SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN WATERMASTER
REGULAR BOARD MEETING AGENDA
WEDNESDAY, MAY 2, 2012 - 2:00 P.M.
MEETING LOCATION
MONTEREY REGIONAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY
BOARD ROOM, 5 HARRIS COURT, BUILDING “D”
“RYAN RANCH”
MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

WATERMASTER BOARD
Coastal Subarea Landowner – Director Paul Bruno, Chair
City of Seaside – Mayor Felix Bachofner, Vice Chair
City of Sand City – Mayor David Pendergrass
California American Water – Director Eric Sabolsice
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District – Director Bob Brower
Laguna Seca Subarea Landowner – Director Bob Costa
City of Monterey – Mayor Chuck Della Sala
City of Del Rey Oaks – Mayor Jerry Edelen
Monterey County/Monterey County Water Resources Agency – Supervisor Dave Potter, District 5

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

III. MINUTES
Two sets (2010-11 Board Term and 2012-2013 Board Term—Both held on February 1, 2012)

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 from January 1, 2012 through April 30, 2012 totaling $27,650.00
B. Consider Approving Fiscal Year Financial Reports through April 30, 2012

VII. ORAL PRESENTATION
None Scheduled

VIII. OLD BUSINESS
None
IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

   a). Discussion of a Potentially Making a Request to the Court Seeking a Temporary Suspension of Triennial Pumping Reductions

X. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS (No Action Required)

   A. Timeline Schedule of Milestone Dates (Critical date monitoring)
   B. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) minutes from January 11, March 14 and April 11, 2012 meetings
   C. Water Production Report for the First Quarter of Water Year 2012 (October 1st through December 31, 2011) and for the Second Quarter of Water Year 2012 (January 1, 2012 through March 31, 2012)

XI. DIRECTOR’S REPORTS

XII. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMENTS

XIII. NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE—JUNE 6, 2012 (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 April 27, 2012 per the Ralph M. Brown Act, Government Code Section 54954.2(a).
ITEM NO. III.

MINUTES
I. CALL TO ORDER
Chairman Bruno called the meeting to order at 2:01 p.m. in the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency Boardroom at 5 Harris Court, Building D, Monterey.

II. ROLL CALL
Coastal Subarea Landowner – Director Paul Bruno, Chair
California American Water (“CAW”) – Alternate Eric Sabolsice
City of Seaside – Mayor Felix Bachofner
City of Del Rey Oaks – Mayor Jerry Edelen
Laguna Seca Subarea Landowner – Bob Costa
City of Monterey – Mayor Charles “Chuck” Della Sala
City of Sand City – Mayor David Pendergrass
Monterey County/Monterey County Water Resources Agency (“MCWRA”) – Supervisor Dave Potter
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (“MPWMD”) – Director Bob Brower

Absent: California American Water (“CAW”) – Director Craig Anthony

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Moved by Mayor Bachofner, seconded by Director Costa, and unanimously carried to approve the minutes of the Watermaster Special Meeting held November 30, 2011.

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

V. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/ORAL COMMUNICATIONS
There were no oral or public communications.

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR
A. Consider approval of Summary for Payments made December 2011 totaling $69,653.12.

Moved by Supervisor Potter, seconded by Director Brower, and unanimously carried, to approve the consent calendar as presented.

VII. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS (No Action Required)
A. Replenishment Assessment calculations for WY 2011 Over-production.

VIII. There being no further business, Chairman Bruno adjourned the meeting at 2:06 p.m.
I. CALL TO ORDER
Chairman Bruno called the meeting to order at 2:07 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL
Coastal Subarea Landowner – Director Paul Bruno, Chair
California American Water (“CAW”) – Director Eric Sabolsice
City of Seaside – Mayor Felix Bachofner
City of Del Rey Oaks – Mayor Jerry Edelen
Laguna Seca Subarea Landowner – Bob Costa
City of Monterey – Mayor Charles “Chuck” Della Sala
City of Sand City – Mayor David Pendergrass
Monterey County/Monterey County Water Resources Agency (“MCWRA”) – Supervisor Dave Potter
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (“MPWMD”) – Director Bob Brower

Chair Bruno welcomed on behalf of the board new director Eric Sabolsice representing California American Water. Director Sabolsice would continue his appointment on the TAC and noted that Mr. Brian Bruce, operations manager recently transferred from CAW in Coronado, was the appointed alternate to the board and the TAC.

III. ELECTION AND APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2012
A. Chairperson – (must be a member of the Board of Directors)
B. Vice Chairperson – (must be a member of the Board of Directors)
C. Secretary – (need not be a member of the Board of Directors)
D. Treasurer – (need not be a member of the Board of Directors)

Moved by Mayor Edelen and seconded by Supervisor Potter to nominate Director Paul Bruno as Chairperson;
Moved by Mayor Edelen and seconded by Supervisor Potter to nominate Mayor Bachofner as Vice Chair;
Moved by Director Brower and seconded by Director Costa to nominate Watermaster CEO Dewey Evans as Secretary; and
Moved by Mayor Bachofner and seconded by Mayor Della Sala to nominate Daphne Hodgson, City of Seaside, as Treasurer.
The board voted unanimously to approve officer appointments as nominated.

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

V. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/ORAL COMMUNICATIONS
There were no public communications.

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR
A. Consider approval of Summary for Payments made during January 2012 totaling $6,600.00.

Moved by Mayor Edelen, seconded by Mayor Della Sala, and unanimously carried, to approve the consent calendar as presented.
VII. ORAL PRESENTATION: None scheduled.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS: None

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. Discussion/Consider appointment of members and designation of a chairperson for the Budget and Finance Committee. CEO Evans relayed that the Budget and Finance Committee recommended that the make-up of the committee remain the same: a representative from each CAW, City of Seaside, City of Sand City, and the Coastal Subarea Landowners since those parties were the ones subject to assessments by Watermaster.

Moved by Director Sabolsice, seconded by Mayor Bachofner, and unanimously carried, to approve the member make-up of the Budget and Finance Committee as a representative from each California American Water, City of Seaside, City of Sand City, and the Coastal Subarea Landowners.

Director Sabolsice appointed himself to be the CAW representative on the committee. Daphne Hodgson confirmed that she would be the City of Seaside representative on the committee.

Moved by Mayor Della Sala, seconded by Supervisor Potter, and unanimously carried, to approve the appointment of Daphne Hodgson as Budget and Finance Committee chairperson.

B. COMMITTEE REPORTS
   1. BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE
   a) Discuss and consider approval of California American Water’s Request to allow a credit for actual expenditures incurred in calendar year 2009 for pursuing the Coastal Water Project amounting to $5,425,799 to be used to offset the Watermaster Year 2010/2011 Over-production Replenishment Assessment. Chair Bruno stepped down at 2:10 p.m. and handed the gavel over to Vice Chair Bachofner during this agenda item due to his company having performed $2,000 to $3,000 of work for CAW on the project in 2009. He did not believe there was a conflict however he left the room during the item in the event anyone felt there was a conflict. There was no public comment on the matter. Mayor Bachofner inquired if there would be any harm to CAW if the board’s consideration of the credit request was postponed to sometime in the future after thorough public scrutiny of the Regional Water Project. Director Sabolsice pointed out that, per the Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”) between CAW and Watermaster, credit would be granted by Watermaster for any investments CAW has made in projects, not specifically the Regional Water Project, in pursuit of an alternative water project, which CAW had been and continued to work toward. He acknowledged that the credit request would not forgive CAW’s debt to the Basin beyond the Natural Safe Yield allocation, as outlined in the MOU. Mayor Pendergrass noted that the credit had been submitted to and approved previously by the Public Utilities Commission Department of Ratepayer Advocates.
Mayor Della Sala requested that, as a course of Watermaster practice, if this or any other item were to be continued to future meetings, specific questions be posed at the meeting where the continuance was requested for advance notice of what would be addressed at the subsequent meeting.

Moved by Director Brower, seconded by Mayor Pendergrass, and unanimously carried (with Chair Bruno recused) to approve the California American Water credit for actual expenditures incurred in calendar year 2009 for pursuing the Coastal Water Project amounting to $5,425,799 to be used to offset the Watermaster Year 2010/2011 Over-production Replenishment Assessment.

Chair Bruno resumed chairmanship at 2:27 p.m.

b) Discuss and consider approving the Memorandum of Understanding between the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, the Marina Coast Water District, the City of Seaside and the Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster regarding water used for irrigation of golf courses. There was no public comment on the matter. Chair Bruno advised the board that the Budget and Finance Committee at a recent meeting had recommended approval of the MOU.

Moved by Director Brower, seconded by Supervisor Potter, and unanimously carried, to approve the Memorandum of Understanding between the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, the Marina Coast Water District, the City of Seaside and the Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster regarding 68.8 acre-feet of water used for irrigation of golf courses.

X. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS (No Action Required)

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

XI. DIRECTORS’ REPORTS
Mayor Bachofner stated he would be conducting a file naming convention presentation to municipal clerks in February or March in an attempt to standardize formatting of agency documents, particularly agendas.

XII. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMENTS
The TAC had cancelled the February 8, 2012 meeting with the next scheduled meeting being March 14th. Nothing had been received from the Court yet in response to the Watermaster 2011 Annual Report to Court.

XIII. NEXT MEETING DATE – It was agreed that the next meeting would be a Regular Meeting held on Wednesday, March 7, 2012, at the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA) Board meeting room at 5 Harris Court, Building "D" on Ryan Ranch in Monterey at 2:00 p.m.

XIV. There being no further business, Chairman Bruno adjourned the meeting at 2:33 p.m.
ITEM NO. VI.

CONSENT CALENDAR
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Dewey D Evans, CEO

DATE: May 2, 2012

SUBJECT: Summary of Payment made during the period from January 1, 2012 through April 30, 2012

PURPOSE:

To advise the Board of payments made during the period from January 1, 2012 through April 30, 2012

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Consider approving the payment of bills submitted and paid during the period from January 1, 2012 through April 30, 2012.

COMMENTS and FISCAL IMPACT:

JANUARY, 2012

DDEvans Consulting (Professional Services Agreement-CEO)—December 26, 2011 through January 22, 2012 worked on Watermaster business a total of 47.5 hours at $100.00 per hour or $4,750.00. Responded to telephone inquiries, e-mail, and other correspondence as needed regarding the Seaside Basin. Updated e-mail file addresses; paid monthly bills. Prepared and sent out cancellation notice of January 4, 2012 regular Board meeting. Spent time on general year end cleanup work. Received, reviewed and processed water production reports for the quarter. Responded to Sierra Club inquiry. Prepared and sent out replenishment invoices to California American Water and the City of Seaside. Discussed and worked with Lori Girard at CalAm on replenishment assessment invoices. Prepared agenda for February 1, 2012 regular Board meeting. Received and reviewed TAC agenda packet. Discussions with Tim Miller and Lori Girard at CalAm on Sierra Club letter. Attended TAC meeting and follow up meeting with Joe Oliver, Bob Jaques, and Laura on City of Seaside’s replenishment assessment; email to CalAm regarding water level and water quality reporting problems. Sent out emails regarding Budget and Finance Committee meeting. Worked on February 1, 2012 Board meeting agenda packet.

Robert “Bob” Jaques (Technical Program Manager)—December 24, 2011 through January 23, 2012 worked on Watermaster business a total of 18.5 hours at $100.00 per hour or $1,850.00. Emails and telecons on variety of TAC issues including preparing agenda and agenda packet reports; emailed out TAC meeting posting notice. Prepared for and attended TAC meeting and post-meeting with CEO Evans, Laura Dadiw and Joe Oliver. Prepared January 11, 2012 TAC meeting minutes and emailed out for review. Prepared meeting materials for January 24th Database meeting and emailed out to attendees. Emails and telecons on TAC issues; review and edit letter to CalAm from the Watermaster.

Total for January, 2012 $6,600.00
FEBRUARY, 2012

**DD Evans Consulting** (Professional Services Agreement-CEO)—January 23, 2012 through February 21, 2012 worked on Watermaster business a total of 52.5 hours at $100.00 per hour or **$5,250.00**. Checked in at the office every weekday to respond to telephone calls, emails and other correspondence as needed regarding the Seaside Basin. Coordinated preparing the Budget and Finance Committee special meeting for January 25th; prepared and distributed the Budget and Finance Committee agenda packet and attended the meeting and worked on follow-up material as needed. Prepared the regular Board meeting agenda packet for the February 1, 2012 and sent out the meeting posting notices as required. Received and reviewed water production reports for the quarter. Processed RFS’s for MPWMD work for FY 2012. Attended and follow up work to February 1st regular Board meeting. Met with CalAm’s staff regarding replenishment assessment calculations.

**Robert “Bob” Jaques** (Technical Program Manager)—January 24, 2012 through February 26, 2012 worked on Watermaster business a total of 17.75 hours at $100.00 per hour or **$1,775.00**. Emails and telecons on variety of TAC issues. Reviewed and approved HydroMetrics invoices; reviewed materials from MPWMD and MRWPCA for next TAC meeting. Preparing TAC agenda packet. Prepared material and attended Database meeting; processed MPWMD RFSs. Prepared for and attended Watermaster Board meeting on February 1, 2012. Prepared and emailed notes from Database meeting to CEO. Preparing TAC agenda packet. Following work to February 1st regular Board meeting.

Total for February, 2012 **$7,025.00**

MARCH, 2012

**DD Evans Consulting** (Professional Services Agreement-CEO)—February 22, 2012 through March 23, 2012 worked on Watermaster business a total of 45.5 hours at $100.00 per hour or **$4,550.00**. Checked in at the office every weekday to respond to telephone calls, emails and other correspondence as needed regarding the Seaside Basin. Begin preparing agenda for March 7, 2012 Board meeting; paid bills and took same to City of Seaside for payment. Discussions with HydroMetrics and Bob Jaques on Basin water levels. Met with CAW’s Tina Haynes and Michael M. with Laura Dadiw regarding reporting of water production data. Discussion with Paul Bruno on March 7th Board meeting regular meeting and lack of sufficient agenda items and decided to cancel meeting. Prepared and sent out cancellation notices to public and Board members. Received and reviewed water production reports. Received and reviewed TAC agenda packet and discussed same with Bob Jaques; began preparing April 4th Board meeting agenda. Attended TAC meeting with Bob J. and Laura D. with follow-up discussions; sent out notice to water producers re: water levels and water production reports. Discussed cancellation of April 4th Board meeting with Paul Bruno; sent out cancellation notice to posting agencies and Board members.

**Robert “Bob” Jaques** (Technical Program Manager)—February 27, 2012 through March 31, 2012 worked on Watermaster business a total of 20.75 hours at $100.00 per hour or **$2,075.00**. Emails and telecons on variety of TAC and Watermaster issues. Prepared and sent out March 14, 2012 TAC agenda packet. Worked on getting well owner data formatted for posting to Watermaster website and emailed MPWMD for posting. Prepared for and attended TAC meeting and attended portion of Regional Water Forum at Oldemeyer Center in Seaside. Completed preparing March 14th TAC meeting minutes and mailed same to TAC members. Started work on April 11, 2012 TAC agenda items; began research on Local Groundwater Assistance Grants from DWR; discussions with R.
Dolan re: questions about Seaside Basin issues as they pertain to development of the new Regional Water Supply Project

**Paxton Imaging (Watermaster Web Site Coordinator) Monthly Hosting Unix Server for the months of January and February, 2012--$400.00.**

Total for March, 2012 $7,025.00

**APRIL, 2012**

**DD Evans Consulting (Professional Services Agreement—CEO—March 26, 2012 through April 23, 2012 worked on Watermaster business a total of 46.0 hours at $100.00 per hour or $4,600.00.**

Checked in at the office every weekday to respond to telephone calls, emails and other correspondence as needed regarding the Seaside Basin. Began preparing Board agenda for April 4th meeting; paid bills and took same to City of Seaside to be processed for payment. Discussions with Bob Jaques and Joe Oliver regarding water needs for the Basin. Reviewed and responded to MPWMD Dave Stoldt regarding general water needs and May meeting to discuss. Discussed LGA Grant with Bob Jaques and need to discuss with TAC at next meeting. Received, reviewing and discussions on quarterly water production reports with Laura, Joe Oliver and Bob as needed. Received and reviewed Seaside Basin water replenishment correspondence from Bob Jaques and Roger Dolan. Sent out cancellation notice of April 4th Board meeting. Working on May 2nd Board meeting agenda. Received TAC agenda, read and reviewed with Bob J. Attended April 11 TAC meeting. Sent out plea for agenda items for May 2nd Board meeting. Discussion regarding HydroMetrics doing modeling work for TAC agenda item. Received and reviewed TAC meeting agenda minutes for April 11th meeting.

**Robert “Bob” Jaques (Technical Program Manager)—April 2, 2012 through April 23, 2012 worked on Watermaster business a total of 18.0 hours at $100.00 per hour or $1,800.00.**

Responded to emails and telecons on a variety of TAC issues. Reviewed and edit HydroMetrics scope/costs for modeling RFS and emailed to them for review and acceptance. Worked on April 11, 2012 TAC agenda packet; prepared RFS for HydroMetrics modeling work. Emailed TAC agenda packet and public posting notices; Met with Joe Oliver regarding Local Groundwater Assistance Grant issues. Prepared for and attended the TAC meeting on April 11, 2012; Prepared and emailed out TAC meeting minutes. Prepared Board meeting agenda transmittal for May 2, 2012 regular Board meeting.

**Paxton Imaging (Watermaster Web Site Coordinator) Monthly Hosting Unix for the month of March, 2012--$200.00.**

**HydroMetrics Water Resources, Inc.—Invoiced for 2.5 hours or $400.00 for general consulting and attending TAC meeting by conference call on March 14, 2012.**

Total for April, 2012 $7,000.00

Grand total for the period from January 1, 2012 through April 30, 2012 $27,650.00
VI.B
5/2/2012

Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster

Budget vs. Actual Administrative Fund
Fiscal Year (January 1 - December 31, 2012)
Balance through April 30, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Balances &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>2012 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 (Rollover)</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
<td>74,595.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY Assessments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available</td>
<td>85,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>99,595.00</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>19,150.00</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>19,150.00</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>

Administrative Fund Assessments owed by City of Seaside
FY 2011 (including 5% penalty) 6,804
## Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster

**Budget vs. Actual Monitoring & Management - Operations Fund**

**Fiscal Year (January 1 - December 31, 2012)**

**Balance through April 30, 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Balances &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>2012 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 2011 Rollover</td>
<td>$337,954.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$372,996.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available</td>
<td>$337,954.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$372,996.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations &amp; Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency @ 20% (not including TPM )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total General</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSULTANTS (Hydrometrics; Web Site Database)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production/Lvl/Qlty Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin Management Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Consultants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPWMD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production/Lvl/Qlty Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seawater Intrusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MPWMD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer Out to Capital Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Appropriations & Expenses | $297,504.00 | $204,744.00 | $8,500.00 |
| Total Available | $40,450.00 |

**Operations Fund Assessments owed by City of Seaside FY 2011 (including 5% penalty)**

| 26,463 |
|--------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|
| Assessments:       |      |      |      |      |      |      |                        |             |                                  |
| WY 05/06           |      |      |      |      |      |      |                        |             |                                  |
| WY 06/07           |      |      |      |      |      |      |                        |             |                                  |
| WY 07/08           |      |      |      |      |      |      |                        |             |                                  |
| WY 08/09           |      |      |      |      |      |      |                        |             |                                  |
| WY 09/10           |      |      |      |      |      |      |                        |             |                                  |
| WY 10/11           |      |      |      |      |      |      |                        |             |                                  |
| Totals Through WY 2011 |      |      |      |      |      |      |                        |             |                                  |
| Totals Through WY 2012 |      |      |      |      |      |      |                        |             |                                  |
| Unit Cost:          |      |      |      |      |      |      |                        |             |                                  |
| $1,132             | $1,132 |      |      |      |      |      | $1,132                 | $1,132      |                                  |
| $2,485             | $2,485 |      |      |      |      |      | $2,485                 | $2,485      |                                  |
| $3,040             | $3,040 |      |      |      |      |      | $3,040                 | $3,040      |                                  |
| $2,780             | $2,780 |      |      |      |      |      | $2,780                 | $2,780      |                                  |
| $2,780             | $2,780 |      |      |      |      |      | $2,780                 | $2,780      |                                  |
| California American Water Balance Forward | $1,641,004 | $4,206,475 | $2,900,435 | $2,868,685 | $3,850,964 | ($6,088,910) | $24,149,725 | $24,149,725 |                                  |
| Operating Yield Overproduction Replenishment | 80,938 | 34,045 |      |      |      | 114,983 |      | 114,983 |                                  |
| CAW Credit Against Assessment | (465,648) | (12,305,924) | (5,095,213) | (5,425,799) | (27,034,298) | - | (27,034,298) | - |                                  |
| CAW Unpaid Balance | $1,641,004 | $4,206,475 | $2,900,435 | $2,868,685 | $3,850,964 | ($6,088,910) | ($6,088,910) | ($2,769,590) | ($2,769,590) |
| City of Seaside Balance Forward | $ - | $230,671 | $413,454 | $1,106,116 | $1,737,569 | $988,414 | $ (13,109) |                                  |
| City of Seaside Municipal | 332.0 AF | 287.7 AF | 294.3 AF | 293.4 AF | 282.9 AF | 240.7 AF |                        |             |                                  |
| Exceeding Natural Safe Yield Considering Alternative Producers | 169,200 | 173,739 | 385,642 | 399,211 | 231,961 | 141,335 | $1,501,088 | 369,175 | $1,870,263 |
| Operating Yield Overproduction Replenishment | 50,487 | 340 | 16,898 | 66,090 | 82,761 | - | 216,575 | 56,786 | 273,361 |
| Total Municipal | 219,687 | 174,079 | 402,540 | 465,300 | 314,721 | 141,335 | 1,717,663 | 425,961 | 2,143,624 |
| City of Seaside - Golf Courses | - | - | 131,705 | 69,701 | - | - | 201,406 | - | 201,406 |
| Operating Yield Overproduction Replenishment | - | - | 131,705 | 69,701 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total Golf Courses | - | - | 263,410 | 139,402 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total City of Seaside* | $219,687 | $174,079 | $665,950 | $604,702 | $314,721 | $141,335 | $2,120,475 | $425,961 | $2,546,436 |
| City of Seaside Late Payment 5% | 10,984 | 8,704 | 26,712 | 26,750 | 15,737 | 88,887 | - | - | 88,887 |
| In-lieu Credit Against Assessment* | - | - | - | - | $1,079,613 | (1,142,858) | (2,222,471) | - | (2,222,471) |
| City of Seaside Unpaid Balance | $230,671 | $413,454 | $1,106,116 | $1,737,569 | $988,414 | $ (13,109) | $412,852 | $412,852 |                                  |
| Total Replenishment Fund Balance | $1,871,675 | $4,619,929 | ($1,794,319) | ($1,131,116) | ($2,862,551) | ($6,102,019) | ($6,102,019) | ($2,356,738) | ($2,356,738) |

* 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
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

DATE: May 2, 2012

SUBJECT: Discussion of Potentially Making a Request to the Court Seeking a Temporary Suspension of the Triennial Pumping Reductions

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that the Board direct legal counsel to communicate with the Court to determine the Court’s willingness to consider temporarily suspending triennial pumping reductions, if groundwater modeling shows that doing so will have negligible adverse impacts on the Seaside Groundwater Basin.

BACKGROUND:

At the March and April 2012 TAC meetings there was discussion regarding the potential benefits of seeking a temporary suspension of the triennial pumping reductions required by the Seaside Groundwater Basin Adjudication Decision. The purpose of this suspension would be to lessen the impacts of potentially severe water rationing and water conservation measures that could be imposed on users within the California American Water (CAW) system in their Monterey District, if the time schedule in the Cease and Desist Order (CDO) issued by the SWRCB regarding the amount of water that CAW can withdraw from the Carmel River Basin cannot be met.

DISCUSSION

Required Reductions in Carmel River Water Diversions: The CDO is SWRCB Order WR 2009-0060, issued in October 2009. Under the CDO by WY 2016 CAW’s allowable water diversions from the Carmel River will be reduced to 9,318 AFY. This is a 17% reduction (1,967 AF) from the 11,285 AFY of annual Carmel River diversions that have been previously allowed. By WY 2017, CAW diversions may total only 3,376 AFY, which is its defined legal water right. This is a 70% (7,909 AF) reduction from the 11,285 AFY previously allowed.

Potential Impacts on Users: If these reductions in water diversion are not met by the water conservation measures currently in effect (Stage 1 of MPWMD’s Expanded Water Conservation and Standby Rationing Plan) and other measures being taken by CAW, then more severe water rationing and water conservation measures will have to be imposed to reduce CAW’s take of water from the Carmel River Basin to the maximum extent possible. Depending on a number of conditions and circumstances, Stage 5 of MPWMD’s Plan might need to be imposed. This would essentially have the following impacts on users:

- For single-family residential use, there would be a usage limit of 70 gallons per day per person, regardless of the size of the home or landscaping.
- Multi-family residential users (apartment dwellers) would receive a ration of 45 gallons per day per person.
• Commercial businesses, public uses and golf courses would also be required to reduce their use to help meet the reduction goals.
• In addition to these impacts under the MPWMD Plan, there could be a moratorium on Water Permits for new construction and remodels, and fines could be levied by the State if pumping limits are exceeded.

Triennial Pumping Reductions Imposed by the Seaside Basin Adjudication Decision: The Decision adjudicating the Seaside Basin requires that there be a 10% reduction in pumping by Standard Producers (which includes CAW) every three years until the 3,000 AFY “natural safe yield” of the Seaside Basin is achieved. These 10% reductions amount to 560 AFY every three years.

A temporary suspension in these pumping reductions to allow continued pumping at the levels which were authorized prior to the last 10 percent pumping cutback (which went into effect on October 1, 2011), and to maintain pumping allowances at that level until WY 2018 (which begins on October 1, 2017) would alleviate approximately 2 x 560 = 1,120 AFY of cutbacks, including the cutback currently scheduled to occur in 2014.

Rationale for Making a Request to Temporarily Suspend Triennial Reductions in Pumping from the Seaside Basin: To date no evidence of seawater intrusion, or even the imminent onset of seawater intrusion, has been detected in the Seaside Basin. However, in the Carmel River Basin, evidence of adverse impacts from current levels of water diversion from the River has been documented. Thus, there exists a current condition in the Carmel River Basin which requires that water diversions be reduced, whereas in the Seaside Basin no such condition currently exists. Temporarily suspending the 10% pumping reductions in the Seaside Basin until WY 2018 (which begins on October 1, 2017) would help to reduce the adverse impacts of water rationing and water conservation measures that may have to be imposed while CAW implements a project to reduce its Carmel River Basin diversions to comply with the CDO.

TAC Recommendations: Following lengthy discussions on this matter the TAC voted in favor of recommending that the Board pursue contacting the Court to determine the Court’s willingness to consider temporarily suspending triennial pumping reductions, if groundwater modeling shows that doing so will have negligible adverse impacts on the Seaside Groundwater Basin.

If the Board makes this request to the Court, and if the Court responds favorably, the TAC further recommends that groundwater modeling be performed to determine the impacts on the Basin of temporarily suspending the pumping reductions. A contract with HydroMetrics, the Watermaster’s consultant on groundwater modeling, would be presented to the Board at a future meeting for its approval before authorizing the modeling to be done. The cost of this modeling will be approximately $31,000. This work was not included in the FY 2012 Budget, but there is sufficient funding within the Contingency line item in the M&MP Operations Budget to cover these costs.

The TAC recognizes that there is considerable cost involved in doing this modeling work, and therefore recommends that the Court initially be asked if it will consider temporarily suspending the triennial pumping reductions if groundwater modeling shows that doing so will have little to no impact on the Seaside Basin. While there is no assurance that the modeling work would find that there is little to no impact on the Basin by temporarily suspending the pumping reductions, using this approach would at least ensure that the Court was receptive to the request before expending funds to perform the modeling work.
ITEM X.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

(NO ACTION REQUIRED)
<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>
<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-07</td>
<td>APA to SPA election amended to its perpetuity 12/12/2009</td>
<td>100% of the Operating Yield of 5,040 decreased 10% another 10% of 5,600 on Oct 1, 2011</td>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commemorating 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 recharge or reclaimed water use results in a decrease in production of Native Water as required by the decision.

After the close of each Water Year, the Watermaster will determine and levy a Replenishment Assessment against all Producers that incurred Operating Yield Over Production during the Water Year, with payment due from Producer 40 days after the mailing of a statement for the assessment by Watermaster.

California American Water to submit annually to Watermaster any augmentation to water supply for possible credit toward Replenishment Assessment

Water level monitoring - monthly data collection from all members for inclusion in the consolidated database.

Water quality monitoring - yearly data collection from all members for inclusion in consolidated database.

California American Water to submit annually to Watermaster any augmentation to water supply for possible credit toward Replenishment Assessment

Administrative Assessments 2011 City of Seaside Not Recvd

Operations Assessments 2011 City of Seaside Not Recvd

Capital Assessments 2009 City of Seaside Not Recvd

Replenishment Assessments Seaside In-Lieu Offset in progress

Develop Repl Assessment Unit Cost 52,780 - Same as last yr

Replenishment Assessments CAW credit CAW credit CAW credit CAW credit CAW credit

Annual Report to Court 15-Nov 15-Nov 15-Nov 23-Dec 8-Dec

<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>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjudication ordered by Court and filed</td>
<td>27-Mar-06</td>
<td>7-Nov</td>
<td>15-Jan-10</td>
<td>15-Jan</td>
<td>15-Jan</td>
<td>15-Jan</td>
<td>15-Jan</td>
<td>15-Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fiscal Year tentative budgets distribution to all parties

Operating Yield of 5,600 decreased 10% ; Declaration of Replenishment Water Available

Administrative Assessments 2011 City of Seaside Not Recvd

Operations Assessments 2011 City of Seaside Not Recvd

Capital Assessments 2009 City of Seaside Not Recvd

Replenishment Assessments Seaside In-Lieu Offset in progress

Development Board Regular Meeting Schedule 2012

SUMMARY PROJECT SCHEDULE (See detailed project schedule for more information)
The meeting was called to order at 1:38 p.m. by Richard Simonitch who filled in as Chairman of this meeting for the 1st and 2nd Vice Chairmen who were unable to attend.

1. **Public Comments**

   There were no public comments.

2. **Administrative Matters:**

   A. **Approve Minutes from November 9, 2011 Meeting**

   There was some discussion regarding the topic of CAW wells having in the past been located near the Sand City Public Works Well, and the topic of including a listing of possible cross-contamination wells in the next SIAR. However, no changes to the Draft Minutes were requested on either of these topics. It was agreed that the issue of cross-contamination wells would be discussed when MPWMD makes its report on its investigation of wells for possible cross-aquifer contamination in the Spring of 2012.

   Mr. Oliver requested that the word “…difference…” be inserted after the words “hydraulic head” in the last sentence in the last paragraph under Agenda item number 6.
On a motion by Mr. Costa, seconded by Mr. Simonitch, the Minutes were unanimously approved with this correction.

3. **Progress Report on Implementing Changes to the Inputting and Management of Data in the Watermaster Database**
Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials for this item. An update will be provided at the next TAC meeting. Mr. Jaques confirmed with other members of the MPWMD and Watermaster staff that they could meet on January 24 @ 10:30 a.m. at the MPWMD offices to finalize plans for going live with the Database on the Watermaster website.

4. **Further Discussion of Issues Pertaining to MRWPCA’s Groundwater Replenishment Project**
Mr. Jaques summarized the Staff Report for this item and suggested that each topic be touched on to provide an opportunity for questions and answers to be discussed. There was considerable discussion on many of the topics listed in the agenda materials. Rather than attempting to capture all of the discussion in the Minutes, Mr. Jaques suggested that he prepare a revised version of the “Discussion Paper on Ground Water Replenishment Project” contained in the agenda packet starting on page 18, and this approach was concurred with by the TAC.

The revised version of this document reflecting the TAC’s requested additions and clarifications/errors to the original version is attached at the end of these Minutes. Revisions made in response to TAC input are shown in **bold italics** therein.

Ms. Thomasberg asked Mr. Holden to provide her a copy of Amendment No. 3 to the MOA between MCWRA and MRWPCA, referred to under this agenda item. Mr. Holden said he would email her a copy.

5. **Schedule**
Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials for this item Mr. Riedl asked when budget preparation was shown on the Schedule. Mr. Jaques responded that they were shown at ID Nos. 3, 4, and 5 in August.

6. **Other Business**
Mr. Simonitch asked what items were proposed for the TAC’s February meeting. Mr. Jaques responded that at this time the only item would probably be an update on implementing the changes to the Watermaster’s Database.

Other topics raised for consideration at future TAC meetings included:
- Diversion of Salinas River water to help replenish the Seaside Groundwater Basin or to directly augment the Monterey Peninsula’s drinking water supply (suggested by Mr. Riedl)
- Hydraulically connecting the Nacimiento and San Antonio Reservoirs with a tunnel and building another equalizing reservoir to help meet the water demands of the agricultural growers as a means of facilitating such a diversion of Salinas River Water (suggested by Mr. Simonitch)
- Examining the Blanco Drain and the Salinas Industrial Ponds as possible additional replenishment water sources for the Seaside Groundwater Basin (suggested by Mr. Riedl)
- Examining MPWMD projects that might be helpful in replenishing the Seaside Groundwater Basin (suggested by Mr. Riedl)

23
Mr. Jaques said he would contact these Committee members to gain a more complete understanding of these potential TAC agenda topics, and to see if they could be developed as agenda items by the February TAC meeting date.

If there will be insufficient agenda items to warrant holding a February TAC meeting, Mr. Jaques will notify the TAC members via email and will suggest cancelling the February meeting.

7. Set Next Meeting Date
The next meeting date was set for Wednesday February 8, 2012 at 1:30 p.m. at the MRWPCA Board Room

On a motion by Mr. Oliver, seconded by Mr. Riedl, the meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.
DISCUSSION PAPER ON GROUND WATER PREPLENISHMENT PROJECT
(Revised to reflect TAC input from January 11, 2012 meeting)

**Question:** Does the CSIP project, or anyone else, have any rights to the recycled water being proposed to be delivered to the Seaside Basin? If so, what are their rights and are they superior?

**Response:** MRWPCA has rights, set forth in Amendment No. 3 of its Memorandum of Understanding with MCWRA, to 3,900 AFY (including 766 AFY during the summer) plus water not used by MCWRA. *These are superior rights that cannot be usurped by another party.*

By the Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project (RUWAP) Memorandum of Understanding with MCWD, MRWPCA dedicates its 766 AFY of summer water to the RUWAP project including the Peninsula.

The Three-Party Memorandum of Understanding between MCWRA, MCWD, and MRWPCA identifies that there is about 6,000 AFY of water available for reuse during winter months. *Storage would need to be provided in order to provide more than 766 AF during summer months.* Both the RUWAP and Three-Party MOUs highlight and prioritize the groundwater replenishment project. MRWPCA thus has rights to more than enough advance treated wastewater to provide 2,700 AFY for the GWRP.

The total amount of recycled water that can be produced is the sum of the 3,900 and 6,000 AF amounts mentioned above, for a total potential production of 9,900 AFY.

**Question:** Can water from the Salinas River project be diverted through the proposed system and delivered to the Seaside Basin?

**Response:** No, not without obtaining water rights from the County, performing an environmental review, obtaining necessary permits and approvals, and designing/constructing completely new facilities. *MCWRA’s enabling legislation prohibits exporting water from the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin.*

Per CDPH requirements, the Advanced Water Treatment (AWT) facilities proposed for the GWRP can only be used to treat water of wastewater origin, and cannot also be used to provide treatment to produce drinking water. *Thus, while Salinas River water could potentially be used as a source of drinking water, that treatment would have to be done by a separate treatment facility from the AWT facility for the GWRP.*

The California Department of Public Health's (CDPH's) groundwater injection standards are much more stringent than drinking water standards. Therefore, it would be more economical to treat the river water so that it would become drinking water directly and pump it through potable water pipelines to the south where it could be used.

Excess drinking water from the Salinas river, when and if available, could be injected into MPWMD's/CAW's ASR wells within the Seaside Groundwater Basin. *This is because the ASR wells can inject and recover drinking quality water, but for a project that intends to inject water for replenishment only, CDPH imposes more stringent standards.*
**Question:** Is there potential for a water wheeling agreement where the proposed dilution water for this project is instead delivered to the CSIP project, and wastewater (or alternatively Salinas Basin water?) is delivered to the Seaside Basin in the summer months?

**Response:** No. CDPH's previous draft groundwater replenishment regulations required dilution water, but the most current draft of these regulations encourage but do not require dilution water.

MRWPCA will try to get injection approved without dilution water. If unsuccessful, MRWPCA will try to get credit for most or all of any required dilution water by seeking credit for the natural seaward flow of water within the Seaside Groundwater Basin. Additional dilution water, if required, will have to be applied in the vicinity of the replenishment water.

MRWPCA is looking at Blanco Drain and Salinas Industrial Pond waters both as sources of dilution water and sources of additional replenishment water. However, the Blanco Drain and Industrial Pond waters are both high in salt content, and both are unsuitable for recycling for agricultural irrigation.

**CDPH regulations require that the dilution water be applied near the injection sites within a 5-year running average period. Dilution water is rarely directly mixed with the AWT water before being injected.**

*Water discharged from food processing industries where vegetables are being rinsed is not directly suitable for reuse because such water also contains other wastes which render the water too salty for reuse.*

**Question:** Has a feasibility study of alternatives been performed. For example, what is the cost of delivering the proposed dilution water, without the treated wastewater, to the Seaside Basin?

**Response:** As part of the Coastal Water Project EIR, MRWPCA provided information about other sources of water and other locations for injection. However, it does not appear that any costs were developed for those sources.

The other sources of water are mostly available during the growing season. They would therefore require a separate pumping and piping system from the Salinas Valley to Seaside (not the RUWAP system), since the RUWAP system would be delivering recycled water for landscape and golf course irrigation during the summer months.

These options would add capital costs to the GWRP, but would provide more water to the Seaside Groundwater Basin and may reduce the cost per acre-foot for that water.

**Question:** What quantity of dilution water could be delivered to the Seaside Basin?

**Response:** The dilution waters investigated by MRWPCA, if needed or desired, are only available during the growing season. As noted in the response to the question immediately above, this means that a separate pumping and piping system would be required (not the RUWAP system).

The volume available could be up to about 3,000 acre-feet per year (AFY) of additional water or 5,700 AFY total (dilution water plus advance treated wastewater).
**Question:** If the proposed injection wells have insufficient capacity, is it feasible to accumulate the treated water for future injection? Could the Seaside golf course reservoir be used for this purpose?

**Response:** The limiting factors for the GWRP are the size of the RUWAP facilities and the size of the Advanced Water Treatment facilities. The GWRP injection wells will be designed to provide all of the injection capacity that will be needed, so there will be no reason to store the advance treated wastewater.

Injection wells are very expensive but they are less expensive than the treatment and conveyance facilities. MRWPCA plans on building excess injection capacity.

Any storage of water, especially in an open reservoir such as the Seaside Golf Course reservoir, introduces the potential for contamination which could render the water unusable for injection.

**Question:** Could the proposed treatment system be installed near the proposed injection wells in Seaside? If so, and if necessary, could this treatment system be used to treat potentially brackish water in the future from the Seaside aquifer?

**Response:** Yes. Treatment facilities for the GWRP could be located near the injection wells, and could be fed with recycled water pumped through RUWAP or fed with raw wastewater from MRWPCA’s Seaside Pump Station. In either case, four dedicated pipelines would be required:

1. One pipeline would provide the input water from the RUWAP or the Seaside Pump Station.
2. The second pipeline would provide the product water from the treatment facilities to the injection wells.
3. A third pipeline would be a brine pipeline (Reverse Osmosis concentrate) from the advanced water treatment facilities back to the Regional Treatment Plant Brine Receiving Structure.
4. The fourth pipeline would carry the microfiltration backwash to the sanitary sewer system.

*Note that pipelines 3 and 4 cannot be combined into a single pipeline because the high salinity of the brine flow makes it unacceptable for discharge into the sanitary sewer. The high salinity waste needs to go to the brine discharge facility at the Regional Treatment Plant which flows directly to the outfall and does not go through the treatment process or to the recycling facility there.*

The raw sewage option (from the Seaside Pump Station) would result in less replenishment due to the lack of sufficient sewage flowrates and its uneven distribution during the day. The recycled water option might be able to provide 2,700 AFY, but it would take more than the five months to provide this volume.

Neither option would allow for dilution water or for additional injection water. Also, the advanced water treatment facilities would be more expensive to construct and operate if they were located in Seaside because it would not be possible to comingle infrastructure with the Regional Treatment Plant, and full buildings (not with just roofs) would be necessary to reduce noise so it does not impact nearby residential and/or commercial land uses.
A brine pipeline would be less expensive than a dedicated replenishment pipeline, but it would not be available to convey dilution water or summer replenishment water. However, if a brine pipeline was built, the advanced water treatment facilities could potentially treat brackish water from the Seaside aquifer during the summer months for groundwater injection, but not directly for drinking water.

Constructing the advanced water treatment facilities in Seaside would be a new project on an undisrupted (prime development) site, and would require a full EIR and a new power source. This facility would require frequent chemical deliveries and other activities that might be viewed as nuisances to the nearby residential and/or commercial land uses.

Question: Is there anything that would limit the Watermaster's ability to accept the water? If so, are there additional steps that the TAC should undertake now to remove the impediments?
Response: MRWPCA is not aware of any impediments at this time that would limit the Watermaster’s ability to accept the water.

In order for the GWRP to be approved and implemented, it would have to obtain permits and approvals from CDPW, Monterey County Environmental Health, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), among others. The Watermaster’s “Agreement for Storage and Recovery of Non-Native Water from the Seaside Groundwater Basin,” which was approved by the Watermaster’s Board in June 2010, contains the following language regarding the quality of water that is proposed for storage and recovery in the Basin:

“The PRODUCER hereby certifies that prior to the Non-Native water being introduced into the Basin for Storage in accordance with this Agreement, all such water will meet all of the requirements imposed on the PRODUCER by permits and/or approvals issued to the PRODUCER by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board and any other water quality standards imposed by any other government entity, including without limitation the California Department of Public Health and the Monterey County Department of Environmental Health.”

These permits and approvals would be necessary in order for the GWRP to be implemented, so the water quality would meet the Watermaster’s storage and recovery quality requirements and should be fully acceptable to the Watermaster for injection into the Basin.

Question: If, as suggested by the MPWMD, the MPWMD purchases the water, would it benefit the Seaside Basin? Or will the water be used to offset the Carmel diversions?
Response: MRWPCA commented that MPWMD has proposed to MRWPCA that if they purchased the water it would be much easier for them to inject the water into the basin than it would be for MRWPCA. MRWPCA has not discussed with MPWMD how they would administer the water after injection.

MPWMD commented that this issue should be thought of in five contexts:
1. Until the unlawful diversions from the Carmel River have been replaced, then it is likely that this resource would be delivered to Cal Am for retail delivery and applied to offset those diversions;

2. Once the unlawful diversions have been replaced, then the water could be delivered to Cal Am, but the Watermaster might direct that some portion of it be retained to replenish the deficit in the Basin. The economics of "who pays?" would have to be worked out.

3. MPWMD could proceed with the project for an extended period of time without offsetting Carmel River diversions or delivering the water to Cal Am by instead using 100% of the output for the benefit of the Basin. However, the cost of the water would have to be covered by Replenishment Assessments from Watermaster producers. Or conceivably, a producer could choose to pay for this water and use in lieu recharge by not pumping its Basin allotment. This concept needs more analysis to see if it could actually be implemented. In addition, if no Replenishment Assessments can be collected because of the offsetting credits for costs incurred on the Regional Water Supply Project, then this option may be unworkable.

4. A scenario could be envisioned where any producer in the Basin could buy the water, over and above its adjudicated allotment, and the Watermaster might direct that some portion of it be retained to replenish the deficit in the Basin. The economics of this would have to be worked out, and the Watermaster would have to be involved, in order to ensure the adjudicated withdrawal limits are being met first and the new water is additive.

5. Finally, there exists the possibility that MPWMD could sell the water for a period of time to a non-Cal Am user for a non-Cal Am purpose, but this would likely require wheeling by Cal Am and would be complex in nature. However, a good example of this might be where the Regional Water Supply Project is not yet online and in order to meet its obligations to the Pebble Beach reclamation project MPWMD would seek to wheel water for a period of time to the project area without being subject to rationing by Cal Am.

**Question:** What, if anything, can the Watermaster TAC do to help expedite the project?

**Response:** MRWPCA commented that the Watermaster has already helped the GWRP by providing $100,000 in funding to MRWPCA during the Coastal Water Project EIR. MRWPCA went on to comment that ways the Watermaster could help in the future include:

- Additional Planning Money
- Use of the Watermaster's Groundwater Model and water quality/elevation data
- Help with the bureaucratic hurdles
- Letters of support for grant and loan applications

The Watermaster is currently not receiving Replenishment Assessment monies, because it has agreements with both Cal Am and the City of Seaside to grant them credits against their assessments. For Cal Am the credits are for the monies Cal Am invests in the Coastal Water Project. For Seaside the credits are for their in-lieu replenishment of the Basin by using water from MCWD to irrigate their golf courses. Thus, at this time there is no money available from the Watermaster to help fund additional planning for the GWRP.
The Watermaster would likely be able and willing to assist in these other ways, subject to approval and direction by the Watermaster Board.
The meeting was called to order at 1:39 p.m.

1. Public Comments
There were no public comments.

2. Administrative Matters:
   A. Approve Minutes from January 11, 2011 Meeting
On a motion by Mr. Simonitch, seconded by Mr. Oliver, the Minutes were unanimously approved as presented.

3. Progress Report on Implementing Changes to the Inputting and Management of Data in the Watermaster Database
Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials for this item.

Mr. Simonitch asked if any follow-up sampling had been done with regard to the high chloride levels found in the Sand City Public Works well. Mr. Oliver responded that this well has always
been an "outlier." He reported that it was resampled and the resample chloride value was lower than the initial sample chloride value. Mr. Oliver reported that prior CAW wells in this general vicinity also had higher chloride levels before they were abandoned.

Mr. Oliver recommended that this well will continue to be monitored, and that this should be done on a quarterly rather than a semi-annual basis.

Mr. Riedl suggested agendizing this matter for further discussion at a future date. Mr. Oliver recommended that this be done in May when the next data will be available.

Mr. Lear suggested that how the well was completed also be examined and reported on. Ms. King offered to assist Mr. Lear and Mr. Oliver in this matter. Mr. Oliver said he would coordinate with CAW to see if water quality data from their abandoned wells would be available.

Ms. King said that the 2011 Production data appears to be distorted on the web site. Mr. Jaques said he would look into this and have the problem corrected.

Mr. Riedl asked if a hit counter was in operation on the web site. Mr. Jaques said he believed that one was, but his experience was that it was not possible to tell exactly what the visitor to the web site was interested in based on the information provided by the hit counter.

### 4. Update on Coastal Water Project

With Mr. Sabolsice gave an oral update on the Coastal Water Project. He reported that on April 23rd CAW must file an application with the Public Utilities Commission for an Order to move forward with a new project. CAW is currently meeting with entities to select the best component or components to be included in the recommended project. He said that tonight there will be a public meeting with CAW, MPWMD, MRWPCA and others to discuss various proposals. There will be break-out groups for more detailed discussions.

He said that CAW is still evaluating options, which include ASR, GWR, and desalination. The size of the desalination plant will be influenced by how much water can be reliably supplied by the two other sources.

CAW estimates it will take approximately one year for this process to be completed. One specific project must be proposed, not multiple possible projects, but the one project may include multiple components.

Mr. Costa asked Mr. Sabolsice what the role would be of the recently formed Mayors Joint Powers Authority. Mr. Sabolsice responded that they could speak with a collective voice on behalf of the cities, conduct technical reviews, and provide other input. Their long-term role is still evolving.

Mr. Riedl asked Mr. Sabolsice if CAW could proceed "at risk" prior to Public Utilities Commission approval. Mr. Sabolsice responded yes, but that this was not the recommended course of action.

Mr. Riedl asked if the public could help expedite the project, so it would not be overly delayed. Mr. Sabolsice responded that public support would be very helpful.
Mr. Costa asked Mr. Sabolsice if there was any way the project could get completed by 2016. Mr. Sabolsice said the schedule is currently being developed with the objective of having the project completed by December 2016, which is when a major cutback in CAW's taking of water from the Carmel Basin must occur.

Mr. Sabolsice then posed the question of whether the Watermaster should go to the Judge and ask to allow well owners to continue pumping for an additional three to four years at current Operating Yield levels without imposing further triennial reductions, since seawater intrusion has not yet been experienced or detected in the Seaside Groundwater Basin. If the Judge were willing to grant such a request, the severe conservation and rationing that will otherwise have to be imposed could be reduced in severity. Mr. Sabolsice suggested that the TAC consider this and potentially make a recommendation to the Board on this matter.

Mr. Sabolsice encouraged TAC members to go to the public forum that will be held tonight at the Oldemeyer Center in Seaside.

5. Further Discussion of Issues Pertaining to Obtaining Water to Help Replenish the Seaside Basin

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

Mr. Sabolsice suggested that if a project was deemed to be "not viable" then no further discussion would be needed on that project.

With regard to the diversion of Salinas River water to help replenish the Seaside Basin, Mr. Riedl asked if diversion of water for this purpose could occur during a part of the season when the Ground Water Replenishment Advanced Water Treatment Plant and pipeline were not operating at full capacity. Mr. Jaques pointed out that MRWPCA had said in its response on this matter that its Advanced Water Treatment Plant would be operating at full capacity, so treating further quantities of water would require a larger treatment plant.

With regard to hydraulically connecting the Nacimiento and San Antonio reservoirs, there were no comments or discussion.

With regard to examining the Blanco Drain and the Salinas Industrial Ponds as possible additional sources of water, there were some questions and answers with regard to the Ground Water Replenish Project and the Blanco Drain/Salinas Industrial Pond issues, and how these would benefit the Seaside Basin. It was noted that the Watermaster could potentially purchase GWRP water, if it became available, by collecting replenishment assessment monies from CAW. Mr. Sabolsice said that CAW wants to diversify the sources of water as it develops its proposed project to present to the Public Utilities Commission.

Mr. Riedl asked why the decision had been made not to simultaneously implement projects in order to avoid confusion, as noted in the MCWRA information provided on page 15 of the agenda packet. Ms. Thomasberg responded by providing some background information, but said she would need to discuss the matter further with Mr. Johnson in order to be able to provide a more definitive answer.
With regard to examining the MPWMD's projects, Mr. Green asked about the status and financing for the proposed desalination plant at the Naval Postgraduate School site in Monterey. Mr. Oliver responded that this project was only in the early planning stages at this point. There were some questions and answers on various aspects of this project. Mr. Oliver said that financing would probably be via bond sales, but that a financing plan had not yet been developed.

Mr. Green suggested that another concept that could be considered would be to treat water from Lake El Estero to help reduce seawater discharges from the city of Monterey, while also providing an additional water source for treatment and potential benefit to the Seaside Basin. There was consensus to have Mr. Green make a presentation on this at a future TAC meeting.

Ms. Thomasberg said that another concept would be to see if the substantial flow of seawater going into and out of the Monterey Bay Aquarium could potentially be used as a water source for treatment through a desalination plant. Mr. Simonitch reported that the proposed Ocean Plaza hotel project on Cannery Row had planned on using its own desalination system with a tie-in to the Monterey Bay Aquarium's facilities.

Mr. Riedl asked how much water would be supplied through the phase 2 ASR project. Mr. Oliver and Mr. Lear responded that the full Phase 2 project would produce approximately 1,040 acre feet per year. The Phase 1 project currently produces approximately 920 acre feet per year. So the total amount that would be produced by the combined Phase 1 and Phase 2 projects would be approximately 1,960 acre feet per year. Mr. Sabolsice said there are some infrastructure limitations within CAW's distribution system that would need to be overcome in order to utilize flows that large.

Mr. Oliver said that the current RWQCB/SWRCB Orders require that all Carmel Basin water that goes into the Seaside Basin must be taken out and used to meet demands, and not left in the basin. Therefore ASR currently provides only a transitory, not a long-term, benefit to the Seaside Basin. Mr. Lear said that if a source of water other than the Carmel Basin was available, the Phase 2 ASR wells could potentially be used for replenishment purposes, and the water would not have to be withdrawn. This could provide a long-term benefit to the Seaside Basin.

Mr. Riedl asked Mr. Oliver what the potential likelihood was for implementation of the various MPWMD projects. Mr. Oliver responded that this varied between the projects.

6. Schedule
Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials for this item He asked Mr. Lear if he would be able to provide a report on the findings from his cross-aquifer contamination evaluation of the coastal wells, and Mr. Lear responded that he would like to do that at the May TAC meeting.

7. Other Business
Mr. Sabolsice asked if there are any other evaluations the Watermaster could be conducting to help benefit the Seaside Basin. For example, if the current pumping levels were continued until approximately 2017 without the triennial ramp-downs required by the Decision, could we determine what effect this would have on water levels. Ms. King responded yes, that the model could analyze this scenario, but we still would not know when/if seawater intrusion would occur. The Watermaster sentinel wells monitor the Santa Margarita aquifer.
Mr. Riedl asked about overpumping inland and piping this water to coastal wells to be injected in order to build a seawater intrusion barrier. Mr. Sabolsice said he would prefer to see what happens to water levels if pumping at current levels were continued. If results looked promising, the TAC could recommend to the Board to ask the Judge to relax the 10 percent ramp-down requirement in order to provide some additional time to implement the Coastal Water Project.

Mr. Sabolsice said that harm is currently actually being seen in the Carmel Basin, whereas currently no harm is being seen in the Seaside Basin. That would be the basis for making such a request. There was discussion of potentially doing additional monitoring to provide an increased level of comfort in conjunction with making this request.

Mr. Riedl also suggested consideration be given to producing a new baseline for modeling which reflects the producers who do not currently pump not pumping, for example Granite Rock and Security National Guarantee. This could then be used as the new baseline to run the model. He suggested exploring building a groundwater mound along the coast by overpumping from inland wells and injecting this water into coastal wells. Mr. Sabolsice said that this would have high costs because of the infrastructure that would have to be constructed in order to do this, and that such a project would only be needed as an interim project, not a long-term project.

There was discussion of whether or not two scenarios need to be included in the proposed model run, one in order to see the effects of using the new baseline suggested by Mr. Riedl, and one to then see the effects of continuing pumping at current Operating Yield levels as suggested by Mr. Sabolsice.

Ms. King said that before proceeding she would like to have a meeting to confirm all of the assumptions that would be used in running the model. Mr. Jaques will obtain a scope of work and cost proposal from HydroMetrics and provide this to the TAC for review and finalizing at the next TAC meeting.

Mr. Riedl asked Mr. Evans if the ramp-down could be less than 10 percent in view of the in-lieu replenishment benefit from the Seaside golf courses using water from MCWD's system. Mr. Jaques said the Watermaster staff could evaluate this and report its findings to the TAC at its next meeting. Mr. Sabolsice recommended not pursuing this at this time and awaiting further direction before doing so, if at all.

Ms. King requested an agenda item for presentation on the Salt and Nutrient Management Plan that is being developed for the Seaside Basin. HydroMetrics has been hired by MPWMD to prepare this plan. Mr. Lear will be the project manager for the Seaside Basin portion of the plan. Stakeholders need to be identified, and data needs to be obtained. Mr. Riedl asked for ample lead-time to be provided for any requests made to the City of Seaside to provide data for this purpose.

8. Set Next Meeting Date
The next meeting date was set for Wednesday April 11, 2012 at 1:30 p.m. at the MRWPCA Board Room

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Sabolsice at 3:48 p.m.
The meeting was called to order at 1:39 p.m. (Mr. Costa was delayed in arriving and arrived at 1:42 p.m., at the start of Agenda Item 3.)

1. Public Comments
There were no public comments.

2. Administrative Matters:
   Approve Minutes from March 14, 2012 Meeting
   Mr. Oliver pointed out that there was an error in the date listed under item 2.A in the minutes from the January 11 meeting. The year should have been 2012, not 2011. With that correction made, on a motion by Mr. Simonitch, seconded by Mr. Green, the Minutes were unanimously approved.

3. Discussion of a Proposed Request to be Made to the Court Seeking a Temporary Suspension of Triennial Pumping Reductions
   Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials for this item.
Mr. Sabolsice suggested going back to the allowed Operating Yield that was in existence prior to the last 10 percent pumping cutback which went into effect on October 1, 2011, and to maintain pumping allowances at that level until approximately October 1, 2017, and to evaluate the impact on Basin water levels of doing this. This would alleviate approximately \(2 \times 560 = 1,120\) AFY of cutbacks, including the cutback scheduled to occur in 2014.

Ms. Thomasberg asked how the judge would likely relate to such a request, and how this would relate to the Cease and Desist order requiring reductions in water diversions from the Carmel River Basin. Mr. Oliver responded that the judge in the Seaside Basin adjudication is only concerned with the Seaside Basin.

Mr. Costa asked Mr. Jaques what conditions needed to be achieved in order to avoid having to impose the 10 percent pumping reductions. In the discussion that ensued the following criteria to be met to avoid a reduction, as set forth in the Adjudication Decision, were described: (1) the Watermaster has obtained an adequate amount of non-native water and is adding it into the Basin on an annual basis, (2) the Watermaster has secured reclaimed water and producers are in the process of utilizing that water in lieu of their production allocations in an amount equal to or greater than the 10 percent reduction quantities, (3) any combination of 1 and 2 that achieves the equivalent of the 10 percent reductions, or (4) the Watermaster has determined that water levels within the aquifers are high enough to prevent seawater intrusion.

Mr. Jaques went on to say that unless the Natural Safe Yield level is reached, water levels will continue to fall, even if replenishment water and/or reduced pumping occurs. Ms. King concurred with this assessment and noted that water levels would typically take years to rise to protective levels.

There was discussion with regard to pumping impacts on water levels and how to distribute the pumping within the Basin when running the groundwater model.

Ms. Thomasberg asked Mr. Sabolsice if CAW could redistribute its pumping. He responded that he would have to check with his Operations Supervisor, but that any redistribution would be limited. Mr. Oliver said that with the ASR wells there could be some ability to redistribute. Mr. Lear noted that retirement of wells is gradually causing pumping to move further inland and into deeper strata.

Mr. Oliver said that modeling would help improve our understanding of what Basin impacts would result from pumping redistribution.

There was discussion as to whether it would be better to first ask the judge if he would consider a temporary suspension of the 10 percent pumping reductions, if modeling showed little to no impact, rather than doing the modeling first and then approaching the judge, or whether modeling should be done before making a request to the judge. Mr. Oliver suggested two approaches be presented to the Board for their consideration, one approach would be to do the modeling first and then make a request to the judge, and the other approach would be to first ask the judge if he would consider a temporary suspension if modeling demonstrated that there would be little to no adverse impact on the Basin.
It was noted that if modeling shows adverse water level impacts from temporarily suspending the reductions, then it probably would not be appropriate to pursue a request to the judge. However, if the modeling showed only minor impacts, it could be desirable to pursue this as a way of lessening the impacts of the Carmel River Cease and Desist Order. Mr. Sabolsic stressed that he did not want anyone in the public to get the wrong impression with regard to such a request potentially being made.

Ms. Thomasberg asked what safeguards could be provided in conjunction with making such a request. Mr. Oliver said that the judge had been very precise and very regimented in his prior dealings on adjudication matters, and felt that there were four things that should be covered: (1) having a time certain to end the suspension, (2) having a schedule for payback of overpumping that has occurred since the adjudication was put into effect, (3) safeguards in terms of modeling and additional monitoring that could be done.

Mr. Lear suggested looking at how the suspension would affect protective water levels and also seeing what steps in the Seawater Intrusion Response Plan could be implemented as safeguards.

Mr. Simonitch asked if the groundwater replenishment project water could be injected to help raise water levels. Mr. Jaques responded that the groundwater replenishment project water probably would not be available until almost the same time as when the proposed temporary suspension would end.

There was also discussion with regard to:
- Sand City’s desalination project and what impacts it might have on Basin water levels
- How ASR water from the Carmel River Basin is accounted for when it is stored and then recovered from the Seaside Basin. It was noted that all ASR water that is taken from the Carmel Basin and put into the Seaside Basin has to be taken out and used to meet demands, and not left stored in the Seaside Basin.
- How best to involve legal counsel if a request were to be made to the judge.

Mr. Evans noted that any such recommendation would need to go through the budget and finance committee before it goes to the Board.

Ms. King said that the model will show that the rate of decline in water levels will be greater without the 10 percent cutbacks than it would be if the cutbacks were imposed.

Ms. Thomasberg asked whether it would be beneficial to pay to have the model recalibrated before doing the proposed modeling.

Mr. Simonitch asked what MPWMD’s Board would think of making a request. Mr. Oliver responded that MPWMD is represented on the Watermaster Board and would thus have the opportunity to provide input on this matter at such time as it is discussed by the Watermaster Board.

Mr. Jaques asked the TAC to determine, by vote, if they wished to pursue making a request to the judge. The vote was 5 in favor of making a request and 2 opposed to making a request. Mr. Jaques then asked the TAC to determine, by vote, whether they felt modeling should be done first or done after an initial request is made to the judge. The vote was unanimous in favor of initially
requesting the judge's reaction to granting a temporary suspension if modeling subsequently supported the request, before performing any modeling.

Mr. Jaques said he would draft language regarding the TAC’s recommendation to the Board and email it to TAC members for their review and editing before he incorporates the language into his Agenda Transmittal for the Board’s consideration of this matter.

4. **Consider Request for Service (RFS) No. 2012-03 with HydroMetrics to Perform Groundwater Modeling**

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

Ms. King said that many assumptions will need to be made with regard to performing the modeling. She said she wanted to insure these are all made in accordance with the TAC’s desires. Mr. Simonitch asked if the model was calibrated to reflect actual pumping and hydrologic conditions, and Ms. King responded that it was.

The TAC unanimously approved the scope and cost for HydroMetrics RFS No. 2012-03 to perform modeling work to support the temporary suspension of the 10 percent pumping cutbacks, if the Board determines to pursue making a request to the judge for a temporary suspension in the 10% pumping reductions.

5. **Consider Submitting an Application for a Grant Under the Local Groundwater Assistance Grant Program**

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

Mr. Oliver said MPWMD was supportive of making an application for a grant, but will likely be making its own application for a grant for another project, so he did not feel that they could also serve as the applying agency for a Watermaster project. He noted, however, that a city could potentially serve in that role.

Ms. Thomasberg and Mr. Simonitch said that the same situations existed with MCWRA and the city of Sand City, in that their respective entities were also considering submitting grant applications for their own projects.

Mr. Holden said that MRWPCA is pursuing a monitoring well for its groundwater replenishment project, but is not an eligible applicant under the grant program requirements, and would therefore have to get a partner to submit an application on its behalf.

There was discussion of monitoring wells, groundwater monitoring, storm water recharge, and other potential projects for which to seek grant funding.

Ms. King said that adding monitoring wells in the areas of the Seaside Basin where the greatest impact on water levels is occurring would seem to be the most beneficial projects from her perspective.

Mr. Oliver said MPWMD is pursuing a grant for a monitoring well to support their ASR project.
There was discussion of other issues pertaining to applying for a grant. Mr. Lear said that his experience has been that the most highly ranked applications were those that could show clear benefit from the projects that were being proposed.

Mr. Sabolsice noted that the Seaside representative was not present at today's meeting, and recommended that the matter be continued to the next TAC meeting for discussion so his input could be included.

6. Schedule
Mr. Jaques briefly summarized the agenda packet materials on this item and noted that there had been no appreciable changes from the schedule in the previous TAC meeting agenda packet.

7. Other Business
Mr. Oliver reported that he was still waiting for sufficient rain to occur to perform ASR this winter season. He said that currently predicted near future rainfall may reach the trigger point to allow ASR to be done.

Mr. Sabolsice reported that CAW will be submitting its proposed project documents to the Public Utilities Commission by the April 23rd deadline.

8. Set Next Meeting Date
The next meeting date was set for Wednesday May 9, 2012 at 1:30 p.m. at the MRWPCA Board Room

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Sabolsice at 3:31 p.m.
## Reported Quarterly and Annual Water Production From the Seaside Groundwater Basin
### For All Producers Included in the Seaside Basin Adjudication -- Water Year 2011

**Values in Acre-Feet (AF)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Type</th>
<th>Oct-Dec 11</th>
<th>Jan-Mar 12</th>
<th>Apr-Jun 12</th>
<th>Jul-Aug-Sep</th>
<th>Total Allocation from 2011-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Subareas</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>212.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seaside (Municipal)</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite Rock Company</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBO Development No. 27</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seaside (Golf Courses)</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand City</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabrese (Cypress Pacific Inv.)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Memorial (Alderswoods)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Subareas Totals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Seca Subarea</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Seca Subarea Totals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Production by WM Producers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
1. The Water Year (WY) begins October 1 and ends September 30 of the following calendar year. For example, WY 2012 begins on October 1, 2011, and ends on September 30, 2012.
2. "Type" refers to water right as described in Seaside Basin Adjudication decision as amended, signed February 9, 2007 (Monte rey County Superior Court Case No. M66343).
3. Values shown in the table are based on reports to the Watermaster as received by MPWMD by January 15, 2012. (see Item IX.C. in 11/30/2011 Board packet).
4. Any minor discrepancies in totals are attributable to rounding.
5. "Base Operating Yield Allocation: values are based on Seaside Basin Adjudication decision. These values are consistent with the Watermaster Producer Allocations Water Year 2012 (see Item IX.C. in 11/30/2011 Board packet).
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