I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

III. MINUTES
The minutes of the Regular Board meeting of August 7, 2013 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 the month of August, 2013 totaling $40,955.00.
B. Consider Approving Fiscal Year Financial Reports through August 31, 2013

VII. ORAL PRESENTATION
None Scheduled
VIII. OLD BUSINESS

Nothing Scheduled

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

   a). Discuss and Consider Approval of Scope and Cost proposals from HydroMetrics Water Resources, Inc and the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD), to Perform Modeling and Analysis on the Laguna Seca subarea; for two Requests For Services in the not-to-exceed amounts as follows:

   HydroMetrics Water Resources, Inc. $25,060.00
   MPWMD 2,209.00
   Total $27,269.00

   And Consider Approving the transfer of said amount; $27,269.00 from the Contingency line item in the Watermaster Management and Monitoring Program Budget which currently has a total of $29,854 in the account.

2. BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE with input from TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

   a). Discuss and Consider Approval of Proposed Unit Cost for Water Year 2014 (October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014) Over-Production Replenishment Assessment Amount

X. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS (No Action Required)

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

XI. DIRECTOR’S REPORTS

XII. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMENTS

XIII. NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: OCTOBER 2, 2013 (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 August 30, 2013 per the Ralph M. Brown Act, Government Code Section 54954.2(a).
ITEM NO. III.

MINUTES
I. CALL TO ORDER – Vice Chair Rubio called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL
Coastal Subarea Landowner – Director Paul Bruno, Chair (arrived after Call to Order)
California American Water (“CAW”) – Director Eric Sabolsice
City of Seaside – Mayor Ralph Rubio
City of Del Rey Oaks – Mayor Jerry Edelen
Laguna Seca Subarea Landowner – Director Bob Costa
City of Sand City – Mayor David Pendergrass (at 3:10 p.m. Steve Matarrazzo, Alternate)
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District – Director Jeanne Byrne, Alternate
City of Monterey – Mayor Charles “Chuck” Della Sala
Monterey County/Monterey County Water Resources Agency – Supervisor David Potter

Absent: None

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Moved by Mayor Edelen, seconded by Mayor Rubio, and carried, to approve the minutes of the May 1, 2013 Watermaster regular meeting. Mayor Della Sala and Director Byrne abstained having not attended the meeting.

IV. REVIEW OF AGENDA

There were no requested changes to the agenda. Note: The $9,532.50 amount under item VI.A is for July payments only; the total amount for approval for the period May through July 2013 provided in the staff report is actually $34,448.95.

V. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Consider approval of Summary for Payments made May through July 2013 totaling $34,448.95.
B. Consider approving fiscal year financial reports through July 31, 2013.

Moved by Mayor Rubio, seconded by Supervisor Potter, and unanimously carried, to approve the consent calendar, including approving the total of $34,448.95 for payments made from May through July 2013.

VII. ORAL PRESENTATION – None scheduled.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. COMMITTEE REPORTS
   1. TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)
      a). The board received and reviewed the memorandum from Technical Project Manager Jaques regarding potential sources of water that could be used to replenish the Seaside Basin and help to achieve protective water levels. Although Watermaster has no current
means to fund any of the projects beyond a possible limited amount of Monitoring and Management - Operations Funds, the board can lend support by writing letters, becoming involved in public outreach, and seeking grant and loan funding sources. Moved by Supervisor Potter, seconded by Director Byrne, and unanimously carried, to receive the report and direct that the TAC refine the seven projects recommended for board support and provide further information by: 1) including projects related to runoff, storm water, and the Groundwater Recharge Project (items 2, 4, and 7); 2) removing projects that would most likely be required by Order 95-10 and the State Water Resources Control Board; 3) including projects most easily implemented; 4) including estimated amounts of water to be captured by each project; 5) including estimated timelines for each project; 6) including estimated costs per acre-foot for each project; and 7) assessing projects for potential grant or loan funding to local communities related to the State’s Area of Special Biological Significance requirements.

b). The board received and reviewed the memorandum from Technical Project Manager Jaques regarding groundwater modeling results of coastal injection in the Seaside Basin. Mayor Edelen requested that modeling be done annually using actual level readings to routinely adjust what is required to achieve protective water levels in the long-term. It was noted that the modeling presented today does not include any sea level rise factor.

Moved by Supervisor Potter, seconded by Mayor Rubio, and unanimously carried to receive the report as information only with no board action.

IX. NEW BUSINESS – None

X. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS (No Action Required)
A. Timeline Schedule of Milestone Dates (Critical date monitoring)
B. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) minutes from May 8 and June 19, 2013 meetings
C. Quarterly Water Production Report for Second Quarter of WY 2012-2013: January 1 through March 30, 2013; and preliminary partial reporting for the Third Quarter of WY 2012-2013

XI. DIRECTORS’ REPORTS
Director Sabolsice reported that CAW is implementing a new commercial rate design to be based on the amount commercial customers conserve using Best Management Practices. Contact Director Sabolsice if there are any concerns with the new rate design.

XII. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMENTS
Watermaster has not received any documents from the court in response to its filing of the 2012 Annual Report to Court by December 15, 2012. The next Watermaster board meeting is scheduled for September 4, 2013. The next TAC meeting will be Wednesday, August 14 and Wednesday, September 11, 2013 at 1:30 p.m. in the MRWPCA conference room.

XIII. NEXT MEETING DATE – It was agreed that the next meeting would be a Regular Meeting held on Wednesday, September 4, 2013, 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.
There being no further business, Chair Bruno adjourned the meeting 3:28 p.m.
ITEM NO. VI.

CONSENT CALENDAR
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Dewey D Evans, CEO

DATE: September 4, 2013

SUBJECT: Summary of Payments Authorized to be paid during the month of August, 2013.

PURPOSE:
To advise the Board of payments authorized to be paid during the month of August, 2013 totaling $40,955.00.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Consider approving the payment of bills submitted and authorized to be paid during the month of August, 2013.

COMMENTS and FISCAL IMPACT:

DDEvans Consulting (Professional Services Agreement—CEO)—July 26, 2013 through August 25, 2013 worked on Watermaster business a total of 49.0 hours at $100.00 per hour or $4,900.00. Responded to telephone inquiries, e-mail, and other correspondence as needed regarding the Seaside Basin. Received and reviewed water production and water level reports. Worked on August 7, 2013 Board meeting agenda packet. Sent out August 7th Board meeting packet to Board and others as appropriate. Attended August 7th Board meeting and conducted follow-up actions as needed; Received and processed for payments to consultants and others as appropriate. Sent out request for Board meeting agenda items to Board members and others as appropriate; received and reviewed August 7th Board meeting minutes. Received and reviewed Budget and Finance Committee report authored by Bob Jaques; sent out request for Board meeting agenda items for September 4th regular meeting. Made arrangements for Budget and Finance Committee meeting for August 28th at Seaside City Hall; sent out public posting notice of Budget and Finance Committee meeting.

Robert “Bob” Jaques (Technical Program Manager)—July 28, 2013 through August 25, 2013 worked on Watermaster business a total of 22.0 hours at $100.00 per hour or $2,200.00. Responded to e-mail, telephone inquiries and other correspondence on a variety of Watermaster issues. Worked on Board meeting agenda items; worked on TAC agenda items preparing for August 11, 2013th meeting. Attended August 11th TAC meeting and worked on items for follow-up after the meeting. Prepare for and attended Board of Directors meeting on August 7, 2013.

Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD)—Two invoices submitted for payment totaling $33,455.00: The first invoice for RFS 2013-01.01 for $32,150.00 covered performing certain tasks contained within the Watermaster’s Monitoring and Management Plan for 2013. Labor
costs amounting to $23,625 covered 249 hours of time spent on the M&MP for 2013; Direct Costs for Water Quality sampling equipment, lab work, induction logging, retrofit, etc amounted to $8,525. The second invoice for $1,305.00 was for approximately 15.0 hours of work performing water level and water quality data collection for specified wells within the Seaside Basin.

**Paxton Imaging**—(Watermaster Web Site Coordinator) -- Monthly Hosting Unix Server for the months of July and August, 2013--$400.00.

Total for August, 2013 $40,955.00
### Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster

**Budget vs. Actual Administrative Fund**

Fiscal Year (January 1 - December 31, 2013)

Balance through August 31, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Balances &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>2013 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Contract Amount</th>
<th>Year to Date Revenue / Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Reserve</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY (Rollover)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Assessments</td>
<td>70,000.00</td>
<td>70,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available</td>
<td>85,000.00</td>
<td>85,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract Staff</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
<td>34,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Advisor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
<td>34,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available</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>Net Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Available Balances & Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Balances &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>2013 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Contract Encumbrance</th>
<th>Year to Date Revenue/Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Management - Ops Fund</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011 Rollover</td>
<td>583,900.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>560,383.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available</td>
<td>$ 583,900.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 560,383.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appropriations & Expenses

#### GENERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations &amp; Expenses</th>
<th>2013 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Contract Encumbrance</th>
<th>Year to Date Revenue/Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Project Manager</td>
<td>$ 60,000.00</td>
<td>$ 60,000.00</td>
<td>$ 23,170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency @ 20% (not including TPM)</td>
<td>39,844.00</td>
<td>$ 9,990.00</td>
<td>9,986.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total General</td>
<td>$ 99,844.00</td>
<td>$ 69,990.00</td>
<td>$ 33,156.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CONSULTANTS (Hydrometrics; Web Site Database)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations &amp; Expenses</th>
<th>2013 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Contract Encumbrance</th>
<th>Year to Date Revenue/Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>$ 8,600.00</td>
<td>$ 62,100.00</td>
<td>$ 4,574.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production/Lvl/Qlt Monitoring</td>
<td>3,900.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin Management Action Plan</td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report</td>
<td>27,750.00</td>
<td>22,655.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Consultants</td>
<td>$ 115,250.00</td>
<td>$ 84,755.00</td>
<td>$ 4,574.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MPWMD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations &amp; Expenses</th>
<th>2013 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>$ 69,086.00</td>
<td>69,086.00</td>
<td>27,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin Management</td>
<td>4,700.00</td>
<td>4,700.00</td>
<td>4,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seawater Intrusion</td>
<td>10,184.00</td>
<td>10,184.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MPWMD</td>
<td>$ 83,970.00</td>
<td>$ 83,970.00</td>
<td>$ 32,150.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reserve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations &amp; Expenses</th>
<th>2013 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Contract Encumbrance</th>
<th>Year to Date Revenue/Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Appropriations & Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations &amp; Expenses</th>
<th>2013 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>$ 299,064.00</td>
<td>$ 238,715.00</td>
<td>$ 69,880.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations &amp; Expenses</th>
<th>2013 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Contract Encumbrance</th>
<th>Year to Date Revenue/Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Available</td>
<td>$ 284,836.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnote 1: The $5,154 contract with MPWMD for data collection services consists of pass through expenditures paid by producers and is not budgeted. For 2013 $3,621 has been collected from producers, and MPWMD has invoiced $1,305 for services rendered.
### Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster

**Budget vs. Actual Monitoring and Management - Capital Fund**

**Fiscal Year (January 1 - December 31, 2013)**

**Balance through August 31, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Balances and Assessments:</th>
<th>2013 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 2007-2012 Rollover to 2013</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer out to Operations Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations &amp; Expenses:</th>
<th>2013 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Contract Encumbrance</th>
<th>Year to Date Revenue / Expense</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>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</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>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Appropriations and Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Available                    | $ -                 |                      |                                |
### Replenishment Fund

#### Water Year 2013 (October 1 - September 30) / Fiscal Year 2013 (January 1 - December 31)

**Balance through August 31, 2013**

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,132</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,132</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,538</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WY 05/06</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WY 06/07</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WY 07/08</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WY 08/09</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WY 09/10</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WY 10/11</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WY 11/12</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WY 12/13</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,780</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **California American Water Balance Forward** | **-$** | **$1,641,004** | **$4,206,475** | **$2,900,435** | **$2,868,685** | **$3,850,964** | **$6,088,910** | **$8,919,379** | **$8,919,379** | **$8,919,379** |
| **Exceeding Natural Safe Yield Considering Alternative Producers** | **2,106,652** | **2,484,533** | **5,164,969** | **3,733,464** | **4,112,933** | **3,187,854** | **1,661,090** | **22,491,495** | **3,449,961** | **26,676,293** |
| **Operating Yield Overproduction Replenishment** | - | **80,038** | **34,045** | - | - | - | - | **619,853** | **734,836** | - |
| **Total California American** | **$2,106,652** | **$2,565,471** | **$5,199,014** | **$3,773,464** | **$4,112,933** | **$3,187,854** | **$2,280,943** | **$23,226,332** | **$3,449,961** | **$26,676,293** |
| **CAW Credit Against Assessment** | (465,648) | (12,305,924) | (3,741,714) | (5,096,213) | (5,425,799) | (5,111,413) | (32,145,711) | - | (32,145,711) |
| **CAW Unpaid Balance** | **$1,641,004** | **$4,206,475** | **$2,900,435** | **$2,868,685** | **$3,850,964** | **$6,088,910** | **$8,919,379** | **$8,919,379** | **$5,469,418** | **$5,469,418** |

| **City of Seaside Balance Forward** | **-$** | **$230,671** | **$413,454** | **$1,106,116** | **$1,737,569** | **$988,414** | **$13,109** | **$678,596** |
| **City of Seaside Municipal** | **332.0 AF** | **287.7 AF** | **294.3 AF** | **293.4 AF** | **282.9 AF** | **240.7 AF** | **233.7 AF** | **$1,657,840** | **150,000** | **$1,807,840** |
| **Exceeding Natural Safe Yield Considering Alternative Producers** | **169,200** | **173,739** | **385,642** | **86,090** | **82,761** | **6,757** | **223,332** | - | 223,332 |
| **Operating Yield Overproduction Replenishment** | - | **131,705** | **69,701** | - | - | - | - | **402,812** | - | 402,812 |
| **Total City of Seaside*** | **$219,687** | **174,079** | **402,540** | **465,300** | **314,721** | **141,335** | **163,509** | **$1,881,172** | **150,000** | **2,031,172** |
| **City of Seaside Late Payment 5%** | **$10,984** | **$8,704** | **$26,712** | **$26,750** | **$15,737** | **$88,887** | **$88,887** | **$88,887** | **$88,887** | **$88,887** |
| **In-lieu Credit Against Assessment** | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | **$2,051,147** | **$1,200,000** | **$4,251,467** |
| **City of Seaside Unpaid Balance** | **$230,671** | **$413,454** | **$1,106,116** | **$1,737,569** | **$988,414** | **$13,109** | **$678,596** | **$7,128,596** | **$7,128,596** | **$7,128,596** |
| **Total Replenishment Fund Balance** | **$1,871,675** | **$4,619,929** | **$1,794,319** | **$2,862,551** | **$6,102,019** | **$9,597,976** | **$9,597,976** | **$9,597,976** | **$9,597,976** | **$9,597,976** |

**2010 = 319.55 AF golf course in-lieu replenishment and 68.8 AF 4-party agmt in-lieu replenishment**

**2011 = 411.1 AF golf course in-lieu replenishment**

**2012 = 298.2 AF golf course in-lieu replenishment**

---

* Replenishment Fund Balance Forward = Replenishment Fund Balance + Replenishment Fund Assessments - Operating Yield Overproduction Replenishment

* Total Replenishment Assessments = Total Replenishment Fund Balance + In-lieu Credit Against Assessment - City of Seaside Late Payment 5%

* Total Replenishment Paid and/or Credited = Total Replenishment Assessments - In-lieu Credit Against Assessment - City of Seaside Late Payment 5%

---
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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 4, 2013

SUBJECT: HydroMetrics RFS No. 2013-04 and MPWMD RFS No. 2013-03 to Perform Modeling and Analysis of the Laguna Seca Subarea

RECOMMENDATION:
Approve HydroMetrics RFS No. 2013-04 in the not-to-exceed amount of $25,060.00, and MPWMD RFS No. 2013-03 in the not-to-exceed amount of $2,209.00, to perform groundwater modeling and analysis of the Laguna Seca Subarea to determine impacts within this Subarea of pumping at current and future projected levels.

Approve a transfer of funds from the Contingency line item account in the Watermaster Management and Monitoring Program Budget and place the $27,269.00, ($25,060 plus $2,209) into the proper working account in the Management and Monitoring Fund Budget.

BACKGROUND:
At the March 13, 2013 TAC meeting Mr. Sabolsice raised the topic of water supply to the Laguna Seca Subarea and whether or not Cal Am’s Operating Yield for this Subarea would drop to zero by 2021 when all of the 10% pumping cutbacks mandated by the Adjudication Decision will be completed. Discussion of this topic continued at four subsequent TAC meetings.

The Discussion Paper in Attachment A summarizes background information on this, concludes that after all of the 10% pumping cutbacks are completed, Cal Am would be entitled to pump 1,474 AFY from wherever in the Basin it wished to pump and still be in compliance with the Adjudication Decision. 1,474 AFY is Cal Am’s full allocation of the 3,000 AFY Natural Safe Yield established by the Decision.

However, the Discussion Paper also points out that the Adjudication Decision is a complex document containing numerous statements and requirements pertaining to extractions (pumping) of water from the Basin, and that at least some of the Producers in the Laguna Seca Subarea will eventually experience Material Injury if pumping at current rates continues. (The Decision defines Material Injury as a substantial adverse physical impact to the Seaside Basin or any particular Producer(s), including but not limited to: seawater intrusion, land subsidence, excessive pump lifts, and water quality degradation). For this reason I recommended that, rather than waiting until groundwater levels in this Subarea decline to that point, the Watermaster should take the following actions:

1. Using the best available monitoring and hydrologic data use the Groundwater Model to develop a revised Natural Safe Yield for the Laguna Seca Subarea.
2. Develop an “Operating Safe Yield” for this Subarea by conducting pump testing of each existing well in the Subarea to determine how low the groundwater level can fall before the well will no longer be able to operate. This would be useful in estimating when Material Injury would occur by creating excessive pump lifts.
3. Determine whether having Cal Am discontinue all pumping from the Laguna Seca Subarea, which might be required if Cal Am’s continued pumping from this Subarea resulted in a continuing drop in groundwater levels, would stop the groundwater levels from falling. If the groundwater levels were to continue to fall, then the Watermaster might need to require the Alternative Producers themselves to reduce pumping below their current Decision-allowed pumping levels.

At its August 14, 2013 meeting the TAC approved developing the attached RFSs with HydroMetrics and MPWMD to perform this work.

DISCUSSION

**HydroMetrics RFS:** The attached RFS No. 2013-04 to HydroMetrics would authorize groundwater modeling work to be performed in order to carry out the analysis of the Laguna Seca subarea described in the Scope of Work for this RFS. HydroMetrics will prepare a Technical Memorandum to document the assumptions and results of the modeling and analysis effort. This Memorandum will:

1. **Describe the influence on groundwater levels of discontinuing pumping from California American Water (Cal-Am) wells located within the Laguna Seca subarea.** The objective of this analysis will be to determine whether the current groundwater elevation declines will stop or be altered by this operational change.

2. **Determine the Natural Safe Yield of the Laguna Seca subarea.** The Natural Safe Yield is the amount of groundwater that can theoretically be extracted from a basin without causing adverse environmental impacts, such as reduced subsurface outflows or reduced stream flows. Unless otherwise directed, the latest baseline used for the recent coastal injection modeling will be used as the model run from which to estimate rainfall recharge and subsurface inflow. The objective of this analysis will be to determine whether or not the 608 AFY Natural Safe Yield for this Subarea established in the Adjudication Decision is valid or whether it needs to be revised.

3. **Estimate the Operational Safe Yield of the Laguna Seca Subarea.** This will be done by starting with the Natural Safe Yield determined under the previous task, and iteratively reducing the amount of pumping from the existing wells until:
   a) Groundwater levels stop declining,
   b) Pumping groundwater levels remain above the well pump intake and top of screen for each well in this Subarea,
   c) Subsurface outflows from the Natural Safe Yield (determined under the preceding task) are achieved, and
   d) Stream flows from the Natural Safe Yield (determined under the preceding task) are achieved.

The Operational Safe Yield is a preferable estimate of safe yield over Natural Safe Yield because it acknowledges that not all groundwater left in the Subarea after recharges and discharges are taken into account can be physically and realistically extracted by production wells. The objective of this analysis will be to determine the amount of groundwater that can be safely extracted from the Laguna Seca Subarea without causing groundwater levels to drop below the well screens or pump intakes of any of the existing wells in this Subarea. This information will be useful to the Watermaster in determining whether the Producer water allocations for the Laguna Seca Subarea established by the Adjudication Decision are feasible, or whether they should be revised.
**MPWMD RFS:** The attached RFS No. 2013-03 to MPWMD would authorize MPWMD to collect field data that HydroMetrics will need to perform this modeling and prepare these analyses. As noted in this RFS, the exact number of wells to which MPWMD will be granted access, and the number of wells that will prove feasible to obtain all of the necessary data, will not be known until the work is undertaken. The cost authorized by this RFS is a not-to-exceed amount and is expected to be sufficient to obtain data from all of the wells which HydroMetrics would like to use to perform the modeling work. If data can only be collected from a smaller number of wells, only the cost to obtain that data will be charged to this RFS.

**FISCAL IMPACTS:**
This work was unanticipated, and therefore not included, when the FY 2013 Watermaster Management & Monitoring Program (M&MP) Operations Budget was prepared. However, the remaining amount in the Contingency line item in the M&MP Budget, in the amount of $29,854, should be sufficient to fund this work. At this point in time the TAC is not aware of any other work that might need to be funded by use of the Contingency during FY 2013.

**ATTACHMENTS:**
A. Discussion Paper on Issues Pertaining to Water Production from the Laguna Seca Subarea
B. HydroMetrics RFS No. 2013-04
C. MPWMD RFS No. 2013-03.
Determining how much water the Adjudication Decision allows each Producer to pump from the Laguna Seca Subarea is a complex matter. The Decision intends to achieve the objective of having the total amount of pumping not exceed the Natural Safe Yield (NSY) of the Basin as a whole. Although not explicitly stated in the Decision, it would be reasonable to presume that another objective would be to have the total amount of pumping from each Subarea of the Basin not exceed that Subarea’s Natural Safe Yield.

This Discussion Paper provides background information on what the Decision says about this issue, as well as what other reports have to say, and the Technical Program Manager’s recommendations on followup actions to be taken by the Watermaster.

ADJUDICATION DECISION

Natural Safe Yield of the Seaside Basin as a Whole and of the Laguna Seca Subarea
The Decision states that the Natural Safe Yield of the Basin as a whole is between 2,581 and 2,913 acre feet per year, that the Natural Safe Yield for the Coastal Subarea is between 1,973 and 2,305 acre feet per year, and the Natural Safe Yield for the Laguna Seca Subarea is 608 acre feet per year.

Note that this 608 AFY of Natural Safe Yield (NSY) for the Laguna Seca Subarea is less than the 644 AFY the Decision specifically provides as a water right to the Alternative Producers in that Subarea.

The Decision then goes on to establish a total-Basin initial NSY figure of 3,000 AFY, which is not broken down between the two Subareas.

The first set of figures pertaining to NSY for the Basin as a whole (a range from 2,581 to 2,913 AFY) is less than the 3,000 AFY figure which the Decision initially establishes for purposes of determining whether or not over-production has occurred. Thus, there is a conflict within the Decision regarding the NSY figures. Due to the conflict described above regarding the NSY of the Laguna Seca Subarea, it would not be reasonable to calculate the NSY of the Coastal Subarea by subtracting the NSY of the Laguna Seca Subarea from the Basin’s NSY of 3,000 AFY, because this would result in a Coastal Subarea NSY of only 2,392 AFY (3,000 – 608 = 2,392), which is below the range of NSY values for the Coastal Subarea, as stated in the Decision.

For these reasons the Watermaster has interpreted the water rights impacts of the 10% Decision-mandated triennial pumping reductions as being applied to the Basin as a whole, not separately by Subareas, using the 3,000 AFY NSY value established in the Decision. Based on this interpretation the Discussion Paper in the Agenda packet for the April 10, 2013 TAC meeting calculated that Cal Am would be entitled to pump 1,474 AFY of water from wherever in the Basin it wished to pump and still be in compliance with the Decision.
**Decision Provisions Pertaining to this Situation**

The Decision authorizes the Watermaster, with justification, to modify both the NSY and the Operational Yield (OY), if there is justification to do so and the Court concurs. Justification would consist of a finding that continued pumping at the NSY or OY levels initially established by the Decision would cause Material Injury to that Subarea, or to a Producer, due to unreasonable pump lifts.

The Decision also authorizes the Watermaster to require that Producers reduce or relocate their pumping, either from the Basin as a whole or from any of its Subareas, and describes the procedures to be used if this is done. Standard Producers must first have their pumping reduced to zero before any Alternate Producers can be required to reduce their Decision-allowed pumping levels.

**LAGUNA SECA SUBAREA WATER PRODUCTION**

Table 1 contains water production data from the Laguna Seca Subarea in recent Water Years. As this data indicates, total production from this Subarea has significantly exceeded the Subarea’s initially assumed Natural Safe Yield of 608 AFY. However, the data also shows that if Cal Am reduced its pumping from this Subarea, total production from the Subarea could be lowered to less than 608 AFY.

### Table 1
**Laguna Seca Subarea Production Amounts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCER</th>
<th>QUANTITY PRODUCED, AF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WY 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Am</td>
<td>430.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadera</td>
<td>170.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Seca/Bishop</td>
<td>224.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York School</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Seca County</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>867.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total less Cal Am</strong></td>
<td>437.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEASIDE BASIN MONITORING**

Water level monitoring performed for the Watermaster by MPWMD shows that groundwater levels in the Laguna Seca Subarea have been steadily declining for many years, and will likely reach the point that Material Injury to at least some of the Producers in this Subarea will occur. Groundwater level plots for several representative wells in the Laguna Seca Subarea are shown in the figures below.

This conclusion is substantiated by conclusions in the HydroMetrics September 2010 modeling report which state that:

- At current (Water Year 2009 when the report was prepared) pumping rates groundwater levels in the Laguna Seca subarea will continue to decline, as demonstrated by the continued extraction of groundwater from storage in this Subarea, and
- 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 conclusion is also substantiated by the following statements in the *Basin Management Action Plan*, February 2009, prepared for the Watermaster by HydroMetrics:

- Groundwater levels in both the shallow and deep aquifers in the Laguna Seca Subarea are declining rapidly, at rates averaging as high as 4 feet per year.
- The estimated Natural Safe Yield using recent data is 540 acre-feet for the Laguna Seca Subarea.
DATE: September 5, 2013
RFS NO. 2013-04
(To be filled in by WATERMASTER)

TO: __Derrik Williams _____
    HydroMetrics LLC
    PROFESSIONAL

FROM: __Robert Jaques
    WATERMASTER

Services Needed and Purpose: Perform groundwater modeling on, and prepare certain analyses of, the Laguna Seca Subarea (see detailed Scope of Work in Attachment 1).

Completion Date: All work of this RFS shall be completed not later than 60 days from the date of execution of this RFS No. 2013-04, or 30 days after receipt of the data to be provided through the Watermaster by MPWMD (as described in Attachment 1), whichever is later.

Method of Compensation: __Time and Materials__ (As defined in Section V of Agreement.)

Total Price Authorized by this RFS: $25,060.00 (Cost is authorized only when evidenced by signature below.) (See Attachment 1 for Estimated Costs).

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

Requested by: ________________________________ Date:__________
    WATERMASTER Technical Program Manager

Authorized by: ________________________________ Date:__________
    WATERMASTER Chief Executive Officer

Agreed to by: ________________________________ Date:__________
    PROFESSIONAL
Mr. Robert S. Jaques, Technical Program Manager  
Seaside Basin Watermaster  
83 Via Encanto  
Monterey, CA 93940  

July 18, 2013  

Subject: Scope and Cost Estimate to Model Laguna Seca Operational Changes and Determination of Natural and Operational Safe Yield

Dear Mr. Jaques:

HydroMetrics Water Resources Inc. is pleased to submit this scope and cost estimate for using the Seaside groundwater model to determine impacts to the Laguna Seca subarea from pumping changes, and to estimate the Natural Safe Yield and Operational Safe Yield of the subarea. The sections below outline the approach to be taken in this work for the Seaside Watermaster Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

Task 1. Groundwater Modeling

Subtask 1.1 Cal-Am Discontinues Laguna Seca Pumping

The first modeling task will be to model the influence of discontinuing pumping from California American Water (Cal-Am) wells in the Laguna Seca subarea. The impacts of this operational change will be evaluated by plotting hydrographs of several key wells in the subarea to determine whether the current groundwater elevation declines stop or are altered in any way.

Subtask 1.2 Estimate Laguna Seca Natural Safe Yield

The second modeling task will be to determine the Natural Safe Yield of the Laguna Seca subarea. The Natural Safe Yield is the amount of groundwater that

HydroMetrics Water Resources Inc. • 519 17th Street, Suite 500 • Oakland, CA 94612  
(510) 903-0458 • (510) 903-0468 (fax)
can theoretically be extracted from a basin without causing adverse environmental effects. We will meet with the TAC to define adverse impacts. These impacts may include reduced subsurface outflows from the Laguna Seca subarea or reduced streamflows. The Natural Safe Yield will be determined as:

\[
\text{Natural Safe Yield} = \text{Aerial Recharge} + \text{Subsurface Inflow} - \text{Required Subsurface Outflow} - \text{Required Streamflow}
\]

Unless otherwise directed by the TAC, the latest baseline used for the recent coastal injection modeling will be used as the model run from which to estimate aerial recharge and subsurface inflow.

**SUBTASK 1.3 ESTIMATE LAGUNA SECA OPERATIONAL SAFE YIELD**

The Operational Safe Yield is a preferable estimate of safe yield over Natural Safe Yield because it acknowledges that not all groundwater left in the basin after recharges and discharges are taken into account can be physically and realistically extracted by production wells. The amount of groundwater that can be extracted safely is a function of the wells’ physical locations, and well screen and pump depths. Groundwater levels dropping below a well’s screen or pump intake could cause damage to the well and/or pump.

The third modeling task estimates the Operational Safe Yield of the Laguna Seca subarea. This will be achieved by starting with the Natural Safe Yield model run obtained in the previous subtask. Using this model run as a basis, the amount of pumping in existing wells will be reduced iteratively until:

1. Groundwater levels stop declining,
2. Pumping groundwater levels remain above the well pump intake and top of screen for each well,
3. Subsurface outflows set in Task 1.2 are achieved, and
4. Streamflows set in Task 1.2 are achieved.

Our cost estimate only includes time for modeling and does not include collecting pumping drawdown, screen and pump data on each production well. We recommend that Monterey Peninsula Water Management District collect and compile the screen depth, pump depth, and pumping drawdown together with the pump rate at the time drawdown is measured for each well in the subarea. Because the model only works with static groundwater levels, the pumping drawdown will be added to the model predicted groundwater level depths to get
the “predicted” pumping groundwater depth. The pumping groundwater depth will be used to determine if the pumping groundwater level is reaching the top of the well screen or the pump intake.

Task 2. Meetings

We will prepare for and attend three meetings: the first will be by telephone to finalize the modeling assumptions; the second meeting will be to present the results to the Technical Advisory Committee in person, and the third meeting will be to present results to the Watermaster Board in person.

Task 3. Reporting

A summary technical memorandum will be prepared to document the assumptions and results of the modeling effort.

The estimated cost for the work discussed is $25,060, as shown on the attached table.

Sincerely,

Derrik Williams

Derrik Williams, President
HydroMetrics Water Resources Inc.

Georgina King, Project Manager
HydroMetrics Water Resources Inc.
# Cost Estimate for Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster

**Laguna Seca Modeling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>HydroMetrics WRI Labor</th>
<th>Other Direct Costs</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Derrick Williams</td>
<td>Georgina King</td>
<td>Stephen Hundt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Senior Hydrogeologist</td>
<td>Staff Hydrogeologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 1. Groundwater Modeling</strong></td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Cal-Am discontinues Laguna Seca pumping</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Estimate Laguna Seca Natural Safe Yield</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Estimate Laguna Seca Operational Safe Yield</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Task 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2. Meetings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume Three Meetings - First meeting to finalize model assumptions (telephone), Second to Present Results to TAC (Seaside) and, Last to Present Results to Board (Seaside)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Task 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 3. Reporting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Technical Memorandum describing Assumptions and Results (Provide as MS Word and PDF)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Task 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**  

|                 |               |       | 171  | $ 24,780 | $ 280 | $ 25,060 |

**Notes**  

Other Direct Costs includes mileage, postage, office supplies

*Estimate for MPWMD to collect and compile the screen depth, pump depth, and current pumping and static groundwater level data for each well in the Laguna Seca subarea*  

to be provided

---

*HydroMetrics Water Resources Inc. • 519 17th Street, Suite 500 • Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 903-0458 • (510) 903-0468 (fax)*)
DATE: September 5, 2013  

RFS NO. 2013-03  

(To be filled in by WATERMASTER)  

TO: Joe Oliver  

FROM: Robert Jaques  

Monterey Peninsula Water Management District  

WATERMASTER  

PROFESSIONAL  

Services Needed and Purpose:  
Provide assistance to HydroMetrics by collecting field data from wells located within the Laguna Seca Subarea (See detailed Scope of Work in Attachment 1).  

Completion Date: The work of this RFS No. 2013-03 shall be completed as soon as possible after the issuance of this RFS, and in any case shall be completed not later than November 1, 2013.  

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

Total Price Authorized by this RFS: $2,209.00 (See Attachment 3 for a Breakdown of this Total Price. Cost is authorized only when evidenced by signature below.)  

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

Requested by: WATERMASTER Technical Program Manager  

Authorized by: WATERMASTER Chief Executive Officer  

Agreed to by: PROFESSIONAL
ATTACHMENT 1

Detailed Scope of Work for RFS No. 2013-03

Background:

Under a separate RFS the Watermaster is having HydroMetrics perform groundwater modeling on, and prepare certain analyses of, the Laguna Seca Subarea. In order to perform that work HydroMetrics needs to have the following types of field data collected and compiled for as many wells as possible (there are believed to be between 14 and 18 wells) within this Subarea:

1. Screen elevation
2. Pump elevation
3. Static water level elevation
4. Pumping water level elevation
4. Pump rate at the time pumping water level elevation is measured.

Scope of Work:

MPWMD staff will contact each of the well owners in the Laguna Seca Subarea to request their permission to obtain data from their wells. For all of the wells for which permission is received, MPWMD will collect and compile the above-described data for a total cost not-to-exceed $2,209, subject to the following qualifications:

1. Data collection will not be possible unless Producers allow access to their wells under static and pumping conditions.
2. Data collection will be subject to an assessment by MPWMD staff as to the risk involved in lowering water level monitoring equipment into the wells to collect static and pumping water level data. If this risk is determined to be unacceptable by MPWMD staff, then it will not be possible to collect the needed data from those wells, as MPWMD cannot accept any risk associated with loss of water level monitoring equipment and/or damage to wells as a result of this work.

The Watermaster recognizes that it will not be possible to determine the number of wells from which it will be possible to obtain the above-described data until MPWMD contacts well owners to receive their permission to perform this work, and conducts the field visits to those wells.

The costs to perform this work will depend on the number of wells from which data is obtained. In any case the total cost to perform this work on all of the wells will not exceed $2,209, unless authorized in advance by the Watermaster.
ITEM NO. IX.A.2.

BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE
With input from
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Laura Dadiw, Assistant to the CEO

REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY: Dewey D Evans, CEO

DATE: September 4, 2013

SUBJECT: Consider Approval of Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost for Water Year 2014

PURPOSE:
The Budget and Finance Committee aims to assist the Board in establishing the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost for Water Year 2014.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
The Budget and Finance Committee recommends that the Board approve $2,702 as the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost for Water Year 2014.

COMMENTS:
A few months ago the Budget and Finance Committee proposed updating the basis from which the annual calculation of the Unit Cost of replenishment water is established. The Unit Cost is used to calculate the Replenishment Assessments that are charged to any Standard Producer that exceeds its pumping allocation during the Water Year.

Per page 33 of the Decision, “The per acre-foot amount of the Replenishment Assessments shall be determined and declared by Watermaster in October of each Water Year in order to provide Parties with advance knowledge of the cost of Over-Production in that Water Year.” Thus, the per acre-foot amount determined by the Board in or before October of 2013 will be used to calculate Replenishment Assessments for pumping that occurs during the Water Year which begins on October 1, 2013 and ends on September 30, 2014.

On pages 9 and 10 (Section 6.5) of the Watermaster Rules and Regulations, there is a discussion of how the Replenishment Assessment per acre-foot costs are to be calculated. It states that “The per acre-foot cost of Replenishment Assessments for Production in excess of Natural Safe Yield shall be based on the anticipated cost of Artificial Replenishment, including the cost to construct, operate, and maintain facilities necessary for replenishment of the Basin.” The per acre-foot cost used to determine the Replenishment Assessments should be the cost that would have to be paid, per acre-foot, to obtain water to recharge the Basin to the extent necessary to offset the cumulative over-production above the Natural Safe Yield during a given Water Year.
It is apparent that there are ongoing changes in projected costs of recharge water and in the timing of the projects which will provide that water. The TAC determined at its June 19, 2013 meeting, and presented to the Board at its August 7, 2013 meeting, currently planned projects potentially able to supply water for replenishment of the Seaside Basin. From those presented, the TAC selected for review at its August 14, 2013 meeting those projects sufficiently developed to provide enough data for consideration. The four projects found by the TAC to be most viable are discussed in Attachment 1, and listed in Table 1 of Attachment 2.

At the August 28, 2013 Watermaster Budget and Finance Committee meeting, members considered that the current Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost is $2,780 based on potential replenishment project data developed five years ago; discussed approximations of volumes produced, inflation rates and contingency factors for each project; and assumed that the highest volume of Basin replenishment water would most likely be procured by Watermaster from the project having the lowest cost per acre-foot. The Committee unanimously voted to recommend $2,702, the average of the Base Unit Cost ($/AF) listed in Table 1 for each project \[\frac{3,507+1,800+2,000+3,500}{4}\], as the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost for Water Year 2014.

**FISCAL IMPACTS:**
Since the Watermaster Replenishment Fund is currently used only for accounting of over pumping with no assessment monies collected or paid out, a change in the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost is anticipated to have no fiscal impact.

**ATTACHMENTS:**
August 28, 2013 Budget and Finance Committee meeting transmittal by Watermaster Technical Program Manager, Robert Jaques - *Information for Use in Establishing the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost for Water Year 2014 (October 1, 2013-September 30, 2014)*

Attachment 1- *Status of and Comments Regarding the Projects Considered in the Water Year 2014 Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost Calculations in Table 1*

Attachment 2: *Table 1- Replenishment Project Information for Use in Establishing the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost for Water Year 2014 (October 1, 2013-September 30, 2014) - Anticipated Unit Costs of Replenishment Water for the Seaside Basin*
**SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER**  
**BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**  
**AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING DATE:</th>
<th>AUGUST 28, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGENDA ITEM:</td>
<td>NO. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENDA TITLE:</td>
<td>Information for Use in Establishing the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost for Water Year 2014 (October 1, 2013-September 30, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARED BY:</td>
<td>Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY:**

This Unit Cost is used to calculate the Replenishment Assessments that are charged to any Standard Producer that exceeds its allocation during the Water Year.

Several years ago in conjunction with developing the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost at that time, the TAC recommended, and the Board approved, using the following procedures:

1. All potential replenishment water supply projects that could bring water to the Seaside Basin any time within the next 10 years will be included in the calculations, assuming sufficient information on those projects can be obtained.
2. Costs for each project will 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 will 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. The footnotes in Table 1 describe the contingency allowances.

Each of the projects that the TAC determined at its June 19, 2013 meeting, and which were presented to the Board at its August 7, 2013 meeting, to be potentially able to supply water for replenishment of the Seaside Basin, and which are sufficiently developed to have all of the necessary data to enable them to be evaluated, is discussed in Attachment 1, and is included in Table 1 in Attachment 2.

Attachment 2 (Table 1) is a spreadsheet showing the unit costs of the four projects described in Attachment 1 which the TAC considers to be viable potential sources of replenishment water within the next ten years. This information is provided for the Budget and Finance Committee’s use in establishing the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost for the upcoming Water Year October 1, 2013-September 30, 2014. The Unit Cost used for the Water Year that is just ending was $2,780. As can be seen from Table 1, two of the four projects have projected unit costs considerably higher than this. The higher costs results primarily from using the more complete and comprehensive cost estimates now available for the projects that were evaluated.

There was considerable TAC discussion at the TAC’s August 14, 2013 meeting on what Unit Cost should be recommended for approval. Some members felt a straight average of the unit costs of the four projects should be used, some felt a weighted approach taking into account the potential amount of water that each project would be able to produce should be used, some felt a weighted approach taking into account the likely potential of a given project to be able to provide replenishment water should be used, and some felt that the highest potential unit cost should be used in order to be conservative. In the end the TAC concluded that this was not a technical issue, and that it was a policy issue that should be determined by the Budget and Finance Committee and subsequently the Board.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA ITEM:</th>
<th>NO. 1 (Continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ATTACHMENTS: | 1. Status of and Comments Regarding the Projects Included in the Water Year 2014 Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost Calculations Contained in Table 1  
2. Table 1: Replenishment Project Information for Use in Establishing the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost |
| RECOMMENDED ACTION: | Determine a Proposed Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost for Water Year 2014 (October 1, 2013-September 30, 2014), and recommend this to the Board for approval as the Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost to be used for WY 2014 |
Attachment 1:

Status of and Comments Regarding the Projects Considered in the Water Year 2014 Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost Calculations in Table 1

1. Possible Initially Unused Capacity of Cal Am’s Regional Desalination Plant in the Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project (Regional Desalination): This project would involve using initially unused capacity in Cal Am’s regional desalination plant as a source of replenishment water for the Seaside Basin.

Cal Am has indicated that it will seek (or may already have done so) approval by the CPUC to increase the size of the Regional desalination plant under the Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project in order to: (1) provide replenishment water to the Seaside Basin, (2) provide service for the build-out of the Pebble Beach Company’s projects, (3) provide water to support the anticipated “bounce back” in local tourism that will result from the improving economy, and (4) to serve legal lots of record that are not currently being served. The anticipated requested increase in desalination plant size is summarized in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>AFY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seaside Basin Replenishment</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBC Projects Build-out</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism “bounce back”</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots of Record</td>
<td>1,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,705</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The report to MPWMD’s Board for its February 12, 2013 meeting commented that MPWMD staff felt some of the demands listed in the table above were overly conservative, at least in the early years, as follows:

1. In the sizing of the desalination plant Cal Am had used a 5-year average to establish its current demand. The 5-year average Cal Am used was 13,291 AFY. MPWMD pointed out that Cal Am’s current actual demand is only approximately 12,500 AFY.
2. As MPWMD understands it, the water demand cited in the EIR for build-out of PBC’s Projects is only 135 AFY, rather than the 325 AFY used by Cal Am.
3. MPWMD’s analysis of commercial water demands in the early-to-mid 2000s, compared to current commercial water demands (during the current economic downturn period) indicates current demand is only about 200 to 400 AFY below pre-economic downturn demand, rather than the 500 AFY used by Cal Am in its plant-sizing analysis.
4. The lots of record demand of 1,180 AFY was reportedly taken from a 2001 MPWMD analysis, but MPWMD does not recommend continued use of this value. MPWMD indicated it planned to examine more recent reports to try to provide an updated figure.

For the reasons stated above, there may be initially unused capacity available in the Regional desalination plant in its early years of operation. If so, that excess capacity could provide a potential additional source of replenishment water for injection.

2. Seaside Basin ASR Expansion: This project would be an expansion of the existing Seaside Basin ASR project. ASR entails diverting excess winter flows from the Carmel River Basin during high flow...
periods using existing Cal Am wells in the lower stretches of the river. Diverted water is treated to potable drinking water standards and pumped through the Cal Am distribution system to the Seaside Basin, where the water is injected for later recovery during dry periods. MPWMD has operated a full-scale ASR test well (Santa Margarita Test Injection Well No. 1) since 2002, and a second injection/extraction well was completed in 2008. Maximum extraction capacity of the current ASR facilities is approximately 1,500 AFY.

Expansion of the ASR project would provide for a greater diversion of water from the Carmel River during high flows for transport and injection into the Seaside Basin, and could increase the maximum extraction to approximately 2,400 AFY. The facilities to accomplish this are included in the scope of Cal Am’s Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project, and include:

- Increased capacity in Cal Am’s Carmel River Basin well capacity in order to deliver water for injection in the Seaside Basin
- Increasing the capacity of Cal Am’s conveyance pipeline from the Carmel River Basin in order to be able to deliver the peak instantaneous flow of injection water to the Seaside Basin
- Making some other improvements in Cal Am’s distribution system in order to remedy limitations in getting water to the ASR sites while simultaneously meeting Cal Am’s system demands

This project is being pursued jointly by MPWMD and Cal Am. Up until the time that Cal Am reduces its Carmel River diversions in accordance with the SWRCB’s Cease and Desist Order No. 95-10, all of the water production of this project has to be used by Cal Am to reduce the amount of water it takes from the Carmel River Basin. Therefore, up until that point in time, which will correspond to the time that Cal Am’s Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project becomes fully operational, this project will not be able to serve as a potential source of supplemental replenishment water for the Seaside Basin. However, once the Cease and Desist Order has been satisfied, in the wet years in which ASR injection water quantities greater than 1,300 AFY are available, it may be permissible to inject and leave in the Seaside Basin at least some portion of any amount over 1,300 AFY, without having to pump it out to reduce Cal Am’s Carmel River Basin diversions. This project would be a potential additional source of replenishment water for injection.

3. **Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project:** This project consists of construction by MCWD of a recycled water distribution system to provide up to 1,727 acre-feet per year (AFY) of recycled water from MRWPCA’s existing Salinas Valley Reclamation Plant (SVRP) to urban users within the Ord Community (former Fort Ord) and the Monterey Peninsula. Approximately 300 AFY would be made available to the Monterey Peninsula with the remainder being supplied for redevelopment of Fort Ord. Additional facilities to store recycled water during winter would be needed to meet instantaneous summer-time demands and to increase the project yield to an envisioned 3,000 AFY. The MCWD recycled water system would service existing and new water users within the Fort Ord community and the City of Marina. Existing users’ irrigation systems would be disconnected from the potable water system and would tie directly into the new recycled water system.

With the exception of a winter storage reservoir, the project design is essentially complete, and much of the right-of-way for the pipelines has been acquired. Some sections of pipeline have already been installed as components of roadway projects constructed under the Fort Ord Reuse Plan.

The current market for recycled water from this project is approximately 550-700 AFY within the City of Seaside, CSUMB, and the City of Marina. The bulk of this (450 to 500 AFY) is the irrigation demand of the two City of Seaside golf courses.
Development fees from Fort Ord redevelopment projects are needed to help fund the project’s capital costs. The project is on hold at this time due to slow progress on redevelopment of the former Fort Ord. In the meantime MCWD and MRWPCA are seeking additional participants to increase the demand for recycled water to make the project economically feasible. It appears that the project is at least 3 to 5 years away from implementation.

The only direct benefit to the Seaside Basin from this project would be the reduction of pumping by the Seaside Golf Courses’ two wells that draw from the Seaside Basin. All of the other markets for the recycled water are currently served by water from the Salinas River Basin. Thus, if this project were to be implemented, it would have the potential of providing in-lieu replenishment of the Seaside Basin only by reducing pumping for the Seaside Golf Courses. It would not be a potential additional source of replenishment water for injection.

4. MRWPCA/MCWD Groundwater Replenishment Project (GWRP): This project would produce highly treated recycled water for use in replenishing the Seaside Basin. If it is deemed feasible, and can be completed on a schedule that is acceptable, Cal Am will include it as a part of the Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project and thereby reduce the size of its desalination plant. Cal Am’s Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project contains two plant size alternatives, one which has a 9,000 AFY seawater desalination plant, and a second one which has a 5,500 AFY desalination plant and a Groundwater Replenishment Project (GWRP) delivering 3,500 AFY of water for replenishment of the Seaside Basin.

With regard to the GWRP component of the second alternative, although there is not yet a formal water purchase agreement in place, institutional agreements are being pursued between MRWPCA, MPWMD, and Cal Am such that:

- MPWMD would enter into a Storage and Recovery Agreement with the Watermaster.
- MPWMD would buy recycled water from MRWPCA when that water is injected into the Seaside Basin. The purchase price for the recycled water would cover O&M, Capital Recovery, and Administrative expenses of MRWPCA and MPWMD.
- 6 months after injection occurs (in order to comply with State Department of Public Health requirements pertaining to groundwater replenishment) Cal-Am would purchase potable water from MPWMD and either withdraw it from the ground or leave it for withdrawal later.

This approach is very similar to the manner in which MPWMD financed the reclamation project at Carmel Area Wastewater District.

Providing additional water beyond the 3,500 AFY is not being considered in the EIR that MRWPCA is currently preparing for the GWRP. However, at the TAC’s May 2013 meeting MRWPCA reported that the GWRP might be capable of also providing an additional amount of water (perhaps on the order of 1,000 AFY) for replenishment of the Seaside Basin. In conjunction with this, MRWPCA reportedly is looking for sources of water to augment its decreasing influent flows of wastewater. Potential augmentation flows it is examining include stormwater flows from its member entities and the City of Salinas’ industrial wastewater flows currently being treated at that city’s industrial wastewater treatment plant.

If this additional water became available, it would be a potential additional source of replenishment water for injection.
## Attachment 2: Table 1. Replenishment Project Information for Use in Establishing the Replenishment Assessment Unit Costs for Water Year 2014 (October 1, 2013-September 30, 2014)

**WATER YEAR 2014 (October 1, 2013-September 30, 2014)**

### ANTICIPATED UNIT COSTS OF REPLENISHMENT WATER FOR THE SEASIDE BASIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POTENTIAL SOURCE OF REPLENISHMENT WATER</th>
<th>POTENTIAL DATE REPLENISHMENT WATER COULD BECOME AVAILABLE</th>
<th>POTENTIAL VOLUME OF WATER THAT COULD BE SUPPLIED BY THE PROJECT (AFY) (1)</th>
<th>LEVEL OF PROJECT DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>CONTINGENCY INCLUDED IN BASE UNIT COST (%)</th>
<th>BASE UNIT COST ($/AF)</th>
<th>BASE UNIT COST YEAR</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL CONTINGENCY ADDED TO REFLECT LEVEL OF PROJECT DEVELOPMENT (%)</th>
<th>UNIT COST INCLUDING ADDITIONAL CONTINGENCY ($/AF)</th>
<th>UNIT COST INFLATED @ 3% FROM COST BASIS YEAR TO YEAR REPLENISHMENT WATER COULD BECOME AVAILABLE ($/AF)</th>
<th>VOLUME-WEIGHTED AVG %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project (Regional Desalination) (4)</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>9,752</td>
<td>Project Report</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$3,507</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$3,507</td>
<td>$4,188</td>
<td>56.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaside Basin ASR Expansion (5)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>$2,502</td>
<td>$2,734</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project (6)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td>$2,476</td>
<td>17.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater Replenishment Project (GWRP) (7)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>20.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Quantity of Replenishment Water (AFY) the Listed Projects Could Cumulatively Potentially be Able to Produce Within the Next 10 Years (8) = 17,252

### FOOTNOTES:

1. For the Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project this is the total amount of water from this source which could potentially come to the CAW distribution system. Only a portion of this amount might be available as initially unused capacity that could be used to help replenish the Seaside Basin. For the RUWAP this is the total amount of water from this source. Only a portion of this amount might be used for in-lieu replenishment of the Seaside Basin. For the ASR Expansion Project this is the additional amount of water that could potentially be provided by this project (see footnote 5). For the RUWAP this is the total amount of water that this project is expected to produce. Only a portion of this amount might be used as in-lieu replenishment of the Seaside Basin. For the GWRP this is the quantity of water that is being considered at this time by CAW for inclusion in its Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project.

2.3 The following Contingency percentages were considered reasonable for the indicated levels of project development: Conceptual Level - 50%, Project Report Level - 30%, and Design Level - 15%. The sum of the values in the columns titled "Contingency Included in Base Unit Cost" and "Additional Contingency Added to Reflect Level of Project Development" equals the Contingency appropriate for the project's level of development.

4. Project data based on documents provided by Cal Am and MPWMD.

5. Project data provided by MPWMD. The 1,000 AFY of potential water that this project could supply would be in addition to the 1,300 AFY included as part of the Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project, and would be an annual average taking into account river flow and hydrologic conditions that change from year to year.

6. Project data provided by MCWD.

7. Project data provided by MRWPCA. MRWPCA reported that the GWRP quantity being used in the current CEQA documentation is 3,500 AFY, but that the project could potentially supply 6,500 AFY or more. The unit cost would be lower if a quantity larger than 3,500 AFY were produced.

8. This value is the cumulative production capacity of all of the Potential Sources of Replenishment Water that listed in this table, and is used only to determine the "Volume-Weighted Average." It is not the amount of water that is expected to be available to the Seaside Basin.
ITEM X.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

(NO ACTION REQUIRED)
# SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN WATERMASTER CRITICAL MILESTONE DATES

**ITEM X.A.**

## ANNUAL 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>Alternative Producers may change to Standard Production by March 27, 2009 (see amendment at right) by filing a declaration with the Court and with the other parties.</td>
<td>27-Mar-06</td>
<td>30-Sep-09</td>
<td>APA to SPA election amended to in perpetuity 12/12/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencing with the fourth Water Year and Triennially thereafter, the Operating Yield for both Subareas will be decreased by 10% until the Operating Yield is equivalent to the Natural Safe Yield unless by recharge or reclaimed water use results in a decrease in production of Native Water as required by the decision.</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>

## MONTHLY MILESTONES

- **January 15, 2010**: 15-Jan-10
- **January 15, 2011**: 15-Jan-11
- **January 15, 2012**: 15-Jan-12
- **January 15, 2013**: 15-Jan-13
- **January 15, 2014**: 15-Jan-14
- **January 15, 2015**: 15-Jan-15
- **January 15, 2016**: 15-Jan-16

## 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>Board Directives Terms</td>
<td>27-Mar-06</td>
<td>7-Nov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replenishment Assessments</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>Annual Report to Court</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>Replenishment Assessment Final Cost</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>
| MONTHLY MILESTONES

- **January 15, 2012**: 15-Jan-12
- **February 15, 2013**: 15-Feb-13
- **March 15, 2013**: 15-Mar-13
- **April 15, 2013**: 15-Apr-13
- **May 15, 2013**: 15-May-13
- **June 15, 2013**: 15-Jun-13
- **July 15, 2013**: 15-Jul-13
- **August 15, 2013**: 15-Aug-13
- **September 15, 2013**: 15-Sep-13
- **October 15, 2013**: 15-Oct-13
- **November 15, 2013**: 15-Nov-13
- **December 15, 2013**: 15-Dec-13

**SPECIAL ISSUES

- **2006-12**: Jul 13
- **2013**: Jan 13
- **2014**: Jan 13
- **2015**: Jan 13
- **2016**: Jan 13
ITEM NO. XI.

DIRECTOR’S REPORTS
ITEM NO. XII.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER

COMMENTS