FILED
07-11-12
04:59 PM

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of California-American Water Company (U 210 W) for Approval of the Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project and Authorization to Recover All Present and Future Costs in Rates	Application No. A.12-04-019 (Filed April 23, 2012)

DECLARATION OF ROBERT B. HOLDEN IN SUPPORT OF MONTEREY REGIONAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY'S OPENING BRIEF REGARDING GROUNDWATER REPLENISHMENT PROJECT WATER RIGHTS

LENNIHAN LAW
A Professional Corporation
MARTHA H. LENNIHAN
1661 Garden Highway
Sacramento, CA 95833
Telephone: (916) 646-4460
E-mail: mlennihan@lennihan.net

Attorneys for Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency

Date: July 11, 2012

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of California-American Water Company (U 210 W) for Approval of the Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project and Authorization to Recover All Present and Future Costs in Rates	Application No. A.12-04-019 (Filed April 23, 2012)

DECLARATION OF ROBERT B. HOLDEN IN SUPPORT OF MONTEREY REGIONAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY'S OPENING BRIEF REGARDING GROUNDWATER REPLENISHMENT PROJECT WATER RIGHTS

I, Robert B. Holden, declare:

1. I am employed by the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA) as its Principal Engineer. My business address is 5 Harris Court, Building D, Monterey, CA 93940.

2. In my current position, I am responsible for managing the Groundwater Replenishment Project, the Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project, and other current and future water recycling projects.

3. I received a Bachelor of Science in Chemical Engineering from the University of California at Berkeley. I received a Master of Science in Oceanography with an emphasis in chemical oceanography from Oregon State University at Corvallis. I am a licensed Civil Engineer (Certificate Number C33105) in the State of California.

4. I have been employed by Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA) since 1989. The various positions I have held with MRWPCA include: Special Projects Engineer, Plant Engineer, Water Recycling Projects Coordinator, and Principal Engineer. I have held the position of Principal Engineer since 2008. My work at MRWPCA has included planning, research, design, construction management, and other tasks related to wastewater collection, treatment, and recycling.

5. Before MRWPCA, I was employed by James M. Montgomery Engineers (JMM) as an Engineer, Construction Manager, and Senior Engineer from 1979 through 1990 (the overlap with MRWPCA was by permission to allow me to support one of JMM's clients in on-going litigation). My work included engineering studies, design, and construction management related to wastewater collection, transmission, treatment, and recycling.

6. The purpose of this declaration is to provide the basis for my opinion that the data provided as part of the MRWPCA Opening Brief regarding GWR Water Rights are accurate.

7. I developed the spreadsheets attached hereto as Exhibits 6 through 13 which show quantities of water related to water rights. The sources of the numbers are identified on each Exhibit. The following paragraphs describe the methodology I employed to prepare each spreadsheet. It is my professional opinion that the methodology and assumptions are reasonable.

8. Exhibit 6: Column 2 reflects the average monthly wastewater influent to the Regional Treatment Plant between 1990 and 2011 (which are the first complete year of operation through the last full year of operation). This is based upon actual data from MRWPCA's NPDES reports to the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The volume of MCWD's water (columns 3 and 4) reflects the actual monthly values during 2010 from the Marina Pump Station flow meter which delivers all of the influent from the existing MCWD service area (sometimes referred to as the MCWD Annexation Agreement service area, because this is the service area that existed at the time of both the 1989 and the 1996 annexation agreements[1]) to the Regional Treatment Plant. The Regional Urban Water Augmentation (RUWAP) project flow of 1,427 AFY was segmented into monthly demands using CH2M Hill's technical memorandum "Review of MRWPCA Regional Urban Recycled Water Distribution Project Demand Analysis" (2007), prepared for MRWPCA and provided to MCWD for its use. The Column 3

[1] The agreements and MOUs referenced in this declaration are as described in and attached to the MRWPCA Opening Brief to which this declaration is attached.

monthly demands were met from MCWD's 300 AFY "summer" portion during April through September (MOU RUWAP, 2009, Exhibit 5). The remaining RUWAP water was distributed from MCWD water allocation during the months when MCWD can take water in addition to its 300 AFY summer portion (October through March), and from MRWPCA water when MCWD did not have the right to take additional water. Column 4, entitled "Other" was determined by taking MCWD's full year's water supply (2010), subtracting MCWD's April through September RUWAP contribution (Column 3). The result was divided it into six equal portions and then the RUWAP contribution for October through March (Column 3) was subtracted. Column 6 reflects MRWPCA's RUWAP contribution which is MRWPCA's 650 AFY portion during May through August matched with MCWD's Column 3 values to meet the expected demand for 1,427 AFY using the above-referenced CH2M Hill technical memorandum. The entire RUWAP demand for April and September, when MCWD would have no additional water allocation, was taken from MRWPCA water rights. Column 7, MRWPCA's other water, is MRPWCA's 3,900 AFY allocation (Amendment 3, Section 17.02) less MRWPCA's RUWAP contribution allocated into monthly segments. May through August allocations of 50 AF each are from MRPWCA's May through August allocation of 766 to 850 AFY (Amendment 3, 17.03) less MRWPCA's 650 AFY allocated to RUWAP.

9. Exhibit 7: Exhibit 7 was created in the same manner as Exhibit 6 except that it assumes that MCWD's water includes the Fort Ord Treatment Plant flow plus the Marina Pump Station flow, both based upon 2010 actual data (sometimes referred to as MCWD's Expanded service area) (Column 4).

10. Exhibit 8. Exhibit 8 was created in the same manner as Exhibit 6, except that it reflects the water allocation under the 1992 Agreement for the Extended Term. Column 2 values are the actual 2010 RTP influent. 2010 data was used because it was available and accurate along with the corresponding pump station data necessary to divide flows into the different sources: Monterey Peninsula and Salinas Valley. Column 3 and 4 are identical to Exhibit 6 Columns 3 and 4 because

MCWD's entitlement remains unchanged in the Extended Term. Column 6 RUWAP allocation remains identical for MRWPCA. The actual monthly Monterey Peninsula flows (Fort Ord Pump Station flow less the Fort Ord Treatment Plant flow) are shown in Column 7 after subtracting the RUWAP (Column 6) allocations.

11. Exhibit 9: Exhibit 9 was created in the same manner as Exhibit 7, with a few exceptions. Column 2 values are the actual 2010 RTP influent (as described for Exhibit 8). Column 3 and 4 are identical to Exhibit 7 Columns 3 and 4. Column 6 RUWAP allocation remains identical for MRWPCA. The actual monthly Monterey Peninsula flows (Column 7) are identical to Exhibit 8, Column 7.

12. Exhibit 10: Exhibit 10 remaining influent (Column 2) is the same as Exhibit 6, Column 8. Surplus water was calculated using two scenarios. The first is the average SVRP flows to CSIP during the years 1990 (the first complete year of operation) through 2011, or 12,219 AFY. The second scenario is the CSIP "up to 19,500 AF/YR" Initial Term demand as set forth in the 1992 Agreement, Section 4.02. It is noted that MCWRA has discussed a possible CSIP expansion that would require 17,700 AFY (MCWRA PowerPoint presentation, Zone 2B Annex Prelim Water Demand, presented to Water Quality & Operations Committee on June 23, 2011) which is within the range of the two scenarios addressed in these spreadsheets. The monthly average or monthly distributed values were subtracted from the remaining influent after MCWD's and MRWPCA's allocations were removed (Column 2) to yield the surplus water values (Columns 3 and 4). The total water remaining or surplus was summed for the months of November through February.

13. Exhibit 11: Exhibit 11 is similar to Exhibit 10 except that the source of the Column 2 numbers is derived from Column 8, Exhibit 7.

14. Exhibit 12: Exhibit 12 is similar to Exhibit 10 except that the source of the Column 2 numbers is derived from Column 8, Exhibit 8. Also, since the 19,500 AFY demand is reduced to the actual previous year's Salinas Valley flow, the Column 4 data was derived from full Column 2 demand.

15. Exhibit 13: Exhibit 13 is similar to Exhibit 12 except that the source of the Column 2 numbers is derived from Column 8, Exhibit 9 and the Column 4 data was derived from full Column 2 demand..

16. The numbers on Exhibits 6 through 13 are listed to the nearest 1 acre-foot. That level of significant figures is inappropriate for most uses but was used here so that values could be subtracted and compared with the various MOUs and agreements.

17. I have reviewed the Opening Brief of the MRWPCA to which this declaration is attached, and it is my opinion that the quantities of water contained in that brief are accurately described.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of California that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. Executed this 11th day of July 2012, at Monterey, California.

/S/ *Robert B. Holden*
Robert B. Holden

Exhibit 6

Initial Term with MCWD Annexation Agreement Service Area in Acre-Feet (AF)

	Actual Wastewater Influent[1] 22,431 AFY[2]	MCWD Entitlement 1,372 AF[3,4]		Remaining Influent After MCWD[7]	MRWPCA Entitlement 3,900 AF[8]		Remaining Influent After MCWD & MRWPCA[12]
		RUWAP[5]	Other[6]		RUWAP[9]	Other[10,11]	
January	1,851	0	179	1,673	0	0	1,673
February	1,744	0	179	1,565	0	287	1,278
March	1,943	60	119	1,764	0	500	1,264
April	1,868	0	0	1,868	151	500	1,217
May	1,923	58	0	1,865	162	50	1,653
June	1,874	58	0	1,816	165	50	1,601
July	1,931	58	0	1,873	181	50	1,642
August	1,940	57	0	1,883	142	50	1,691
September	1,859	69	0	1,790	112	500	1,178
October	1,882	126	53	1,704	0	500	1,204
November	1,798	28	151	1,619	0	500	1,119
December	1,817	0	179	1,638	0	0	1,638
Total Year	22,431	514	858	21,059	913	2,987	17,159

[1]This spreadsheet is framed in terms of influent for clarity, and does not account for various losses.

[2]Average monthly RTP influent values calculated between 1990 and 2011

[3]Actual monthly values measured in 2010 at the Marina Pump Station

[4]All influent from MCWD's existing boundaries (1,372 AF); presently all unused

[5]Public documents indicate that MCWD's currently proposed project is between 780 AFY (MCWD 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, Table 4.4) or 1,000 AFY (Coastal Water Project FEIR, Table 5.2). While there is programmatic CEQA/NEPA review of a 1,727 AFY project including a Monterey Peninsula component, the project level approved project is 1,427 AFY. Because of its environmental review status, because it could be bid, constructed and in operation in the near term, and because MRWPCA presently intends to use the 300 AF it reserved for the Monterey Peninsula portion of RUWAP for the GWR, in this brief MRWPCA primarily refers to RUWAP as a 1,427 AF project (exclusive of the Monterey Peninsula component.).

[6]Monthly allocation determined by taking MCWD's annual flow less April through September RUWAP allocation (300 AFY) divided by the remaining 6 months. These monthly portions are reduced by the October through March RUWAP values to determine MCWD's remaining entitlement

[7]The actual wastewater influent less MCWD's water (RUWAP and Other)

[8]Section 17.02, Amendment No. 3, starting 1/1/09

[9]MRWPCA's RUWAP contribution is the water to provide the RUWAP demand calculated by CH2M Hill (Review of MRWCPA Regional Urban Recycled Water Distribution Project Demand Analysis, July 2007), in accordance with the 2009 RUWAP MOU and MCWD water constraints.

[10]The 200 AF shown between May and August is the Section 17.03 Amendment No. 3 allocation of 766 plus 11% (850 AFY) less that allocated to RUWAP during May through August (650 AFY).

[11]The remainder of the 3,900 AFY is distributed during February through April and September through November.

[12]Remainding RTP influent after subtracting MCWD and MRWPCA entitlements.

Exhibit 7

Initial Term with MCWD Expanded Service Area in Acre-Feet (AF)

	Actual Wastewater Influent[1] 22,431 AFY[2]	MCWD Entitlement 2,383 AF[3,4]		Remaining Influent After MCWD[7]	MRWPCA Entitlement 3,900 AF[8]		Remaining Influent After MCWD & MRWPCA[12]
		RUWAP[5]	Other[6]		RUWAP[9]	Other[10,11]	
January	1,851	0	347	1,504	0	0	1,504
February	1,744	0	347	1,397	0	287	1,110
March	1,943	60	287	1,596	0	500	1,096
April	1,868	0	0	1,868	151	500	1,217
May	1,923	58	0	1,865	162	50	1,653
June	1,874	58	0	1,816	165	50	1,601
July	1,931	58	0	1,873	181	50	1,642
August	1,940	57	0	1,883	142	50	1,691
September	1,859	69	0	1,790	112	500	1,178
October	1,882	126	221	1,535	0	500	1,035
November	1,798	28	319	1,451	0	500	951
December	1,817	0	347	1,470	0	0	1,470
Total Year	22,431	514	1,869	20,049	913	2,987	16,149

[1]This spreadsheet is framed in terms of influent for clarity, and does not account for various losses.

[2]Average monthly RTP influent values calculated between 1990 and 2011

[3]Actual monthly values measured in 2010. Flows are the sum of the Marina Pump Station and the Fort Ord Treatment Plant.

[4]All influent from MCWD's proposed expanded boundaries (2,383 AF); presently all unused

[5]Public documents indicate that MCWD's currently proposed project is between 780 AFY (MCWD 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, Table 4.4) or 1,000 AFY (Coastal Water Project FEIR, Table 5.2). While there is programmatic CEQA/NEPA review of a 1,727 AFY project including a Monterey Peninsula component, the project level approved project is 1,427 AFY. Because of its environmental review status, because it could be bid, constructed and in operation in the near term, and because MRWPCA presently intends to use the 300 AF it reserved for the Monterey Peninsula portion of RUWAP for the GWR, in this brief MRWPCA primarily refers to RUWAP as a 1,427 AF project (exclusive of the Monterey Peninsula component.).

[6]Monthly allocation determined by taking MCWD's annual flow less April through September RUWAP allocation (300 AFY) divided by the remaining 6 months. These monthly portions are reduced by the October through March RUWAP values to determine MCWD's remaining entitlement

[7]The actual wastewater influent less MCWD's water (RUWAP and Other)

[8]Section 17.02, Amendment No. 3, starting 1/1/09

[9]MRWPCA's RUWAP contribution is the water to provide the RUWAP demand calculated by CH2M Hill (Review of MRWCPA Regional Urban Recycled Water Distribution Project Demand Analysis, July 2007), in accordance with the 2009 RUWAP MOU and MCWD water constraints.

[10]The 200 AF shown between May and August is the Section 17.03 Amendment No. 3 allocation of 766 plus 11% (850 AFY) less that allocated to RUWAP during May through August (650 AFY).

[11]The remainder of the 3,900 AFY is distributed during February through April and September through November.

[12]Remainding RTP influent after subtracting MCWD and MRWPCA entitlements.

Exhibit 8

Extended Term with MCWD Annexation Agreement Service Area in Acre-Feet (AF)

	2010 Wastewater Influent[1] 22,269 AFY[2]	MCWD Entitlement 1,372 AF[3,4]		Remaining Influent After MCWD[7]	MRWPCA Entitlement 6,148 AF[8]		Remaining Influent After MCWD & MRWPCA[11]
		RUWAP[5]	Other[6]		RUWAP[9]	Other[10]	
January	1,863	0	179	1,685	0	551	1,134
February	1,724	0	179	1,546	0	519	1,026
March	1,958	60	119	1,780	0	595	1,185
April	1,874	0	0	1,874	151	387	1,336
May	1,907	58	0	1,849	162	361	1,326
June	1,837	58	0	1,779	165	337	1,277
July	1,908	58	0	1,850	181	338	1,330
August	1,926	57	0	1,869	142	374	1,354
September	1,836	69	0	1,767	112	364	1,291
October	1,859	126	53	1,681	0	471	1,210
November	1,782	28	151	1,603	0	459	1,144
December	1,794	0	179	1,616	0	479	1,137
Total Year	22,269	514	858	20,897	913	5,235	14,750

[1]This spreadsheet is framed in terms of influent for clarity, and does not account for various losses.

[2]Monthly RTP influent values during 2010

[3]Actual monthly values measured in 2010 at the Marina Pump Station

[4]All influent from MCWD's existing boundaries (1,372 AF); presently all unused

[5]Public documents indicate that MCWD's currently proposed project is between 780 AFY (MCWD 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, Table 4.4) or 1,000 AFY (Coastal Water Project FEIR, Table 5.2). While there is programmatic CEQA/NEPA review of a 1,727 AFY project including a Monterey Peninsula component, the project level approved project is 1,427 AFY. Because of its environmental review status, because it could be bid, constructed and in operation in the near term, and because MRWPCA presently intends to use the 300 AF it reserved for the Monterey Peninsula portion of RUWAP for the GWR, in this brief MRWPCA primarily refers to RUWAP as a 1,427 AF project (exclusive of the Monterey Peninsula component.).

[6]Monthly allocation determined by taking MCWD's annual flow less April through September RUWAP allocation (300 AFY) divided by the remaining 6 months. These monthly portions are reduced by the October through March RUWAP values to determine MCWD's remaining entitlement

[7]The actual wastewater influent less MCWD's water (RUWAP and Other)

[8]Actual monthly Peninsula (non-Salinas Valley) flows calculated by subtracting the Fort Ord Treatment Plant flow (Ord water from Salinas Valley) from the Fort Ord Pump Station (Peninsula plus Ord) flow.

[9]MRWPCA's RUWAP contribution is the water to provide the RUWAP demand calculated by CH2M Hill (Review of MRWCPA Regional Urban Recycled Water Distribution Project Demand Analysis, July 2007), in accordance with the 2009 RUWAP MOU and MCWD water constraints.

[10]Actual 2010 monthly Monterey Peninsula flows less RUWAP allocation.

[11]Remainding 2010 RTP influent after subtracting MCWD and MRWPCA entitlements.

Exhibit 9

Extended Term with MCWD Expanded Service Area in Acre-Feet (AF)

	2010 Wastewater Influent[1] 22,269 AFY[2]	MCWD Entitlement 2,383 AF[3,4]		Remaining Influent After MCWD[7]	MRWPCA Entitlement 6,148 AF[8]		Remaining Influent After MCWD & MRWPCA[11]
		RUWAP[5]	Other[6]		RUWAP[9]	Other[10]	
January	1,863	0	347	1,516	-	551	965
February	1,724	0	347	1,377	-	519	858
March	1,958	60	287	1,611	-	595	1,017
April	1,874	0	-	1,874	151	387	1,336
May	1,907	58	-	1,849	162	361	1,326
June	1,837	58	-	1,779	165	337	1,277
July	1,908	58	-	1,850	181	338	1,330
August	1,926	57	-	1,869	142	374	1,354
September	1,836	69	-	1,767	112	364	1,291
October	1,859	126	221	1,512	-	471	1,041
November	1,782	28	319	1,434	-	459	975
December	1,794	0	347	1,447	-	479	968
Total Year	22,269	514	1,869	19,887	913	5,235	13,739

[1]This spreadsheet is framed in terms of influent for clarity, and does not account for various losses.

[2]Monthly RTP influent values during 2010

[3]Actutal monthly values measured in 2010. Flows are the sum of Marina Pump Station and the Fort Ord Treatment Plant flows.

[4]All influent from MCWD's proposed expanded boundaries (2,383 AF); presently all unused

[5]Public documents indicate that MCWD's currently proposed project is between 780 AFY (MCWD 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, Table 4.4) or 1,000 AFY (Coastal Water Project FEIR, Table 5.2). While there is programmatic CEQA/NEPA review of a 1,727 AFY project including a Monterey Peninsula component, the project level approved project is 1,427 AFY. Because of its environmental review status, because it could be bid, constructed and in operation in the near term, and because MRWPCA presently intends to use the 300 AF it reserved for the Monterey Peninsula portion of RUWAP for the GWR, in this brief MRWPCA primarily refers to RUWAP as a 1,427 AF project (exclusive of the Monterey Peninsula component.).

[6]Monthly allocation determined by taking MCWD's annual flow less April through September RUWAP allocation (300 AFY) divided by the remaining 6 months. These monthly portions are reduced by the October through March RUWAP values to determine MCWD's remaining entitlement

[7]The actual wastewater influent less MCWD's water (RUWAP and Other)

[8]Actual monthly Peninsula (non-Salinas Valley) flows calculated by subtracting the Fort Ord Treatment Plant flow (Ord water from Salinas Valley) from the Fort Ord Pump Station (Peninsula plus Ord) flow.

[9]MRWPCA's RUWAP contribution is the water to provide the RUWAP demand calculated by CH2M Hill (Review of MRWCPA Regional Urban Recycled Water Distribution Project Demand Analysis, July 2007), in accordance with the 2009 RUWAP MOU and MCWD water constraints.

[10]Actual 2010 monthly Monterey Peninsula flows less RUWAP allocation.

[11]Remainding 2010 RTP influent after subtracting MCWD and MRWPCA entitlements.

Exhibit 10

Surplus Water, Initial Term with MCWD Annexation Agreement Service Area in Acre-Feet (AF)

	Remaining Influent After MCWD & MRWPCA[1,2]	Surplus Water (Otherwise Flows to Outfall) Using Two Demand Scenarios[3]	
		CSIP = 12,219 AF[4]	CSIP =19,500 AF[5]
January	1,673	1,666	1,483
February	1,278	1,165	798
March	1,264	695	0
April	1,217	0	0
May	1,653	0	0
June	1,601	0	0
July	1,642	0	0
August	1,691	0	0
September	1,178	0	0
October	1,204	146	0
November	1,119	922	779
December	1,638	1,616	1,388
Total Year	17,159	6,210	4,449
Total Nov-Feb	5,709	5,369	4,449

[1]This spreadsheet is framed in terms of influent for clarity, and does not account for various losses.

[2]Average monthly RTP influent values calculated for the period 1990 through 2011, less MCWD (RUWAP and Other) and MRWPCA entitlements per Exhibit 6.

[3]Assuming full MCWD and MRWPCA use of their waters, surplus water during the period of November through February is equal to 5,369 and 4,449 AFY respectively for the two scenarios.

[4]Actual scenario using actual monthly CSIP use between 1999 and 2011, or 12,219 AFY.

[5]Demand according to 1992 Agreement between MCWRA and MRWPCA (Exhibit 3) or 19,500 AFY (50 AFY added to Agreement Exhibit B values to equal 19,500).

Exhibit 11

Surplus Water, Initial Term with MCWD Expanded Service Area and CSIP in Acre-Feet (AF)

	Remaining Influent After MCWD & MRWPCA[1,2]	Surplus Water (Otherwise Flows to Outfall) Using Two Demand Scenarios[3]	
		CSIP = 12,219 AF[4]	CSIP =19,500 AF[5]
January	1,504	1,497	1,314
February	1,110	997	630
March	1,096	526	0
April	1,217	0	0
May	1,653	0	0
June	1,601	0	0
July	1,642	0	0
August	1,691	0	0
September	1,178	0	0
October	1,035	0	0
November	951	753	611
December	1,470	1,448	1,220
Total Year	16,149	5,221	3,775
Total Nov-Feb	5,035	4,695	3,775

[1]This spreadsheet is framed in terms of influent for clarity, and does not account for various losses.

[2]Average monthly RTP influent values calculated for the period 1990 through 2011, less MCWD (RUWAP and Other) and MRWPCA entitlements per Exhibit 6.

[3]Assuming full MCWD and MRWPCA use of their waters, surplus water during the period of November through February is equal to 5,369 and 4,449 AFY respectively for the two scenarios.

[4]Actual scenario using actual monthly CSIP use between 1999 and 2011, or 12,219 AFY.

[5]Demand according to 1992 Agreement between MCWRA and MRWPCA (Exhibit 3) or 19,500 AFY (50 AFY added to Agreement Exhibit B values to equal 19,500).

Exhibit 12

Surplus Water, Extended Term with MCWD Annexation Agreement Service Area and CSIP in Acre-Feet (AF)

	MCWRA Extended Demand Schedule[1,2]	Surplus Water (Otherwise Flows to Outfall) Using Two Demand Scenarios[3]	
		CSIP = 12,219 AF[4]	CSIP =14,750 AF[5]
January	1,196	1,189	1,015
February	1,099	985	853
March	1,244	674	522
April	1,219	0	0
May	1,264	0	0
June	1,222	0	0
July	1,272	0	0
August	1,295	0	0
September	1,251	0	0
October	1,278	221	288
November	1,209	1,011	891
December	1,202	1,179	1,062
Total Year	14,750	5,260	4,630
Total Nov-Feb	4,705	4,365	3,821

[1]This spreadsheet is framed in terms of influent for clarity, and does not account for various losses.

[2]Monthly Salinas Valley influent (Salinas, Moss Landing, Castroville, and Ord) for 2010, 14,750 AF.

[3]Assuming full MCWD and MRWPCA use of their waters, surplus water during the period of November through February is equal to 4,365 and 3,821 AFY respectively for the two scenarios.

[4]Actual scenario using actual monthly CSIP use between 1999 and 2011, or 12,219 AFY.

[5]Assumed monthly distribution proportional to 1999 to 2011 CSIP averages for full (2010) Salinas Valley flow, 14, 750 AFY.

Exhibit 13

Surplus Water, Extended Term with MCWD Expanded Service Area and CSIP in Acre-Feet (AF)

	MCWRA Extended Demand Schedule[1,2]	Surplus Water (Otherwise Flows to Outfall) Using Two Demand Scenarios[3]	
		CSIP = 12,219 AF[4]	CSIP =13,739 AF[5]
January	1,111	1,104	942
February	1,019	906	790
March	1,157	588	485
April	1,133	0	0
May	1,178	0	0
June	1,147	0	0
July	1,194	0	0
August	1,211	0	0
September	1,163	0	0
October	1,185	128	263
November	1,122	924	827
December	1,118	1,096	988
Total Year	13,739	4,745	4,294
Total Nov-Feb	4,370	4,030	3,546

[1]This spreadsheet is framed in terms of influent for clarity, and does not account for various losses.

[2]Monthly Salinas Valley influent (Salinas, Moss Landing, and Castroville) for 2010, 13,739 AF.

[3]Assuming full MCWD and MRWPCA use of their waters, surplus water during the period of November through February is equal to 4,030 and 3,546 AFY respectively for the two scenarios.

[4]Actual scenario using actual monthly CSIP use between 1999 and 2011, or 12,219 AFY.

[5]Assumed monthly distribution proportional to 1999 to 2011 CSIP averages for full (2010) Salinas Valley flow, 13,739 AFY.