was formulated as follow [10]
a. Net Present Value (NPV)
\[ P = \frac{F}{(1+i)^n} \]
\[ P = \text{present value} \]
\[ F = \text{future value} \]
\[ i = \text{rate of interest} \]
b. Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR)
\[ \text{BCR} = \frac{\text{PV benefit}}{\text{PV cost}} \]
\[ \text{BCR} = \frac{\text{PV benefit}}{\text{PV cost}} \]
c. Internal Rate of Return
IRR = \Gamma' \frac{NPV}{NPV' - NPV''} \quad \text{...................................... (11)}

Note
\Gamma': \text{rate of interest with } NPV > 0
\Gamma': \text{rate of interest with } NPV < 0
NPV: \text{net present value}
NPV': NPV > 0
NPV'': NPV < 0

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Projection of population growth was predicted using exponential method that was \( P_n = P_0 \cdot e^{rn} \), \( P_0 \) was as the number of population in the year of 2010, \( n \) was years projection, \( r \) was rate of population growth, and \( P_n \) was population in the projection of year. Projection of population growth was presented as in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>917,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>980,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,048,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,121,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,199,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,282,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,371,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1,466,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1,567,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1,676,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1,792,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>1,916,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2,049,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>2,191,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2,343,382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The goodness of fit test on projection method used coefficient of correlation. The result showed that the coefficient of correlation for exponential method was approximate to +1. It indicated that this method was suitable for prediction population growth at location of study.

Economical analysis

Analysis of Benefit-Cost Ratio was carried out based on interest Bank of Indonesia of 12% in 2008 and life time of Titab Reservoir was 60 years. It was obtained total of cost at present was Rp 774,848,487,402.; and benefit was Rp. 130,680,082,750.; so that analysis of BCR was as follow:

\[ BCR = \frac{Rp1,087,781,088,814}{Rp774,848,487,402} = 1.404 > 1 \]

B/C of Titab reservoir was more than 1 (> 1), it could be said that this project was economically feasible or the project exceed the break event point.

The second method used in economical analysis was based on Net Present Value (NPV) or the difference between Benefit and Cost (B–C). In this method, interest rate had to be more than zero (> 0). If NPV = 0, it meant that the benefit of project was the same as investment cost. If NPV < 0, it meant that the project economically was not feasible to be built [10]. The result of analysis for this method was as follow: benefit at present was Rp 1,087,781,008,814.; total of cost was Rp 774,848,487,402.; so that the difference between benefit and cost (B–C) was Rp 214,043,338,793.;

Internal Rate of Return (IRR) was defined as level of interest rate which made benefit and cost had the same value or \( B-C = 0 \) or \( B/C = 1 \) [10]. Based on the 10th equation as above, it was obtained the IRR as follow: \( NPV' = \text{positive} = 90,725,222,039; \) \( NPV'' = \text{negative} = -7,083,128,664; \) so

\[ IRR = 14\% + \frac{90,725,222,039}{(90,725,222,039 - (-7,083,128,664)) \times (14\% - 15\%)} = 14\% + 0.93\% = 14,93\% > 12\% \] (the standard of interest that was used in this study)

The sensitivity analysis was intended to know what matter with the project result if there was the possibility of changes in determining on the value of benefit and cost, and it was just as an estimation. Therefore there were some assumptions which were not the same as real condition. In this study, it was carried out for the conditions as follow: [11]
- Cost was up to 10%, benefit was remain
- Cost was down to 10%, benefit was remain
- Cost was remain, benefit up to 10%
- Cost was remain, benefit was up to 10%
- Cost was up to 10%, benefit was down to 10%
- Cost was down to 10%, benefit was up to 10%

**Analysis of fresh water price**

The analysis of fresh water price was due to the most critical condition when benefit was down to 10% and the cost was up to 10%, so that minimum water sale price could be charged to consumers and project of Titab Reservoir was really feasible. At this condition: B/C = 1.126; B-C = Rp 256,754,029,530.; IRR = 15.203%; rate of interest = 12%; the average of fresh water demand = 0.493 m³/s; fresh water demand per-year = 0.493 x 365 days x 24 hours x 60 minutes x 60 seconds = 15,547.248 m³/year. Then fresh water price was as follow

$$\text{fresh water price} = \frac{Rp.256,754,029,530}{15,547.248 \times (8.324) \times (1.1761)} = \text{Rp. 1,127/m}^3$$

The electrical services at Buleleng Regency was carried out by Public Electrical Company (PLN) of Singaraja. Source of electrical supply to Public Electrical Company of Buleleng was as interconnection from some hydro electrical power of Java-Bali. Cost on operation and maintenance of hydro electrical power at Titab Reservoir was estimated by River Basins Public of Bali Regional Government (BWS Bali Penda) as follow: Rp. 1,752,065,073.-.

Depreciation value was influenced by interest and life time of project. Based on interest of 12% and life time of project of 60 years, it was obtained SFF value = 0.00013 and the depreciation was 0.00013 x Rp. 11,425,875,700 = Rp 1,485,363.-

Yearly annual cost was included analysis of constant yearly cost during life time of project and not for inconstant annual cost. For this study: rate of interest was 12%, depreciation was Rp. 1,485,363.-; cost of operation and maintenance was Rp. 1,752,065,073.-; so that annual cost was Rp. 3,124,655,520.-. Therefore the average of price could be calculated. Rate of each customer of social was 466.60; household was 758.80; business was 758.80; industry was 589.00; government and lighting of public road was 792.00. Total of average value per-kWh for 1 month was 663,042. According to basic value as above, Public Electrical Company (PLN) estimated for the usage of Block I was Rp. 663,042.-. So that the income per-kWh for 1 year was 12 x Rp 663,042 = Rp 7,956.-.

**Analysis of electrical price**

The life time of hydro electrical power project was 60 years and interest rate of 12%. Project cost of Titab Reservoir for hydro electrical power was Rp. 11,425,875,700.00; annual cost of Titab Reservoir for hydro electrical power (A/P, 12, 60) was Rp. 1,372,642,444.; cost of electrical energy per-kWh was Rp. 2416.-; value of electrical sale at Block I was Rp. 663,042; benefit of electrical energy per-kWh was Rp. 1,752.-; Benefit of electrical energy per-year was Rp 995,036,136.00

**Benefit of agriculture**

Benefit of project was obtained from the increasing of agricultural product before and after project building of Titab Dam. This kind of benefit was as tangible one. Cropping pattern included rice-second crop-wine was planned at location of study. Effective rainfall used in this study was of 50% dependable probability and cropping start was on November 1. Project of Titab Reservoir would directly influence irrigation water supply on dry season, so that would increase the harvest and economy of society. This kind was as intangible benefit.

Analysis of Benefit Cost Ratio used present value method. Rate of interest used in this study was 12% as described above. Life time of Titab reservoir was 60 years. The analysis was as follow: Total of cost at present was Rp 744,848,487,402.-; Benefit total of irrigation at present was Rp. 154,150,729,909.-; Construction cost at present was Rp 1,283,150,675,758.-, so that BCR was as follow:

$$BCR = \frac{Rp 1,283,150,675,758}{Rp 2416} = 1.656 > 1$$

B/C of Titab Reservoir was more than 1 (> 1). It meant that this project was economically feasible or this project exceeded the break even point.

The second method in economical analysis used Net Present Value that was to find the net Benefit (B - C). This method evaluated project that NPV of present interest would more than zero (> 0). If NPV = 0 it meant that the benefit of project was the same as investation cost. If NPV < 0 it meant that the project was economically not feasible to be built. Case of this study used interest of 12%, total of benefit at present (B) was
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Rp. 1,283,150,675,758.; total of cost at present (C) was Rp. 774,848,487,402.; and the difference between benefit and cost (B-C) was Rp. 508,302,188,356.

Internal Rate of Return (IRR) was defined as rate of interest which caused benefit and cost had the same value or B/C = 0 or rate of interest that caused B/C ratio = 1. In this case: positive NPV = 15%, negative NPV = 20%, so that IRR was as follow:

\[ IRR = 15\% + \frac{149,348,734,645}{(149,348,734,645 - (307,834,002.072)} (20\% - 15\%) \]

\[ = 15\% + 0.6\% \]

\[ = 15.06\% > 12\% \] (the interest that was used)

**Determination of irrigation water price**

The analysis was carried out based on the most critical condition that was when benefit was down to 10% but cost was up to 10%, so that minimum water sale price could be charged to consumers and project of Titab Reservoir was really feasible. On the condition of benefit was down to 10% and cost was up to 10%, water sale price was analyzed as follow: B/C ratio was 1.55; B-C was Rp. 449,776,631,758.; IRR was 16.648%; interest of bank was 12%; total of irrigation water demand was 407,652,010.26 m$^3$/year; price of irrigation water was \[ \frac{Rp.449,776,631.758}{407,652,010.26} \times (8.324) \times 1.761 \times X = \text{Rp.88,69 m}^3/\text{year} \]

**Simulation of reservoir operation and optimization of price on reservoir fresh water**

This kind of analysis used solver. The storage capacity of Titab Reservoir was analyzed based on map of measuring result. The highest elevation was +162.00 m. Relation between elevation, reservoir capacity, and number area of storage was presented as in Figure 2.

Reservoir simulation was intended to know the successful level of reservoir based on water supply and number of water demand as reservoir outflow for irrigation and fresh water. The capacity of effective storage was analyzed using the storage capacity curve and number area of Titab Reservoir as presented in Figure 1. The base principal in capacity analysis of effective storage was using dependable discharge that was Q80, but outflow discharge for irrigation was using selected alternative which was added by fresh water, maintenance flow, discharge for electrical energy power, and evaporation of dam. Dead storage was designed at the elevation of 131.20 m with storage capacity of 2.19 juta m$^3$. Analysis of effective storage produced effective storage for Titab Reservoir was 10.37 x 10$^6$ m$^3$ and volume of total storage was 12.795 juta m$^3$.

The price optimization for reservoir in this study was carried out for one reservoir without connection with other reservoir. The objective function was to maximize total of net benefit and the constraints were included X $\geq$ demand volume; \( \sum X_i \leq \text{certain volume; } \sum Y_i \leq \text{ratio of model; } Bi = \text{Benefit per-}m^3; Z \geq \sum X_i Y_i ; \text{and } Z = \text{Total of reservoir cost. The result of optimization was included the changes of storage volume and elevation of reservoir along the year; reliability of reservoir; and the pattern of reservoir operation. This simulation used 15 daily discharge for each year, but outflow was based on irrigation water demand for 6
alternative cropping start with some variations those were January 1, January 16, February 1, February 16, March 1, and March 16, fresh water demand until the tear of 2025, maintenance flow, evaporation, and water demand for electrical energy power.

Failure of storage simulation was determined with percentage of failure number due to total of simulation period, the maximum result was 20% or percentage of significant number was 80%. Table 2 and Figure 3 presented optimization result of simulation water price with cropping start on January 1. Table 3 and Figure 4 presented optimization result of simulation water price with cropping start on January 16.

Table 2 Optimization result of simulation water price (Result of solver) [12] (Cropping start on January 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pengguna</th>
<th>Alokasi X10^6m^3</th>
<th>Harga X10^8Rp</th>
<th>Total Harga</th>
<th>F.Power</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>F.Logarit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3TA</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigasi</td>
<td>167.00</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Baku</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lurah</td>
<td>335.00</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>5609</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIA Rata-rata</td>
<td>112.13</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sumber : Perhitungan Kendala Hasil optimasi</th>
<th>PLTA</th>
<th>Iriagasi</th>
<th>Air Baku</th>
<th>Lurah NIA Rata-rata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol Inflow</td>
<td>Alok</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Vol Wdk</td>
<td>Alok X Harga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3TA</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigasi</td>
<td>167.00</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Baku</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lurah</td>
<td>335.00</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>5609</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIA Rata-rata</td>
<td>112.13</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of cropping start on January 1 presented that inflow of reservoir was 101,388,636 m^3, number area of Saba irrigation: cropping pattern-1 was 1,396.4 ha; cropping pattern-2 was 1,186.94 ha; and cropping pattern-3 was 1,256.76 ha, number area of Puluran irrigation: cropping pattern-1 was 398.42 ha; cropping pattern-2 was 338.657 ha; cropping pattern-3 was 358.578 ha, fresh water supply was 0.526 m/s; volume of total storage was 12.795 million m^3; maximum elevation of reservoir water level was 156 m; maintenance flow was 0.29 m/s; discharge of hydro electrical power for interconnection supply was 0.77 m^3/s; maximum hydro power was 3.15 MW and the minimum power was 1.36 MW.
The result of cropping start on January 16 presented that all kinds item were the same as cropping pattern start on January 1, the expection was maximum hydro power was 3.18 MW and the minimum power was 1.32 MW.

Table 3 Optimization result of simulation water price (Result of silver) [12] (Cropping start on January 16)
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- The net benefit (B-C) was Rp 449,776,631,758 ; B/C ratio was 1.55; and IRR was 16.648%.
- Fresh water price was Rp. 88.69 - per-m³ when cost was up to 10%, benefit was down at 10%, and the cost was Rp 529,946,667,935.31.

3. Water price based on the result of comparison analysis showed that minimum price of existing water was Rp. 800 -/m³ and the maximum price was Rp. 2,700 -/m³, but based on simulation result there was obtained no minimum water price and the maximum price was Rp. 2,951 -/m³. Therefore, to obtain B/C ratio was more than one (> 1), decision maker could apply the water price which had been analyzed as above.

4. Electrical price at Buleleng regency was included the analysis as follow: average price of social was 466.60, household was 708.81, business was 758.80, industry was 589.00, government and lighting of public road was 792.00, and price of total average was 663.02. Therefore the income during 1 year was Rp 7,956 .- per-kWh
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