

Summary of Activity to Develop an Alternative Water Supply
for the San Lucas Water District

September 21, 2016
Prepared by G.H. Nichols, PE

2003	<i>Replace existing storage tank & water mains.</i> County uses \$400,000 CDBG grant to replace San Lucas Water District's existing storage tank and transmission lines. This funding was awarded based on the affordable housing that would be provided by a 33-unit CHISPA project.
2005	<i>Upgrade sewer ponds; discover TDS in well.</i> County uses \$248,500 CDBG grant to improve the District's wastewater treatment facility to support the proposed CHISPA development. RWQCB discharge permit could not be issued for the treatment facility because of high TDS in the treated effluent. County determines the source of the problem is the District's existing well.
2008	<i>Recommend new well.</i> County uses \$40,000 CDBG Planning and Technical Assistance (PTA) grant to analyze solutions to resolve the TDS problem at the well. Report recommends a new well be drilled closer to the Salinas River, and the existing well be reserved as a back up well.
2010	<i>Property owner refuses access for test well.</i> State HCD approves \$183,000 CDBG Program Income to drill the required test well and complete environmental review. This work could not be started because the property owner would not grant access easements for the proposed test well site.
2011	<i>Nitrates in well; bottled water order.</i> Routine water quality testing reveals elevated level in nitrates in the District's well. County Environmental Health Bureau issues a "bottled water order" to the community, to remain in effect until a replacement water supply for the community is developed.
2011	<i>Updated analysis continues to recommend new well – question re surface water influence.</i> County updates the study for the proposed new well site in light of the elevated nitrate levels. Amended report concludes the proposed new well site would likely address the nitrate issue as well as TDS, although until a test well is installed and water testing accomplished this conclusion cannot be confirmed. During inter-agency review, questions arose regarding possibility of surface water influence at the proposed new well site, which could lead to possible need for appropriative water right.
2012	<i>RWQCB issues Notice of Violation to property owner and lessee,</i> stating their changed farming practices are the cause of the nitrate contamination in the Water District's public water supply. Mission Ranches continued to provide bottled water to the community at no charge, implemented repairs to the District's well, and developed an alternative site to drill a new well for the community.
2012	<i>Water District adopts resolution authorizing County to continue to assist the District</i> to improve its community water supply by acting on behalf of the District to seek funding to design and construct a new municipal water supply project. County submits application to CDPH for SDWSRF project planning funds
2013	<i>CDPH approves Funding Agreement with the County and Water District</i> for a "planning grant" in the amount of \$440,000 to prepare a Feasibility Study and complete the Engineering Design. Agreement requires completion of the construction-ready plans, specifications, rights-of-way, and permits by April 15, 2015.
Feb 2014	<i>County retains AMEC Environmental and Infrastructure Inc.,</i> (now Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.) for the consulting engineering services necessary to implement the project. Work begins on the Feasibility Report required as the first phase of the scope of work.
Nov 2014	<i>Mission Ranches drills new "interim" well</i> on their property to provide potable water to San Lucas at no cost until such time as Water District can implement a new permanent water supply. This well continues to provide water to the community.

March 2015	SWRCB executes Amendment to Funding Agreement to extend the completion date to October 15, 2016.
May 2015	Feasibility Study is completed and circulated for review. Consultant recommends Alternative 2, acquisition of Mission Ranches new interim well with treatment as may be required. This is the “least-cost” alternative.
Sept 2015	Water District selects intertie pipeline alternative. After a four-month review process involving a large number of meetings and consultations with staffs of SWRCB, RWQCB, County Environmental Health Bureau, and County Water Resources Agency, together with the affected landowner and agricultural lessee, the Water District Board of Directors selects Alternative 4, purchase water from California Water Services via construction of a seven-mile intertie pipeline to King City. This decision was based on the Board’s evaluation of all the feedback and input received on the Feasibility Study, determination that the other options either cannot be funded or are not feasible, and the looming expiration of the SDWSRF grant.
Oct 2015	SWRCB approves selection of pipeline alternative. SWRCB staff confirms approval for the District to proceed with the Preliminary Engineering phase of the intertie pipeline project.
Dec 2015	Start work on pipeline design; update design budget. Consulting firm embarks on Preliminary Engineering of intertie pipeline project, and updates its scope of services and fee estimate to perform engineering design, environmental review, acquisition of permits and easements, and completion of construction drawings and bid documents.
Feb 2016	Request to SWRCB for grant increase. County submits to SWRCB a request for a \$545,000 increase in the planning grant (to total of \$985,000) and to extend the time for completion to 2018. SWRCB staff agrees to provide time extension and increase grant by \$60,000 (to total of \$500,000). Work continues on preliminary engineering.
Aug 2016	SWRCB notifies County/Water District to stop work on design of pipeline, and instead pursue Alternative 3, new groundwater under the influence of surface water (GWUI) source. In a follow-up conference call, SWRCB states that the cost-benefit ratio for the pipeline project is significantly higher than SWRCB guidelines allow, and that there has not been adequate analysis of groundwater options. SWRCB agrees to take the lead in coordinating preparation of a scope of work for additional groundwater studies to “definitively answer all the unanswered questions” regarding possible use of groundwater as a long-term source. SWRCB says the studies should be performed by the County/Water District’s current consultant and funded by the SDWSRF grant.