

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF THE SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER

DATE: Wednesday, April 14, 2010

MEETING TIME: 1:30 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 Watermaster Conference Line by dialing (877)810-9415. Use the Access Code of 4560043. Please note that if no telephone attendees have joined the meeting by 10 minutes after its start, the conference call will be ended.

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)

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
1. Administrative Matters:	
A. Approve Minutes from March 10, 2010 Meeting	2
B. Continued Discussion Regarding Appointment of Alternate Public Member to the TAC (Bob Jaques)	8
2. Continued Discussion on RFS No. 2010-04 to HydroMetrics to Perform Groundwater Modeling (Bob Jaques)	9
3. RFS to MPWMD to Implement Enhancements to the Database (Bob Jaques)	16
4. Work Plan for MPWMD to Evaluate Coastal Wells for Cross-Aquifer Contamination Potential (Bob Jaques)	22
5. Discussion of Watermaster Role/Responsibilities Regarding Development of Salt and Nutrient Management Programs (Bob Jaques)	24
6. Schedule (Bob Jaques)	26
7. Other Business	
8. Set next meeting date:	
The next regular meeting will be held on Wednesday, May 12, 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:	April 14, 2010
AGENDA ITEM:	1.A
AGENDA TITLE:	Approve Minutes from March 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
March 10, 2010**

Attendees: TAC Members

City of Seaside – Sydney Moe
California American Water – Eric Sabolsice (arrived @ 9:50 a.m.)
City of Monterey – Norm Green
Laguna Seca Property Owners – No Representative
MPWMD – Joe Oliver
Public Member – No Representative
MCWRA – Rob Johnson
City of Del Rey Oaks – No Representative
City of Sand City – No Representative
Coastal Subarea Landowners – No Representative

Watermaster

Technical Program Manager - Robert Jaques

Consultants

HydroMetrics LLC – Derrik Williams

Others:

MPWMD – Jonathan Lear

The meeting was called to order at 9:10 a.m. after waiting for a quorum to arrive. In the interest of time the meeting began without a quorum, but no action was taken during the initial part of the meeting until a quorum had arrived.

1. Administrative Matters:

A. Approve Minutes from February 10, 2010 Meeting

On a motion by Mr. Oliver, second by Mr. Johnson the minutes were unanimously approved as presented with Ms. Moe and Mr. Green abstaining because they were not present at that meeting.

B. Appoint Alternate Public Member to the TAC

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

Mr. Johnson noted that Mr. Riley had asked for reimbursement for his time spent on matters pertaining to REPOG meetings, and he was concerned about this. Mr. Jaques suggested that Mr. Riley could be informed that the position of Public Member does not receive reimbursement to insure this is clear to Mr. Riley.

Mr. Green asked how Mr. Fischer had gotten appointed to serve on the TAC. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Oliver recalled that he was asked to serve by a member of the Board.

Mr. Johnson recommended that if Mr. Riley is appointed to serve as the alternate Public Member, Mr. Riley and Mr. Fischer should coordinate and communicate between themselves as to who will be attending TAC meetings, so they would not both attend the same meeting.

Ms. Moe reported that she did not know Mr. Riley.

Mr. Johnson said that if the responses from Mr. Riley were positive, then the matter should be put on the next TAC meeting agenda for action.

2. Recommendations for Changes in Standard Operating Procedures for the M&MP
Mr. Oliver summarized the agenda packet materials for this item.

Mr. Oliver said that no changes are recommended at this time in the Monitoring and Management Program data collection procedures. However, after two years of data has been collected using the low-flow purge sampling method, if results continue to show essentially no change in water quality, he will likely recommend reducing the frequency of sampling the coastal monitoring wells to semi-annually.

Mr. Johnson asked for clarification as to the interpretation of the term "semi-annual." Following discussion there was the agreement that with regard to taking water quality samples this means twice per year, approximately six months apart (spring and fall)

Mr. Jaques asked Mr. Oliver if the Seaside Basin Watermaster sentinel wells were also part of the sampling program, and Mr. Oliver responded that yes, they were sampled annually, except that the northernmost sentinel well was sampled semi-annually.

Mr. Williams asked if the BLM well is being sampled as well. Mr. Oliver responded that yes it was being sampled but only to get initial water quality characterization data. Thereafter, only water level measurements will be made unless there is a desire to get more water quality data from that well in the future.

Mr. Jaques asked if we need to have the Monitoring and Management Program reviewed by MPWMD twice per year, as is currently scheduled, or whether doing this once per year would be sufficient. There was discussion that the Monitoring and Management Program has now been carried out for several years, and it has become fairly routine. There was consensus that it would be satisfactory to have MPWMD perform a review and to make recommendations on this once per year. Mr. Lear and Mr. Oliver suggested having the recommendations made not later than the January TAC meeting in future years.

With regard to other changes that might be recommended in the future, Mr. Oliver said it might be recommended at a future time to include barium as a sampling constituent. Mr. Johnson suggested that SAR might also be considered and Mr. Williams suggested that iodide might also be considered, if there were some indicators of seawater intrusion occurring.

3. Request for Service (RFS) for HydroMetrics to Perform Modeling Scenarios
Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials for this item.

Mr. Lear and Mr. Oliver said they believed the Scenario 1 revisions that had been requested by the Board were correctly presented in the agenda packet. They commented that CAW did not want any indication or appearance given that they intended to increase pumping in the Laguna

Seca subarea. Mr. Oliver commented that total CAW pumping within the basin in recent years has been less than the amount they are allotted to pump.

Mr. Williams said the original model scenario used the full allocated amounts of pumping. Mr. Oliver said this is now more of a sensitivity analysis as well as examining water moving into and out of the Laguna Seca subarea. Mr. Lear said that CAW needs to keep pumping at current levels in the Laguna Seca subarea in order to meet demands, so he did not envision them being able to reduce pumping within the Laguna Seca subarea by the triennial 10 percent amount required by the Decision. Rather, they would reduce their pumping in other subareas to achieve this.

Mr. Williams posed the question of whether or not to include the 10 percent triennial reductions. Mr. Oliver said that Scenario 1 came about as a result of a prior request from the Laguna Seca property owners for a determination as to whether Laguna Seca subarea pumping was affecting the other subareas. If not, they wondered if (1) they could not be subjected to the 10 percent triennial pumping reductions and (2) potentially be able to increase their pumping above their currently allotted amounts.

Mr. Williams said that if all Standard Producer production continued being cut back triennially by 10 percent, and all of the Alternative Producers continue to pump less than their allocated amounts, then total pumping within the basin would eventually fall below the Natural Safe Yield of 3, 000 acre feet per year. Mr. Sabolsice concurred with keeping CAW's pumping levels at their current levels for Scenario 1.

There was discussion regarding progress with the Division of Ratepayer Advocates and others to address questions and issues pertaining to implementing the Regional Water Supply Project. Mr. Johnson said this private/public partnership will be a major achievement if it occurs.

Mr. Jaques asked Mr. Sabolsice if he knew how the additional 272 acre feet per year to offset pumping by "other users" would be delivered to the Seaside basin. Mr. Sabolsice said the intent of the Coastal Water Project is to bring Carmel River pumping down to levels allowed by the CDO. Also, CAW has an agreement with MPWMD to perform ASR using Carmel River water to be stored in the Seaside basin. The Laguna Seca system of CAW is not interconnected with any other systems, so desalinated water from the regional desalination plant cannot get to those systems using existing piping. Mr. Jaques asked Mr. Sabolsice to confirm Mr. Jaques understanding that all 3, 247 acre feet per year of desalination water intended to go to the Seaside basin would be used to reduce CAW's pumping from the Seaside basin. Mr. Sabolsice confirmed this understanding.

Mr. Williams said that the 3, 247 acre feet per year would be close to the total amount of CAW's Seaside basin pumping. Mr. Williams wondered if there was enough water in the Regional Project to also meet CAW's needs to reduce its Carmel River pumping. Mr. Jaques commented that these figures are what are contained in the Final Environmental Impact Report document. Mr. Sabolsice said the ASR capacity will be expanded and other small projects will be involved in helping CAW to comply with the CDO. Mr. Johnson recommended having Mr. Williams e-mailed the TAC with his questions/concerns about the water quantities to be used in the modeling, before asked the starting the work. These would be discussed at the April TAC meeting.

There was consensus to delete the last sentence of Task 1 (on page 13 of the agenda packet) as it could be confusing.

Ms. Moe expressed concern that all of the 3,247 acre feet per year appears to be going to CAW, and none of it to other users.

With regard to Scenario 2, Mr. Sabolsice said that a more realistic start-up date should be available by the April TAC meeting.

Mr. Williams confirmed that there would be no change in costs or schedule to incorporate the revisions recommended by the Board and discussed the today's TAC meeting. On a motion by Mr. Johnson, second by Mr. Sabolsice there was unanimous approval of the RFS with the one change described above.

4. Update on Refining Protective Water Levels

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

Mr. Lear said he felt the Board wanted to consider evaluating what percentage of protection would be needed to protect all of the production wells. Mr. Williams said there was no way to go directly to the answer to that question. Rather, a series of runs would be needed in order to produce enough data to be able to interpolate to that value.

Mr. Jaques asked the TAC for its direction on whether to continue to recommend having more Protective Water Level work done, or to simply wait for Board direction on when to proceed. There was consensus to wait for Board direction, but also to include performing such work in next year's budget, so the Board could weigh-in on this matter at budget approval time.

5. Approve Enhancements to be Made to the Database

Mr. Jaques introduced this topic and Mr. Oliver briefly summarized the proposed items of work to be done to enhance the Database, as listed on pages 20 through 22 of the agenda packet. There were questions-and-answers on several of these items.

There was brief discussion of the potential benefit of Item 10, interactive mapping, as a potential future activity.

There was consensus to proceed with these enhancements and to get a scope and cost proposal from MPWMD to do the work, so that a draft RFS could be brought to the TAC for approval at its April meeting.

6. SPCA Well Production and Related Issues

Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet materials for this item

Mr. Lear said that the substantial reductions in reported pumping quantities in recent years would cause one to question the accuracy of the meter.

Mr. Sabolsice asked if MPWMD had any jurisdiction over the metering accuracy issue. Mr. Oliver said that they could do a flow meter inspection, and went on to say that MPWMD only gets annual production data for the SPCA well. Mr. Oliver said he would follow up with a well inspection and report back to the TAC at a future meeting once this has been done.

7. Schedule

There were no comments or questions on this item.

8. Other Business

Mr. Williams briefly reported on several informational items:

- He is tracking the salt/nutrient management plan process and noted that there was a meeting this afternoon by the RWQCB at the MRWPCA regional treatment plant.
- He is tracking Senate Bill SBX 7-6 (passed in November 2009). Mr. Williams reported that he is a member of an ACWA committee which is dealing with this. It would require seasonal water level reporting to DWR. Not all water levels just "seasonal" water levels a term which is still being defined. They May ACWA meeting will be held in Monterey and at that time more information is expected to be released. He reported that you must sign up by December 31, 2010 if you are one of the parties that are required to submit data. DWR can withhold funding to a County if any basin in the County fails to report data. Basins are defined in DWR Bulletin No. 118.
- He is tracking Senate Bill SBX 7-7 which pertains to conservation laws that need to be addressed through Urban Water Management Plans. The deadline on this has been deferred to June 2010. If an agency is already conserving to some level (yet to be established) it may not be required to do any additional conservation.

Mr. Johnson said that the State's data tracking system has had significant problems.

Mr. Williams reported to Mr. Jaques that the Watermaster may be the appropriate party to provide data to DWR, but that the Watermaster is not required to do so. Any party can take on this responsibility. Mr. Sabolsice said it made sense to him for MPWMD to take on the reporting responsibility for the Seaside basin.

9. Set next meeting date:

The next regular meeting was set for Wednesday, April 14, 2010 at 1:30 p.m. at the City of Seaside City Hall – Portable Buildings Conference Room

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

**SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

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

MEETING DATE:	April 14, 2010
AGENDA ITEM:	1.B
AGENDA TITLE:	Continued Discussion Regarding Appointment of Alternate Public Member to the TAC
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager
SUMMARY: At the last TAC meeting we discussed asking Mr. George Riley to serve as the Alternate Public Member of the TAC, since Mr. Fischer had announced that he would be going in for further cancer treatments and will likely be unable to attend Watermaster TAC Meetings for a number of weeks. It may turn out that he will no longer be able to attend at all, depending on the outcome. There were some concerns regarding Mr. Riley's willingness to serve, if he was not reimbursed for his time. It was agreed that Mr. Jaques would contact Mr. Riley to ensure he was aware that the position provided no reimbursement, and also that, if he was selected and agreed to serve, he would coordinate with Mr. Fischer so that only one of them would attend any given meeting of the TAC. I have contacted Mr. Riley to address these two issues, and he is agreeable to both of them. He is prepared to being filling this role as soon as the TAC approves his appointment. I recommend that the TAC approve the appointment of Mr. Riley to serve as the Alternate Public Member of the TAC, and to attend TAC meetings when Mr. Fischer is unable to attend.	
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:	April 14, 2010
AGENDA ITEM:	2
AGENDA TITLE:	Continued Discussion on RFS No. 2010-04 to HydroMetrics to Perform Groundwater Modeling
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager

SUMMARY: At the TAC's March 10th meeting the RFS for HydroMetrics to being the 2010 Groundwater Modeling work was approved, but that approval included verifying certain of the parameters to be used in the modeling work. Specifically, Mr. Williams commented that the 3,247 acre feet per year that is proposed to be supplied to CAW to offset pumping from the Seaside Basin would be close to the total amount of CAW's Seaside basin pumping. He questioned whether the FEIR provided enough water in the Regional Project to also meet CAW's needs to reduce its Carmel River pumping. I commented that these figures are what are contained in the Final Environmental Impact Report document, and Mr. Sabolsice commented that the ASR capacity will be expanded and other small projects will be involved in helping CAW to comply with the Carmel River Cease and Desist Order. Mr. Williams was asked to e-mail the TAC with his questions/concerns about the water quantities to be used in the modeling, so these could be discussed at the April TAC meeting.

Here is clarifying information from the Final EIR for the Coastal Water Project on this subject:

1. A grand total of 12,500 AFY is needed to meet regulatory replacement requirements within the CAW service area for both the Carmel River and the Seaside Basin, as stated at the bottom of page 3-4 of the FEIR.
2. The 12,500 AFY (precise calculation was 12,507 AFY, which was rounded to 12,500 per Table 2-2 on page 2-7 and 2-8 of the FEIR) is to be distributed as follows:
 - 8,498 AFY as Carmel River replacement water, based on CAW's weather-adjusted average demand from Carmel River sources being 11,874 AFY and CAW having a legal right of 3,376 AFY
 - 2,975 AFY as Seaside Basin replacement water for CAW pumping, based on CAW's average annual production from the Coastal Subarea of 3,983 AFY and from the Laguna Seca Subarea of 466 AFY, less CAW's eventual allowable pumping allocation under the Seaside Adjudication Decision of 1,474 AFY
 - 762 AFY to replace lost capacity from the Los Padres reservoir due to continuing sedimentation
 - 272 AFY as Seaside Basin replacement water for pumping by other producers (besides CAW) whose pumping allocations will be reduced under the Seaside Adjudication Decision by this amount from their existing pumping demand levels.
3. The 12,500 AFY is to be supplied as follows (per Table 3-2 on page 3-5 of the FEIR):
 - 10,900 AFY from the new regional desal plant
 - 1,300 AFY from ASR of Carmel River water via storage in the Seaside Basin, and

**SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

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

AGENDA ITEM:	2 (Cont'd)
• 300 AFY from the Sand City desal plant At first glance this information appears to show consistency between supply and demand figures and also appears to provide the necessary quantities to both the Seaside Basin and the Carmel River. However, Table 5-2 indicates that the 12,500 AFY is only going to be supplied in “Critically Dry Weather Years,” and that the “Normal Weather Year” supply will be only 10,400 AFY to the CAW Service Area. If 8,498 AFY of this is needed as Carmel River replacement water, and 762 AFY of this is needed for the Los Padres Reservoir, then only 1,140 AFY will be available to reduce Seaside Basin pumping in normal weather years. This is far less than is needed to offset current annual overpumping in the Seaside Basin, which is probably on the order of about 2,000 to 2,500 AFY, since the average Seaside Basin production when the Adjudication Decision was rendered was about 5,600 AFY and the Natural Safe Yield has been established (in the Decision) at 3,000 AFY. HydroMetrics’ analysis of the FEIR is the same as described above, as set forth in their attached Memo. In an effort to resolve this apparent disconnect between one of the stated Objectives of the CWP, as presented in the FEIR, and the quantities of water the Regional Project is expected to supply, I emailed Mr. Lyndel Melton of RMC Water and Environment and Mr. Andrew Barnsdale of the CPUC. Both of these persons were heavily involved in the preparation of the FEIR. This series of emails is attached. Based on Mr. Barnsdale’s response, it is clear that the Regional Project will <u>not</u> supply the necessary amounts of water to protect the Seaside Basin against seawater intrusion. This is a significant finding, and one that warrants serious discussion by the TAC with possible recommendations to be made by the TAC to the Board. It is requested that the MPWMD and CAW representatives who will be attending today’s meeting provide whatever insight into this matter that they can, so that HydroMetrics’ work assignment can move forward using the best-available information.	
ATTACHMENTS:	1. Memo from HydroMetrics dated March 27, 2010, Subject: Model Scenario 2 – Final EIR Regional Project 2. Series of emails to parties involved in preparing the CWP FEIR
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	Determine what quantities of water should be used in the groundwater modeling work to be performed by HydroMetrics

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

To: Seaside TAC
From: Derrik Williams and Georgina King
Date: October 11, 2020
Subject: Model Scenario 2 – Final EIR Regional Project

Scenario 2 is intended to simulate the effect on the Seaside Groundwater Basin from the Regional Project as described in the Final EIR for the Coastal Water Project (October 30, 2009).

To estimate how much the Regional Project will reduce pumping in the Seaside Groundwater Basin, we compared the Project's total supply with non-pumping demands. The table below was developed from Table 2-2 and Table 5-2 in the Final EIR.

SUPPLY	Average Year [AFY]	Critically Dry Year [AFY]
Sand City Water Supply Project	300	300
Carmel River via Seaside Basin ASR	1,300	1,300
Regional Desalination Facility	8,800	10,900
<i>CalAm Service Area Total</i>	<i>10,400</i>	<i>12,500</i>
DEMAND		
Carmel River Replacement	8,498	8,498
Carmel River – Los Padres Reservoir	762	762
	<i>9,260</i>	<i>9,260</i>
Amount Available to Seaside Basin	1,140	3,240

In average years, there are only 1,140 acre-feet per year (AFY) available to offset Seaside Groundwater Basin pumping. This is not sufficient to bring pumping down to the assumed sustainable yield. In critically dry years, the Seaside Groundwater Basin will receive an additional 2,100 AFY from the Regional Project for a total supply of 3,240 AFY. This increase is possible as the Regional Desalination Facility will increase capacity by 2,100 AFY in critically dry years.

To accurately simulate the impacts from the Regional Project, we propose simulating average year demands and average year supplies. This means we will simulate pumping greater than the sustainable yield. We will not simulate the mandated triennial reduction after the Regional Project comes on line because there is no replacement water beyond the 1,140 AFY from the Regional Project. The 1,140 AFY from the Regional Project will be used to offset CalAm's pumping in the Coastal Subarea. Another option is for a portion of this water to be used by the City of Seaside, however this would require implementing institutional agreements that are currently not in place.

SERIES OF EMAILS TO PARTIES INVOLVED IN PREPARING THE CWP FEIR

1. Emails to and from Lyndel Melton of RMC Water and Environment, the firm that prepared many of the cost estimates and engineering analyses contained in the FEIR.

To: Lyndel Melton, RMC Water and Environment
From: Bob Jaques

Subject: Apparent disconnect in FEIR

Lyndel,

We have been struggling trying to see how the water demand figures in Table 2-2 (on pages 2-7 and 2-8 of the FEIR) match up with the water supply figures in Table 5-2 (on page 5-13 of the FEIR) as follows:

1. At the bottom of page 3-4 of the FEIR, it states that a grand total of 12,500 AFY is needed to meet regulatory replacement requirements within the CAW service area for both the Carmel River and the Seaside Basin. I would assume this means that on an annual average, this quantity of water is what is needed, but that is not explicitly stated.
2. Per Table 2-2 on pages 2-7 and 2-8 of the FEIR, the 12,500 AFY (precise calculation was 12,507 AFY, which was rounded to 12,500) is to be distributed as follows:
 - 8,498 AFY as Carmel River replacement water, based on CAW's weather-adjusted average demand from Carmel River sources being 11,874 AFY and CAW having a legal right of 3,376 AFY
 - 2,975 AFY as Seaside Basin replacement water for CAW pumping, based on CAW's average annual production from the Coastal Subarea of 3,983 AFY and from the Laguna Seca Subarea of 466 AFY, less CAW's eventual allowable pumping allocation under the Seaside Adjudication Decision of 1,474 AFY
 - 762 AFY to replace lost capacity from the Los Padres reservoir due to continuing sedimentation
 - 272 AFY as Seaside Basin replacement water for pumping by other producers (besides CAW) whose pumping allocations will be reduced under the Seaside Adjudication Decision by this amount from their existing pumping demand levels.

This implies to me that on an annual average there will be 2,975 AFY for CAW's overpumping and an additional 272 AFY for overpumping by "others" from the Seaside Basin, for a total annual average supply of 3,247 AFY being provided to reduce pumping by this amount from the Seaside Basin.

3. Per Table 3-2 on page 3-5 of the FEIR, the 12,500 AFY is to be supplied as follows:
 - 10,900 AFY from the new regional desal plant
 - 1,300 AFY from ASR of Carmel River water via storage in the Seaside Basin, and
 - 300 AFY from the Sand City desal plant

4. However, Table 5-2 on page 5-13 of the FEIR shows that in a "normal weather year" which I take to mean on an annual average basis, only 10,400 AFY would be supplied to the CAW service area, and that only in "critically dry weather years" will the full 12,500 AFY be supplied. By simple subtraction, this means that all that will be available to offset Seaside Basin overpumping in average weather years will be $10,400 - 8,498$ (CAW's Carmel River Replacement water) $- 762$ (CAW's Los Padres Reservoir needs) $= 1,140$ AFY for Seaside overpumping. This is far less than is needed to offset current annual overpumping in the Seaside Basin, which is probably on the order of about 2,000 to 2,500 AFY, since the average Seaside Basin production when the Adjudication Decision was rendered was about 5,600 AFY and the Natural Safe Yield has been established (in the Decision) at 3,000 AFY.

So we are at a loss to understand the apparent disconnect in these figures and how the Regional Project will be able to supply the water needed to fulfill the Adjudication Decision. Can you help with our understanding on this, or refer me to someone who can?

-----0-----

To: Bob Jaques

From: Lyndel Melton, RMC Water and Environment

Bob – Sorry for the delay in getting back to you. But, after talking this question over with the Regional partners, it would appear this is an issue that is best addressed thru discussions between the MPWMD, CAW and the Water Master. The Regional Project was designed to be consistent with the project purpose as described in the CWP EIR, plus meet the water delivery needs for approved redevelopment of the former Fort Ord. The delivery capacities were designed to address CAW's water needs after meeting the reduced pumping from the Seaside Basin and reduced diversions from the Carmel River, plus delivery to MCWD.

Hope this helps.

-----0-----

To: Lyndel Melton, RMC Water and Environment

From: Bob Jaques

Lyndel,

Thanks for your reply, but unfortunately it really doesn't help. If only the "Normal Weather Year" water quantity of 10,400 AFY is provided to the CAW Service Area, as shown in Table 5-2, and if 8,498 AFY of this is needed to reduce CAW's Carmel River production, and 762 AFY of this is needed for the Los Padres Reservoir, then by simple subtraction only 1,140 AFY will be available to reduce pumping from the Seaside Basin. In Water Year 2008 5,272 AF was pumped from the Seaside Basin (3,862.9 AF of this by CAW), and in 2009 4,545 AF was pumped (3,138 AF of this by CAW).

Since the Court-recognized Natural Safe Yield of the Basin is only 3,000 AFY, in these two recent years the Basin was being overpumped by 2,272 AFY and 1,545 AFY respectively. If only 1,140 AF had been provided to reduce this overpumping in each of these years, the Natural Safe Yield would have continued to be significantly exceeded. The result would be continued lowering of the groundwater levels, and an acceleration of the onset of sea water intrusion.

Page 3-3 of the FEIR states that one of the Project Objectives is to "Protect the Seaside Basin for long-term reliability." Clearly if seawater intrusion is allowed to continue advancing toward the Seaside Basin by not providing enough water to at least reduce pumping in the Basin down to the Natural Safe Yield, then the Project is not achieving this Objective.

Discussing this with MPWMD and CAW representatives will be pursued, as both are represented on the Watermaster's TAC as well as the Watermaster's Board. This topic is being agendized for the TAC's April 14th meeting, as part of the discussion regarding HydroMetrics upcoming work assignment to model the effects on the Seaside Basin of implementing the Regional Project. However, it is difficult to see how those discussions will be able to remedy this shortfall in water supply from the Regional Project.

Again, if you or any of the cc recipients of this email can clarify how the Regional Project will provide enough water on an annual average basis to reduce Seaside Basin pumping down to the Natural Safe Yield, your providing me that information so I can include it in the TAC's April 14 agenda packet will be much appreciated.

- - - 0 - - -

2. The same email sent to Lyndel Melton was also sent to Andrew Barnsdale, CPUC Project Manager for the CWP EIR. Mr. Barnsdale's response is below:

Bob,

From the end of your email, the question you seem to be raising is: "... we are at a loss to understand ... how the Regional Project will be able to supply the water needed to fulfill the Adjudication Decision."

The short answer is: The CWP was not meant to resolve the Seaside basin adjudication decision/overdraft problem. The CWP was meant to solve the difference between CalAm's Seaside Basin and Carmel River supply allocations, and their customers' demand. You will find that we have provided an explanation of this in response to comment L_SBWM-12 in the FEIR.

In summary: the CWP production does not include supplies to remedy the Seaside Basin overdraft issue; however, the CWP does keep CalAm within their current entitlement within the Seaside Basin.

Those overseeing the Seaside Basin need to fill the historic existing deficit that has been created by over pumping. The CWP project does not have that as an objective and does not fulfill that role in the regional water supply mix.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

MEETING DATE:	April 14, 2010
AGENDA ITEM:	3
AGENDA TITLE:	RFS to MPWMD to Implement Enhancements to the Database
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager
When the TAC prepared the M&MP Scope of Work and Budget for 2010, a task was included and \$25,000 was budgeted for making improvements to the Database in order to improve its user-friendliness and functionality. A compilation of potential enhancements was approved by the TAC at its March 10, 2010 meeting. At that meeting it was agreed that an RFS to perform this work would be prepared and presented to the TAC at today's meeting for approval. The attached RFS No. 2010-03 to MPWMD would authorize them, using their database consultant Zone 24x7, to implement these enhancements to the database. MPWMD has recommended adding a 15% contingency to the Total Estimated Cost provided by Zone 24x7, to allow for the possible need for extra time for testing of the database changes once they have been made. This brings the Total Price for the RFS to \$9,985. Once the TAC has approved the RFS, it will be forwarded to the Board for its approval, after which the work would begin. This RFS does not include the map capability optional feature which was briefly discussed at the TAC's March 10, 2010 meeting. More information on that optional feature is being developed for presentation at a future TAC meeting.	
ATTACHMENTS:	MPWMD RFS No. 2010-03
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	Approve or edit RFS No. 2010-03

SEASIDE BASIN WATERMASTER
REQUEST FOR SERVICE

DATE: May 6, 2010

RFS NO. 2010-03

(To be filled in by WATERMASTER)

TO: Joe Oliver

FROM: Robert Jaques

Monterey Peninsula Water Management District
PROFESSIONAL

WATERMASTER

Services Needed and Purpose:

Make enhancements to the Watermaster's database in accordance with the Scope of Work contained in Attachment 1.

Completion Date: The work of this RFS No. 2010-03 shall be completed within 90 days from the date of execution of this RFS No. 2010-03.

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

Total Price Authorized by this RFS: \$9,985.00 (See Attachment 1 for details regarding this Total Price. Cost is authorized only when evidenced by signature below.)

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

Requested by: _____ **Date:** _____.

WATERMASTER Technical Program Manager

Authorized by: _____ **Date:** _____.

WATERMASTER Chief Executive Officer

Agreed to by: _____ **Date:** _____.

PROFESSIONAL

ATTACHMENT 1

Scope of Work for RFS No. 2010-03

Background:

The WATERMASTER has a database into which water production, water level, water quality, and other data is entered and stored. This RFS No. 2010-03 authorizes PROFESSIONAL to make certain enhancements to the database as more fully described below.

Zone 24X7 will act as a subcontractor to PROFESSIONAL in performing the work, and will perform the work of this RFS under the direction and management of PROFESSIONAL.

Scope of Work:

The detailed scope of work to be performed under this RFS consists of implementing the nine Items described in the attached table titled “Enhancements to be Made to the Watermaster’s Database Under RFS NO. 2010-03.”

Cost:

The Total Price authorized by this RFS No. 2010-03 is \$9,985.00, broken down as shown below:

<u>ACTIVITY</u>	<u>COST</u>
Project Management	\$1,311
Requirement Analysis and System Design	3,718
Implementation	2,664
QA / Testing	<u>990</u>
Total Estimated Cost	\$8,683
Contingency @ 15%	<u>1,302</u>
TOTAL PRICE	<u>\$9,985</u>

Use of any part of the Contingency amount shown in the breakdown above must first be authorized by WATERMASTER’s Technical Program Manager. If no use of any portion of the Contingency is authorized, the Total Price of this RFS No. 2010-03 is limited to the Total Estimated Cost of \$8,683.00.

ENHANCEMENTS TO BE MADE TO THE WATERMASTER'S DATABASE
UNDER RFS NO. 2010-03

ITEM NO.	LOCATION WITHIN THE DATABASE	DESCRIPTION
1	Compliance Report (new report)	A Compliance Report will be developed that lists for each type of reporting data (i.e., Water Level, Water Quality, and Water Production): (a) what data each well owner is required to submit to the Watermaster, and (b) whether or not the required data have been submitted (i.e., entered into the database). This improvement will be accessible to all User Access Levels (1 through 4).
2	Well List Screen (well status improvement)	Currently, the Well List screen has only one checkbox to filter for "Only Watermaster Producers" and when checked, the list shows <u>all</u> of the Watermaster Production wells including those that are "inactive." The programming will be revised to provide the capability to list just the "active" Producer Wells. This will require modifications to the Well Details screen, as there are currently no data fields for "Well Status", i.e., Active, Inactive, Destroyed. At present in the Contacts screen, a user must select whether or not a particular Contact is a "Watermaster Producer". Once a user does that and clicks on the checkbox on the Well List screen, all wells associated with that Contact are listed. However, some of the Producers have either active, inactive and/or destroyed wells, and we would like to be able to make this distinction. For example, we would only want to include the "active" Producer wells in the Production Report. This improvement will be accessible to all User Access Levels (1 through 4).

ITEM NO.	LOCATION WITHIN THE DATABASE	DESCRIPTION
3	Well List Screen (custom views improvement)	The programming will be revised to provide the capability, by selecting checkboxes, to use the Well List screen to filter the data to allow various “custom views”. For example, we might want to create a “Well Information Report” view which would display selected fields from the database and would include the Watermaster Well ID No. and the Well Name. The following is a list of the data fields that will be included as checkboxes in a pull-down menu on the Well List screen (in addition to the columns currently listed) to allow custom views: Company Name, Address, City, State, Zip, Contact Person, Telephone, Email, Owner Type, Assessor’s Parcel Number, Subarea, Northing, Easting, Reference Point Elevation, Well Casing Diameter, Total Depth of Completed Well, Date Well Completed, DWR Well Completion Report No. (Construction), Date Well Destroyed, DWR Well Completion Report No. (Destruction), Geologic Unit, Meter Unit. Because this improvement will include certain data regarding well location and completion, this improvement will only be accessible to User Access Levels 3 and 4.
4	Production Screen (format improvement)	The current individual well Production screen (accessible from the Well Details screen) will be modified to match the monthly production reporting template the Watermaster has requested that Producers use to report their well production. This improvement will be accessible to users who enter production data at User Access Levels 3 and 4.
5	<i>Detailed</i> Production Report (existing report)	Currently, when Production is selected from the Report pull-down menu that is accessible in the upper left of most screens, a production report can be produced that shows actual recorded meter readings for a specified time period (i.e., a detailed report). The purpose of this report is to allow users to easily review detailed production data from the database. The user has options to select an individual well owner or ALL well owners, and an individual well or ALL wells. The problems with this structure format include: (a) the report lists a column called “Begin Date” but data that show up in this column do not seem to be tied in any meaningful way to entries in the database; (b) accordingly, the report will not produce a “Begin Reading” to allow an initial meter reading to be used to make the proper production calculation; and (c) for cases when ALL wells of an individual well owner are selected, the report does not show which calculation is attributable to which well. The programming will be revised to correct these problems to facilitate efficient review of the detailed production data. This report will be accessible to all User Access Levels (1 through 4).

ITEM NO.	LOCATION WITHIN THE DATABASE	DESCRIPTION
6	<u>Summary</u> Production Report (new report)	Currently, it is not possible to generate a Production Report that is similar in format to the one that has historically been used by the Watermaster for reporting to the Board, and also in the Annual Report that is filed with Court (i.e., a summary report). The proper summary report format will not show actual meter dates and readings, but rather will be a Water Year report that breaks down production quarterly within the year, by each producer within each subarea. The programming will be revised so that the Summary Production Report matches the format being used by the Watermaster Board. This improvement will be accessible to users who enter production data at User Access Levels 3 and 4.
7	Water Quality screen (format improvement)	Some of the Water Quality analytical results that are being provided by the labs include two extra parameters that would be useful to add to the data entry page of the database. These are: 1. Bicarbonate 2. Carbonate The Water Quality data entry screen will be expanded to include these parameters.
8	Contacts Screen (new column)	The programming will be revised to add a column next to “Company Name” titled “Common Name” to enter the Producers’ names as they are more commonly known. This “Common Name” will also be added to the list of check box items shown in Item 3 above.
9	Most Screens and Reports (format improvement)	Where feasible, cross-linking will be provided between the “Well Names” and “Watermaster Well ID Nos.”

SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

* * * AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM * * *

MEETING DATE:	April 14, 2010		
AGENDA ITEM:	4		
AGENDA TITLE:	Work Plan for MPWMD to Evaluate Coastal Wells for Cross-Aquifer Contamination Potential		
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager		
SUMMARY: MPWMD has been authorized through Task No. I.3.d in their Request for Service (RFS) No. 2010-01 to Evaluate Coastal Wells for Cross-Aquifer Contamination Potential. The amount budgeted for that Task is \$5,000. The specific work they are to do is described in the RFS as follows: <i>PROFESSIONAL will perform a review of the well construction records for each of the coastal wells to determine whether or not they were properly constructed so as to prevent such cross-aquifer contamination from occurring. As part of that review, PROFESSIONAL will also review records to determine whether there is any indication of well seal deterioration that would lead to the potential for cross-aquifer contamination. PROFESSIONAL will prepare a report summarizing the findings of this review, with recommendations for any field inspection or other followup work that should be done in this regard.</i> The language in the Monitoring and Management Program (M&MP) which describes what this work is being undertaken, and what it will consist of, is as follows: <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%; vertical-align: top;"> I. 3. d. Evaluate Coastal Wells for Cross-Aquifer Contamination Potential (\$5,000) </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> If seawater intrusion were to reach any of the coastal wells in any aquifer, and if a well was constructed without proper seals to prevent cross-aquifer communication, or if deterioration of the well had compromised these seals, it would be possible for the intrusion to flow from one aquifer to another. A review of the well construction records for each of the coastal wells will be made to determine whether or not they were properly constructed so as to prevent such cross-aquifer contamination from occurring. As part of that review, records will also be reviewed to determine whether there is any indication of well seal deterioration that would lead to the potential for cross-aquifer contamination. A report summarizing the findings of this review will be prepared, with recommendations for any field inspection or other followup work that should be done in this regard. </td> </tr> </table> Attached is a description of MPWMD's work plan for carrying out Task No. I.3.d. Mr. Oliver will summarize the work plan during today's meeting to provide the TAC with the opportunity to voice any questions or suggestions before the work gets started.		I. 3. d. Evaluate Coastal Wells for Cross-Aquifer Contamination Potential (\$5,000)	If seawater intrusion were to reach any of the coastal wells in any aquifer, and if a well was constructed without proper seals to prevent cross-aquifer communication, or if deterioration of the well had compromised these seals, it would be possible for the intrusion to flow from one aquifer to another. A review of the well construction records for each of the coastal wells will be made to determine whether or not they were properly constructed so as to prevent such cross-aquifer contamination from occurring. As part of that review, records will also be reviewed to determine whether there is any indication of well seal deterioration that would lead to the potential for cross-aquifer contamination. A report summarizing the findings of this review will be prepared, with recommendations for any field inspection or other followup work that should be done in this regard.
I. 3. d. Evaluate Coastal Wells for Cross-Aquifer Contamination Potential (\$5,000)	If seawater intrusion were to reach any of the coastal wells in any aquifer, and if a well was constructed without proper seals to prevent cross-aquifer communication, or if deterioration of the well had compromised these seals, it would be possible for the intrusion to flow from one aquifer to another. A review of the well construction records for each of the coastal wells will be made to determine whether or not they were properly constructed so as to prevent such cross-aquifer contamination from occurring. As part of that review, records will also be reviewed to determine whether there is any indication of well seal deterioration that would lead to the potential for cross-aquifer contamination. A report summarizing the findings of this review will be prepared, with recommendations for any field inspection or other followup work that should be done in this regard.		
ATTACHMENTS:	MPWMD Work Plan to perform this work		
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	Approve the proposed Work Plan so the work can commence		



MONTEREY PENINSULA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

5 HARRIS COURT, BLDG. G
POST OFFICE BOX 85
MONTEREY, CA 93942-0085 • (831) 658-5600
FAX (831) 644-9560 • <http://www.mpwmd.dst.ca.us>

Seaside Groundwater Basin Evaluate Coastal Wells for Contamination Potential

Tasks:

1. Create dataset of all coastal production, monitor and special-installation wells, using all data sources, including: (1) Seaside Basin Watermaster database, (2) MPWMD well database, (3) DWR well database, and (4) Fort Ord environmental cleanup database.
2. Compare current Watermaster database well logs files to those available from the other sources and identify well logs that should be entered into Watermaster database.
3. Create and populate a new well lithology database with available lithology, DWR well number, TIFF number, well construction details, age of well, drilling method, casing materials, estimated capacity, water level, and location data for well logs located in the coastal subareas of the basin.
4. Prepare digital elevation model of coastal subareas with all wells identified as to location, total depth, seal depth, screened intervals, etc.
5. Acquire Seaside Basin groundwater model files (Hydrometrics) and incorporate model layers, structural geology features into digital elevation model.
6. Evaluate surface and/or cross-aquifer contamination potential based on digital elevation model.
7. Prepare brief technical memorandum report summarizing;
 - a. Procedures employed in evaluation,
 - b. Well statistics including number and type of wells in study area,
 - c. Ranking and assessment of wells regarding potential for surface and/or cross-aquifer contamination,
 - d. Recommendations regarding potential additional evaluation of specified wells to enhance assessment.

***SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE***

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

MEETING DATE:	April 14, 2010
AGENDA ITEM:	5
AGENDA TITLE:	Discussion of Watermaster Role/Responsibilities Regarding Development of Salt and Nutrient Management Programs
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager
SUMMARY: Attached are notes I made from attending the RWQCB Workshop on March 10, 2010 regarding Salt and Nutrient Management Plans. Based on my understanding of the regulations that pertain to preparing these Plans, the Watermaster is not obligated to prepare one for the Seaside Basin, but should be a participant in the preparation of such a plan, with some other party, possibly the MPWMD, taking the lead. Several other TAC members attended this same Workshop, and they are invited to share their comments on this topic.	
ATTACHMENTS:	Notes from RWQCB Workshop on Salt and Nutrient Management Plans
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	None required – information only

**NOTES FROM RWQCB WORKSHOP ON SALT AND NUTRIENT
MANAGEMENT PLANS
MARCH 10, 2010
MRWPCA REGIONAL TREATMENT PLANT**

Harvey Packard (RWQCB)

The RWQCB representative said that DWR Bulletin No. 118 lists the basins within California. Some of the basins in our area include Soquel, Pajaro Valley, Yogas subbasin, Bolsa, Hollister, San Juan Bautista, Salinas Valley, Paso Robles, Seaside, Santa Cruz, Scotts Valley, Felton, and Carmel River.

Mary Grace Paulson (Winzler and Kelly)

Development of Plans is part of the state's recycled water permitting process handled by the California Department of Public Health and the State Water Resource Control Board. This is one part of the state's Water Recycling Policy.

California Department of Health's Title 22 regulations protect public health, the RWQCB's Recycled Water policy protects water quality.

You have five to seven years to develop your Plans. Projects can be presumed under CEQA to benefit water quality if they are done in compliance with the Policy.

Local agencies are expected to lead the preparation of Plans. A few Plans have now been prepared in some regions. Plans will be reviewed by the RWQCB, not by the SWRCB.

Matthew Kuen (RWQCB)

Stakeholders, through a cost-sharing agreement, are to develop the Plans. The RWQCB will look at Waste Discharge Requirement permittees as parties to prepare these Plans.

It is not clear if the RWQCB has any direct authority to require any entity or entities to prepare Plans. If no Plan is developed for a basin, it may be impossible to get recycled water projects approved by the RWQCB in that basin. Or, a recycled water project proponent may be required to prepare the Plan in order to get its project approved. So the Watermaster may be a participant in the development of the Seaside Basin Plan, but could not be required to develop the Plan.

Groundwater basin boundaries can be redefined from DWR Bulletin 118 if there is a basis for this.

Leslie Dumont (RMC)

Focuses of Plans are urban landscape irrigation uses. All plans statewide to be done by May of 2015. The RWQCB's Basin Plans will then be amended to incorporate these Plans.

You need to know the RWQCB's Water Quality Objectives for your Basin in order to develop a Plan.

Various types of land uses and developments can contribute salt and nutrients to a basin, not just water recycling projects, e.g. dairies, other agricultural uses, and low impact development (LID).

For sub-basins where a recycled water project would not cause any adverse water quality impacts, you should be able to get an RWQCB waiver to not have to prepare a Plan.

***SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE***

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

MEETING DATE:	April 14, 2010
AGENDA ITEM:	6
AGENDA TITLE:	Schedule
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager
SUMMARY: 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 entity, MPWMD, which is performing certain portions of the work, and of the Critical Program Milestones Schedule. Attached is the Updated Consultants Work Schedule.	
ATTACHMENTS:	Updated Schedule of 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 2010 Work Schedule

ID	Task Name	2010																	
		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
1	CRITICAL PROJECT MILESTONES ASSOCIATED WITH TAC, BOARD, AND/OR CONSULTANT WORK																		
2	2011 Administration, Operations and Replenishment Budgets																		
3	Prepare M&MP Draft Budgets (Same as Task 35)																		
4	TAC Approves M&MP Budgets (Same as Task 36)																		
5	Board Approves M&MP Budgets (Same as Task 37)																		
6	Watermaster Prepares Quarterly Water Production, Water Level, and Water Quality Reports																		
25	Replenishment Assessment Unit Costs for Water Year 2011																		
26	Develop Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost for 2011 Water Year																		
27	TAC Approves 2011 Water Year Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost																		
28	Board Adopts and Declares 2011 Water Year Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost																		
29	Replenishment Assessments for Water Year 2010																		
30	Watermaster Prepares Replenishment Assessments for Water Year 2010																		
31	Watermaster Board Approves Replenishment Assessments for Water Year 2010																		
32	Watermaster Levies Replenishment Assessment for 2010																		
33	Monitoring & Management Program (M&MP) Budgets for 2011 and 2012																		

Seaside Basin Watermaster Monitoring and Management Program 2010 Work Schedule

ID	Task Name	2010																	
		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Ju
34	Prepare Draft 2011 and 2012 M&MP O&M and Capital Budgets																		
35	TAC approves Draft 2011 and 2012 M&MP O&M and Capital Budgets																		
36	Board approves 2011 and 2012 M&MP O&M and Capital Budgets																		
37	2009 Annual Report																		
38	Prepare Preliminary Draft 2010 Annual Report																		
39	TAC Provides Input on Draft 2010 Annual Report																		
40	Prepare Revised Draft 2010 Annual Report (Incorporating TAC Input)																		
41	Board Provides Input on Revised Draft 2010 Annual Report																		
42	Prepare Final 2010 Annual Report (Incorporating Board Input)																		
43	Watermaster Submits Final 2010 Annual Report to Judge																		
44	MANAGEMENT																		
45	M.1 PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION (All Work Performed by Watermaster Staff)																		
46	Prepare Initial Consultant Contracts for 2011																		
47	TAC Approval of Initial Consultant Contracts for 2011																		
48	Board Approval of Initial Consultant Contracts for 2011																		

Seaside Basin Watermaster Monitoring and Management Program 2010 Work Schedule

ID	Task Name	2010																	
		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Ju
49	IMPLEMENTATION																		
50	I.2.a DATABASE MANAGEMENT																		
51	I.2.a.1 Conduct Ongoing Data Entry/Database Maintenance																		
52	Perform Data Entry (Production, Level, and Quality)																		
53	Initial TAC Discussion of Possible Enhancements to Database																		
54	Compile Enhancements to be Made to the Database Based on User Input																		
55	TAC Approves Enhancements to be Made to the Database																		
56	Prepare RFS to Have Enhancements Made to the Database																		
57	TAC Approves RFS for Enhancements to be Made to the Database																		
58	Board Approves RFS for Enhancements to be Made to the Database																		
59	Make Enhancements to the Database																		
60	I.2.b DATA COLLECTION PROGRAM																		
61	I.2.b.2 Collect Monthly Water Levels (MPWMD)																		
62	I.2.b.3 Collect Quarterly Water Quality Samples (MPWMD)																		
63	I.2.b.4 Update Program Schedule and Standard Operating Procedures																		

Seaside Basin Watermaster Monitoring and Management Program 2010 Work Schedule

ID	Task Name	2010																	
		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
64	MPWMD Prepares Memo with Recommendations	Completed																	
67	TAC Approves Recommendations	Completed																	
70	I.2.b.6 Reports (from MPWMD)	SEE ID 6 ABOVE																	
71	I.3.a ENHANCED SEASIDE BASIN GROUNDWATER MODEL																		
72	I.3.a.2 Develop Protective Water Levels																		
73	HydroMetrics Meets with TAC to for Preliminary Discussion of Development of Protective Water Levels	Completed																	
74	HydroMetrics Meets with TAC to for Further Discussion of Development of Protective Water Levels	Completed																	
75	Prepare Contract with HydroMetrics to Refine Protective Water Levels Developed in 2009	Completed																	
76	Board Approves Contract with HydroMetrics to Refine Protective Water Levels (Board Deferred Performing this Work to an Unspecified Future Date. A Date of July, 2010 Has Been Shown Only as a Placeholder).	7/7																	
77	HydroMetrics Refines Protective Water Levels																		
78	HydroMetrics Makes Summary Report to TAC on Refinement of Protective Water Levels	9/8																	
79	HydroMetrics Makes Summary Report to Board on Protective Water Levels	10/6																	
80	I.3.a.3 Evaluate Replenishment Scenarios and Develop Answers to Basin Management Questions																		

Seaside Basin Watermaster Monitoring and Management Program 2010 Work Schedule

ID	Task Name	2010																	
		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Ju
81	HydroMetrics Meets with TAC for Preliminary Discussion on Additional Scenarios to be Evaluated	Completed																	
82	HydroMetrics Meets with TAC to Complete Selection of Management Objectives and Additional Scenarios to be Evaluated	Completed																	
83	Board Approves Management Objectives and Scenarios to be Evaluated		Completed																
84	Prepare Contract with HydroMetrics to Evaluate Additional Replenishment Scenarios		Completed																
85	TAC Approves Contract with HydroMetrics to Evaluate Additional Replenishment Scenarios		Completed																
86	Board Approves Contract with HydroMetrics to Evaluate Additional Replenishment Scenarios				4/7														
87	TAC Finalizes Criteria to be Used in the Modeling Work				4/14														
88	HydroMetrics Evaluates Additional Replenishment Scenarios																		
89	HydroMetrics Makes Summary Report to TAC Regarding Evaluation of Additional Replenishment Scenarios							7/14											
90	HydroMetrics Makes Summary Report to Board Regarding Evaluation of Replenishment Scenarios and Answers to Basin Management Questions							8/4											
91	I.3.b Complete Preparation of Basin Management and Action Plan (BMAP)	WORK COMPLETED - NO FURTHER WORK PLANNED IN 2010																	
92	I.3.c Refine and/or Update the BMAP																		
93	TAC Discusses Issues to be Addressed in Updating the BMAP							6/9											
94	Prepare Contract with HydroMetrics for Updating the BMAP																		

Seaside Basin Watermaster Monitoring and Management Program 2010 Work Schedule

ID	Task Name	2010																	
		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Ju
95	TAC Approves Contract with HydroMetrics for Updating the BMAP							◆ 7/14											
96	Board Approves Contract with HydroMetrics for Updating the BMAP							◆ 8/4											
97	HydroMetrics Updates the BMAP																		
98	HydroMetrics Makes Presentation on Draft Updated BMAP to TAC																		
99	HydroMetrics Makes Presentation of Final Draft Updated BMAP to Board and Board Adopts Final Updated BMAP																		
100	I.3.d Evaluate Coastal Wells for Cross-Aquifer Contamination Potential																		
101	Prepare Contract with MPWMD for Evaluating the Wells																		
102	TAC Approves Contract with MPWMD for Evaluating the Wells																		
103	Board Approves Contract with MPWMD for Evaluating the Wells																		
104	MPWMD Evaluates the Wells																		
105	MPWMD Makes Presentation of Well Evaluation to TAC																		
106	MPWMD Makes Presentation of Well Evaluation to Board																		
107	I.4.a HydroMetrics & MPWMD Provide Oversight of Seawater Intrusion Detection and Tracking																		
108	I.4.b HydroMetrics Analyzes and Maps Water Quality from Coastal Monitoring Wells																		
109	I.4.c Annual Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report (SIAR)																		

Seaside Basin Watermaster Monitoring and Management Program 2010 Work Schedule

ID	Task Name	2010																	
		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Ju
110	HydroMetrics Provides Draft SIAR to Watermaster										◆ 10/6								
111	TAC Approves Annual Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report (SIAR)										◆ 10/13								
112	Board Approves Annual Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report (SIAR)										◆ 11/3								
113	I.4.d Complete Preparation of Seawater Intrusion Response Plan (SIRP)	WORK COMPLETED - NO FURTHER WORK PLANNED IN 2010																	
114	I.4.e Refine and/or Update the SIRP	NOT NECESSARY																	