

INDIAN WELLS VALLEY GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Indian Wells Valley Water District 500 W. Ridgecrest Blvd. Ridgecrest, CA 93555

A G E N D A

Thursday, November 1st, 2018, Time 1:00 p.m.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you are a disabled person and you need a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, please contact Ronald Strand at (760) 499-5002. Requests must be made as early as possible and at least one full business day before the start of the meeting. Documents and material relating to an open session agenda items that are provided to the IWVGA TAC Committee prior to a regular meeting will be available for public inspection and copying at Indian Wells Valley Water District, 500 W. Ridgecrest Blvd, Ridgecrest, CA 93555, or online at <https://iwvga.org/>.

Statements from the Public

The public will be allowed to address the Committee during Public Comments about subjects within the jurisdiction of the IWVGA Technical Advisory Committee and that are NOT on the agenda. No action may be taken on off-agenda items unless authorized by law. Questions posed to the Committee may be answered after the meeting or at future meeting. Dialog or extended discussion between the public and the Committee or staff will be limited in accordance with the Brown Act. The Public Comments portion of the meeting shall be limited to three (3) minutes per speaker. Each person is limited to one comment during Public Comments. Legal representatives are available for information regarding the Brown Act and will be present for comments if needed.

All remarks and questions should be addressed to the Committee as a whole and not to any individual member or staff. There will be time after each action item on the agenda to receive comments from the public. Again each speaker will be limited to three (3) minutes. Speakers should be brief and limit their comments to the specific subject being discussed. Persons will be limited to one comment per person unless directed by the Chair.

1. CALL TO ORDER

- a. Roll Call of TAC Members Attending

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

This time is reserved for the public to address the Committee about matters NOT on the agenda. No action will be taken on non-agenda items unless authorized by law. Comments are limited to three minutes per person.

3. WATER RESOURCES MANAGER'S DISCUSSION OF DRAFT GSP SECTIONS (WORK IN PROGRESS)

- a. Plan Area and Basin Setting:
 - i) Modeling Schedule
 - ii) Baseline Model Assumptions
- b. Projects and Management Actions: Sustainable Management Actions Modeling Scenarios
- c. Sustainable Management Criteria: Data Gaps
 - i) Data Gap Status Report

IWVGA TAC COMMITTEE
Meeting of November 1, 2018

- ii) Review of Data Gap Budgets/Prop 1 Scope (Peter Brown's request)
- d. Sustainable Management Criteria: Monitoring Protocols
- e. Projects and Management Actions: Imported Water (GA Responsibilities)
- f. Projects and Management Actions: Allocation Summary

4. SPECIAL PRESENTATION – GROUNDWATER MONITORING TECHNOLOGY (IWVWD)

5. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (DECEMBER TAC)

- a. Plan Area and Basin Setting: Baseline Model Assumptions
- b. Plan Area and Basin Setting: Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model
- c. Projects and Management Actions: Sustainable Management Actions Modeling Scenarios
- d. Sustainable Management Criteria: Data Gap Status Report

6. FUTURE TAC MEETING DATES

- a. Next three month planned dates:
 - i) December 6th, January 3rd, February 7th

7. WATER RESOURCES MANAGER/COMMITTEE MEMBER ANNOUNCEMENTS OR COMMENTS

- a. WRM – No items at this time
- b. TAC Chair- Future Meeting Dates Due to Holidays

8. ADJOURN

TAC November 1, 2018 Meeting

Agenda Item 3.c.ii

GSP Scope/Budget Questions/Review

1. Prior to finalizing the IWVGA Prop 1 Grant, Scope, and Budget, and Agreement. DWR required a “final” scope/budget. (June, 2018).
2. At the time DWR required a “final” scope/budget, the IWVGA Prop 1 Grant still required 50% funding match from IWVGA. Maximum Grant amount of \$1.5 million was directed by TAC, PAC, and GA Board. WRM used significant prior “in-kind” costs for IWVGA 50% cost match. In addition, many projects previously identified by the TAC were added to the “basic” GSP scope for the remaining IWVGA 50% cost match. Some of these costs are to be funded by the IWVGA and some of these costs are to be funded by “other” in-kind funding (e.g. Navy Seabees well drilling).
3. The WRM worked with the TAC and GA Board during May, 2018 and June, 2018 to revise and reduce the Prop 1 Grant scope/budget, where deemed appropriate by TAC.
4. The DWR notified IWVGA in July, 2018 that the Prop 1 Grant 50% local funding match had been “waived”.
5. The final DWR Agreement, including revised/final scope/budget was executed on September 24, 2018.
6. IWVGA Vice-Chair Peter Brown has made several inquiries to the IWVGA Board, TAC and WRM, asking if certain scope/budget items may be reduced or eliminated, in an effort to save GA funds and reduce costs to the IWV pumpers.

Note: The signed and executed grant agreement contains the Work Plan and Budget for the Prop 1 Tasks. Any proposed changes to the scope/budget would require DWR approval. When all TAC reviews are completed and as authorized by the GA, the WRM will request DWR authorize the proposed changes to the Prop 1 Grant agreement scope/budget.

7. Attached is a draft table that attempts to clarify Director Brown’s questions and provide preliminary answers. Also attached are Director Brown’s specific questions.

8. Responses to Peter Brown Questions (attachments)

- A. Application Task 2: Salt and Nutrient Management Plan. It is believed Director misinterpreted this item as a “new cost”. It is not. This is a DWR reimbursement of past costs (in-kind services) to the GA.
- B. Application Task 3: Data Management System. Under review by the TAC. The TAC will provide any change of scope/budget recommendation to the WRM/GA Board.
- C. Application Task 4: Identify/Evaluate Data Gaps. In process and over halfway completed. TAC is directly involved.
- D. Application Task 5: Monitoring Wells. Includes 4 new MW’s at a cost of about \$550,000, with GA contribution only about \$40,000. Under review and coordination with TAC.
- E. Application Task 6: Stream Gages. Original scope/budget already reviewed/revised by TAC. Under review and coordination with TAC.
- F. Application Task 7: Weather Stations. Original scope/budget already reviewed/revised by TAC. Under review and coordination with TAC.
- G. Application Task 8: Water Quality. To be reviewed by TAC. TAC will make any change of scope/budget recommendation to the WRM/GA/Board.
- H. Application Task 9: Aquifer Tests. To be reviewed by TAC.
- I. Application Task 10: Alternative Water/Conservation Study. Technical Memorandum in final draft. Work remains on conservation documentation. Actual coordination and acquisition of new water supply is not included.
- J. Application Task 11: Recycled Water Study. Technical Memorandum completed through TAC. Completed Task.

TASK COSTS SUMMARY

Response to Vice-Chair Peter Brown. Questions sent in October 8, 2018 email.

Application Task Number	Task Name	Total Task Cost	DWR Grant Award	Remaining Cost		Stetson Budget	Stetson Expenditures /4	Notes
Task 2	Salt and Nutrient Management Plan Development	\$80,000	\$20,000	\$60,000	/1	\$0	\$0	\$80,000 is past IWWVD and City of Ridgecrest costs. DWR Grant Award of \$20,000 available for reimbursement or towards other GSP costs.
Task 3	Data Management System	\$308,700	\$238,105	\$70,595	/2	\$308,700	\$54,191	Database development and population. Monitoring Protocols. Transducers/Telemetry (\$180,000). Transducers to be reviewed by TAC.
Task 4	Identify and Evaluate Hydrogeologic Data Gaps	\$66,700	\$51,447	\$15,253	/2	\$66,700	\$35,523	Required task. Coordinated entirely through the TAC. More than half way complete.
Task 5	Monitoring Wells	\$548,000	\$129,118	\$418,882	/3	\$167,400	\$2,514	Scope includes 4 new monitoring wells to be drilled by the Navy Seabees. Direct GA costs about \$40,000. All work coordinated through TAC.
Task 6	Stream Gages	\$91,800	\$70,807	\$20,993	/2	\$91,800	\$0	Scope includes telemetry retrofits/improvements to two existing stream gages. Original scope reduced by TAC. Potential additional TAC review.
Task 7	Weather Stations	\$68,400	\$52,758	\$15,642	/2	\$68,400	\$0	Scope includes one new weather station and retrofits to one existing weather station. Original scope already reduced by TAC. Potential additional TAC review.
Task 8	Water Quality and Stable Isotope Sampling and Analysis	\$108,700	\$83,842	\$24,858	/2	\$108,700	\$0	To be reviewed by TAC. Water age-dating is important.
Task 9	Aquifer Tests	\$172,300	\$132,898	\$39,402	/2	\$172,300	\$655	To be reviewed by TAC. Model verification.
Task 10	Alternative Water/Conservation Study	\$175,000	\$134,980	\$40,020	/2	\$175,000	\$101,498	Technical Memorandum for Alternative Water in progress after monthly TAC presentations/updates since February 2018. Work remains on conservation.
Task 11	Recycled Water Study	\$61,000	\$47,050	\$13,950	/2	\$61,000	\$65,374	Technical Memorandum prepared through TAC review. Completed task.
TOTAL		\$1,680,600	\$961,005	\$719,595		\$1,220,000	\$259,754	

Notes:
All Task scopes have been approved in executed Grant Agreement with DWR.
Task scope for those shaded yellow may be reduced based on TAC recommendation dependent on DWR approval/discretion.
/1 Funding Source: City of Ridgecrest and IWWVD
/2 Funding Source: IWWGA
/3 Funding Source: IWWGA, US Navy, Bureau of Land Management, and Searles Valley Minerals
/4 Costs as of 10.10.18

Table 4 - Project Budget

Proposal Title: Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin - Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development and SDAC Groundwater Conservation Pilot Project

Project Title: Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin - Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development

Project serves a need of a DAC?:

☒ Yes ☐ No

Cost Share Waiver Request?:

☒ Yes ☐ No

Tasks		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source	Other Cost Share	Total Cost
	Objective 1				
1	Task 1 - <u>Model Development</u>	\$304,207	\$710,793	\$0	\$1,015,000
	Task 1a - Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model	\$23,756.51	\$7,043 ¹	\$0	\$30,800
	Task 1b - Numerical Groundwater Model (Basin Model Updates, Sustainable Management Scenarios, Transport Modeling, Land Subsidence Evaluation, Safe Yield Review)	\$280,450.28	\$83,150 ¹	\$0	\$363,600
	Previous and Ongoing Model Development In-Kind Services	\$0	\$620,600 ²	\$0	\$620,600
2	Task 2 - <u>Salt and Nutrient Management Plan Development</u>	\$20,000	\$60,000 ³	\$0	\$80,000
	Task 2a - Loading Analysis (Existing)	\$0	\$30,000	\$0	\$30,000
	Task 2b - Mixing Model Development (Existing)	\$0	\$30,000	\$0	\$30,000
	Task 2c - Reporting and Coordination	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$20,000

We already have a plan that is paid Why 20K more Coordinate with WHO?

Tasks		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source	Other Cost Share	Total Cost
	Objective 2				
3	Task 3 - <u>Data Management System</u>	\$238,105	\$70,595 ¹	\$0	\$308,700
	Task 3a - Establish Monitoring Protocols and Reporting Standards	\$23,833.65	\$7,066	\$0	\$30,900
	Task 3b- Populate Database with Historical Data	\$41,805.29	\$12,395	\$0	\$54,200
	Task 3c - Install Transducers and Telemetry Equipment This can be done by others. In house	\$138,605.38	\$41,095	\$0	\$179,700
	Task 3d - Integrate GSP Goals and Objectives - Adaptive Management	\$33,860.75	\$10,039	\$0	\$43,900
4	Task 4 - <u>Identify and Evaluate Hydrogeologic Data Gaps</u> Can't this be done by TAC. We've already been discussing this specific topic for over 5 years and have a list of needs already established.	\$51,447	\$15,253 ¹	\$0	\$66,700
	Task 4a - Review Existing Model and Monitoring Network	\$32,703.77	\$9,696	\$0	\$42,400
	Task 4b - Identification and Prioritization of Data Gaps	\$18,742.96	\$5,557	\$0	\$24,300
5	Task 5 - <u>Monitoring Wells</u> We can do this as well. Using TAC and pooling our funds. CB's will also help.	\$129,118	\$418,882	\$0	\$548,000
	Task 5a - Design and Location Siting	\$10,567.02	\$3,133 ¹	\$0	\$13,700
	Task 5b - Work Plan and Well Construction	\$0	\$373,400 ⁴	\$0	\$373,400
		\$76,283.09	\$22,617 ¹	\$0	\$98,900
	Task 5c - Collection of Monitoring Well Data	\$0	\$7,200 ⁴	\$0	\$7,200
	Would like to seriously look into the feasibility with outfitting 100's of existing wells with data loggers. "Wellintel" makes an awesome unit that comes with its on gateway and the data is cloud based. More on that in memo.	\$42,268.08	\$12,532 ¹	\$0	\$54,800

Tasks		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source	Other Cost Share	Total Cost
6	Task 6 - Stream Gages Can also do in house through TAC and Tom Hasslebocker?? Spelling Task 6a - Hydrologic Analysis Task 6b - Design and Location Siting Task 6c - Equipment Purchase, Installation, and Testing	\$70,807 \$12,418.18 \$23,062.33 \$35,326.25	\$20,993 ¹ \$3,682 \$6,838 \$10,474	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	\$91,800 \$16,100 \$29,900 \$45,800
7	Task 7 - Weather Stations Don't Need?? We have BLM Weatherstations Task 7a - Design and Location Siting Task 7b - Equipment Purchase Task 7c - Installation and Testing We have done isotopic samples before and have data on this. Why again.	\$52,758 \$12,572.44 \$22,676.67 \$17,508.86	\$15,642 ¹ \$3,728 \$6,723 \$5,191	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	\$68,400 \$16,300 \$29,400 \$22,700
8	Task 8 - Water Quality and Stable Isotope Sampling and Analysis Task 8a - Surface and Groundwater Sampling Task 8b - Perform Geochemical Reaction and Transport Analysis	\$83,842 \$62,862.21 \$20,979.78	\$24,858 ¹ \$18,638 \$6,220	\$0 \$0 \$0	\$108,700 \$81,500 \$27,200
9	Task 9 - Aquifer Tests Task 9a - Prepare Aquifer Test Work Plan Task 9b - Perform Aquifer Testing This seems unreasonable. We did a 30 day test for our primary well field. Ag pumps water all of the time. Cause and effect can be distilled from that data NO???	\$132,898 \$27,844.49 \$105,053.16	\$39,402 ¹ \$8,256 \$31,147	\$0 \$0 \$0	\$172,300 \$36,100 \$136,200

Tasks		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Estimated Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source	Other Cost Share	Total Cost
	Objective 3				
10	Task 10 - Alternative Water/Conservation Study	\$134,980	\$40,020 ¹	\$0	\$175,000
	Task 10a - Evaluate Alternative Water Sources and Conservation	\$57,848.66	\$17,151	\$0	\$75,000
	Task 10b - Evaluate Water Banking Alternatives and Extraction Schedules	\$19,282.89	\$5,717	\$0	\$25,000
	Task 10c - Evaluate Infrastructure Requirements	\$19,282.89	\$5,717	\$0	\$25,000
	Task 10d - Prepare Technical Memorandum	\$38,565.77	\$11,434	\$0	\$50,000
11	Task 11 - Recycled Water Study	\$47,050	\$13,950 ¹	\$0	\$61,000
	Task 11a - Existing Supply and Demand Analysis	\$5,090.68	\$1,509	\$0	\$6,600
	Task 11b - Identify Existing Recycled Water Infrastructure and Users	\$4,627.89	\$1,372	\$0	\$6,000
	Task 11c - Review Regulatory and Institutional Requirements	\$2,622.47	\$778	\$0	\$3,400
	Task 11d - Identify and Evaluate Potential Recycled Water Users	\$15,426.31	\$4,574	\$0	\$20,000
	Task 11e - Prepare Technical Memorandum	\$19,282.89	\$5,717	\$0	\$25,000

We have already exhausted all avenues of conservation and squeezed the sponge dry. The brackish water study will provide cost of treatment. Others would be willing to invest in feasibility for there uses. Farm this one out or work with what we already have.

Seems like a lot of money to say the city's waste treatment plan can do ABC they already have costs to bring water to tertiary. If anything It would be good to perhaps fund that to make it happen as a future source of supply.

Tasks		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source	Other Cost Share	Total Cost
	Objective 4				
12	Task 12 - <u>GSP Development and Compilation</u>	\$234,788	\$69,612 ¹	\$0	\$304,400
	Task 12a - Prepare Executive Summary Chapter	\$694.18	\$206	\$0	\$900
	Task 12b - Prepare Introduction Chapter	\$925.58	\$274	\$0	\$1,200
	Task 12c -Prepare Plan Area and Basin Setting Chapter	\$12,495.31	\$3,705	\$0	\$16,200
	Task 12d - Prepare Sustainable Management Criteria Chapter	\$23,139.46	\$6,861	\$0	\$30,000
	Task 12e - Prepare Projects and Management Actions to Achieve Sustainability Goal Chapter	\$38,565.77	\$11,434	\$0	\$50,000
	Task 12f - Prepare Plan Implementation Chapter	\$26,996.04	\$8,004	\$0	\$35,000
	Task 12g- Prepare References and Technical Studies Chapter	\$1,542.63	\$457	\$0	\$2,000
	Task 12h - Develop Draft and Final GSP	\$24,142.17	\$7,158	\$0	\$31,300
	Task 12i - Project Management	\$57,694.39	\$17,106	\$0	\$74,800
	Task 12j - Stakeholder/DWR Coordination	\$48,592.87	\$14,407	\$0	\$63,000
	Grand Total (Tasks 1-12)	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$0	\$3,000,000

Notes

1. Funding Source: IWVGA
2. Funding Source: US Navy
3. Funding Source: City of Ridgecrest and IWWVD
4. Funding Source: US Navy, Bureau of Land Management, and Searles Valley Minerals

Marked items total \$841,526. Some costs would be incurred if we did them with outside services. I would like to see what those cost are. Further like to see justification for doing some of them since we already have. MY GOAL IS TO SAVE MONEY. By using our existing talent in house wherever possible. I do not believe we are doing this enough

TAC/PAC November 1, 2018 Meeting

Imported Water IWVGA Roles and Responsibilities

There is very broad agreement in the IWW that a new source and supply of imported water is required for “sustainability” of the IWW groundwater basin. There is not universal agreement that new imported water is feasible for IWW.

The TAC is requested to suggest to the WRM, what the IWVGA roles and responsibilities should be for “imported water”.

(Respond in writing to TAC Chair and WRM.)

Additional information for TAC discussion and suggestion to WRM:

1. Comment/Discussion on idea that work on securing an imported water supply should have started years ago.
2. Comment/Discussion on the current WRM draft Technical Memorandum describing LADWP banking and AVEC treated water supply as the primary potential imported water supplies.
3. Comment/Discussion on the role large pumpers should have on imported water (e.g. IWWWD and Ag)
4. Comment/Discussion on should there be an Ad Hoc committee formed for imported water. GA Board? Others?

TAC/PAC Meetings – November 1, 2018

Special Counsel Markman/WRM Summary

Report on October 1, 2018 Pumping Allocation Meetings

(Report to IWVGA Board on October 18, 2018)

A. Pumping Allocation Meetings on October 1, 2018

1. Attending: Special Counsel Markman; WRM Johnson; IWVGA staff: General Manager Ron Strand, Phill Hall, Kern County; administrator Alan Christensen, Kern County.
2. Pumper Groups included Navy (federal), IWVWD and mutual (municipal), Searles (industrial), Agricultural (large and small), and Domestic/De Minimis (private wells).
3. Individual pumper group meetings held one to two hours each.
4. WRM key points for each pumper group meetings are attached.

B. Special Counsel/WRM Key Take-Away Points

1. Imported water is required for “sustainability”. IWV should have been working on new imported water many years ago. Some indicated imported water is not feasible for IWV and strict limited “public health and safety” pumping should be enforced”.
2. Total basin pumping should be “ramped down” to allow for pumpers adjustments. IWVGA should try to limit economic and lifestyle impacts. The ramp down period should be agreed to by all pumpers.
3. The cost of imported water and the pumping ramp down plan must be equitable to all pumpers.
4. The Navy will continue to exercise its Reserved rights to pump groundwater, and should document conservation efforts. There is a significant Navy work staff living off of the Base that must have affordable water, or they may relocate to the Base and just increase the Reserved right pumping.
5. Some important technical information is needed.
 - a. Do we have adequate water in-storage to support the agreed upon ramp-down pumping?

- b. Will there be water quality impacts that result from the ramp-down pumping of water in storage?
 - c. Will there be additional impacts to shallow wells during ramp-down pumping? Can this be mitigated?
- 6. Pumping allocations, ramp-down of pumping, potential transferability of unused pumping allocation, funding of imported water, and assessments for excess-pumping are all issues to be addressed.

IWVGA

PUMPER GROUP ALLOCATION MEETING 1 – AGRICULTURAL

(OCTOBER 1, 2018)

KEY POINTS

1. Ag must be treated fairly. No representation on IWVGA Board.
2. Imported water required with/without Ag pumping.
3. Willing to cooperate.
4. For many, farms are livelihood.
5. Would like to use White/Discussion Paper as the guide.
6. Di Minimis pumper's must pay fair share.
7. Imported water is possible, must have ramp down too, must address shallow/domestic wells during ramp down.

IWVGA

PUMPER GROUP ALLOCATION MEETING 1 – FEDERAL RESERVE/NAVY

(OCTOBER 1, 2018)

KEY POINTS

1. Navy estimate of “short-term” future use/needs is 2,041 AFY, includes a 25% increase.
2. In 1971, 13,000 people lived on-base. From 1971 to mid-1980’s most moved to Ridgecrest.
3. Navy has instituted significant conservation, 53%.
4. Navy is now estimating its “off-Base” water use by employees – may be part of Reserve Right.
5. Recommends Ramp Down, use of Imported Water, coordinate with LADWP on existing turnout, relocate the Chubb Fish (save 400-800 AFY).

IWVGA

PUMPER GROUP ALLOCATION MEETING 1 – INDUSTRIAL/SEARLES

(OCTOBER 1, 2018)

KEY POINTS

1. Searles/mining goes back to early 1900's.
2. SVM water use has been steady at about 2,600 AFY since 1950's, during expansion and water conservation. Searles to provide conservation info.
3. Must import water. Searles will share fair cost – able to absorb into financials. No shutdown or reduction.
4. Willing to use alternative sources, recycled water/brine.

IWVGA

PUMPER GROUP ALLOCATION MEETING 1 – DOMESTIC

(OCTOBER 1, 2018)

KEY POINTS

1. Must “import water” ASAP. Start yesterday.
2. Need to ramp down pumping. Prefer 10 years but not more than 20 years.
3. Water in storage for ramp down may have water quality issues. BLM deep wells misleading for WQ.
4. Must address shallow/domestic wells during ramp down – WL impacts. Programs – deeper wells, share existing deeper wells, drill new deeper wells to share. Needs funding.
5. Annual replenishment of 7,700 AFY is questionable. Only inflow may be from Little Lake.
6. Domestic/Di Minimis are willing to pay fair share for imported water/reliable water supply.
7. Ag reduction must be negotiated, Buy-outs or increased water costs/assessments.
8. Must have a re-vegetation plan/desert for fallowed areas (dust).

IWVGA

PUMPER GROUP ALLOCATION MEETING 1 – MUNICIPAL

(OCTOBER 1, 2018)

KEY POINTS

1. Must “ramp down”/ phase-in pumping reductions – not clear “how”? Assessments?
2. If imported water is not feasible, must reduce pumping to Domestic/Commercial “human health needs” and Navy – to reach ~7,700 AFY natural replenishment. (Panzer).
3. Water District conservation at its limits, next steps (a) program/incentive remove evaporative coolers, and (b) possible domestic irrigation reduction programs.
4. 1993 BOR report says 3MAF in storage. Estimate is 2.5MAF still in storage to use during ramp down (quality may be issue).
5. Suggest Ag convert to solar – but this requires SCE transmission upgrade.
6. Minimum Water District water use (using winter time) is about 400 AF/month or 4,800 AFY – “health and safety”.
7. Suggest Water District customers could survive a water rate “double”, from about \$60/month to about \$120/month.
8. Treat “late-comer” Ag different/stricter and be most lenient with small Ag (quantify). (Both good intention/difficult implement.)