

3. Question/Comment – Why is the recycled water going to be conveyed to Oxnard for free when it could be used in Ventura?
Response – Conveyance to Oxnard is one of the alternatives, and while it is low cost, there are other criteria considered in the alternatives evaluation, including the potential benefits to City water supply.
4. Question/Comment – The Harbor Blvd. bridge is in the 100 year floodplain. Any alternative using the bridge as support for pipeline across the river will need to consider rebuilding the bridge.
Response – Comment noted.
5. Question/Comment – What is the current stage of the estuary?
Response – Approximately 12 feet
6. Question/Comment – Is DPR required by federal or state regulation?
Response – There is no existing requirement to evaluate DPR. However, there are policies that recommend evaluating recycled water uses including DPR, and federal and state funded research on DPR.
7. Question/Comment – Are the costs of the alternatives additional to the VCK/HTB settlement? Rate payers are going to have to vote on this? They are the ones who have to pay for any projects?
Response – The \$55M identified in the settlement agreement would be used to implement a recycled water alternative. And yes, rate payers are going to have to vote on this. The City is not simply checking off a box that they complied with the settlement agreement; rather the City is looking for opportunities for integrated water resources planning. In addition, the City will seek out grant funds for implementation of the preferred alternative.
8. Question/Comment – How are the costs per gallon determined?
Response – The costs per gallon/day were provided as a metric of comparison among alternatives. This is the capital investment divided by the flow that could be diverted from the SCRE.
9. Question/Comment – Where did the \$107/gal per day come from for the North Decentralized Irrigation Alternative?
Response – This is the unit cost based on the amount of water that provides a water supply benefit to the City. Since this alternative results in a very low potable water supply offset (as most is used for agriculture), then the unit cost is high.
10. Question/Comment – What development is included in these alternatives? Is new development driving the need for this project?
Response – No. The effluent discharge issues drive the project, but the alternatives provide an opportunity to help provide a more reliable water supply. City is trying to hold onto the supply they currently have, but there are a lot of pressures on the water supply.
11. Question/Comment – There are tidewater goby around the edge of the lagoon. There is

not a mono-species environment in the lagoon/estuary. The system is more complex than the metrics/data used in the study?

Response – Correct, although goby may be found throughout the SCRE, more are found in shallow waters near the vegetated margins. Although almost no information exists regarding on locations of steelhead rearing habitat uses in the SCRE, the report estimated the area of suitable habitat for each species based on their depth preferences from other systems.

12. Question/Comment – Nitrate sources upstream include wastewater plants east of Santa Paula? How much nitrate is coming down the river from upstream sources?

Response – The lower river is hydrologically decoupled from the upper river during dry weather, so upstream discharges are likely not affecting quality in the lower river.

13. Question/Comment – Can 6 mgd and 7 mgd be added to the SCRE analysis?

Response – Yes.

14. Question/Comment – Describe the issue/criteria for enhancement

Response – The issue of enhancement is whether the VWRf discharge to the SCRE enhances the beneficial uses of the SCRE. Beneficial uses include the species related beneficial uses and the recreational beneficial uses. A finding of enhancement under the Enclosed Bays and Estuaries Policy is supported where the following three conditions are met:

- The treatment facility consistently and reliably achieves full secondary treatment, with disinfection and dechlorination;
- The treatment facility consistently and reliably meets NPDES permit effluent limits designed to protect designated beneficial uses of the receiving waters; and
- The discharge either results in a new beneficial use or a “fuller realization” of an existing designated beneficial use of the receiving waters than would result in the absence of all point source discharges.

15. Question/Comment – Does sand removal from harbor impact the SCRE breaching frequency?

Response – Yes. As reported in the Phase 1 study, because littoral currents serve to transport beach sands from the north side of the SCRE to the south. Alterations in the sediment supply due to dredging operations may alter the timing of berm formation as well as berm height along McGrath State Beach.

16. Question/Comment – Is there opportunity for suggesting other solutions that involved public/private partnerships?

Response – Yes. Stakeholders can suggest other solutions in this workshop or as written comments to the City.

The stakeholders were provided an opportunity to use selection “dots” on some of the presentation graphics to indicate an opinion on the amount of discharge that should remain in the SCRE (discharge from the treatment wetlands to the SCRE), and to indicate preference among the various alternatives. The red dots were used to indicate if there was agreement with the finding that 4 to 5 mgd should remain in the discharge from treatment wetlands to the SCRE. The results of this exercise are included in as Attachment 1. The blue and yellow dots

were used to indicate first and second preference among the alternatives. The results of this exercise are included as Attachment 2.

After the selection “dots” exercise, the stakeholders were asked to provide input on:

- Based on Phase 2 data presented, how much flow should be left in the estuary?
- Which alternatives best meet the needs of the estuary and put the valuable resource (water) to its best and highest use?
- What additional data/studies are needed to confirm flow to remain in estuary and which reuse alternative to implement?

Additional discussion included the following comments and questions.

17. Question/Comment –This is not a democratic process where the most popular alternative should be selected based on a vote.

Response – We recognize this, and the intent of the exercise is to obtain feedback from stakeholders on the information presented in the Draft report and presentation.

18. Question/Comment –The placement of the wells downgradient of the golf course may be the reason that we observed high nitrate concentrations. The south wells may be more representative of nitrate concentrations. In general, there is not enough evidence to support the high nitrate concentrations in the analysis of the SCRE water quality.

Response – The nitrate in the groundwater is not unexpected as found in many river and coastal groundwater systems with agricultural land uses across southern California. Although the low nitrate levels were found along McGrath State Beach to the south, groundwater enters the SCRE from the north bank and leaves the SCRE from the south bank due to artificial depression of the groundwater table at McGrath Lake. For this reason, increased groundwater TIN estimates combined with recent reductions in TIN from the VWRf suggests that the VWRf discharge serves to reduce the overall TIN levels as compared to a zero discharge alternative to the SCRE. Additional groundwater sampling locations may improve the confidence of conclusions regarding the relative contributions of the VWRf as compared to groundwater inputs of nitrate to the SCRE.

19. Question/Comment –Against the north decentralized treatment plant if this would lead to more development in that area.

Response – The intent is to maintain water supply not to support growth.

20. Question/Comment –Any new water from these projects should be used to support streamflow and to provide environmental benefits. The City should provide a strategy/plan as to how new sources would be used.

Response – Comment noted.

21. Question/Comment –Emerging contaminants present an issue that needs to be addressed in DPR and IPR projects. Need to do IPR and DPR in a safe way.

Response – Comment noted.

22. Question/Comment –Public outreach for DPR is critical.

Response – Comment noted.

23. Question/Comment – Why were the wetlands combined with perched recharge

alternatives eliminated?

Response – They were eliminated because there is very limited land available to site a wetlands/perched recharge project.

24. Question/Comment –More than 1 week is needed to review the report.

Response – Comment noted. Actually 2 weeks were provided.

A summary of the stakeholders provided recommendations for further study:

- Collection of additional groundwater quality data at existing and potentially new locations.
- Collection of data regarding presence of constituents of emerging concerns in support of potential future evaluations of biological effects on steelhead and other possible effects.
- Development of an integrated water management plan clearly defining local water needs for current and future uses, how new water supplies would be utilized, and the larger benefits of reuse and habitat.

Prepared By:



Elisa Garvey