

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF THE SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER

DATE: Wednesday, September 10, 2008

TIME: 1:30 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

LOCATION: City of Seaside City Hall – Portable Buildings Conference Room
440 Harcourt Avenue
Seaside, CA 93955

If you wish to participate in the meeting from a remote location, please call in on the new Watermaster Conference Line by dialing (877)810-9415. Use the Access Code of 4560043.

OFFICERS

Chairperson: Diana Ingersoll, City of Seaside

Vice-Chairperson: Tom. Bunosky, California American Water Company

MEMBERS

California American Water Company	City of Del Rey Oaks	City of Monterey
City of Sand City	City of Seaside	Coastal Subarea Landowners
Laguna Seca Property Owners	Monterey County Water Resources Agency	
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District	Public Member (John Fischer)	

Agenda Item

Page No.

- | | |
|---|----|
| 1. Administrative Matters: | |
| A. Approve Minutes from August 13, August 20, August 27, and September 3, 2008 (Bob Jaques) | 2 |
| 2. Schedule for Completion of Basin Management Action Plan and Seawater Intrusion Response Plan (Bob Jaques) | 14 |
| 3. Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost for Water Year 2008-2009 (Bob Jaques) | 16 |
| 4. Proposed Updated Phase 2 Scope of Work for 2009 (Bob Jaques) | 21 |
| 5. Schedule (Bob Jaques) | 25 |
| 6. Other business | |
| 7. Set next Special meeting date for Monday September 22, 2008 at 9:00 a.m.
Set next Regular meeting date for Wednesday October 8, 2008 at 1:30 p.m.
Both of these meetings will be held at the Seaside City Hall Portable Office Buildings Conference Room | |

**SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***** AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM *****

MEETING DATE:	September 10, 2008
AGENDA ITEM:	1.A
AGENDA TITLE:	Approve Minutes from August 13, August 20, and August 27, 2008
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager
SUMMARY:	<p>Draft Minutes from these meetings were emailed to all TAC members. Any changes that were requested have been included in the attached versions.</p>
ATTACHMENTS:	Minutes from these meetings
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	Approve the minutes

D-R-A-F-T
MINUTES

**Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
August 13, 2008**

Attendees: TAC Members
City of Seaside – Rick Riedl
California American Water – Tom Bunosky and Craig Anthony
City of Monterey – Les Turnbeaugh
Laguna Seca Property Owners – Stan Powell (by telephone)
MPWMD – Joe Oliver
Public Member – John Fischer
MCWRA – Kathy Thomasberg
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 - Derrik Williams (by telephone)

Others:
MRWPCA – Bob Holden

The meeting was called to order at 1:36 p.m.

1. Administrative Matters:

B. Approve Minutes from July 9, July 21, July 31, and August 6, 2008

Mr. Jaques said that a paragraph had been requested by Mr. Fischer to be added at the end of Agenda item 4 from the August 6, 2008 Special TAC meeting, reading as follows:

“Because many of the terms and discussion topics in these documents are very technical in nature, it was recommended that as much as possible the language in the body of the documents be prepared so as to be understandable by a lay audience. Technical details should also be included, but in appendices to the body of the documents.”

On a motion by Ms. Thomasberg, second by Mr. Fischer, the minutes from all four of these meetings were unanimously approved as presented, with the addition of the paragraph requested by Mr. Fischer to the minutes of the August 6, 2008 Special TAC meeting.

2. Progress Reports

Mr. Oliver reported that he is starting the next cycle of water quality data collection work. He said most of his recent efforts have been focused on reviewing the HydroMetrics documents.

Ms. Thomasberg reported that she had reviewed MPWMD's recently Quarterly Report. She recommended that pumping (production) data be included in these Quarterly Reports. Mr. Oliver said he would see if this was feasible.

Mr. Williams said that by now everyone should have received a revised Section 4 of the SIRC. Mr. Fischer informed Mr. Williams that a report on Monterey Bay sediments is now available for public review. He recommended that this be used as a resource for estimating erosion impacts in conjunction with preparation of the SIRC.

Mr. Jaques asked Mr. Williams what he felt the focus of the next Special TAC meetings should be. Mr. Williams recommended that Chapter 2 (State of the Basin) and Chapter 4 (Interim Action Plan) be the subjects of the next two Special TAC meetings. For the next meeting it was agreed that the focus would be on Chapter 4 of the BMAP. This will be held August 20th. If time allows at that meeting, discussion will then move into Section 4 of the SIRC. If not enough time is available, that topic will become the subject of the next Special TAC meeting scheduled to be held August 27th.

Mr. Fisher asked when revised versions of the documents reflecting edits from prior meetings would be available for review. Mr. Williams said that he would include the edits in the full revised draft BMAP and the full revised draft SIRC documents. He expects the full SIRC draft document to be available during the week of August 25th, and the full BMAP draft document to be available in early September, approximately two weeks after the August 25th Special TAC meeting.

A Special TAC meeting was then scheduled to be held September 22nd at which the TAC would provide final comments on both of these documents, so they can be finalized and subsequently presented to the Board. There was consensus to set the September 22nd meeting at 9:00 a.m. at the Seaside City Hall portable office building meeting location.

It was also recommended that the Board get the two full documents at its October 1st meeting with a presentation to be made on both documents at that meeting by Mr. Williams. It was also recommended that the Board have a second meeting in October to complete its receipt of information on these documents and complete asking questions, in order to be able to approve the two documents at that second meeting.

Mr. Bunosky asked Mr. Jaques to provide a progress report to the Board in their upcoming September meeting agenda packet as to the plans and reasons for recommending the two October Board meetings, including presentations by Mr. Williams.

3. Updating the Watermaster's Data Collection Program

Ms. Thomasberg and Mr. Oliver discussed the work they have been doing with regard to updating the Watermaster's Data Collection Program. Mr. Oliver said they would like to coordinate their work with Mr. Williams as Mr. Williams prepares the Sea Water Intrusion Analysis Report (SIAR), so any changes recommended by Ms. Thomasberg and Mr. Oliver can be incorporated into that document.

There was consensus that Ms. Thomasberg and Mr. Oliver will report on this at the same TAC meeting at which Mr. Williams presents to the TAC the draft SIAR. These are tentatively scheduled for the October 8 TAC meeting.

4. Replenishment Assessment Issue

Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet material for this item. There was consensus to use all projects with the ten-year planning horizon, as recommended by Mr. Jaques.

There was some discussion with regard to the status of the request for a credit against CAW's Replenishment Assessment, and also how the Replenishment Assessment is calculated.

8. Schedule

Mr. Jaques briefly summarized some of the key upcoming schedule milestone dates. Numerous updates were made with regard to meeting dates and approval dates for various reports. These will be reflected in the next version of the schedule.

9. Well Survey Data from Central Coast Surveyors

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

Mr. Oliver said he has checked many of the elevations and is satisfied with the data that has been presented. The data is given on two datums: NAVD-29 and NAVD-88.

Mr. Oliver said the NAVD-88 data is about 2.79 feet higher than NAVD-29 data. This will become important when protective water levels above mean sea level (MSL) are discussed.

Mr. Williams asked Mr. Oliver if Mr. Oliver could get the local MSL elevation value and provide it to him.

Mr. Riedl said that "MSL" should be deleted from the column headings in these tables. Elevations are just with regard to the NAVD datum to which the data applies.

Mr. Bunosky asked how the survey data can be formalized into the records of the Watermaster. It was agreed that Mr. Jaques will prepare a short transmittal memo attached to the Central Coast Surveyors data and forward this to the Watermaster CEO saying this is the data being input into the Watermaster Database for purposes of determining water surface elevations.

10. MRWPCA Groundwater Replenishment Project Update

Mr. Jaques provided a very brief background discussion on this topic, and Mr. Holden gave a short overview of the key elements of MRWPCA's proposed Groundwater Replenishment Project.

Once the TAC has completed its review of the Project Description for the Groundwater Replenishment Project, the TAC's comments will be given to MRWPCA and they will be addressed as MRWPCA prepares further documents.

Mr. Holden reported that two recharge sites are proposed: one near the coast and one inland. Either site can provide all of the recharge area that is needed.

He said there are three potential dilution water sources being considered: the Blanco Drain, the Reclamation Ditch, and the Salinas Industrial Wastewater Treatment Plant effluent.

Mr. Holden said that the project looks at recharging up to 6,000 acre feet per year, but help is needed with modeling to see if this is feasible.

Mr. Williams said that his \$285K scope proposal, submitted earlier this year for consideration by the TAC, includes getting the Model updated and ready to be run. This work is identified in Task 4 of that proposal and totals about \$175,000.

Mr. Powell asked Mr. Williams how firm that cost estimate was. Mr. Williams said it is very difficult to estimate the effort needed for this type of work under Task 4, but that he would do his best to work within that dollar amount.

Mr. Jaques commented that we will need to include modeling costs in the 2009 budget, if the Watermaster is going to perform modeling work to assist MRWPCA.

Mr. Bunosky said he felt a decision on whether to perform modeling should be made based on the Watermaster's needs, rather than the Groundwater Replenishment Project's needs.

There was consensus that a more in-depth discussion of the Project Description document for the Groundwater Replenishment Project would be held after all of the HydroMetrics reports have been completed and all of the other work in the next couple of months to comply with the Court Decision requirements has been completed.

11. Budget Items for 2009

Mr. Jaques summarized agenda packet materials for this item.

There was consensus to include one additional monitoring well in the upcoming CIP budget.

Mr. Bunosky recommended including in next year's O&M budget some amount for additional engineering work to follow up on this year's work.

Mr. Powell said it would also be good to think about how the supplemental water will be used and paid for in future years. It was agreed that these would be good topics for discussion at future meetings.

12. Other business

There was no Other Business.

13. Set next meeting date for Wednesday September 10, 2008 at 1:30 p.m. at the Seaside City Hall Portable Office Buildings Conference Room

The next regular meeting was set for this time and date, but Special TAC meetings were scheduled for August 20, August 27, and September 22.

The meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m.

D-R-A-F-T
MINUTES

**Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster
Technical Advisory Committee
Special Meeting
August 20, 2008**

Attendees: TAC Members

City of Seaside – Rick Riedl
California American Water – Tom Bunosky (by telephone)
City of Monterey – Les Turnbeaugh
Laguna Seca Property Owners – Stan Powell (by telephone)
MPWMD – Joe Oliver
Public Member – John Fischer
MCWRA – Kathy Thomasberg
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 - Derrik Williams

Others:

None

The meeting was called to order at 1:40 p.m.

There was no set agenda for this Special meeting. Its focus was to continue discussions on the reports being prepared by HydroMetrics.

1. There was discussion leading to an agreement that Section 4 of the BMAP will be discussed today along with some discussion regarding Protective Water Level issues.

Section 2 of the BMAP will be targeted for discussion at the August 27 special TAC meeting, as will Section 4 of the SIRP for that same meeting.

One more section will come out and titled "Conclusions and Recommendations" which will probably be Section 5 of the BMAP. Section 1-Background and Purpose-has not yet been prepared nor reviewed by the TAC. Section 6-Implementation Plan and Schedule-will likely be consolidated into Section 5, so no Section 6 will likely be prepared.

Also, the SIRP will be coming out October 1st for of approval at the October 8 regular TAC meeting.

2. Mr. Bunosky requested that in the future a footer be added to the documents as they are prepared showing the Document Revision Date.

3. Mr. Powell said he felt many actions listed are under the control of other agencies, not the Watermaster, for example development of supplemental water supplies. Mr. Williams will add language on this.

4. Mr. Williams will replace "life" of the Basin with clarifying wording such as that suggested in Mr. Powell's August 17, 2008 e-mailed comments.

5. The title of Section 4 of the BMAP will be retitled to read simply "Groundwater Management Actions".

6. They were numerous editorial changes for clarity per TAC member requests.

7. Mr. Bunosky asked whether or not Seaside needed to request a change from being an "Alternative" producer to a "Standard" producer, if they wish to transfer water from MCWD to serve the Seaside golf courses. There was much discussion on this subject, with no clear conclusion. It was felt that this was more a legal decision than a TAC issue.

8. Mr. Oliver asked if the Operating Yield would get a 10 percent reduction, as currently planned, even if actual production was more than 10 percent below the current Operating Yield of 5,600 acre feet per year. Mr. Powell felt the answer was "yes", but Mr. Jaques noted that even if that was the case, the 10 percent cutback would pose little problem for water users if they were already using amounts that would total less than the reduced amount.

9. There was discussion about clarifying the Phase 1 ASR work under Subsection 4.1.3 and noting that the project has only "incidental" benefit to the Seaside Basin.

10. Discussion on Section 4 the BMAP concluded at the end of Section 4.2.1. The discussion will resume with Subsection 4.2.2 at the August 27 Special TAC meeting. However, Mr. Bunosky pointed out that there would be a need for funding approval from CPUC for CAW to cover costs associated with such things as (1) redistributing pumping as described under Subsections 4.2.2, 4.2.3, and 4.2.4, (2) installation of additional piping for many of the alternatives, and (3) addressing water quality changes from pumping from new locations (might require additional treatment).

12. There was the following discussion with regard to protective water levels.

Mr. Williams explained that the protective water level development work currently included in the BMAP just prevents sea water intrusion problems at specific production wells. His \$285K proposal would develop levels to protective the entire basin via higher levels along the coast, because this would also protect the inland portions of the basin.

Mr. Jaques posed the question as to whether the Watermaster should budget for (1) no protective water level work to be performed in 2009, (2) approximately \$50,000 of work to be performed in 2009, or (3) the full \$285K scope of the proposal to be performed in 2009.

Mr. Bunosky said he was comfortable with option (2) at present, but did not feel he had enough information to make a decision with regard to option (3).

It was agreed that there will be further discussion on this subject at future TAC meetings, so that a recommendation can be made to the Board at a future date.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

D-R-A-F-T
MINUTES

**Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster
Technical Advisory Committee
Special Meeting
August 27, 2008**

Attendees: TAC Members

City of Seaside – Rick Riedl
California American Water – Tom Bunosky, Craig Anthony
City of Monterey – Les Turnbeaugh
Laguna Seca Property Owners – Stan Powell, Eric Robinson
MPWMD – No Representative
Public Member – John Fischer
MCWRA – Kathy Thomasberg
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 - Derrik Williams

Others:

None

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.

1. There was no set agenda for this Special meeting. Its focus was to continue discussions on the reports being prepared by HydroMetrics.
2. Mr. Fischer read a recent e-mail from Mr. Kasower of the R. P. O. G. group. He also reported information from Jim Heitzman of MCWD regarding the status of the Regional Water Augmentation Plan. That project has been stalled at this point.
3. The TAC resumed discussion at paragraph 4.2.2 of the Basin Management Action Plan Section 4 (Groundwater Management Actions).
4. Mr. Powell and others requested clarifying language be added to the first Disadvantage listed under section 4.2.2 with regard to impacts on the Paso Robles aquifer. Under the third Disadvantage Mr. Riedl asked if production capacities could also be listed.
5. Mr. Powell requested clarifying in the Disadvantages of section 4.2.3 that putting in new wells in the Southern Coastal subarea would pose a risk of sea water intrusion there.
6. Mr. Powell felt that some of the Decision provisions may restrict some of water transfer options that are discussed in Section 4.

7. There was discussion of the long-term benefits of installing new wells further inland, and the feeling that even with supplemental water supplies, the Basin will still need good management to mitigate sea water intrusion.
8. Mr. Jaques requested clarifying language be added in the third Disadvantage under section 4.2.5.
9. There was discussion of potential benefits of ASR being done in the Laguna Seca subarea.
10. This concluded discussion with regard to Section 4.
11. There was much discussion with regard to what the Recommendations chapter should cover and include. Mr. Williams will draft that chapter, and it will be included for discussion at the September 22nd special TAC meeting.
12. The TAC then began discussion of BMAP Section 2, now retitled "State of the Seaside Basin" (formerly "Seaside Basin Conceptual Model").
13. Numerous clarifying language changes were requested.
14. There was much discussion with regard to differences between the Exhibit "A" basin boundary in the Decision, and the hydrogeologic basin boundary developed in the (Yates 2005) report. There was consensus to have Mr. Williams add language to the paragraph on page 2 to clarify this, and for the conclusions and recommendations drawn from the BMAP to pertain to the basin as defined in the Decision.
15. There was a request for Mr. Williams to define technical terms either when they are first used in the documents or to include a Glossary to define these terms.
16. There was a request to improve several figures to be fully understandable when viewed in black and white, rather than color.
17. There was a request to delete some other paragraphs that are not essential to understanding of the document and which tended to complicate the document and might be confusing to the reader.
18. There was a decision to schedule another special TAC meeting to continue these discussions on Wednesday September 3, 2008 from 9:00 AM to 1:00 PM. At that point the discussion will resume starting at section 2.2 "Groundwater Levels".

The meeting adjourned at 1:07 p.m.

D-R-A-F-T
MINUTES

**Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster
Technical Advisory Committee
Special Meeting
September 3, 2008**

Attendees: TAC Members

City of Seaside – Rick Riedl
California American Water – Tom Bunosky, Craig Anthony
City of Monterey – Les Turnbeaugh
Laguna Seca Property Owners – Stan Powell (by telephone)
MPWMD – Joe Oliver (first portion of meeting only)
Public Member – No Representative
MCWRA – No Representative
City of Del Rey Oaks – No Representative
City of Sand City – No Representative
Coastal Subarea Landowners – No Representative

Watermaster

Technical Program Manager - Robert Jaques

Consultants

HydroMetrics LLC - Derrik Williams and Georgina King

Others:

None

The meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m.

1. There was no set agenda for this Special meeting. Its focus was to continue discussions on the reports being prepared by HydroMetrics. The TAC resumed discussion of BMAP Section 2, p. 7 (paragraph 2.2).
2. Mr. Oliver and Mr. Williams explained that the term "deep" aquifer can mean the Santa Margarita or the Purisima aquifer, so it would not be good to do a global word change to try to more clearly define what the actual name of the aquifer is. Mr. Williams will add definitions for the terms "shallow" and "deep" to verify this.
3. Figures will be improved for readability.
4. There was much discussion about having a more readable Basin boundary map than the one contained in the Decision Exhibit "B". Mr. Williams is trying to get the original map from CH2M (Terry Foreman) who prepared the original map. Mr. Bunosky suggested that the TAC recommend to the Board to have a better Basin boundary map prepared. The one that Mr. Williams will prepare could serve this purpose, and he will make it available to the Watermaster electronically.
5. Mr. Williams will expand the language describing the significance of a hydrologic boundary, and the fact that it can move with time depending on pumping and recharge rates. There was consensus to show both the Basin (Decision) and the hydrologic boundaries in Figure 4 only.

and in the other figures to just show the Decision boundary. There was also agreement that the boundary lines should terminate at the coastline and not extend out into the bay.

6. Mr. Williams will use figures to clarify the locations of wells for which data is shown in Figures 9 and 10.
7. There was consensus to remove the intermediate (10 foot) contours from the maps, since the data upon which the contours are plotted is limited.
8. Mr. Williams said that hydrologically the aquifers in the Seaside and Salinas groundwater basins are assumed to be "in communication", i.e., water can flow between the aquifers in the two basins. The hydrologic boundary of the basins will change with time depending on such factors as pumping and recharge. The pumping depressions in the Seaside and Salinas basins have created this hydrologic boundary.
9. Mr. Jaques stressed to Mr. Williams that writing the Executive Summary will be critical to the understanding of most readers. As much "lay language" and as little "technical terminology" as possible should be used in the Executive Summary. Mr. Powell cautioned against watering down the technical depth of Section 2, but agreed that using more lay language for the Executive Summary was appropriate.
10. Mr. Bunosky recommended breaking up paragraph 2.2 into two subsections—one for shallow and one for deep aquifer discussions.
11. Mr. Jaques will contact Central Coast Surveyors to get elevation information for Mean Sea Level on the NGVD-88 data, so Mr. Williams can make the contour maps depict elevations based on Mean Sea Level.
12. Mr. Jaques asked whether the tidal fluctuations shown in Figure 10 demonstrated that the deep aquifer was connected to the ocean. Mr. Williams responded that this was not necessarily the case. Rather, this could simply be due to pressure from tidal changes being reflected from the shallow to the deep aquifer, due to leakage between the two aquifers. Mr. Williams will clarify this in the text or Figure 10.
13. There was consensus to add the term "Storage Capacity" in the first paragraph of Section 2.3.1, with Storage Capacity being the sum of Total Stored Groundwater plus Total Usable Storage Space.
14. There was discussion of the meaning and intent of the wording from the Decision which states "... less storage space which may be reserved by the Watermaster for its use in recharging the Basin." There was consensus that at this point in time the Watermaster does not have to reserve any storage space for itself. However, each year the Watermaster will be redetermining the Total Usable Storage Space, and at that time each year the Watermaster can make such a reservation if it deems appropriate.
15. There was discussion about the allocating the Total Usable Storage Space of 52,153 acre feet (p. 28)" between the Coastal and Laguna Seca subareas. Mr. Williams will recommend the allocation quantities to each subarea.
16. There was much discussion of Net Safe Yield (page 37). Mr. Williams will correct the language in this Section to make it clear that the most recent data does not change the range of values for the Net Safe Yield as discussed in the Decision. Therefore, continuing to use 3,000

acre foot per year Net Safe Yield is still a reasonable decision, and no change to this is warranted.

17. There was discussion about how and whether the Watermaster needs to define Material Injury.
18. It was apparent that there are a number of topics and issues still to be discussed, and that time is running out to get the documents (BMAP and SIRP) perfected at the TAC level, in time to have the documents ready to provide to the Board for approval at their October Board meetings. For this reason there was consensus to have the TAC complete its work by the end of 2008, rather than on the currently proposed schedule, and to provide the full documents to the Board for their review in early 2009, with Board approval targeted to occur by March, 2009.
19. Mr. Bunosky recommended setting up some more Special TAC meeting dates in the near future to continue discussions of the completed draft documents and the remaining sections that have yet to be reviewed by the TAC. There was consensus to continue with plans for making two Board PowerPoint presentations in October, but that the full documents would not be delivered to the Board until after the TAC completes its review and editing of them later in 2008.
20. There was consensus that for the September 22nd Special TAC meeting the topics of discussion will include: Conclusions and Recommendations Section, Executive Summary, and Section 4 of the SIRP.

The meeting adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

**SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***** AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM *****

MEETING DATE:	September 10, 2008
AGENDA ITEM:	2
AGENDA TITLE:	Schedule for Completion of Basin Management Action Plan and Seawater Intrusion Response Plan
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager
SUMMARY:	<p>At the September 3, 2008 Special TAC meeting there was considerable discussion, toward the end of the meeting, about how best to complete the Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP) and the Seawater Intrusion Response Plan (SIRP) so that they can be presented to and approved by the Board.</p> <p>As everyone who has been participating in the series of recent TAC and Special TAC meetings extending back into June, 2008 knows, there has been an extensive amount of dialog, exchange of ideas and opinions, clarification of terms and concepts, and requests for additional language to be added to the preliminary draft versions of these documents.</p> <p>The documents are quite technical in nature, and very comprehensive and complex in scope. For these reasons, and because these documents are essential foundations upon which the Watermaster will be making many Basin management decisions in the future, it has taken considerable time and effort on the part of the TAC to work through these documents.</p> <p>Even by holding essentially weekly meetings for approximately two months, the TAC has still not yet completed its discussions with the author of the documents, Derrick Williams. Further, there are still two sections of the BMAP to be drafted for TAC review, and one redraft of a Section of the SIRP has yet to be discussed.</p> <p>For these reasons there was unanimous agreement by those TAC members participating in the September 3, 2008 Special TAC meeting to revise the schedule for completing these documents as shown in the attached Table.</p>
ATTACHMENTS:	None
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	Confirm revising the schedule for completing the BMAP and SIRP as described above and in the attached Table

MEETING	DATE	TOPICS	DESIRED OUTCOME
Special TAC	9/22/2008	Discussion of (1) SIRP Section 4 (Seawater Intrusion Contingency Actions), (2) New BMAP Section on Conclusions and Recommendations, and (3) New BMAP Executive Summary Section	Complete discussions with D. Williams on these 3 sections
Regular Board	10/1/08	1. Replenishment Assessment Unit Costs for Water Year 2008-2009 2. 1 st Power Point presentation by Derrick Williams on the Draft BMAP and SIRP documents. No documents to be provided to Board at this time – just presentation to begin acquainting Board with the scope and content of the documents and to solicit any initial questions or feedback from Board members	1. Board approval of Replenishment Assessment Unit Costs 2. Input from Board on various issues involved in the BMAP and SIRP
Regular TAC	10/8/08	1. Draft Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report (SIAR) 2. Draft FY 2009 Budgets (M&MP O&M and Capital) 3. Discussion of topics and materials to be included in the Annual Report	1. and 2. TAC approval of the Draft SIAR and the Draft M&MP Budgets and move to Board for approval at its October 23 or November 5 meetings 3. Approve outline of topics and issues to addressed in the Annual Report
Special TAC	October - TBD	1. Water Year 2007-2008 Replenishment Assessments (once Production data for 4 th Quarter has all been received) 2. 1 st discussion of completed Draft of the full BMAP and SIRP documents	1. TAC approval of the Replenishment Assessments and move to Board for approval at its November 5 meeting
Special Board	October 23	2 nd Power Point presentation by Derrick Williams on the Draft BMAP and SIRP documents. Again, no documents to be provided to Board at this time – just presentation to complete acquainting Board with the scope and content of the documents and to solicit any further questions or feedback from Board members	Continuation from October 1 Board meeting to receive input from Board on various issues involved in the BMAP and SIRP
Regular Board	November 5	Draft Annual Report including the M&MP Budgets	Board approval of the Annual Report
Regular TAC	November 12	Continued discussions on BMAP and SIRP documents, with additional Special TAC meetings scheduled, if necessary, to ensure the documents are completed by the end of calendar year 2008	Complete discussions on the BMAP and SIRP documents so they can be printed in Draft form for presentation to the Board in January, 2009

**SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***** AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM *****

MEETING DATE:	September 10, 2008
AGENDA ITEM:	3
AGENDA TITLE:	Replenishment Assessment Unit Costs for Water Year October 1, 2008-September 30, 2009
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager
<p>SUMMARY: Several months ago the TAC revised some of the steps involved in preparing the annual calculation of the Unit Cost of replenishment water. This Unit Cost is used to calculate the Replenishment Assessments that are charged to any Standard Producer that exceeds its allocation during the Water Year.</p> <p>The changes which the TAC made, and which were submitted to the Board for its approval were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All potential supplemental water supply projects that could bring water to the Seaside Basin any time within the next 10 years will be included in the calculations, assuming sufficient information on those projects can be obtained. 2. Costs for each project will be inflated to the first year in which it could potentially begin supplying water, to reflect the increase in costs that will be occurring before the projects actually come on-line. 3. Contingency allowances will be included in these costs based on the level of project development for each project. This allowance is intended to provide for unforeseen cost impacts to the projects, particularly for projects that are only at the conceptual level of development. <p>With the completion of the draft section of the Basin Management Action Plan titled "Supplemental Water Supplies" we now have detailed information on all potential projects for inclusion in this year's calculation of the Unit Cost.</p> <p>Attached is a background paper describing Replenishment Assessment issues. Also attached is the proposed Unit Cost calculation spreadsheet for use in the Water Year October 1, 2008-September 30, 2009.</p> <p>The Unit Cost used for the Water Year that is just ending was \$1,119. The new Unit Cost is \$3,040, which is obviously considerably higher. This higher cost is reflective of: (1) the higher costs of the projects being planned to provide supplemental water, (2) the fact that many of them are only at the Conceptual level of project development - meaning that contingencies needed to be added to their base costs, and (3) the fact that many of them will not come on-line for a number of years, resulting in inflation impacts on their costs.</p>	
ATTACHMENTS:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Paper discussing the Replenishment Assessment, its purpose and intent under the Court Order 2. Updated Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost development spreadsheet
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	Discuss and either modify or approve the attached spreadsheet

Replenishment Assessments

What is the Replenishment Assessment?

The Amended Decision filed with the Court February 9, 2007 contains the following statements and/or requirements pertaining to the Replenishment Assessment on pages 32 and 33:

Each Water Year, the Watermaster will determine a Replenishment Assessment for Artificial Replenishment of the Seaside Basin necessary to offset the cumulative Basin Over-Production (as defined in Section III.A. 21), and levy a Replenishment Assessment. Replenishment Assessments based on Over-Production and on Operating Yield Over-Production shall be assessed within 60 days of the end of each Water Year on a per acre-foot basis on each acre-foot, or portion of an acre-foot, of Over-Production, and payment shall be due no later than January 15th of the following year. The per acre-foot amount of the Replenishment Assessments shall be determined and declared by Watermaster in October of each Water Year in order to provide Parties with advance knowledge of the cost of Over-Production in that Water Year.

Section III.A.21 of the Order defines Over-Production to mean, with regard to all Production from the Seaside Basin, "...that quantity of Production which exceeds an initially assumed Natural Safe Yield of 3,000 AFY." With regard to each Producer, Over-Production means "...that quantity of Water Produced in any Water Year in excess of that Producer's Base Water Right, as applied to an assumed Natural Safe Yield of 3,000 AFY."

There are **two** components to the Replenishment Assessment:

1. The **Artificial Replenishment Assessment** is a fee that is charged proportionately against the cumulative amount that all Producers pump over the (assumed) 3,000 AFY Natural Safe Yield of the basin. However, the Order provides that for Alternative Producers there is no fee charged if the Alternative Producer does not pump any water in excess of the fixed amount allocated to it in Table 2 of the Order, and
2. The **Operating Yield Over-Production Assessment** is a fee that is charged against each Standard Producer for the amount of water the Standard Producer pumps in excess of its Base Water Right, as determined using the Allocation percentages in Table 1 of the Order, and against each Alternative Producer that pumps in excess of its allocation in Table 2 of the Order.

The actual calculation of each of these Assessment components gets complex and will therefore not be discussed or explained in this paper. The purpose of this paper is to describe the Replenishment Assessments and what the monies collected through these Assessments is intended to be used for.

The first component of the Replenishment Assessment collects monies from all of the Standard Producers (and Alternative Producers if they exceed their allocations) in proportion to the amount that they have cumulatively pumped in excess of the Natural Safe Yield of 3,000 AFY. So even if a Standard Producer pumps no water in excess of its Allocation, if cumulative pumping has exceeded the Natural Safe Yield, this Standard Producer will still have to pay a fee under this first component in proportion to its contributing toward the over-pumping of the Basin in excess of the Natural Safe Yield.

The second component of the Replenishment Assessment collects monies only from those Standard Producers who pumped amounts of Native Water in excess of their Standard Production Allocations, again as calculated using the percentages in Table 1 of the Order. Alternative Producers are only subject to the second component of the Replenishment Assessment if they pump amounts in excess of

their fixed allocations in Table 2 of the Order. So if a Standard Producer does not pump amount of water in excess of its Allocation, it will not have to pay a fee under the second component.

What Are the Monies Collected Through the Replenishment Assessments to be Used for?

Per page 33 of the Order, funds generated through the Artificial Replenishment Assessments “...are to be used solely for replenishment of the Basin Groundwater supply with Non-Native water.” Non-native water is defined in the Order to mean “...all water that would not otherwise add to the Groundwater supply through natural means or from return flows from surface applications other than intentional Spreading.”

Also per page 33 of the Order, funds generated through the Operating Yield Over-Production Assessments “...shall be utilized by the Watermaster to engage in or contract for Replenishment of the Operating Yield Over-Production occurring in the Preceding Water Year as expeditiously as possible.”

On Page 34 of the Order it states that “...All proceeds of Replenishment Assessments shall be used to procure Non-Native water, including, if appropriate, substitute reclaimed water.”

Although there is some variation in language between these sections of the Order, it is clear that the monies collected through the Replenishment Assessments are intended to be used to obtain water to recharge the Basin to the extent necessary to reduce the net water production taken from the Basin to a level at or below the Natural Safe Yield of 3,000 AFY. The recharge water could be such things as water imported from another water supply outside the Basin, recycled water used to reduce pumping for landscape irrigation, or recycled water used for recharge through direct injection or spreading.

How is the Per Acre-Foot Cost of the Replenishment Assessments to be Determined?

Per page 33 of the Order, “The per acre-foot amount of the Replenishment Assessments shall be determined and declared by Watermaster in October of each Water Year in order to provide Parties with advance knowledge of the cost of Over-Production in that Water Year.” Thus, the per acre-foot amount determined by the Board in October of 2007 will be used to calculate Replenishment Assessments for pumping that occurs during the Water Year which begins on October 1, 2007 and ends on September 30, 2008.

On pages 9 and 10 (Section 6.5) of the Watermaster Rules and Regulations, there is a discussion of how the Replenishment Assessment per acre-foot costs are to be calculated. It states that “The per acre-foot cost of Replenishment Assessments for Production in excess of Natural Safe Yield shall be based on the anticipated cost of Artificial Replenishment, including the cost to construct, operate, and maintain facilities necessary for replenishment of the Basin. Replenishment Assessment may only be used for Artificial Replenishment.” The Order defines Artificial Replenishment to mean the act of engaging in or contracting for Non-Native Water to be added to the Groundwater Basin through spreading or direct injection to offset the cumulative Over-Production from the Basin in any particular Water Year. It can also include programs in which Producers agree to refrain from exercising their rights to pump their full Production Allocations where the intent is to cause the replenishment of the Basin through forbearance in lieu of the injection or spreading of Non-Native Water.

So the per acre-foot cost used to determine the Replenishment Assessments should be the cost that would have to be paid, per acre-foot, to obtain water to recharge the Basin to the extent necessary to offset the cumulative over-production above the Natural Safe Yield, during a given Water Year.

From work done to date in calculating the per acre-foot cost, it is apparent that there are ongoing changes in projected costs of recharge water and in the timing of the projects which will provide that

water. Hence, the per acre-foot cost needs to be recalculated each year using updated cost projections and implementation schedules for these recharge projects.

If recharge water is not available to be purchased in a given Water Year to offset the cumulative over-production that occurred in that year, then the monies collected through the Replenishment Assessments in that Water Year may be accumulated for multiple Water Years until they can be used to purchase recharge water.

It is to be expected that the costs of the recharge projects will increase with inflation, among other things. Therefore, the unspent Replenishment Assessment monies should be invested in interest-earning accounts that will offset these inflation increases, until such time as the recharge projects come on-line and the needed water can then be purchased.

As long as the unit costs of water from the various potential recharge projects is forecast by the agencies sponsoring the recharge projects to the dates at which the projects will come on-line, there should be no need to inflate those unit costs when the per acre-foot cost used to determine the Replenishment Assessments is calculated.

WATER YEAR 2008-2009

ANTICIPATED UNIT COSTS OF REPLENISHMENT WATER FOR THE SEASIDE BASIN ⁽⁹⁾

POTENTIAL SOURCE OF REPLACEMENT WATER	POTENTIAL DATE REPLACEMENT WATER COULD BECOME AVAILABLE	POTENTIAL VOLUME OF WATER THAT COULD BE SUPPLIED BY THE PROJECT (AFY)	LEVEL OF PROJECT DEVELOPMENT	CONTINGENCY INCLUDED IN BASE UNIT COST ⁽¹¹⁾ (%)	BASE UNIT COST (\$/AF)	BASE UNIT COST YEAR	ADDITIONAL CONTINGENCY ADDED TO REFLECT LEVEL OF PROJECT DEVELOPMENT ⁽¹⁰⁾ (%)	UNIT COST INCLUDING ADDITIONAL CONTINGENCY (\$/AF)	UNIT COST INFLATED @ 3% FROM COST BASIS YEAR TO YEAR REPLACEMENT WATER COULD BECOME AVAILABLE	VOLUME-WEIGHTED AVG %	REPLENISHMENT UNIT COST SHARE
Moss Landing Desalination Plant – Local Alternative	2015	10,430	Conceptual	25%	\$2,230	2007	25%	\$2,788	\$3,531	10.87%	\$383.91
Moss Landing Desalination Plant – Regional Alternative	2015	18,972	Conceptual	25%	\$1,690	2007	25%	\$2,113	\$2,676	19.78%	\$529.22
North Marina Desalination Plant – Local Alternative (brine disposal at MLPP) ⁽¹⁾	2015	10,430	Conceptual	10%	\$1,980	2005	40%	\$2,772	\$3,725	10.87%	\$405.02
North Marina Desalination Plant – Regional Alternative (brine disposal at MLPP) ⁽¹⁾	2015	18,972	Conceptual	10%	\$1,660	2005	40%	\$2,324	\$3,123	19.78%	\$617.66
MPWMD's 95-10 Desal Plant	2015	8,400	Conceptual	25%	\$2,920	2007	25%	\$3,650	\$4,624	8.76%	\$404.85
Sand City Water Supply Project ⁽²⁾	2009	300	Design	0%	\$3,600	2007	15%	\$4,140	\$4,392	0.31%	\$13.73
Salinas River Surface Water Treatment Plant ⁽⁶⁾	2012	7,500	Conceptual	30%	\$1,500	2008	20%	\$1,800	\$2,026	7.82%	\$158.38
Regional Desalination ⁽⁷⁾	2015	9,930	Conceptual	30%	\$1,791	2008	20%	\$2,149	\$2,643	10.35%	\$273.60
Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project	2011	3,000	Conceptual	5%	\$1,200	2006	45%	\$1,740	\$2,017	3.13%	\$63.08
Seaside Aquifer Storage and Recovery Project	2008	1,300	Design	25%	\$260	2005	-10%	\$234	\$256	1.36%	\$3.46
MRWPCA Groundwater Replenishment Project for the Seaside Basin	2012	6,700	Conceptual	30%	\$1,865	2006	20%	\$2,238	\$2,672	6.98%	\$186.63
Seawater Conversion Vessel ⁽⁵⁾	2018	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pacific Grove Stormwater Project ⁽³⁾	2010	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Conservation ⁽⁴⁾	2009	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Total Quantity of Replacement Water (AFY) Expected to Potentially be Available Within the Next 10 Years = 95,934

Volume-Weighted Replacement Water Cost Per Acre-Foot = \$3,040

FOOTNOTES:

- (1) Contingency percentage included in Base Unit Cost was not stated. Assume 10%.
- (2) Contingency percentage included in Base Unit Cost was not stated. Assume 0%.
- (3) This Project was not included because the costs were not known. A feasibility study for the Pacific Grove Stormwater Project was just recently completed, and it is unknown whether preliminary costs were developed.
- (4) This Project was not included because the costs were not known. The cost for conservation will be realized through rebates and are unknown at this time.
- (5) This Project was not included because there is no apparent project sponsor for it.
- (6) Project has a proposed range of supply of 5,000 to 10,000 AFY. For this analysis assume 7,500 AFY.
- (7) Project has a proposed range of supply of 7,430 to 12,430 AFY. For this analysis assume 9,930 AFY.
- (8) Project has a proposed range of supply of 5,000 to 10,000 AFY. For this analysis assumed 7,500 AFY.
- (9) The data used in this table was taken from the Basin Management Action Plan, Section 3, titled "Supplemental Water Supplies."
- (10) The following Contingency percentages were considered reasonable for the indicated levels of project development: Conceptual Level - 50%, Project Report Level - 30%, and Design Level - 15%.
- (11) This percentage of Contingency was included in the Base Unit Cost.

**SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***** AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM *****

MEETING DATE:	September 10, 2008
AGENDA ITEM:	4
AGENDA TITLE:	Proposed 2009 Monitoring and Management Program Scope of Work
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager
SUMMARY:	<p>In September, 2007 the TAC went through the initial "Phase 2 Anticipated Scope of Work" that had been prepared and filed with the Court in March 2007 when the Implementation Plan was submitted to the Judge. The TAC produced and approved an "Updated Anticipated Phase 2 Scope of Work." The "Updated Anticipated Phase 2 Scope of Work" was subsequently approved by the Board, and was included in the Annual Report that was submitted to the Court in November, 2007.</p> <p>I have reviewed the "Updated Anticipated Phase 2 Scope of Work" which was prepared in 2007, and have made some revisions to reflect events or information that was not known or available when the 2007 updating was done. This "Anticipated 2009 Scope of Work" is attached. It shows, in "Track Changes" the revisions I have made from the "Updated Anticipated Phase 2 Scope of Work" that was included in the November, 2007 Annual Report.</p> <p>Once the TAC has discussed this proposed scope of work and we have edited it to meet the satisfaction of the TAC, I will use it as the basis of developing budgets for the Monitoring and Management Program for 2009. Those budgets will come to the TAC, along with the final "Anticipated 2009 Scope of Work," for approval at the October 8, 2008 Regular TAC meeting.</p>
ATTACHMENTS:	Proposed "Anticipated 2009 Scope of Work"
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	At today's meeting the TAC is asked to review and discuss the attached Proposed 2009 Scope of Work so that this can be finalized and used to prepare the 2009 and 2009 budgets which will be presented to the TAC for approval at the October 8 th TAC meeting.

Seaside Groundwater Basin Management and Monitoring Program Anticipated 2009 Scope of Work

(Prepared September 9, 2008)

The tasks outlined below are those that are ~~not anticipated to be completed as a part of Phase 1 of the Seaside Basin Monitoring and Management Program. It has been determined that the Tasks listed below are either dependent on results of the initial phase of the Program (and therefore subject to scope refinement) or, they are recommended for Phase 2 because Tasks in the initial phase must be completed before the tasks below can commence. By phasing implementation of the MMP, the Watermaster can better understand the Basin's baseline condition through the Phase 1 work effort before determining the exact scope and budget for Phase 2-anticipated to be performed during 2008.~~

Some Tasks listed below ~~are also depicted~~ were included in the Initial Phase 1 Scope of Work ~~that was contained in the Implementation Plan prepared in March, 2007, and the Updated Phase 2 Scope of Work contained in the November, 2007 Annual Report.~~ This is because some Tasks recur throughout the program. For instance, data collection and database entry are continuous activities that will occur throughout the program. Program Administration Tasks will also occur on a day-to-day, as needed basis throughout the program.

M.1 Program Administration

M. 1. a.

Project Budget and Controls

Contractors will provide monthly or bimonthly invoices to the Watermaster for work performed under their contracts with the Watermaster. Contractors will perform maintenance of their internal budgets and schedules, and management of their subconsultants. The Watermaster will perform management of its Contractors.

M. 1. b.

Assist with Board and TAC Agendas

Watermaster staff will prepare Board and TAC meeting agenda materials. No assistance from Contractors is expected to be necessary to accomplish this Task.

M. 1. c.

Preparation and Attendance of Meetings

The Contractors' work will require internal meetings ~~both internally~~ and possibly with outside governmental agencies; and ~~possibly with~~ the public. For meetings with outside agencies, other Contractors, or any other parties which are necessary for the conduct of the work of their contracts, the Contractors will set up the meetings and prepare agendas and meeting minutes to facilitate the meetings. These may include planning and review meetings with Watermaster staff. The costs for these meetings will be included in their contracts, under the specific Tasks and/or subtasks to which the meetings relate. The only meeting costs that will be incurred under Task M.1.c will be:

- Those associated with attendance at TAC meetings, and
- From time-to-time when Watermaster staff asks Contractors to make presentations to the Watermaster Board and/or TAC.

For TAC meetings appropriate Contractor representatives will attend the TAC meetings, but will not be asked to prepare agendas or meeting minutes. As necessary, Contractors may provide oral updates to their progress reports (prepared under Task M.1.~~bd~~) at the TAC meetings.

M. 1. d.

Prepare Board/ TAC Status Updates and Reports

Contractors will provide written monthly progress reports to the Watermaster for inclusion in the agenda packets for the TAC meetings. These progress reports will typically include project progress that has been made, and problem identification and resolution.

M. 1. e.

Peer Review of Documents and Reports

When requested by the Watermaster staff, Contractors may be asked to assist the TAC and the Watermaster staff with peer reviews of documents and reports prepared by various other Watermaster Contractors and/or entities.

M. 1. f.

QA/QC

MPWMD will provide general QA/QC support over the Seaside Basin Monitoring and Management Program.

Deliverables

- Monthly Status Reports
- Technical Data as required for Meetings

I. 2 Comprehensive Basin Production, Water Level and Water Quality Monitoring Program

I. 2. a. Conduct ongoing data entry/ database maintenance	The database will be maintained by a Contractor performing this work for the Watermaster. Either <u>one of the other Contractors or the Contractor</u> or the Watermaster staff will enter new data into the consolidated database. Such data will include water production volumes, water quality, and water levels <u>data, and such other data as may be appropriate.</u>
I. 2. b. Data Collection Program Enhancements	
I. 2. b. 1. Site Representation and Selection.	<u>The monitoring well network review that was started in 2008 will be completed to select the specific site where an additional monitoring well will be installed to fill a data gap that was identified through the work performed in 2008. This new well will be used to develop additional data that will be beneficial to the management of the basin. The new well will be constructed under subtask I.2.b.5.</u>
I. 2. b. 2. Collect Monthly Manual Water Levels.	Each of the monitoring wells will be visited on a monthly basis. Water levels will be determined by either taking manual water levels using an electric sounder, or by dataloggers, if it is determined that dataloggers are appropriate. It is expected that dataloggers, if used, will only be installed on the Coastal Sentinel monitoring wells, and that the other wells will be manually measured.
I. 2. b. 3. Collect Quarterly Water Quality Samples.	Water quality data will be collected quarterly from certain of the monitoring wells. This data may come from water quality samples that are taken from these wells and submitted to a State Certified analytic laboratory for general mineral and physical suite of analyses, or the data may come from induction logging of these wells and/or other data gathering techniques. A decision on the most cost-effective method of obtaining the desired data will be made early in the 2008 Water Year.
I. 2. b. 4. Update Program Schedule and Standard Operating Procedures.	The TAC will conduct periodic reviews of the data collection program and will recommend to the Watermaster improvements as warranted.
<u>I. 2. b. 5. Monitor Well Construction</u>	<u>Similar to the approach taken in Phase 1 under Task I.1, the Watermaster will hire a Contractor to design and construct an additional monitoring well to fill a data gap in the existing monitoring well network. The work to select the site for this well will be performed under subtask I. 2. b. 1.</u>
I. 2. c. Reports	The groundwater level and quality monitoring will be conducted on a monthly, quarterly, and annual basis, as described <u>herein in the Contractor's Scope of Work</u> . Reports summarizing data collected and analyzed will be submitted to the Watermaster on a schedule to be established. Reports would include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Quality and Water Level Quarterly Reports • <u>An Annual Water Quality and Water Level Reports</u>
<i>I. 3 Basin Management</i>	
I. 3. a. Enhanced Seaside Basin Groundwater Model	As a result of the data obtained during Phase 1, including constructing new coastal sentinel monitoring wells and developing a consolidated database of groundwater production, water levels, and water quality, it is <u>was concluded that at this time it was not necessary to develop no longer recommended that a new model be developed.</u> The basis for this decision was included in the Phase 1 documents submitted with the November 15, 2007 Annual Report. <u>Preliminary conclusions from work performed on preparing the Basin Management Action Plan in 2008 continue to support this finding. Therefore, no work to develop a new model, or to update the existing model, is planned for 2009.</u>
I. 3. b. Prepare Basin Management and Action Plan	<u>The Watermaster's Contractor, hired in 2008 to prepare the Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP) has nearly completed preparation of the BMAP. Preparation of the BMAP will be completed by mid-2009. The BMAP is comprised of subtasks I. 3. b. 1, I. 3. b. 2, and I. 3. b. 3, as well as some additional materials described below under subtask I.c.3. staff will prepare and distribute a Request for Proposals (RFP) to qualified Contractors to perform certain subtasks of Task I.3.c, as indicated below. The status of completion of each of these subtasks is described below, along with a description of the work that will be performed in 2009 to complete each of these subtasks.</u>
I. 3. b. 1.	The Supplemental Water Supplies analysis performed in Phase 1 <u>will be</u> updated

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

	<p>Supplemental Water Supplies</p>	<p>by a Contractor, and a Technical Memorandum on this issue will be and a draft Section of the BMAP covering this material has been prepared (Section 3 listed under subtask I.3.c). This update may <u>addresses</u> the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated status and review Of Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Projects • Updated costs, schedules, permitting issues, and volumes of water that the Projects can supply • Distribution and Delivery System/ End Use Consumer Improvements and Mandatory Conservation Efforts • Non-Potable Water Resources • Out-of-Basin Imports
	<p>I. 3. b. 2. Pumping Redistribution Strategies</p>	<p>Based on the work performed during Phase 1, a Contractor will develop additional Draft p pumping redistribution strategies, and a Technical Memorandum on this issue will be have <u>been</u> prepared. This work may include <u>addresses</u> the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basin overdraft, mandatory GW reduction • Salinity detection, mandatory GW reduction • Reduced GW delivery impacts and solutions • In Lieu, Voluntary pumping reductions • Water Banking • Salinity barrier system • Develop TM on P pumping variability • Storage capacity of the basin
	<p>I. 3. c. Plan Preparation</p>	<p>A Contractor will prepare A <u>a</u> detailed draft <u>Basin Management Plan</u> BMAP has nearly been completed, summarizing results of Tasks I.3.a through I.3.c, as well as some other topics. <u>The BMAP will be completed and approved by the Watermaster by mid-2009 at the latest.</u> The Sections that will be included in the final BMAP are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Summary • Section 1 – Background and Purpose • Section 2 – State of the Basin • Section 3 – Supplemental Water Supplies • Section 4 – Groundwater Management Actions • Section 5 – Conclusions, Recommendations, and Implementation Plan
<p>I.3.d</p>		<p>ARE THERE ADDITIONAL TASKS WE SHOULD INCLUDE FOR BASIN MANAGEMENT FOR 2009, such as development of Protective Water Levels, Updating the Model, etc???</p>
<p><i>I. 4 Seawater Intrusion Contingency Plan</i></p>		
	<p>I. 4. a. Oversight of Seawater Intrusion Detection and Tracking</p>	<p>A Contractor will provide general oversight over the Seawater Intrusion detection program.</p>
	<p>I. 4. b. Analyze and Map Water Quality from Coastal Monitoring Wells</p>	<p>Annual chloride concentration maps will be produced incorporating the data from the coastal wells. During Phase 2, water quality <u>D</u> data from the Phase 1 coastal sentinel wells will be used to develop time series graphs, that are not included in the Phase 1 water quality graphs.</p>
	<p>I. 4. c. Annual Report- Seawater Intrusion Analysis</p>	<p>At the end of each water year, a Contractor will reanalyze all water quality data. Semi-annual chloride concentration maps will be produced for each aquifer in the basin. Time series graphs, trilinear graphs, and stiff diagram comparisons will be updated with new data. The annual EM logs will be analyzed to identify changes in seawater wedge locations. All analyses will be incorporated into an annual report that follows the format of the initial, historical data report. Potential seawater intrusion will be highlighted in the report, and if necessary, recommendations will be included. The annual report will be submitted for review by the TAC and the Board. Modifications to the report will be incorporated based on input from these bodies, as well as Watermaster staff.</p>
	<p>I. 4. d. Develop Implement Contingency Response Plan</p>	<p>If seawater intrusion is identified, the Watermaster, with assistance from a Contractor and the TAC, will develop a response plan to ensure adequate water supplies for reasonable beneficial uses. This will include implementing the measures detailed in Exhibit A of the Decision, devising a pumping redistribution plan, and securing alternative water sources if necessary. <u>A Seawater Intrusion Response Plan (SIRP) was developed in 2008, and is</u></p>

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.05" + Tab after: 0.3" + Indent at: 0"

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

included in the November, 2008 Annual Report. This Plan will be implemented if seawater intrusion, as defined in the Plan, is determined by the Watermaster to be occurring.

**SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***** AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM *****

MEETING DATE:	September 10, 2008
AGENDA ITEM:	5
AGENDA TITLE:	Schedule
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager
SUMMARY:	<p>As a regular part of each monthly TAC meeting, I will provide the TAC with an updated Consultants Work Schedule of the activities being performed by the Watermaster's consultants and the public entities (MPWMD and MCWRA) that are performing certain portions of the work, and of the Critical Program Milestones Schedule.</p> <p>Attached is the Updated Consultants Work Schedule. It contains a number of new tasks added since the last update to reflect full processing and approvals of the BMAP and the SIRP through the Board, and the addition of tasks for preparing and approving the M&MP budgets.</p>
ATTACHMENTS:	Updated Schedule of Consultants Work Activities
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	Provide Input to Technical Program Manager Regarding Any Corrections or Additions to This Schedule

Seaside Basin WaterMaster Monitoring and Management Program 2008 Work Schedule

ID	Task Name	2008												Jan	F				
		Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug			Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
1	CRITICAL PROJECT MILESTONES ASSOCIATED WITH TAC, BOARD, AND/OR CONSULTANT WORK																		
2	2008 Administration, Operations and Replenishment Budgets Due					◆	Completed												
3	Respond to November 26, 2007 Court Order					◆	Completed	◆											
4	TAC Develops Specific Action Plan to Cure Deficiencies					◆	Completed	◆											
7	Board Approves Specific Action Plan to Cure Deficiencies					◆	Completed	◆											
8	Supplemental Water Level and Water Quality Data Collected and Compiled					◆	Completed	◆											
9	Preparation of Preliminary Draft Response to Court					◆	Completed	◆											
10	TAC Reviews Preliminary Draft Response to Court					◆	Completed	◆											
11	Preparation of Final Response to Court					◆	Completed	◆											
12	Watermaster Submits Final Response to Court					◆	Completed	◆											
13	Watermaster Prepares Quarterly Water Production, Water Level, and Water Quality Reports		◆	Completed		◆	Completed	◆		◆	Completed			◆					
18	Replenishment Assessments for Water Year 2009													◆					
19	TAC Develops Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost for 2009 Water Year													◆					
20	TAC Approves 2009 Water Year Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost													◆	9/10				

Seaside Basin WaterMaster Monitoring and Management Program 2008 Work Schedule

ID	Task Name	2008																	
		Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	F
21	Board Declares 2009 Water Year Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost																		
22	Replenishment Assessments for Water Year 2008																		
23	Watermaster Prepares Replenishment Assessments for Water Year 2008																		
24	Watermaster Board Approves Replenishment Assessments for Water Year 2009																		
25	Watermaster Levies Standard Replenishment Assessment for 2008																		
26	Monitoring & Management Program (M&MP) Budgets for 2009 and 2010																		
27	TAC prepares Draft 2009 and 2010 M&MP O&M and Capital Budgets																		
28	TAC approves Draft 2009 and 2010 M&MP O&M and Capital Budgets																		
29	Board approves 2009 and 2010 M&MP O&M and Capital Budgets																		
30	2008 Annual Report																		
31	Watermaster Prepares Draft 2008 Annual Report																		
32	TAC Provides Input on Draft 2008 Annual Report																		
33	Watermaster Prepares Revised Draft 2008 Annual Report (Incorporating TAC Input)																		
34	Board Provides Input on Revised Draft 2008 Annual Report																		
35	Watermaster Prepares Final 2008 Annual Report (Incorporating Board Input)																		

Seaside Basin WaterMaster Monitoring and Management Program 2008 Work Schedule

ID	Task Name	2008												Jan	F			
		Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug			Sep	Oct	Nov
75	TAC Subcommittee Reviews Proposals				Completed													
76	TAC Review Subcommittee Decides if Interviews are Necessary				Completed													
77	Consultants Notified to Attend Interviews (if Necessary)				Interviews Not Necessary													
78	Subcommittee Holds Consultant Interviews (if Necessary)				Interviews Not Necessary													
79	TAC Approves Subcommittee's Consultant Selection Recommendation (by email)				Completed													
80	Initial Contract Negotiations with Selected Consultant(s)				Completed													
81	Board Authorizes Award of Contract(s) to Selected Consultant(s) for Not-to-Exceed Amounts				Completed													
82	Final Contract Negotiations with Selected Consultant(s) and Execution of Contract(s)				Completed													
83	<i>1.3.b.1 Supplemental Water Supplies</i>																	
84	Consultant Updates Phase 1 Supplemental Water Supplies Analysis (Part of the BMAP)																	
85	Consultant Provides Draft Update Section of the BMAP to Watermaster																	Completed
86	TAC Approves Draft Updated Supplemental Water Supplies Analysis (Section 3 of BMAP)																	Completed
87	<i>1.3.b.2 Pumping Redistribution Strategies</i>																	
88	Consultant Prepares Pumping Redistribution Strategies Report (Part of the SIRP)																	
89	Consultant Provides Draft Section of the SIRP to Watermaster																	7/14

Seaside Basin WaterMaster Monitoring and Management Program 2008 Work Schedule

ID	Task Name	2008												Jan	F					
		Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug			Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
105	I.4.c Consultant Prepares Annual Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report (SIAR)																			
106	Consultant Provides Draft Report to Watermaster																			
107	TAC Approves Annual Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report (SIAR)																			
108	Board Approves Annual Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report (SIAR)																			
109	I.4.d Seawater Intrusion Response Plan (SIRP)																			
110	MPWMD Prepares Interim SIRP																			
111	MPWMD Provides Draft Plan to Watermaster																			
112	TAC Approves Interim SIRP																			
113	Board Approves Interim SIRP																			
114	Consultant Prepares Long-term SIRP																			
115	Consultant Provides Draft Long-Term SIRP to Watermaster																			
116	TAC Approves Draft Long-term SIRP																			
117	Consultant Prepares Final Draft SIRP																			
118	Consultant Provides Final Draft SIRP to Watermaster																			
119	Board Approves Long-Term SIRP (Over two to three meetings)																			