

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: BRUCE BUEL *BB*
DATE: OCT. 20, 2006

**AGENDA ITEM
E-4
OCT. 25, 2006**

WATER ALLOCATION AND ANNEXATION POLICY DEVELOPMENT

ITEM

Receive Presentation on Water Allocation and Annexation Policy Issues and Schedule Special Meeting to Consider Revisions to Water Allocation Policy and Annexation Policy [Receive Presentation and set meeting]

BACKGROUND

Your Honorable Board set this item to further its discussion of the respective policy issues. Staff is scheduled to summarize the Second Groundwater Technical Memorandum for SAIC and to provide feedback on Water Allocation and Annexation Policy Issues. Staff will also summarize the responses to the questions regarding the First Groundwater Technical Memorandum raised by your Honorable Board at your October 11, 2006 Meeting (See attached summary).

RECOMMENDATION

Staff believes that these two issues are related and sufficiently complex that they deserve discussion at a workshop. Staff recommends that the Board schedule a workshop starting at 9am on Wednesday November 15, 2006 at the NCSD Office. It should be noted that the WRAC will meet this same day starting at 1:30pm.

ATTACHMENTS

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS RAISED REGARDING FIRST TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

T:\BOARD MATTERS\BOARD MEETINGS\BOARD LETTER\BOARD LETTER 2006\allocation review 061025.DOC

QUESTIONS RE SAIC TECHNICAL MEMO

1. Page 1; Table 1 – Is the DWR Estimate of 84,000 AF of GW in storage above Sea Level for the Hydrologic Sub-Area the same number as Page 90 of the 2002 DWR Report?

RESPONSE: Yes.

2. Page 1; Table 1 – Do the storage values assume continuous saturation below the surface of the Groundwater Level?

RESPONSE: Yes.

3. Page 1; Table 1 – Do the storage values assume a constant specific yield of 11.7% throughout the aquifer?

RESPONSE: Yes.

4. Page 1; Table 1 – Is there a difference between potentially useable volume and total volume of groundwater above sea level? If so, can we quantify the two measures?

RESPONSE: The difference between potentially useable volume and total volume is established through the assumed specific yield. The 121,000 acre feet presented in the Technical Memorandum is potentially useable groundwater above sea level; however, the capture system would need to avoid any cones of depression in order to get 100% of the potentially useable storage.

5. Page 1; Table 1 – Were all of the “non-rejected wells” from table 2 used to calculate the 2006 storage volume? Some of the wells at the bottom of Page 1 of Table 2 appear to be East Side wells outside of the NMMA, if so, were they used??

RESPONSE: All of the “Non-Rejected” wells listed on Table 2 were used in the analysis. The East Side wells are listed so that SAIC can estimate the surface geometry of the groundwater at the interface of the NMMA and the East Side aquifer.

6. Page 1; Table 1 – Where can I get a listing of the wells used to compute the 2000 storage volume?

RESPONSE: SAIC will supply this table to NCSD by close of business 10/27/06.

7. Figure 2 and Figure 3 – What is the meaning of the white perimeter at the bottom of the side view (cut away)? If it is bedrock or aquiclude, why is it different between Figure 2 and Figure 3?

RESPONSE: Figure 2 and 3 are not cross sections as we see in traditional representations of hydrogeologic characteristics, similar to plan and profile views in engineering work. Instead, they represent the top of the groundwater (or groundwater surface elevation) predicted at each point along the “angle of view” as shown in the inset figure. The maximum groundwater surface elevation along the

“angle of view” is represented by the top of the colored field and the minimum groundwater surface elevation along the “angle of view” is represented by the bottom of the colored field. Thus, the elevations within the white space at the base of the colored field are elevations where groundwater exists along the entire “angle of view”. The difference between 2000 and 2006 is because the pumping that occurred in the interval changed the lowest groundwater surface elevation along the transect line.

8. Figure 2 and Figure 3 – Is Sea Level accurately illustrated??

RESPONSE: Yes. The sea level line displayed is a constant that did not change between 2000 and 2006, however, the graphic above the sea level line must be interpreted as stated above instead of a traditionally cross section above a reference point or line.