Possible questions for the Parties

1. How do you intend to comply with the Governor's order with an allocation only 2% below 2013 production levels?
2. What happens if the infrastructure programs don't stop seawater intrusion? What is the plan to stop seawater intrusion then and how long will it take to implement it?
3. What happens if Broderson leach fields don't take all the water they are supposed to or cause salt build up in the Basin or destabilize soil downhill and have to be cut back?
4. What happens if seawater intrusion starts in the upper aquifer?
5. What happens if the recycled water is too high in salts for a viable recycled water program?
6. What are your specific reasons for eliminating low water use landscaping, greywater reuse, and rainwater catchment from your conservation program (did you do a detailed cost analysis factoring what it would cost for desalination and imported water?)
7. Why not use the EPA Climate Change estimates of yield for the Basin? Although the EPA scenario was a so-called "worse case" it assumes average annual rainfall of that's no unreasonable given the recent drought. Why isn't it advisable to err on the side of caution with this Basin?
8. Why do you set no time-specific objectives for implementing programs and seeing measurable improvements in Basin conditions?
9. Why do you not discuss and provide back up plans?
10. Could shifting funding of LOWWP recycled water and conservation programs to Basin Plan funding delay full implementation of those programs?
11. How much of the Basin's total capacity has been contaminated by seawater since the 1970s?
12. Shouldn't the Basin monitoring reports include an estimate and update of total storage capacity above sea level to help gauge the health and resilience of the Basin (capacity to withstand droughts and climate change).
13. If the "sustainable yield" is 2400 AFY according to the model, and you pump at 2400 AFY, when does modeling indicate seawater intrusion will stop (how many years in the future) and where will it stop?
14. Shouldn't "sustainable yield" be redefined to reverse seawater intrusion in Zone D, stop it in Zone E, and not cause salt buildup in the internal parts of the Basin. Why define it in a way that allows an undesirable condition Basin, and then recommend a 20% reduction in estimated sustainable yields to prevent that? Why not define it in a way that avoids harm to begin with?
15. If the 20% is needed to redefine "sustainable yield" as a true sustainable yield, doesn't this mean there is no margin of safety to account for modeling error. How much is the uncertainty, and uncertainty not analyzed and uncertainty values stated as recommended in the 2009 peer review?
16. Does the water level metric for Zone E stop seawater intrusion in that aquifer? What is the danger of abandoning Zone E to seawater intrusion? Can't seawater intrusion "upcone" into Zone D accelerating seawater intrusion there?

PATRICK MC GIBNEY
SIERRA CLUB
Item 14 - NOV mtg

POINTS TO ADDRESS

It may be too late to exercise your full authority and responsibility to protect the Basin, but here are some things we ask you to do.

1. The Stipulated Judgment states that the parties will still have to comply with state and federal laws for the projection of ***water quality***... Therefore, you may still have the ability to implement a water quality objective and control plan for **chlorides**. An enforceable, time-specific objective for reducing **chlorides** in the Basin is a bottom line for sustainable management of the Basin.
2. Implement or modify the **Salt and Nutrient Management Plan, Recycled Water Master Plan, and septic system management plan** so they ***require*** conservation, recycled water use, and **metering and monitoring**. All of these improve **water quality.**
3. Require a **Storm Water Management Plan** that captures and infiltrates the runoff now flowing to the estuary (as shown in the photo presented) and Los Osos Creek. The Basin Plan rejects storm water recharge as a supplemental water source, but low cost, low impact development (LID) (which your Board recognizes as the Best Management Practice) could infiltrate a substantial amount of water (possibly 200 AFY) that now pollutes the estuary and creek.
4. Request the parties to make improvements in the Basin Plan agreement.
5. Request the State Board to seek legislation to place the Basin on probationary status and intervene in the near future to ensure the Basin Plan is improved.
6. Schedule a follow up meeting to take these actions.