

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF THE SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER

DATE: Wednesday, March 10, 2010

NOTE CHANGE FROM NORMAL MEETING TIME: 9:00 a.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 Watermaster Conference Line by dialing (877)810-9415. Use the Access Code of 4560043.

OFFICERS

Chairperson: Diana Ingersoll, City of Seaside

1st Vice-Chairperson: Eric Sabolsice, California American Water Company

2nd Vice-Chairperson: Rob Johnson, MCWRA

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 February 10, 2010 Meeting

2

B. Appoint Alternate Public Member to the TAC (Bob Jaques)

7

2. Recommendations for Changes in Standard Operating Procedures for the M&MP (Joe Oliver)

8

3. Request for Service (RFS) for HydroMetrics to Perform Modeling Scenarios (Bob Jaques)

11

4. Update on Refining Protective Water Levels (Bob Jaques)

18

5. Approve Enhancements to be Made to the Database (Bob Jaques)

19

6. SPCA Well Production and Related Issues (Bob Jaques)

23

7. Schedule (Bob Jaques)

26

8. Other Business

9. Set next meeting date:

The next regular meeting will be held on Wednesday, April 14, 2010 at 1:30 p.m. at the City of Seaside City Hall – Portable Buildings Conference Room

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Seaside does not discriminate against persons with disabilities. Both Seaside City Hall and the Portable Office Buildings Conference Room are accessible facilities. If you wish to attend this meeting and you will require assistance in order to participate, please contact the Office of the City Clerk (831) 899-6707 at least three days in advance of the event to make necessary arrangements. If you need assistance in speaking on a specific item noted on the agenda, please inform staff as to which item you would like to comment on and arrangements will be made for you to participate. Portable microphones and assisted listening devices are available upon request.

**SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

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

MEETING DATE:	March 10, 2010
AGENDA ITEM:	1.A
AGENDA TITLE:	Approve Minutes from February 10, 2010
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager
SUMMARY: Draft Minutes from this meeting were emailed to all TAC members. Proposed changes have been included in the attached version.	
ATTACHMENTS:	Minutes from this meeting
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	Approve the minutes

D-R-A-F-T
MINUTES

**Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
February 10, 2010**

Attendees: TAC Members
City of Seaside – Rick Riedl
California American Water – Eric Sabolsice
City of Monterey – No Representative
Laguna Seca Property Owners – No Representative
MPWMD – Joe Oliver
Public Member – John Fischer
MCWRA – Rob Johnson (by telephone only for the first part of meeting)
City of Del Rey Oaks – No Representative
City of Sand City – No Representative
Coastal Subarea Landowners – No Representative

Watermaster
Technical Program Manager - Robert Jaques
Chief Executive Officer – Dewey Evans

Consultants
HydroMetrics LLC – Derrik Williams and Georgina King

Others:
MPWMD – Jonathan Lear

The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m.

Mr. Fischer reported that he will be undergoing further cancer treatments in the immediate future, probably lasting about eight weeks. He suggested Ms. Ingersoll may wish to find an alternate Public Member to cover for him when he is unable to attend meetings.

1. Administrative Matters:

A. Approve Minutes from January 13, 2010 Meeting

The following corrections were requested by Mr. Riedl: Referring to page 6 of the Minutes, Mr. Riedl said that with regard to Scenario 2 he had asked what the current modeling told us about the Laguna Seca subarea. Referring to page 5 of the Minutes, under Management Objectives he said that he had suggested adding "Including how quickly the protective water levels are achieved".

With these corrections to the Minutes made, on a motion by Mr. Oliver, second by Mr. Fischer, the Minutes were unanimously approved.

2. Continued Discussion of Management Objectives and Possible Modeling Scenarios to be Performed in 2010

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

Mr. Sabolsice asked whether achieving 90% Protective Water Levels would protect the entire Basin. Mr. Williams responded that achieving 90% Protective Water Levels would allow the toe of the sea

water intrusion front to intrude slightly inland of the coastal wells. So it would not actually be protecting the "entire" Basin.

Mr. Johnson asked what achieving 90% Protective Water Levels would mean with regard to the elevation to be protected. Mr. Williams responded that this would provide protection to the upper 90% of the aquifer depth, and that the bottom 10% of the aquifer depth would be intruded. Mr. Johnson recommended that this be clearly explained when a presentation on this material is made to the Board.

Mr. Williams went on to say that the purpose of achieving only 90% Protective Water Levels would be to see if we can save money and/or supplemental water by not having to raise groundwater levels as high as would be required to achieve 100% Protective Water Levels. Ms. King said this also assumes that no sea water intrusion is occurring between the four coastal monitoring wells.

Mr. Johnson said he felt that the proposed Management Objectives and Scenarios were satisfactory for purposes of getting the work started. At this point (1:56 PM), Mr. Johnson had to leave the meeting.

Mr. Sabolsice said he was also interested in seeing how quickly the Protective Water Levels would be reached and suggested that this be one of the objectives. There was discussion on how many years, for example 1, 2, 5, 10, etc. years, would be picked as an objective.

Mr. Williams asked if the subject of how soon Protective Water Levels are reached was an important issue to the Board. There was much discussion on this and the Court Decision constraints that are lifted if Protective Water Levels are reached, for example the mandatory 10% pumping reductions.

Mr. Riedl commented that the cost of installing an offshore monitoring well is considerably less than the cost of bringing in supplemental water to help achieve Protective Water Levels through construction of coastal injection barrier wells, and therefore further consideration should be given to the feasibility of installing an offshore monitoring well to help detect the location of the sea water intrusion front. There was much discussion on this topic, during which Mr. Williams commented that an additional module could be added to the proposed Regional Desalination Plant as a way of producing additional water for this purpose.

Mr. Jaques explained that his intent in proposing Management Objective No. 2 was to see whether a Scenario would protect all areas of the Basin, not just the areas in the vicinity of the four coastal monitoring wells. Mr. Williams said the assumption is that there is a smooth transition in water levels between these four monitoring wells. Mr. Oliver asked Mr. Williams if it would be feasible to construct an additional modeling cross-section parallel to the coast through these four monitoring wells. Mr. Williams said he did not think that doing this would be necessary.

Mr. Williams and Mr. Oliver suggested editing Management Objective No. 2 to include the language "... along the coastal length of the Basin..." There was consensus to include this revised language.

Mr. Williams noted that the Scenarios only run for approximately 22 years, so the modeling results will only go out that far in time.

Following discussion there was consensus to delete Management Objective No. 3.

Mr. Sabolsice and Mr. Oliver suggested considering whether or not the Natural Safe Yield is being increased as an additional Management Objective. Mr. Williams said the Natural Safe Yield is already pretty well established.

Following further discussion there was consensus to recommend for Board approval the first two Management Objectives contained in the agenda packet, with the language revision mentioned above to

Management Objective No. 1, as the Management Objectives against which the modeling scenarios would be measured.

Scenario 1: Mr. Williams said all of the Alternative Producers were allowed to pump their full allocations under the scenario that was previously modeled, and that actual pumping production figures were not used for that work. Mr. Williams reported that currently the Alternative Producers are pumping less than their cumulative allocations would allow. Mr. Williams said the prior modeling work did not examine the movement of water to or from the Laguna Seca subarea, or the impacts of Laguna Seca pumping with regard to the other subareas within the Basin.

There was consensus to edit this Scenario to examine the 0%, 10%, and 20% pumping increases within the Laguna Seca subarea.

Scenario 2: Mr. Williams felt it would not be necessary to run this Scenario, because the Baseline Scenario of the previous modeling work essentially evaluated this set of criteria. Mr. Jaques asked if the Baseline Scenario that was previously used in the modeling had CAW getting its full Regional Project water supply in the year 2012, as indicated in the schedule contained in the Final EIR for the Coastal Water Project. Mr. Williams responded no, so this would be a significantly different scenario than the previously modeled Baseline Scenario. Mr. Jaques also noted that the Final EIR states that approximately 2,900 acre feet per year of the 8,800 acre feet per year Desalination Plant water supply will be used to reduce pumping within the Seaside Basin. This would be another difference from the Baseline Scenario. As a result of this discussion there was consensus to model this Scenario.

Mr. Williams and Ms. King also recommended using average rainfall, not cyclical rainfall data, because the length of 22 year length of the modeling is too short to really reflect the long-term effects of cyclical rainfall data. There was consensus that it would be more meaningful to use average rainfall, rather than actual cyclical rainfall data patterns.

Mr. Williams said he would also review the previous work to confirm that ASR pumping is not being double-counted.

Scenarios 3 & 4: There was consensus to delete Scenario 3 and to defer consideration of Scenario 4 to a possible future modeling activity.

3. Continued Discussion of Possible Refinements to Protective Water Levels to be Performed in 2010

Mr. Williams said that HydroMetrics would be agreeable with the Technical Program Manager's suggestion to reduce their scope of work to cover Tasks 1 and 2 as described in their Proposal, but to provide only an abbreviated amount of work under Task 3.

Mr. Williams said that where Protective Water Levels are only a few feet above mean sea level, they would still always have to stay slightly above mean sea level to provide protection, so very little lowering of Protective Water Levels in those locations could occur.

Mr. Sabolsice felt there was value to performing the proposed evaluation of 90% Protective Water Levels with the reduced scope of work and reduced costs for Task 3. Following discussion there was unanimous agreement to do this.

4. Discussion of Potential Improvements to the Database

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

Mr. Oliver recommended setting a separate meeting for those persons directly involved in using the Database to go through the proposed improvements in detail. There was agreement to set that meeting

for 9:00 AM on Wednesday February 24, 2010 at the MPWMD offices. Mr. Jaques said he would e-mail out an invitation to the full TAC listserv to attend this meeting.

5. Consider Request to Classify Security National Guaranty Well as Inactive

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

Following discussion there was consensus to support Security National Guaranty's request and to recommend its approval to the Board.

6. Schedule

Mr. Jaques reviewed several upcoming milestones shown on the schedule. There was agreement to stay with the proposed schedule dates for taking TAC recommendations to the Board. Due to MPWMD's workload, there was consensus to delay the start of work for ID No. 100, having to do with evaluating wells for cross-aquifer contamination potential, by one month.

Mr. Fischer expressed chagrin that Laguna Seca representatives do not come to the TAC meetings to provide input on their issues.

7. Set next meeting date:

The next regular meeting was set for Wednesday, March 10, 2010 at 1:30 p.m. at the City of Seaside City Hall – Portable Buildings Conference Room

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

**SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

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

MEETING DATE:	March 10, 2010
AGENDA ITEM:	1.B
AGENDA TITLE:	Appoint Alternate Public Member to the TAC
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager
SUMMARY:	<p>At the last TAC meeting John Fischer announced he will be going in for further cancer treatments and will likely be unable to attend Watermaster TAC Meetings for a number of weeks, and in fact it may turn out that he will no longer be able to attend at all, depending on the outcome. He recommended that an Alternate Public Member be selected, so there would always be a member of the public attending the TAC meetings.</p> <p>I proposed to Diana Ingersoll, the Chair of the TAC, that Mr. George Riley be asked to serve as the Alternate Public Member. Mr. Riley has been very active in attending the Regional Plenary Oversight Group (subsequently renamed Water for Monterey County) meetings, as well as some of the Watermaster Board meetings. I've found him to be insightful and his questions and comments/suggestions have always seemed reasonable to me. Ms. Ingersoll concurs with asking Mr. Riley to serve in this capacity.</p> <p>Mr. Riley said he would be willing to be an alternate at least on an interim basis, until Mr. Fischer's ability to return to attending TAC meetings becomes clearer. Mr. Riley's acceptance is based on him not having to spend significant time outside of the meetings themselves in order to fulfill the role as Alternate Public Member, as he has a rather full plate of activities.</p>
ATTACHMENTS:	None
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	Make the appointment of an Alternate Public Member to the TAC, as described above

**SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

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

MEETING DATE:	March 10, 2010
AGENDA ITEM:	2
AGENDA TITLE:	Recommendations for Changes in Standard Operating Procedures for the M&MP
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager
SUMMARY:	<p>One of the tasks listed in the M&MP for each year is to have MPWMD review the processes and procedures used to carry out the M&MP and to recommend any changes to improve them.</p> <p>The attached Memo contains Mr. Oliver's recommendations with regard to this topic. Mr. Oliver will discuss his Memo with the TAC at today's meeting.</p>
ATTACHMENTS:	Memo from MPWMD titled "Summary Regarding Consideration of Watermaster Data Collection Program Recommended Improvements or Modifications"
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	Approve or modify the recommendations of MPWMD

MONTEREY PENINSULA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 3, 2010
To: Bob Jaques, Seaside Basin Watermaster
From: Joe Oliver, MPWMD
Subject: **Summary Regarding Consideration of Watermaster Data Collection Program Recommended Improvements or Modifications**

Recommendation: At this time, staff at the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD) that are providing groundwater data collection services on behalf of the Seaside Basin Watermaster (Watermaster) are not recommending any changes to the present data collection program. Certain modifications as described below should be considered at a later date after additional data are collected to provide appropriate justification for the modifications.

Background and Purpose: The MPWMD has been providing groundwater data collection services for the Watermaster since 2007. Periodically, MPWMD staff reviews the data collection program to determine if modifications should be considered. For example, such modifications could be in the form of reduced monitoring frequency and associated costs, if these reductions are appropriate and justifiable, in light of the data that are available. Conversely, such modifications could be in support of increased monitoring frequency or type to allow a better understanding of the resources, or to more closely track emerging trends. The Watermaster Monitoring and Management Program 2010 Work Schedule includes a task (ID No. 64) for this purpose.

Modification Under Consideration: Presently, groundwater-quality monitoring is conducted at the following coastal sites:

- Three sites closest to coastline -- samples are collected quarterly from 2 wells at each site (Site common names: MSC, PCA West, FO-09)
- Three sites farther from coastline – samples are collected annually from 2 wells at each site (Site common names: PCA East, FO-10, Ord Terrace)

At the three sites closest to the coastline, at which the more frequent quarterly samples are collected, the historical data show no evidence of chemical changes that would be indicative of potential seawater intrusion, and very little variance in water quality has occurred over the period of record at these sites, particularly of parameters useful as indicators in assessing potential seawater intrusion (e.g., Specific Conductance, Chloride, Sodium, Calcium, Magnesium).

However, a modification to the sampling method at these sites was initiated in 2009. In prior years, these samples had been collected by the “air-lift” method, with the use of a portable air compressor that was towed to each well site. At the June 10, 2009 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting, we recommended a change to the “low-flow” purge method of sample collection, as a means to increase sample collection efficiency and reduce Watermaster costs. With the TAC and Watermaster concurrence, this new collection system was implemented beginning in Summer 2009 using a portable low-flow sampling unit. In 2010, we have been installing dedicated low-flow equipment in each of the coastal monitor wells as the permanent installations.

At this time, we feel it would be appropriate to continue collecting the coastal well water-quality samples on a quarterly basis until we can acquire and evaluate two full years of data collected via the new method, prior to considering a recommendation to reduce the collection frequency, which would likely be to a semi-annual frequency. This will ensure that we have adequate and supportable data to present in justification of the sample-frequency reduction. This would be similar to the situation with our recent recommendation for reduced frequency of geophysical induction logging from quarterly to semi-annually at the Watermaster's four new Sentinel wells, located in and near the Northern Coastal Subarea of the basin. That recommendation was considered after two years of quarterly data had been obtained at these sites. The judge presiding over the adjudication case questioned this monitoring reduction in his Minute Order filed on January 5, 2010, but allowed the reduction in his Minute Order¹ filed February 19, 2010, based on his review of the additional justification provided by the Watermaster TAC.

U:\Joe\wp\SBWatermaster\2010\TAC\datamodsmemo_1mar10.doc

¹ The judge's approval of the Sentinel well monitoring reduction included the caveat that "any significant change detected by semi-annual logging be immediately reported to the Court."

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

MEETING DATE:	March 10, 2010
AGENDA ITEM:	3
AGENDA TITLE:	HydroMetrics Request for Service No. 2010-04 to Perform Groundwater Modeling Work
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager
SUMMARY: At its February 10, 2010 meeting the TAC selected and recommended for Board approval a set of scenarios to be Modeled by HydroMetrics in 2010. At that same meeting a set of Management Objectives was also selected and recommended for Board approval. At the March 3, 2010 Board meeting, the Scenarios and Management Objectives recommended by the TAC were essentially approved by the Board, but with the following revisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No changes to the Management Objectives• For <u>Scenario 1</u> (Laguna Seca Pumping Impacts) make the following changes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">◇ For the 0% pumping increase run, use current <u>actual</u> pumping quantities for <u>all</u> Producers, both Standard and Alternative◇ For the 10% and 20% pumping increase runs, increase all of the <u>current actual</u> Alternative Producer production rates by 10% and 20%, but leave the CAW production rates at their current actual levels• For Scenario 2 (Regional Water Supply Project) update the start-up date for the Regional Water Supply Project to a date later than the 2012 date in the FEIR. The updated date will be provided by MPWMD toward the end of March, and will be their best estimate based on the progress of those discussions and negotiations. Attached is proposed Request for Service (RFS) No. 2010-04 with HydroMetrics to perform this modeling work. The scope of work has been edited to reflect the Board-directed revisions described above, but the RFS does not reflect any schedule or cost impacts resulting from incorporating these revisions. At today's meeting HydroMetrics will report on any impacts these revisions will have on their schedule or costs, so the RFS can be edited as necessary to reflect these revisions.	
ATTACHMENTS:	Proposed RFS No. 2010-04 with HydroMetrics to perform Scenario modeling
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	Edit and then approve the RFS so it can be forwarded to the Board for approval at its April 7, 2010 meeting

SEASIDE BASIN WATERMASTER
REQUEST FOR SERVICE

DATE: 4/8/2010

RFS NO. 2010-04
(To be filled in by WATERMASTER)

TO: Derrick Williams
HydroMetrics LLC
PROFESSIONAL

FROM: Robert Jaques
WATERMASTER

Services Needed and Purpose: Perform groundwater modeling of scenarios for the Seaside Basin. See detailed Scope of Work in Attachment 1.

Completion Date: All work of this RFS shall be completed not later than October 1, 2010. See Attachment 3 for planned work schedule.

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

Total Price Authorized by this RFS: \$ 24,775.00 (Cost is authorized only when evidenced by signature below.) (See Attachment 2 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

Task 1: Scenario 1: Model the effects of additional pumping in the Laguna Seca subarea. The purpose of this scenario is to begin addressing questions about the impacts on other subareas of the Basin resulting from pumping by wells in the Laguna Seca subarea. In the 2009 modeling work all of the Alternative Producers were allowed to pump their full allocations, rather than using actual historical pumping production figures. The prior modeling work did not examine the movement of water to or from the Laguna Seca subarea, or the impacts of Laguna Seca pumping with regard to the other subareas within the Basin. Under Scenario 1 three new simulations will be run, with 0%, 10%, and 20% pumping increases for all years as follows:

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

Each simulation will be analyzed for the following:

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

The 0% pumping increase will effectively become the new Baseline Scenario, which will be revised from the previous Baseline Scenario in the modeling work performed by PROFESSIONAL in 2009 to include average rainfall in place of historical rainfall.

Task 2: Scenario 2: 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. The following parameters describe Phase 1 of this project, and were taken directly from the Final EIR:

- Conservation Programs potentially saving up to 1,000 AFY. Note, however, that this amount is not counted on in terms of reducing demands on the CAW Monterey Peninsula distribution system.
- Sand City Desalination Project providing on average 300 AFY. This amount is counted as reducing demand on the CAW Monterey Peninsula distribution system.
- Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project (RUWAP) which on average would deliver 1,000 AFY of recycled water for landscaping and golf course irrigation on lands some of which overlie the Seaside Basin. However, with the exception of the water currently being pumped from the Seaside Basin by the Seaside Golf Course wells (Bayonet and Blackhorse Golf Courses), which has an allocation of 540 AFY under the Seaside Basin Court Adjudication Decision, the RUWAP would not decrease pumping demands on the Seaside Basin, because the water supplying the demands of the remaining landscape and golf course uses is pumped by MCWD from the Salinas River Basin.
- Regional Desalination System, the principle components of which are:
 - 6 Vertical Seawater Wells located inland of the sand dunes and west of Highway 1 in an area south of the Salinas River and north of Reservation Road.
 - 10 MGD Regional Desalination Facility located just south of the MRWPCA Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant, with brine disposal to MRWPCA’s outfall. This desalination plant on average would produce 10,500 AFY of potable water and would deliver 8,800 AFY of this water to the CAW Monterey Peninsula distribution system for

urban users. Of this 8,800 AFY, 2,975 AFY is to offset Cal Am's pumping from the Seaside Basin, and 272 AFY is to offset other users pumping from the Seaside Basin, for a total amount of 3,247 AFY of pumping from the Seaside Basin being reduced by delivering that quantity of water from the Regional Desalination Plant and the Carmel River ASR facilities. The other 1,700 AFY of potable water from the desalination plant would be delivered to MCWD, in order for MCWD to be able to reduce its pumping of water from the Salinas River Groundwater Basin by this amount to offset the amount of Salinas Basin groundwater that would be extracted by the Vertical Seawater Wells that supply the desalination plant.

- Approximately 56,000 LF of 36" diameter pipelines (referred to as the Product Water Pipeline and the Transmission Main South) from the Desalination Facility to a point of connection in Seaside to the existing CAW distribution system and to the Terminal Reservoirs, and through another pipeline, the Monterey Pipeline, to a point of connection to the existing CAW distribution system in Pacific Grove.
- 2 - 3 MG Terminal Reservoirs located east of General Jim Moore Boulevard in Seaside on the former Fort Ord. These reservoirs can receive water during dry weather periods from the Desalination Facility and/or the ASR Wells, and via a pipeline from the Carmel River during wet weather diversion periods.
- 2 Existing ASR Wells and 2 New ASR Wells, all located near General Jim Moore Boulevard in Seaside. On average 1,300 AFY of Carmel River water would be stored in the Seaside Basin and then pumped out of the Basin and into the CAW distribution system to potable urban users. This amount is counted as reducing demand on the CAW Monterey Peninsula distribution system.
- Interconnecting piping between certain of the components listed above, and other facilities, to comprise an operational system.
- Startup of Phase 1 is projected in the FEIR to occur on November 30, 2012. However, for this Scenario the start-up date will be revised to a date later than 2012 to reflect delays being experienced in implementing the early work of Phase 1. The updated date will be provided to the PROFESSIONAL by the WATERMASTER just prior to the start of work on this Scenario.

Phase 2 of the Regional Water Supply Project is not included in Scenario 2, because the components of Phase 2 are not as fully developed as those for Phase 1 and thus were not fully addressed in the CWP FEIR. In addition, the time schedule for implementation of the Phase 2 components is less certain than the schedule for implementation of the Phase 1 components. Phase 2 would consist of some or all of the following components:

- Pacific Grove Stormwater Diversion Project (up to 200 AFY)
- Expanded Salinas River Diversion Facility (SRDF) delivering river water to a 14 MGD Surface Water Treatment Plant to be located adjacent to the Phase 1 Desalination Facility. This Surface Water Treatment Plant would initially deliver on average up to 2,980 AFY of potable water to urban customers. These facilities could be further expanded at a subsequent date to increase the delivery of water to urban customers to 5,800 AFY.
- Expanded Regional Desalination Facility to 13 MGD capacity and 2 additional intake wells to increase the desalination capacity by 4,400 AFY.
- Groundwater Replenishment Project using highly treated recycled water from MRWPCA for injection of up to 6,720 AFY into the Seaside Basin.
- Auxiliary components that would potentially be needed to support the other Phase 2 components could include:
 - Further expansion of the SRDF
 - Expansion of the Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project (CSIP)
 - Additional ASR wells and pumping capacity
 - Additional Terminal Reservoirs

Under Scenario 2 average rainfall, rather than historical cyclical rainfall data, will be used

Under Scenario 2, California American Water will start using its full Regional Project water supply in the year 2012, and 3,247 acre-feet per year from the Desalination Plant will be used to offset pumping from the Seaside Groundwater Basin by delivering this amount of water to the California American Water distribution system.

Task 3: Prepare charts, maps and graphs showing results of both Scenarios 1 and 2. The graphs and charts will show the predicted groundwater elevations at the coast for each scenario. Results for Scenario 1 will also involve evaluating the amount of groundwater flowing into the Southern Coastal and Northern Inland subareas, and predicted changes to Laguna Seca subarea groundwater levels. A short memorandum will be prepared summarizing the findings and conclusions of these two simulations. Provide 7 hard copies of the completed work, suitably bound, and a CD containing these documents in MS Word or other format that can be used for cutting and pasting, i.e. not a pdf format.

Task 4: Attend one TAC meeting and one Board meeting to present the results of this work.