

Section 6

Recharge Projects Considered in the 2013 RMPU Amendment

Background

In June 2012, Watermaster staff sent a “call for projects” to the Watermaster parties seeking their recommendations for recharge improvement projects. Responses were provided by the CBWCD, Cities of Fontana, Ontario and Upland, the JCSD and the IEUA. Watermaster staff combined these proposed projects with the 2010 RMPU projects and subsequently prepared an initial listing of these projects in July 2012.

The Steering Committee conducted seven meetings to discuss these recharge projects, among other things, over the period of July 19, 2012 through November 29, 2012. The projects in the initial list were characterized by their potential impact on production sustainability and their contribution to improving the balance of recharge and discharge in the Basin. Several potential project groupings based on these characterizations were discussed by the Steering Committee. At the end of these discussions the Steering Committee recommended the complete initial list of projects be included by the Watermaster for consideration in the 2013 Amendment to the 2010 RMPU process. The Steering Committee recommendation was based on the collective opinion that the cost and benefit of each project should be understood before any projects were eliminated from consideration.

The Steering Committee recommendations are included in Table 6-1 which lists these projects. This table is described in more detail below. The final project list is a result of extensive discussions in which all the Steering Committee members’ comments and suggestions were considered. The final list of projects for consideration in the 2013 RMPU Amendment was approved in December 2012 by the Watermaster Pool Committees, the Advisory Committee and the Board.

Recharge Projects Being Considered

Table 6-1 lists the projects submitted by the Steering Committee for consideration in the 2013 RMPU Amendment as approved by the Watermaster. Figure 6-1 shows the approximate location of these projects. The projects can be grouped by owner/advocate to include the 2010 RMPU projects, IEUA suggested projects and projects suggested by Parties. Those projects characterized as 2010 RMPU projects

Section 6 Recharge Projects Considered in the 2013 RMPU Amendment

include those projects included in the 2010 RMPU. In November 2011, the Steering Committee requested that IEUA develop a list of improvements and suggested actions that, based on their experience in operating the CBFIP facilities, could increase stormwater recharge at a reasonable cost – the IEUA suggested projects include these projects. Finally several Watermaster Parties suggested projects that include stormwater management facilities and other recharge facilities that can be used to improve sustainable production in the JCSD and CDA Desalter II well field areas.

Table 6-1 lists the projects and other information that was used by the Steering Committee to characterize the projects.¹ Table 6-1 contains the following:

- Project Name – generally a facility name or in some cases a name more descriptive of what the project does.
- Facility Owner – generally the facility owner for an existing stormwater management facility or the probable owner for a future stormwater management facility or other recharge facility.
- Project Advocate – generally the entity that proposed the recharge project. In IEUA’s case, “IEUA” is used herein to represent a larger group of stakeholders including IEUA that “advocate” the project.
- Map Code – denotes a location code for the project on Figure 6-1.
- Management Zone – denotes the management zone(s) that will be directly recharged from the proposed project.
- Estimated Increase in Recharge from Improvements – if known contains estimates of the three sources of water that could potentially be recharged: storm and dry-weather discharge, imported water and recycled water.
- Proposed Improvements – includes a list of the proposed improvements, their cost if known, and expected benefits.

The proposed improvements are characterized with either a: “C” which means a capital improvement, an “O” which signifies an operational improvement, or an “I” which signifies a proposed investigation. Capital improvements could include the construction or expansion of new basins, drainage improvements, pump stations and other conveyance facilities, etc. Operational improvements include more aggressive operations and maintenance activities that will increase stormwater recharge. The types of investigations proposed in Table 6-1 include investigations to determine: the recharge feasibility on presently undeveloped land, the causes of poor infiltration performance at select existing basins and ways to improve their infiltration rates, the feasibility of recycled water recharge in select existing basins, and the feasibility of drainage improvements in the Cucamonga Basin that could increase recharge in the Chino and Cucamonga Basins.

¹ Table 6-1 is a summary table that was based on a more expansive table.

Section 6 Recharge Projects Considered in the 2013 RMPU Amendment

All the proposed projects listed in Table 6-1 will be evaluated using the evaluation criteria discussed in Section 7 Evaluation Criteria. Section 8 summarizes the evaluation and ranking of the proposed projects and Appendix D contains the detailed evaluation of the proposed projects.

1st Draft