

SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN WATERMASTER

REGULAR BOARD MEETING AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2010 - 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:

City of Seaside – Mayor Ralph Rubio, Chair

Coastal Subarea Landowner – Director Paul Bruno, Vice Chair

Monterey Peninsula Water Management District – Director Judi Lehman, Secretary

City of Del Rey Oaks – Mayor Jerry Edelen

California American Water – Director Craig Anthony

Laguna Seca Subarea Landowner – Director Bob Costa

City of Monterey – Mayor Chuck Della Sala

City of Sand City – Mayor David Pendergrass

Monterey County/Monterey County Water Resources Agency -- Supervisor Dave Potter, District 5

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

III. MINUTES

The minutes of the Regular Board meeting of September 22, 2010 are attached to this agenda. The Board is requested to consider approving the minutes.

IV. REVIEW OF AGENDA

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

V. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

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

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Consider Approval of Summary for Payments made during September and October, 2010 totaling \$49,283.40

B. Consider Fiscal Year Financial Reports through October 31, 2010

C. Consider Approving the following Professional Service Contracts for Fiscal Year 2011

1) Two Contracts with MPWMD—one for \$81,010 covering their normal M&MP tasks as in preceding years and the second one for \$4,140 for continuing monitoring and other work on Seaside Groundwater Basin Management and Monitoring Program (M&MP)

2) Two Contracts with HydroMetrics Water Resources, Inc.—one for \$22,020 to prepare the Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report (SIAR) for 2011 and the second one for \$12,000 providing ongoing and as requested general hydrogeologic consulting services during the year

VII. ORAL PRESENTATION

None scheduled

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

None

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

- a) Discussion/Consider Approving the Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report (SAIR) for FY 2010
- b) Discussion/Consider Approving a request to redefine a “quorum” and voting requirements for TAC meetings

B. Discussion/Consider Approving Watermaster Annual Report for WY 2010 due to be filed with the Court on or before November 15, 2010

C. Discussion/Consider Adopting for Water Year 2011 a **Declaration regarding the Unavailability of Artificial Replenishment Water** (Water Year 2011 Allocations attached)

D. Discussion/Consider Assessing Replenishment Assessments for WY 2010 Over Production

X. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS (No Action Required)

- A.** Timeline Schedule of Milestone Dates (Critical date monitoring)
- B.** Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) minutes of October 13, 2010
- C.** Water Production Report for Fourth Quarter of Water Year 2010 (July 1st through September 30, 2010) and for the entire Water Year 2009-2010
- D.** Groundwater Quality and Groundwater Level Report for Water Year 2010
- E.** Annual Assessments Invoiced for FY 2011; Administration; and Monitoring and Management--Operations

XI. DIRECTOR’S REPORTS

XII. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMENTS

XIII. NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE –DECEMBER 1, 2010 (MRWPCA-Board Room) 2:00 P.M.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

This agenda was forwarded via e-mail to the City Clerks of Seaside, Monterey, Sand City and Del Rey Oaks; the Clerk of the Monterey Board of Supervisors, the Clerk to the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District; the Clerk at the Monterey County Water Resources Agency, Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency and the California American Water Company for posting on October 28, 2010 per the Ralph M. Brown Act, Government Code Section 54954.2(a).

ITEM NO. III.

MINUTES

SPECIAL MEETING
Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster
September 22, 2010

DRAFT MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. ROLL CALL

City of Seaside – Steve Bloomer, City of Seaside Councilmember (Alternate)
Coastal Subarea Landowner – Director Paul Bruno, Vice Chair
City of Del Rey Oaks – Mayor Jerry Edelen
California American Water (“CAW”) – Director Craig Anthony
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (“MPWMD”) – Director Judi Lehman, Secretary
Laguna Seca Subarea Landowner – Gary Cursio (Alternate)
City of Monterey – Mayor Charles “Chuck” Della Sala

Absent: City of Sand City – Mayor David Pendergrass
Monterey County/Monterey County Water Resources Agency (“MCWRA”) – Supervisor Dave Potter

Vice Chair Bruno offered a moment of silence for community activist and TAC Member John Fisher who passed away.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Moved by Mayor Edelen, seconded by Director Lehman, and unanimously carried, to approve the minutes of the Watermaster Regular Meeting held June 2, 2010.

IV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

There were no questions or comments from the public.

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Consider Approval of Summary for Payments made during June, July and August 2010 totaling \$45,418.39.

B. Consider Fiscal Year Financial Reports – Through August 31, 2010.

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

VII. ORAL PRESENTATION

Derrick Williams, HydroMetrics Water Resources Inc., presented groundwater modeling results in response to the question directed by the TAC: What would be the impacts on the Basin in the Laguna Seca Subarea if pumping was increased 10-20%? Alternative Producers currently produce approximately 50% of the water from the Laguna Seca Subarea. The analysis modeled water movement, drawdown, drawdown plus 20% additional pumping and drawdown plus 10% additional pumping, and no replenishment was assumed. Modeling results showed that each year the groundwater levels would continue to drop even with no changes in production, resulting in a regular downward trend in water levels for 3 of the 4 wells in the Laguna Seca Subarea, and a decrease of 5 to 10 feet in water levels throughout the Subarea if pumping was increased. The Laguna Seca subarea was determined not to be

isolated, and that over the long-term a reduction in water migrating into the Fort Ord area due to increased production would subsequently reduce the amount migrating into the Subarea. Well owners just outside the Basin would be more immediately impacted by increased production according to the modeling presented. Mr. Williams noted that financial impacts were not included in the analysis nor used to develop any scopes of work, although that determination would be the logical next step.

Mayor Edelen noted that the simulation results and the actual recorded data appeared to be plausibly correlated.

Vice Chair Bruno asked if there was a way to capture water in the Laguna Seca Subarea before it migrated to the Southern Coastal Subarea and out to the ocean. Mr. Williams suggested wells could be deepened, which would most likely be deemed impractical from a technical standpoint, or wells in the Laguna Seca Subarea that appear to have had origins of placement based on the location of land owned by producers or near well service areas, be relocated more strategic to outflow capture in the Laguna Seca Subarea or relocated in the Southern Coastal Subarea.

Director Lehman suggested additional analysis be done to determine if there were any sources of water that could be captured to the benefit of the Basin and perhaps for use by those parties needing to maintain the integrity of current supply.

Mayor Edelen inquired if the geology of the area would lend itself to well injection to which Mr. Williams responded that injection rates would probably be relatively low and benefit/cost would need to be evaluated.

The board accepted the report and Vice Chair Bruno thanked Mr. Williams and Hydrometrics for modeling efforts.

VIII. **OLD BUSINESS** – None.

IX. **NEW BUSINESS**

A. **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

1. **TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (“TAC”)**

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

Technical Program Manager, Robert Jaques presented the Management and Monitoring Program (M&MP) Work Plan for FY 2011 describing the technical tasks and activities that would be conducted next fiscal year.

Moved by Director Lehman, seconded by Mayor Edelen, and unanimously carried, to approve the Management and Monitoring Program (M&MP) Work Plan for FY 2011.

b) **Discussion/Consider Approval of TAC’s recommendation to defer the start of work on: (1) Updating the Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP); (2) Refining the Protective**

Water Levels; and (3) Groundwater Modeling of Scenario 2 (Regional Water Supply Project)

The items proposed to be deferred were not time sensitive and the financial impact of the deferrals had been accounted for in the 2011 budget.

Moved by Mayor Edelen, seconded by Mayor Della Sala, and unanimously carried, to (1) Approve the TAC's recommendation to defer the start of work on updating the Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP), (2) Approve the TAC's recommendation to defer refining the Protective Water Levels, and (3) Approve the TAC's recommendation to defer the start of work on Groundwater Modeling of Scenario 2.

2. BUDGET/FINANCE COMMITTEE with TAC Support and approval of technical aspects

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

Mr. Evans reported that in the past the TAC had difficulty determining the unit cost for overproduction replenishment assessment due to the lack of concrete information on proposed or potential water supply projects. With that in mind, the Budget/Finance Committee met last week, reviewed the current criteria and unanimously agreed to maintain the unit cost for the Water Year 2010-2011 at \$2,780.00 per acre-foot ("AF"), the same as the 2009-2010 Water Year. As a member of the Budget Finance Committee in attendance at last week's meeting, Vice Chair Paul Bruno commented that although some committee members felt that a new unit cost could be recalculated and reduced by rehashing speculated costs of future water supply projects however considering the available information the committee concurred to recommend that last year's unit cost carry forward into 2010-2011. Director Lehman asked what the TAC had calculated as a proposed unit cost and Mr. Evans stated \$3,600.00 per AF. Director Lehman felt that, considering the current economic state, it made sense to proceed with the current amount, noting it as being a working number that could be revised if deemed necessary by the board. Mr. Evans offered to meet and review in detail with anyone interested the Replenishment Assessment Fund Budget for 2011 listing CAW and City of Seaside replenishment amounts owed based on the Unit Cost Over Production Replenishment Assessment Amount of \$2,780 per AF.

Moved by Director Anthony, seconded by Mayor Edelen, and unanimously carried, to approve a Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost of \$2,780 per acre-foot of overproduction for WY 2011.

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

Mr. Evans noted that the committee was only seeking approval of the Fiscal Year 2011 budgets although the 2012 year budgets were presented for reference. The court required that the budgets be adopted by October 31st and circulated to parties in the Adjudication no earlier than November 1st and no later than November 15th.

Administrative Fund - The administrative budget anticipated administrative contractual services costs decreasing. Legal fees were budgeted however were not likely to be expended. Considering \$60,000 of “roll over” assessments collected in previous years, the Administrative Assessment for 2011 would be approximately \$45,000.

Vice Chair Bruno acknowledged Mr. Evans’ efficient job in preparing the budget.

Moved by Director Lehman, seconded by Mayor Della Sala, and unanimously carried, to approve the Administrative Fund Budget for FY 2011 and receive as information the projected FY 2012 Administrative Fund Budget.

Management and Monitoring Fund – Operations and Capital Budgets - Mr. Evans noted that the two budget items could be addressed together since the Capital Fund Budget for 2011 was zero.

Vice Chair Bruno commented that the budgets were a good road map for the board and appreciated prudent staff management.

Moved by Mayor Edelen, seconded by Director Lehman, and unanimously carried, to approve the M&MP O&M and Capital Budgets for FY 2011, and receive as informational items the attached M&MP O&M and Capital Budget forecasts for FY 2012.

Replenishment Fund – Mr. Evans explained no action from the Board was necessary: the document was provided for informational purposes only detailing the CAW and City of Seaside replenishment assessment amounts owing.

X. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS (No Action Required)

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

XI. DIRECTORS’ REPORTS – None

XII. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMENTS

CEO Evans reported that CAW legal counsel had provided a copy of a lawsuit filed by the Sierra Club challenging Water Management District’s issuance of a permit allowing CAW to wheel water to SNG. Copies would be provided upon request to anyone interested.

Notices would be sent out to all water producers requesting water production levels and quality by the 15th of September.

The Technical Advisory Committee regular meeting of October 13, 2010 would be held at the MRWPCA board room at 1:30 p.m.

Director Anthony asked what the storage permit submittal deadline date was. Mr. Evans would confirm the date and report back.

NEXT MEETING DATE – It was agreed that the next Regular Meeting would be held on Wednesday, October 6, 2010, at the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA) Board meeting room at 5 Harris Court, Building "D" on Ryan Ranch in Monterey at 2:00 p.m.

Since it had been previously suggested that administrative costs be reduced by holding Watermaster board meetings every other month, staff would review agenda items each month and recommend whether to cancel an upcoming meeting if a lack of items warranted such. If the October Watermaster regular board meeting was cancelled due to lack of agenda items, the meeting of November 3rd would be required to be held due to the need to address the filing of the Annual Report filing to Judge Randall on or before November 15th.

XIII. There being no further business, Vice Chairman Bruno adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

ITEM NO. VI.

CONSENT CALENDAR

**SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN
WATERMASTER**

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Dewey D Evans, CEO

DATE: November 3, 2010

SUBJECT: Summary of Payments Authorized to be paid during the months of September and October, 2010.

PURPOSE:

To advise the Board of payments authorized to be paid during the months of September and October, 2010

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Consider approving the payment of bills submitted and authorized to be paid during the months of September and October, 2010.

COMMENTS and FISCAL IMPACT:

September, 2010

DDEvans Consulting (Professional Services Agreement—CEO)—August 23, 2010 through September 24, 2010 worked on Watermaster business a total of 68.5.0 hours at \$100.00 per hour or **\$6,850.00**. Responded to telephone calls, attended meetings, email correspondence with a number of people regarding a variety of items involving the Seaside Basin. Discussions, review of documents and preparation of September 22, 2010 Board meeting packet. Sent same to Board and all Interested Parties. Attended September 22nd Board meeting and took follow up actions where necessary. Reviewed TAC agenda items and commented on same with Bob Jaques. Prepared and attended Budget and Finance Committee. Sent out copy of MPWMD's first two quarterly reports (October 1, 2009 through March 31, 2010) of the Basin water levels and water qualities. Sent out Water Production Report for first three quarters of WY 2009-2010 (October 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010). Discussions with Bob Jaques regarding various invoices received at Watermaster office. Sent out notice of October 6, 2010 Board meeting requesting items for the agenda. Processed and audited invoices and delivered to City of Seaside for payment.

Robert "Bob" Jaques (Technical Program Manager)—August 27, 2010 through September 25, 2010 worked a total of 31.0 hours at \$100.00 per hour or **\$3,100.00**. Prepared TAC meeting packet, attended and transcribed minutes for TAC meeting of September 8, 2010. Prepared Board agenda items for September 22, 2010 Board meeting and sent same to CEO. Telecom attendance at Budget and Finance Committee on September 15, 2010.

HydroMetrics Water Resources Inc.—Three invoices were submitted dated September 3, 2010 for a total of **\$5,300.00** that covers 30.5 hours of work preparing for and attending the August 11, 2010 TAC meeting by telephone; working on the groundwater modeling scenarios and drafting the 2010 SIAR.

Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD)—Two invoices were submitted during the month of September and authorized for payment of the third quarter of Water Year 2009-2010, (April 1, 2010 through June 30, 2010) totaling **\$14,542.30** amounts billed include conducting ongoing data entry/database maintenance, site representation and selection, collecting monthly water levels, quarterly water quality samples, perform seawater intrusion analysis, prepare response plan.

October, 2010

DDEvans Consulting (Professional Services Agreement—CEO)—September 27, 2010 through October 31, 2010 worked on Watermaster business a total of 46 hours at \$100.00 per hour or **\$4,600.00**. Responded to telephone inquiries, e-mail, and other correspondence as needed regarding the Seaside Basin. Discussions, review of documents and preparing agenda packet for the November 3, 2010 Board meeting. Sent out quarterly water production notices to all water producers. Received and reviewed first section of Annual Report from Bob Jaques. Sent out public posting notice of cancellation of October 6th regular Board meeting. Reviewed and discussed TAC meeting agenda packet with Bob Jaques. Discussed HydroMetrics work and billing with Bob Jaques. Followed up with water producers who did not send in quarterly water production reports. Worked with Laura on replenishment assessments.

Robert “Bob” Jaques (Technical Program Manager)—September 27 through October 25, 2010 worked on Watermaster business a total of 47.5 hours at \$100.00 per hour or **\$4,750.00**. Worked on TAC agenda for October 13th meeting. Worked on Preliminary Draft of Annual Report. Worked on consultant contracts. Spent time working on 2011 Project Schedule. Prepared for and attended October 13 TAC meeting with followup meeting with MPWMD staff members. Prepared Board meeting agenda items and sent to CEO. Prepared and sent out minutes of October 13th TAC meeting. Worked on Replenishment Assessment calculation spreadsheet with Laura Dadiw. Prepared comments/edits for HydroMetrics on SAIR.

HydroMetrics Water Resources Inc.—Two invoices were submitted for payment totaling **\$10,141.10**. The first invoice was for \$1,881.10 preparing for and attending TAC and Board meetings to present the Groundwater Modeling Scenarios. The second invoice for \$8,260.00 was for 50.5 hours of work preparing data and writing up the SAIR report for FY2010

Total payments authorized to be paid during the months of April and May totaled **\$49,283.40.90**

Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster
Budget vs. Actual Administrative Fund
 Fiscal Year (January 1 - December 31, 2010)
 Balance through October 31, 2010

	<u>2010 Adopted Budget</u>	<u>Contract Amount</u>	<u>Year to Date Revenue / Expenses</u>
Available Balances & Assessments			
Dedicated Reserve	25,000.00		25,000.00
FY 2008 (Rollover)	43,000.00		47,416.90
FY 2009 Assessments	82,000.00		48,792.00
Available	<u>150,000.00</u>		<u>121,208.90</u>
Expenses			
Contract Staff	100,000.00	100,000.00	46,650.00
Legal Advisor	25,000.00	-	-
Total Expenses	<u>125,000.00</u>	<u>100,000.00</u>	<u>46,650.00</u>
Total Available	25,000.00		
Dedicated Reserve	<u>25,000.00</u>		
Net Available	<u><u>-</u></u>		

Administrative Fund Assessments owed by City of Seaside

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

Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster
Budget vs. Actual Monitoring & Management - Operations Fund
 Fiscal Year (January 1 - December 31, 2010)
 Balance through October 31, 2010

VI.B.
 11/3/2010

	<u>2010 Adopted Budget</u>	<u>Contract Encumbrance</u>	<u>Year to Date Revenue/Expenses</u>
Available Balances & Assessments			
Monitoring & Management - Ops Fund	\$ 351,664.00	\$ -	\$ 327,047.52
FY 2009 Rollover	361,581.00	-	361,581.00
Total Available	\$ 713,245.00	\$ -	\$ 688,628.52
Appropriations & Expenses			
GENERAL			
Technical Project Manager	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 33,525.00
Contingency @ 20% (not including TPM)	41,944.00	\$ 41,944.00	-
Total General	\$ 141,944.00	\$ 141,944.00	\$ 33,525.00
CONSULTANTS (Hydrometrics)			
Program Administration	\$ 8,000.00		
Production/Lvl/Qlty Monitoring	30,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 33,613.56
Basin Management (BMAP, Modeling)	50,000.00		
Seawater Intrusion (Plan, Analysis)	27,000.00	22,020.00	-
Total Consultants	\$ 115,000.00	\$ 34,020.00	\$ 33,613.56
MPWMD			
Production/Lvl/Qlty Monitoring	\$ 91,120.00	74,780.00	\$ 30,025.69
Basin Management	-	5,000.00	-
Seawater Intrusion	3,600.00	3,600.00	-
Direct Costs	-	-	-
Total MPWMD	\$ 94,720.00	\$ 83,380.00	\$ 30,025.69
Transfer Out to Capital Fund			
			-
Total Appropriations & Expenses	\$ 351,664.00	\$ 259,344.00	\$ 97,164.25
Total Available	361,581.00		

Operations Fund Assessments owed by City of Seaside

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

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

VI.B.
 11/3/2010

	2010 Adopted Budget	Contract Encumbrance	Year to Date Revenue / Expense
Available Balances and Assessments:			
Monitoring & Management Fund - Capital	\$ -		\$ -
FY 2007-2008 Rollover to 2009	5,499		5,499
Transfer in from Operations Fund	-		-
Subtotal	<u>5,499</u>		<u>5,499</u>
Appropriations & Expenses:			
Professional Services			
Project Management	-	-	-
Subtotal	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
Direct Costs			
Well Drilling -	-	-	-
Subtotal	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
Total Appropriations and Expenses	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ -</u>
Total Available	<u><u>\$ -</u></u>		
Capital Fund Assessments owed by City of Seaside			
FY 2009 (including 5% penalty)		16,538	
Total		<u><u>\$ 16,538</u></u>	

Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster

Budget vs. Actual - Replenishment Fund

Water Year 2010 (October 1 - September 30) / Fiscal Year (January 1 - December 31, 2010)

Balance through October 31, 2010

Replenishment Fund	2006	2007	2008	2009	Totals Through WY 2009	2010 Adopted Budget (10/7/09)	Projected Totals Through WY 2010
Assessments:	WY 05/06	WY 06/07	WY 07/08	WY 08/09		WY 09/10	
Unit Cost:	\$1,132	\$1,132	\$2,485	\$3,040		\$2,780	
California American Water							
Exceeding Natural Safe Yield Considering Alternative Producers	2,108,570	2,484,533	5,164,969	3,773,464	\$ 13,531,537	5,778,119	\$ 19,309,656
Operating Yield Overproduction Replenishment	-	80,938	34,045	-	\$ 114,983	38,086	\$ 153,069
Total California American	2,108,570	2,565,471	5,199,014	3,773,464	\$ 13,646,520	5,816,205	\$ 19,462,725
CAW Credit Against Assessment	(465,648)		(12,305,924)	\$ (3,741,714)	\$ (16,513,286)	-	\$ (16,513,286)
Balance	1,642,922	2,565,471	\$ (2,898,517)	\$ (2,866,766)	-	-	\$ -
CAW Unpaid Balance	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (2,866,766)	\$ 5,816,205	\$ 2,949,439
City of Seaside - Municipal							
Exceeding Natural Safe Yield Considering Alternative Producers	169,200	173,739	385,642	399,211	\$ 1,127,792	431,428	\$ 1,559,220
Operating Yield Overproduction Replenishment	50,487	340	16,898	66,090	\$ 133,815	18,904	\$ 152,719
Total Municipal	219,687	174,079	402,540	465,300	\$ 1,261,606	450,332	\$ 1,711,939
City of Seaside - Golf Courses							
Exceeding Natural Safe Yield - Alternative Producer	-	-	131,705	69,701	\$ 201,406	73,670	\$ 275,076
Operating Yield Overproduction Replenishment	-	-	131,705	69,701	\$ 201,406	73,670	\$ 275,076
Total Golf Courses	-	-	263,410	139,402	\$ 402,812	147,340	\$ 550,152
Total City of Seaside*	219,687	174,079	665,950	604,702	1,664,418	597,672	2,262,091
City of Seaside Late Payment 5%	10,984	8,704	26,712	26,750			
City of Seaside Paid Assessments	-	-	-	-	\$ -	-	-
City of Seaside Unpaid Balance	\$ 230,671	\$ 182,783	\$ 692,662	\$ 631,453	\$ 1,737,569	\$ 597,672	\$ 2,335,241
Grand Total Replenishment Fund Balance	\$ 230,671	\$ 182,783	\$ 692,662	\$ 631,453	\$ (1,202,348)	\$ 6,413,877	\$ 5,211,529
Total Replenishment Assessments	1,873,594	2,748,254	5,891,676	4,404,917	15,310,938	6,413,877	\$ 21,724,815
Total Replenishment Paid and Credited	(1,642,922)	(2,565,471)	(5,199,014)	(3,741,714)	(16,513,286)		(16,513,286)
MRWPCA GWRP Payment			15				(100,000)
Grand Total Replenishment Fund Balance	230,671	182,783	692,662	663,203	\$ (1,202,348)	6,413,877	\$ 5,111,529.23

11/3/10

**SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN
WATERMASTER**

TO: Board of Directors

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

DATE: November 3, 2010

SUBJECT: Consider Approving the following Professional Service Contracts for Fiscal Year 2011:

- 1) Two Contracts with MPWMD—one for \$81,010 and the second one for \$4,140 for continuing monitoring and other work on the Seaside Groundwater Basin Management and Monitoring Program (M&MP)
- 2) Two Contracts with HydroMetrics Water Resources, Inc. — one for \$12,000 for providing ongoing and as-requested general hydrogeologic consulting services during the year and the second. for \$22,020 to prepare the Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report (SIAR) for 2011.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that the Board approve the attached RFSs No. 2011-01 and 2011-02 with MPWMD, and RFSs No. 2011-01 and 2011-02 with HydroMetrics for FY 2011.

BACKGROUND:

Attached are the proposed initial contracts for each of the Watermaster's consultants that are expected to work on M&MP activities during 2011. Each of these firms is currently working under a master form of agreement with the Watermaster called a "Professional Services Agreement" (PSA). Actual work assignments are made through the issuance of Requests for Service (RFS) under the umbrella language of the PSA. The TAC reviewed each of these contracts at its October 13, 2010 meeting and recommends that the Board approve each of them.

DISCUSSION

The attached RFSs constitute the proposed initial 2011 work assignments for MPWMD and HydroMetrics as follows:

- MPWMD RFS No. 2011-01 for \$81,010 covering their normal M&MP tasks as in preceding years. This RFS also includes the initial work of further evaluating the coastal wells for cross-aquifer contamination potential, as recommended by the TAC.
- MPWMD RFS No. 2011-02 for \$4,140 covering their obtaining water quality and water level data from private producers who ask the Watermaster collect this data for them. The costs for this work are paid for by the well owners and are at no cost to the Watermaster.
- HydroMetrics RFS No. 2011-01 for \$12,000 covering their providing general hydrogeologic consulting services throughout the year.
- HydroMetrics RFS No. 2011-02 for \$22,020 covering their preparing the 2011 Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report.

If recommended by the TAC, and approved by the Board, additional RFSs will be developed for HydroMetrics during 2011 to (1) perform groundwater modeling of Scenario 2, (2) to refine protective water levels, and/or (3) to update the BMAP. These are included as tasks in the proposed 2011 Work Schedule, but are not yet scheduled pending further direction from the TAC and the Board during 2011.

The costs for all of these RFSs are included in the approved FY 2011 Budget. These contracts are being presented to the Board for approval at today's meeting to ensure the contracts can be in effect at the start of 2011.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. MPWMD RFS No. 2011-01
2. MPWMD RFS No. 2011-02
3. HydroMetrics RFS No. 2011-01
4. HydroMetrics RFS No. 2011-02

SEASIDE BASIN WATERMASTER
REQUEST FOR SERVICE

DATE: January 1, 2011

RFS NO. 2011-01
(To be filled in by WATERMASTER)

TO: Joe Oliver
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District
PROFESSIONAL

FROM: Robert Jaques
WATERMASTER

Services Needed and Purpose:

Perform certain Tasks contained within the Watermaster's Monitoring and Management Plan for 2011 (See detailed Scope of Work in Attachment 1).

Completion Date: The work of this RFS No. 2011-01 shall be completed in accordance with the schedule contained in Attachment 2.

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

Total Price Authorized by this RFS: \$ 81,010.00 (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: _____ Date: _____
WATERMASTER Technical Program Manager

Authorized by: _____ Date: _____
WATERMASTER Chief Executive Officer

Agreed to by: _____ Date: _____
PROFESSIONAL

ATTACHMENT 1

Detailed Scope of Work for RFS No. 2011-01

Background:

The Watermaster Board approved the Budget for the 2011 Management and Monitoring Program Work Plan (hereinafter referred to as the “2011 M&MP Work Plan”) at its meeting of September 22, 2010.

This RFS No. 2011-01 authorizes PROFESSIONAL to perform certain work on certain of the Tasks described in the 2011 M&MP Work Plan. The Task numbers listed in Table 1 of this Detailed Scope of Work for RFS No. 2011-01 correspond to the Task numbers in the 2011 M&MP Work Plan.

Table 1

M&MP TASK NO.	TASK DESCRIPTION	WORK TO BE PERFORMED
I. 2. a.1	Conduct ongoing data entry/ database maintenance	PROFESSIONAL will perform water level and water quality data entry and data editing as necessary, and will provide appropriate quality control and quality assurance for this data. WATERMASTER will perform water production data entry and data editing as necessary. PROFESSIONAL will review the data entered by WATERMASTER for quality assurance and quality control purposes, and will notify WATERMASTER of any discrepancies PROFESSIONAL observes in this data. WATERMASTER will followup as appropriate with the water producers to resolve any such discrepancies. PROFESSIONAL will also host and maintain the Watermaster’s Database. Any changes to the Watermaster’s Database will be authorized under a separate agreement for performing database maintenance work for WATERMASTER. That agreement will either be with PROFESSIONAL or with another consultant.
I. 2. b. 2.	Collect Monthly Water Levels	The monitoring wells from which water level data is to be collected by PROFESSIONAL are listed under the heading “MONITORING TO BE PERFORMED BY PROFESSIONAL” in the column titled “Level” in Table 2. PROFESSIONAL will visit each of the indicated wells at the frequencies shown in Table 2 in order to obtain the water level data. At these visits PROFESSIONAL will measure and record water levels by either taking manual water levels using an electric sounder, or by dataloggers. Dataloggers which have been installed on the four Coastal Sentinel, the four ASR monitoring, and the inland (BLM site) monitoring wells will be used to measure the levels at those wells. All of the other wells will be manually measured.

M&MP TASK NO.	TASK DESCRIPTION	WORK TO BE PERFORMED
I. 2. b. 3.	Collect Quarterly Water Quality Samples	<p>The monitoring wells from which water quality data is to be collected by PROFESSIONAL are listed under the heading “MONITORING TO BE PERFORMED BY PROFESSIONAL” in the column titled “Quality” in Table 2. PROFESSIONAL will visit each of the indicated wells at the frequencies shown in Table 2 in order to obtain the water quality samples, and will perform water quality analyses on these samples. The water quality constituents that will be measured in these analyses are: Specific Conductance (micromhos/cm), Total Alkalinity (as CaCO₃), pH, Chloride, Sulfate, Ammonia Nitrogen (as NH₃), Nitrate Nitrogen (as NO₃), Total Organic Carbon, Calcium, Sodium, Magnesium, Potassium, Iron, Manganese, Orthophosphate, Total Dissolved Solids, Hardness (as CaCO₃), Boron, Bromide, and Fluoride. This data may either come from water quality samples that are collected by the airlift method, by the positive displacement method during induction logging of these wells and/or other data gathering techniques, or combinations of these methods, at the discretion of PROFESSIONAL, and will be submitted to a State-certified analytical laboratory for analysis.</p>
I. 2. b. 6.	Reports	<p>PROFESSIONAL will prepare and submit reports to WATERMASTER summarizing and analyzing the data that is collected, according to the following schedule:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Submit quarterly reports summarizing and analyzing the water quality and water level data (1st & 2nd Quarter reports will be a combined report, 3rd and 4th Quarter reports will be separate). 2. Submit one annual report that contains tables consolidating the data from the quarterly reports and a narrative summarization of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations from the quarterly reports. This annual report may include, as attachments, each of the quarterly reports.

M&MP TASK NO.	TASK DESCRIPTION	WORK TO BE PERFORMED
I.3.d	Evaluate Coastal Wells for Cross-Aquifer Contamination Potential	<p>PROFESSIONAL will perform the following initial work to further evaluate coastal wells for their potential risk of causing cross-aquifer contamination:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Field verify selected older steel cased wells – Wells older than 30 years that were constructed with steel casings have been identified. Under this task PROFESSIONAL will contact land owners and conduct interviews, conduct site investigations using a metal detector (if appropriate), document the condition of the well head, determine total available well depth, and collect a water level (if possible). 2. Inspect well logs to assess proper seal placement to isolate aquifers – Wells that penetrate multiple aquifers but are screened in one can be conduits for cross-aquifer contamination if well seals were not placed adjacent to confining layers between the aquifer units. Under this Task PROFESSIONAL will review well logs to determine if surface and/or transition seals are installed, and assessed as to the risk associated with those that do not contain sufficient seals. 3. Add wells to Watermaster database – Adding wells identified during the first phase of this investigation will provide the Watermaster with a more complete list of wells known to exist in the basin. If the current well status can be verified (e.g., inactive, destroyed, etc.) they can then be tracked by the database, with the correct current well status. Under this Task PROFESSIONAL will add these additional wells to the Watermaster’s database. 4. Investigate the Santa Margarita – Purisima interface – Wells constructed with PVC provide the opportunity to collect resistivity information via an induction log. This is of interest because the transition between the Santa Margarita Sandstone and the Purisima Formation is not well understood. Locating PVC constructed wells in the region of the Seaside Basin where the transition between the units is thought to occur and collecting resistivity data will help to better define this boundary, and will provide additional information about current, depth-specific water quality conditions. Under this Task PROFESSIONAL will identify and field verify wells that are candidates for induction logging and prepare a list of wells to bring back to the Watermaster.

M&MP TASK NO.	TASK DESCRIPTION	WORK TO BE PERFORMED
I.3.d (Cont'd)	Evaluate Coastal Wells for Cross-Aquifer Contamination Potential (Cont'd)	<p>5. Investigate video logging of selected wells suspected to be conduits for cross-contamination – Video logs verify if the well has been compromised and is allowing groundwater flow between aquifer units. Following field verification of wells, under this Task MPWMD will provide a list of wells recommended for video logging. Criteria for selection will be age of well, condition of well head, proximity of well to potential contamination sources (e.g., coastline), and aquifer units penetrated by well.</p> <p>6. Identify abandoned wells that are screened in the Santa Margarita – The Santa Margarita Sandstone is the primary production aquifer for drinking water in the Seaside Basin and is also the target aquifer currently used for Aquifer Storage and Recovery and potential future aquifer replenishment projects. While properly-sealed wells screened solely in the Santa Margarita are not candidates for cross-aquifer contamination, such abandoned wells could provide a direct conduit for pollutants. MPWMD staff believes that to best protect the water resource system these wells should also be identified. Under this Task MPWMD would prepare a list of any such abandoned wells that are identified, and a course of action to conduct any additional work if warranted.</p> <p>Pertinent information from the above tasks will be prepared in summary tables and figures, along with a brief report.</p>
I. 4. a and b	Review Seawater Intrusion Analyses	WATERMASTER will have a consultant perform analyses and prepare mapping and other documents pertaining to seawater intrusion detection. PROFESSIONAL will participate in meetings with the consultant during the course of its work, and will provide review comments and recommendations to WATERMASTER regarding this work as it is being carried out by the consultant.

Table 2

WELL NAME AND SUBAREA LOCATION ⁽⁸⁾	MONITORING NETWORK ⁽¹⁾		MONITORING REQUIRED BY DECISION ⁽²⁾		MONITORING CURRENTLY BEING PERFORMED BY PROFESSIONAL NOT SUBJECT TO THIS RFS ⁽³⁾		MONITORING TO BE PERFORMED BY PROFESSIONAL UNDER THIS RFS ⁽⁴⁾			
	Existing	Enhanced	Level (Monthly)	Quality (Annually)	Level		Level		Quality	
					Frequency		Frequency		Frequency	
					Monthly	Quarterly	Monthly	Quarterly	Annually	Quarterly
Northern Coastal Subarea (and vicinity)										
MSC-Shallow	X				X					X
MSC-Deep	X				X					X
PCA-W Shallow	X					X				X
PCA-W Deep	X					X				X
PCA-E (Multiple) Shallow	X				X				X	
PCA-E (Multiple) Deep	X				X				X	
Ord Grove Test-Shallow/Deep	X				X					
Paralta Test-Shallow/Deep	X				X					
Ord Terrace-Shallow	X				X				X	
Ord Terrace-Deep	X				X				X	
MPWMD #FO-09-Shallow	X				X					X
MPWMD #FO-09-Deep	X				X					X
MPWMD #FO-10-Shallow	X				X				X	
MPWMD #FO-10-Deep	X				X				X	
Fort Ord Monitor MW-B-23-180-Dune/Aromas		X					X		X	
CDM MW-1-Dune/Aromas		X					X			
CDM MW-2-Dune/Aromas		X					X			
CAW Del Monte Observation-Shallow		X							X	
SBWM MW-1-Deep (Purisima) ⁽⁶⁾		X						X	X	
SBWM MW-2-Deep (Purisima) ⁽⁶⁾		X						X	X	
SBWM MW-3-Deep (Purisima) ⁽⁶⁾		X						X	X	
SBWM MW-4-Deep (Purisima/Santa Margarita) ⁽⁶⁾		X						X	X	
Northern Inland Subarea (and vicinity)										
MPWMD #FO-01-Shallow	X					X				
MPWMD #FO-01-Deep	X					X				
MPWMD #FO-07-Shallow	X					X				
MPWMD #FO-07-Deep	X					X				
MPWMD #FO-08-Shallow	X					X				
MPWMD #FO-08-Deep	X					X				
MPWMD #FO-11-Shallow	X					X				
MPWMD #FO-11-Deep	X					X				
SBWM MW-5-Shallow (Paso Robles) ⁽⁶⁾		X						X	X	
SBWM MW-5-Deep (Santa Margarita) ⁽⁶⁾		X						X	X	

Table 2 (Continued)

WELL NAME AND SUBAREA LOCATION ⁽⁸⁾	MONITORING NETWORK ⁽¹⁾		MONITORING REQUIRED BY DECISION ⁽²⁾		MONITORING CURRENTLY BEING PERFORMED BY PROFESSIONAL NOT SUBJECT TO THIS RFS ⁽³⁾		MONITORING TO BE PERFORMED BY PROFESSIONAL UNDER THIS RFS ⁽⁴⁾			
	Existing	Enhanced	Level (Monthly)	Quality (Annually)	Level		Level		Quality	
					Frequency		Frequency		Frequency	
					Monthly	Quarterly	Monthly	Quarterly	Annually	Quarterly
Southern Coastal Subarea (and vicinity)										
Plumas '90 Test-Deep	X				X					
K-Mart-Dune/Aromas	X				X					
CDM MW-3-Dune/Aromas		X					X			
CDM MW-4-Dune/Aromas		X					X			
MW-BW-08A-Dune/Aromas		X					X			
MW-BW-09-180-Shallow		X					X			
Laguna Seca Subarea (and vicinity)										
MPWMD #FO-03-Shallow	X					X				
MPWMD #FO-03-Deep	X					X				
MPWMD #FO-04-Shallow (E)	X					X				
MPWMD #FO-04-Deep (W)	X					X				
MPWMD #FO-05-Shallow	X					X				
MPWMD #FO-05-Deep	X					X				
MPWMD #FO-06-Shallow	X					X				
MPWMD #FO-06-Deep	X					X				
Justin Court (RR M2S)-Shallow	X					X				
LS Pistol Range (Mo Co TH-1)-Deep	X					X				
York Rd-West (Mo Co MW-1 D)-Deep	X					X				
Seca Place (Mo Co MW-2)-Deep	X					X				
Robley Shallow (North) (Mo Co MW-3S)-Shallow	X					X				
Robley Deep (South) (Mo Co MW-3D)-Deep	X					X				
LS No. 1 Subdivision-Deep	X					X				
Blue Larkspur-East End-Believed to be Deep	X					X				
York School-Shallow		X	X						X	
Laguna Seca Driving Range (SCS-Deep)-Shallow		X						X	X	
Laguna Seca County Park #2-Shallow		X	X						X	
CAW Granite Construction-Deep		X					X			
CAW Ryan Ranch (RR) #7-Deep		X	X						X	
Laguna Seca Golf New #12-Deep ⁽⁹⁾		X							X	
Pasadera Main Gate-Deep		X	X						X	
No. of Wells in Each Network⁽⁵⁾=	40	21	4	0	14	26	8	7	20	6

Notes:

- (1) The wells within the Existing Monitoring Well Network are the wells that PROFESSIONAL has been monitoring in the recent years as part of PROFESSIONAL's own monitoring program. The wells within the Enhanced Monitoring Well Network are the wells to be monitored under this RFS.
- (2) Monitoring required by the Decision is the monitoring described in the Monitoring and Management Program which was incorporated by reference in the Decision of the Court dated February 9, 2007.
- (3) Monitoring currently being performed by PROFESSIONAL not subject to this RFS is monitoring work PROFESSIONAL is performing under other monitoring programs. This monitoring is not a part of this RFS.
- (4) Monitoring to be performed by PROFESSIONAL is the monitoring to be performed under this RFS.
- (5) The Enhanced Monitoring Well Network includes 15 wells recommended in the Enhanced Monitoring Well Network report prepared by PROFESSIONAL, dated October 23, 2007, plus the 4 new Sentinel Wells installed in 2007.
- (6) The Seaside Basin Watermaster (SBWM) wells are all equipped with dataloggers that obtain measurements at least daily, but will be manually sounded for water level on a quarterly basis for calibration purposes. SBWM MW-4 Deep is to be sampled for water quality semi-annually.
- (7) Not used.
- (8) Shallow=Paso Robles; Deep=Santa Margarita or Purisima.
- (9) This well is so close to the Laguna Seca Old No. 12 well that no water level monitoring is necessary.
- (10) CAW East Fence Shallow well can no longer be sampled and was therefore dropped from this list.

**ATTACHMENT 2
SCHEDULE**

**MPWMD RFS No. 2011-01
Work Schedule**

ID	Task Name	2011																	
		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Ju
1	I.2.a DATABASE MANAGEMENT																		
2	I.2.a.1 Conduct Ongoing Data Entry/Database Maintenance																		
3	I.2.b DATA COLLECTION PROGRAM																		
4	I.2.b.2 Collect Monthly Water Levels (MPWMD)																		
5	I.2.b.3 Collect Quarterly Water Quality Samples (MPWMD)																		
6	I.2.b.6 Reports (from MPWMD)																		
7	Watermaster Prepares Combined Quarterly Water Production, Water Level, and Water Quality Reports for 1st & 2nd Quarters																		
8	Watermaster Prepares Quarterly Water Production, Water Level, and Water Quality Report for 3rd Quarter																		
9	Watermaster Prepares Quarterly Water Production, Water Level, and Water Quality Report for 4th Quarter																		
10	I.3.d Evaluate Coastal Wells for Cross-Aquifer Contamination Potential																		
11	MPWMD Performs Further Evaluations of these Wells																		
12	MPWMD Makes Presentation of Well Evaluations to TAC																		
13	MPWMD Makes Final Presentation of Well Evaluations to TAC & TAC Determines if Further Work Should be Done in 2011																		
14	If Further Work is Recommended for 2011 Board Approves Contract with MPWMD to Perform this Work																		
15	I.4.a HydroMetrics & MPWMD Provide Oversight of Seawater Intrusion Detection and Tracking																		

Work Schedule for MPWMD RFS No 2011-01 10-14-10

Page 1

ATTACHMENT 3 SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED COSTS

M&MP TASK NO.	LABOR HOURS		HOURLY RATE	SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS		TOTAL
	BREAKDOWN	TOTAL		BREAKDOWN	TOTAL	
I.2. a. 1	12 mo. @ 8 hrs/mo.	96	\$100	Other services needed to host and maintain Watermaster's Database: 12 months @ ~2 hours/month @ \$130/hour = \$3,100	\$3,100	\$12,700
I.2. b. 2.	12 mo. @ 4 hrs/mo.	48	\$70	N/A	\$0	\$3,360
I.2. b. 3.	Existing Coastal wells (6 wells @ 3 sites): 4 events @ 20 hrs/event	80	\$70	Fuel: 4 events @ \$10/site x 3 sites = \$120; Lab costs: 4 events @ \$200/well x 6 wells = \$4,800.	\$4,920	\$10,520
	Annual WQ wells per Table 2: 1 event @ 24 hrs/event = 24 hrs: Quarterly new WQ well per Table 2 (BLM site): 1 event @ 4 hr/event = 4 hrs	24	\$70	Eductor setup (needed for each event at the BLM site): \$500 x 1 site = \$500; Airlift equip.: \$100 x 1 site x 1 event = \$100; Fuel: \$20 x 1 site x 1 event = \$20; Lab cost (annual WQ wells): \$200 x 16 wells x 1 event = \$3,200; One-time perm. pump retrofits (2 sites): \$2,500 x 2 sites = \$5,000.	\$8,820	\$10,500
	WM Sentinel and Northern Inland wells: download/store dataloggers, 4 events @ 2 hrs/event	8	\$70	N/A	\$0	\$560
	WM Sentinel wells: Semi-annual induction logging - all 4 sites; annual WQ samples from each aquifer at each site (=2 per well site) - all 4 sites; semi-annual WQ samples - SBWM MW-4 site. Total labor = 2 events @ 4 wells @ 3 hrs/well.	24	\$70	Induction logging: \$7,200 for all 4 sites/event x 2 events = \$14,400; Lab cost (annual): \$200 x 4 sites x 2 samples = \$1,600; Lab cost (second sampling @ SBWM MW-4): \$200 x 1 site x 2 samples = \$400.	\$16,400	\$18,080
	Compile data: 4 events @ 25 hours/event	100	\$70	N/A	\$0	\$7,000
I.2. b. 6	4 - quarterly reports @ 12 hrs/report	48	\$85	N/A	\$0	\$4,080
	1- annual report @ 16 hrs	16	\$100	N/A	\$0	\$1,600
I.3.d	Initial portion of further evaluation of Coastal Wells for cross-aquifer contamination potential	106	\$85	N/A	\$0	\$9,010
I.4. a and b	12 mo. @ 3 hrs/mo.	36	\$100	N/A	\$0	\$3,600

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST = \$81,010

Notes:

1. Vehicle mileage is included in the labor costs above.
2. Regardless of the use of the term "Estimated Cost" in this RFS, if the work of this RFS is to be compensated for using Lump Sum Payment method, it is understood and agreed to by PROFESSIONAL that the Total Price listed on page A-1 of this RFS is binding and limiting as defined in Section V of the Agreement.

SEASIDE BASIN WATERMASTER
REQUEST FOR SERVICE

DATE: January 1, 2011

RFS NO. 2011-02

(To be filled in by WATERMASTER)

TO: Joe Oliver

FROM: Robert Jaques

Monterey Peninsula Water Management District
PROFESSIONAL

WATERMASTER

Services Needed and Purpose:

Perform water level and water quality data collection for specified wells within the Seaside Basin in accordance with the Scope of Work contained in Attachment 1.

Completion Date: The work of this RFS No. 2011-02 shall be completed on an as-directed basis from the Watermaster during 2011. All work under this RFS will be completed not later than December 31, 2011.

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

Total Price Authorized by this RFS: \$4,140.00 (See Attachment 1 for details regarding this Total Price, and how costs will be authorized on an as-directed basis. 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: _____ Date: _____.

WATERMASTER Technical Program Manager

Authorized by: _____ Date: _____.

WATERMASTER Chief Executive Officer

Agreed to by: _____ Date: _____.

PROFESSIONAL

ATTACHMENT 1

Scope of Work for RFS No. 2011-02

Background:

The WATERMASTER Board authorized its staff to contract with the PROFESSIONAL to collect water level and water quality data from certain wells located within the Seaside Basin, if the owners/operators of those wells expressed this desire to the WATERMASTER. The procedures for this data collection are described in the January 17, 2008 “Notice to Well Owners” that was sent out by the Watermaster to well owners in the Seaside Groundwater Basin..

This RFS No. 2011-02 authorizes PROFESSIONAL to perform this data collection work on an as-directed basis, with formal authorization from the WATERMASTER to the PROFESSIONAL being required prior to the PROFESSIONAL performing such work on any specified well. This will provide the WATERMASTER with full control over which wells are provided this service, as well as over the costs for having this work performed.

The wells to which these services may be provided are listed in Table 1.

The estimated costs, per well, to perform these services are as follows:

Monthly Water Levels - It is estimated that it will take approximately 0.5 hour/well to perform a water level measurement. This time estimate is based on the assumption that the water level measurements will be performed at the time that a field person is already out and about collecting data from other wells, and the fact that the distance between wells located within the Basin is not that great. This labor would be billed at the field rate of \$70/hr, so the estimated cost per water level measurement would be \$35.

The total estimated cost would be \$420 per year per well for 12 monthly measurements.

Annual Water Quality Sampling - Assuming that annual water sample collection would coincide with water level collection at a well, it is estimated that it will take approximately 0.5 hr to collect the water quality sample, including sampling time, bottle labeling, custody forms, delivery to laboratory, etc. There will also be an estimated 0.5 hr for receipt, review and computer entry of laboratory data, and an estimated \$200 per sample for the laboratory analysis. The sampling work would be billed at the field rate of \$70/hr, so the estimated cost per annual water quality sample would be \$70 for labor, and \$200 for laboratory services, for a total cost per sample of \$270. Only one sample per well will need to be collected and analyzed in 2011. This sample will be collected in the fall of 2011.

The total estimated cost for collecting and analyzing the sample per well is \$270.

Combined Water Level Measurements and Water Quality Sampling: For combined water level and water quality monitoring, the total estimated cost, per well, for the 12-month period is \$690.

Of the wells listed in Table 1 it is assumed that not more than 6 will ask to have data collected for them by the WATERMASTER, the total estimated cost would be:

Potential No. of Wells Needing Water Level Data Collected = 6 @ \$420 = \$2,520
Potential No. of Wells Needing Water Quality Data Collected = 6 @ \$270 = \$1,620
TOTAL = \$4,140

Table 1

APN	DETAILS	COMPANY	Watermaster "Producer" Well?	MPWMD Assigned Well #	Monthly Water Levels Required	Monthly Water Levels Being Collected?	Annual Water Quality Analyses Required?	Annual Water Quality Data Being Collected?
Within MPWMD Boundaries								
012-432-004	CAW - Plumas #4	California American Water Co.	Y	T15S/R1E-27Jg	Y	Y	Y	N
012-843-013	CAW - Darwin	California American Water Co.	Y	T15S/R1E-23Ea	Y	Y	Y	N
011-041-018	CAW - Military	California American Water Co.	Y	T15S/R1E-14Nd	Y	Y	Y	N
011-061-004	CAW - Ord Grove #2	California American Water Co.	Y	T15S/R1E-23Bc	Y	Y	Y	N
011-071-018	CAW - New Luzern	California American Water Co.	Y	T15S/R1E-23De	Y	Y	Y	N
011-091-017	CAW - Playa #3	California American Water Co.	Y	T15S/R1E-22Bc	Y	Y	Y	N
011-091-017	CAW - Playa #4	California American Water Co.	Y	T15S/R1E-22Bf	Y	Y	N	
011-493-028	CAW - Paralta	California American Water Co.	Y	T15S/R1E-14Ra	Y	Y	Y	N
031-151-010	Reservoir Well	City of Seaside	Y	T15S/R1E-13Na	Y	?	Y	N
031-231-062	Coe Avenue Well	City of Seaside	Y	T15S/R1E-14Ma	Y	?	Y	N
011-181-014	Public Works Corp. Yard	City of Sand City	Y	T15S/R1E-22Ed	Y	?	Y	N
011-011-020	Cypress Pacific	Monterey Peninsula Engineering	Y	T15S/R1E-22Dd	Y	N	Y	N
011-236-010	Robinette -Design Ctr.	City of Sand City	Y	T15S/R1E-22Mc	Y	?	Y	N
011-041-043	(in front of Target)	DBO Development	Y	T15S/R1E-22Ce	Y	N	N	
011-061-022	MMP prod well	Mission Memorial Park	Y	T15S/R1E-23Ab	Y	Y	N	
011-061-022	PRTIW -operated by MMP	Mission Memorial Park	Y	T15S/R1E-23Ac	Y	N	Y	N
011-501-014-500		Security National Guaranty, Inc.	Y	T15S/R1E-15K1	Y	N	Y	N
011-532-005		Granite Rock Company	Y	T15S/R1E-22Eb	Y	?	N	
012-511-005	Shea Well	City of Del Rey Oaks	Y	T15S/R1E-26Mc	Y	N	N	
012-115-017	City #4	Seaside Municipal Water System	Y	T15S/R1E-23Gc	Y	?	Y	?
012-653-003	City #2	Seaside Municipal Water System	Y	T15S/R1E-23Pb	Y	?	N	
012-664-017	City #1	Seaside Municipal Water System	Y	T15S/R1E-23Lb	Y	?	N	
012-115-017	City #3	Seaside Municipal Water System	Y	T15S/R1E-23Ga	Y	?	Y	?
173-071-052	East Well (Lot #9)	CAW - Bishop Unit	Y	T16S/R2E-05Fa	Y	N	N	
173-072-034	well lot Bishop #1 (west)	CAW - Bishop Unit	Y	T16S/R2E-05Ea	Y	Y	N	
173-072-041	well lot Bishop #2 (east)	CAW - Bishop Unit	Y	T16S/R2E-05Fb	Y	Y	N	
416-111-002	Mutual	CAW - Hidden Hills Unit	Y	T16S/R2E-09Cb	Y	N	N	
416-111-004	Standex	CAW - Hidden Hills Unit	Y	T16S/R2E-09Cc	Y	N	N	
416-111-004	Bay Ridge	CAW - Hidden Hills Unit	Y	T16S/R2E-09Cd	Y	Y	N	
259-031-011	RR#7	CAW - Ryan Ranch #7	Y	T15S/R1E-36Nb	Y	Y	N	
259-031-012	RR#8	CAW - Ryan Ranch #8	Y	T16S/R1E-01Cb	Y	Y	N	
259-031-012	RR#11	CAW - Ryan Ranch #11	Y	T16S/R1E-01Cd	Y	Y	N	
173-071-056	Old Main Gate (Lot #12)	Pasadera - New Cities Developme	Y	T16S/R2E-05Mg	Y	Y	N	
173-071-051	Paddock #1(Lot #11)	Pasadera - New Cities Developme	Y	T16S/R2E-05Mf	Y	N	N	
203-031-034	01-349	York School	Y	T15S/R1E-36Qa	Y	?	N	
173-071-048	(new #12)	Laguna Seca Golf Resort	Y	T16S/R2E-06Hb	Y	Y	N	
173-071-048	(racetrack)	Laguna Seca Golf Resort	Y	T16S/R2E-06Ga	Y	Y	N	
Outside MPWMD Boundaries								
173-011-025, -026	LS Cnty Park #3	MPPRPD	Y	T16S/R2E-05Gd	Y	?	N	
173-011-025, -026	LS Cnty Park #4	MPPRPD	Y	T16S/R2E-05Ge	Y	?	N	
					Y = 38	N or ? = 21	Y = 16	N or ? = 16

SEASIDE BASIN WATERMASTER
REQUEST FOR SERVICE

DATE: January 1, 2011

RFS NO. 2011-01

(To be filled in by WATERMASTER)

TO: Derrick Williams
HydroMetrics LLC
PROFESSIONAL

FROM: Robert Jaques
WATERMASTER

Services Needed and Purpose: See Scope of Work in Attachment 1.

Completion Date: All work of this RFS shall be completed not later than December 31, 2011, and shall be performed in accordance with the Schedule contained in Attachment 2.

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

Total Price Authorized by this RFS: \$ 12,000.00 (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

ATTACHMENT 1

SCOPE OF WORK

On an ongoing and as-requested basis, PROFESSIONAL will provide general hydrogeologic consulting services to WATERMASTER on a variety of topics. These may include, but not be limited to interpretation of water level and water quality data collected by WATERMASTER, and BMAP and SIRP implementation issues.

Providing these services will likely involve attending certain of WATERMASTER's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings, most of which will be attended telephonically. These TAC meetings do not include special TAC or other meetings which may be required as part of performing other work which may be authorized under other RFSs issued to PROFESSIONAL by WATERMASTER. Any such other scope and cost proposals will incorporate costs for those meetings.

The Tasks in WATERMASTER's 2011 Monitoring and Management Program (M&MP) to which this RFS No. 2011-01 pertains are:

- M. 1. c - Preparation and Attendance of Meetings
- M. 1. e - Peer Review of Documents and Reports
- I. 2. b. 6 - Reports
- I. 4. a. - Oversight of Seawater Intrusion Detection and Tracking

ESTIMATED COSTS

General Consulting Services, including attending some TAC and other meetings either via telephone or in-person in Seaside, as requested by WATERMASTER will be billed at the following hourly rates, including all markups and other direct costs:

Derrick Williams = \$180.00/hour

Georgina King = \$160.00/hour

In addition to hourly labor costs, an allowance of \$1,000.00 is included in this RFS to cover travel and other incidental costs associated with the performance of this work.

The total cost authorized by this RFS No. 2011-01 is \$12,000.00.

ATTACHMENT 2
SCHEDULE

HydroMetrics RFS No. 2011-01
Work Schedule

ID	Task Name	2011														Jan	F				
		Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct			Nov	Dec		
1	M. 1. c - Preparation and Attendance of Meetings																				
2	M. 1. e - Peer Review of Documents and Reports																				
3	I.2.b.6 Reports (by HydroMetrics)																				
4	I.4.a HydroMetrics & MPWMD Provide Oversight of Seawater Int																				

SEASIDE BASIN WATERMASTER
REQUEST FOR SERVICE

DATE: 1/1/2011

RFS NO. 2011-02

(To be filled in by WATERMASTER)

TO: Derrick Williams
HydroMetrics LLC
PROFESSIONAL

FROM: Robert Jaques
WATERMASTER

Services Needed and Purpose: Prepare the Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report for 2011. See Scope of Work in Attachment 1.

Completion Date: All work of this RFS shall be completed not later than December 31, 2011, and shall be performed in accordance with the Schedule contained in Attachment 2.

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

Total Price Authorized by this RFS: \$ 22,020.00 (Cost is authorized only when evidenced by signature below.) (See Attachment 3 for Detailed Breakdown of Estimated Costs).

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

Requested by: _____ Date: _____
WATERMASTER Technical Program Manager

Authorized by: _____ Date: _____
WATERMASTER Chief Executive Officer

Agreed to by: _____ Date: _____
PROFESSIONAL

ATTACHMENT 1

SCOPE OF WORK

The scope consists of providing professional consulting services to WATERMASTER for preparation of the 2011 Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report (SIAR).

To promote efficiency, much of the text and graphics from the 2010 SIAR will be incorporated directly into the 2011 SIAR. Changes that will be incorporated into the 2011 SIAR will include:

- Updating charts, graphs, and maps to reflect the most recent sampling and water level data.
- Analyzing the quarterly electric induction logs (EM logs) from the coastal sentinel wells to look for evidence of seawater intrusion.
- Incorporating data from the new Northern Inland (BLM Site) well which was added to WATERMASTER's enhanced monitoring well network in late 2009.

Preparing the 2011 SIAR will involve analyzing all water quality data at the end of Water Year 2011 (October 1, 2010 to September 30, 2011) and producing semi-annual (2nd and 4th quarters 2011) chloride concentration maps for each aquifer in the Basin. Time series graphs, trilinear graphs, and stiff diagram comparisons will be updated with new data. Second and fourth quarter groundwater elevation maps will also be produced. The annual EM logs will be analyzed to identify changes in seawater wedge locations. A determination of whether there is any evidence of seawater intrusion will be made, and recommendations will be included as warranted.

A Draft 2011 SIAR will be provided to WATERMASTER in electronic (not printed) form for review. WATERMASTER will provide its review comments and those of its TAC members through direct discussions with PROFESSIONAL at a TAC meeting. In addition to these oral comments, some TAC members may also provide recommended editorial changes electronically directly to PROFESSIONAL. These comments will be addressed in a Final 2011 SIAR. A CD containing an electronic version of the entire Final 2011 SIAR in MS Word and 15 printed and bound copies of the Final 2011 SIAR will be provided to WATERMASTER.

ATTACHMENT 2

HydroMetrics RFS No. 2011-02 Work Schedule

ID	Task Name	2011																	
		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Ju
1	I.4.c Annual Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report (SIAR)																		
2	HydroMetrics Provides Draft SIAR to Watermaster												◆ 10/6						
3	TAC Approves Annual Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report (SIAR)												◆ 10/12						
4	Board Approves Annual Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report (SIAR)												◆ 11/2						

ATTACHMENT 3

DETAILED BREAKDOWN OF ESTIMATED COSTS

Note: Regardless of the use of the term "Estimated Cost" in this RFS, if the work of this RFS is to be compensated for using Lump Sum Payment method, it is understood and agreed to by PROFESSIONAL that the Total Price listed on page 1 of this RFS is binding and limiting as defined in Section V of the Agreement.

DETAILED BREAKDOWN OF ESTIMATED COSTS

HOURLY RATES:

Derrick Williams = \$180.00

Georgina King = \$160.00

Task	Hours		Costs			
	Derrick Williams	Georgina King	Derrick Williams	Georgina King	Expenses	Total Costs
2010 Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report						
Produce 2011 SLAR	16	88	\$2,880	\$14,080	\$3,130	\$20,090
Attend One TAC Meeting in Monterey	10	0	\$1,800	\$0	\$130	\$1,930
TOTALS	26	88	\$4,680	\$14,080	\$3,260	\$22,020

ITEM. IX.

NEW BUSINESS

ITEM IX.A.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

ITEM NO. IX.A.1.

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY
COMMITTEE
(TAC)**

**SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN
WATERMASTER**

TO: Board of Directors

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

DATE: November 3, 2010

SUBJECT: Discussion/Consider Approving the Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report (SIAR) for FY 2010

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that the Board approve the Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report for WY 2010.

BACKGROUND:

HydroMetrics has prepared the Draft Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report (SIAR) for Water Year 2009-2010. The Executive Summary from the SIAR is attached. The SIAR examines the “health” of the Basin with regard to whether or not there are any indications that seawater intrusion is either occurring or is imminent.

DISCUSSION

The key Conclusion contained in the SIAR is that depressed groundwater levels, continued pumping in excess of recharge and fresh water inflows, and ongoing seawater intrusion in the nearby Salinas Valley all suggest that seawater intrusion could occur in the Seaside Groundwater Basin, but in spite of these factors, no seawater intrusion is currently observed in existing monitoring wells.

One of the recommendations of the SIAR is that the protective groundwater elevations for the Seaside Basin be refined using calibrated aquifer properties from the Seaside Basin groundwater flow model. This Task has been included in the approved Management and Monitoring Program (and its Budget) for 2011.

ATTACHMENTS:

Executive Summary of WY 2010 Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report. The complete SIAR is posted on the Watermaster’s website at <http://www.seasidebasinwatermaster.org/>, for review by those Board members who wish to examine the entire document, including all of its attachments.

Executive Summary

This annual report addresses the potential for, and extent of, seawater intrusion in the Seaside Groundwater Basin. Continued pumping in excess of recharge and fresh water inflows, pumping depressions near the coast, and ongoing seawater intrusion in the nearby Salinas Valley all suggest that seawater intrusion could occur in the Seaside Groundwater Basin. Fortunately, no seawater intrusion is currently observed in existing monitoring wells, as demonstrated by the different tools and analyses that were used to investigate for evidence of seawater intrusion:

- Piper diagrams for groundwater samples collected from depth-discreet monitoring wells during Water Year 2010 show no changes towards seawater.
- No groundwater samples analyzed with Stiff diagrams are indicative of incipient seawater intrusion.
- Wells with chloride concentration increases over the past year are: PCA-W deep, PCA-E shallow, MSC shallow, FO-09 shallow, FO-9 deep, FO-10 deep, Sentinel Well 1 at 1,140 ft, Sentinel Well 1 at 1,390 ft, Sentinel Well 3 at 870 ft, and Sentinel Well 3 at 1,275 ft. Although the increases mentioned above do not indicate seawater intrusion, their future trends must be continued to be followed. Stiff and Piper diagrams for these wells do not indicate seawater intrusion, and it is likely that the increase is merely a localized fluctuation that is unrelated to seawater intrusion. No additional monitoring is warranted.
- Of the wells from last year's SIAR that had increasing chloride concentrations, the deep Fort Ord 10 well is the only monitoring well that continued with an increase over the past year. Stiff and Piper diagrams for this well do not indicate seawater intrusion, and it is likely that the increase is merely a localized fluctuation that is unrelated to seawater intrusion. No additional monitoring is warranted.
- No wells display decreasing sodium/chloride ratios that would indicate seawater intrusion.
- Maps of chloride concentrations do not show chlorides increasing towards the coast.
- Although production wells have a different water quality than the monitoring wells, this is probably as a result of them being screened across both shallow and deep zones. The production well water qualities are not indicative of seawater intrusion.
- Groundwater production in the Seaside Groundwater Basin remained the same as Water Year 2009. The amount pumped, 4,547.6 acre-feet, is less than the Court-mandated operating yield of 5,600 acre-feet per year. The lower than historic pumping is a result of implementing the Court-mandated triennial reduction in an effort to bring the basin closer to hydrologic balance which is necessary to prevent seawater intrusion.
- Groundwater levels continue to be below preliminary protective elevations in all deep target monitoring wells (MSC deep, PCA-W, and Sentinel Well 3). Two of the three shallow wells' groundwater levels are above protective elevations: PCA-W shallow and CDM-MW4. MSC shallow remains below preliminary protective elevations.

Based on the findings of this report, the following recommendations should be implemented to continue to monitor and track potential seawater intrusion.

1. Semi-Annual Water Quality Sampling in Well SBWM-4

Continue to collect semi-annual samples at sentinel well SBWM-4 because chloride concentrations from a depth of 900 feet below surface remain greater than 250 mg/L.

2. Continue to Analyze and Report on Water Quality Annually

Seawater intrusion is a threat, and data must be analyzed regularly to identify incipient intrusion. Maps, graphs, and analyses similar to what are found in this report should continue to be developed every year.

3. Refine Preliminary Protective Groundwater Elevations

It is recommended that the preliminary protective groundwater elevation estimated during modeling (HydroMetrics LLC, 2009b) be refined using final calibrated aquifer properties from the Seaside Basin groundwater flow model. It is expected that the protective elevations will be decreased up to a few feet, which will make them more practical to meet.

11/3/10

**SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN
WATERMASTER**

TO: Board of Directors

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

DATE: November 3, 2010

SUBJECT: Discussion/Consider Approving a request to redefine a “quorum” and voting requirements for TAC meetings.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that the Board:

- (1) Approve the language revisions to its Rules and Regulations described in the attachment to this Agenda Transmittal to redefine a quorum and voting requirements for TAC meetings.
- (2) Determine whether or not to continue having a Public Member on the TAC, and if having a Public Member is to be continued, to name a replacement for Mr. Fischer, who was recently deceased.

BACKGROUND:

The issue has arisen on several occasions as to how many members must be present to constitute a “quorum” for holding a TAC meeting, and also how many members must vote at those meetings in order for the TAC to take an action. In some instances a shortage of TAC members present has resulted in the TAC being unable to conduct a meeting, or to take action on any issues. The attached “Discussion Paper on TAC Quorum and Voting Issues” provides background information on this topic and proposes solutions to these problems.

DISCUSSION

The TAC currently has 10 designated members on it, as prescribed by the WM Board and its Rules and Regulations. However, many of these members virtually never attend and in fact some have NEVER attended TAC meetings during the entire existence of the TAC. This is apparently because the Board Members from those entities feel that by participating on the Board, through which all actions of the TAC must pass and be approved before they can be carried out, they can remain fully informed and involved in the TAC's activities without having to send a representative to the TAC meetings. Consequently, there have typically not been more than 6 TAC members present at any meeting, including Mr. Fischer who was the “Public Member” and was a regular attendee.

At a Board meeting earlier this year, the TAC sought Board direction with regard to naming an Alternate Public Member to the TAC, as suggested by Mr. Fischer, because he reported he would be unable to attend some TAC meetings due to medical issues he was experiencing. The Board decided not to name an Alternate Public Member at that time, pending Mr. Fischer’s ability to resume attending TAC meetings. Unfortunately, Mr. Fischer recently passed away, and consequently there will likely not be more than 5 TAC members attending future meetings.

If the number of TAC members remains at 10, the number of members that would need to be present to conduct a meeting, and to take action by voting, would be 6 if a simple majority of the members must be present to conduct a meeting. If the Board decides not to have a Public Member on the TAC, the TAC would be comprised of only 9 members, and a simple majority would be 5. Both of these situations pose a problem for the TAC, as all it would take would be for one of the regular attendees to be absent, and there could be no TAC meeting and no action could be taken.

The TAC believes this is impractical, and recommends that the Board take the following actions:

1. Formally clarify that all of the "Parties" are invited to send a representative to participate in TAC meetings, and that each of those representatives would have a voting right on the TAC if they were in attendance, but that as long as representatives of at least 4 of the "Parties" are present, the TAC can hold a meeting and act on the items on its Agenda and forward any recommendations coming out of those meetings as the TAC's recommendations to the Board.
2. State that only an affirmative vote of a majority of the TAC members present at any TAC meeting is necessary to take an action, as long as the prerequisite number of TAC representatives (4) is present for the meeting.

Proposed language to revise the Board's "Rules and Regulations" to accomplish these actions is attached.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Discussion Paper on TAC Quorum and Voting Issues.
2. Proposed language revisions to the Board's "Rules and Regulations"

DISCUSSION PAPER ON TAC QUORUM AND VOTING ISSUES

Prepared by Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager

Background

John Fischer sometimes raised the issue of how many TAC members must be present for the TAC to conduct its meetings or take any actions, and also how many votes need to be cast at those meetings to constitute taking action.

Mr. Fischer was of the belief that at least 6 TAC members must be present, or a TAC meeting could not be held. He said he based this understanding on that fact that there are 10 designated TAC members, and that a majority number of those members must be present for the TAC to convene a meeting. He also stated his belief that at least 6 members must vote on an item for any action to be taken on it. His basis for this belief was the same as that just stated regarding the number of TAC members necessary to conduct a meeting.

I contacted Dave Laredo, Legal Counsel for the MPWMD, and asked for his input on this matter. He stated that he believed Mr. Fischer was correct in his belief that 6 TAC members constituted a quorum, and that a majority of the members is needed for any specific action of TAC.

Watermaster Board Rules and Regulations Pertaining to These Issues

Shortly after its inception the Watermaster Board developed and formally adopted a set of "Rules and Regulations." The following items discuss those Sections of the Rules and Regulations that pertain to quorum and voting issues affecting the TAC:

1. **Brown Act Applicability:** Paragraph 3.1 of the Rules and Regulations defines the term "Member" to mean the individual appointed by each of the "Parties" to serve on the Board [emphasis added]. Paragraph 4.2 defines "Alternate Members" to mean the individual appointed by each of the "Parties" to act in place of the "Member" if the "Member" is absent at a Board meeting [emphasis added]. Paragraph 3.3 describes how the Board will establish its committees and appoint persons to serve on those committees, and also states that such appointees need not be "Members". It also states that no more than 5 "Members" or "Alternates" may serve on any individual committee. Paragraph 3.3.1.1 defines the Technical Advisory Committee as one of the Board's standing committees. In my view this is why the Brown Act applies to the TAC, since the Brown Act applies to standing committees of the legislative (governing) body. However, in our case there are no "Members" or "Alternates" that serve on the TAC. Rather, each of the Parties sends a member of its staff to represent it at the TAC.

The "actions" of the TAC are essentially to make recommendations to the Board, which must approve those recommendations before any real "action" is taken, e.g. consultant contracts awarded, approval or acceptance of work products such as consultant reports, Watermaster Budgets, Management and Monitoring Program Scopes of Work, etc. Thus, the TAC has not been given any "subject matter jurisdiction" of its own by the Board, because the Board retains that jurisdiction over such matters at its own level.

2. **Voting and the Conduct of TAC Meetings:** There are 9 "Members" on the Board. Paragraph 3.1.1 of the Rules and Regulations states that the Board must have a minimum of 6 members present to constitute a quorum, and that a minimum of 7 affirmative votes are required for any action of the Watermaster (which presumably means any action of the Watermaster Board). However, there does not appear to be any language in the Rules and Regulations that states how many TAC members must be present to constitute a quorum, nor how many affirmative votes are needed for any action of the

TAC. Again, as discussed above, the TAC doesn't really take "action" in the true sense of the word in this context, since all it can do is to make recommendations to the Board for it to act upon.

It appears that when the TAC was created it seemed logical to the Board that all of the Parties should be invited to participate in TAC activities, if they wanted to, and that also having a member of the public participate in TAC meetings might add to the value of the TAC's work. However, there does not appear to be any language in the Rules and Regulations that states that this will be the makeup of the TAC, just as there is nothing in the Rules and Regulations that states what the makeup of the other standing committee, the Budget and Finance (B&F) Committee, is to be. The B&F Committee, however, is actually comprised of "Members" as defined in paragraph 3.1, whereas there are no "Members" or "Alternates" on the TAC. So there are clear differences between the makeups of these two committees, even though they are both defined as standing committees.

All of this complexity leaves the potential for differing interpretations, which in turn may make it confusing and difficult for the TAC to conduct business. For example, to date only 6 of the 10 members of the TAC have typically attended any TAC meetings, with representatives from the Cities of Sand City and Del Rey Oaks, and the Coastal and Laguna Seca Subareas, rarely if ever in attendance. If any one of these 6 is unable to attend or send an alternate, then by one interpretation the TAC could not hold a meeting, which in most instances would have set the TAC a month behind on its work schedule. With John Fischer's recent passing, it will be nearly impossible for future TAC meetings to be legitimate meetings, since in all likelihood TAC meetings will lack the 6 members-present criteria. This could prevent the TAC from being able to make recommendations to the Board.

PROPOSED LANGUAGE REVISIONS TO THE BOARD’S
“RULES AND REGULATIONS”

Revise Section 3.1.1 *Quorum* by adding a second paragraph to that Section reading:

“A minimum of four (4) Members (or their representatives) shall be required to constitute a quorum of the Technical Advisory Committee. No fewer than three (3) affirmative votes shall be required for any action by the Technical Advisory Committee.”

Revise Section 3.3.1.1 *Technical Advisory Committee* by adding a paragraph reading:

“The Technical Advisory Committee shall be comprised of one representative from each of the Parties. In recognition of the fact that some of the Parties may only have their representatives attend Board meetings, and not Technical Advisory Committee meetings, the Quorum for meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee, and the number of votes required for actions by the Technical Advisory Committee, has been set lower than the Quorum and affirmative votes required for meetings of the Board, as defined in Section 3.1.1.”

**SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN
WATERMASTER**

TO: Board of Directors

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

DATE: November 3, 2010

SUBJECT: Discussion/Consider Approving Watermaster Annual Report for WY 2010 due to be filed with the Court on or before November 15, 2010

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that the Board approve the Watermaster Annual Report for WY 2010.

BACKGROUND:

The Watermaster submits an Annual Report to the Court after the end of each Water Year to fulfill one of its obligations under the Court Decision that created the Watermaster.

Since many items that must be included in the Annual Report cannot be finished until after the Water Year has ended, e.g. Production, Water Level, and Water Quality Reports, Replenishment Assessments, and the Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report, the Final version of the Annual Report cannot be completed until very late in October. It is therefore at the Board's November Board meeting that the final Annual Report is approved and staff then transmits it through an attorney to the Court.

DISCUSSION

A Preliminary Draft Annual Report was presented to the TAC for its review and input at the TAC's October 13, 2010 meeting. Attached is the body of the Final Draft 2010 Annual Report, reflecting input from the TAC. The complete Final Draft version is posted on the Watermaster's website at <http://www.seasidebasinwatermaster.org/>, for review by those Board members who wish to examine the entire document, including all of its attachments.

One item of particular note in the 2010 Annual Report is a proposal from the TAC that the deadline for submittal of the Annual Report be revised to February 15 of the following year, rather than the presently-required November 15 of the current year, to allow more time to prepare the report. This proposal is contained in the Conclusions and Recommendations section of the Annual Report.

The Final Draft version will be made into a Final version, reflecting any comments or recommendations from the Board at today's meeting. The Final version will be submitted to the Court.

ATTACHMENTS:

Body of the Final Draft version of the Watermaster 2010 Annual Report.

SEASIDE BASIN WATERMASTER

ANNUAL REPORT – 2010

Integral to the Superior Court Decision (Decision) rendered by Judge Roger D. Randall on March 27, 2006 is the requirement to file an Annual Report. The ruling of the Court requires that the Annual Report be prepared and filed with the Court and mailed to all the parties on or before the 15th day of November every year for the preceding Water Year. This 2010 Annual Report is being filed on or before November 15, 2010, consistent with the provisions of the Decision. This Annual Report addresses the specific Watermaster functions set forth in Section III. L. 3. x. of the Decision. In addition this Annual Report includes a section pertaining to Water Quality Monitoring and Basin Management.

A. Groundwater Extractions

The schedule summarizing the Water Year 2010 (WY 2010) groundwater production from all the producers allocated a Production Allocation in the Seaside Groundwater Basin is provided in Attachment 1, “Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster, Reported Quarterly and Annual Water Production From the Seaside Groundwater Basin for all Producers Included in the Seaside Basin Adjudication During Water Year 2010.” For the purposes of this Annual Report Water Year 2010 is defined as beginning October 1, 2009 and ending on September 30, 2010.

B. Groundwater Storage

Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD), in cooperation with California American Water (CAW), operated the Seaside Basin Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) program during WY 2010. During WY 2010, a total of 1,111 acre-feet (AF) of water was diverted by CAW from its Carmel River sources during periods of flow in excess of NOAA-Fisheries’ recommended bypass flows, transported through the existing CAW distribution system for injection and storage in the Seaside Basin at the MPWMD’s Santa Margarita ASR Well Nos. 1 and 2 located on former Fort Ord property. This is the only reported storage of non-native groundwater into the Seaside Basin in WY 2010.

Also during WY 2010, work was completed on installation of a permanent water delivery pipeline in the newly realigned section of General Jim Moore Boulevard south of Eucalyptus Road, as well as the installation of Pressure Regulating Valves (PRVs) at key locations within the CAW distribution system to allow the Phase 1 ASR Project to operate at its full design capacity of 3,000 gallons per minute (13 acre-feet per day). In addition, the MPWMD and CAW proceeded with installation of a test ASR well at the nearby Seaside Middle School. Installation of this new well is intended to satisfy one of the requirements of State Water Resources Control Board Order 2009-0060 (i.e., the Cease and Desist Order) that requires CAW to implement one or more “small projects” that total not less than 500 AF per year to reduce unlawful diversions from the Carmel River.

Based upon production reported for WY 2009, the following Standard Producers are entitled to Free and Not-Free Carryover Credits in accordance with the Decision, Section III. H. 5. for WY 2010:

<u>Producer</u>	<u>Free Carryover Credit</u>	<u>Not-Free Carryover Credit</u>
Granite Rock	40.39 acre-feet	50.47 acre-feet
DBO Development	91.60 acre-feet	101.03 acre-feet
CAW	0 acre-feet	495.90 acre-feet

C. Amount of Artificial Replenishment, if any, performed by Watermaster

No Artificial Replenishment of water was performed by the Watermaster for WY 2010.

D. Leases or sales of Production Allocation

No sale of Production Allocation occurred during WY 2010.

However, during WY 2010 two actions pertaining to real property and/or water rights occurred, as described below:

1. One Standard Producer, DBO Development No. 27, conveyed the real property it owned that is subject to the Decision to D.B.O. Development No. 30. In addition, D.B.O. No. 27 assigned to D.B.O. No. 30 all its right, title, and interest under the Decision, including but not limited to its water rights, water allocations, carryover credits, storage rights, and all other rights defined in the Decision, and also delegated, and D.B.O. No. 30 agreed to assume, all D.B.O. No. 27's duties and obligations under the Judgment and Decision. A copy of the legal document pertaining to this action is contained in Attachment 13.

2. One Alternative Producer, Security National Guaranty (SNG), executed a Front Loading Agreement (wheeling agreement) with CAW in May of 2009 in order for SNG's property to be served water from the Seaside Basin via CAW's distribution system. A copy of the legal document pertaining to this action is contained in Attachment 13.

E. Use of imported, reclaimed, or desalinated Water as a source of Water for Storage or as a water supply for lands overlying the Seaside Basin

In addition to the water imported from the Carmel Basin for the ASR program described in **Section B** above, during WY 2010 **xxx** acre-feet of imported water was used to irrigate golf courses owned by the City of Seaside overlying the Seaside Basin. The terms and conditions under which this in-lieu replenishment water was used to generate a credit to be applied against the City of Seaside's overproduction replenishment assessments is described in the "Memorandum of Understanding Between the Seaside Basin Watermaster and the City of Seaside" contained in Attachment 3. This is the only imported, reclaimed or desalinated water used either directly or for storage in the groundwater basin that has been reported to the Watermaster during WY 2009-2010.

F. Violations of the Decision and any corrective actions taken

Section III. D. of the Decision enjoins all Producers from any Over-Production beyond the Operating Yield in any Water Year in which the Watermaster declares that Artificial Replenishment is not available or possible. Section III. L. 3. j. iii. requires that the Watermaster declare the unavailability of Artificial Replenishment prior to the beginning of the Water Year so that the Producers are informed of the prohibition against pumping in excess of the Operating Yield.

The Watermaster made this declaration regarding the unavailability of Artificial Replenishment for WY 2011 at its Board meeting of November 3, 2010. In 2010 the Watermaster increased the original production allocation reduction of 7.5%, made during WY 2009, by an additional 2.5% to bring the reduction up to the full 10% as required under Section III.B.2 of the Decision. A copy of this declaration is contained in Attachment 2.

Total pumping for WY 2010 did not exceed the Operating Yield (OY) for the Seaside Basin, but it did exceed the Natural Safe Yield (NSY) of the Basin.

CAW and the City of Seaside reported annual pumping quantities that exceeded their Standard Production NSY allocations by 368.84 and 83.43 acre-feet, respectively, and the City of Seaside's reported annual pumping quantity exceeded its OY by 29.77 acre-feet. The City of Seaside did not exceed its Alternative Production NSY. The Watermaster has assessed CAW and the City of Seaside a Replenishment Assessment for these over productions, as further described in Section H, below.

G. Watermaster administrative costs

The total estimated Administrative costs for Fiscal Year 2010 amounted to \$90,000 including a \$25,000 dedicated reserve. This included the cost of maintaining an office and paying a part time administrator and some part time staff to take and transcribe minutes of the Watermaster Board meetings during 2010. The "Fiscal Year 2010 Administrative Fund Report" is provided as Attachment 4.

H. Replenishment Assessments

A Replenishment Assessment of \$2,780 per acre-foot was established by the Watermaster Board at its October 7, 2009 meeting for use against WY 2010 pumping. At its meeting of September 22, 2010 the Watermaster Board determined that this same \$2,780 per acre-foot Replenishment Assessment unit cost should be used against WY 2011 pumping. The Agenda transmittal from that meeting discussing this determination is contained in Attachment 5.

Alternative and Standard Producers report their production amounts from the Basin to the Watermaster on a quarterly basis. Based upon the reported production for WY 2010, CAW's Replenishment Assessment for Overproduction in excess of its share of the NSY is \$1,025,374.89. CAW did not incur any assessment for Operating Yield Over Production in WY 2010. The City of Seaside's Replenishment Assessment for its Municipal System for Overproduction in excess of its share of the NSY is \$231,922.29 and its Replenishment Assessment for Operating Yield Over Production is \$82,760.60. The City of Seaside did not exceed its Alternative Production Allocation for its Golf Course System production. A summary of the calculations for Replenishment Assessment for WY 2010 is contained in Attachment 6.

I. All components of the Watermaster budget

The Watermaster budget has four separate funds: Administrative Fund; Monitoring & Management–Operations; Monitoring and Management–Capital Fund and; Replenishment Fund. Copies of the Fiscal Year 2011 adopted budgets are contained in Attachment 7. The Chief Executive Officer provides monthly financial status reports to the Watermaster Board on all financial activities for each month with year-to-date totals.

J. Water Quality Monitoring and Basin Management

Water Quality Analytical Results

Groundwater quality data continued to be collected and analyzed on a quarterly basis during WY 2010 from the enhanced network of monitoring wells. As initiated in the preceding year, a new low-flow sampling method continued to be implemented to improve the efficiency of sample collection, and will continue to be employed during the upcoming year. Data collection with the new method will continue for two full years at these coastal monitor well locations prior to requesting any modifications to the quarterly data collection frequency at these wells for WY 2012. This is consistent with the process used prior to recommending a reduction in induction logging

frequency at the Watermaster Sentinel wells. Where feasible, water quality at selected locations may be supplemented with continuous water-quality dataloggers to offset the reduction in sample collection frequency.

In addition, quarterly geophysical (induction) logging continued to be performed at the four Watermaster Sentinel wells that were installed in 2007. The induction logging results have shown very little variations and trends have been steady since this monitoring began, indicating that the coastal water quality conditions are not changing at this sample frequency. Therefore, beginning in WY 2010, as approved by the Court's Order dated February 19, 2010, the induction logging frequency was reduced to semi-annually at these wells. Water samples from these wells continue to be collected on an annual basis.

Copies of the sampling results are contained in Attachment 8. Analysis of the results indicate no evidence of water quality changes indicative of seawater intrusion at the locations and depths sampled in the coastal areas of the basin.

All of the recommendations contained in the report in Attachment 8 are being actively pursued by the Watermaster. Funds to pursue these recommendations have been included in the adopted FY 2011 budgets contained in Attachment 7.

Construction of New Monitoring Well in the Northern Inland Subarea

During WY 2009 an additional monitoring well in the northern inland subarea of the Basin was constructed at the BLM site. Construction began in August 2009, but drilling difficulties were encountered that delayed completion of the well until November 2009. The consultant that managed this work prepared a report describing the construction, hydrogeologic findings, and initial water quality sampling results of this project. However, that report could not be completed until after the 2009 Annual Report had been prepared, so it is included in Attachment 9 to this 2010 Annual Report.

The principle conclusions described in that report are:

- The depth to the Monterey Formation, the adopted base of freshwater for the Seaside Basin, is greater than previously believed by approximately 450 feet at the location of the new monitoring well.
- The thickness of the Santa Margarita Sandstone and Paso Robles Formations at this location are significantly thicker than have been encountered at other locations in the Basin.
- The observed water levels at the new well were accurately predicted by the Watermaster's Groundwater Model.
- It is likely that the deep aquifer at the new well site is impacted by pumping in the highly-confined Santa Margarita Sandstone from wells in Seaside proper. It is also likely that water levels will be influenced by injection operations in the Santa Margarita Sandstone.

Basin Management Database

Pertinent groundwater resource data obtained from a number of sources has been consolidated into the Watermaster's database to allow more efficient organization and data retrieval.

In 2009 initial internal testing and debugging of the Database was completed, and the Database was placed on the Watermaster's website for access by all interested parties. In 2010 enhancements to the Database were being completed to improve its usefulness and user-friendliness. Those enhancements are described in Attachment 10.

Enhanced Monitoring Well Network

The Seaside Basin M&MP uses an Enhanced Monitoring Well Network to fill in data gaps in the previous monitoring well network used by the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD), and others, in order to improve the Basin management capabilities of the Watermaster. The Enhanced Monitoring Well Network has been described in detail in previous Watermaster Annual Reports. It continues to be used to obtain additional data that is useful to the Watermaster in managing the Basin.

Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP)

HydroMetrics LLC was hired by the Watermaster to prepare the BMAP which contains these Sections:

- Executive Summary
- The Background and Purpose of the Plan
- The State of the Basin
- Supplemental Water Supplies (long-term water supply solutions)
- Groundwater Management Actions (to be taken as interim measures while long-term supplies are being developed)
- Recommended Management Strategies
- References

The Final BMAP was approved by the Watermaster Board at its February 2009 meeting, and the Executive Summary from the BMAP was contained in Attachment 9 of the 2009 Annual Report. The complete document may be viewed and downloaded from the Watermaster's website at: <http://www.seasidebasinwatermaster.org/>.

Updating of the BMAP was planned for FY 2010, but certain information (coming from other parties) that would be needed to perform that work was not yet available. Therefore, updating the BMAP has been rescheduled for FY 2011, as described in the M&MP Work Plan contained in Attachment 12.

Seawater Intrusion Response Plan

HydroMetrics LLC was hired by the Watermaster to prepare a long-term Seawater Intrusion Response Plan (SIRP), as required in the M&MP.

The Final SIRP was approved by the Watermaster Board at its January 2009 meeting, and a summary of the Seawater Intrusion Contingency Actions from the SIRP were contained in Attachment 10 of the 2009 Annual Report. The complete document may be viewed and downloaded from the Watermaster's website at: <http://www.seasidebasinwatermaster.org/>.

Seawater Intrusion Analysis

The Watermaster retained HydroMetrics LLC to prepare the WY 2010 Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report (SIAR) required by the M&MP. The WY 2010 SIAR provides an analysis of data collected during this Water Year.

The principle conclusions reported in the SIAR are that depressed groundwater levels, continued pumping in excess of recharge and fresh water inflows, and ongoing seawater intrusion in the nearby Salinas Valley all suggest that seawater intrusion could occur in the Seaside Groundwater

Basin. However, in spite of these factors, multiple forms of analyses led to the conclusion that no seawater intrusion is currently being observed in existing monitoring wells within the Basin.

The SIAR is lengthy, but the full *Executive Summary Section* from it is provided in Attachment 11. A complete copy of the document may be viewed and downloaded from the Watermaster's website at: <http://www.seasidebasinwatermaster.org/>.

The Watermaster continues to analyze the data that is being gathered at the various monitoring sites in order to keep a close watch on the conditions within the Basin, as discussed under the "Enhanced Monitoring Well Network" heading above.

Groundwater Modeling

During FY 2009 the previous Groundwater Model of the Basin was updated and a separate Groundwater Model was developed to determine protective water levels within the Basin. The modeling work was performed by HydroMetrics LLC. This Model development work was described in the 2009 Annual Report.

Modeling Scenarios

In FY 2010 two Scenarios were to be modeled using the updated Groundwater Model were developed, and funds to model those Scenarios were included in the FY 2010 M&MP Budget.

These two Scenarios are described below:

Scenario 1 models the effects of additional pumping in the Laguna Seca Subarea. Although no additional pumping from wells in this Subarea is currently being considered, the purpose of this scenario was to begin addressing questions about the impacts on other subareas of the Basin resulting from pumping by wells in the Laguna Seca subarea. Under Scenario 1 three new simulations were run, with pumping from all wells in the Laguna Seca subarea increased by 0%, 10%, and 20% for all years. Each simulation was analyzed for the following:

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

Work on Scenario 1 was completed, and a full copy of the Technical Memorandum describing that work is contained in Attachment 14. The principle conclusions from this work were:

- At current pumping rates, groundwater levels in the Laguna Seca subarea will continue to decline.
- After 5 years of pumping at 10% increased rates, the groundwater levels within the Laguna Seca Subarea where the greatest drop in groundwater levels occurs will be 3 feet lower than they would be without this increase in pumping. This grows to 5 feet lower after 22 years of 10% increased pumping rates.
- After 5 years of pumping at 20% increased rates, the groundwater levels within the Laguna Seca Subarea where the greatest drop in groundwater levels occurs will be 5 feet lower than they would be without this increase in pumping. This grows to 10 feet lower after 22 years of 20% increased pumping rates.
- Continued pumping even at current (Water Year 2009) rates is unsustainable because groundwater levels will eventually fall low enough to cause some wells to no longer be operational.

This problem would be accelerated by increasing the pumping rates of the Alternative Producers within the Laguna Seca subarea.

- Increasing Alternative Producer's pumping rates by 10% or 20% reduces groundwater flow to the Southern Coastal subarea by only a minor amount because of the wells' distance from the Southern Coastal subarea. However, it considerably reduces groundwater flow into the Northern Inland subarea.
- The Laguna Seca subarea is not isolated. Although increasing pumping has only minor impacts on the Southern Coastal subarea, it has more significant impacts on groundwater flows into the Northern Inland subarea. Increasing Laguna Seca pumping also significantly impacts areas outside the Seaside Groundwater Basin, including the Toro area.

Scenario 2 will be to model the effects of implementing the "Monterey Regional Water Supply Project –Phase 1" as that project is defined in the Final EIR for the Coastal Water Project. A key component of this project will be a Regional Desalination Plant.

One of the initial steps in beginning work on this Scenario would be for HydroMetrics to determine the quantities of water that would be supplied to the Seaside Groundwater Basin by the Monterey Regional Water Supply Project. During the course of starting to compile this information it became clear that there were some water supply issues that were not fully or clearly explained in the Final EIR, and that those issues would likely be at least partially clarified when the PUC acts to approve the project. The issues will be further clarified when water quality data from monitoring wells that will be constructed to help refine the estimate of how much groundwater will be taken from the Salinas Valley Basin by the proposed Regional Desalination Plant intake wells has been obtained. PUC approval of the project is anticipated to occur in the late fall of 2010, and data from the monitoring wells is anticipated to become available in mid-summer of 2011.

For these reasons the Watermaster has deferred proceeding with work on Scenario 2 at this time, and to reconsider starting that work in FY 2011. This Scenario 2 modeling work has been included in the Monitoring and Management Program Scope of Work and Budget for FY 2011, so that this work can be performed when the more definitive data necessary to perform this work will be available.

If the Watermaster were to proceed with Scenario 2 without having a clear understanding of each of these issues, HydroMetrics would have to make assumptions on some of the water supply quantities for the Seaside Basin. This could result in having to re-run the model after decisions on those issues have been made, which would cause the expenditure of additional funds by the Watermaster beyond those currently budgeted for this work. Since the Regional Water Supply Project will take at least several years to be completed after PUC approval is granted, there does not appear to be any risk in delaying this modeling work until clearer answers to these water supply issues are available.

Protective Water Levels

In FY 2009 the Watermaster completed development of preliminary Protective Water Levels (PWLs) for each of the Basin's production aquifers at the locations of several coastal wells. There was discussion of performing refined analyses and/or to determine how the PWLs would be affected if less than 100% of the Basin was to be protected. Performing these refinements was included as a Task in the 2010 M&MP Work Plan, and in the M&MP Budget.

However, certain information (water supply information from the Regional Water Supply Project as discussed above under *Modeling Scenarios*) that would be needed to perform that work was not yet

available. There was consensus that there was no danger at this time in delaying refining the Protective Water Levels. Therefore, refining the PWLs has been rescheduled and budgeted for FY 2011, as described in the M&MP Work Plan contained in Attachment 12.

K. Conclusions and Recommendations

The Seaside Basin Watermaster Board has worked diligently to meet all of the Court's established deadline dates. All of the Phase 1 Scope of Work activities, which are described in the "Implementation Plan for the Seaside Basin Monitoring and Management Program" dated March 7, 2007, have been completed. At the Watermaster Board meeting held on September 22, 2010 the Board adopted the budgets contained in Attachment 7, which support carrying out all elements of the "Seaside Groundwater Basin Management and Monitoring Program Anticipated 2011 Work Plan." That Work Plan describes the M&MP activities that will be conducted during Fiscal Year 2011. A copy of this Work Plan is contained in Attachment 12.

As described in **Section J** above, information from the Enhanced Monitoring Well Network is being utilized to detect any seawater intrusion. The response actions described in the Watermaster's Seawater Intrusion Response Plan, which was contained the 2009 Annual Report, will be implemented if seawater intrusion is detected within the Basin.

Each year that the Watermaster has prepared its Annual Reports as required by the Decision, it has been very difficult to assemble all of the data that is necessary to complete the report in time for the completed draft document to be reviewed by the Watermaster's Technical Advisory Committee, which sometimes proposes edits to the draft document, and then by the Board, which sometimes also proposes edits to the draft document.

Water production data is needed to prepare the Production Report that goes into Attachment 1. The production data, as well as water quality data, is also needed in order to complete preparation of the SIAR which goes into Attachment 11. However, the 4th quarter production data cannot be generated until the 4th quarter of the Water Year has ended, on September 30, and is often not received by the Watermaster until October 15 or later. In addition production reports from the de minimis producers are submitted only to the MPWMD, not to the Watermaster, and HydroMetrics would like to include that production data when it prepares the SIAR. However, MPWMD's reporting deadline for that data is November 15 which means that much of that data cannot be included in the SIAR, if the SIAR is to be included as part of the Annual Report which is due to the Court by November 15.

Similarly, water quality data is needed in order for MPWMD to complete preparation of its 4th quarter Water Quality Analytical Results report that goes into Attachment 8, and for the SIAR to be completed. However, water quality data from some of the producers is also often not received until at least mid-October. In some instances this had led to the necessity of holding special meetings in order to complete the Annual Report in time to submit it to the Court by the currently-required November 15th filing deadline.

Several other adjudicated basin Watermasters were contacted regarding the submittal schedules for their annual reports. Based on the information that was received it appears that Watermaster annual reports are required anywhere between 2 and 6 months after the end of the reporting period. The information is summarized in the table below. The Seaside Basin's schedule for submitting its Annual Report, 1.5 months after the end of the Water Year, is shorter than any of the other adjudicated basins.

Basin	Reporting Period	Report Due Date	Time Allotted for Preparing Report
Main San Gabriel Basin	July 1 – June 30	November 1	4 Months
Raymond Basin	July 1 – June 30	September 1	2 Months
Chino Basin	July 1 – June 30	January 1	6 Months
Santa Maria Basin	January 1 – December 31	April 30	4 Months
Seaside Basin	October 1 – September 30	November 15	1.5 Months

For future Annual Reports, subject to the Court’s approval of this proposal following its review of this Annual Report, it is proposed that Annual Reports be filed with the Court by February 15 following the end of each Water Year. This is 3.5 months after the end of the reporting period.

**SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN
WATERMASTER**

TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Dewey D Evans, CEO
DATE: November 3, 2010
SUBJECT: Declaration regarding the Availability of Artificial Water

DISCUSSION:

The staff report and recommendation on this item will be sent separately. Due to the lateness of the hour, Saturday with the World Series game number 3 underway we are unable to find out the amount of water received by the City of Seaside from the Marina Coast Water District (MCWD). We will complete a separate report and send it out the first part of the week before the Board meeting on Wednesday, November 3, 2010.

ITEM X.

**INFORMATIONAL
REPORTS**

(NO ACTION REQUIRED)

ANNUAL MILESTONES	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	11/3/2010	
Each Producer is authorized to Produce its Production Allocation within the designated Subarea in each of the first three Water Years. Alternative Producers may change to Standard Production by March 27, 2009 by filing a declaraton with the Court and with the other parties.	27-Mar-06	30-Sep-07	APA to SPA election amended to in perpetuity 12/12/2009										
Commencing with the fourth Water Year and Triennially thereafter, the Operating Yield for both Subareas will be decreased by 10% until the Operating Yield is equivalent to the Natural Safe Yield unless by recharge or reclaimed water use results in a decrease in production of Native Water as required by the decision.				100% of the Operating Yield of 5,600 decreased 10% Oct 1, 2009			Operating yield could decrease 10% every three years on October 1st until it is the equivalent of Natural Safe Yield	1-Oct	1-Oct	1-Oct			
Each Water Year by November 15th, the Watermaster will determine and levy a Replenishment Assessment on each Standard Producer, with payment due from Producer 40 days after the levy is mailed. After the close of each Water Year, the Watermaster will determine and levy a Replenishment Assessment against all Producers that incurred Operating Yield Over Production during the Water Year, with payment due from Producer by January 15th		15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov		
California American Water to submit annually to Watermaster any augmentation to water supply for possible credit toward Replenishment Assessment	Annually	15-Nov	CAW Credit Request Granted (signed MOU) January 15, 2009	CAW Credit Req Granted 2/3/10		15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov		
Water level monitoring - monthly data collection from all members for inclusion in the consolidated database.	Reported Annually	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly		
Water quality monitoring - yearly data collection from all members for inclusion in consolidated database	Reported Annually	15-Nov	28-Feb & 15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov		
Summary report of water resources data to all members/parties Reported the 15th each quarter month:	Quarterly	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th	Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct 15th		
Annual Report to Court	15-Jan	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov		
ADMINISTRATIVE MILESTONES	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016		
Adjudication ordered by Court and filed	27-Mar-06												
Board Directors Terms		7-Nov											
Budget (Administrative) Adopted/distributed					15-Jan-10	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan		
Budget (Operations) Adopted/distributed					15-Jan-10	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan		
Budget (Replenishment)Adopted/distributed					15-Jan-10	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan	15-Jan		
Administrative Assessments	15-Jan-06	15-Jan-07	15-Jan-08	15-Jan-09	15-Jan-10	15-Jan-11	15-Jan-12	15-Jan-13	15-Jan-14	15-Jan-15	15-Jan-16		
Operations Assessments	15-Jan-07	15-Jan-07	15-Jan-08	15-Jan-09	15-Jan-10	15-Jan-11	15-Jan-12	15-Jan-13	15-Jan-14	15-Jan-15	15-Jan-16		
Capital Assessments	15-Jan-07	15-Jan-07	NONE	15-Jan-09	NONE	15-Jan-11	15-Jan-12	15-Jan-13	15-Jan-14	15-Jan-15	15-Jan-16		
Replenishment Assessments	CAW credit	CAW credit	CAW credit	CAW credit	CAW credit	15-Jan-12	15-Jan-13	15-Jan-14	15-Jan-15	15-Jan-16	15-Jan-17		
Annual Report to Court	15-Nov-06	15-Nov-07	15-Nov-08	15-Nov-09	15-Nov-10	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov	15-Nov		
Answers to Judge's Questions re: Annual Report		30-Jan-09	28-Feb-08	1-Feb-09	5-Feb-10								
Declaration of Replenishment Water Availability	Feb-06	Dec-06	Dec-07	18 Mar	2-Dec-09	1-Dec-10	Dec-11	Dec-12	Dec-13	Dec-14	Dec-15		
MONTHLY MILESTONES	2006-09	Jan 10	Feb 10	Mar 10	Apr 10	May 10	Jun 10	Jul 10	Aug 10	Sep 10	Oct 10	Nov 10	Dec 10
Board Directors Terms													
Fiscal Year tentative budgets distribution to all parties													11/2/10
Operating Yield of 5,600 decreased 10% ; Declaration of Replenishment Water Available	18-Mar-09												11/3/10
Administrative Assessments													2009 & 10 Seaside Not Recvd
Operations Assessments													2009 & 10 Seaside Not Recvd
Capital Assessments													2009 Seaside Not Recvd
Replenishment Assessments													2005/06 - 2008/09 Seaside Not Recvd
Develop Repl Assessment Unit Cost													11/3/10
SPECIAL ISSUES	2006-09	Jan 10	Feb 10	Mar 10	Apr 10	May 10	Jun 10	Jul 10	Aug 10	Sep 10	Oct 10	Nov 10	Dec 10
Cal-Am CWP/Alternative Projects EIR	ALJ & Commission FEIR Proceedings				Board Support								Per A.J.L Proceed w/Reg Project
SWRCB Cease Desist Order California American Water	Stay Issued				Stay Lifted								Moratorium sought by CAW
Storage and Recovery Application and Agreement Development						Templates Approved							
Watermaster Board Regular Meeting Schedule		6-Jan cancel'd	3-Feb	3-Mar	7-Apr	5-May cancel'd	2-Jun	7-Jul cancel'd	4-Aug cancel'd	22-Sep Sp Mtg	6-Oct cancel'd	3-Nov	1-Dec
SUMMARY PROJECT SCHEDULE (See detailed project schedule for more information)													
Program Administration, Database Management				1/1/10 - 12/31/10									Complete =
Coastal Wells Cross-Aquifer Contamination Potential Evaluation				01/01/11 - 12/31/11									Yet to be completed =
Enhanced Groundwater Model: Protective Water Levels & Basin Scenarios (Hydrometrics)				1/13/10 - 8/4/10									Scheduled for Board or TAC meeting =
Production Water Level & Water Quality Monitoring (Hydrometrics, MPWMD)				1/1/10 - 12/31/10									Imminent Critical Deadline =
Refine/Update BMAP (Hydrometrics)				6/9/10 - 11/3/10									
Seawater Intrusion Analysis (Hydrometrics)				10/6/10 - 11/3/10		11/3/2010							Revised October 30, 2010

D-R-A-F-T
MINUTES

**Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
October 13, 2010**

Attendees: TAC Members
City of Seaside – Sydney Moe
California American Water – Mike Magretto
City of Monterey – Norm Green
Laguna Seca Property Owners – No Representative
MPWMD – Joe Oliver
Public Member – No Representative
MCWRA – Rob Johnson
City of Del Rey Oaks – No Representative
City of Sand City – No Representative
Coastal Subarea Landowners – No Representative

Watermaster
Technical Program Manager - Robert Jaques

Consultants
HydroMetrics LLC – Derrick Williams & Georgina King (via telephone)

Others:
MPWMD – Jonathan Lear

The meeting was called to order at 1:33 p.m.

Prior to starting on the Agenda, Vice-Chair Johnson held a moment of silence in memory of John Fischer, long-time Public Member of the TAC, who had recently passed away.

1. Administrative Matters:

A. Approve Minutes from August 11, 2010 Meeting

On a motion by Mr. Oliver, second by Mr. Green, the minutes were unanimously approved as presented.

B. Receive Notes from Gathering of Portion of TAC on September 8, 2010 (No Quorum so no meeting was convened)

This item was received for information only, and there was no discussion on it.

2. Select Possible Further Work Tasks to be Performed Regarding Evaluation of Coastal Wells for Possible Cross-Aquifer Contamination Potential

Mr. Jaques summarized the background on this agenda item along with his recommendations with regard to what work items he felt should be implemented, as described in the agenda packet.

Mr. Lear explained that Task 3 was proposed because it would be helpful to create a complete list of all wells in the Basin. Getting the data to HydroMetrics for the SIAR this year highlighted to Mr. Lear the desirability of including all of the wells HydroMetrics needs in the database. Currently not all of those wells are in the

database. In response to a question from Mr. Jaques with regard to why the wells had not already been included in the database, Mr. Oliver responded that they apparently had not all been identified by RBF Consultants when they prepared the original database.

Mr. Oliver explained that Task 4 was proposed because it would be efficient to perform this work when all of the other data is also being compiled. Under the proposed scope of work for this Task, PVC well casing locations would be identified, but no induction logging would actually be performed. That would be extra work funding additional cost.

Mr. Oliver explained that Task 6 was probably the least-needed of the proposed tasks in the list. This was thought of in conjunction with AB3030 which requires development of Groundwater Management Plans. However, adjudicated basins are not required to prepare such plans, so this is more of a peripheral issue. Mr. Jaques commented that this may be more a task for the Monterey County Health Department to carry out.

Mr. Lear explained that Task 7 would be useful if grant funds were sought in order to have funding in order to properly destroy any abandoned wells. Mr. Johnson noted that well destruction can be very costly. Mr. Lear said that under this Task he would field verify the location of abandoned wells.

Mr. Oliver said that he recommended that Tasks 1 through 5 be performed at this time, and that Tasks 6 and 7 could be deferred to the future date. Ms. Moe said that she recommended doing Tasks 1 through 5 and 7 at this time, because the Santa Margarita aquifer is one of the aquifers from which the City of Seaside's water system draws.

Mr. Lear said that Task 7 is the hardest one for which to develop a budget estimate.

A motion was made by Ms. Moe, seconded by Mr. Green, to perform Tasks 1 through 5 and 7 at this time, and to defer further consideration of Task 6. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Discuss and Take Potentially Take Action to Approve the 2010 Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report (SIAR)

Mr. Jaques introduced this agenda topic and Ms. King provided an overview discussion with regard to the SIAR. She said that it is very similar to prior SIARs with the following exceptions:

SBWM-5 (BLM site) has been added.

A section has been added discussing protective water levels.

Ms. King briefly summarized the findings as contained in the agenda packet materials. All of the diagnostic tools, including Piper diagrams, Stiff diagrams, Na:Cl ratios, and chloride concentration mapping all produced very similar results to previous years. Production data is still coming in from the Watermaster, and it will probably not all be received until late October.

Higher chloride levels were found in some wells than were found in prior years, but most of these were still well below historic highs, according to Mr. Williams.

Ms. King said that some ground water levels have risen one to two feet, possibly due to reduced production levels in the Northern Coastal Subarea. Other subareas are pretty much the same as last year, she reported. She also said that there was more rainfall than in the prior year, but it was still below historic average levels. Mr. Oliver said that ASR injection of 1,111 acre-feet last Water Year may also have contributed in part to rising groundwater levels. The water that was injected has not yet been extracted. None of the deep wells had water levels reaching protective water levels, but some of the shallow wells did.

Ms. King summarized the SIAR recommendations as follows:

Refine protective water levels using refined aquifer properties. This may result in some of the protective water levels going down slightly.

Continue at the same semi-annual water quality sampling frequency at SBWM-4.

Continue preparing the SIAR annually.

Mr. Jaques asked Ms. King if last year's precipitation was below long-term historic averages. Mr. Lear said that the rainfall data this past winter was very close to historical averages at the range gauge located near the MPWMD's office building. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Oliver said they were somewhat surprised to learn that the rainfall in the Seaside Basin area was below historic averages, because in other areas of the county, for example the Salinas Valley at the Los Padres dam rainfall gauge, precipitation was approximately 130% of average rainfall. Mr. Lear said that he would coordinate with Ms. King on this for continuity of data between the various agencies.

Ms. King said that the PCA-West shallow well showed a jump in groundwater level and she is still investigating an explanation for this with MPWMD.

Ms. King said that data from SBWM-5 has been added as a data point which results in some altering of the contour maps in this report compared to the maps contained in prior reports.

Mr. Williams said that the shallow aquifer may have a "dry area", and that extending the contour lines all the way to the southeasterly boundary of the Seaside Basin probably should not be done in this report, although it has been projected that far inland in prior reports which did not detect the dry area.

Following some additional questions and answers, there was TAC consensus to recommend approval of the SIAR to the Board. In response to a question from Ms. King, Mr. Jaques said that the deadline for completion of the SIAR would be the Friday preceding the November 3 Board meeting, so the SIAR can be posted on the Watermaster's web site at that time. Ms. King should stand electronic version of the final SIAR to the Watermaster by that date.

4. Initial Consultant Contracts for FY 2011

- A. MPWMD RFS No. 2011-01**
- B. MPWMD RFS No. 2011-02**
- C. HydroMetrics RFS No. 2011-01**
- D. HydroMetrics RFS No. 2011-02**

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

The four contracts were discussed as a group. Mr. Oliver reported that he was still making some corrections to Table 2 of MPWMD RFS No. 2011-01, but there would be no cost impacts as a result of making those corrections. He also reported some reduction in cost in Attachment 3 of that RFS.

Mr. Jaques noted a correction in the dollar amount for MPWMD RFS No. 2011-02 on page 37 of the agenda packet. The correct dollar amount should be \$4,140, rather than the \$5,760 that is shown.

With these edits made, a motion was made by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Green, to approve these four contracts, and the motion passed unanimously.

5. Discuss and Potentially Take Action Regarding Revising Definition of Quorum for TAC Meetings and Voting Requirements for Taking Action at TAC Meetings

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

Ms. Moe said she recommended that the new TAC quorum consist of 4 members, and that at least 3 affirmative votes should be necessary for any action to be taken. Mr. Oliver suggested that the Board determine whether 3 or 4 members should constitute a quorum.

Following additional discussion, there was a motion by Mr. Oliver, seconded by Mr. Johnson, that the revised TAC quorum be 4 members, and that 3 affirmative votes be required to take action. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Report by MPWMD on Program Schedule and Standard Operating Procedures

Mr. Oliver said that his only recommendation at this time was to continue collecting and reviewing groundwater quality data using the low-flow purge sampling technique for a total of two full years before making any recommendations with regard to reducing sampling frequencies. He said this is consistent with prior year recommendations. He will continue to plan for at least one site to have a continuous water quality data logger installed, at MPWMD expense, on a coastal well.

7. Discuss and Potentially Take Action Regarding Performing Another Wellhead Elevation Survey in 2011 to Determine Whether or Not Subsidence is Occurring

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

Mr. Williams recommended performing an additional wellhead survey just one time, and if no subsidence was detected, then to discontinue performing further wellhead surveys. Mr. Green asked what if no subsidence is seen at this time, could it occur later. Mr. Williams responded that if groundwater levels rise, subsidence should not occur due to overpumping of the aquifer. Mr. Oliver said that generally subsidence is due to falling groundwater levels, and would likely be gradual. Mr. Lear and Mr. Johnson said that subsidence can also be affected by climatic conditions such as drought periods, pumping levels, and even earthquakes. Mr. Lear said there are other remote sensing techniques available such as satellite data (NSAR) which might be useful for examining subsidence possibilities, but these have their limitations.

There was consensus to do the same type of survey this year as was previously performed in 2008.

Mr. Oliver said some wells may drop off the list, and some new ones should be added. If the 2008 wellhead survey data and is compared to the 2011 survey data, it would probably yield some initial conclusions with regard to subsidence issues.

Mr. Green commented that the surveyors may also be able to get some additional data when they are at the well sites.

There was discussion that if the new wellhead survey data indicates possible subsidence, a repeat wellhead survey should probably be done in the following year to determine if this is a trend.

8. Discuss and Provide Input on Preliminary Draft Annual Report for 2010

Mr. Jaques briefly summarized the scope of the Annual Report and some of the key findings contained in it. He highlighted the proposal in the Annual Report to postpone the submittal deadline for future reports until January 15th to allow more time to compile and analyze data. Mr. Johnson recommended further deferring the submittal deadline to February 15th. Mr. Williams reported that some of his other clients also do not submit such reports until February. Mr. Jaques will make these revisions to the Annual Report.

9. Offer by Pasadera to Discuss Possible Use of Storm Water Runoff from Pasadera as a Water Source for Helping to Recharge the Seaside Basin

Following brief discussion on this topic the TAC decided to defer discussion on this topic until early in 2011. Mr. Johnson said he would like his stormwater staff to look at this material and provide input to him on it. It will likely be rescheduled to the January 2011 TAC meeting.

10. Schedule

Mr. Jaques briefly discussed the 2010 and 2011 Schedules, and there were no questions on those items.

11. Other Business

There was no other business.

12. Set next meeting date

The next regular meeting was set for Wednesday, November 10, 2010 at 1:30 p.m. at the MRWPCA Board Room

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

2010 WATER YEAR

Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster

Reported Quarterly and Annual Water Production (in Acre Feet) From the Seaside Groundwater Basin For All Producers Included in the Seaside Basin Adjudication (All Values in Acre-Feet ([AF]))

Producer	Type	Quarters				Annual To-Date Reported Total	Base Operating Yield Allocation	Carry Over from 2008/09
		Oct-Dec 2009	Jan-Mar 2010	Apr-Jun 2010	Jul-Sep 2010			
<u>Coastal Subareas</u>								
CAW (Coastal Subareas)	SPA	888.3	31.4	950.9	1,412.9	3283.5	3,086.6	495.9
Seaside (Municipal) ¹	SPA	69.7	61.1	76.8	75.3	282.9	253.1	-
Granite Rock Company	SPA	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	0.0	23.9	90.9
DBO Development No. 30 ¹	SPA	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	0.0	43.3	192.6
City of Seaside (Golf Courses)	APA	62.8	21.7	16.1	0.0	100.7	540.0	-
Sand City	APA	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.2	9.0	-
Security National Guaranty	APA	-	-	-	-	0.0	149.0	-
Cypress Pacific Investors ²	APA	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	0.0	14.0	-
Alderwoods Group (Mission Memorial)	APA	2.3	-	3.9	6.6	12.8	31.0	-
Coastal Subarea Totals		1,023.1	114.2	1,047.8	1,495.0	3,680.1	4,149.9	779.4
<i>Previous Year Totals (2009)</i>		<i>1,128.4</i>	<i>111.3</i>	<i>912.8</i>	<i>1,361.5</i>	<i>3,514.0</i>	<i>4,265.2</i>	
<u>Laguna Seca Subareas</u>								
CAW (Inland Subareas)	SPA	101.1	66.5	110.7	151.7	430.0	246.1	-
Pasadera Country Club	APA	14.8	1.9	53.6	99.7	170.0	251.0	-
Laguna Seca/Bishop	APA	19.1	0.0	68.4	136.7	224.2	320.0	-
York School	APA	4.1	1.8	5.1	7.6	18.6	32.0	-
Laguna Seca Park (County)	APA	3.7	2.7	7.9	10.5	24.8	41.0	-
Laguna Seca Subarea Totals		142.8	72.9	245.7	406.2	867.6	890.1	-
<i>Previous Year Totals (2009)</i>		<i>186.3</i>	<i>93.0</i>	<i>366.3</i>	<i>415.1</i>	<i>1,060.7</i>	<i>914.8</i>	
Subtotal Pumped (Not Including ASR)		1,165.9	187.2	1,293.5	136.7	4,547.6	5,040.0	
Alternative Producers =						551.3		
Standard Producers =						3,996.4		
<u>CAW ASR (Injection)/Recovery</u>								
Monterey County District		(129.5)	(576.2)	(404.8)	0.0	(1,110.5)		
Total Pumped (Including ASR)		1,036.4	(389.0)	888.7	1,901.2	3,437.2	5,040.0	
Total Production by Alternative Producers =						551.3		
Total Production by Standard Producers =						2,886.0		

¹Transfer of Parcel and Assignment of Rights from D.B.O. Development No. 27 to D.B.O. Development No. 30

²Referred to as "M.E. Calabrese 1987 Trust" in Decision

Notes:

1. The Water Year (WY) begins October 1 and ends September 30 of the following calendar year. For example, WY 2010 began on October 1, 2009, and ends on September 30, 2010.
2. "Type" refers to water right as described in Seaside Basin Adjudication decision as amended, signed February 9, 2007 (Monterey County Superior Court Case No. M66343).
3. Values shown in the table are based on reports to the Watermaster as received by MPWMD by **October 26, 2010**.
4. All values are rounded to the nearest tenth of an acre-foot. Where required, reported data were converted to acre-feet utilizing the relationships: 325,851 gallons = 43,560 cubic feet = 1 acre-foot.
5. "Base Operating Yield Allocation" values are based on Seaside Basin Adjudication decision. These values are consistent with the *Watermaster Producer Allocations Water Year 2010* (see Attachment 2 of Item VIII.B. in 11/4/2009 Board packet).
6. Any minor discrepancies in totals are attributable to rounding.
7. APA = Alternative Producer Allocation; SPA = Standard Producer Allocation; CAW = California American Water.
8. During September 2010, CAW - Coastal Subareras provided 12.6 AF of water to City of Seaside (Minicipal); the production volumes for

**SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN
WATERMASTER**

TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Dewey D Evans, CEO
DATE: November 3, 2010
SUBJECT: Groundwater Quality and Groundwater Level Report for Water Year 2010

PURPOSE:

To inform the Board of Directors and Other Interested Parties as to the quality and general levels of water within the Seaside Groundwater Basin during the entire Water Year 2010.

RECOMMENDATION:

Continue to monitor the water quality and water levels in the Seaside Basin

DISCUSSION:

Due to the sheer size and complexity of the Water Year 2010, Groundwater-Quality and Groundwater-Level report prepared by the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (74 pages and 9MGB) the document will be sent in a separate mailing and will also be posted on the Watermaster's website at <http://www.seasidebasinwatermaster.org/> for review by Board members and other Interested Parties.

The report indicates that the chemical data from WY 2010 for the MPWMD dedicated coastal monitor wells do not show significant changes relative to previous samplings, and are not indicative of seawater intrusion into the Basin at the locations and depths of these monitor wells. This conclusion continues to be supported by work completed this year for the Watermaster as documented in the WY 2010 Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report prepared by HydroMetrics Water Resources, Inc.

Based on the long-term water-level hydrographs for coastal monitor wells that are presented in the report, the trend of declining groundwater levels is continuing in the deeper Santa Margarita aquifer monitor wells, whereas groundwater levels have generally stabilized, and in a few cases displayed an overall increase in the shallower Paso Robles aquifer. The high water levels in the Santa Margarita monitoring wells for WY 2010 seen in these plates are higher than water levels from WY 2009. This increase is likely due to a wetter winter and the injection of a record volume of 1,111 AF of water into the Santa Margarita aquifer by the MPWMD and Cal-Am at the Phase 1 Aquifer Storage and Recovery site in Seaside.

For a much more in-depth review please refer to the document that will be sent out separately and/or the Watermaster website.

**SEASIDE GROUNDWATER BASIN
WATERMASTER**

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Dewey D Evans, CEO

DATE: November 3, 2010

SUBJECT: Watermaster Assessments for 2011: Administrative; Monitoring and Management-Operations & Capital Funds

PURPOSE:

To provide information on 2011 budget assessments issued to cover expenditures throughout the year on Administration, Monitoring and Management—Operations and Monitoring and Management –Capital projects.

RECOMMENDATION:

This item is informational only and requires no action.

DISCUSSION AND FISCAL IMPACT:

The budget assessment for the administrative budget shall be assessed against each Producer (except those in the Landowner Group) by multiplying the amount of the budget for the ensuing Administrative Year by the following percentages:

- (1) California American Water 83%
- (2) City of Seaside 14.4%
- (3) City of Sand City 2.6%

The budget assessment for the Monitoring and Management Budgets shall be assessed against each Producer (except those in the Landowner Group) by multiplying the amount of the Monitoring and Management Plan budget for the ensuing Administrative Year by the following percentages:

- (1) California American Water 91%
- (2) City of Seaside 7%
- (3) D.B.O. Development No. 30 1%
- (4) Graniterock Company 1%

Assessments estimates and levied each year have created larger than expected rollover amounts which when taken into consideration have reduced the amounts needed to assess. Watermaster assessments for FY 2011, due by January 15, 2011, are:

Producer	Adminstrative	Operations	Capital
California American Water	@ 83.0%=\$37,350	@91%=\$68,250	@91%=\$0
City of Seaside	@ 14.4%= \$ 6,480	@ 7%= \$ 5,250	@ 7%= \$0
City of Sand City	@ 2.6%= \$ 1,170	@ 0%= \$ 0	@ 0%= \$0
D.B.O. Development No.30	@ 0.0%= \$ 0	@ 1%= \$ 750	@ 0%= \$0
Graniterock Company	@ 0.0%= \$ 0	@ 1%= \$ 750	@ 0%= \$0
Total Assessments	\$45,000	\$75,000	\$0

ITEM NO. XI.

**DIRECTOR'S
REPORTS**

ITEM NO. XII.

**EXECUTIVE OFFICER
COMMENTS**