I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

III. MINUTES
The minutes of the Regular Board meeting of June 2, 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 June, July and August, 2010 totaling $45,418.39
B. Consider Fiscal Year Financial Reports – Through August 31, 2010

VII. ORAL PRESENTATION
A. Derrik Williams of HydroMetrics Water Resources Inc. will present the findings and conclusions of the Scenario 1 Groundwater Modeling work which is now completed and has been approved by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
VIII. OLD BUSINESS

None

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

   a) Discussion/Consider Approval of proposed Monitoring and Management Program (M&MP) Work Plan for FY 2011

   b) Discussion/Consider Approval of TAC’s recommendation to defer the start of work on
      (1) Updating the Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP),
      (2) Refining the Protective Water Levels
      (3) Groundwater Modeling of Scenario 2 (Regional Water Supply Project)

2. BUDGET/FINANCE COMMITTEE with TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) Support and approval of technical aspects

   a) Discussion/Consider Adoption of Proposed Unit Cost for Water Year 2010-2011 Over-Production Replenishment Assessment Amount

   b) Discussion/Consider Adoption of Fiscal Year 2011 Annual Budgets
      Administrative Fund
      Monitoring and Management Fund—Operations
      Monitoring and Management Fund—Capital
      Replenishment Fund

X. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS (No Action Required)

A. Timeline Schedule of Milestone Dates (Critical date monitoring)
B. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) minutes of June 9 and notes from August 11, 2010

XI. DIRECTOR’S REPORTS

XII. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMENTS

XIII. NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE —OCTOBER 6, 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 September 16, 2010 per the Ralph M. Brown Act, Government Code Section 54954.2(a).
ITEM NO. III.

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 Dave Potter

Absent: None

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Moved by Mayor Pendergrass, seconded by Mayor Edelen, and carried, to approve the minutes of the Watermaster Regular Meeting held April 7, 2010.

IV. REVIEW OF AGENDA
There were no requests for 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 April and May 2010 totaling $39,883.00.
C. Approve Request for Service (RFS) No. 2010-03 with MPWMD for $9,985.00 to prepare improvements to the Watermaster’s Database. (Authorized by CEO as this was under the $10,000 authorized limit.)

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

VII. ORAL PRESENTATION – None.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS – None.

IX. NEW BUSINESS
A. COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (“TAC”)

a) Storage and Recovery Application and Storage and Recovery Agreement Templates

Technical Program Manager, Robert Jaques presented the Storage and Recovery Application Template and Storage and Recovery Agreement Template. The documents had been distributed to and review by Standard and Alternative Producers and legal counsels, and requested edits were included. Mr. Jaques explained that the Application and Agreement would be used for Standard Producers seeking approval from Watermaster to store water in the Basin.

Director Bruno asked if there were any terms in the documents that were more restrictive than the Decision itself. Mr. Jaques responded that the documents had undergone peer and legal counsel review and any concerns had been addressed in the revised documents presented for approval today. Director Anthony inquired what the timeline would be for Producers to complete the application process and obtain a permit. Mr. Jaques stated that upon receipt of the application by Watermaster the TAC would review the technical aspects at its most immediate meeting and forward for the Board’s consideration at its immediate meeting subsequent to TAC review. The timeline would be dependent on the date of submission and the schedule of upcoming TAC and board meetings subsequent to application submission. Director Anthony inquired if there was any documentation prohibiting the assignment of Producers storage rights to another party; staff would research and report findings to the Board. Director Lehman asked how the costs for the permit and regulatory review would be handled. Mr. Jaques replied that any costs would be a matter between the applicant and any regulatory agency performing services required in the process.

Mayor Rubio inquired if the documents presented were at all in conflict with the Decision. Mr. Jaques noted that the application and agreement were compatible with the Decision and read aloud item 18 in the agreement: “Conflicts with the Decision: The PRODUCER’s rights under this Agreement are subject to the Decision and in the event of any conflict between the provisions of this Agreement and the Decision, the Decision shall control.”

Director Bruno inquired if an applicant could apply and be approved prior to receiving permits and if a “pre-approval process” should be considered in an effort to save applicants time and money. Mr. Jaques pointed out that approval was part and parcel to the application process. Director Anthony expected that communication during the process would be ongoing and that timing was not anticipated to be an issue. In the event of an incomplete application delays could occur however all documentation, permits, and approvals would be coordinated and reviewed for completeness by the TAC prior to submission to the Board.

Mr. Jaques informed the Board that since the documents were consistent with the Decision they would not be subject to review by the judge prior to approval.

Joe Oliver stated that MPWMD staff would be working closely with CAW staff regarding past ASR Project storage and extractions as it would relate to an application to the Watermaster, as opposed to including wording to address past storage issues in the agreement language itself.
Moved by Director Anthony, seconded by Mayor Pendergrass, and unanimously carried, to approve the Storage and Recovery Application Template and Storage and Recovery Agreement Template for use by any Standard Producer to request approval to store water in the Basin.

b) TAC Public Member

Mr. Jaques informed the Board that John Fisher had been on the TAC ever since its creation, and that Mr. Fisher was currently experiencing health problems and had requested that TAC find an alternate for him. During TAC discussions it was realized that no one at the TAC knew how Mr. Fisher’s public membership position came to be. The issue was not addressed in the Watermaster rules and regulations. Director Bruno, with no disrespect to Mr. Fisher or his membership on the TAC, felt that a public member was not necessary since public representation was the function of directors. Director Anthony stated his preference to interact with the public at the board level instead of at a committee level. Mayor Pendergrass also did not feel a public member was necessary, but if it was decided to continue the position, that someone residing inside the adjudicated basin boundaries be appointed to insure protection of parties’ water rights. Mayor Della Sala felt since the position was never memorialized in the Decision or the Watermaster rules and regulations, the position should be dissolved after Mr. Fisher’s departure. Supervisor Potter felt that having a public member lent transparency to the TAC. He felt criteria and qualifications should be established for the position and encouraged appointing an alternate. Chair Rubio directed that the issue be addressed at the time of Mr. Fisher’s resignation or departure from the committee.

(b continuation) Recommendation to Delay Start of Scenario 2 Groundwater Modeling Work

Director Anthony felt that TAC concern regarding the quantities of water that the Regional Project would be able to supply to CAW under various hydrological conditions and establishing the resulting impact to the Seaside Basin created confusion with modeling. He advised running scenarios based on Basin physical characteristics at two set quantities such as 250 acre feet and 500 acre feet of over pumping and with assumptions on a timeline for paying back the amount of water owed at the point of project startup; consideration of the size of the Regional Project should not be involved. Subsequent to running scenarios, parties that have over pumped the Basin should then be queried as to how and when they would be paying back what they owed. Mr. Jaques clarified that the sole purpose of Scenario 2 adopted by the Board at an earlier meeting was to see how the project would affect the Basin thereby fomenting TAC concern regarding the amount of water to be supplied to the Basin per the project EIR. The Board concurred to direct the TAC to delay Scenario 2 groundwater modeling until the July TAC meeting or until more information regarding the estimated start up date of the Regional Project was obtained.

X. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS (No Action Required)

A. Timeline Schedule of Milestone Dates (Critical date monitoring)
B. Technical Advisory Committee (“TAC”) minutes of April 14, 2010.
C. Water Production Report for Second Quarter of Water Year 2010 (January 1, 2010 through March 31, 2010)
XI. DIRECTORS’ REPORTS
Director Anthony reported that 1,111 acre feet of water had been injected by CAW/MPWMD under the ASR Project, and an additional ASR Project well at Fitch School was being aggressively pursued. CAW was relieved to learn that the expansion of the ASR project would be considered by the State as a small project under the Cease and Desist Order.

XII. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMENTS
CEO Evans reported that the minute order from the Court regarding the City of Seaside taking possession of land involved in the City’s In-lieu Replenishment Project had conditions applied to it however the Minute Order was in favor of the City of Seaside and its In-lieu Replenishment Project.

The Technical Advisory Committee regular meeting of June 9, 2010 would be held at the Seaside modular conference room at 1:30 p.m.

XIII. NEXT MEETING DATE – It was agreed that the next Regular Meeting would be held on Wednesday, July 7, 2010, 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. It was suggested that administrative costs would be saved if meetings were held every other month. The staff would take this under consideration and base its recommendation after a review of draft agenda items each month.

XIV. There being no further business, Chairman Rubio adjourned the meeting at 2:43 p.m.
ITEM NO. VI.

CONSENT CALENDAR
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Dewey D Evans, CEO

DATE: September 22, 2010

SUBJECT: Summary of Payments made during the months of June, July and August 2010.

PURPOSE:

To advise the Board of payments made during the months of June, July and August, 2010

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Consider approving the payment of bills submitted and paid during the months of June, July and August, 2010.

COMMENTS and FISCAL IMPACT:

JUNE:

**DDEvans Consulting** (Professional Services Agreement—CEO)—May 24, 2010 through June 23, 2010 worked on Watermaster business a total of 39.0 hours at $100.00 per hour or $3,900.00. Responded to telephone calls, attended meetings, email correspondence with a number of people regarding a variety of items involving the Seaside Basin. Discussions, review of documents and preparation of June 2nd Board meeting packet. Sent agenda packets to Board and all Interested Parties. Attended June 2nd Board meeting and took follow up actions where necessary. Reviewed TAC agenda items and commented on same with Bob Jaques. Met with Darby Fuerst, Joe Oliver, Laura Dadiw and Bob Jaques on Basin storage issues. Met with Dean Leonard and Bob Jaques at Pasadera Country Club to reviewed water storage system and discussed use of excess water that may be injected into the Basin. Discussions with Bob Jaques regarding TAC meeting agenda material. Received, reviewed and sent SNG Ecoresort court petition to Board for information. Sent out notice of July 7th Board meeting cancellation to public agencies and the Board.

**Robert “Bob” Jaques** (Technical Program Manager)—May 21, 2010 through June 24, 2010 worked a total of 28.75 hours at $100.00 per hour or $2,875.00. Prepare for and attended meeting with CEO at MPWMD with Darby Fuerst and Joe Oliver regarding water supply issues. Prepare for and attended the Board meeting of June 2nd. Prepared TAC meeting packet, attended and transcribed minutes for TAC meeting of June 9, 2010. Research storage agreement questions from Craig Anthony posed at June 2nd Board meeting and e-mailed information to him. Attended field visit to Pasadera water system with CEO and Dean Leonard. Sent out cancellation notice of TAC’s July meeting.
HydroMetrics Water Resources Inc.—One invoice was submitted dated June 3, 2010 for $4,400.00 that covered 27.5 hours of work at $160.00 per hour preparing WY2009 groundwater modeling pumping data for scenario 1 and preparing model for simulation.

Total bills paid for June, 2010—$11,175.00

JULY:

DEEvans Consulting (Professional Services Agreement—CEO)—June 24, 2010 through July 26, 2010 worked on Watermaster business a total of 25.0 hours at $100.00 per hour or $2,500.00. Responded to telephone inquiries, e-mail, telephone and other correspondence as needed regarding the Seaside Basin. Discussed HydroMetrics work and billing with Bob Jaques. Sent out water production, quality and level notices to appropriate producers. Reviewed water production reports from producers as they complied with notices. Discussed with Joe Oliver and sent out water quality and water level reports to Board and all interested parties. Sent out notice looking for agenda items for August 4th regularly scheduled Board meeting. Received and reviewed legal documents from Sheri Damon on SNG matter. Sent court documents to Board and all interested parties for information only.

Robert “Bob” Jaques (Technical Program Manager)—June 25, 2010 through July 25, 2010 worked on Watermaster business a total of 10.5 hours at $100.00 per hour or $1,050.00. Updated work schedule and work on August 11 TAC meeting agenda items. Scheduled future TAC meetings for MRWPCA Board room.

HydroMetrics Water Resources Inc.—Two invoice were submitted dated July 2, 2010 totaling $2,360.00. The first invoice for $1,760.00 was submitted for 10 hours of work preparing WY2009 groundwater modeling Scenario 1 pumping, plot comparison years for producers and setting up scenario 1 model. The second invoice for $600.00 was for 3.5 hours of reviewing contract for modeling two scenarios and attending TAC meeting by telephone.

Total bills paid for July, 2010—$5,910.00

AUGUST:

DEEvans Consulting (Professional Services Agreement—CEO)—July 27, 2010 through August 22, 2010 worked on Watermaster business a total of 38.0 hours at $100.00 per hour or $3,800.00. General office work responding to telephone and e-mail inquiries as needed. Reviewed and made corrections on water production reports and financial statements. Participated in series of telephone calls regarding SNG vs MPWMD court hearing. After discussing the lack of meaningful agenda items with several key people sent out cancellation notice for August 4, 2010 regular Board meeting. Discussions with Bob Jaques on Pasadera CC visit and review of Becky’s notes on same visit. Sent out water production report to Board and all interested parties. Reviewed TAC agenda with Bob Jaques and Laura Dadiw. Discussed with Bob and Laura on replenishment assessment unit cost formula. Sent out water level and water quality reports to Board and all interested parties. Had several discussions with attorney Dave Sweigert regarding DBO transfer of water rights to new potential owners. Reviewed WM Court decision and WM rules and regulations regarding transfer of water rights. Received, reviewed and sent out court order from Sheri Damon to Board and all interested parties for information only. Discussed changing September regular Board meeting date to a Special Board meeting date of September 22 with Chair Rubio and several others.
Robert “Bob” Jaques (Technical Program Manager)—July 26, 2010 through August 27, 2010 worked on Watermaster business a total of 33.0 hours at $100.00 per hour for $3,300.00. Preparing agenda packet for regular TAC meeting of August 11, 2010. Attended TAC meeting and prepared and sent out minutes of meeting. Followed up on TAC meeting business. Met with Keith Israel regarding RUWAP project status for replenishment assessment unit cost calculation.

HydroMetrics Water Resources Inc.—Two invoices were submitted dated August 4, 2010 totaling $4,700.00. The first invoice for $4,520.00 was submitted for 23.5 hours of work preparing Scenario 1 pumping data and running and summarizing zone budget for Scenario 1 and preparing technical memo for TAC meeting. The second invoice for $180.00 was for 1 hour of work providing model data to Jon Lear.

Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD)—Two invoices were submitted during the month of August for the second quarter of Water Year 2009-2010, (January 1, 2010 through March 31, 2010) totaling $16,533.39. The amount billed include performing water level and water quality data collection for specified wells within the Seaside Basin and for performing certain tasks contained within the Watermaster’s Monitoring and Management Plan for 2010.

**Total bills paid in August, 2010**—$28,333.39

**Total payments made during the months of June, July and August, 2010**—$45,418.39
Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster

Budget vs. Actual Administrative Fund
Fiscal Year (January 1 - December 31, 2010)
Balance through August 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Balances &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>2010 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Contract Amount</th>
<th>Year to Date Revenue / Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Reserve</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008 (Rollover)</td>
<td>43,000.00</td>
<td>47,416.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009 Assessments</td>
<td>82,000.00</td>
<td>48,792.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available</strong></td>
<td><strong>150,000.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>121,208.90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>2010 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Contract Amount</th>
<th>Year to Date Revenue / Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract Staff</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td>35,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Advisor</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>125,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>35,200.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available</strong></td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Reserve</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Available</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrative Fund Assessments owed by City of Seaside
FY 2009 (including 5% penalty) 16,444
FY 2010 (including 5% penalty) 8,618
### Available Balances & Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2010 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Contract Encumbrance</th>
<th>Year to Date Revenue/Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Management - Ops Fund FY 2009 Rollover</td>
<td>$351,664.00</td>
<td>$361,581.00</td>
<td>$327,047.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available</td>
<td>$713,245.00</td>
<td>$713,245.00</td>
<td>$688,628.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appropriations & Expenses

#### GENERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2010 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Contract Encumbrance</th>
<th>Year to Date Revenue/Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Project Manager</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$25,675.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency @ 20% (not including TPM)</td>
<td>$41,944.00</td>
<td>$41,944.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total General</td>
<td>$141,944.00</td>
<td>$141,944.00</td>
<td>$25,675.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CONSULTANTS (Hydrometrics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2010 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Contract Encumbrance</th>
<th>Year to Date Revenue/Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production/Lvl/Qlt Monitoring</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>$18,172.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin Management (BMAP, Modeling)</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seawater Intrusion (Plan, Analysis)</td>
<td>$27,000.00</td>
<td>$22,020.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Consultants</td>
<td>$115,000.00</td>
<td>$34,020.00</td>
<td>$18,172.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MPWMD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2010 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Contract Encumbrance</th>
<th>Year to Date Revenue/Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production/Lvl/Qlt Monitoring</td>
<td>$91,120.00</td>
<td>$74,780.00</td>
<td>$16,008.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin Management</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seawater Intrusion</td>
<td>$3,600.00</td>
<td>$3,600.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MPWMD</td>
<td>$94,720.00</td>
<td>$83,380.00</td>
<td>$16,008.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transfer Out to Capital Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2010 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Contract Encumbrance</th>
<th>Year to Date Revenue/Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Appropriations &amp; Expenses</td>
<td>$351,664.00</td>
<td>$259,344.00</td>
<td>$59,855.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available</td>
<td>$361,581.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operations Fund Assessments owed by City of Seaside

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009 (including 5% penalty)</td>
<td>50,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010 (including 5% penalty)</td>
<td>25,847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster
### Budget vs. Actual Monitoring and Management - Capital Fund
#### Fiscal Year (January 1 - December 31, 2010)
##### Balance through August 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Balances and Assessments:</th>
<th>2010 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Contract Encumbrance</th>
<th>Year to Date Revenue / Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Management Fund - Capital</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007-2008 Rollover to 2009</td>
<td>5,499</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer in from Operations Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,499</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5,499</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations &amp; Expenses:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Drilling -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Appropriations and Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ -</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Total Available** | **$ -** |

Capital Fund Assessments owed by City of Seaside

- FY 2009 (including 5% penalty) | 16,538
- **Total** | **$ 16,538**
### Replenishment Fund 2006 2007 2008 2009 Totals Through WY 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Totals Through WY 2009</th>
<th>2010 Adopted Budget (10/7/09)</th>
<th>Projected Totals Through WY 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California American Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding Natural Safe Yield</td>
<td>2,108,570</td>
<td>2,484,533</td>
<td>5,164,969</td>
<td>3,773,464</td>
<td>$13,531,537</td>
<td>5,778,119</td>
<td>$19,309,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering Alternative Producers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80,938</td>
<td>34,045</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$114,983</td>
<td>38,086</td>
<td>$153,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total California American</strong></td>
<td>2,108,570</td>
<td>2,565,471</td>
<td>5,199,014</td>
<td>3,773,464</td>
<td>$13,646,520</td>
<td>5,816,205</td>
<td>$19,462,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAW Credit Against Assessment</td>
<td>(465,648)</td>
<td>(12,305,924)</td>
<td>(3,741,714)</td>
<td>(16,513,286)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAW Unpaid Balance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seaside - Municipal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding Natural Safe Yield</td>
<td>169,200</td>
<td>173,739</td>
<td>385,642</td>
<td>399,211</td>
<td>$1,127,792</td>
<td>431,428</td>
<td>$1,559,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering Alternative Producers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Yield Overproduction Replenishment</td>
<td>50,487</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>16,898</td>
<td>66,090</td>
<td>$133,815</td>
<td>18,904</td>
<td>$152,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Municipal</strong></td>
<td>219,687</td>
<td>174,079</td>
<td>402,540</td>
<td>465,300</td>
<td>$1,261,606</td>
<td>450,332</td>
<td>$1,711,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seaside - Golf Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding Natural Safe Yield - Alternative Producer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>131,705</td>
<td>69,701</td>
<td>$201,406</td>
<td>73,670</td>
<td>$275,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Yield Overproduction Replenishment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>131,705</td>
<td>69,701</td>
<td>$201,406</td>
<td>73,670</td>
<td>$275,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Golf Courses</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>263,410</td>
<td>139,402</td>
<td>$402,812</td>
<td>147,340</td>
<td>$550,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total City of Seaside</strong></td>
<td>219,687</td>
<td>174,079</td>
<td>665,950</td>
<td>604,702</td>
<td>1,664,418</td>
<td>597,672</td>
<td>2,262,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seaside Late Payment 5%</td>
<td>10,984</td>
<td>8,704</td>
<td>26,712</td>
<td>26,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seaside Paid Assessments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Seaside Unpaid Balance</strong></td>
<td>$230,671</td>
<td>$182,783</td>
<td>$692,662</td>
<td>$631,453</td>
<td>$1,737,569</td>
<td>$597,672</td>
<td>$2,335,241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grand Total Replenishment Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Totals Through WY 2009</th>
<th>2010 Adopted Budget (10/7/09)</th>
<th>Projected Totals Through WY 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Replenishment Assessments</strong></td>
<td>1,873,594</td>
<td>2,748,254</td>
<td>5,891,676</td>
<td>4,404,917</td>
<td>15,310,938</td>
<td>6,413,877</td>
<td>21,724,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Replenishment Paid and Credited</strong></td>
<td>(1,642,922)</td>
<td>(2,565,471)</td>
<td>(5,199,014)</td>
<td>(3,773,464)</td>
<td>(16,513,286)</td>
<td>(16,513,286)</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MRWPCA GWRP Payment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total Replenishment Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>230,671</td>
<td>182,783</td>
<td>692,662</td>
<td>631,453</td>
<td>(1,202,348)</td>
<td>6,413,877</td>
<td>5,211,529.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM NO. VII.

ORAL PRESENTATIONS
TO: Board of Directors

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

DATE: September 22, 2010

SUBJECT: Presentation by Derrik Williams of HydroMetrics Water Resources Inc. of the findings and conclusions of the Scenario 1 Groundwater Modeling work

RECOMMENDATIONS:
It is recommended that the Board accept the Technical Memorandum prepared by HydroMetrics describing their findings and conclusions regarding Scenario 1.

BACKGROUND:
Under its contract with the Watermaster HydroMetrics has performed modeling to determine what the groundwater impacts are due to pumping by wells in the Laguna Seca subarea. In the modeling work performed by HydroMetrics in 2009 all of the Alternative Producers were allowed to pump their full allocations, rather than using actual historical pumping production figures. That 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 were run, with 0%, 10%, and 20% pumping increases for all years as follows:

1. For the 0% pumping increase simulation, current actual pumping quantities were used for all Producers, both Standard and Alternative.
2. For the 10% and 20% pumping increase simulations, all of the current actual Alternative Producer production rates were increased by 10% and 20%, but the California American Water Standard Producer production rates were held at their current actual levels.

Each simulation was analyzed for the following:

1. Impact on coastal groundwater levels,
2. Impact on amount of groundwater flowing into the Southern Coastal subarea,
3. Impact on amount of groundwater flowing into the Northern Inland subarea, and
4. Changes to Laguna Seca subarea groundwater levels.

DISCUSSION
At the August 10, 2010 TAC meeting HydroMetrics made a presentation on the initial work on groundwater modeling of Scenario 1. A final Technical Memorandum addressing questions and comments from that TAC meeting, and describing the findings and conclusions from this modeling work, was included in the agenda for the September 8, 2010 TAC meeting. A copy of this final Technical Memorandum is attached.
The TAC finds that this Technical Memorandum fulfills HydroMetrics’ work assignment to model Scenario 1.

Mr. Williams of HydroMetrics will make a presentation on this work and respond to any questions the Board may have on it.

**ATTACHMENT:**
Technical Memorandum dated September 1, 2010 titled “Results from Scenario 1 – Increased Laguna Seca Alternative Producer Pumping”
TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

To: Bob Jaques
From: Derrrik Williams
Date: September 1, 2010
Subject: Results from Scenario 1 – Increased Laguna Seca Alternative Producer Pumping

HydroMetrics WRI was asked to use the calibrated Seaside Basin Groundwater Model to simulate the anticipated groundwater impacts of the Alternative Producers in the Laguna Seca subarea increasing their current pumping rates by either 10% or 20%. These simulations were referred to as the 2010 Scenario 1 simulations. Although the 10% and 20% pumping rate increases are not currently planned, the Watermaster was interested in investigating the sensitivity of groundwater flows between subareas to potential pumping changes. This memorandum summarizes the results of those simulations.

Simulations
Three simulations were run as part of Scenario 1. The first simulation was a baseline simulation that repeated the Water Year 2009 pumping throughout the entire Seaside Basin for 22 years. The second simulation held the pumping from all Standard Producers and all Alternative Producers outside the Laguna Seca subarea constant at Water Year 2009 pumping rates: pumping rates for Alternative Producers in the Laguna Seca area were increased by 10% over Water Year 2009 rates. The pumping rate for the only Standard Producer in the Laguna Seca subarea, California American Water, was held constant at the Water Year 2009 rate. The third simulation was similar to the second simulation, but pumping rates for Alternative Producers in the Laguna Seca area were increased by 20% over Water Year 2009 rates. Recharge rates were maintained at a constant rate for all three simulations; representing the average recharge for the 1987 through 2008 period.

Water Budgets
Figure 1 shows the generalized water budget for the Laguna Seca subarea during the baseline simulation. The amount of water pumped out of the Laguna Seca subarea is approximately 1,127 acre-feet per year, and is represented by the dark blue line with diamond data markers. It is worth noting that in 2017, due to falling groundwater levels some wells dry out and pumping ceases at those wells for the remainder of the
simulation. The total pumping in the Laguna Seca subarea is therefore reduced from 1,127 acre feet per year to 1,106 acre-feet per year from 2017 onwards.

The other two groundwater losses are groundwater flow from the Laguna Seca subarea to the Northern Inland subarea, represented by the green line with triangular data markers; and groundwater flow to the Southern Coastal subarea, represented by the purple line with cross-shaped data markers. The sources of groundwater for the Laguna Seca subarea include: groundwater recharge from deep percolation of precipitation, represented by the orange line with diamond data markers; groundwater flowing into the Seaside Basin from outside the basin boundaries, represented by the cyan line with round data markers; and groundwater extracted from storage, represented by the red line with square data markers. The groundwater extracted from storage is manifested by lowered groundwater levels.

Although the flows into and out of the Laguna Seca subarea vary over time due to falling groundwater levels, on average 53% of the groundwater leaving the subarea is extracted by pumping, 32% of the groundwater leaving the subarea flows into the Northern Inland subarea, and 15% of the groundwater leaving the subarea flows into the Southern Coastal subarea. Of the two groundwater sources, shown on the upper half of Figure 1, that provide water to Laguna Seca subarea, 52% of the water comes from falling water levels (storage), and 48% of the water comes from outside the Basin.

Figures 2 and 3 summarize the results from simulations 2 and 3 in Scenario 1. Figure 2 shows water budget changes caused by increasing alternative producer pumping in the Laguna Seca subarea by 10%. Figure 3 shows water budget changes after increasing pumping by Laguna Seca subarea alternative pumps by 20%.

The top blue line with diamond data markers on each chart represents the amount of additional pumping by the Laguna Seca subarea alternative producers. Increasing the alternative producer’s pumping by 10% translates into an annual pumping increase of 54.4 acre-feet. Increasing the alternative producer’s pumping in the Laguna Seca subarea by 20% translates into an annual pumping increase of 108.8 acre-feet. Note that the sharp dips in pumping difference on Figures 2 and 3 are due to wells that dried out in 2017 in simulation 1, drying out earlier in the two simulations of increased pumping. Specifically, the dips on the chart are due to the following: in simulation 1, wells start drying out in 2017, in simulation 2 (10% increase) wells start drying out in 2016, and in simulation 3 (20% increase) wells start drying out in 2015. When comparing the pumping difference in Figure 2 between simulation 2 and simulation 1, and Figure 3 between simulation 3 and simulation 1, the different timing of wells drying out is evident. During the years where simulation 1 has all wells pumping and simulation 2 or 3 has dried up wells, a dip will be observed. In 2017, the line representing pumping increases again because at that time, all simulations have the same number of wells that have gone dry.
The other four lines on each graph represent the sources of water that supply the additional pumping. The amount of additional pumping equals the sum of the four sources. In early years, water for increased pumping is supplied by a lowering of groundwater levels in the Laguna Seca subarea. Lower groundwater levels are shown on the two graphs as water extracted from storage. In later years, groundwater levels do not fall as quickly, and the relative amount of groundwater supplied by storage diminishes. This is offset by a reduction in the amounts of water flowing out of the Laguna Seca subarea and into the Southern Coastal and Northern Inland subareas. While water continues to flow from the Laguna Seca subarea into these other two subareas under both the 10% and 20% pumping increase simulations, it flows at reduced rates and thus provides less recharging benefit to those subareas than would be the case if there were no increases in pumping.

The light blue lines with round data markers on Figures 2 and 3 show that the most significant source of water in later years comes from outside the Seaside Basin. This is water that is captured from the Toro area or other surrounding areas. The second most significant source of water is water from the Northern Inland subarea. The decreased amount of flow to the Northern Inland subarea is shown on Figures 2 and 3 with the green lines with triangular data markers. As described in the paragraph above, the additional pumping by the alternative producers causes a reduction in groundwater flow that previously flowed from the Laguna Seca subarea, into the Northern Inland subarea. Similarly there is also a decrease in flow to the Southern Coastal subarea, although a much smaller amount of decrease than the decrease in flow to the Northern Inland subarea. This is shown on Figures 2 and 3 with the lavender lines and the “X” data markers.

Figure 4 shows the location of alternative producer wells in the Laguna Seca subarea, and supports the data shown on the two charts. The map shows that the alternative producer wells are located between the Northern Inland subarea and the Toro area; and are relatively distant from the Southern Coastal subarea. The cone of depression from these alternative producer wells will therefore reach into the Northern Inland subarea and Toro area well before they reach into the Southern Coastal subarea. Therefore, most of the water supplying the increased pumping is expected to come from storage, the Toro area, and a decrease in the amount of water flowing to the Northern Inland subarea. To supply the increased pumping there will also be a slight decrease in the amount of water flowing to the Southern Coastal subarea.

Figures 5 through 8 show the predicted amounts of additional groundwater drawdown that will occur after 5 and 22 years of pumping at the 10% and 20% increased rates.
Conclusions
Results from Scenario 1 lead to the following conclusions regarding pumping in the Laguna Seca subarea:

- At current pumping rates, groundwater levels in the Laguna Seca subarea will continue to decline. This is supported by the continued extraction of groundwater from storage shown in Figure 1.

- After 5 years of pumping at 10% increased rates, the groundwater levels in the vicinity of the two Pasadera wells, which is where the greatest drop in groundwater levels occurs, will be 3 feet lower than they would be without this increase in pumping. This grows to 5 feet lower after 22 years of 10% increased pumping rates.

- After 5 years of pumping at 20% increased rates, the groundwater levels in the vicinity of the two Pasadera wells will be 5 feet lower than they would be without this increase in pumping. This grows to 10 feet lower after 22 years of 20% increased pumping rates.

- Continued pumping even at current (Water Year 2009) rates is unsustainable because groundwater levels will eventually fall low enough to cause some wells to no longer be operational. This problem would be accelerated by increasing the pumping rates of the Alternative Producers within the Laguna Seca subarea.

- Increasing Alternative Producer’s pumping rates by 10% or 20% reduces groundwater flow to the Southern Coastal subarea by only a minor amount because of the wells’ distance from the Southern Coastal subarea. However, it considerably reduces groundwater flow into the Northern Inland subarea.

- The Laguna Seca subarea is not isolated. Although increasing pumping has only minor impacts on the Southern Coastal subarea, it has more significant impacts on groundwater flows into the Northern Inland subarea. Increasing Laguna Seca pumping also significantly impacts areas outside the Seaside Groundwater Basin, including the Toro area.
Figure 1: Generalized Laguna Seca Groundwater Budget under Existing Pumping (Simulation 1)
Figure 2: Changes in Water Budget Components from 10 Percent Pumping Increase (Simulation 2 less Simulation 1)

HydroMetrics Water Resources, Inc. • 519 12th Street, Suite 500 • Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 903-0458 • (510) 903-0468 (fax)
Figure 3: Changes in Water Budget Components from 20 Percent Pumping Increase (Simulation 3 less Simulation 1)
Figure 5: Five Year Prediction of Head Difference with 10% Increase in Laguna Seca Subarea Alternative Production
Figure 6: Twenty-two Year Prediction of Head Difference with 10% Increase in Laguna Seca Subarea Alternative Production
Figure 8: Twenty-two Year Prediction of Head Difference with 20% Increase in Laguna Seca Subarea Alternative Production
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ITEM. IX.

NEW BUSINESS
ITEM IX.A.

COMMITTEE REPORTS
ITEM NO. IX.A.1.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Robert S. Jaques, Technical Program Manager

MODIFIED AND APPROVED BY: Dewey D Evans, CEO

DATE: September 22, 2010

SUBJECT: Discussion/Consider Approval of Proposed Management and Monitoring Program (M&MP) Work Plan for FY 2011

RECOMMENDATIONS:
It is recommended that the Board approve the attached M&MP Work Plan for FY 2011.

BACKGROUND:
At the August 11, 2010 TAC meeting a preliminary draft of a proposed M&MP Work Plan for 2011 was presented for TAC discussion and possible revisions.

At that TAC meeting only one revision was requested to the description of Task I.2.b.3. Mr. Oliver (of MPWMD) requested that this Task include work to retrofit the wells that are sampled on an annual basis to use the new low-flow purge approach for getting water quality samples. He explained that the wells that are sampled quarterly had already been retrofitted, but that the wells that are sampled annually had not yet been retrofitted. No other changes were requested.

DISCUSSION
Attached is the proposed final version of the M&MP Work Plan for 2011, including the revision requested by Mr. Oliver. Corresponding budget amounts for each Task are shown.

The following is a summary of the proposed changes from the 2010 Scope of Work to the 2011 Scope of Work:

- **Tasks M.1.c and M.1.d**: These tasks were consolidated to improve clarity, as they are both for preparation and attendance at meetings.
- **Task I.2.a.1**: It was assumed that we will complete making all of the identifiable/desired enhancements to the Database this year, so only regular ongoing data entry and maintaining of the Database will be needed in 2011.
- **Task I.2.b.1**: It was assumed that no additional monitoring wells will need to be constructed in 2011.
- **Task I.2.b.3**: The Scope of Work description for this task was edited to state that it includes retrofitting of some wells for use as monitoring wells became necessary, in response to Mr. Oliver’s request as described above.
- **Task I.2.b.4**: Since we have been having our data collection program reviewed by both MPWMD and MCWRA for the past two years, and since only a few relatively minor improvements have been recommended and implemented, having these reviews was discontinued.
- **Task I.3.a.2**: It was assumed that we will not do any work this year to refine the Protective Water Levels, but that we may wish to do this in 2011.
• Task I.3.c: It was assumed that we will not do any work this year to update the BMAP, but that we may wish to do this in 2011.
• Task I.3.d: It was assumed that some followup work may be undertaken in 2011 as a result of MPWMD’s preliminary evaluation of coastal wells for possible cross-aquifer contamination risk.

The agenda packet for the September 8, 2010 TAC meeting contained the information above, as well as the attached Work Plan which, with the exception of the revision to Task I.2.b.3 and a clarifying revision to Task I.3.d, is identical to the one presented to the TAC at its August 11, 2010 meeting at which a quorum was present. No questions or concerns were raised by any of the recipients of that agenda packet prior to the September 8 scheduled meeting date. Due to scheduling conflicts a quorum was not able to be present for the September 8 TAC meeting. However, three TAC members did participate and they unanimously recommended using the attached Work Plan for FY 2011.
Seaside Groundwater Basin Management and Monitoring Program
FY 2011 Work Plan

The tasks outlined below are those that are anticipated to be performed during 2011. Some tasks listed below are specific to 2011, while others tasks recur throughout the program, such as data collection and database entry, and Program Administration Tasks.

Within the context of this document the term “Consultant” refers either to a firm providing professional engineering or other types of technical services, or to the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD). The term “Contractor” refers to a firm providing construction or field services such as well drilling, induction logging, or meter calibration.

### M. 1 Program Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. 1. a.</td>
<td>Consultants will provide monthly or bimonthly invoices to the Watermaster for work performed under their contracts with the Watermaster. Consultants will perform maintenance of their internal budgets and schedules, and management of their subconsultants. The Watermaster will perform management of its Consultants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. 1. b.</td>
<td>Watermaster staff will prepare Board and TAC meeting agenda materials. No assistance from Consultants is expected to be necessary to accomplish this task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. 1. c. &amp; M. 1. d</td>
<td>The Consultants’ work will require internal meetings and possibly meetings with outside governmental agencies and the public. For meetings with outside agencies, other Consultants, or any other parties which are necessary for the conduct of the work of their contracts, the Consultants will set up the meetings and prepare agendas and meeting minutes to facilitate the meetings. These may include planning and review meetings with Watermaster staff. The costs for these meetings will be included in their contracts, under the specific Tasks and/or subtasks to which the meetings relate. The only meeting costs that will be incurred under Tasks M.1.c and M.1.d will be:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Those associated with attendance at TAC meetings (either in person or by teleconference connection), including providing written monthly progress reports to the Watermaster for inclusion in the agenda packets for the TAC meetings, when requested by the Watermaster to do so. These progress reports will typically include project progress that has been made, problem identification and resolution, and planned upcoming work. and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• From time-to-time when Watermaster staff asks Consultants to make special presentations to the Watermaster Board and/or the TAC, and which are not included in the Consultant’s contracts for other tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. 1. e.</td>
<td>Appropriate Consultant representatives will attend TAC meetings when requested to do so by Watermaster Staff (either in person or by teleconference connection), but will not be asked to prepare agendas or meeting minutes. As necessary, Consultants may provide oral updates to their progress reports (prepared under Task M.1.d) at the TAC meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. 1. f.</td>
<td>When requested by the Watermaster staff, Consultants may be asked to assist the TAC and the Watermaster staff with peer reviews of documents and reports prepared by various other Watermaster Consultants and/or entities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA/QC ($0)</td>
<td>A Consultant (MPWMD) will provide general QA/QC support over the Seaside Basin Monitoring and Management Program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. 2 Comprehensive Basin Production, Water Level and Water Quality Monitoring Program

I. 2. a. Database Management

I. 2. a. 1 Conduct Ongoing Data Entry and Database Maintenance/Enhancement ($13,000) The database will be maintained by a Consultant performing this work for the Watermaster. Either one of the other Consultants or the Watermaster staff will enter new data into the consolidated database. Such data will include water production volumes, water quality and water level data, and such other data as may be appropriate. The database programming was enhanced in 2010 at the direction of the Watermaster to improve the usefulness and “user friendliness” of the database. No further enhancements are anticipated during 2011.

I. 2. a. 2 Verify Accuracy of Production Well Meters ($0) To ensure that water production data is accurate, the well meters of the major producers were verified for accuracy during 2009. No additional work of this type is anticipated during 2011.

I. 2. b. Data Collection Program

I. 2. b. 1. Site Representation and Selection. ($0) The monitoring well network review that was started in 2008 has been completed, and sites have been identified where future monitoring well(s) could be installed, if it is deemed necessary to do so in order to fill in data gaps. No further work of this type is anticipated in 2011.

I. 2. b. 2. Collect Monthly Manual Water Levels. ($3,450) Each of the monitoring wells will be visited on a monthly basis. Water levels will be determined by either taking manual water levels using an electric sounder, or by dataloggers.

I. 2. b. 3. Collect Quarterly Water Quality Samples. ($68,600) Water quality data will be collected quarterly from certain of the monitoring wells. This data may come from water quality samples that are taken from these wells and submitted to a State Certified analytic laboratory for general mineral and physical suite of analyses, or the data may come from induction logging of these wells and/or other data gathering techniques. The Consultant selected to perform this work will make this judgment based on consideration of costs and other factors. This Task includes $5,000 to retrofit the wells that are sampled on an annual basis to use the new low-flow purge approach for getting water quality samples. The wells that are sampled quarterly have previously been retrofitted.

I. 2. b. 4. Update Program Schedule and Standard Operating Procedures. ($0) The TAC, with assistance from Consultants, has conducted periodic reviews of the data collection program. Only a few small improvements have been recommended in recent years, and these recommendations have been implemented. No additional work of this type is anticipated in 2011.

I. 2. b. 5. Monitor Well Construction ($0) An additional monitoring well was installed in 2009. No further work of this type is anticipated in 2011.

I. 2. b. 6. Reports ($6,900) The groundwater level and quality monitoring will be conducted on a monthly, quarterly, and annual basis, as described in the Consultant’s Scope of Work. Reports summarizing data collected and analyzed will be submitted to the Watermaster on a schedule to be established during the year. Reports will include:

- Water Quality and Water Level Quarterly Reports
- An Annual Water Quality and Water Level Report
### I. 3. Basin Management

#### I. 3. a. Enhanced Seaside Basin Groundwater Model (Costs listed in subtasks below)

As a result of the data obtained during Phase 1, including constructing new coastal sentinel monitoring wells and developing a consolidated database of groundwater production, water levels, and water quality, it was concluded that at that time it was not necessary to develop a new Model. Preliminary conclusions from work performed on preparing the Basin Management Action Plan in 2008, along with comments and questions from Technical Advisory Committee and Board members, indicated that it was desirable to update the existing Model during 2009, so that it could be used as more data becomes available.

- **I.3.a.1 Update the Existing Model (S0)**
  
The existing Model, described in the report titled “Groundwater Flow and Transport Model” dated October 1, 2007, was updated in 2009 in order to develop protective water levels, and to evaluate replenishment scenarios and develop answers to Basin management questions (Tasks I.3.a.2 and I.3.a.3). This work was done by a Consultant hired by the Watermaster. No further work of this type is anticipated in 2011.

- **I. 3. a. 2 Develop Protective Water Levels ($25,000)**
  
  A series of cross-sectional models was created in order to develop protective water levels for selected production wells, as well as for the Basin as a whole. This work was done in 2009 by a Consultant hired by the Watermaster (Hydrometrics), and is discussed in Hydrometrics’ “Seaside Groundwater Basin Protective Water Elevations Technical Memorandum.” In 2010 further work was scheduled and budgeted to be done to refine these protective water levels to find the most cost-effective approach to provide the desired degree of protection. However, not all of the information needed to perform the refinements was available in 2010, so this Task has been rescheduled to occur in 2011.

- **I. 3. a. 3 Evaluate Replenishment Scenarios and Develop Answers to Basin Management Questions ($25,000)**
  
  The updated Model was used to evaluate different scenarios to determine such things as the most effective methods of using supplemental water sources to replenish the Basin and/or to assess the impacts of pumping redistribution. This work was done in 2009 by a Consultant hired by the Watermaster (Hydrometrics), and is described in HydroMetrics’ “Seaside Groundwater Basin Groundwater Model Report.” In 2010 HydroMetrics used the updated Model to develop answers to some questions associated with Basin management. In 2011 if requested by the Watermaster additional work may be performed to answer additional questions.

#### I. 3. b. Complete Preparation of Basin Management Action Plan (S0)

The Watermaster’s Consultant completed preparation of the Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP) in February 2009. The BMAP serves as the Watermaster’s long-term seawater intrusion prevention plan. The Sections that are included in the BMAP are:

- Executive Summary
- Section 1 – Background and Purpose
- Section 2 – State of the Seaside Groundwater Basin
- Section 3 – Supplemental Water Supplies
- Section 4 – Groundwater Management Actions
- Section 5 – Recommended Management Strategies
- Section 6 – References

The only work which is anticipated to be performed on the BMAP in 2011 is discussed under Task I. 3. c.
**I. 3. c.**
Refine and/or Update the Basin Management Action Plan ($25,000)

During 2011 it may be beneficial to update the BMAP based on new data, and/or knowledge that is gained from the work described under Tasks I. 3. a. 2 and/or I. 3. a. 3. Such work might involve issues pertaining to Basin storage capacity, water storage rights, or pumping redistribution strategies. This work was originally scheduled and budgeted for 2010, but not all of the information needed to update the BMAP was available, so the updating has been rescheduled to occur in 2011. This task is included primarily for budgeting purposes in the event such work is deemed necessary.

**I. 3. d.**
Evaluate Coastal Wells for Cross-Aquifer Contamination Potential ($10,000)

If seawater intrusion were to reach any of the coastal wells in any aquifer, and if a well was constructed without proper seals to prevent cross-aquifer communication, or if deterioration of the well had compromised these seals, it would be possible for the intrusion to flow from one aquifer to another. In 2010 a preliminary review of the well construction records for each of the coastal wells was made. As a result of that review it was deemed desirable to further evaluate certain higher-risk wells in 2011 to determine whether or not they were properly constructed so as to prevent such cross-aquifer contamination from occurring. As part of this further evaluation, records will also be reviewed to determine whether there is any indication of well seal deterioration that would lead to the potential for cross-aquifer contamination. A report summarizing the findings of this further evaluation will be prepared, with recommendations for any further followup work that should be done.

**I. 4 Seawater Intrusion Response Plan (formerly referred to as the Seawater Intrusion Contingency Plan)**

**I. 4. a.**
Oversight of Seawater Intrusion Detection and Tracking ($5,750)

A Consultant will provide general oversight over the Seawater Intrusion detection program.

**I. 4. b.**
Analyze and Map Water Quality from Coastal Monitoring Wells (costs included above under Task I. 4. a)

Annual chloride concentration maps will be produced incorporating the data from the coastal wells. Data from the Phase 1 coastal sentinel wells will be used to develop time series graphs.

**I. 4. c.**
Annual Report - Seawater Intrusion Analysis ($25,750)

At the end of each water year, a Consultant will reanalyze all water quality data. Semi-annual chloride concentration maps will be produced for each aquifer in the basin. Time series graphs, trilinear graphs, and sniff diagram comparisons will be updated with new data. The annual EM logs will be analyzed to identify changes in seawater wedge locations. All analyses will be incorporated into an annual report that follows the format of the initial, historical data report. Potential seawater intrusion will be highlighted in the report, and if necessary, recommendations will be included. The annual report will be submitted for review by the TAC and the Board. Modifications to the report will be incorporated based on input from these bodies, as well as Watermaster staff.

**I. 4. d**
Complete Preparation of Seawater Intrusion Response Plan ($0)

The Watermaster’s Consultant (HydroMetrics) completed preparation of the long-term Seawater Intrusion Response Plans (SIRP) in February 2009. The Sections that are included in the SIRP are:

- Section 1 – Background and Purpose
- Section 2 – Consistency with Other Documents
- Section 3 – Seawater Intrusion Indicators and Triggers
- Section 4 – Seawater Intrusion Contingency Actions
- Section 5 - References

No further work on the SIRP is anticipated in 2011.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>I. 4. e.</strong> Refine and/or Update the Seawater Intrusion Response Plan ($0)</th>
<th>At the beginning of 2009 it was thought that it might be beneficial or necessary to perform work to refine the SIRP and/or to update it based on new data or knowledge that was gained subsequent to the preparation of the SIRP. However, this did not prove to be necessary, and no further work of this type is anticipated in 2011.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. 4. f.</strong> If Seawater Intrusion is Determined to be Occurring, Implement Contingency Response Plan ($0)</td>
<td>The SIRP will be implemented if seawater intrusion, as defined in the Plan, is determined by the Watermaster to be occurring.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Robert S. Jaques, Technical Program Manager
APPROVED BY: Dewey D Evans, Chief Executive Officer

DATE: September 22, 2010

SUBJECT: Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Recommendations Regarding: (1) Updating the Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP), (2) Refining Protective Water Levels, and (3) Groundwater Modeling of Scenario 2

RECOMMENDATIONS:
It is recommended that the Board: (1) Approve the TAC’s recommendation to defer the start of work on updating the Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP), (2) Approve the TAC’s recommendation to defer refining the Protective Water Levels, and (3) Approve the TAC’s recommendation to defer the start of work on Groundwater Modeling of Scenario 2.

BACKGROUND:
The Watermaster’s Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) has discussed updating the BMAP, refining the Protective Water Levels, and Groundwater Modeling of Scenario 2. All of these tasks were included in the FY 2010 Budget and were originally planned to be undertaken mid-year in 2010. This Agenda Transmittal provides a discussion on the TAC’s recommendations on each of these items.

DISCUSSION
1. Updating the BMAP
As part of the work plan for the current Fiscal Year we identified the possible need and/or desirability of updating the BMAP which HydroMetrics prepared for the Watermaster in February 2009. The purpose of such an update, if it were to be performed, would be to incorporate more recent data that has been obtained about the Basin, and to modify some of the findings and recommendations if the newer data affected the previous ones.

A review of the February 2009 BMAP identified several Sections of that report which would benefit from updating, including:

- Updating the final characteristics of the Coastal Water Project (CWP) based on the adopted EIR for that project.
- Updating Groundwater Management Actions based on things that have occurred since the BMAP was prepared, as well as recently obtained data about the Basin.
- Updating the information in the report regarding groundwater levels, hydrographs, and Natural Safe Yield, using data obtained from completion of the new monitoring well on the BLM Site at the former Fort Ord, the most recent Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report, and other data obtained on the Basin.
- Updating the information in the report regarding the alternative water supply options being considered through the CWP EIR process. Now that that process has been finalized, these discussions could be updated.
• Updating the information in the report regarding obtaining a new source of water to irrigate the Seaside Golf Courses, ASR Phase 2, and the Sand City Desalination Plant. All of these could be updated with more recent information.
• Updating the Recommendations contained in the report, based on more recent information.

There was TAC consensus at its June 9, 2010 meeting that updating the BMAP would be desirable. However, during discussion of this topic the TAC also came to consensus that updating the BMAP would be better done at a future date when more definitive data on the Coastal Water Project becomes available following PUC approval of the project.

Consequently, the TAC recommends that no action be taken at this time regarding updating the BMAP. The TAC further recommends that this work be included in the Monitoring and Management Program Scope of Work and Budget for FY 2011 when it is expected that the more definitive data necessary to perform this work will be available.

2. Refining the Protective Water Levels

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, we included in the FY 2010 Budget a $25,000 line-item to perform additional work on this.

At its March 3, 2010 meeting the Board determined not to proceed with this work at that time, but to reconsider it in mid-summer.

This topic was briefly discussed at the TAC’s June 9, 2010 meeting. There was consensus that there was no danger at this time in delaying refining the Protective Water Levels, except that any groundwater modeling scenarios would likely be using the currently-defined Protective Water Levels as a measure of the impacts of the scenarios being modeled. Since the TAC is recommending that we defer work on Groundwater Modeling of Scenario No. 2 (see discussion below), the TAC is recommending that work to refine the Protective Water Levels be similarly deferred at this time. The TAC further recommends that this work be included in the Monitoring and Management Program Scope of Work and Budget for FY 2011 when it is expected that the more definitive data necessary to perform this work will be available.

3. Groundwater Modeling Activities

Under the contract approved by the Board at its April 7, 2010 meeting, HydroMetrics is to analyze two groundwater modeling Scenarios.

Scenario 1 is to model the effects of additional pumping in the Laguna Seca subarea. The purpose of this scenario is to begin addressing questions about the impacts on other subareas of the Basin resulting from pumping by wells in the Laguna Seca subarea. Under Scenario 1 three new simulations are being run, with pumping from all wells in the Laguna Seca subarea increased by 0%, 10%, and 20% for all years. Each simulation will 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.
Work on Scenario 1 has now been completed and is the subject of a separate agenda topic presentation on today’s agenda.

**Scenario 2** is to 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.

One of the initial steps in beginning work on this Scenario was for HydroMetrics to determine the quantities of water that would be supplied to the Seaside Groundwater Basin by the Monterey Regional Water Supply Project. During the course of compiling this information it became clear to the TAC that there were some water supply issues that were not fully or clearly explained in the Final EIR, and that those issues would likely be at least partially clarified when the PUC acts to approve the project. The issues will be further clarified when water quality data from monitoring wells that will be constructed to help refine the estimate of how much groundwater will be taken from the Salinas Valley Basin by the proposed Regional Desalination Plant intake wells has been obtained. PUC approval of the project is anticipated to occur in the late fall of this year, and data from the monitoring wells is anticipated to become available in mid-summer of 2011.

For these reasons the TAC recommends that we defer proceeding with work on Scenario 2, and to reconsider starting that work in FY 2011. The TAC further recommends that this work be included in the Monitoring and Management Program Scope of Work and Budget for FY 2011 when it is expected that the more definitive data necessary to perform this work will be available.

If we were to proceed with Scenario 2 without having a clear understanding of each of these issues, HydroMetrics would have to make assumptions on some of the water supply quantities for the Seaside Basin. This could result in having to re-run the model after decisions on those issues have been made, which would cause the expenditure of additional funds by the Watermaster beyond those currently budgeted for this work. Since the Regional Water Supply Project will take at least several years to be completed after PUC approval is granted, there does not appear to be any risk in delaying this modeling work until clearer answers to these water supply issues are available.
ITEM NO. IX.A.2.

BUDGET/FINANCE COMMITTEE with TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)
(Support and approval of technical aspects)
TO: Board of Directors

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

DATE: September 22, 2010

SUBJECT: Discussion/Consider Adoption of Proposed Unit Cost for Water Year 2010-2011 Over-Production Replenishment Assessment Amount

RECOMMENDATIONS:
It is recommended that the Board approve a Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost of $2,780 per acre-foot of overproduction for WY 2011.

BACKGROUND:
The Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost is used in the calculation of Replenishment Assessments that are charged to any Standard Producer that exceeds its allocation during the Water Year. The approach that was approved by the Board last year is as follows:
1. All potential supplemental water supply projects that could bring water to the Seaside Basin any time within the next 10 years are to be included in the calculations, assuming sufficient information on those projects can be obtained.
2. Costs for each project are to be inflated to the first year in which it could potentially begin supplying water, to reflect the increase in costs that will be occurring before the projects actually come on-line.
3. Contingency allowances are to be included in these costs based on the level of project development for each project. This allowance is intended to provide for unforeseen cost impacts to the projects, particularly for projects that are only at the conceptual level of development.

When the TAC developed the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost for WY 2010 it used 8 projects which the TAC felt had the potential to deliver water to the Seaside Basin within the next 10 years. These projects were:
1. CAW Moss Landing Desalination Plant
2. CAW North Marina Desalination Plant
3. MPWMD’s 95-10 Desal Plant
4. Salinas River Surface Water Treatment Plant
5. Regional Desalination
6. Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project
7. MRWPCA Groundwater Replenishment Project for the Seaside Basin
8. Pacific Grove Stormwater Project

The Budget and Finance Committee determined that only three of the projects listed above should be considered to have the potential to deliver water within the next 10 years, and recommended to the Board that only the following three projects be used in the calculation of the WY 2010 Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost: 1. Salinas River Surface Water Treatment Plant, 2. Regional Desalination, and 3. Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project. The Board approved the Budget and Finance Committee’s recommendation.

DISCUSSION
The Board determined that these were the only three projects that had the potential to deliver water to the Seaside Basin within the next 10 years. Since there did not appear to be any new projects that were not considered by the TAC and the Board last year, at its August 11, 2010 meeting (at which a quorum was present) the TAC made the preliminary decision to develop the WY 2011 Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost using these same three projects. The projects were to be updated using whatever information could be obtained from the project proponents with regard to the characteristics of each of these three projects, e.g. estimated costs, water supply quantities, and the dates at which each project could start delivering water.

MCWRA, MRWPCA, MCWD, and CAW were contacted to seek this updated information. Here is what transpired:

• Mr. Sabolsice of CAW provided updated startup year and unit cost information for the Regional Desalination project which is a component of what is now referred to as the Regional Water Supply Project.
• Mr. True of MCWD said that he would contact his manager to seek permission to contact the consulting firm they are using as the project manager for the RUWAP to see if there was updated information that should be used. Mr. Israel of MRWPCA felt that the startup date for the RUWAP would be later than previously listed, due to the slowness of progress on some of the issues that will affect the startup date. However, Mr. True felt that it might still be possible for the listed startup date to be achieved. As of this date no updated information has been provided to the Watermaster by MCWD, so continuing to use the data that was used last year is recommended, based on Mr. True’s comment.
• Mr. Weeks and Mr. Johnson, both of MCWRA, requested that the Salinas River Surface Water Treatment Plant not be used as one of the projects for calculating the Unit Cost, because the MCWRA Board has not identified that as a future project that MCWRA will be implementing, and because they have not closely examined the cost data or the proposed schedule for implementing the project to determine their reasonableness. Also, Supervisor Calcagno, in a recent conversation with MRWPCA personnel, mentioned that this project hasn't been vetted in the Salinas Valley and may cause controversy if it is included.

Based on this information and the lack of better and more concrete criteria, the Budget and Finance Committee unanimously agreed to recommend to the Board at leaving the unit cost for Water Year 2010-2011 over production replenishment assessment amount the same as the current water year amount or $2,780.
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Dewey D Evans, CEO

DATE: September 22, 2010

SUBJECT: Proposed Fiscal Year 2011 Annual Administrative Fund Balance and Projected FY 2012 Administrative Fund Budget

PURPOSE:

To advise the Board of the estimated amount necessary to properly fund the Administrative oversight portion of the Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster for Fiscal Year 2011 and review the projected Fiscal Year 2012 estimate.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Board consider approving the attached proposed Administrative Fund Budget for FY 2011 and receive as information the projected FY 2012 Administrative Fund Budget.

DISCUSSION:

The Watermaster Budget and Finance Committee met on September 15, 2010 and reviewed and unanimously voted to recommend for approval the attached proposed Administrative Fund Budget for FY 2011. It should be noted that with a projected rollover of unspent funds of approximately $60,000 the expected assessment for this year will total about $45,000. It is also important to point out that the requested budget to oversee the Watermaster administrative element has dropped from $100,000 to $80,000 or 20% less than in previous years.

The court decision states that the next year fiscal year’s budgets must be approved by the Board of Directors no later than the end of October each year in order for the tentative budgets to be circulated to each Party to the adjudication “no earlier that November 1 and no later than November 15” of each fiscal year.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Provides sufficient funds for the proposed administrative oversight financial spending plan for next fiscal year 2011.

ATTACHMENTS:

1) Proposed Administrative Fund Budget Schedule
Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster
Administrative Fund
Proposed Budget
Administrative Years 2011 & 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Reserve</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY Rollover</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>* 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Fund</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>* 45,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services - Admin</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services - Legal</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Dedicated Reserve</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Available</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 60,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN
WATERMASTER

TO: Board of Directors

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

DATE: September 22, 2010

SUBJECT: Discussion/Consider Approval of Fiscal Year 2011 Management and Monitoring Funds – Operations and Capital

RECOMMENDATIONS:
It is recommended that the Board approve the attached M&MP O&M and Capital Budgets for FY 2011, and receive as informational items the attached M&MP O&M and Capital Budget forecasts for FY 2012.

BACKGROUND:
At the August 11, 2010 TAC meeting a preliminary draft of the proposed M&MP O&M and Capital Budgets for 2011 and 2012 were presented for TAC discussion and possible revisions.

At that TAC meeting only one revision was requested to the budget and that was for Task I.2.b.3. Mr. Oliver (of MPWMD) requested that this Task include the costs of work to retrofit the wells that are sampled on an annual basis to use the new low-flow purge approach for getting water quality samples. He explained that the wells that are sampled quarterly had already been retrofitted, but that the wells that are sampled annually had not yet been retrofitted. There was also discussion about providing some level of funding in FY 2011 for additional evaluation of the potential for cross-aquifer contamination in the coastal wells, with a decision on that to be made at the September 8, 2010 TAC meeting at which time the preliminary evaluation recommendations from MPWMD would be provided to the TAC. No other changes were requested.

At the September 8, 2010 TAC meeting the revised (proposed final) budgets were again presented to the TAC. Following review of MPWMD’s preliminary evaluation under Task I.3.d, the TAC felt that it would be desirable to provide $10,000 of funding in the FY 2011 O&M Budget to allow for further evaluation of the potential for cross-aquifer contamination in the coastal wells. This would be sufficient to implement all of MPWMD’s recommended followup actions. Once the TAC has had the opportunity to review the MPWMD report in detail, a specific scope of work and cost for this further evaluation will be prepared and presented to the Board for its approval, probably in early 2011. To provide funding for this work, $10,000 was allocated to this Task in the 2011 O&M Budget

DISCUSSION
Attached is the proposed final version of the M&MP O&M and Capital Budgets for FYs 2011 and 2012, including the revision requested by Mr. Oliver and the allocation of funds to the coastal well evaluation Task. These budget amounts correspond to the Tasks contained in the M&MP Work Plan that was provided under a previous agenda item. The right-hand column in the FY 2011 O&M Budget shows the estimated FY 2011 costs when the 2-year budget forecast was made in the fall of 2009. The
The principle differences between the two sets of budget figures are: (1) projected cost savings in Tasks I.2.b.3, I.2.b.4, and I.2.b.5, (2) newly identified costs for Task I.3.d, and (3) re-budgeting costs for Tasks I.3.a.2 and I.3.C which were originally budgeted to occur in FY 2010, but which will instead be performed in FY 2011.

The agenda packet for the September 8, 2010 TAC meeting contained the budget information described above, as well as the attached M&MP O&M and Capital Budgets which, with the exception of the revision to the costs for Tasks I.2.b.3 and Task I.3.d, is identical to the one presented to the TAC at its August 11, 2010 meeting at which a quorum was present. No questions or concerns were raised by any of the recipients of that agenda packet prior to the September 8 scheduled meeting date. Due to scheduling conflicts a quorum was not able to be present for the September 8 TAC meeting. However, three TAC members did participate and they unanimously recommended approval of the attached Budgets.
## Management and Monitoring Plan Operations Budget

**For Tasks to be Undertaken in 2011**

### Comparative Costs from Previously Projected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Subtask</th>
<th>Sub-Subtask</th>
<th>Cost Description</th>
<th>Consultants &amp; Contractors</th>
<th>Total 2011 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MPWMD MCWRA Private Contracts</td>
<td>2011 Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0 $0 $100,000 $0 $100,000 $100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M.1 Program Administration

- **M.1.a** Project Budget and Controls: $0 $0 $0 $0 $0 $0
- **M.1.b** Assist with Board and TAC Agendas: $0 $0 $0 $0 $0 $0
- **M.1.c & M.1.d** Preparation for and Attendance at Meetings: $0 $0 $5,150 $0 $5,150 $5,150
- **M.1.e** Peer Review of Documents and Reports: $0 $0 $3,100 $0 $3,100 $3,100
- **M.1.f** QA/QC: $0 $0 $0 $0 $0 $0

### I. 1. Initial Phase 1 Monitoring Well Construction (Task Completed in Phase 1)

#### I.2 Production, Water Level and Quality Monitoring

1. **I.2 a.** Database Management
   - **I.2 a. 1.** Database Management: $9,900 $0 $3,100 $0 $13,000 $38,728
   - **I.2 a. 2.** Verify Accuracy of Production Well Meters: $0 $0 $0 $0 $0 $0

2. **I.2 b.** Data Collection Program
   - **I.2 b. 1.** Site Representation and Selection: $0 $0 $0 $0 $0 $3,708
   - **I.2 b. 2.** Collect Monthly Water Levels: $3,450 $0 $0 $0 $3,450 $3,461
   - **I.2 b. 3.** Collect Quarterly Water Quality Samples: $39,800 $0 $0 $28,800 $68,600 $73,624
   - **I.2 b. 4.** Update Program Schedule and Standard Operating Procedures: $0 $0 $0 $0 $0 $2,060
   - **I.2 b. 5.** Monitor Well Construction: $0 $0 $0 $0 $0 $7,622
   - **I.2 b. 6.** Reports: $5,850 $0 $1,050 $0 $6,900 $6,880

### I. 3. Basin Management

1. **I.3 a.** Enhanced Seaside Basin Groundwater Model
   - (Costs Shown in Subtasks Below)
   - **I.3 a. 1.** Update the Existing Model: $0 $0 $0 $0 $0 $0
   - **I.3 a. 2.** Develop Protective Water Levels: $0 $0 $25,000 $0 $25,000 $0
   - **I.3 a. 3.** Evaluate Replenishment Scenarios and Develop Answers to Basin Management Questions: $0 $0 $25,000 $0 $25,000 $25,000

2. **I.3 b.** Complete Preparation of Basin Management Action Plan: $0 $0 $0 $0 $0 $0

3. **I.3 c.** Refine and/or Update the Basin Management Action Plan: $0 $0 $25,000 $0 $25,000 $10,000

4. **I.3 d.** Evaluate Coastal Wells for Cross-Aquifer Contamination Potential: $0 $0 $10,000 $0

### I.4 Seawater Intrusion Contingency Plan

1. **I.4 a.** Oversight of Seawater Intrusion Detection and Tracking: $3,700 $0 $2,050 $0 $5,750 $5,768

2. **I.4 b.** Analyze and Map Water Quality from Coastal Monitoring Wells: (Costs Included Under I.4 a)

3. **I.4 c.** Annual Report - Seawater Intrusion Analysis: $0 $0 $25,750 $0 $25,750 $25,750

4. **I.4 d.** Complete Preparation of Seawater Intrusion Response Plan: $0 $0 $0 $0 $0 $0

5. **I.4 e.** Refine and/or Update the Seawater Intrusion Response Plan: $0 $0 $0 $0 $0 $0

6. **I.4 f.** If Seawater Intrusion is Determined to be Occurring, Implement Contingency Response Plan: (No Costs are Included for This Task, as This Task Will Likely Not be Necessary During 2011. If it Does Become Necessary, Use of Contingency Funds or a Budget Modification Will Likely be Necessary)

### Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultants &amp; Contractors</th>
<th>$62,700</th>
<th>$0</th>
<th>$225,200</th>
<th>$28,800</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL (not including Technical Program Manager)</td>
<td>$216,700</td>
<td>$210,842</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (not including Technical Program Manager) @ 20%</td>
<td>$45,340</td>
<td>$42,168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Program Manager</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$360,040</td>
<td>$353,010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Footnotes:
(1) An outside contractor would be used to perform the induction logging, and potentially to also collect some water quality samples in conjunction with doing the induction logging. MPWMD is expected to perform portions of the work of this Subtask, and would likely be the party that contracts with the Contractor to perform the induction logging and sample collection work on certain of the wells.
(2) The response plan would only be implemented in the event sea water intrusion is determined to be occurring.
(3) Within the context of this document the term “Consultant” refers either to a Private Consultant providing professional engineering or other types of technical services, or to the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD). The term “Contractor” refers to a firm providing construction or field services such as well drilling, induction logging, or meter calibration.
(4) Due to the uncertainties of the exact scopes of some of the Tasks listed above at the time of preparation of this Budget, e.g. Tasks I.3.a, I.3.c, and I.3.d, it is recommended that a 20% Contingency be included in the Budget.
(5) Includes $5,000 in potential well site retrofitting costs that may be necessary in order to make some of these wells available for use as monitoring wells.
(6) Does not include costs for MPWMD to collect water level data or water quality samples from wells other than those that are part of the basic monitoring well network, i.e. for private well owners who have requested that the Watermaster obtain this data for them. Costs to obtain that data are to be reimbursed to the Watermaster by those well owners, so there should be no net cost to the Watermaster for that portion of the work under these Tasks.
(7) No additional monitoring well is expected to be constructed in 2011.
(8) For HydroMetrics to provide hydrogeologic consulting assistance to the Watermaster, beyond that associated with performing other specified Tasks, when requested to do so by the Technical Program Manager.
(9) If work under this Task is found to be necessary, it will be funded through the Contingency line item in this Budget.
(10) Does not include funds for Database enhancement, as it is assumed that all desired enhancements had been made in 2010.
(11) If necessary to reflect knowledge gained from modeling work or other data sources. Provides funds for work originally budgeted for 2010, but which has been rescheduled to 2011.
(12) Includes approximately a 3% inflation factor on most 2010 Budget costs, rounded to the nearest $50, except the Technical Program Manager cost which has no inflation factor applied to it.
## Management and Monitoring Plan Operations Budget

**For Tasks to be Undertaken in 2012**

### Task Subtask Sub-subtask Cost Description CONSULTANTS & CONTRACTORS<br>(MPWMD MCWRA Private Contractors Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Subtask Sub-subtask Cost Description</th>
<th>MPWMD</th>
<th>MCWRA</th>
<th>Private Consultants</th>
<th>Contractors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.1 Program Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.1.a Project Budget and Controls</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.1.b Assist with Board and TAC Agendas</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.1.c &amp; M.1.d Preparation for and Attendance of at Meetings(3)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,305</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.1.e Peer Review of Documents and Reports(3)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,193</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.1.f QA/QC</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Initial Phase 1 Monitoring Well Construction (Task Completed in Phase 1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. 2. Production, Water Level and Quality Monitoring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 2. a. Database Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 2. a. 1. Conduct Ongoing Data Entry/Database Maintenance/Enhancement</td>
<td>$10,197</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,193</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$13,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 2. a. 2. Verify Accuracy of Production Well Meters</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 2. b. Data Collection Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 2. b. 1. Site Representation and Selection(3)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 2. b. 2. Collect Monthly Water Levels&lt;sup&gt;(7)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$3,553</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 2. b. 3. Collect Quarterly Water Quality Samples&lt;sup&gt;(1)(3)(5)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$35,844</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$29,664</td>
<td>$65,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 2. b. 4. Update Program Schedule and Standard Operating Procedures.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 2. b. 5. Monitor Well Construction&lt;sup&gt;(7)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$6,026</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 2. 6. Reports</td>
<td>$6,026</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,082</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. 3. Basin Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 3. a. Enhanced Seaside Basin Groundwater Model (Costs Shown in Subtasks Below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 3. a. 1 Update the Existing Model</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 3. a. 2 Develop Protective Water Levels</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 3. a. 3 Evaluate Replenishment Scenarios and Develop Answers to Basin Management Questions</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 3. b. Complete Preparation of Basin Management Action Plan</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 3. c. Refine and/or Update the Basin Management Action Plan&lt;sup&gt;(3)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 3. d. Evaluate Coastal Wells for Cross-Aquifer Contamination Potential</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. 4. Seawater Intrusion Contingency Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 4. a. Oversight of Seawater Intrusion Detection and Tracking</td>
<td>$3,811</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,112</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 4. b. Analyze and Map Water Quality from Coastal Monitoring Wells (Costs Included Under I.4.a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 4. c. Annual Report- Seawater Intrusion Analysis</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$26,523</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$26,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 4. d. Complete Preparation of Seawater Intrusion Response Plan&lt;sup&gt;(2)(9)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 4. e. Refine and or Update the Seawater Intrusion Response Plan&lt;sup&gt;(2)(9)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 4. f. If Seawater Intrusion is Determined to be Occurring, Implement Contingency Response Plan&lt;sup&gt;(2)&lt;/sup&gt; (No Costs are Included for This Task, as This Task Will Likely Not be Necessary During 2011. If it Does Become Necessary, Use of Contingency Funds or a Budget Modification Will Likely be Necessary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS CONSULTANTS & CONTRACTORS**

|                      | $64,431 | $0 | $216,406 | $29,664 | $352,602 |

**SUBTOTAL not including Technical Program Manager**

| Contingency (not including Technical Program Manager) @ 20%<sup>(4)(12)</sup> | $42,100 |

| Technical Program Manager | $100,000 |

**TOTAL**

| $352,602 |
Footnotes:
(1) An outside contractor would be used to perform the induction logging, and potentially to also collect some water quality samples in conjunction with doing the induction logging. MPWMD is expected to perform portions of the work of this Subtask, and would likely be the party that contracts with the Contractor to perform the induction logging and sample collection work on certain of the wells.
(2) The response plan would only be implemented in the event sea water intrusion is determined to be occurring.
(3) Within the context of this document the term “Consultant” refers either to a Private Consultant providing professional engineering or other types of technical services, or to the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD). The term “Contractor” refers to a firm providing construction or field services such as well drilling, induction logging, or meter calibration.
(4) Due to the uncertainties of the exact scopes of some of the Tasks listed above at the time of preparation of this Budget, e.g. Tasks I.3.a, I.3.c, and I.3.d, it is recommended that a 20% Contingency be included in the Budget.
(5) No well retrofit costs are included in this Task.
(6) Does not include costs for MPWMD to collect water level data or water quality samples from wells other than those that are part of the basic monitoring well network, i.e. for private well owners who have requested that the Watermaster obtain this data for them. Costs to obtain that data are to be reimbursed to the Watermaster by those well owners, so there should be no net cost to the Watermaster for that portion of the work under these Tasks.
(7) No additional monitoring well is expected to be constructed in 2012.
(8) For HydroMetrics to provide hydrogeologic consulting assistance to the Watermaster, beyond that associated with performing other specified Tasks, when requested to do so by the Technical Program Manager.
(9) If work under this Task is found to be necessary, it will be funded through the Contingency line item in this Budget.
(10) Does not include funds for Database enhancement, as it is assumed that all desired enhancements had been made in 2010.
(11) If necessary to reflect knowledge gained from modeling work or other data sources.
(12) Includes a 3% inflation factor on most 2011 Budget costs, except the Technical Program Manager cost which has no inflation factor applied to it.
The Capital projects and expenditures for 2011 are:

No Capital projects are anticipated to be undertaken in 2011, so this budget is $0.

The Capital projects and expenditures that may be necessary in 2012 are:

1. Install one additional monitoring well at an estimated cost of $300,000 (including consultant costs and well contractor costs).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessments:</td>
<td>WY 05/06</td>
<td>WY 06/07</td>
<td>WY 07/08</td>
<td>WY 08/09</td>
<td>WY 09/10</td>
<td>WY 10/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Cost:</td>
<td>$1,132</td>
<td>$1,132</td>
<td>$2,485</td>
<td>$3,040</td>
<td>$2,780</td>
<td>$2,780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California American Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Yield Overproduction Replenishment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80,938</td>
<td>34,045</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$114,983</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$114,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAW Credit Against Assessment</td>
<td>(465,648)</td>
<td>(12,305,924)</td>
<td>(3,741,714)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$16,513,286</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$16,513,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAW Unpaid Credit Balance</td>
<td>1,642,922</td>
<td>2,565,471</td>
<td>$2,898,517</td>
<td>$2,866,767</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAW Unpaid Balance</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$994,653</td>
<td>$994,653</td>
<td>$3,319,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seaside - Municipal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding Natural Safe Yield Considering Alternative Producers</td>
<td>169,200</td>
<td>173,739</td>
<td>385,642</td>
<td>399,211</td>
<td>370,296</td>
<td>$1,498,088</td>
<td>369,740</td>
<td>$1,867,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Yield Overproduction Replenishment</td>
<td>50,487</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>16,898</td>
<td>66,090</td>
<td>61,438</td>
<td>$195,253</td>
<td>61,438</td>
<td>$256,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Municipal</td>
<td>219,687</td>
<td>174,079</td>
<td>402,540</td>
<td>465,300</td>
<td>431,734</td>
<td>$1,693,340</td>
<td>431,178</td>
<td>$2,124,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seaside - Golf Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding Natural Safe Yield - Alternative Producer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>131,705</td>
<td>69,701</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$201,406</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$201,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Yield Overproduction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>131,705</td>
<td>69,701</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$201,406</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$201,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Golf Courses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>263,410</td>
<td>139,402</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$402,812</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$402,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total City of Seaside*</td>
<td>219,687</td>
<td>174,079</td>
<td>665,950</td>
<td>604,702</td>
<td>431,734</td>
<td>2,096,152</td>
<td>431,178</td>
<td>2,527,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seaside Late Payment 5%</td>
<td>10,984</td>
<td>8,704</td>
<td>26,712</td>
<td>26,750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73,150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAW Credit Against Assessment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAW Unpaid Credit Balance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seaside Unpaid Balance</td>
<td>$230,671</td>
<td>$182,783</td>
<td>$692,662</td>
<td>$631,453</td>
<td>$431,734</td>
<td>$2,169,303</td>
<td>$431,178</td>
<td>$2,600,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Replenishment Fund Balance</td>
<td>$230,671</td>
<td>$182,783</td>
<td>$692,662</td>
<td>$631,453</td>
<td>$1,426,387</td>
<td>$3,163,956</td>
<td>$3,750,498</td>
<td>$6,914,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Replenishment Assessments</td>
<td>2,339,241</td>
<td>2,748,254</td>
<td>5,891,676</td>
<td>4,404,917</td>
<td>4,293,154</td>
<td>19,677,242</td>
<td>3,750,498</td>
<td>$23,427,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Replenishment Paid and/or Credited</td>
<td>(2,108,570)</td>
<td>(2,565,471)</td>
<td>(5,199,014)</td>
<td>(3,773,464)</td>
<td>(2,866,767)</td>
<td>(16,513,286)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(16,513,286)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRWPCA GWRP Payment</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total Replenishment Fund Balance</td>
<td>$230,671</td>
<td>$182,783</td>
<td>$692,662</td>
<td>$631,453</td>
<td>$1,426,387</td>
<td>$3,163,956</td>
<td>$3,750,498</td>
<td>$6,814,454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM X.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

(NO ACTION REQUIRED)
## Annual Milestones

|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|

### Summary Project Schedule

- **Operating yield could decrease 10% every three years on October 1st until it is the equivalent of Natural Safe Yield.**

## Administrative Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget (Administrative) Adopted/distributed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget (Operations) Adopted/distributed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Producers may change to Standard Production by March 2009 by filing a declaration with the Court and with the other parties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Special Issues

- **CAL-AM CWP/Alternative Projects EIR**

### Watermaster Board Regular Meeting Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>15-Jan-09</td>
<td>15-Jan-09</td>
<td>15-Jan-09</td>
<td>15-Jan-09</td>
<td>15-Jan-09</td>
<td>15-Jan-09</td>
<td>15-Jan-09</td>
<td>15-Jan-09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Summary

- **Operating yield could decrease 10% every three years on October 1st until it is the equivalent of Natural Safe Yield.**

---

**Revised September 8, 2010**
The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m.

1. Administrative Matters:
   A. Approve Minutes from April 14, 2010 Meeting
      On a motion by Mr. Johnson, second by Mr. Oliver, the minutes were unanimously approved as presented.

   B. Future TAC Meeting Locations
      Following a brief discussion there was consensus to hold the July 14, 2010 TAC meeting at the Seaside City Hall Main Conference Room at 1:30 PM. While there was a general preference to use the MRWPCA Boardroom because it was better equipped for TAC meetings, there was concern that it did not have telephone conference call capabilities. However, Mr. Johnson said that MCWRA has wireless conference phone equipment and offered to bring it to the MRWPCA Boardroom to see if it could be used at that location. If so, the TAC may be elect to hold meetings at future dates at the MRWPCA Boardroom. It was agreed that at the July meeting the location for the August meeting would be selected.

   C. Public Member of the TAC
Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials on this item. He reported that Mr. Fischer is getting infusion treatments on certain Wednesdays, and he would not be able to attend TAC meetings on those Wednesdays. However, he said that he hopes to resume attending TAC meetings on dates when he is not receiving treatments. There was brief discussion on this item, and no action was taken or necessary, as this item was provided for information only.

2. HydroMetrics Groundwater Modeling
Mr. Jaques introduced this item and Mr. Williams then continued the discussion. Mr. Williams said that the Scenario 1 modeling work will look at Alternative Producers pumping at current levels, as well as at levels increased by 10 percent and 20 percent. Standard Producers would remain at current production levels without any changes. Ms. King pointed out that the tables on page 12 of the agenda packet include the proposed production quantities to be used in the modeling and represent current production data. The shaded data for October 30 through December of 2009 was not yet available, so data from Water Year 2008 was used. This data is plotted on pages 10 and 11 of the agenda packet. She noted that there would be an increase in production of about 150 to 170 acre-feet per year with the 20 percent pumping increase mentioned above.

Mr. Jaques asked why the October through December 2009 data was still not available. Mr. Oliver said that MPWMD does not get all of the production data reported on a monthly basis, and some is only reported on a quarterly basis. The data has not yet been processed for purposes of the modeling. However, Mr. Oliver said he expected to be able to provide the missing data to Ms. King by the end of this week.

Mr. Oliver said that the MPWMD uses Water Years, not calendar years, for all water data, and recommended using Water Year data, as it is easier to track and obtain from the databases. Mr. Johnson said he concurred with this recommendation.

Mr. Riedl asked if there was more historical pumping data that could be used, rather than using just the most recent year's data. Ms. King responded in the affirmative. Mr. Riedl asked if the pumping pattern in the table in the agenda packet appeared to be representative of prior years. Mr. Oliver said he did not feel the actual month-to-month production pattern was critical to the modeling, because the modeling period will span a number of years. He noted that the Alternative Producers include golf courses which have large seasonal variations in pumping, whereas CAW's demands are mostly residential and commercial in nature, and those do not have the same type of seasonal variations.

Mr. Oliver said that there had been a trend showing an increase in production each year due to land development up to the point in time when the Court Decision was issued adjudicating the Seaside Basin. Thereafter, the increases largely ended.

Mr. Sabolsice summarized the intent of Scenario 1 as being to see the impact on the Basin if Alternative Producers in the Laguna Seca subarea increased their pumping rates. He said he could check within CAW to see if last year's production was a representative year, or whether there were some unusual circumstances affecting production during the last year.

Mr. Jaques noted that when the Board gave its approval for this work, it requested that current pumping levels be used.
Mr. Oliver and Mr. Riedl said that a quick analysis of the last three years' production pattern could be performed to make sure that the data to be used for the modeling are representative. Mr. Williams said he could do this, but that it will take some time and effort to do so. He commented that he did not feel that there would be much benefit to do this, due to the multi-year duration of the modeling period.

Following discussion and there was consensus to have HydroMetrics examine the last three Water Years' production data, and if it appears consistent with the pattern shown in the agenda packet materials, HydroMetrics would then proceed with the Scenario 1 modeling. However, if significant anomalies are found, HydroMetrics would report this information to the TAC and await direction from the TAC meeting before proceeding with the modeling. Mr. Sabolsice requested that HydroMetrics provide an email to TAC members describing the findings of their analysis.

Mr. Oliver said this modeling will also include several non-Watermaster producers as well, and noted that the prior modeling had included those producers within the Laguna Seca subarea. Each of these produce less than five acre-feet per year, which is the deminimis amount defined in the Decision. These do not report production quantities to the Watermaster, but do report them to MPWMD.

3. Update on Sentinel Well Induction Logging
Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials on this item. Mr. Oliver said that the data did not indicate any appreciable change from prior years.

Mr. Riedl asked if conductivity was found to be increasing, what would that mean. Mr. Lear said that this would represent an increase in salinity, and that increases in salinity would likely be indications of seawater intrusion. Mr. Lear explained that induction logging measures the conductivity in the soil outside of the well casing. There were several questions and answers on issues pertaining to the data and its significance.

Mr. Lear and Mr. Oliver reported that the dune sands have been intruded for some years.

Mr. Sabolsice asked Mr. Oliver what depths were of greatest concern, and Mr. Oliver responded that typically they were in the 1,000 to 1,500 foot depth range. Mr. Lear said he could plot the aquifers on the graphs for the TAC’s information and send that out via email. Mr. Oliver pointed out the Seaside Basin Watermaster well locations on a map that was available in the meeting room.

4. Discuss Issues to be Addressed in Updating the BMAP
Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials on this item.

Mr. Oliver said he concurred that the items listed on page 15 of the agenda packet would be beneficial to update, but wondered if updating would be better done at a future date when more definitive data on the Coastal Water Project was available following PUC approval of the project. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Lear also felt it would be beneficial to update the BMAP, but concurred with Mr. Oliver's feeling that updating the document should be postponed.

Mr. Sabolsice asked if the BMAP was not updated, what would be the result. Mr. Jaques said that the Board was currently not using the BMAP for any decision-making, but was waiting for more definition of the Coastal Water Project before considering any possible actions on any of the BMAP recommendations.
There was consensus to take no action or to make any recommendations regarding updating the BMAP at this time, but to discuss this matter again at the October TAC meeting. Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Jaques to alert the Board to the TAC's decisions on this matter.

5. Information Regarding Funding for Water Projects
Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials on this item.

Mr. Johnson said he concurred that there would be considerable staff effort to take a proposed project through the Integrated Regional Water Management planning process. He said the focus currently is on the "shovel-ready" projects, and that there are six Integrated Regional Water Management "Regions" along the central coast. He said he did not feel there would be a lot of money made available to each of the potential projects this year. There was discussion that Local Groundwater Assistance grant funds (described on page 25 of the agenda packet) cover many of the Watermaster's activities.

There was TAC consensus to take no action now. However, if the Board wishes an additional monitoring well to be installed in the future, introducing that project into the Integrated Regional Water Management planning process could be considered at that time.

6. Discussion on HydroMetrics Use of Seaside Modeling Results in a paper for an ASCE Conference
Mr. Sabolsice introduced this item, and Mr. Williams summarized it. Mr. Lear and Mr. Johnson were noted as co-authors of the paper. On a motion by Mr. Johnson, second by Mr. Oliver, the TAC unanimously gave its approval for HydroMetrics to use the Seaside Basin modeling results in a paper they intend to present at the conference.

7. Schedule
Mr. Jaques highlighted several items to be updated within the schedule contained in the agenda packet.

In response to a question, Mr. Williams commented that he did not feel there was any danger in delaying refining the Protective Water Levels, except that any modeling scenarios would likely be using the currently-defined Protective Water Levels as a measure of the impacts of the scenarios being modeled. There was TAC consensus that bringing the matter of refining the Protective Water Levels back to the Board, as listed under ID No. 76, did not need to be undertaken at this time.

Mr. Oliver noted that under ID No. 59, the work duration should be 90 days and that it should be updated to reflect starting work on June 9, 2010.

With regard to ID No. 106 pertaining to evaluation of wells, Mr. Lear said that he is about half-way through the evaluation process, and that data from about 260 wells has been compiled within the entire Basin, and about 220 of these wells are in the Coastal Subarea. He said he recommended moving the presentation on this work as listed under ID No. 107 to the August TAC meeting.

Mr. Jaques will make these updates in the schedule.

8. Other Business
Mr. Riedl reported that the Main Conference Room, which is proposed as a site for future TAC meetings, is in the City Hall building itself, across the parking lot from the Portable Buildings Conference Room location.

9. **Set next meeting date:**
The next regular meeting was set for Wednesday, July 14, 2010 at 1:30 p.m. at the City of Seaside City Hall – Main Conference Room

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.
MEETING NOTES

Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster
Informal Gathering of Technical Advisory Committee Members
September 8, 2010

Attendees:  TAC Members
City of Seaside – No Representative
California American Water – Eric Sabolsice (by telephone)
City of Monterey – Norm Green
Laguna Seca Property Owners – No Representative
MPWMD – Joe Oliver
Public Member – No Representative
MCWRA – No Representative
City of Del Rey Oaks – No Representative
City of Sand City – No Representative
Coastal Subarea Landowners – No Representative

Watermaster
Technical Program Manager - Robert Jaques

Consultants
None

Others:
MPWMD – Jonathan Lear

After waiting until 1:40 p.m. it was concluded by the TAC members that were present for the meeting that the lack of a quorum would preclude having a formal TAC meeting. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Sabolsice had both received last minute work assignments that prevented their attending the meeting. None of the other absentees had notified the Technical Program Manager or other TAC members that they would be unable to attend.

Mr. Sabolsice was able to join the gathering of TAC members via telephone, and these Meeting Notes describe the discussions were held.

Consensus was reached that the following items should be sent to the B&F Committee with the support of the TAC:

1. The Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost of $3,635, calculated using just the Regional Desalination and the RUWAP projects.
2. The M&MP O&M and Capital Budgets for 2011 and 2012 with only a revision to the costs in the O&M Budgets for 2011 and 2012 for Task I.3d and in the Scope of Work for this Task in the M&MP to provide some funds to conduct further analyses of coastal wells for possible cross-aquifer contamination
Consensus was reached that the following items should be sent to the Board with the support of the TAC:

1. The Final Technical Memorandum from HydroMetrics on Scenario 1 Groundwater Modeling.
2. The M&MP Scope of Work for 2011 with only a revision to the Scope of Work for Task I.3d in the M&MP to provide for conducting further analyses of coastal wells for possible cross-aquifer contamination.

The agenda transmittals to the B&F Committee and to the Board on all of these items will include qualifying language to the effect that although the full TAC was unable to meet, those 3 TAC members who did participate were unanimous in the recommendations described above. The intent of this will be to allow the B&F Committee and the Board to take these as the TAC's recommendations when they consider them at their respective meetings, so as not to have these items fall behind schedule.

Discussion of all of the other items on the agenda for today’s meeting was deferred, with the exception of some Q&A on Jon Lear's report (Agenda item 3) and on a couple of schedule items (Agenda item 7). No action was taken on any of these other items. However, Mr. Jaques said he anticipated that the Board may elect to cancel its December 1 regular Board meeting due to the Holidays, so he will plan on getting some of the consultant contracts ready for TAC approval in October, and then Board approval in November, so we will be able to keep having MPWMD and HydroMetrics perform work for us after January 1, 2011 when the next Fiscal Year will begin.

There was also some discussion regarding the problem that was experienced not only today but on several occasions in the past, namely getting enough TAC members to be present to have a quorum. The Technical Program Manager will prepare an agenda transmittal for the TAC’s consideration on this matter at its next meeting. Since the TAC was created by action of the Board, which has also defined what constitutes a quorum, any changes the TAC may wish to propose on these matters will need to be formalized through action of the Board itself.

This informal gathering of TAC members ended at approximately 2:25 p.m.
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