

**From Seth J. Zielke
December 20, 2012 by email**

Good afternoon Mr. Kavounas,

The following responds to the Chino Basin Watermaster ("Watermaster") request for questions and comments on the Section 7 Evaluation Criteria (2nd Draft) now being considered by the Watermaster Recharge Master Plan Update ("RMPU") Steering Committee, and was distributed at the December 18, 2012 meeting.

Page 7-1 States "To improve the balance of recharge and discharge in the northern parts of MZ2 and MZ3, Watermaster could implement the some of the storm and dry-weather recharge projects listed in Table 6-1 that recharge in MZ2 and MZ3."

- Fontana Water Company request that this language be changed by having the word **northern** removed.
- Specifying a single location seems exclusionary. Fontana Water Company has experienced declining water levels of nearly 20 feet throughout MZ3 over the last 15 years, not specific to the northern area.

Page 7-3 States "Groundwater modeling investigation over the last five years suggest: that new artificial recharge at existing stormwater retention facilities will provide marginal benefits towards resolving the sustainability challenge faced by the JCSD and the CDA; and that reducing net production in the JCSD well field was significantly more beneficial in resolving the production sustainability challenge."

- Please define "marginal benefits."
- How was this quantified?

Page 7-4 States "A proposed storm and dry-weather flow recharge project would be considered for implementation when the unit cost of new recharge is determined to be less than the unit cost of importing a comparable volume of untreated Tier 1 water from Metropolitan."

- Fontana Water Company requests that Watermaster consider removing the unit cost criteria from Section 7.
- Consistent with previous RMPU Steering Committee discussions, a more appropriate section for deriving a mechanism or criteria related to project cost, as well as, determining when a project becomes financially feasible should be considered in Section 8 along with allocation and project funding considerations.

Page 7-5 States "For a new spreading basin that would not be otherwise built for flood control purposes, the implementation barriers may include: property acquisition; obtaining change in the general plan to allow the land to be developed as recharge basin; agreement with the owner of the drainage works to divert storm water and convey excess back to the drainage works; mitigation for habitat losses and other resource agency requirements; Watermaster material physical injury findings; obtaining the ability, pursuant to a water right permit, to divert water for recharge and subsequent beneficial use; and the potential for diverting water that would otherwise be captured at an existing downstream facility."

- Are these barriers weighted or scored? For example the sustainability impact of a project is scored, are barriers scored or ranked similarly?
- Does the addition of the last barrier “the potential for diverting water that would otherwise be captured at an existing downstream facility” create a need for mitigation?

Page 7-1 States “Reoperation has caused groundwater levels to decline in the northern parts of MZ2 and MZ3.”

Page 7-6 States “The modeling work also demonstrated that reoperation has little impact on sustainable production in the CDA Desalter II and JCSD well fields.”

- These statements seem contradictory.
- Please clarify.

Mark Kinsey for MVWD December 20, 2012 Letter by Email

Dear Mr. Kavounas,

Monte Vista Water District (MVWD) appreciates the opportunity to submit comments on the second draft of Section 7 as presented at the Recharge Master Plan Update (RMPU) Steering Committee meeting on December 18, 2012. Some of the following may reflect prior comments provided by email on December 11, 2012, in response to the first draft of Section 7. All page numbers refer to the nonredline ("clean") version of the second draft of Section 7.

1. MVWD agrees with the approach of prioritizing projects that can most cost-effectively address sustainability issues in Management Zones (MZ) 3, 4, and 5. However, we believe that the description of this prioritization on page 7-8 is too broad as currently written. At the December 18 meeting, it was suggested that priorities # 1 and #2 would be combined into one priority. We recommend that such a unified priority be stated as simply as possible to reference projects that will most cost-effectively address production sustainability issues in MZs 3-5. Finally, we do not believe that water quality impacts and institutional challenges in these zones should be prioritized over similar impacts and challenges in other zones, and request that such criteria be removed from this priority.

2. It is our understanding that the cost-effectiveness analyses of potential projects will compare annualized construction costs to future imported water supply costs over a standard 30-year period. We would request that, prior to conducting these analyses, Watermaster provide parties with the specific evaluation criteria (e.g., discount rate, projected imported water supply costs, etc.) to be used, and that Watermaster conduct sensitivity studies to ensure that the cost effectiveness analyses rely on conservative data.

3. We believe that production curtailment by the Chino Desalter Authority should be evaluated for achieving the above-referenced sustainability issues. Such curtailment would provide the same benefits as curtailment by Jurupa Community Services District while helping to address the District's more immediate concerns. Mitigation of contractual issues and obligations and fixed cost impacts that may occur due to production curtailment should be part of the evaluation.

4. This and prior sections of the RMPU make it clear that the sustainability challenges in the southern portion of MZs 3-5 are the result of unsustainable production levels. We believe that past successful actions by producers in the southern portion of MZ 1 provide a useful parallel for finding a reasonable solution to the current issues being faced in MZs 3-5. Through a combination of production forbearance, investment in alternative supplies, and targeted Watermaster actions, southern MZ 1 producers have been able to address similar production related sustainability issues. We believe the approach in southern MZs 3-5 should follow this successful precedent, including the development of alternative supplies by the impacted producing parties. We also believe that criteria should be developed to reflect the best efforts on the part of these producing parties to mitigate production-related impacts.

5. The following are general suggested edits and minor revisions:

- a. Page 7-1, first paragraph: You may want to provide a footnote describing the two-phase analysis process of developing preliminary and then detailed cost and yield estimates for

these projects.

b. Page 7-1, second paragraph: A footnote explaining the 3,200 acre-ft/yr replenishment threshold would be helpful.

c. Page 7-1, second paragraph: "and/or ASR projects"

d. Page 7-1, third paragraph: remove "into future"

e. Page 7-2, third-to-last paragraph: "do *not* constitute Best Efforts"

f. Page 7-3, second bullet: remove space after "Therefore"

Scott Burton for the City of Ontario December 20, 2012 Letter by Email

Dear Peter,

Please see below for Ontario's comments and feel free to call if you have any questions.

1. Watermaster's Recharge Goals

Page 7-1 "*.... Appropriative Pool parties could make their own arrangements, independent of the Watermaster, to [develop in-lieu recharge / exchange or ASR projects]; and "...., a Party could implement [projects that recharge in MZ2 and MZ3] and Watermaster could facilitate their implementation by petitioning for amendment of its existing State Water Board stormwater diversion permits to include other recharge sites, in effect "sharing" its rights under its stormwater diversion permit with the implementing Party.*"

Comment: Any such independent effort by an implementing party or parties would be consistent with Watermaster's obligation to exercise Best Efforts to protect and enhance the Safe Yield of the Basin. We believe such efforts should be encouraged by Watermaster, perhaps through a proportional recharge benefit to the implementing party.

2. Is the Project Cost Effective?

Page 7-4 "*A proposed storm and dry-weather flow recharge project would be considered for implementation when the unit cost of new recharge is determined to be less than the unit cost of importing a comparable volume of untreated Tier 1 water from Metropolitan.*"

Comment: Based on recent history, MWD Untreated Tier 1 water may be subject to mandatory reductions in the future which impacts the direct use supply mix (more pumping) and availability of supplemental recharge water. The basis for comparing RMP projects to the alternative (imported water at \$1,000 to \$1,500 per AF) is a price point comparison without consideration for reliability and local control. Without suggesting that a higher price be used for this exercise, the text should acknowledge other factors that may need to be considered in the future.

3. Is This Project Required for MS4 Compliance?

Page 7-5 "*If yes then the proponent pays for the project.*"

Comment: This section is incomplete and does not address areas such as projects that are implemented for multiple purposes or are enhanced to meet more than minimum MS4 compliance. A section heading change was suggested in the last RMP Steering Committee meeting but upon further consideration, the section would still be incomplete and seems out of place for Chapter 7 – Evaluation Criteria. Projects with the potential to create new yield via stormwater recharge and provide for recharge in excess of the minimum MS4 requirement are consistent with Watermaster's obligation to exercise Best Efforts. It seems appropriate for Watermaster to encourage such efforts, perhaps through Watermaster cost sharing for the enhancement or a proportional recharge benefit to the implementing party.

4. Watermaster Minimum Standard of Performance

Page 7-3 *“Groundwater modeling investigation over the last five years suggest: that the new artificial recharge at existing stormwater retention facilities will provide marginal benefits towards resolving the sustainability challenge faced by the JCSD and the CDA; and that reducing net production in the JCSD well field was significantly more beneficial in resolving the production sustainability challenge.”*

Comment: The quantity of water needed to meet production sustainability in MZ3 should be determined. Recognizing that a solution could be both direct recharge and in-lieu, perhaps the MZ3 issues should be evaluated using scenarios of combined projects versus evaluating projects individually. Such projects should also not result in adverse impacts to other areas. For example, a project to reduce production in MZ3 should not result in adverse impacts to production sustainability in another management zone.

5. Storm water and Dry-Weather Flow Recharge Projects

Page 7-8 *“Water Quality – the new recharge must not cause existing contaminant plumes to be redirected in such a way as to cause contamination to wells or interfere with existing groundwater cleanup programs.”*

Comment: In addition to existing contaminant plumes, impacts from other water quality parameters such as emerging contaminants, etc. should also be considered.