WRAC update for 7/1/09

I went to the TMA meeting June 10th, and was thrown out of the 5:30pm secret meeting but then I came back for the "public" meeting 6:30pm. I asked for a public record copy of the presentation and the meeting transcript but because the TMA is not a public agency they do not have to comply with the Brown Act, the Public records Act, or CEQA and I have not received a copy.

Mr Scalmanini spoke on his basin report, and made the following comments:

Confirmed "supply disposition": not used in practice but made up by lawyers, and not to be used to mean analysis of actual supply amounts:

> "The monitoring program is set up to -- we will call it provide input to how land is used for agricultural purposes, what types of crops on how many acres, those kind of things, to provide input to be able to, as I said, estimate what agricultural water requirements are for all that irrigation; to measure, in most cases, what municipal water requirements are; to measure groundwater pumping, where it is measured or keep track of those measurements is a better way to say it; keep track of imported water, how much and distribution through time; **and then finally to deal with this topic "disposition," although I think this is the first time in my career, which now 42 years, I have ever dealt with the word disposition of water. But we interpret that to mean where the water went."**

Confirmed status of basin is not overdrafted:

> "But as far as groundwater levels go in this area, the groundwater referrals in 2008 are closer to a full basin and certainly with in the historical range of fluctuations that has occurred over the past several decades. **And I mentioned the critical conditions of overdraft, because in order for that to be triggered in one way, the groundwater levels need to come down to or below where they have been historically. And this is not true here or, basically, anywhere else.**"

Confirmed no analysis of the water supplies maximum ability to supply water, And

Confirmed there is no clear understanding of what is planned to be "Exported" as "Supplemental" water:

> **There hasn't been any analysis of the availability of surplus water to the basin**, and there hasn't been any **clear definition of what is going to be exported and how that is going to comport with what is required in the Stipulation for importation of State Project Water and use of that water in the Santa Maria Valley.**

Confirmed no analysis of impacts of additional pumping needed to support the Water Inter Tie:

> "Exports of water, there weren't any in 2008. You probably all know way better than I do that there is ongoing planning for a water line inter-tie project between the Valley, between Santa Maria and Nipomo, Mesa Management Area, but specifically Nipomo Community Services District. **I looked at all the environmental documentation on that project**, and the points I thought were appropriate to make relative to the Santa Maria Valley only is that there is, **to the best of my knowledge, no existing analysis that there is surplus water in the Santa Maria Valley that is available to export** for another management or anywhere else. And **there is no analysis that I know of any impact of any planned exports on the Santa Maria Valley.**

There was no analysis of ocean outflow for 2008 or the needed outflow to prevent sea water that could be used to determine maximum useable supplies.

Confirmed Ag use is down and urban use is up for about the same "Water Requirements" as before

Confirmed Santa Maria could not meet its requirement to use Imported State Water in the valley for 2008 if it had supplied any water for "export" as "supplemental" water for Nipomo.

Questions for San Luis Obispo County :

How can there be a "shortage" if there has never been an analysis of how much surpluss water there is that can be pumped and used?

As the Pipe line project and its EIR was approved knowing that there was no analysis of the effect/affect of pumping additional water from the Santa Maria area, What is the "reliability" of that supply given the cost?

New information on other sources of supply:

Santa Maria claimed to have four "supplies" that could be sold for "supplemental water" in the EIR

Appropriated groundwater, State Water Imports, State Water Imports Return flows
And what the contested Settlement calls "Twitchell Yield"

In a dry year with little State Water Imports, Santa Maria will need Appropriated groundwater and all its reduced State Water Imports and State Water Imports Return flows. That leaves the question of what is "Twitchell Yield" and is it worth $1200 per acre foot?

20% of the "Twitchell Yield" is allocated to stipulating landowners with the Twitchell benefit district in the settlement. Of the total claimed 32,000 AF/Year of "Twitchell Yield" that places 6,400 AF/Year in the control of landowners

Preliminary estimates are that there are 21,666 Acres of land that must share a "TMA" costs of $130,000

Or **a cost of $20.3125 per acre foot per year as compared to the cost of $1200 per acre foot per year** that Santa Maria intends to charge Nipomo.

It is reported that there will be a system in place to "transfer" shares of Twitchell yield soon.

Area of Use Vs Areas of Supply