SARCCUP Elements

- Habitat Improvement: Arundo Removal & Santa Ana Sucker fish habitat restoration
- Water Use Efficiency: Conservation-Based Rates Support, Water-use Efficient Landscaping Design
- Groundwater Banking: “Put and Take” Conjunctive Use Facilities
Initial Total Cost, $101 million

- Administration, $1,000,000, 1%
- SA Sucker Habitat Creation, $9,044,656, 9%
- Arundo Removal, $4,000,000, 4%
- Water Use Efficiency, $1,652,000, 2%
- Master Plan, $1,000,000, 1%
- Water Bank, $84,576,243, 83%
Initial SARCCUP

- Habitat Creation & Arundo Removal (conserved water supply) 2,000 AFY
- Water Use Efficiency - Turf Removal & Conservation-Based Rates (conserved water supply) 7,400 AFY
- Groundwater Bank (New Dry-Year Yield) 60,000 AFY

Total New Water Supply 69,400 AFY
SARCCUP Groundwater Banking

- 1,000,000 AF potential storage capacity in SAR GW Basins
- SARCCUP Water Bank: 180,000 AF
  - Recharge and extraction infrastructure to take advantage of wet year extraordinary supplies
  - Storage on “use-side” of major earthquake faults
  - All five agencies share in dry year yield
Simulate SARCCUP Operations:
- Recharge of wet year water
- Dry year pumping
- How water moves throughout the watershed and the SARCCUP facilities

Adaptable:
- Easily add facilities
- Can be upgraded by staff

Goals
- Fast (schematic)
- Quantify benefits and costs
- Identify future phases
## Initial and New SARCCUP Groundwater Bank Storage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groundwater Basin</th>
<th>Initial Storage (AF)</th>
<th>New Storage (AF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chino</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jacinto</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>19,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsinore</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>180,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>180,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Equivalent Storage Volume to both Lake Mathews and Pyramid Lake)
## Conjunctive Use Bank Facility Changes

### Proposed Projects to be Removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Feeder (BLF) Extension &amp; Associated Chino Basin Facilities</td>
<td>$29,302,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsinore Basin Aquifer Storage &amp; Recovery (ASR) Wells</td>
<td>$6,140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino Basin Area Project</td>
<td>$24,255,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$59,697,340</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed Projects to be Added

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chino Basin Project</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsinore Basin Project</td>
<td>$4,662,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Basin Project</td>
<td>$12,228,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Sierra Pipeline &amp; Sterling Pump Station</td>
<td>$10,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42,690,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Banks are Connected & Can Share Dry Year Yield

- Chino Basin (50,000 AF)
- Orange County (36,000 AF)
- San Bernardino Basin (64,000 AF)
- San Jacinto Basin (19,500 AF)
- Elsinore Basin (4,500 AF)
- Riverside Basin (6,000 AF)
Initial Cost Sharing Arrangement

Total SARCCUP Project Cost = $100 million

- Prop 84 Grant: $55M
- Local Match: $45M

- WMWD
- SBVMWD
- OCWD
- IEUA
- EMWD
- Arundo
- Habitat
- Administration
- Water Bank
- WUE
## SARCCUP New Scenario
### Capital Program Cost Sharing Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PM/WUE/MP-DSM</th>
<th>Arundo Removal</th>
<th>Habitat Restoration</th>
<th>Water Bank Infrastructure</th>
<th>Grant Adjustment</th>
<th>Total Cost Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMWD</strong></td>
<td>$636,649</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,264,214</td>
<td>$(2,749,266)</td>
<td>$7,151,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IEUA</strong></td>
<td>$636,649</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,264,214</td>
<td>$(2,749,266)</td>
<td>$7,151,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCWD</strong></td>
<td>$636,649</td>
<td>$2,488,053</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$(613,561)</td>
<td>$2,511,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SBVMWD</strong></td>
<td>$636,649</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,034,282</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$(1,230,244)</td>
<td>$4,440,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WMWD</strong></td>
<td>$636,649</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,264,214</td>
<td>$(2,749,266)</td>
<td>$7,151,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$3,183,245</td>
<td>$2,488,053</td>
<td>$5,034,282</td>
<td>$27,792,641</td>
<td>$(10,091,603)</td>
<td>$(a)$28,406,620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Locally funded cost share ($28,406,620) is 34.1% of total project cost.
### Prop 84 DWR 2015 Implementation Agreement

#### Recommended Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source (Funding Match)</th>
<th>Additional Cost Share</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>% Funding Match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project 1: Grant Administration</td>
<td>$3,213,384</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,213,384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 2: Newhope-Placentia Trunk Sewer (NHP)</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>$73,890,000</td>
<td>$104,890,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Project 2-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 3: 2015 Integrated Watershed Protection Program</td>
<td>$5,054,302</td>
<td>$9,060,000</td>
<td>$16,379,698</td>
<td>$30,494,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 4: Santa Ana River Conservation and Conjunctive Use Program</td>
<td>$55,000,000</td>
<td>$25,300,000</td>
<td>$3,106,618</td>
<td>$83,406,618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,500,000</td>
<td>$15,772,800</td>
<td>$101,272,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$64,267,686</td>
<td>$69,560,000</td>
<td>$106,042,597</td>
<td>$239,870,283</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                                      | $64,360,000  | $93,376,316                                      | $222,004,002          |                |                 |
**Recommendation**

- Direct staff to execute an amendment to the SAWPA/DWR Grant Agreement to reflect revised SARCCUP Project Facilities as recommended by the Project Agreement 23 Committee subject to minor facility cost adjustments
Questions?
Technical Writing/Grant Writing Support Services

Presented by Mark Norton P.E.,
Water Resources & Planning Manager

SAWPA Commission
December 19, 2017
SAWPA need for Technical/Grant Writing Services

- Included in the approved FY 17-19 SAWPA Budget for staff that the SAWPA Commission agreed could be used for consulting services instead
- Fulfills SAWPA Strategic Assessment need to address OWOW and Roundtable goals and objectives
- Improves ability to communicate OWOW Plan Update 2018 to decision makers
- Improves sharing of beneficial outcome of Roundtable projects
- Supports Brine Line marketing and business plan updates
SAWPA Approved the Following Oct. 16, 2017

- Issue Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to provide Technical and Grant writing services.

- Obtain approval for list of qualified consultants for SAWPA to use on an as-needed basis.

- Negotiate consultant support services as needed using funds that were included in the FY 17-19 budget for this purpose.

- Bring proposed consultant agreements back to the Commission for authorization and execution.
# List of Qualified Consultants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Firm</th>
<th>Technical Writing</th>
<th>Grant Writing</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dudek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNS Engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodard &amp; Curran</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blais &amp; Associates</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammons Strategies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kahlen Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two firms, Blue Tomorrow and CA Consulting, did not meet qualifications so six remaining firms are recommended for approval for on-call list.
Technical Writing Services Contract

- Four firms were interviewed for expertise in technical writing services.
- Immediate need exists to bring on consultant to support OWOW Plan Update 2018.
- Dudek is recommended to best meet SAWPA immediate technical writing needs.
- Additional contracts for other services forthcoming in January 2018.
Future Technical and Grant Writing Contracts

Forthcoming in January 2018

- Roundtable Results Reporting and Handouts
- Cowbird Trapping Results Briefing Document
- Inland Empire Brine Line Business Plan Update
- Inland Empire Brine Line Marketing Materials
Recommendation

- Approve the list of qualified firms that could provide technical writing and grant writing support services to SAWPA on an as needed basis.

- Execute Task Order No. DUDEK373-01 with Dudek in the amount of $25,600 and Amendment No. 1 to the General Services Agreement to provide technical writing services in support of the SAWPA Planning Department and the OWOW Plan Update 2018.
Questions?
Dudek Scope of Work

- Conduct a complete review of the OWOW 2.0 Plan, and evaluate the current content and document structure in relation to the 2016 IRWM Plan.

- Complete a review of document items that require refreshing, including dates, names, acronyms, figures and exhibits. Track the necessary updates within the OWOW Plan, as well as in a separate tracking sheet. This effort will exclude Chapter 5 and its subchapters.

- Provide SAWPA with a mark-up version of the OWOW 2.0 Plan, taking into account items related to passive language, duplicative material, and clarity.

- Provide an online tool for use by consultant and SAWPA staff to manage the OWOW update process, with version control, task tracking, and timelines.
Technical Writing Support
Grant Writing Support – Pursues all types of grants
Inland Empire Brine Line
Reach 4D Rehabilitation Work Plan
RFP

Item 6.C.

December 19, 2017
Recommendation to Commission
- Direct staff to release a RFP for engineering services for the Reach 4D Rehabilitation Work Plan
Background
Background

Exposed Concrete Pipe Invert

T-Lock Liner Termination

Project Boundaries

Angle Of Coverage Per Job Specifications

PVC Liner
Embedded PVC Liner Rib

Inland Empire Brine Line, Reach IVD and IVE
RFP for Reach 4D Work Plan

Scope of Work

- Field Investigation to Confirm Extent of the Problem
- Evaluate and Recommend Potential Repair Methods
- Identify Work Area Requirements
- Identify CEQA Requirements
- Prepare Preliminary Schedule and Cost Estimate
RFP Schedule

- Direct Staff to Issue RFP  Dec 19, 2017
- Pre-proposal Meeting  Jan 10, 2018
- Proposals Due  Jan 19, 2018
- Conduct Interview of Top Proposing Firms  Jan 31, 2018
- Recommend Award  Feb 20, 2018
Recommendation to Commission

- Direct staff to release a RFP for engineering services for the Reach 4D Rehabilitation Work Plan
Questions
Reach 5 Rehabilitation and Improvement Project – Phase 1
Notice of Completion

Item 6.D.

December 19, 2017
Project Summary

Task 1, 2 (Reach 1)
- Remove 3,340’ of deficient PVC/CIPP and replace with new PVC Pipe

Task 3 (Reach 1)
- Remove by-pass line

Task 4 (Reach 2 and 3)
- CIPP Line 10,722 ft
- Remove and Replace 1,366 ft
- No Lining 416 ft
## Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Authorized Amount</th>
<th>Expenditures Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction (Weka)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Task 1, 2 (Deficient Work)</td>
<td>$2,116,207</td>
<td>$2,107,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Task 3 (Remove By-Pass Reach 1)</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$598,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Task 4 (Reach 2 and 3 CIPP) (a.)</td>
<td>$12,950,113</td>
<td>$12,091,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$15,666,320</td>
<td>$14,798,239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a.) Includes estimated costs for final application for payment from Contractor.
Recommendation

- Authorize the GM to accept the Weka, Inc. work as complete and direct staff to file a Notice of Completion with the Riverside County Clerk upon the following:
  - Contractor has delivered all documents required by the Contract Documents
  - Notice from Engineer accepting the work
  - Receipt of Final Application for Payment from the Contractor
  - Notice from Construction Manager recommending final payment
Questions?
## Reach V Repair Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period Ending</th>
<th>10/31/2017</th>
<th>Projections</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>618,788.36</td>
<td>160,746.76</td>
<td>779,535.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>268,773.08</td>
<td>70,919.19</td>
<td>339,692.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>965,399.82</td>
<td>229,028.29</td>
<td>1,194,428.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contract Services</td>
<td>177,020.46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>177,020.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>3,354,586.54</td>
<td>373,042.30</td>
<td>3,727,628.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>129,269.63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>129,269.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting</td>
<td>8,220.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,220.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>21,533,939.71</td>
<td>736,844.00</td>
<td>22,270,783.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>1,306,704.40</td>
<td>1,193,295.60</td>
<td>2,500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Supplies</td>
<td>3,174.80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,174.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting &amp; Travel</td>
<td>7,618.39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,618.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Expense</td>
<td>2,513.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,513.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping and Postage</td>
<td>548.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>548.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expense</td>
<td>1,233.37</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>3,233.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Interest</td>
<td>88,960.82</td>
<td>141,908.18</td>
<td>230,869.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Expenditures**: $28,466,789  
**Total Projections**: $2,907,784  
**Total**: $31,374,574

**Project Budget (4/18/2017 Commission Meeting)**: $32,262,000
# Ovality Results / Segment Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment #</th>
<th>Length (ft)</th>
<th>Ovality Range</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.5% - 9.5%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>2.3% - 9.4%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>1.3% - 11.5%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1.5% - 8.0%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1.4% - 3.9%</td>
<td>No Lining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1.3% - 9.0%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1.0% - 7.5%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1.5% - 10.4%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1.6% - 10.0%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6.0% - 16.5%</td>
<td>Remove and Replace Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1.6% - 7.7%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0.7% - 9.0%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11B.</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>0.7% - 9.0%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1.5% - 12.0%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>4.0% - 18.0%</td>
<td>CIPP (Increase wall thickness at 18% Ovality, 9ft) Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>3.6% - 13.5%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>3.3% - 16.1%</td>
<td>Remove and Replace Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ovality Results / Segment Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment #</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Ovality Range</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>400 ft</td>
<td>2.9% - 11.2%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>350 ft</td>
<td>3.2% - 12.4%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>350 ft</td>
<td>1.4% - 12.0%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>510 ft</td>
<td>1.0% - 8.0%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>270 ft</td>
<td>2.2% - 8.0%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>470 ft</td>
<td>0.6% - 7.0%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>225 ft</td>
<td>1.2% - 7.8%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>354 ft</td>
<td>0.6% - 7.0%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>446 ft</td>
<td>1.4% - 10.6%</td>
<td>CIPP Line on 10/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>654 ft</td>
<td>1.1% - 8.5%</td>
<td>CIPP Line on 10/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>400 ft</td>
<td>0.4% - 10.2%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>350 ft</td>
<td>0.4% - 10.2%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>660 ft</td>
<td>0.5% - 8.5%</td>
<td>CIPP Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>69 ft</td>
<td>1.2% - 8.2%</td>
<td>Remove and Replace Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29B.</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
<td>0.0% - &lt;5%</td>
<td>No Lining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>650 ft</td>
<td>2.7% - 10.4%</td>
<td>Remove and Replace Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>232 ft</td>
<td>0.9% - 7.9%</td>
<td>Remove and Replace Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chino Basin Conjunctive Use Environmental Water Storage/Exchange Program

The Chino Basin Project
Project Partners & Supporters

- Chino Basin Desalter Authority
- Chino Basin Watermaster
- Jurupa Community Services District
- Metropolitan Water District of So. California
- Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority
- Southern California Water Committee
- The Nature Conservancy
- Western Municipal Water District
Provides ecological benefits north & south of Delta
New source of conjunctively managed water
Not dependent on climate
New Source of Water, Not Dependent on the Delta

- Reliable new dedicated water supply
- Available on-call anytime, including dry, critically dry and successive dry years
- Flexible delivery of water (i.e., annually or all at once)

Source: http://www.keepcalmandflyfish.com/search?q=feather+river

Chino Basin Project — 4
Ref: A1 Executive Summary P 2, 5, 8, 11, 13
State Water Project (SWP) Deliveries to Southern California
- From Lake Oroville
- Across the Delta
- Pumped through the SWP California Aqueduct
- Delivered to partnering SWP contracting agencies

IEUA treats 54 TAF/year of recycled water
- 15 TAF/year currently available for other uses

TAF: Thousand Acre Feet
**Ecosystem Benefits**
- Reliable new dedicated water supply
- Available on-call anytime, including dry, critically dry and successive dry years
- Increased Delta outflow
- Borrowing capacity starting 2020

**Proposed Project**
- Advanced water treatment of recycled water
- Stored as new water in the local basin – flexible, secure and resilient
- Continue supply for Santa Ana River ecosystem
- On-call from DFW, deliver water from storage for Delta ecosystem benefits

**Simple Water Exchange**
Chino Basin groundwater in exchange for release of stored water at Lake Oroville
Borrow Capacity from Existing Surplus Groundwater

- Utilize surplus Chino Basin storage
- Leverage existing infrastructure
- Project benefit as early as 2020

Ref: A3 Program Description P 1, 7, 15
Provide Ecological Benefits to Delta

- Dedicates blocks of water for ecological needs
- Lake Oroville discharges benefit the Feather River, fall and spring run Chinook salmon and aquatic habitat

Chino Basin Project Components

- Advanced water treatment facility
- Wells and treatment system
- Pipelines and interconnection
- Secure supply for Santa Ana River discharges
- Local agencies pay for operations and maintenance costs, while 100% supply is dedicated to Delta
Chino Basin Project Public Benefits

- Reliable **new water supply** in all types of years
- **Flexible delivery** of water (annually, all at once, etc.)
- **Dedicates blocks of water** for ecological needs
  - Lake Oroville discharges benefit the Feather River, **fall and spring run Chinook salmon** and aquatic habitat
- **Enhances local water quality** in the Chino Basin
- **Emergency response** supply for Southern California
  - Through agreements with State Water Project Contractor(s)
Chino Basin Project Non-Public Benefits

• Frees up capacity in California Aqueduct, improving **flexibility & resilience** of State Water Project operations

• Ensures **sustainable groundwater management** by increasing local groundwater recharge

• Addresses historical Chino Basin land subsidence

• Year-round flows provide **ecological benefits** for Santa Ana River

Chino Basin Project Timeline & Milestones

- Grant Application: Aug 2017
- Early Project Benefit Borrowing Capacity Available: 2020
- Final Environmental Document: 2020
- Agreements Executed: 2020
- Permits & Design Complete Begin Construction: 2021
- Facilities Startup: 2025
Create a dedicated environmental water account with 100% of the water available for Delta Benefits while providing regional and local water resiliency benefits.

Consistent with California Water Action Plan.
A. Proposed project assets to be acquired with WSIP funds

1. Secure commitments for continued discharge of 15,000 acre-feet per year of treated wastewater from upstream sources tributary to the Santa Ana River for 25 years. Estimated capital cost: $95 million
2. Construct advanced water treatment and distribution facilities to produce and store 15,000 acre-feet per year and recharge this treated water in the Chino Basin Water Bank (CBWB). Estimated capital cost: $180 million
3. Construct facilities to extract and treat water withdrawn from the CBWB and connect to a partnering State Water Project Contractor (SWPC) (Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWDSC) and/or the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District (SBVMWD)) distribution system with capacity of 50,000 acre-feet per year. Estimated capital cost: $205 million

B. Proposed financing of ongoing O&M costs

1. The annual operations and maintenance (O&M) costs will be allocated among the local agencies and SWPC.
2. Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA) to pay approximately 75 percent of total anticipated costs for annual O&M of $910 per acre-foot for 25 years. IEUA to pay all ongoing O&M costs after 25 years.
3. Partnering SWPC to pay approximately 25 percent of total anticipated costs for annual O&M of $910 per acre-foot for 25 years. (To be negotiated)
4. Project assets revert to IEUA after the end of the 25-year project life span for local use.

C. Proposed operational strategy

1. 15,000 acre-feet per year of new water produced by the advanced water treatment facilities will be stored in the CBWB.
2. When an ecosystem need arises (dry and critical years in the operations proposed here), up to 50,000 acre-feet per year for up to three sequential years can be extracted from the CBWB and provided to the partnering SWPC.
3. Partnering SWPC would forebear delivery of SWP Table A delivery of an equivalent amount provided by the CBWB.
4. State of California Department of Water Resources (DWR) would dedicate the equivalent amount of water that would have been delivered to the partnering SWPC to instream flow purposes and release from Lake Oroville per a schedule provided by California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW)

D. Proposed institutional arrangements

1. DFW agrees to manage its participation in the CBEWP. DFW agrees to make calls for water for instream flow purposes subject to terms of their participation, including availability of stored water or borrowing capacity, in quantities and schedule DFW determines will provide optimum ecosystem benefit.
2. DWR agrees to seek a water right change under Section 1707 of the Water Code to provide the ability to dedicate water released from Lake Oroville for instream flow purposes. Terms of the water right change would include conditions and requirements for implementing dedicated instream flow, including availability of alternative water to substitute for scheduled delivery of Table A water to SWPC and no injury to other water rights holders and SWP contractors. DWR agrees to release water from Lake Oroville per terms of agreement and an approved Water Code Section 1707 petition and further agrees not to export those releases. DWR agrees to negotiate and complete any needed amendments to the SWP water supply contract with SWPC.
3. IEUA agrees to manage CBEWP operations within the CBWB and provide water to SWPC subject to availability when called by DFW.
4. SWPC agrees to accept alternative supply from CBWB when called by DFW and forebear delivery of SWP Table A. SWPC agrees to pay IEUA a to-be-determined contribution towards operating costs of the water bank, as informed by the cost savings realized by not paying transportation costs for delivery of SWP water and any reduced treatment costs associated with the improved quality of CBEWP supplies compared to imported SWP water. SWPC agrees to negotiate and complete any needed amendments to SWP water supply contract with DWR.

C Proposed project operational parameters

1. Reserve 100,000 acre-feet of storage capacity in the CBWB for Chino Basin Environmental Water Program Operations, to be used for deposit of up to 15,000 acre-feet in each year for 25 years of water produced by the project’s advanced water treatment facilities, and accessible for withdrawal at a maximum capacity of 50,000 acre-feet per year, when an ecosystem need arises (dry and critical years in the operations proposed here, and up to three years in sequence).
2. Provide up to 50,000 acre-feet per year of “borrowed water” from the CBWB in advance of deposits, with a maximum “credit limit” of 100,000 acre-feet. Any borrowed water must be returned to the CBWB by the end of 25 years.
Chino Basin Project

Halla Razak
General Manager
Inland Empire Utilities Agency

6075 Kimball Avenue
Chino, CA 91708
(909) 993-1762
www.ieua.org
California Environmental Quality Act and Right of Entry Agreement

SAWPA Commission
December 19, 2017

Ian Achimore
Senior Watershed Manager
Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority
Purpose of Commission Item

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

Property Access
Santa Ana Sucker and Project Overview

- Listed under the Endangered Species Act in 2000
- “The most pressing threat is the lack of suitable habitat” U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2014
- Sucker’s habitat includes rock and cobble
- Project seeks to expose rock beneath sandy river bottom
- Construction Estimate: $136K

Photo/graphic credit: Santa Ana Watershed Association and Scheevel Engineering
Roundtable: Santa Ana Sucker Conservation Team

Team Members:

Team Description:
Determine reasons for the decline of the Sucker in the Watershed, and devise strategies for its recovery.

Team Benefits:
Receive grant funding regulated entities not eligible to receive.
Team projects improve baseline of species.
Funding
Project Schedule

- September 2017 – Briefed Commission on CEQA
- November 2017 – CEQA Public Comment Period
- December 2017 – CEQA and Right of Entry Approval
- January 2018 – Submit Permit Applications
- Summer 2018 – Public Works Bid Process
- Fall 2018 – Construct Project
Project Area

- Land owned by Riverside County Parks.
- Standard Right of Entry Agreement Conditions.
- Waived Agreement Fee.
CEQA and Mitigation Monitoring

• Comment Period: Nov 2017
• Scoping Meeting: Nov 16, 2017
• Three comments
  – Native American Heritage Commission
  – Riverside County Department of Transportation
  – San Bernardino County Department of Public Works
**Expected Useful Life**

With $136K Available Funding; Built for Flow Levels of 2,500 Cubic Feet Per Second

Cost of $2M; Built for Flow Levels of 10,000 Cubic Feet Per Second

Graphic credit: Schevel Engineering, Burbex, City of Los Angeles
Recommendation

Take the following actions with respect to the Project:

- Conduct a public hearing and consider any public comments and comment responses to the Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

- Adopt:
  - The Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.
  - The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

- Direct Staff to file a Notice of Determination.

- Approve execution of a right of entry agreement with the Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District.
Water Energy Community Action Network

Mike Antos, Ph.D.
Senior Watershed Manager

SAWPA Commission Meeting
December 19, 2017
Distribution of benefits across the watershed fairly and equitably.
Roundtable Business Line - Critical Success Factors

SAWPA’s reputation as a trusted leader and administrator.
State of WECAN

- Grant admin and program on budget

- Following extension granted by DWR, on-schedule for Dec 2018 completion.
WECAN Background

- Funding via Water-Energy Nexus grant from DWR, matched by local dollars from retail water supply partners
- For disadvantaged communities, providing:
  - Indoor fixture retrofits to save water and energy
  - Outdoor front-yard turf replacement
  - Training on landscape maintenance
Our team

- Five funding partners
- Three Community Action Partnerships
- Three consultant firms
## Achievements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixture</th>
<th>No. Installed</th>
<th>Perc. Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HE Toilets</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-flow showerheads</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermostatic Shower Valves</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faucet Aerators</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE Hot Water Heaters</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Water Heater Blankets</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turf Partner</th>
<th>Sq. Ft. Removed</th>
<th>Perc. Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim PU</td>
<td>28,035</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana WC</td>
<td>24,120</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa CSD</td>
<td>77,190</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley WD</td>
<td>33,346</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAWPA Recognition

San Bernardino County Community Action Partnership

1. Supervisors of San Bernardino County
2. California State Senator Mike Morrell (23rd)
3. California State Senator Connie Leyva (20th)
4. California State Assemblymember Freddie Rodriguez (52nd)
5. California State Assemblymember Tom Lackey (36th)
6. California State Assemblymember Chad Mayes (42nd)
7. California State Assemblymember Eloise Gomez Reyes (47th)
8. California State Assemblymember Marc Steinorth (40th)
9. US House of Representative Norma Torres (35th)
10. US House of Representatives Pete Aguilar (31st)
MOU Amendment

- Committed to 92,500 square feet of turf removal
- Decided to stop prior to that achievement at about 77,000 square feet removed

- Committed to 32,500 square feet of turf removal
- Wants to do 20,000 additional
The memo recommends:

1. That the Commission authorize the General Manager to negotiate and sign an amendment to the MOU between SAWPA and the Anaheim Public Utilities to accept an additional $40,000 of match dollars from the Anaheim Public Utilities to execute the Water Energy Community Action Network Project.