

Monterey Peninsula Water Management District

95-10 Project Constraints Analysis

Prepared for:

Monterey Peninsula Water Management District
5 Harris Court, Building G
Monterey, CA 93942-0085
Contact: Andy Bell



Prepared by:

ICF Jones & Stokes
630 K Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814
Contact: Mike Rushton
916/737-3000



and

Camp, Dresser & McKee, Inc.
100 Pringle Avenue, Suite 300
Walnut Creek, CA 94596-3580
Contact: Polly Boissevain



August 2008

Data Gaps and Next Steps

Key data gaps identified in the Phase 1 analysis and next steps to implement a project are presented below. Table 6 summarizes the next steps, including a schedule and budget range.

1. Address Policy Issues Related to Implementation Feasibility

Three significant policy issues were identified that could affect project implementation. Although agency discussions were held as part of this Phase 1 analysis, further work is advisable to more definitively address these issues and determine whether they preclude project implementation. It is assumed that ICF Jones & Stokes staff would initiate these discussions, with support from CDM as needed.

- Inter-basin Transfer. As noted in this document, Chapter 52-21 of the MCWRA enabling legislation specifically prohibits the extraction and export of groundwater outside of the Salinas Basin except for use at Fort Ord. Initial discussions with the MCWRA indicate that while not a fatal flaw, this issue is significant and could considerably lengthen the implementation timeline for a project. Further discussion with MCWRA and agricultural stakeholders regarding use of the 180-foot and Dune Sands aquifers in the northern portion of former Fort Ord is advised. Additionally, a hydrogeologic determination- consisting of review and interpretation of existing information- should be conducted for the Dune Sands basin boundary.
- SWRCB Anti-Degradation Policy. Per this policy, a project cannot result in degradation of groundwater quality from saline intrusion below that which currently exists. Confirmation is advised as to how the policy would be applied to use of the 180-foot and Dune Sands aquifers along the southern Monterey Bay coastline.
- Site Review with DPR. General plan information was used to identify Fort Ord Dunes State Park “development areas” (areas not set aside as habitat) with potential for well sites, and two meetings were held to review well placement concepts with local DPR representatives. Additional work is needed to define specific DPR plans/locations for facilities, to refine site constraints and identify potential well site locations, both for field programs and permanent facilities. A meeting should also be held with regional representatives at DPR to review potential projects.

2. Perform Phase 2 Technical Evaluations

If completion of the policy issues review indicates that a project is still feasible, MPWMD should authorize Phase 2 of the CDM engineering scope for collection and analysis of additional hydrogeology and engineering information to describe a project and alternatives. Key activities are identified below:

- Field Hydrogeologic Investigations. Conduct field investigations to refine well siting locations and yields. Field activities would include:
 - Place exploratory borings to verify the extent and continuity of the clay layer overlying the Paso Robles Formation at the project sites.
 - Install test production and observation wells in the Dune Sands aquifer at Bunker and Stilwell sites to assess potential project yields. The Stilwell site testing could also be used to further assess whether the Dune Sands aquifer in this location is within the Salinas Basin.
 - Perform flow testing and monitoring on installed test production wells.
- Groundwater Modeling. Conduct groundwater modeling to assess potential impacts to the Salinas and Seaside Basins.
- Outfall Brine Characterization Studies. The MRWPCA NPDES permit would require brine characterization studies to assess brine constituents and how constituent levels relate to the permitted levels in the NPDES permit.
- Project Description. Using information from the 2004 CDM study, the project description for all project aspects would be updated and finalized. This would include identifying specific WTP locations, evaluating raw and treated water pipeline alignments and connections to CAW distribution/transmission facilities. Project facilities layouts and cost estimates would be prepared.

3. Prepare Phase 3 EIR.

ICF Jones & Stokes, with support from CDM, would prepare a draft and final EIR on the project and alternatives identified in Phase 2.

Table 6. Summary of Next Steps, Schedule and Initial Budget Estimates

Activity/Task	Schedule	Budget	
1. Complete Policy Review for Projects Additional consultations with MCWRA, RWQCB, DPR	Sep – Oct 2008	\$13,000	- \$19,000
2. Authorize Phase 2 Scope of Work - Detailed Facilities Plan for EIR	Nov 2008 – Apr 2010		
Field Hydrogeology Investigations		\$150,000	- \$250,000
Groundwater Modeling		\$70,000	- \$150,000
Outfall Brine Characterization Studies		\$50,000	- \$100,000
Finalize Project Descriptions		\$40,000	- \$80,000
Project Management		\$40,000	- \$80,000
		\$350,000	- \$660,000
3. Authorize Phase 3 Scope of Work - Prepare EIR	May – Dec 2010	\$200,000	- \$250,000
Project Totals		\$563,000	- \$929,000