SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN WATERMASTER

REGULAR BOARD MEETING AGENDA
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 3, 2010 - 2:00 P.M.
MONTEREY REGIONAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY
BOARD ROOM, 5 HARRIS COURT, BUILDING "D"
"RYAN RANCH"
MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

WATERMASTER BOARD:
City of Seaside – Mayor Ralph Rubio, Chair
Coastal Subarea Landowner – Director Paul Bruno, Vice Chair
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District – Director Judi Lehman, Secretary
City of Del Rey Oaks – Mayor Jerry Edelen
California American Water – Director Craig Anthony
Laguna Seca Subarea Landowner – Director Bob Costa
City of Monterey –Mayor Chuck Della Sala
City of Sand City – Mayor David Pendergrass
Monterey County/Monterey County Water Resources Agency -- Supervisor Dave Potter, District 5

I. CALL TO ORDER

II ROLL CALL

III. MINUTES;

The minutes of the Regular Board meeting of February 3, 2010 are attached to this agenda. The Board is requested to consider approving the minutes.

IV. REVIEW OF AGENDA

If there are any items that arose after the 72-hour posting deadline, a vote may be taken to add the item to the agenda pursuant to the requirements of Government Code Section 54954.2(b). (A 2/3-majority vote is required).

V. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

Oral communications is on each meeting agenda in order to provide members of the public an opportunity to address the Watermaster on matters within its jurisdiction. Matters not appearing on the agenda will not receive action at this meeting but may be referred to the Watermaster Administrator or may be set for a future meeting. Presentations will be limited to three minutes or as otherwise established by the Watermaster. In order that the speaker may be identified in the minutes of the meeting, it is helpful if speakers would use the microphone and state their names. Oral communications are now open.

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Consider Approval of Summary for Payments made during February, 2010 totaling $21,920.00
B Consider Fiscal Year Financial Reports – Through February 28, 2010

VII. ORAL PRESENTATION

(None scheduled)

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Information/Action regarding Superior Court response to February 5, 2010 Report responding to Court's Minute Order dated January 6, 2010 concerns regarding the Watermaster's 2009 Annual Report to the Court

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

a). Consider Selection of Management Objectives and Initial Scenarios for Groundwater Modeling Work

b). Consider Approval of Request for Service No. 2010-03 with HydroMetrics to Refine Protective Water Levels

c). Consider Reclassifying the Security National Guaranty (SNG) Well from Active Status to Inactive Status

X INFORMATIONAL REPORTS (No Action Required)

A. Timeline Schedule of Milestone Dates (Critical date monitoring)

B. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) minutes of February 10, 2010

XI. DIRECTOR'S REPORTS

XII. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMENTS

XIII. NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE –APRIL 7, 2010 (MRWPCA-Board Room) 2:00 P.M.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

This agenda was forwarded via e-mail to the City Clerks of Seaside, Monterey, Sand City and Del Rey Oaks; the Clerk of the Monterey Board of Supervisors, the Clerk to the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District; the Clerk at the Monterey County Water Resources Agency, Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency and the California American Water Company for posting on February 26, 2010 per the Ralph M. Brown Act, Government Code Section 54954.2(a).

ITEM NO. III.

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING
2008/2009 Board of Directors
Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster
February 3, 2009

MINUTES

I. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Rubio called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. in the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency Boardroom at 5 Harris Court, Building D, Monterey.

II. **ROLL CALL**

City of Seaside – Mayor Ralph Rubio, Chairman
Coastal Subarea Landowner – Director Paul Bruno, Vice Chair
City of Del Rey Oaks – Mayor Jerry Edelen
California American Water ("CAW") – Director Craig Anthony
City of Sand City – Mayor David Pendergrass
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District ("MPWMD") – Director Judi Lehman, Secretary
Laguna Seca Subarea Landowner – Director Bob Costa
City of Monterey – Mayor Charles "Chuck" Della Sala
Monterey County/Monterey County Water Resources Agency ("MCWRA") – Supervisor Jane Parker (Alternate)

Absent: None

III. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

It was approved by consensus of the board to accept the minutes of the Watermaster Regular Meeting of December 2, 2009. Supervisor Parker abstained due to her not being in attendance at the December 2nd meeting.

IV. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

A. Consider Approval of Summary for Payments made during December 2009 totaling $64,183.88.
B. Consider current year Financial Reports – Through December 31, 2009.

Moved by Mayor Pendergrass, seconded by Director Costa, and unanimously carried, to approve the consent calendar as presented.

V. There being no further 2008/2009 business, Chairman Rubio adjourned the meeting at 2:04 p.m.

REGULAR MEETING
2009/2010 Board of Directors
Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster
February 3, 2009

MINUTES

I. **CALL TO ORDER**
Chairman Rubio called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m. in the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency Boardroom at 5 Harris Court, Building D, Monterey.

II. **ROLL CALL**
City of Seaside – Mayor Ralph Rubio, Chairman
Coastal Subarea Landowner – Director Paul Bruno, Vice Chair
City of Del Rey Oaks – Mayor Jerry Edelen
California American Water ("CAW") – Director Craig Anthony
City of Sand City – Mayor David Pendergrass
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District ("MPWMD") – Director Judi Lehman, Secretary
Laguna Seca Subarea Landowner – Director Bob Costa
City of Monterey – Mayor Charles "Chuck" Della Sala
Monterey County/Monterey County Water Resources Agency ("MCWRA") – Supervisor Jane Parker (Alternate)

Absent: None

III. **ELECTION AND APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS FOR CALENDAR YEARS 2010-2011**

It was moved by Mayor Pendergrass, seconded by Director Lehman, and unanimously carried, to appoint Mayor Rubio to continue as board chair.

It was moved by Director Costa, seconded by Mayor Della Sala, and unanimously carried, to appoint Director Bruno to continue as board vice chair.

It was moved by Director Bruno, seconded by Director Costa, and unanimously carried, to appoint Director Lehman to continue as board secretary.

It was moved by Director Bruno, seconded by Supervisor Potter, and unanimously carried, to appoint Ray Corpuz as board treasurer.

IV. **REVIEW OF AGENDA**
There were no changes to the agenda.

V. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**
There were no questions or comments from the public.

VI. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

A. Consider Approval of Summary for Payments made during January 2010 totaling $9,400.00.
B. Consider current year Financial Reports – Through January 31, 2010.
C. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Monitoring Well Construction Report
D. Consider Approval of Modification to MPWMD Request for Service No. 2010-01 to Change Water Quality Sampling Frequency of New BLM Monitoring Well.

Moved by Mayor Edelen, seconded by Mayor Della Sala, and unanimously carried, to approve the consent calendar as presented.

VII. **ORAL PRESENTATION** – None.

VIII. **NEW BUSINESS**

A. **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

1. **TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

a) **Declaration of Total Usable Storage Capacity of the Basin**

The board received and reviewed the submitted staff report by Mr. Robert Jaques, Watermaster Technical Program Manager, and the Declaration of Total Usable Storage Capacity of the Seaside Groundwater Basin. Mr. Jaques stated that the related agreement in draft form for storage usage has been sent to all standard producers, and would be sent per Directors Bruno's request to alternative producers as well.

It was moved by Director Costa, seconded by Supervisor Parker, and unanimously carried, to issue the Declaration of Total Usable Storage Capacity of the Basin as presented.

2. **BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

a) **California American Water Credit Against Replenishment Assessment Request**

The board received and reviewed the submitted staff report regarding the extension of a credit to California American Water to offset the Replenishment Assessment Fees imposed by Watermaster for over pumping of the Seaside Basin and the related conditional agreement. Mr. Evans advised the board that the Committee had reviewed the request and recommended board approval.

It was moved by Mayor Pendergrass, seconded by Director Costa, and unanimously carried, to approve California American Water's request to allow a credit for pre-construction costs incurred in calendar year 2007 for pursuing the Coastal Water Project amounting to $3,741,714 to be used to offset the Watermaster 2008/2009 Overproduction Replenishment Assessment.

b) **Response to Court Minute Order Regarding Watermaster Annual Report**

The board received and reviewed the submitted staff report and Court Minute Order from Judge Randall issued January 6, 2010 in regards to the 2009 Annual Report submitted by Watermaster to the Court due by November 15, 2009. Also submitted to the board was a draft Watermaster response to the Minute Order points. Director Anthony provided in

writing three alternative response options, changes more of form than substance from those drafted by staff.

It was moved by Director Anthony, seconded by Mayor Edelen, and unanimously carried, to approve the use option three of the alternative response language provided by California American Water.

It was moved by Director Bruno, seconded by Supervisor Potter, and unanimously carried, to authorize Counsel Girard to file with the Court the response to Judge Randall's Minute Order.

IX. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS (No Action Required)

A. Timeline Schedule of Milestone Dates (Critical date monitoring)
B. Watermaster Work Plan for FY 2010
C. Technical Advisory Committee ("TAC") minutes of January 13, 2010.
D. Water Production Report for the First Quarter (October 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009) of Water Year 2009/2010.

X. **DIRECTORS' REPORTS**

Director Lehman introduced Regina Doyle, newly elected MPWMD Board Chair. Mayor Della Sala commented that Director Anthony, Jim Heitzman, Curtis Weeks, and Keith Israel gave a very positive, clear presentation on the proposed Regional Plan conceivable to be on line by 2013. Director Bruno stated that next Tuesday oral arguments will take place at the appeal of the SNG Ecoresort matter. Director Bruno would be absent at the March 3, 2010 meeting and Director Costa would serve as alternate.

XI. **EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMENTS**

The Technical Advisory Committee regular meeting of February 10, 2010 would be held at the Seaside modular conference room at 1:30 p.m.

XIII. **NEXT MEETING DATE – By consensus of the Board, it was determined the next Regular Meeting would be held on Wednesday, March 3, 2009, at the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA) Board meeting room at 5 Harris Court, Building "D" on Ryan Ranch in Monterey at 2:00 p.m.**

XIV. There being no further business, Chairman Rubio adjourned the meeting at 2:38 p.m.

ITEM NO. VI.

CONSENT CALENDAR

ITEM VI.A.
3/3/2010

SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN
WATERMASTER

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Dewey D Evans, CEO

DATE: March 3, 2010

SUBJECT: Summary of Payments Authorized to be paid during the month of February, 2010.

PURPOSE:

To advise the Board of payments authorized to be paid during the month of February, 2010

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Consider approving the payment of bills submitted and authorized to be paid during the month of February, 2010.

COMMENTS and FISCAL IMPACT:

DDEvans Consulting (Professional Services Agreement—CEO)—January 26, 2010 through February 23, 2010 worked on Watermaster business a total of 70.0 hours at $100.00 per hour or **$7,000.00**. Responded to a variety of telephone calls, meetings, email correspondence with a number of people regarding a wide variety of items involving the Seaside Basin. Discussions, review of documents and preparation of February 3rd Board meeting packet. Sent same to Board and all Interested Parties. Attended February 3rd Board meeting and took followed up actions where directed. Spent time working with Russ McGlothlin on MOU between City of Seaside and Watermaster and Declarations for report back to the Court on January 6, 2010 Minute Order due to court by February 6th. Worked with Lori Girard, Corporate Counsel at California American Water who filed the Watermaster's Report back to the Court by February 6, 2010. Attended the Watermaster TAC meeting held on February 10th at Seaside City Hall. Discussions with Bob Jaques regarding various invoices received at Watermaster office. Sent out notice of March 3rd Board meeting requesting items for the agenda. Various discussions with staff and others regarding the March 3rd Board meeting. Processed and audited invoices and delivered to City of Seaside for payment.

Robert "Bob" Jaques (Technical Program Manager)—January 25, 2010 through February 23, 2010 worked a total of 38.50 hours at $100.00 per hour or **$3,850.00.** Prepared TAC meeting packet, attended and transcribed minutes for meeting of February 10, 2010. Corresponded with HydroMetrics on protective water level issues, scope of work and costs. Prepared Board agenda items, attended February 3, 2010 Board meeting and performed follow-up work as necessary. Worked with Joe Oliver on CAW exemption from subarea Operating Yield overproduction issues. Prepared reports for March 3, 2010 Board meeting agenda.

Martin Feeney—Two invoices were submitted and authorized for payment during the month of February for **$9,300.00**. The first invoice dated January 26, 2010 for $5,100.00 covering the billing period from December 16, 2009 through January 15, 2010 was for 34 hours at $150.00 per hour of Hydrogeologic Consulting and participation in TAC meetings. The second invoice dated February 10, 2010 covered the billing period from January 16, 2010 through February 10, 2010 was for 28 hours of Hydrgeologic Consulting at $150.00 per hour in preparing revisions to draft report on "Inland Monitoring Well Project—Construction of SBWM Monitoring Well #5 and Summary of Operations". This second invoice was Martin's Final billing under the RFS No. 2009-03 contract totaling $262,599.00, dated July 1, 2009.

HydroMetrics Water Resources Inc.—One invoice was submitted dated February 5, 2010 for **$1,770.00** that covered 10.5 hours of work preparing for and attending the January 13 TAC meeting.

Total payments authorized to be paid during February totaled **$21,920.00**

Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster

Budget vs. Actual Administrative Fund

Fiscal Year (January 1 - December 31, 2010)
Balance through February 28, 2010

	2010 Adopted Budget	Contract Amount	Year to Date Revenue / Expenses
Available Balances & Assessments			
Dedicated Reserve	25,000.00		25,000.00
FY 2008 (Rollover)	43,000.00		47,416.90
FY 2009 Assessments	82,000.00		48,792.00
Available	**150,000.00**		**121,208.90**
Expenses			
Contract Staff	100,000.00	100,000.00	11,900.00
Legal Advisor	25,000.00	-	-
Total Expenses	**125,000.00**	**100,000.00**	**11,900.00**
Total Available	25,000.00		
Dedicated Reserve	25,000.00		
Net Available	**-**		

Administrative Fund Assessments owed by City of Seaside

FY 2009 (including 5% penalty)	16,444
FY 2010 (including 5% penalty)	8,618

ITEM VI.B.
3/3/2010

Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster

Budget vs. Actual Monitoring & Management - Operations Fund

Fiscal Year (January 1 - December 31, 2010)

Balance through February 28, 2010

	2010 Adopted Budget	Contract Encumbrance	Year to Date Revenue/Expenses
Available Balances & Assessments			
Monitoring & Management - Ops Fund	$ 351,664.00	$ -	$ 327,047.52
FY 2009 Rollover	361,581.00	-	361,581.00
Total Available	**$ 713,245.00**	**$ -**	**$ 688,628.52**
Appropriations & Expenses			
GENERAL			
Technical Project Manager	$ 100,000.00	$ 100,000.00	$ 8,350.00
Contingency @ 20% (not including TPM)	41,944.00	$ 41,944.00	-
Total General	**$ 141,944.00**	**$ 141,944.00**	**$ 8,350.00**
CONSULTANTS (Hydrometrics)			
Program Administration	$ 8,000.00		
Production/Lvl/Qlty Monitoring	30,000.00	$ 12,000.00	$ 2,850.00
Basin Management (BMAP, Modeling)	50,000.00		
Seawater Intrusion (Plan, Analysis)	27,000.00	22,020.00	-
Total Consultants	**$ 115,000.00**	**$ 34,020.00**	**$ 2,850.00**
MPWMD			
Production/Lvl/Qlty Monitoring	$ 91,120.00	74,780.00	$ -
Basin Management	-	5,000.00	-
Seawater Intrusion	3,600.00	3,600.00	-
Direct Costs	-	-	-
Total MPWMD	**$ 94,720.00**	**$ 83,380.00**	**$ -**
Transfer Out to Capital Fund			-
Total Appropriations & Expenses	**$ 351,664.00**	**$ 259,344.00**	**$ 11,200.00**
Total Available	**361,581.00**		

Operations Fund Assessments owed by City of Seaside

FY 2009 (including 5% penalty)	50,274
FY 2010 (including 5% penalty)	25,847

ITEM VI.B.
3/3/2010

Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster
Budget vs. Actual Monitoring and Management - Capital Fund
Fiscal Year (January 1 - December 31, 2010)
Balance through February 28, 2010

	2009 Adopted Budget	Contract Encumbrance	Year to Date Revenue / Expense
Available Balances and Assessments:			
Monitoring & Management Fund - Capital	$ -		$ -
FY 2007-2008 Rollover to 2009	5,499		5,499
Transfer in from Operations Fund	-		-
Subtotal	5,499		5,499
Appropriations & Expenses:			
Professional Services			
Project Management	-	-	-
Subtotal	-	-	
Direct Costs			
Well Drilling -	-	-	-
Subtotal	-	-	-
Total Appropriations and Expenses	$ -	$ -	$ -
Total Available	**$ -**		

Capital Fund Assessments owed by City of Seaside	
FY 2009 (including 5% penalty)	16,538
Total	$ 16,538

Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster
Budget vs. Actual - Replenishment Fund
Water Year 2010 (October 1 - September 30) / Fiscal Year (January 1 - December 31, 2010)
Balance through February 28, 2010

Replenishment Fund	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**Totals Through WY 2009**	**2010 Adopted Budget (10/7/09)**	**Projected Totals Through WY 2010**
Assessments:	WY 05/06	WY 06/07	WY 07/08	WY 08/09		WY 09/10	
Unit Cost:	$1,132	$1,132	$2,485	$3,040		$2,780	
California American Water							
Exceeding Natural Safe Yield Considering Alternative Producers	2,108,570	2,484,533	5,164,969	3,773,464	$ 13,531,537	5,778,119	$ 19,309,656
Operating Yield Overproduction Replenishment	-	80,938	34,045	-	$ 114,983	38,086	$ 153,069
Total California American	2,108,570	2,565,471	5,199,014	3,773,464	$ 13,646,520	5,816,205	$ 19,462,725
CAW Credit Against Assessment	**(465,648)**		**(12,305,924)**	**$ (3,741,714)**	**$ (16,513,286)**	**-**	**$ (16,513,286)**
Balance	**1,642,922**	**2,565,471**	**$ (2,898,517)**	**$ (2,866,766)**	**-**	**-**	**$ -**
CAW Unpaid Balance	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ (2,866,766)**	**$ 5,816,205**	**$ 2,949,439**
City of Seaside - Municipal							
Exceeding Natural Safe Yield Considering Alternative Producers	169,200	173,739	385,642	399,211	$ 1,127,792	431,428	$ 1,559,220
Operating Yield Overproduction Replenishment	50,487	340	16,898	66,090	$ 133,815	18,904	$ 152,719
Total Municipal	219,687	174,079	402,540	465,300	$ 1,261,606	450,332	$ 1,711,939
City of Seaside - Golf Courses							
Exceeding Natural Safe Yield - Alternative Producer	-	-	131,705	69,701	$ 201,406	73,670	$ 275,076
Operating Yield Overproduction Replenishment	-	-	131,705	69,701	$ 201,406	73,670	$ 275,076
Total Golf Courses	-	-	263,410	139,402	$ 402,812	147,340	$ 550,152
Total City of Seaside*	219,687	174,079	665,950	604,702	1,664,418	597,672	2,262,091
City of Seaside Paid Assessments	-	-	-	-	$ -	-	-
City of Seaside Unpaid Balance	**$ 219,687**	**$ 174,079**	**$ 665,950**	**$ 604,702**	**$ 1,664,418**	**$ 597,672**	**$ 2,262,091**
Grand Total Replenishment Fund Balance	**$ 219,687**	**$ 174,079**	**$ 665,950**	**$ 604,702**	**$ (1,202,348)**	**$ 6,413,877**	**$ 5,211,529**
Total Replenishment Assessments	1,862,609	2,739,550	5,864,964	**$ 4,378,167**	15,310,938	6,413,877	**$ 21,724,815**
Total Replenishment Paid and Credited	(1,642,922)	(2,565,471)	(5,199,014)	**(3,741,714)**	(16,513,286)		**(16,513,286)**
MRWPCA GWRP Payment							**(100,000)**
Grand Total Replenishment Fund Balance	**219,687**	**174,079**	**665,950**	**636,453**	$ (1,202,348)	**6,413,877**	**$ 5,111,529.23**

ITEM NO. VIII.

OLD BUSINESS

SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN
WATERMASTER

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Dewey D Evans, CEO

DATE: March 3, 2010

SUBJECT: Superior Court's Response to February 5, 2010 Report responding to Court's Minute Order dated January 6, 2010 concerns regarding the Watermaster's 2009 Annual Report to the Court

PURPOSE:

To inform the Board of the Court's order dated February 19, 2010 responding to the Watermaster's and the City of Seaside's report to the Court's January 6, 2010 Minute Order regarding the Watermasters 2009 Annual Report.

RECOMMENDATION:

Abide by the Court Order and direct the Watermaster staff to prepare an order reflecting the decisions of the Court

DISCUSSION:

The Court Order clearly points out the direction the Watermaster must follow to abide by Court's decision.

ATTACHMENTS:

Superior Court Minute Order dated February 19, 2010

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF MONTEREY	
California American Water, Plaintiff vs. **City of Seaside, et al,** Defendant	**Minute Order** Clerk: **Erika Catania** Date: February 19, 2010
	Case No. M66343

The Court has received and read the responses from the Watermaster and the City of Seaside to its January 6, 2010 minute order regarding the 2009 Annual Report. After due consideration of the responses it makes the following orders:

1) The Court will not allow a stay of enforcement of replenishment assessments against the City of Seaside in advance of the securing of replenishment water, per paragraph 4 of the MOU between the City and SGBW. Neither will it allow a stay of assessments thereafter to the extent that the assessment may exceed the amount of water obtained from MCWD. Obviously, replenishment water obtained from MCWD should offset, on a unit for unit bases, future replenishment assessments. While its empathetic to the financial problems faced by the City, as Seaside indicates in its response such problems cannot determine the manner in which the Decision is implemented.

2) Concerning the issue of the double RA on Operating Yield Overproduction, the Court reiterates its statement in the Minute Order of January 6, 2010: The OYO assessment is to be assessed in addition to the base assessment for production in excess of NSY. The additional assessment, of course, only impacts that portion of usage exceeding the Operating Yield allotment. The amount of the OYO assessment is to be determined by the Watermaster, and might be the same as or different from the base RA. The example cited by the City involving delivery of desalinated or treated water fails to consider the provisions of the decision as a whole.

3) The Court has read the reply of the Watermaster regarding monitoring of the sentinel wells on a semi-annual basis, and will allow semi-annual monitoring, with the caveat that any significant change detected by semi-annual induction logging be immediately reported to the Court.

The Court does not believe it is necessary to schedule a hearing on these matters at this time. Counsel for the Watermaster is directed to prepare an order reflecting these decisions by the Court.//

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
C.C.P. SEC. 1013a

I do hereby certify that I am not a party to the within stated cause and that on FEB 2 3 2010

I deposited true and correct copies of the following document:

Minute Order of February 19, 2010

in sealed envelopes with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the mail at Salinas, California 93901,

directed to each of the following named persons at their respective addresses, as hereinafter set forth:

SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

Dated: FEB 2 3 2010

CONNIE MAZZEI, Clerk of the
Superior Court, for the County of Monterey

By E Catania
E Catania, Deputy

ITEM. IX.

NEW BUSINESS

ITEM IX.A.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

ITEM NO. IX.A.1.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN
WATERMASTER

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Robert S. Jaques, Technical Program Manager
MODIFIED AND APPROVED BY: Dewey D Evans, CEO

DATE: March 3, 2010

SUBJECT: Consider Selection of Management Objectives and Initial Scenarios for Groundwater Modeling Work
- -

RECOMMENDATIONS:
It is recommended that the Board approve use of the two Management Objectives and evaluating the two Scenarios described in this Agenda item as the initial groundwater modeling work to be performed during 2010.

BACKGROUND:
In the FY 2010 Budget the Watermaster has included funds for HydroMetrics to simulate additional management Scenarios with the regional groundwater Model which they developed for the Watermaster in 2009. At its January and February 2010 meetings the TAC discussed establishing "Management Objectives" for this work, as well as the selection of the initial Scenarios to be evaluated.

DISCUSSION:
Management Objectives
The term "Management Objectives" was touched on in HydroMetrics' presentations to the TAC and the Board on the Groundwater Model. HydroMetrics recommended the development of Management Objectives prior to defining scenarios to be evaluated by the groundwater Model, and the TAC concurred with that recommendation. In this context the term Management Objectives refers to the targets or goals toward which the Watermaster's groundwater management actions would be directed. After agreeing to a set of Management Objectives, each Scenario that is modeled would be measured against them to determine whether or not they achieve these objectives.

Following lengthy discussion on this subject the TAC recommended establishing the following two Management Objectives:

(1) Reaching protective water levels along the coastal length of the Basin. This would involve determining whether or not protective water levels are reached at the locations of coastal wells CDM MW-4 (WM Well No. 238), MSC (Deep and Shallow - WM Well Nos. 102 & 101), PCA-W (Deep and Shallow – WM Well Nos. 104 & 103), and SBWM-MW3 (WM Well No. 247), and then projecting a line along the coast from the northern to the southern boundaries of the Basin showing where protection was being achieved. The wells listed above are the wells used when the preliminary protective water levels were determined by HydroMetrics in the work they performed in 2009.
(2) Protecting the entire Seaside Groundwater Basin against seawater intrusion.

Each modeled Scenario would be measured against these two objectives to see to what degree the Scenario accomplishes each objective.

Scenarios

During 2009, HydroMetrics evaluated five Scenarios using the groundwater Model. The Scenarios were intended to show the general groundwater impacts that would result from various types of groundwater management schemes. Results from the 2009 Scenarios showed the following:

- Most groundwater management objectives can be achieved, but not necessarily simultaneously.
- The mandated triennial pumping reduction results in a slow increase in most groundwater elevations. The mandated pumping reduction decreases does not completely eliminate inflow from the ocean.
- Because the Santa Margarita aquifer is highly confined beneath thick clay beds near the ocean, it does not receive significant deep percolation recharge near the ocean. Therefore, it will take a long time for wells in the Santa Margarita aquifer to reach protective elevations without artificial recharge.
- Inland injection (along General Jim Moore Boulevard) is effective at raising groundwater levels in the Santa Margarita Formation. However, coastal injection may allow additional pumping in the basin by focusing the groundwater level rise at the coast.
- The amount of water in storage is highly dependent on rainfall.
- The quantity of groundwater in storage does not necessarily equate to recoverable groundwater. Groundwater stored in the shallow Paso Robles aquifer in some Scenarios may not be easily recovered with existing wells, which mostly extract from the underlying Santa Margarita aquifer. New wells will be required in the Paso Robles aquifer to recover more of the stored water.
- Groundwater management will likely require a number of coordinated actions combining managed groundwater pumping with an injection and/or recharge plan. It will be difficult to rely on either reduced pumping or injection/recharge alone for basin recovery.
- Moving pumping inland has limited benefit.
- The groundwater model should be used to refine the general management plans.

The Watermaster FY 2010 Budget includes $25,000 to fund evaluation of additional modeling Scenarios. These Scenarios should build on the information obtained in 2009 to answer specific questions or focus on more realistic groundwater management options than those modeled in 2009.

Following lengthy discussion on this subject the TAC recommended that for the initial modeling work in 2010 we have HydroMetrics model the following two Scenarios:

Scenario 1: Model the effects of additional pumping in the Laguna Seca subarea. The purpose of this scenario would be to begin addressing questions about the impacts on other subareas of the Basin resulting from pumping by wells in the Laguna Seca subarea. In the 2009 modeling work all of the Alternative Producers were allowed to pump their full allocations, rather than using actual historical pumping production figures. Currently the Alternative Producers in the Laguna Seca subarea are pumping less than their cumulative allocations would allow. The prior modeling work did not examine the movement of water to or from the Laguna Seca subarea, or the impacts of Laguna Seca pumping with regard to the other subareas within the Basin. Under Scenario 1 three new simulations would be run, with pumping from all wells in the Laguna Seca subarea increased by 0%, 10%, and 20% for all years. Each simulation would be analyzed for the following:

A. Impact on coastal groundwater levels,
B. Impact on amount of groundwater flowing into the Southern Coastal subarea,
C. Impact on amount of groundwater flowing into the Northern Inland subarea, and
D. Changes to Laguna Seca subarea groundwater levels.

Scenario 2: Model the effects of implementing the "Monterey Regional Water Supply Project –Phase 1" as that project is defined in the Final EIR for the Coastal Water Project. The following parameters describe Phase 1 of this project, and were taken directly from the Final EIR:

- Conservation Programs potentially saving up to 1,000 AFY. Note, however, that this amount is not counted on in terms of reducing demands on the CAW Monterey Peninsula distribution system.
- Sand City Desalination Project providing on average 300 AFY. This amount is counted as reducing demand on the CAW Monterey Peninsula distribution system.
- Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project (RUWAP) which on average would deliver 1,000 AFY of recycled water for landscaping and golf course irrigation on lands some of which overlie the Seaside Basin. However, with the exception of the water currently being pumped from the Seaside Basin by the Seaside Golf Course wells (Bayonet and Blackhorse Golf Courses), which has an allocation of 540 AFY under the Seaside Basin Court Adjudication Decision, the RUWAP would not decrease pumping demands on the Seaside Basin, because the water supplying the demands of the remaining landscape and golf course uses is pumped by MCWD from the Salinas River Basin.
- Regional Desalination System, the principle components of which are:
  - 6 Vertical Seawater Wells located inland of the sand dunes and west of Highway 1 in an area south of the Salinas River and north of Reservation Road.
  - 10 MGD Regional Desalination Facility located just south of the MRWPCA Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant, with brine disposal to MRWPCA's outfall. This desalination plant on average would produce 10,500 AFY of potable water and would deliver 8,800 AFY of this water to the CAW Monterey Peninsula distribution system for urban users. Of this 8,800 AFY, 2,975 AFY is to offset Cal Am's pumping from the Seaside Basin, and 272 AFY is to offset other users pumping from the Seaside Basin, for a total amount of 3,247 AFY of pumping from the Seaside Basin being reduced by delivering that quantity of water from the Regional Desalination Plant and the Carmel River ASR facilities. The other 1,700 AFY of potable water from the desalination plant would be delivered to MCWD, in order for MCWD to be able to reduce its pumping of water from the Salinas River Groundwater Basin by this amount to offset the amount of Salinas Basin groundwater that would be extracted by the Vertical Seawater Wells that supply the desalination plant.
- Approximately 56,000 LF of 36" diameter pipelines (referred to as the Product Water Pipeline and the Transmission Main South) from the Desalination Facility to a point of connection in Seaside to the existing CAW distribution system and to the Terminal Reservoirs, and through another pipeline, the Monterey Pipeline, to a point of connection to the existing CAW distribution system in Pacific Grove.
- 2 - 3 MG Terminal Reservoirs located east of General Jim Moore Boulevard in Seaside on the former Fort Ord. These reservoirs can receive water during dry weather periods from the Desalination Facility and/or the ASR Wells, and via a pipeline from the Carmel River during wet weather diversion periods.
- 2 Existing ASR Wells and 2 New ASR Wells, all located near General Jim Moore Boulevard in Seaside. On average 1,300 AFY of Carmel River water would be stored in the Seaside Basin and then pumped out of the Basin and into the CAW distribution system to potable urban users. This amount is counted as reducing demand on the CAW Monterey Peninsula distribution system.
- Interconnecting piping between certain of the components listed above, and other facilities, to comprise an operational system.
- Startup of the Phase 1 is projected to occur on November 30, 2012.

Phase 2 of the Regional Water Supply Project is not included in Scenario 2, because the components of Phase 2 are not as fully developed as those for Phase 1 and thus were not fully addressed in the CWP FEIR. In addition, the time schedule for implementation of the Phase 2 components is less certain than the schedule for implementation of the Phase 1 components. Phase 2 would consist of some or all of the following components:

- Pacific Grove Stormwater Diversion Project (up to 200 AFY)
- Expanded Salinas River Diversion Facility (SRDF) delivering river water to a 14 MGD Surface Water Treatment Plant to be located adjacent to the Phase 1 Desalination Facility. This Surface Water Treatment Plant would initially deliver on average up to 2,980 AFY of potable water to urban

customers. These facilities could be further expanded at a subsequent date to increase the delivery of water to urban customers to 5,800 AFY.

- Expanded Regional Desalination Facility to 13 MGD capacity and 2 additional intake wells to increase the desalination capacity by 4,400 AFY.
- Groundwater Replenishment Project using highly treated recycled water from MRWPCA for injection of up to 6,720 AFY into the Seaside Basin.
- Auxiliary components that would potentially be needed to support the other Phase 2 components could include:
  - Further expansion of the SRDF
  - Expansion of the Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project (CSIP)
  - Additional ASR wells and pumping capacity
  - Additional Terminal Reservoirs

Under these two Scenarios average rainfall, rather than historical cyclical rainfall data, would be used because the 22 year length of the model runs is too short to really reflect the long-term affects of cyclical rainfall data.

If funding remains after running and analyzing those two Scenarios, additional Scenarios could be defined, if desired by the Board, and these new Scenarios analyzed to gain further knowledge for making management decisions.

SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN
WATERMASTER

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Robert S. Jaques, Technical Program Manager
MODIFIED AND APPROVED BY: Dewey D Evans, CEO

DATE: March 3, 2010

SUBJECT: Consider Approval of Request for Service No. 2010-03 with HydroMetrics to Refine Protective Water Levels

- -

RECOMMENDATIONS:
It is recommended that the Board approve the attached Request for Service No. 2010-03 with HydroMetrics in the amount of $13,800.00 to refine the Protective Water Levels developed in 2009.

BACKGROUND:
In 2009 we completed development of preliminary Protective Water Levels (PWLs) for each of the Basin's production aquifers at the locations of several coastal wells. When these PWLs were presented to the TAC and then to the Board, there was discussion of performing refined analyses, and/or to determine how the PWLs would be affected if less than 100% of the Basin was to be protected. To provide for further work to be done on the PWLs in 2010, we included in the FY 2010 Budget a $25,000 line-item to perform additional work on this.

DISCUSSION:
Results from the protective groundwater elevation analyses were presented to the Board at its November 4, 2009 Meeting. Two issues which would justify refining this initial work were identified:

1. In order to complete the work in time for it to be included in the 2009 Annual Report, the initial protective groundwater elevation analyses relied on previous estimates of aquifer properties. Now that the regional groundwater model has been calibrated, better estimates of the aquifer properties are available.
2. It may not be necessary to protect 100% of the aquifer depth. Protecting 90%, or even some lesser amount, of the aquifer depth may adequately protect municipal and private wells.

There was general agreement that these concerns should be addressed in 2010.

The objectives of updating the PWLs will be to find the most cost-effective approach to provide the desired degree of protection to the wells within the Basin. HydroMetrics envisions the work as generally consisting of the following tasks:

1. Revise the protective groundwater elevation analyses using aquifer parameters derived from the calibrated groundwater model, and a reasonable range of aquifer parameters around the calibrated values. This will provide more confident estimates of the protective groundwater elevations. A report would be produced showing the revised estimates and range of uncertainty.
2. Estimate the impact of protecting only 90% of the aquifer depth. An estimate would be made of how far inland from each monitoring well the toe of the seawater intrusion front may reach if only 90% of the aquifer depth is protected. If the toe of the seawater intrusion front does not approach any currently active production wells, it may be preferable to use the 90% protective elevation as the target management objective.

3. Also, if it is found that the 90% protective elevations still provide substantial protection to the existing production wells, it may be worthwhile examining an even lower percentage level of protection.

Following lengthy discussion on this subject the TAC recommended having HydroMetrics perform the work described under items 1 and 2 above. The attached Request for Service (RFS) No 2010-03 would authorize HydroMetrics to proceed with this work.

After performing the refinements covered under RFS No. 2010-03, further refinements could be performed within the amount budgeted for this work in 2010, if the Board desires.

ATTACHMENT:
HydroMetrics RFS No. 2010-03

SEASIDE BASIN WATERMASTER
REQUEST FOR SERVICE

DATE: 3/4/2010 **RFS NO**. 2010-03
(To be filled in by WATERMASTER)

TO: Derrik Williams
HydroMetrics LLC
PROFESSIONAL

FROM: Robert Jaques
WATERMASTER

Services Needed and Purpose: Refine Protective Water Levels for the Seaside Basin. See PROFESSIONAL's proposed Scope of Work in Attachment 1.

Completion Date: All work of this RFS shall be completed not later than December 31, 2010.

Method of Compensation: Time and Materials (As defined in Section V of Agreement.)

Total Price Authorized by this RFS: $ 13,800.00 (Cost is authorized only when evidenced by signature below.) (See Table 1 in Attachment 1 for Detailed Breakdown of Estimated Costs).

Total Price may not be exceeded without prior written authorization by WATERMASTER in accordance with Section V. COMPENSATION.

Requested by: _____ Date:_____.
WATERMASTER Technical Program Manager

Authorized by: _____ Date:_____.
WATERMASTER Chief Executive Officer

Agreed to by: _____ Date:_____.
PROFESSIONAL

ATTACHMENT 1

HydroMetrics
519 17th Street, Suite 500
Oakland, CA 94612

Mr. Robert S. Jaques
Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster
83 Via Encanto
Monterey, CA 93940

February 22, 2010

Subject: Scope and Cost to Revise Seaside Basin Protective Elevation Models and Carry Out 90% and 100% Depth Protection Runs

Bob:

HydroMetrics Water Resources Inc. is pleased to provide you with this scope and cost to provide continued professional consulting services for refining the protective groundwater elevations for the Seaside Groundwater Basin.

The work would involve the following tasks:

1. Revise the protective groundwater elevation analyses using aquifer parameters derived from the calibrated groundwater model, and a reasonable range of aquifer parameters around the calibrated values. This will provide more confident estimates of the 100% protective groundwater elevations that protect the full depth of the aquifers. Results from this task will include revised recommendations of the 100% depth protective groundwater elevation, as well as the range of uncertainty at each well.

2. Estimate the impact of protecting only 90% of the aquifer depth. We will estimate how far inland from each monitoring well the toe of the seawater intrusion may reach if we protect only 90% of the aquifer depth.

3. Prepare a brief letter summarizing modeling results, including a map showing the inland extent of seawater intrusion due to only protecting 90% of the aquifer.

A table summarizing the estimated project cost is provided in Table 1.

If you have any questions, please contact me or Georgina King.

Sincerely,

Derrik Williams

Derrik Williams
HydroMetrics LLC

Table 1: Estimated Cost to Revise Seaside Basin Protective Elevation Models and Carry Out 90% and 100% Depth Protection Runs

Tasks	HydroMetrics WRI Labor						Other Direct Costs	TOTALS
	Derrik Williams	Cameron Tana	Georgina King	Admin	Labor Total			
	Program Manager	Lead Modeler	Senior Hydrogeologist	Office Support				
Rates	$180	$160	$160	$85	**Hours**	**($)**	**($)**	**($)**
Task 1. Revise Protective Elevation Models with Final Calibrated Model Aquifer Parameters. Rerun 100% Protection Models and Analyze.	8	34	0	0	42	$ 6,880	$ -	$ 6,880
Task 2. Run 90% Protection, Analyze Results and Prepare Map Showing Inland Extent of Seawater Intrusion at 90% Protection	8	12	16	0	36	$ 5,920	$ -	$ 5,920
Task 3. Reporting - Brief Letter Summarizing Results	2	2	2	0	6	$ 1,000	$ -	$ 1,000
TOTALS	***18***	***48***	***18***	***0***	***84***	***$ 13,800***	***$ -***	***$ 13,800***

2/22/2010

SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN
WATERMASTER

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Robert S. Jaques, Technical Program Manager
MODIFIED AND APPROVED BY: Dewey D Evans, CEO

DATE: March 3, 2010

SUBJECT: Consider Reclassifying the Security National Guaranty (SNG) Well from Active Status to Inactive Status

- -

RECOMMENDATIONS:
It is recommended that the Board approve reclassifying the Security National Guaranty (SNG) well from a status of active to a status of inactive.

BACKGROUND:
Under the Watermaster's Monitoring and Management Program, data is collected from all of the production wells in the Basin. Production wells that are "active" are required to provide data on production quantities, water level, and water quality. Production wells that are "inactive" are only required to report water level data.

DISCUSSION:
Ed Ghandour, the owner of the SNG Well (Watermaster Well No. 171, Well Name "PCA Production Well") near the beach in Sand City has requested that his well be reclassified from active to inactive status, so he will not be required to provide production and water quality data. If this request is granted, his only reporting requirement would be to report water level data on a monthly basis.

The definition the Watermaster uses to determine whether a well is active or inactive is as follows:

An active production well is defined as any well that has extracted water within the last year for a beneficial use, such as landscape irrigation, commercial uses, or drinking water. An inactive production well is defined as any well that could extract water for a beneficial use, but which has not extracted water within the last year and currently either has an inoperable pump, or no pump at all, and is therefore not currently capable of extracting water for a beneficial use.

Production reporting records show that no water has been produced from this well for well over a year. The well is currently not capable of production due to several factors, including: (a) no active power supply to the wellhead from PG&E supply, (b) no operable flow meter, and (c) disconnected discharge pipe.

The TAC discussed Mr. Ghandour's request at its February 10, 2010 meeting. Since this well meets the requirements to be classified as inactive, the TAC recommended that the Board approve Mr. Ghandour's request and that his well be reclassified from an active status to an inactive status.

ITEM X.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

(NO ACTION REQUIRED)

SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN WATERMASTER CRITICAL MILESTONE DATES

ITEM X.A. 3/3/10

ANNUAL MILESTONES	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Each Producer is authorized to Produce its Production Allocation within the designated Subarea in each of the first three Water Years. Alternative Producers may change to Standard Production by March 27, 2009 by filing a declaraton with the Court and with the other parties.	27-Mar-06	30-Sep-07	APA to SPA election amended to in perpetuity 12/12/2009								
Commencing with the fourth Water Year and Triennially thereafter, the Operating Yield for both Subareas will be decreased by 10% until the Operating Yield is equivalent to the Natural Safe Yield unless by recharge or reclaimed water use results in a decrease in production of Native Water as required by the decision.				75% of the Operating Yield of 5,600 decreased 10% Jan 1, 2009		Operating yield could decrease 10% every three years on October 1st until it is the equivalent of Natural Safe Yield			1-Oct	1-Oct	1-Oct
Each Water Year by November 15th, the Watermaster will determine and levy a Replenishment Assessment on each Standard Producer, with payment due from Producer 40 days after the levy is mailed		15-Nov		15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov
After the close of each Water Year, the Watermaster will determine and levy a Replenishment Assessment against all Producers that incurred Operating Yield Over Production during the Water Year, with payment due from Producer by January 15th		15-Nov		30-Nov	30-Nov	30-Nov	30-Nov	30-Nov	30-Nov	30-Nov	30-Nov
California American Water to submit annually to Watermaster any augmentation to water supply for possible credit toward Replenishment Assessment	**Annually**	15-Nov	CAW Credit Request Granted (signed MOU) January 15, 2009		CAW Credit Req Granted 2/3/10	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov
Water level monitoring - monthly data collection *from all members for inclusion in the consolidated database.*	**Reported Annually**	**Monthly**	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly
Water quality monitoring - yearly data collection *from all members for inclusinon in consolidated database*	**Reported Annually**	15-Nov	28-Feb & 15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov
Summary report of water resources data *to all members/parties* Reported the 15th each quarter month:	**Quarterly**		Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th
Annual Report to Court	**15-Jan**	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov

ADMINISTRATIVE MILESTONES	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Adjudicaton ordered by Court and filed	27-Mar-06										
Board Directors Terms		**7-Nov**									
Budget (Administrative) Adopted/distributed					15-Jan-09	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan
Budget (Operations) Adopted/distributed					15-Jan-09	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan
Budget (Replenishment)Adopted/distributed					15-Jan-09	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan
Administrative Assessments	15-Jan-06	15-Jan-07	15-Jan-08	15-Jan-09	15-Jan-09	15-Jan-11	15-Jan-12	15-Jan-13	15-Jan-14	15-Jan-15	15-Jan-16
Operations Assessments	15-Jan-07	15-Jan-07	15-Jan-08	15-Jan-09	15-Jan-09	15-Jan-11	15-Jan-12	15-Jan-13	15-Jan-14	15-Jan-15	15-Jan-16
Capital Assessments	15-Jan-07	15-Jan-07	**NONE**	15-Jan-09	**NONE**	15-Jan-11	15-Jan-12	15-Jan-13	15-Jan-14	15-Jan-15	15-Jan-16
Replenishment Assessments				15-Jan-09	CAW credit req	15-Jan-12	15-Jan-13	15-Jan-14	15-Jan-15	15-Jan-16	15-Jan-17
Annual Report to Court	15-Nov-06	15-Nov-07	15-Nov-08	15-Nov-09	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov
Answers to Judge's Questions re: Annual Report		30-Jan-09	28-Feb-08	1-Feb-09	Due Feb 5, 2010						
Declaration of Replenishment Water Availability	Feb-06	Dec-06	Dec-07	18 Mar	2-Dec-09	1-Dec-10	Dec-11	Dec-12	Dec-13	Dec-14	Dec-15

MONTHLY MILESTONES	2006-10	Jan 10	Feb 10	Mar 10	Apr 10	May 10	Jun 10	Jul 10	Aug 10	Sep 10	Oct 10	Nov 10	Dec 10
Board Directors Terms													
Fiscal Year tentative budgets distribution to all parties													
Operating Yield of 5,600 decreased 10% ; Declaration of Replenishment Water Available	Due by December	To TAC 11-Mar-09		18-Mar-09									
Administrative Assessments			2009 & 10 Seaside Not Recvd										
Operations Assessments			2009 & 10 Seaside Not Recvd										
Capital Assessments			2009 Seaside Not Recvd										
Replenishment Assessments			2005/06 - 2008/09 Seaside Not Recvd										
Develop Repl Assessment Unit Cost													

SPECIAL ISSUES	2006-09	Jan 10	Feb 10	Mar 10	Apr 10	May 10	Jun 10	Jul 10	Aug 10	Sep 10	Oct 10	Nov 10	Dec 10
Cal-Am CWP/Alternative Projects EIR	ALJ & Commission FEIR Proceedings												
SWRCB Cease Desist Order California American Water	Stay Issued												
Watermaster Board Regular Meeting Schedule		6-Jan cancl'd	3-Feb	3-Mar	7-Apr	5-May	2-Jun	7-Jul	4-Aug	1-Sep	6-Oct	3-Nov	1-Dec

SUMMARY PROJECT SCHEDULE *(See detailed project schedule for more information)*	Monitoring and Management Program 2010
Program Administration, Database Management	1/1/10 - 12/31/10
Coastal Wells Cross-Aquifer Contamination Potential Evaluation	2/1/10 - 7/7/10
Enhanced Groundwater Model: Protective Water Levels & Basin Scenarios (Hydrometrics)	1/13/10 - 8/4/10
Production Water Level & Water Quality Monitoring (Hydrometrics, MPWMD)	1/1/10 - 12/31/10
Refine/Update BMAP (Hydrometrics)	6/9/10 - 11/3/10
Seawater Intrusion Analysis (Hydrometrics)	10/6/10 - 11/3/10

Complete =
Yet to be completed =
Scheduled for Board or TAC meeting =
Imminent Critical Deadline =

Revised February 24, 2010

D-R-A-F-T
MINUTES

Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
February 10, 2010

Attendees: **TAC Members**
City of Seaside – Rick Riedl
California American Water – Eric Sabolsice
City of Monterey – No Representative
Laguna Seca Property Owners – No Representative
MPWMD – Joe Oliver
Public Member – John Fischer
MCWRA – Rob Johnson (by telephone only for the first part of meeting)
City of Del Rey Oaks – No Representative
City of Sand City – No Representative
Coastal Subarea Landowners – No Representative

Watermaster
Technical Program Manager - Robert Jaques
Chief Executive Officer – Dewey Evans

Consultants
HydroMetrics LLC – Derrik Williams and Georgina King

Others:
MPWMD – Jonathan Lear

The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m.

Mr. Fischer reported that he will be undergoing further cancer treatments in the immediate future, probably lasting about eight weeks. He suggested Ms. Ingersoll may wish to find an alternate Public Member to cover for him when he is unable to attend meetings.

1. **Administrative Matters:**
   A. **Approve Minutes from January 13, 2010 Meeting**

The following corrections were requested by Mr. Riedl: Referring to page 6 of the Minutes, Mr. Riedl said that with regard to Scenario 2 he had asked what the current modeling told us about the Laguna Seca subarea. Referring to page 5 of the Minutes, under Management Objectives he said that he had suggested adding "Including how quickly the protective water levels are achieved".

With these corrections to the Minutes made, on a motion by Mr. Oliver, second by Mr. Fischer, the Minutes were unanimously approved.

2. **Continued Discussion of Management Objectives and Possible Modeling Scenarios to be Performed in 2010**

Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials on this item.

Mr. Sabolsice asked whether achieving 90% Protective Water Levels would protect the entire Basin. Mr. Williams responded that achieving 90% Protective Water Levels would allow the toe of the sea water intrusion front to intrude slightly inland of the coastal wells. So it would not actually be protecting the "entire" Basin.

Mr. Johnson asked what achieving 90% Protective Water Levels would mean with regard to the elevation to be protected. Mr. Williams responded that this would provide protection to the upper 90% of the aquifer depth, and that the bottom 10% of the aquifer depth would be intruded. Mr. Johnson recommended that this be clearly explained when a presentation on this material is made to the Board.

Mr. Williams went on to say that the purpose of achieving only 90% Protective Water Levels would be to see if we can save money and/or supplemental water by not having to raise groundwater levels as high as would be required to achieve 100% Protective Water Levels . Ms. King said this also assumes that no sea water intrusion is occurring between the four coastal monitoring wells.

Mr. Johnson said he felt that the proposed Management Objectives and Scenarios were satisfactory for purposes of getting the work started. At this point (1:56 PM), Mr. Johnson had to leave the meeting.

Mr. Sabolsice said he was also interested in seeing how quickly the Protective Water Levels would be reached and suggested that this be one of the objectives. There was discussion on how many years for example 1, 2, 5, 10, etc. years would be picked it has an objective.

Mr. Williams asked if the subject of how soon Protective Water Levels are reached was an important issue to the Board. There was much discussion on this and the Court Decision constraints that are lifted if Protective Water Levels are reached, for example the mandatory 10% pumping reductions.

Mr. Riedl commented that the cost of installing an offshore monitoring well is considerably less than the cost of bringing in supplemental water to help achieve Protective Water Levels through construction of coastal injection barrier wells, and therefore further consideration should be given to the feasibility of installing an offshore monitoring well to help detect the location of the sea water intrusion front. There was much discussion on this topic, during which Mr. Williams commented that an additional module could be added to the proposed Regional Desalination Plant as a way of producing additional water for this purpose.

Mr. Jaques explained that his intent in proposing Management Objective No. 2 was to see whether a Scenario would protect <u>all</u> areas of the Basin, not just the areas in the vicinity of the four coastal monitoring wells. Mr. Williams said the assumption is that there is a smooth transition in water levels between these four monitoring wells. Mr. Oliver asked Mr. Williams if it would be feasible to construct an additional modeling cross-section parallel to the coast through these four monitoring wells. Mr. Williams said he did not think that doing this would be necessary.

Mr. Williams and Mr. Oliver suggested editing Management Objective No. 2 to include the language "... along the coastal length of the Basin..." There was consensus to include this revised language.

Mr. Williams noted that the Scenarios only run for approximately 22 years, so the modeling results will only go out that far in time.

Following discussion there was consensus to delete Management Objective No. 3.

Mr. Sabolsice and Mr. Oliver suggested considering whether or not the Natural Safe Yield is being increased as an additional Management Objective. Mr. Williams said the Natural Safe Yield is already pretty well established.

Following further discussion there was consensus to recommend for Board approval the first two Management Objectives contained in the agenda packet, with the language revision mentioned above to Management Objective No. 1, as the Management Objectives against which the modeling scenarios would be measured.

Scenario 1: Mr. Williams said all of the Alternative Producers were allowed to pump their full allocations under the scenario that was previously modeled, and that actual pumping production figures were not used for that work. Mr. Williams reported that currently the Alternative Producers are pumping less than their cumulative allocations would allow. Mr. Williams said the prior modeling work did not examine the movement of water to or from the Laguna Seca subarea, or the impacts of Laguna Seca pumping with regard to the other subareas within the Basin.

There was consensus to edit this Scenario to examine the 0%, 10%, and 20% pumping increases within the Laguna Seca subarea.

Scenario 2: Mr. Williams felt it would not be necessary to run this Scenario, because the Baseline Scenario of the previous modeling work essentially evaluated this set of criteria. Mr. Jaques asked if the Baseline Scenario that was previously used in the modeling had CAW getting its full Regional Project water supply in the year 2012, as indicated in the schedule contained in the Final EIR for the Coastal Water Project. Mr. Williams responded no, so this would be a significantly different scenario then the previously modeled Baseline Scenario. Mr. Jaques also noted that the Final EIR states that approximately 2,900 acre feet per year of the 8,800 acre feet per year Desalination Plant water supply will be used to reduce pumping within the Seaside Basin. This would be another difference from the Baseline Scenario. As a result of this discussion there was consensus to model this Scenario.

Mr. Williams and Ms. King also recommended using average rainfall, not cyclical rainfall data, because the length of 22 year length of the modeling is too short to really reflect the long-term affects of cyclical rainfall data. There was consensus that it would be more meaningful to use average rainfall, rather than actual cyclical rainfall data patterns.

Mr. Williams said he would also review the previous work to confirm that ASR pumping is not being double-counted.

Scenarios 3 & 4: There was consensus to delete Scenario 3 and to defer consideration of Scenario 4 to a possible future modeling activity.

3. **Continued Discussion of Possible Refinements to Protective Water Levels to be Performed in 2010**

Mr. Williams said that HydroMetrics would be agreeable with the Technical Program Manager's suggestion to reduce their scope of work to cover Tasks 1 and 2 as described in their Proposal, but to provide only an abbreviated amount of work under Task 3.

Mr. Williams said that where Protective Water Levels are only a few feet above mean sea level, they would still always have to stay slightly above mean sea level to provide protection, so very little lowering of Protective Water Levels in those locations could occur.

Mr. Sabolsice felt there was value to performing the proposed evaluation of 90% Protective Water Levels with the reduced scope of work and reduced costs for Task 3. Following discussion there was unanimous agreement to do this.

4. **Discussion of Potential Improvements to the Database**

Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials on this item.

Mr. Oliver recommended setting a separate meeting for those persons directly involved in using the Database to go through the proposed improvements in detail. There was agreement to set that meeting for 9:00 AM on Wednesday February 24, 2010 at the MPWMD offices. Mr. Jaques said he would e-mail out an invitation to the full TAC listserve to attend this meeting.

5. **Consider Request to Classify Security National Guaranty Well as Inactive**

Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials on this item.

Following discussion there was consensus to support Security National Guaranty's request and to recommend its approval to the Board.

6. **Schedule**

Mr. Jaques reviewed several upcoming milestones shown on the schedule. There was agreement to stay with the proposed schedule dates for taking TAC recommendations to the Board. Due to MPWMD's workload, there was consensus to delay the start of work for ID No. 100, having to do with evaluating wells for cross-aquifer contamination potential, by one month.

Mr. Fischer expressed chagrin that Laguna Seca representatives do not come to the TAC meetings to provide input on their issues.

7. **Set next meeting date:**

The next regular meeting was set for Wednesday, March 10, 2010 at 1:30 p.m. at the City of Seaside City Hall – Portable Buildings Conference Room

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

ITEM NO. XI.

DIRECTOR'S REPORTS

ITEM NO. XII.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMENTS