SANTA ANA RIVER WATERMASTER

ORANGE COUNTY WATER DISTRICT v. CITY OF CHINO, et al.
CASE NO. 117628--COUNTY OF ORANGE

WATERMASTER
Shivaji Deshmukh
Heather Dyer
Roy L. Herndon
Michael R. Markus
Craig D. Miller

MAILING ADDRESS
c/o SBVMWD
380 East Vanderbilt Way
San Bernardino CA 92408-3593
Telephone (909) 387-9200
FAX (909) 387-9247

April 30, 2022

To: Clerk of Superior Court of Orange County and all Parties

Re: Watermaster Report for Water Year October 1, 2020 - September 30, 2021

Ladies and Gentlemen:

We have the honor of submitting herewith the Fifty-First Annual Report of the Santa Ana River Watermaster. The supporting Basic Data Appendices are bound separately.

The principal findings of the Watermaster for the Water Year 2020-21 are as follows:

At Prado

1	Measured Outflow at Prado	99,158	acre-feet
2	Base Flow at Prado	74,580	acre-feet
3	Annual Weighted TDS in Base and Storm Flows	609	mg/L
4	Annual Adjusted Base Flow	80,236	acre-feet
5	Cumulative Adjusted Base Flow	5,884,614	acre-feet
6	Other Credits (Debits)	137	acre-feet
7	Cumulative Entitlement of OCWD	2,142,000	acre-feet
8	Cumulative Credit	3,785,640	acre-feet
9	One-Third of Cumulative Debit	0	acre-feet
10	Minimum Required Base Flow in 2021-22	34,000	acre-feet

At Riverside Narrows

1	Base Flow at Riverside Narrows	31,099	acre-feet
2	Annual Weighted TDS in Base Flow	623	mg/L
3	Annual Adjusted Base Flow	31,099	acre-feet
4	Cumulative Adjusted Base Flow	2,181,690	acre-feet
5	Cumulative Entitlement of IEUA and WMWD	777,750	acre-feet
6	Cumulative Credit	1,403,940	acre-feet
7	One-Third of Cumulative Debit	0	acre-feet
8	Minimum Required Base Flow in 2021-22	12,420	acre-feet

Based on these findings, the Watermaster concludes that there was full compliance with the provisions of the Stipulated Judgment in 2020-21.

At the end of the 2020-21 Water Year, Inland Empire Utilities Agency (formerly Chino Basin Municipal Water District) and Western Municipal Water District have a cumulative credit of 3,785,640 acre-feet to their Base Flow obligation at Prado Dam. San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District has a cumulative credit of 1,403,940 acre-feet to its Base Flow obligation at Riverside Narrows.

The Watermaster continued to exercise surveillance over the many active and proposed projects within the watershed for their potential effect on Base Flow.

Sincerely yours,
Santa Ana River Watermaster

By: Shivaji Deshmukh
Shivaji Deshmukh

Michael R. Markus

Heather P. Dyer

Craig D. Miller

Roy L. Herndon

SANTA ANA RIVER WATERMASTER

FOR

ORANGE COUNTY WATER DISTRICT

v. CITY OF CHINO, et al.

CASE NO. 117628 - COUNTY OF ORANGE

FIFTY-FIRST
ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE
SANTA ANA RIVER WATERMASTER

FOR WATER YEAR
OCTOBER 1, 2020 - SEPTEMBER 30, 2021

APRIL 30, 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF PLATES

(Located at back of report)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

APPENDICES

The following appendices are bound separately and available for review at the office of the Secretary of the Santa Ana River Watermaster.

CHAPTER I

WATERMASTER ACTIVITIES AND WATER CONDITIONS

Introduction

This Fifty-First Annual Report of the Santa Ana River Watermaster covers Water Year 2020-21. The annual report is required by the Stipulated Judgment (Judgment) in the case of Orange County Water District v. City of Chino, et al., Case No. 117628-County of Orange, entered by the court on April 17, 1969. The Judgment became effective on October 1, 1970. It contains a declaration of rights of the water users and other entities in the Lower Area of the Santa Ana River Basin downstream of Prado Dam as against those in the Upper Area tributary to Prado Dam, and provides a physical solution to satisfy those rights. Chapter IV presents a history of the litigation and a summary of the Judgment.

The physical solution accomplishes, in general, a regional intrabasin allocation of the surface flow of the Santa Ana River System. The Judgment leaves to each of the major hydrologic units within the basin the determination and regulation of individual rights therein and the development and implementation of its own water management plan subject only to compliance with the physical solution.

The Judgment designates four public agencies to represent the interests of the Upper and Lower Areas and gives them the responsibility to fulfill the obligations set forth in the Judgment, including the implementation of the physical solution. The Lower Area is represented by Orange County Water District (OCWD). The Upper Area is represented by San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District (SBVMWD), Western Municipal Water District of Riverside County (WMWD), and Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA), formerly the Chino Basin Municipal Water District (CBMWD). The locations of the districts are shown on Plate 1, "Santa Ana River Watershed".

The court appoints a five-member Watermaster Committee (Watermaster) to administer the provisions of the Judgment. The duties of the Watermaster are to maintain a continuous accounting of each of the items listed in the letter of transmittal at the front of this report and to report thereon annually for each water year to the court and the parties. The water year begins October 1 and ends the following September 30. The time for submission of the annual report was amended by the court (dated December 24, 1981) to be seven months after the end of the water year (April 30).

The Watermaster Committee signing the Water Year 2020-21 Annual Report consisted of Shivaji Deshmukh, Heather Dyer, Roy L. Herndon, Michael R. Markus, and Craig D. Miller. At the January 27, 2022 meeting, Mr. Herndon was re-elected Chairman and Ms. Dyer was elected Secretary/Treasurer. The history of the Watermaster membership is presented in Chapter IV.

Compilation of Basic Data

The Watermaster annually compiles the basic hydrologic and water quality data necessary to determine compliance with the provisions of the Judgment. The data include records of stream discharge (flow) and quality for the Santa Ana River (River) at Prado Dam and at Riverside Narrows as well as discharges for most tributaries; flow and quality of Nontributary water entering the River; rainfall records at locations in or adjacent to the Watershed; and other data that may be used to support the determinations of the Watermaster. For Water Year 2020-21 the United States Geological Survey (USGS) provided discharge and water quality data for the River at two gaging stations, "Santa Ana River Below Prado Dam" (Prado) and "Santa Ana River at Metropolitan Water District (MWD) Crossing" (Riverside Narrows). The discharge data at both stations consist of computed daily mean discharges, expressed in cubic feet per second (cfs), and are based on continuous recordings. At times the USGS must estimate daily mean discharges due to damaged or malfunctioning recording equipment.

The USGS also provided discharge data for other gaging stations for streams tributary to Prado, including, among others, the Santa Ana River at E Street in San Bernardino, Temescal Creek above Main Street in Corona, Cucamonga Creek near Mira Loma, Chino Creek at Schaefer Avenue, Lytle Creek at Colton, Warm Creek near San Bernardino, and San Timoteo Creek near Loma Linda (see Appendix A). Based on a determination by the Watermaster in Water Year 2011-12, the USGS was requested to establish a new gaging station at the spillway at Lee Lake. Expenses associated with the installation and measurements at this gage were added to the Watermaster costs paid by the Parties. Beginning in Water Year 2012-13, the new Temescal Creek at Corona Lake "Lee Lake" (near Corona) gage provided useful data (also included in Appendix A) to assist in the determination of the amount of water discharged from the San Jacinto Watershed that arrived at Prado.

The Water Year 2020-21 daily mean discharge records at Prado are rated "fair" by the USGS. Daily mean discharges at the station are controlled at times by storage operations in the reservoir behind Prado Dam just upstream. The maximum and minimum daily mean discharge values during the water year were, respectively, 435 cfs on December 30, 2020 and 58.6 cfs on July 20, 2021. The Water Year 2020-21 daily mean discharge record at Riverside Narrows was rated "fair" by the USGS. The maximum and minimum daily mean discharge values during the year were, respectively, 1,170 cfs on January 29, 2021 and 20.7 cfs on August 28, 2021.

The water quality data at Prado consist of daily maximum and minimum and mean values for electrical conductivity (EC), measured as specific conductance and expressed in microsiemens per centimeter (μs/cm) based on a continuous recording, and 42 measured values (three to four per month) for EC and/or total dissolved solids (TDS) expressed in milligrams per liter (mg/L). The water quality data at Riverside Narrows consist of 24 values measured by the USGS (generally twice per month) and 105 values measured by the City of Riverside (generally twice per week) for both EC and TDS. The maximum and minimum, daily, flow-weighted mean EC values reported by the USGS for the River at Prado were 1,240 μs/cm on April 14, 2021 and 380 μs/cm on January 30, 2021, respectively. The

corresponding calculated TDS concentrations were 759 and 233 mg/L. At Riverside Narrows, the maximum and minimum EC values were, respectively, 1,089 μs/cm on October 27, 2020 as reported by the City of Riverside and 863 μs/cm on January 6, 2021 as reported by the USGS. The corresponding measured TDS concentrations on these dates were 658 and 611 mg/L. Specific conductance records are affected by releases from Prado Dam. Interruptions in record occur at times due to malfunction of recording or sensing equipment. A portion of chemical data was collected for the National Water-Quality Assessment (NAWQA) Program. There were interruptions of the Prado EC records from December 26, 2020 to January 6, 2021 and from July 21 to August 4, 2021 due to malfunction of recording or sensing equipment.

To assist in making its determinations each year the Watermaster refers to the records of many precipitation stations located in or near the Santa Ana River Watershed. The record for the former Perris Hill Station 163 in the Bunker Hill-San Timoteo area, operated by the San Bernardino County Flood Control District, was used to define the hydrologic base period for the physical solution in the Judgment. The record for San Bernardino County Department of Public Works (SBCDPW) Station 2146, which was located very near to Station 163 at the San Bernardino County Hospital, was used until Water Year 2000-01 in the Annual Reports of the Watermaster to provide a comparison with historical conditions.

During Water Year 2000-01 Station 2146 was destroyed when the hospital buildings were demolished. For several years, the Watermaster used estimated precipitation data based on the records for three nearby stations. The SBCDPW established a new station, Station 2146-A, near the location of the former Station 2146. During the preparation of the report for Water Year 2004-05, the precipitation total recorded at Station 2146-A was sufficiently close to the estimate prepared from the three nearby stations that the Watermaster used the record for Station 2146-A.

The USGS established a precipitation gage network during the Water Year 2003-04 to assist local flood control agencies with flood prediction in the area of the “Old Fire”, which burned a large portion of the northerly mountains of the Santa Ana River Watershed area during October and November 2003. When the flood control agencies declined to fund the ongoing operation of the precipitation gage network, the Parties to the Judgment agreed to add the precipitation gage program to the ongoing stream gage program. The Parties also added a gage designated as “Gilbert Street Precipitation Gage” (USGS No. 340742117161701) at the same location as SBCDPW Station 2146-A. The Gilbert Street Gage was placed into operation in October 2005.

The Watermaster has compared the record from the USGS Gilbert Street Gage to the record from the Station 2146-A gage and has found them to be virtually identical. The Watermaster has accepted the Gilbert Street Gage in this report as the most accurate and reliable of the two gages. Because of the Watermaster’s finding of suitability of the Gilbert Street Gage, in Water Year 2011-12 the Parties determined that funding of the other precipitation gages was no longer a necessary Watermaster expense.

For Water Year 2020-21, the total precipitation recorded at the Gilbert Street gage was 8.19 inches, or 46% of the average of 17.98 inches that occurred during the 26-year base

period (1934-35 through 1959-60) that was used in the formulation of the physical solution. Plate 3 graphically portrays the annual precipitation from 1934-35 through 2020-21.

Watermaster Determinations

Each year the Watermaster uses its long-established procedures to analyze the basic hydrologic and water quality data in order to determine, at Riverside Narrows and at Prado, the Base Flow, the Adjusted Base Flow, the Cumulative Credits or Debits to Upper Area parties, and the Minimum Required Base Flow for the following water year. The procedures include determining, for both locations, the amounts of Nontributary Flow or other non-storm flow to be excluded from Base Flow.

During Water Year 2020-21 there were no sources of Nontributary Flow in the River at Riverside Narrows or Prado Dam.

There was one source of non-storm flow in the River at Prado that the Watermaster has not included in Base Flow. Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) reported that it discharged 2,480 acre-feet of treated wastewater to Temescal Creek, with a flow-weighted average TDS of 749 mg/L, that originated in the San Jacinto River Watershed. Discharges from the San Jacinto Watershed were not taken into account in the settlement discussions and calculations that led to the flow obligations in the Judgment. In the past the Watermaster decided that fifty percent of any portion of such discharges that reach Prado Reservoir and that are subsequently captured by OCWD should be added to the Cumulative Credit at Prado (after the usual water quality adjustment). IEUA Groundwater Recharge Coordinator/Hydrogeologist Andy Campbell estimated that 273 acre-feet of the EMWD treated wastewater, with an average TDS concentration of 789 mg/L, reached Prado Reservoir, that 273 acre-feet of it was captured by OCWD, and recommended that the Cumulative Credit at Prado be increased 137 acre-feet accordingly using the previously established fifty percent rule. The Watermaster accepted the estimate and the recommendation.

The determinations of the Watermaster for Water Year 2020-21 are explained in detail for Prado in Chapter II and for Riverside Narrows in Chapter III. A summary of the annual determinations by the Watermaster is presented in Table 1 for both locations for the period of 1970-71 through 2020-21. Note that the Base Flow obligations set forth in the Judgment at both Prado and Riverside Narrows have been met for the water year and cumulative credits have accrued to the upper respective Districts.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AT PRADO

Water Year	Rainfall (in)[1]	USGS Measured Flow (ac-ft)	Total Flow (ac-ft)[2]	Base Flow (ac-ft)[3]	Weighted TDS (mg/L)[4]	Adjusted Base Flow (ac-ft)	Cumulative Credit (ac-ft)[5]
1971-72	9.62	51,743	51,743	40,416	707	40,416	-5,182
1972-73	18.46	76,848	77,484	48,999	638	51,531	4,349
1973-74	12.72	128,436	62,511	43,106	633	45,513	7,862
1974-75	13.49	93,397	61,855	50,176	694	51,263	17,125
1975-76	15.86	120,590	59,209	45,627	635	48,098	23,223
1976-77	11.95	72,278	62,953	48,387	660	50,000	31,223
1977-78	30.47	255,043	252,850	58,501	383	73,955	63,178
1978-79	17.51	145,198	134,506	71,863	580	79,049	100,227
1979-80	30.93	536,174	527,760	82,509	351	106,505	164,732
1980-81	10.45	118,300	117,888	74,875	728	74,875	205,652
1981-82	18.34	143,702	143,367	81,548	584	89,431	253,083
1982-83	32.36	426,273	426,750	111,692	411	138,591	353,036
1983-84	10.81	178,730	177,606	109,231	627	115,876	431,514
1984-85	12.86	163,247	162,912	125,023	617	133,670	523,184
1985-86	17.86	196,900	197,373	127,215	567	141,315	622,499
1986-87	8.08	140,872	143,191	119,848	622	127,638	708,137
1987-88	13.78	176,292	166,818	124,104	582	136,308	802,445
1988-89	12.64	159,659	152,743	119,572	583	131,230	891,675
1989-90	8.53	144,817	143,463	119,149	611	127,986	977,661
1990-91	15.48	195,186	186,426	111,151	514	128,379	1,064,040
1991-92	16.54	198,280	189,677	106,948	499	124,862	1,146,902
1992-93	30.92	571,138	566,630	128,067	368	163,499	1,268,401
1993-94	11.62	159,560	152,808	111,186	611	119,432	1,345,833
1994-95	25.14	429,270	422,816	123,468	415	152,792	1,458,387
1995-96	11.92	217,160	190,553	131,861	514	152,299	1,568,686
1996-97	18.64	249,685	198,459	136,676	514	157,861	1,684,547
1997-88[6]	33.41	462,646	456,316	155,711	392	195,677	1,838,224
1998-99	8.02	184,998	182,310	158,637	581	174,369	1,970,593
1999-00	11.09	207,850	188,538	148,269	527	169,644	2,098,237
2000-01	16.13	222,559	208,535	153,914	525	176,360	2,232,597
2001-02	5.08	174,968	156,596	145,981	587	159,728	2,350,325
2002-03	16.22	256,157	245,947	146,113	463	174,970	2,484,182
2003-04[7]	10.80	214,102	201,967	143,510	502	167,190	2,609,619
2004-05	29.89	638,513	637,568	154,307	348	199,570	2,769,555
2005-06	13.23	247,593	246,101	147,736	517	170,266	2,901,383
2006-07	4.61	156,147	153,823	129,830	604	140,216	3,005,130
2007-08	13.70	199,690	194,309	116,483	495	136,382	3,103,677
2008-09	10.14	162,698	161,026	102,711	527	117,519	3,181,385
2009-10	17.79	243,776	243,690	103,099	443	125,179	3,266,053
2010-11[7]	23.50	324,892	313,018	102,031	522	117,166	3,342,412

TABLE 1 (continued)

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AT PRADO

Water Year	Rainfall (in)[1]	USGS Measured Flow (ac-ft)	Total Flow (ac-ft)[2]	Base Flow (ac-ft)[3]	Weighted TDS (mg/L)[4]	Adjusted Base Flow (ac-ft)	Cumulative Credit (ac-ft)[5]
2011-12	9.01	121,123	121,123	93,068	597	101,056	3,401,833
2012-13	9.53	100,003	99,735	81,452	621	86,814	3,446,890
2013-14	12.42	86,486	86,486	63,536	582	69,784	3,474,674
2014-15	11.09	107,600	107,600	64,048	522	73,548	3,506,222
2015-16	8.84	115,023	102,610	71,225	560	79,535	3,543,757
2016-17[9]	21.57	191,539	191,539	69,806	405	86,967	3,589,347
2017-18[9	6.81	82,554	82,554	65,438	625	69,528	3,616,875
2018-19[9	19.85	251,974	251,974	97,993	395	122,900	3,698,925
2019-20[9	12.74	160,915	160,915	74,465	462	89,234	3,747,267
2020-21	8.19	99,158	99,158	74,580	609	80,236	3,785,640

TABLE 1 (continued)

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AT RIVERSIDE NARROWS

Water Year	Rainfall (in)[1]	USGS Measured Flow (ac-ft)	Total Flow (ac-ft)[2]	Base Flow (ac-ft)[3]	Weighted TDS (mg/L)[4]	Adjusted Base Flow (ac-ft)	Cumulative Credit (ac-ft)[5]
1971-72	9.62	41,257	22,253	16,157	712	16,017	2,529
1972-73	18.46	33,048	32,571	17,105	700	17,105	4,384
1973-74	12.72	25,494	24,494	16,203	700	16,203	5,337
1974-75	13.49	20,970	19,644	15,445	731	15,100	5,187
1975-76	15.86	27,627	26,540	17,263	723	16,977	6,914
1976-77	11.95	24,871	23,978	18,581	722	18,286	9,950
1977-78	30.47	182,500	181,760	22,360	726	21,941	16,641
1978-79	17.51	47,916	47,298	26,590	707	26,456	27,847
1979-80	30.93	254,333	253,817	25,549	676	25,549	38,146
1980-81	10.45	34,698	34,278	19,764	715	19,550	42,446
1981-82	18.34	83,050	82,708	32,778	678	32,778	59,974
1982-83	32.36	279,987	279,645	57,128	610	57,128	101,852
1983-84	10.81	83,087	82,745	56,948	647	56,948	143,550
1984-85	12.86	79,113	78,771	69,772	633	69,772	198,072
1985-86	17.86	99,600	99,258	68,220	624	68,220	251,042
1986-87	8.08	78,093	77,752	59,808	649	59,808	295,600
1987-88	13.78	80,047	79,706	55,324	620	55,324	335,674
1988-89	12.64	62,717	62,376	52,259	607	52,259	372,683
1989-90	8.53	58,500	58,159	53,199	590	53,583	411,016
1990-91	15.48	74,525	73,790	45,041	616	45,041	440,807
1991-92	16.54	71,768	71,427	40,306	620	40,306	465,863
1992-93	30.92	267,384	267,043	41,434	634	41,434	492,047
1993-94	11.62	45,477	45,006	31,278	677	31,278	508,075
1994-95	25.14	245,617	243,411	45,562	646	45,562	538,387
1995-96	11.92	83,256	81,786	54,548	625	54,548	577,685
1996-97	18.64	107,280	104,518	62,618	624	62,618	625,053
1997-98	33.41	214,375	213,033	65,013	601	65,013	674,816
1998-99	8.02	76,294	76,294	73,094	603	73,094	732,660
1999-00	11.09	75,572	75,572	63,499	602	63,499	780,909
2000-01	16.13	78,091	75,331	61,872	603	61,872	827,531
2001-02	5.08	68,844	59,434	58,705	606	58,705	870,986
2002-03	16.22	92,166	88,502	57,747	617	57,747	913,483
2003-04	10.80	77,336	75,799	54,788	634	54,788	953,021
2004-05	29.89	355,503	355,503	65,760	616	65,760	1,003,531
2005-06	13.23	111,840	111,113	67,161	608	67,161	1,055,442
2006-07	4.61	57,868	56,022	56,123	635	56,123	1,096,315
2007-08[8]	13.70	78,619	74,554	46,776	674	46,776	1,127,841
2008-09	10.14	69,027	67,567	43,902	663	43,902	1,156,493
2009-10	17.79	112,631	112,631	45,887	643	45,887	1,187,130
2010-11	23.50	174,075	174,075	49,753	654	49,753	1,221,633

TABLE 1 (continued)

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
AT RIVERSIDE NARROWS

Water Year	Rainfall (in)[1]	USGS Measured Flow (ac-ft)	Total Flow (ac-ft)[2]	Base Flow (ac-ft)[3]	Weighted TDS (mg/L)[4]	Adjusted Base Flow (ac-ft)	Cumulative Credit (ac-ft)[5]
2011-12	9.01	45,049	45,049	42,641	664	42,641	1,249,024
2012-13	9.53	41,337	41,337	36,407	662	36,407	1,270,181
2013-14	12.42	42,766	42,766	32,313	646	32,313	1,287,244
2014-15	11.09	41,958	41,958	28,302	630	28,302	1,300,296
2015-16	8.84	41,007	41,007	30,877	635	30,877	1,315,923
2016-17	21.57	83,601	83,601	36,090	650	36,090	1,336,763
2017-18	6.81	34,792	34,792	28,378	662	28,378	1,349,891
2018-19	19.85	97,063	97,063	36,604	652	36,604	1,371,245
2019-20	12.74	56,622	56,622	32,096	627	32,096	1,388,091
2020-21	8.19	39,311	39,311	31,099	623	31,099	1,403,940

TABLE 1 (continued)

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
FOOTNOTES

(1) Measured at San Bernardino County Department of Public Works (SBCDPW) Station 2146 (former San Bernardino County Hospital) until Water Year 2000-01. Estimated for that location for Water Years 2000-01 through 2003-04. Measured at SBCDPW Station 2146-A for Water Year 2004-05. Measured at USGS Gilbert Street Precipitation Gage at San Bernardino for Water Year 2005-06. For 2006-07, measured at SBCDPW 2146 from Oct. 1 to Dec. 21 and at USGS Gilbert Street Precipitation Gage for the remainder of the year. Measured at USGS Gilbert Street Precipitation Gage at San Bernardino since Water Year 2007-08.

(2) As determined by the Watermaster, Total Flow based on Computed Inflow at Prado or measured flow at Riverside Narrows in any year may be exclusive of any Nontributary Flow, Exchange Water or other "water management" flows and, at Prado, may include discharges from Lake Elsinore or the San Jacinto Watershed that reach the Santa Ana River.

(3) As determined by the Watermaster: (a) Base Flow at Prado in any year is exclusive of Storm Flow and may be exclusive of any Nontributary Flow, Exchange Water or other "water management" flows as well as any discharges from Lake Elsinore or the San Jacinto Watershed that reach the Santa Ana River; (b) Base Flow at Riverside Narrows in any year is exclusive of Storm Flow and may be exclusive of any Nontributary Flow, Exchange Water or other "water management" flows and, beginning in 1979-80, includes wastewater from Rubidoux CSD that is treated at the Riverside Regional WWTP.

(4) For Base and Storm Flow at Prado and Base Flow only at Riverside Narrows.

(5) As determined by the Watermaster, Cumulative Credit at Prado in any year may include credit for a portion of any water discharged from Lake Elsinore or the San Jacinto Watershed that reach the Santa Ana River.

(6) The Base Flow and Adjusted Base flow for Water Year 1997-98 were returned to their originally published values to correct an error in the adjustment to account for San Jacinto Watershed flows arriving at Prado. This correction is also reflected in the Cumulative Credit for this and subsequent years.

(7) A correction was made for Water Years 2003-04 and 2010-11 in the calculation of Weighted TDS based on an adjustment to account for OC-59 water that arrived at Prado. This correction is reflected in the Weighted TDS and Adjusted Base Flow for these years. This correction is also reflected in the Cumulative Credit for these and subsequent years.

(8) The Base Flow amount for Water Year 2007-08 at Riverside Narrows was published as 47,760 acre-feet in the Thirty-Eighth Annual Report. The correct amount is 46,776 acre-feet.

(9) In 2021, EMWD identified that its recycled water discharges to Temescal Creek in Water Year 2016-17 were not reflected in the Watermaster annual reports. This omission was corrected by estimating the volume of the San Jacinto Watershed discharge that arrived at Prado using procedures described in Appendix E of the Fifty-First Annual Report. Accordingly, adjustments were made to the Total Flow, Base Flow, and Adjusted Base Flow at Prado for Water Year 2016-17, and to the Cumulative Credit at Prado for Water Years 2016-17 through 2019-20.

Notable Watershed Programs and Activities

Each year when the Watermaster is compiling and analyzing the information it needs to prepare its report to the court, it also takes notice of programs and activities in the Watershed that, while they do not directly enter into the determinations of the Watermaster, do have significant potential to affect River flow or quality. The following are brief descriptions of such items.

Upper Area Treated Wastewater Discharges

Data on treated wastewater discharged in the Upper Area are compiled annually because wastewater is a major contributor to Base Flow in the River. The historical data on treated wastewater discharged are summarized in Table 2. The locations of wastewater treatment plants are shown on Plate 2.

Salt Exports from the Upper Area

High salinity water, mostly from groundwater desalters, is exported from the Upper Area to the ocean through Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority's Santa Ana Regional Interceptor (SARI) in Orange County and Inland Empire Brine Line (IEBL) in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties and IEUA's Non-Reclaimable Wastewater System (NRWS). This salt export helps to protect River water quality and, therefore, helps the Upper Area parties comply with the Judgment. The available historical data on salt export are summarized in Table 3. The SARI/IEBL first went into service in Water Year 1985-86. The NRWS went into service prior to 1970, but records of NRWS flow data are only available beginning with Water Year 1981-82. The locations of the SARI/IEBL and NRWS pipelines are shown on Plate 2.

Arundo donax Eradication

Arundo donax is a non-native species of reed that has invaded many waterways in California. It displaces native vegetation, resulting in undesirable habitat for animals. *Arundo* also consumes water at the rate of about 5.6 acre-feet per acre per year compared to only about 1.9 for native plants, a net water loss of about 3.7 acre-feet per year per acre of *Arundo*. By the early 1990s there were about 10,000 acres of *Arundo* in the Santa Ana River Watershed. In 1997 a consortium of local, state and federal agencies launched a long-term eradication program in the watershed for reasons of both habitat restoration and water savings. *Arundo* spreads quickly downstream as roots and rhizomes break off during high stream flows. Therefore, the eradication program began at the farthest upstream locations and is working toward the River mouth. Each location requires multiyear retreatment. To date the consortium has eradicated 8,250 acres of *Arundo* in the watershed.

TABLE 2

TREATED WASTEWATER EFFLUENT DISCHARGED ABOVE PRADO

(acre-feet)

Water Year	Wastewater discharges upstream from Colton that generally do not flow continuously to Santa Ana River above E Street				Wastewater discharges to Santa Ana River and its tributaries that have hydraulic continuity to the Santa Ana River above Riverside Narrows					Wastewater discharges to the Santa Ana River between Riverside Narrows and Prado Dam								Wastewater discharges to Temescal Creek or its tributaries which have hydraulic continuity to the Santa Ana River					Total Discharge to surface flow of the Santa Ana River	Total Waste Water Discharged in the Watershed
	Redlands	Beaumont	Yucaipa[8]	Subtotal (A)	San Bernardino[7]	Colton	Rialto	RIX[1]	Subtotal (B)	Riverside	Corona[2]	IEUA RP 1[3]	IEUA RP 2	IEUA RP 5	IEUA CCWRF[4]	WRCRWA[5,9]	Subtotal (C)	EMWD Discharge[10] (1)	Est. EMWD Arriving at Prado[10] (2)	Temescal Valley[6] WRP (3)	Elsinore Valley MWD (4)	Subtotal (D) (2+3+4)	(B+C+D)	(A+B+C+D+1-2)
1970-71	2,650	no record	-	2,650	17,860	2,520	2,270	-	22,650	18,620	3,190	-	-	-	-	-	21,810	-	-	-	-	-	44,460	47,110
1971-72	2,830	no record	-	2,830	16,020	2,230	2,400	-	20,650	19,010	3,230	6,740	-	-	-	-	28,980	-	-	-	-	-	49,630	52,460
1972-73	2,810	450	-	3,260	18,670	2,530	2,260	-	23,460	19,060	3,340	10,380	-	-	-	-	32,780	-	-	-	-	-	56,240	59,500
1973-74	2,770	600	-	3,370	17,680	2,530	2,320	-	22,530	19,560	3,510	11,440	2,320	-	-	-	36,830	-	-	-	-	-	59,360	62,730
1974-75	2,540	570	-	3,110	16,750	1,980	2,320	-	21,050	19,340	4,020	14,960	2,280	-	-	-	40,600	-	-	-	-	-	61,650	64,760
1975-76	2,450	620	-	3,070	17,250	2,540	2,240	-	22,030	19,580	4,700	15,450	2,950	-	-	-	42,680	-	-	-	-	-	64,710	67,780
1976-77	3,170	580	-	3,750	17,650	3,260	2,330	-	23,240	18,770	5,010	14,640	3,380	-	-	-	41,800	-	-	-	-	-	65,040	68,790
1977-78	3,280	620	-	3,900	18,590	3,810	2,380	-	24,780	20,310	5,200	14,650	4,060	-	-	-	44,220	-	-	-	-	-	69,000	72,900
1978-79	3,740	670	-	4,410	19,040	3,850	3,050	-	25,940	21,070	5,390	15,040	5,070	-	-	-	46,570	-	-	-	-	-	72,510	76,920
1979-80	4,190	690	-	4,880	20,360	4,190	2,990	-	27,540	22,910	5,360	14,410	5,520	-	-	-	48,200	-	-	-	-	-	75,740	80,620
1980-81	4,410	690	-	5,100	20,550	3,930	3,370	-	27,850	24,180	5,590	17,270	5,260	-	-	-	52,300	-	-	-	-	-	80,150	85,250
1981-82	4,420	700	-	5,120	23,340	3,780	3,470	-	30,590	25,640	5,410	19,580	5,360	-	-	-	55,990	-	-	-	-	-	86,580	91,700
1982-83	4,530	710	-	5,240	24,160	3,600	3,620	-	31,380	25,020	5,860	20,790	4,290	-	-	-	55,960	-	-	-	-	-	87,340	92,580
1983-84	5,150	800	-	5,950	22,080	3,700	3,830	-	29,610	26,090	6,200	20,950	3,950	-	-	-	57,190	-	-	-	-	-	86,800	92,750
1984-85	4,990	840	-	5,830	23,270	3,830	4,070	-	31,170	27,750	6,250	25,160	4,280	-	-	-	63,440	-	-	-	-	-	94,610	100,440
1985-86	5,200	820	-	6,020	24,720	4,010	4,720	-	33,450	28,820	5,900	28,240	2,660	-	-	-	65,620	-	-	-	-	-	99,070	105,090
1986-87	5,780	880	800	7,460	26,810	4,170	5,350	-	36,330	30,340	6,170	27,160	5,000	-	-	-	68,670	-	-	-	-	-	105,000	112,460
1987-88	6,060	940	1,850	8,850	27,880	5,240	6,040	-	39,160	34,660	6,050	31,290	5,500	-	-	-	77,500	-	-	-	-	-	116,660	125,510
1988-89	5,250	1,030	2,260	8,540	27,640	5,550	6,280	-	39,470	35,490	8,080	35,510	6,180	-	-	-	85,260	-	-	-	-	-	124,730	133,270
1989-90	6,360	1,100	2,370	9,830	28,350	5,810	6,260	-	40,420	33,210	9,140	34,760	5,730	-	-	-	82,840	-	-	-	-	-	123,260	133,090
1990-91	6,690	1,120	2,490	10,300	27,570	5,670	6,290	-	39,530	32,180	9,110	36,840	6,100	-	-	-	84,230	-	-	-	-	-	123,760	134,060
1991-92	6,230	1,150	2,580	9,960	25,060	5,660	6,360	-	37,080	32,660	9,010	40,360	5,780	-	1,550	-	89,360	-	-	-	-	-	126,440	136,400
1992-93	6,880	1,180	2,580	10,640	25,550	6,210	6,460	-	38,220	34,100	9,600	41,510	5,640	-	4,720	-	95,570	-	-	-	-	-	133,790	144,430
1993-94	6,440	1,150	2,710	10,300	23,800	5,830	6,540	-	36,170	32,640	7,790	37,310	5,430	-	7,010	-	90,180	-	-	-	-	-	126,350	136,650
1994-95	6,720	1,180	2,560	10,460	26,330	5,500	6,820	-	38,650	33,950	7,340	39,680	5,360	-	8,690	-	95,020	-	-	-	-	-	133,670	144,130
1995-96	6,550	1,260	2,640	10,450	13,240	2,770	6,890	20,760	43,660	33,960	7,850	39,590	4,810	-	9,060	-	95,270	-	-	-	-	-	138,930	149,380
1996-97	6,510	1,280	2,780	10,570	-	-	7,160	42,800	49,960	34,240	5,040	39,940	4,790	-	9,750	-	93,760	-	-	-	-	-	143,720	154,290
1997-98	7,022	1,356	3,116	11,494	-	-	7,063	49,683	56,746	35,422	8,718	44,940	4,969	-	9,264	1,461	104,774	1,779	1690	-	-	1,690	163,210	174,793
1998-99	7,379	1,367	3,128	11,874	-	-	6,524	47,587	54,111	34,844	11,629	43,354	5,345	-	9,534	4,594	109,300	-	-	-	3,049	3,049	166,460	178,334
1999-00	7,670	1,373	3,284	12,327	-	-	7,392	45,012	52,404	35,399	13,152	42,967	4,378	-	9,954	2,371	108,221	-	-	-	4,159	4,159	164,784	177,111
2000-01	7,379	1,377	3,345	12,101	-	-	8,346	49,407	57,753	35,663	13,100	43,863	4,401	-	11,615	2,210	110,852	-	-	-	4,245	4,245	172,850	184,951
2001-02	7,395	1,434	3,285	12,114	-	-	7,952	44,513	52,465	35,586	12,378	40,377	4,056	-	10,677	2,380	105,454	-	-	352	4,477	4,829	162,748	174,862
2002-03	7,499	1,593	3,480	12,572	217	4	8,042	45,570	53,833	36,298	12,027	45,838	4,343	-	10,837	2,409	111,752	2,312	2,024	444	5,012	7,480	173,065	185,925
2003-04	6,625	1,793	3,898	12,316	124	0	8,158	44,526	52,808	36,664	11,394	39,734	2,307	4,821	9,113	2,818	106,851	4,345	1,140	549	5,037	6,726	166,386	181,907
2004-05	7,632	2,051	3,899	13,583	4,406	183	7,815	42,025	54,428	38,123	12,558	40,644	-	8,777	8,637	3,521	112,260	15,195	13,746	653	7,025	21,424	188,112	203,144
2005-06	5,789	2,246	3,945	11,981	1,184	101	7,883	45,259	54,427	37,358	13,021	35,486	-	9,036	8,389	3,311	106,601	14,669	12,631	701	6,259	19,591	180,618	194,637
2006-07	4,991	2,555	4,056	11,601	10	-	7,654	44,011	51,676	36,355	11,727	31,829	-	12,534	6,851	4,376	103,672	13,105	11,092	691	4,792	16,575	171,922	185,537
2007-08	3,665	2,856	4,055	10,576	518	0	7,258	42,476	50,252	35,703	9,408	26,001	-	12,200	8,029	5,952	97,293	10,808	8,930	811	1,553	11,294	158,839	171,293
2008-09	2,386	2,894	3,993	9,273	263	0	6,724	40,311	47,299	33,636	9,062	23,854	-	9,711	8,920	6,374	91,557	6,669	4,653	948	518	6,119	144,975	156,264
2009-10	2,876	2,956	4,105	9,937	298	-	6,658	40,672	47,628	33,731	8,808	21,983	-	8,046	7,258	6,153	85,978	4,961	4,814	934	876	6,624	140,231	150,315
2010-11	3,271	3,050	4,196	10,516	1,292	-	6,710	39,333	47,335	33,487	9,275	18,177	-	7,279	5,987	6,486	80,690	5,680	5,418	622	4,464	10,504	138,529	149,308

TABLE 2 (continued)
TREATED WASTEWATER EFFLUENT DISCHARGED ABOVE PRADO
(acre-feet)

Water Year	Wastewater discharges upstream from Colton that generally do not flow continuously to Santa Ana River above E Street				Wastewater discharges to Santa Ana River and its tributaries that have hydraulic continuity to the Santa Ana River above Riverside Narrows					Wastewater discharges to the Santa Ana River between Riverside Narrows and Prado Dam								Wastewater discharges to Temescal Creek or its tributaries which have hydraulic continuity to the Santa Ana River					Total Discharge to surface flow of the Santa Ana River	Total Waste Water Discharged in the Watershed
	Redlands	Beaumont	Yucaipa[8]	Subtotal (A)	San Bernardino[7]	Colton	Rialto	RIX[1]	Subtotal (B)	Riverside	Corona[2]	IEUA RP 1[3]	IEUA RP 2	IEUA RP 5	IEUA CCWRF[4]	WRCRWA[5,9]	Subtotal (C)	EMWD Discharge[10] (1)	Est. EMWD Arriving at Prado[10] (2)	Temescal Valley[6] WRP (3)	Elsinore Valley MWD (4)	Subtotal (D) (2+3+4)	(B+C+D)	(A+B+C+D+1-2)
2011-12	3,503	3,054	4,112	10,669	76	-	6,703	37,966	44,745	31,622	9,249	14,563	-	7,184	5,137	6,409	74,164	1,225	735	507	786	2,027	120,936	132,096
2012-13	3,652	3,139	4,191	10,982	13	-	6,611	35,390	42,014	31,996	9,406	10,647	-	5,388	5,015	6,994	69,446	2,727	502	502	650	1,654	113,113	126,321
2013-14	3,549	3,345	4,133	11,028	175	-	6,527	33,271	39,973	30,302	8,662	9,898	-	3,188	3,606	6,402	62,058	0	0	533	623	1,156	103,187	114,215
2014-15	3,149	3,428	2,892	9,469	0	-	6,285	31,668	37,954	29,673	9,611	11,589	-	3,957	4,124	7,173	66,127	0	0	605	626	1,231	105,311	114,780
2015-16	3,274	3,372	3,148	9,794	15	-	6,420	32,343	38,778	29,074	10,425	12,531	-	2,910	3,368	7,575	65,883	0	0	174	644	818	105,479	115,273
2016-17	3,084	3,645	3,445	10,174	327	-	6,755	35,306	42,387	30,030	8,445	12,390	-	3,324	3,813	7,363	65,365	2,919	1,400	894	589	2,882	110,634	122,327
2017-18	1,891	3,749	3,562	9,202	0	-	6,210	32,493	38,703	28,922	8,574	12,564	-	3,854	1,627	7,610	63,151	0	0	1154	626	1,780	103,634	112,836
2018-19	3,909	4,043	3,430	11,382	0	-	6,892	32,925	39,817	24,962	8,851	19,093	-	6,831	2,944	7,829	70,510	6,116	4,317	1,070	520	5,907	116,234	129,414
2019-20	3,633	4,272	2,996	10,901	0	-	7,385	32,506	39,890	23,283	8,668	16,228	-	4,982	2,872	7,483	63,516	7,280	4,597	139	569	5,305	108,712	122,295
2020-21	3,748	4,151	2,904	10,803	0	-	7,675	31,902	39,577	28,798	8,744	13,615	-	5,223	2,416	9,062	67,858	2,480	273	819	540	1,631	109,066	122,076

1. RIX = Rapid Infiltration and Extraction Facility for San Bernardino and Colton, including over-extraction of groundwater
2. A portion of the Corona discharge goes to ponds, which are considered tributary to the Santa Ana River.
3. Beginning in 1997-98, includes IEUA Plant #4 flows. In 2016-17 RP1 effluent includes flows into Prado Regional Park Lake.
4. CCWRF = Carbon Canyon Water Reclamation Facility
5. WRCRWA = Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority (Treatment Plant)
6. Lee Lake WTP name changed to Temescal Valley WRP in WY 2014-15
7. Discharge data were updated during the 2016-17 reporting cycle.
8. Discharge data for Water Year 2014-15 through 2018-19 were updated during the 2019-20 reporting cycle.
9. Discharge data for Water Year 2014-15 through 2017-18 were updated during the 2020-21 reporting cycle.
10. Discharge data for Water Year 2016-17 were updated during the 2020-21 reporting cycle.

Dashes = A treatment plant cannot have a release because it either was not built at the time (i.e. RIX pre 1995), has been decommissioned, or the flows ultimately end up being released through another plant (i.e. IEQA #2 post 2004)
Zeros = A treatment plant with a permit to allow wet weather releases.

The amounts shown in this table were determined from data provided by the agencies.

TABLE 3

HIGH SALINITY WATER EXPORTED
FROM THE SANTA ANA RIVER WATERSHED

Water Year	Inland Empire Utility Agency Non-Reclaimable Wastewater North System[4] (acre-feet)	Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority Santa Ana Regional Interceptor (SARI)[1] SARI Flow[2] (acre-feet)	Average TDS (mg/L)	Total IEUA and SARI Flow (acre-feet)
1980-81	NA	0		NA
1981-82	4,236	0		4,236
1982-83	4,651	0		4,651
1983-84	4,142	0		4,142
1984-85	2,346	0		2,346
1985-86	2,995	2,791 [3]	NA	5,786 [3]
1986-87	4,943	2,869 [3]	NA	7,813 [3]
1987-88	5,177	2,948 [3]	NA	8,125 [3]
1988-89	5,949	3,622 [3]	NA	9,572 [3]
1989-90	5,240	7,393	1,649	12,633
1990-91	2,847	7,340	1,906	10,187
1991-92	3,421	6,457	2,346	9,878
1992-93	3,774	5,277	2,516	9,051
1993-94	3,764	7,860	2,302	11,624
1994-95	4,131	8,656	1,903	12,787
1995-96	3,863	9,597	2,175	13,460
1996-97	4,191	10,225	2,292	14,417
1997-98	4,575	8,210	2,456	12,785
1998-99	3,666	4,305	2,611	7,971
1999-00	4,272	7,711	2,154	11,983
2000-01	5,075	8,205	2,504	13,280
2001-02	4,297	8,385	3,289	12,682
2002-03	3,926	9,331	3,482	13,257
2003-04	3,950	10,505	3,798	14,455
2004-05	4,220	10,971	3,460	15,191
2005-06	5,085	12,847	4,118	17,932
2006-07	4,609	13,168	4,120	17,777
2007-08	4,658	12,123	4,986	16,781
2008-09	4,284	12,993	5,037	17,277
2009-10	3,865	13,325	5,003	17,190
2010-11	3,443	13,282	5,066	16,725
2011-12	3,668	13,471	5,884	17,139
2012-13	3,862	12,061	5,626	15,923
2013-14	4,190	12,185	5,350	16,375
2014-15	4,063	12,056	5,460	16,119
2015-16	4,110	11,396	5,364	15,506
2016-17	4,324	11,957	5,361	16,281
2017-18	4,410	11,520	5,626	15,930
2018-19	4,193	11,336	5,953	15,529
2019-20	4,033	12,628	5,806	16,661
2020-21	4,177	12,299	6,239	16,476

(1) Santa Ana Regional Interceptor began operation in 1985-86.
(2) IEUA Non-Reclaimable Wastewater from the South System goes into the SARI and is included in SARI Flow.
(3) SARI flow and Total Flow for 1985-86 through 1988-89 is partial flow.
(4) From WY1970-21 to WY1980-81, IEUA Non-reclaimable Wastewater North System Discharges Data are not available (NA).

Chino Groundwater Basin Hydraulic Control

During most of the twentieth century much of the land overlying the Chino Basin was devoted to irrigated agriculture that obtained its water supply directly from the basin. In more recent times the agriculture is being replaced by urban development, but the agricultural water use left behind a legacy of high concentrations of nitrates and other salts in the groundwater, making it unsuitable for urban use unless treated. As agricultural pumping of groundwater in the lower part of the Basin was cut back, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region ("RWQCB"), and OCWD both became concerned about the outlook for increased amounts of poor quality water rising in the Santa Ana River above Prado Dam.

Under historic anti-degradation water quality standards, the recharge of recycled water in the Chino Basin was impossible because the Basin lacked assimilative capacity. In order to allow for the use and recharge of recycled water, the RWQCB amended the Basin Plan for the Santa Ana Watershed to allow for the use of special "maximum benefit" standards. As a condition of approval of the use of the maximum benefit standards, the RWQCB's Water Quality Control Plan requires that the Chino Basin entities develop and implement a Hydraulic Control Program with the dual objectives of minimizing the loss of groundwater to the River and protecting the River against the salts by increasing pumping from wells low in the Basin. Much of the pumped groundwater is treated in desalination facilities, with the product water being served to municipalities and the brine stream being exported to the ocean via the SARI/IEBL.

The Chino Basin Watermaster files an annual report with RWQCB on the program, water chemistry, hydrologic balance, piezometric groundwater surface elevations, and groundwater modeling. In February 2016, Chino Basin Watermaster announced that hydraulic control had been achieved.

Watermaster Service Expenses

In accordance with Paragraph 7(d) of the Judgment, the fees and expenses of each of the members of the Watermaster are borne by the parties by whom they were nominated. All other Watermaster service expenses are shared by the parties with OCWD paying 40% of the cost and WMWD, SBVMWD, and IEUA each paying 20% of the cost.

The Watermaster annually adopts a budget for the costs of services other than those provided by the USGS. Table 4 shows the budget and actual expenses incurred for such services during the 2020-21 fiscal year as well as the budget adopted for the 2021-22 fiscal year. A financial review was performed by OCWD and is reported in Appendix C.

TABLE 4

WATERMASTER SERVICE BUDGET AND EXPENSES

Budget Item	July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021 Budget	July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021 Expenses	July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022 Budget
Support Services	$11,500.00	$8,500.00*	$9,000.00
Reproduction of Annual Report	1,000.00	660.00*	1,000.00
TOTAL	$12,500.00	$9,160.00*	$10,000.00

* The expenses for Fiscal Year 2020-21 were paid during Fiscal Year 2021-22.

Stream flow measurements and water quality data required by the Watermaster are, for the most part, furnished by the USGS through a cooperative monitoring program which also includes some precipitation data to supplement data provided by the USGS and other agencies. The costs of the cooperative monitoring program for Water Year 2020-21, and each party's share of the costs, are set forth in Table 5.

TABLE 5

COSTS TO THE PARTIES AND USGS FOR MEASUREMENTS WHICH PROVIDE DATA USED BY THE SANTA ANA RIVER WATERMASTER

October 1, 2020 to September 30, 2021

	Total Cost	USGS Share	Parties' Share
USGS PRECIPITATION GAGING STATIONS			
Gilbert Street Precipitation Gage at San Bernardino	$8,430	$0	$8,430
Middle Fork Lytle Creek Precipitation	$8,430	$8,430	$0
USGS FLOW AND WATER QUALITY GAGING			
Santa Ana River at MWD Crossing (Riverside Narrows)			
Surface Water Gage	$30,250	$10,130	$20,120
Water Quality Monitoring TDS Sampling	$12,700	$4,480	$8,220
Santa Ana River below Prado Dam			
Surface Water Gage	$26,300	$26,300	$0
Extra Measurements in WY20	$8,400	$0	$8,400
Water Quality Monitoring	$19,430	$6,400	$13,030
Water Quality Monitoring TDS Sampling	$12,700	$3,450	$9,250
Water Quality Conductance Program	$2,950	$0	$2,950
Temescal Creek above Main St., near Corona	$21,770	$7,330	$14,440
Chino Creek at Schaefer Avenue	$21,770	$7,330	$14,440
Cucamonga Creek near Mira Loma	$21,770	$7,330	$14,440
Temescal Creek at Corona Lake near Corona	$14,480	$0	$14,480
TOTAL COST AND SHARES	$209,380	$81,180	$128,200
COST DISTRIBUTION AMONG PARTIES			
Inland Empire Utilities Agency	20%		$25,640
Orange County Water District	40%		$51,280
San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District	20%		$25,640
Western Municipal Water district	20%		$25,640

CHAPTER II

BASE FLOW AT PRADO

This chapter deals with determinations of 1) the components of flow at Prado, which include Nontributary Flow, water discharged from San Jacinto Watershed, Storm Flow, and Base Flow and 2) the Adjusted Base Flow at Prado credited to IEUA and WMWD.

Flow at Prado

During Water Year 2020-21, the flow of the River as measured at the USGS gaging station below Prado Dam amounted to 99,158 acre-feet. There was no water in storage at the beginning of the Water Year, and 1 acre-foot remained in storage at the end of the Water Year. Inflow to the reservoir included 74,580 acre-feet of Base Flow and 24,306 acre-feet of Storm Flow. There were no Nontributary Flows to Prado. Water discharged from the San Jacinto Watershed was excluded from Base Flow but was partially credited to the Cumulative Credit at Prado. Discharge from the San Jacinto Watershed calculated to have reached Prado Reservoir was 273 acre-feet. The monthly components of flow of the River at Prado Dam for Water Year 2020-21 are listed in Table 6 and are shown graphically on Plate 4. Historical Base and Storm Flows of the River below Prado during Water Years 1934-35 through 2020-21 are presented on Plate 5.

Nontributary Flow

Nontributary Flow includes water that originated outside the watershed and other water that the Watermaster has determined should be excluded from Base Flow. During Water Year 2020-21, there were no Nontributary Flows that were determined to have reached Prado. Some flows from the San Jacinto Watershed were determined to have reached Prado Reservoir. In the past, Nontributary Flows have included, and may include in the future, other water discharged to the River pursuant to water exchange or other such programs.

Releases to San Antonio Creek

Since May 1973, OCWD has from time to time purchased State Water Project water for the replenishment of the groundwater basin in Orange County. The water has been released at two locations: Santa Ana River above Riverside Narrows (1972-72 only) and San Antonio Creek near the City of Upland. The general procedure used by the Watermaster to account for Nontributary Flows released to San Antonio Creek via OC-59 is fully described in the Twelfth (1981-82) Annual Report. During Water Year 2020-21, there was no water discharged to San Antonio Creek for OCWD via OC-59.

TABLE 6

COMPONENTS OF FLOW AT PRADO DAM
WATER YEAR 2020-21
(acre-feet)

	USGS Measured Outflow	Storage Change (1)	Computed Inflow	San Jacinto Watershed Flow at Prado (2)	San Antonio Creek (3)	Storm Flow	Base Flow
2020							
October	4,759	1	4,760	0	0	0	4,760
November	7,384	1	7,385	0	0	1,033	6,352
December	9,431	3,583	13,014	0	0	5,521	7,493
2021							
January	13,148	6,341	19,489	0	0	10,995	8,494
February	13,252	(4,189)	9,063	0	0	1,246	7,817
March	14,874	(2,145)	12,729	242	0	4,321	8,166
April	11,377	(3,590)	7,787	31	0	680	7,076
May	6,386	0	6,386	0	0	30	6,356
June	4,920	(1)	4,919	0	0	0	4,919
July	4,588	25	4,613	0	0	349	4,264
August	4,421	(25)	4,396	0	0	62	4,334
September	4,618	0	4,618	0	0	69	4,549
Total	99,158	1	99,159	273	0	24,306	74,580

(1) The monthly change in storage is included in the monthly components of flow.

(2) Discharge due to overflow of Lake Elsinore and/or discharge of wastewater by EMWD from the San Jacinto Watershed.

(3) State Water Project water released into San Antonio Creek from turnout OC-59 for OCWD and calculated to have reached Prado this Water Year.

San Jacinto Watershed Discharge

Prior to Water Year 1997-98, discharges from the San Jacinto Watershed reaching Prado Reservoir were due to discharges from Lake Elsinore and had been accounted for as "Lake Elsinore Discharge." In 1998, Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) completed its Reach 4 discharge pipeline to Wasson Canyon, which is tributary to Temescal Wash. The pipeline discharges tertiary-treated wastewater to Temescal Wash above Lee Lake when flows exceed EMWD's storage facility capacity. The collective discharges from Lake Elsinore and EMWD to Temescal Wash are referred to herein as San Jacinto Watershed discharges.

During water Year 2020-21, EMWD discharged 2,480 acre-feet of treated wastewater to Temescal Wash, and 273 acre-feet of that discharge was estimated to have reached Prado Reservoir. OCWD captured 273 acre-feet of the San Jacinto Watershed discharge and none of that water flowed past OCWD groundwater recharge facilities and was considered as lost to the ocean. Because discharges from the San Jacinto Watershed were not envisioned in the formulation of the Judgment, the Watermaster previously determined that to the extent such discharges occur and are captured by OCWD, fifty percent of such captured water will be added as Cumulative Credit at Prado. Thus, for Water Year 2020-21, the Cumulative Credit at Prado includes 137 acre-feet of San Jacinto Watershed outflow. Summaries of the EMWD Discharges, San Jacinto Watershed Discharge Calculations, and San Jacinto Watershed Discharges are contained in Appendix E. Page E-16 of Appendix E includes hydrographs of Discharge of Temescal Creek at Main Street in Corona, Lee Lake Discharge, EMWD Discharge, and Elsinore Precipitation. These hydrographs illustrate the known and estimated components of flow of Temescal Creek

Storm Flow

Portions of storm flows are retained behind Prado Dam for flow regulation and for water conservation purposes. The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) owns and operates the Dam according to a flow release schedule which allows for water to be captured and subsequently released at rates which can be captured and recharged by OCWD. The Dam has a spillway elevation of 543 feet above mean sea level. In 1995 the USACE, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and OCWD reached an agreement to increase the seasonal water conservation pool from elevation 494 to elevation 505 feet after March 1 of each year in exchange for a $1 million contribution by OCWD to the USFWS to be used to develop least Bell's vireo habitat by the removal of a non-native plant, *Arundo donax*. In 2006 the USACE and OCWD signed an agreement to increase the winter conservation pool elevation from elevation 494 to 498 in exchange for a $930,000 contribution from OCWD to habitat restoration in the watershed and other commitments from OCWD. In 2018 the USACE began operating the winter conservation pool elevation to 505 feet as part of a multi-year planned deviation to the Prado Dam Water Control Manual. In 2021 the USACE South Pacific Division Commander approved updating the Water Control Manual for the winter conservation pool elevation to be 505 feet on a permanent basis. With this update in 2021, the water conservation pool elevation is 505 feet without seasonal restrictions. Monthly and annual quantities of Storm Flow at Prado Dam are shown in Table 6.

During Water Year 2020-21, the maximum volume of water stored in Prado Reservoir reached 10,031 acre-feet on February 1, 2021. The maximum daily mean flow released from Prado Dam to the River during the Water Year was 435 cfs on December 30, 2020.

Base Flow

The Base Flow is that portion of the total flow remaining after subtracting Storm Flow, Nontributary Flow and certain other flows determined by the Watermaster. Flows affecting the determination of Base Flow in Water Year 2020-21 did not include discharges from the San Jacinto Watershed. The general procedure used by the Watermaster to separate the Water Year 2020-21 flow components was the same as used for previous years and is fully described in the Fifth (1974-75) Annual Report. Table 6 shows the monthly and annual quantities of Base Flow.

Water Quality Adjustments

The flow-weighted average TDS for the total flow passing Prado Dam was calculated to be 609 mg/L. This determination was based on records from a continuous monitoring device operated by the USGS for EC of the River flow below Prado Dam. This record was supplemented by forty-two (42) grab samples for EC collected by the USGS and then analyzed for TDS.

For Water Year 2020-21 a correlation between TDS and EC yields the following best fit equation:

$$TDS = EC \times 0.6123$$

(where the units of TDS and EC are mg/L and μs/cm, respectively)

Using the daily EC data, flow-weighted average daily concentrations for TDS were calculated using the above equation. The plot of TDS on Plate 6 shows the average daily TDS concentration of the River flow passing Prado Dam. A summary of daily TDS and EC of the River below Prado Dam is contained in Appendix F. At Prado Dam, the flow-weighted average annual TDS concentration of 609 mg/L represents the quality of the total flow including releases to San Antonio Creek and discharges from San Jacinto Watershed, if any. The Judgment requires that Base Flow shall be subject to adjustment based on the TDS of Base Flow and Storm Flow only. Hence, a determination of the TDS of Base Flow plus Storm Flow only is detailed in the following paragraphs.

Adjustment for State Water Project Flow to San Antonio Creek

No State Water Project flows discharged to San Antonio Creek reached Prado Dam.

Adjustment for San Jacinto Watershed Discharge

Discharge from the San Jacinto Watershed during Water Year 2020-21 reaching Prado Reservoir was estimated to be 273 acre-feet. Using EMWD discharge data, the TDS data

for the discharge, and monthly volume of the discharge estimated to have reached Prado Reservoir, a flow-weighted average TDS of 789 mg/L was calculated. A summary of these calculations is contained in Appendix E.

Flow Component	Annual Flow (acre-feet)	Average TDS	Annual Flow X Average TDS
1. Measured Outflow	99,158	609	60,387,222
2. Less Nontributary Flow San Antonio Creek	0	---	---
3. Less San Jacinto Watershed Discharge	273	789	215,397
4. Measured Outflow less lines 2 and 3	98,885		60,171,825
Average TDS in Total Base and Storm Flow	60,171,825 ÷ 98,885 = 609 mg/L		

As shown above, the flow-weighted average annual TDS of Storm Flow and Base Flow for Water Year 2020-21 is 609 mg/L.

Adjusted Base Flow at Prado

The Judgment provides that the amount of Base Flow at Prado received during any year shall be subject to adjustment based on flow-weighted average annual TDS of the Base Flow and Storm Flow at Prado as follows:

If the Weighted Average TDS in Base Flow and Storm Flow at Prado is:	Then the Adjusted Base Flow shall be determined by the formula:
Greater than 800 mg/L	$Q - \frac{35}{42,000} Q(TDS-800)$
700 mg/L to 800 mg/L	Q
Less than 700 mg/L	$Q + \frac{35}{42,000} Q(700-TDS)$

where Q = Base Flow actually received.

The flow-weighted average annual TDS of 609 mg/L is less than 700 mg/L. Therefore, the Base Flow of 74,580 acre-feet must be adjusted by the above equation for TDS less than 700 mg/L. Thus, the Adjusted Base Flow is as follows:

$$(74,580 \text{ acre-feet}) + \frac{35}{42,000} \times (74,580 \text{ acre-feet}) \times (700 - 609) = 80,236 \text{ acre-feet}$$

Entitlement and Credit or Debit

Paragraph 5(c) of the Judgment states that "CBMWD (now IEUA) and WMWD shall be responsible for an average annual Adjusted Base Flow of 42,000 acre-feet at Prado. CBMWD (IEUA) and WMWD each year shall be responsible for not less than 37,000 acre-feet of Base Flow at Prado, plus one-third of any cumulative debit; provided, however, that for any year commencing on or after October 1, 1986, when there is no cumulative debit, or for any year prior to 1986 whenever the cumulative credit exceeds 30,000 acre-feet, said minimum shall be 34,000 acre-feet."

The Watermaster agreed that San Jacinto Watershed outflows were not envisioned during the formulation of the Judgment and because of the periodic occurrence of San Jacinto Watershed flows at Prado, the Watermaster decided, as in previous years, to credit one-half of any such outflows recharging the groundwater basin in Orange County to IEUA and WMWD.

The findings of the Watermaster concerning flow at Prado for Water Year 2020-21 required under the Judgment are as follows:

1.	Measured Outflow at Prado	99,158 acre-feet
2.	Base Flow at Prado	74,580 acre-feet
3.	Annual Weighted TDS of Base and Storm Flow	609 mg/L
4.	Annual Adjusted Base Flow	80,236 acre-feet
5.	Cumulative Adjusted Base Flow	5,884,614 acre-feet
6.	Other Credits (Debits) [1]	137 acre-feet
7.	Cumulative Entitlement of OCWD	2,142,000 acre-feet
8.	Cumulative Credit [2]	3,785,640 acre-feet
9.	One-Third of Cumulative Debit	0 acre-feet
10.	Minimum Required Base Flow in 2021-22	34,000 acre-feet

1. Other Credits (Debits) are comprised of San Jacinto Watershed outflow.
2. Cumulative Credit includes 43,026 acre-feet of San Jacinto Watershed cumulative outflow.

TABLE 7
HISTORICAL WATERMASTER FINDINGS AT PRADO DAM
(acre-feet)

Water Year	Base Flow	Annual Adjusted Base Flow	Cumulative Adjusted Base Flow	Other Credits (Debits)[1]	Cumulative Entitlement of OCWD	Cumulative Credit[2]
1970-71	38,402	38,402	38,402	0	42,000	-3,598
1971-72	40,416	40,416	78,818	0	84,000	-5,182
1972-73	48,999	51,531	130,349	0	126,000	4,349
1973-74	43,106	45,513	175,862	0	168,000	7,862
1974-75	50,176	51,263	227,125	0	210,000	17,125
1975-76	45,627	48,098	275,223	0	252,000	23,223
1976-77	48,387	50,000	325,223	0	294,000	31,223
1977-78	58,501	73,955	399,178	0	336,000	63,178
1978-79	71,863	79,049	478,227	0	378,000	100,227
1979-80	82,509	106,505	584,732	0	420,000	164,732
1980-81	74,875	74,875	659,607	8,045	462,000	205,652
1981-82	81,548	89,431	749,038	0	504,000	253,083
1982-83	111,692	138,591	887,629	3,362	546,000	353,036
1983-84	109,231	115,876	1,003,505	4,602	588,000	431,514
1984-85	125,023	133,670	1,137,175	0	630,000	523,184
1985-86	127,215	141,315	1,278,490	0	672,000	622,499
1986-87	119,848	127,638	1,406,128	0	714,000	708,137
1987-88	124,104	136,308	1,542,436	0	756,000	802,445
1988-89	119,572	131,230	1,673,666	0	798,000	891,675
1989-90	119,149	127,986	1,801,652	0	840,000	977,661
1990-91	111,515	128,379	1,930,031	0	882,000	1,064,040
1991-92	106,948	124,862	2,054,893	0	924,000	1,146,902
1992-93	128,067	163,499	2,218,392	0	966,000	1,268,401
1993-94	111,186	119,432	2,337,824	0	1,008,000	1,345,833
1994-95	123,468	152,792	2,490,616	1,762	1,050,000	1,458,387
1995-96	131,861	152,299	2,642,915	0	1,092,000	1,568,686
1996-97	136,676	157,861	2,800,776	0	1,134,000	1,684,547
1997-98[3]	155,711	195,677	2,996,453	0	1,176,000	1,838,224
1998-99	158,637	174,369	3,170,822	0	1,218,000	1,970,593
1999-00	148,269	169,644	3,340,466	0	1,260,000	2,098,237
2000-01	153,914	176,360	3,516,826	0	1,302,000	2,232,597
2001-02	145,981	159,728	3,676,554	0	1,344,000	2,350,325
2002-03	146,113	174,970	3,851,524	887	1,386,000	2,484,182
2003-04[4]	143,510	167,190	4,018,714	247	1,428,000	2,609,619
2004-05	154,307	199,570	4,218,284	2,366	1,470,000	2,769,555
2005-06	147,736	170,266	4,388,550	3,562	1,512,000	2,901,383
2006-07	129,830	140,216	4,528,766	5,531	1,554,000	3,005,130
2007-08	116,483	136,382	4,665,148	4,165	1,596,000	3,103,677
2008-09	102,711	117,519	4,782,667	2,189	1,638,000	3,181,385
2009-10	103,099	125,179	4,907,846	1,489	1,680,000	3,266,053
2010-11[4]	102,031	117,166	5,025,012	1,193	1,722,000	3,342,412
2011-12	93,068	101,056	5,126,068	365	1,764,000	3,401,833
2012-13	81,452	86,814	5,212,882	243	1,806,000	3,446,890

TABLE 7 (Continued)
HISTORICAL WATERMASTER FINDINGS AT PRADO DAM
(acre-feet)

Water Year	Base Flow	Annual Adjusted Base Flow	Cumulative Adjusted Base Flow	Other Credits (Debits)[1]	Cumulative Entitlement of OCWD	Cumulative Credit[2]
2013-14	63,536	69,784	5,282,666	0	1,848,000	3,474,674
2014-15	64,048	73,548	5,356,214	0	1,890,000	3,506,222
2015-16	71,225	79,535	5,435,749	0	1,932,000	3,543,757
2016-17[5]	69,806	86,967	5,522,716	623	1,974,000	3,589,347
2017-18[5]	65,438	69,528	5,592,244	0	2,016,000	3,616,875
2018-19[5]	97,993	122,900	5,715,144	1,150	2,058,000	3,698,925
2019-20[5]	74,465	89,234	5,804,378	1,108	2,100,000	3,747,267
2020-21	74,580	80,236	5,884,614	137	2,142,000	3,785,640

(1) Other Credits (Debits) are comprised of San Jacinto Watershed outflow which is the sum of discharge from Lake Elsinore and wastewater discharged by EMWD.

(2) Cumulative Credit includes 43,026 acre-feet of San Jacinto Watershed cumulative outflow.

(3) The Base Flow and Adjusted Base Flow for Water Year 1997-98 were returned to their originally published values to correct an error in the adjustment to account for San Jacinto Watershed flow arriving at Prado. This correction is also reflected in the Cumulative Credit for this and subsequent years.

(4) A correction was made for Water Years 2003-04 and 2010-11 in the calculation of Weighted TDS based on an adjustment to account for OC-59 water that arrived at Prado. This correction is reflected in the Weighted TDS and Adjusted Base Flow for these years. This correction is also reflected in the Cumulative Credit for these and subsequent years.

(5) In 2021, EMWD identified that their recycled water discharges to Temescal Creek in Water Year 2016-17 were not reflected in the Watermaster annual reports. This omission was corrected by estimating the volume of the San Jacinto Watershed discharge that arrived at Prado using procedures described in Appendix E of the Fifty-First Annual Report. Accordingly, adjustments were made to the Base Flow, Adjusted Base Flow, and Other Credits at Prado for Water Year 2016-17, and to the Cumulative Adjusted Base Flow and Cumulative Credit at Prado for Water Years 2016-17 through 2019-20.

CHAPTER III

BASE FLOW AT RIVERSIDE NARROWS

This chapter deals with determinations of 1) the components of flow at Riverside Narrows, which include Storm Flow and Base Flow and 2) the Adjusted Base Flow at Riverside Narrows credited to SBVMWD.

Flow at Riverside Narrows

The flow of the River at Riverside Narrows was to 39,311 acre-feet, measured at the USGS gaging station near the MWD Crossing. Separated into its components, Base Flow was 31,099 acre-feet and Storm Flow was 10,106 acre-feet. Included in Base Flow is 1,894 acre-feet of treated wastewater from Rubidoux Community Services District (Rubidoux CSD) that now bypasses the USGS gaging station. The Storm and Base Flow components of the flow of the River at Riverside Narrows for each month in the Water Year 2020-21 are listed in Table 8 and shown graphically on Plate 7. The components of flow of the River at Riverside Narrows during the period 1934-35 through 2020-21 are presented on Plate 8.

Nontributary Flow

Nontributary Flow includes water that originated outside the watershed, as well as other water that the Watermaster has determined should be excluded from Base Flow. During Water Year 2020-21, no Nontributary Flow was delivered to the River upstream of Riverside Narrows and Prado Dam. In the past, Nontributary Flows have included, and may include in the future, other water discharged to the River pursuant to water exchange or other such programs.

Base Flow

Based on the hydrograph shown on Plate 7 a separation was made between Storm Flow and the sum of Base Flow and Nontributary Flow utilizing in general the procedures reflected in the Work Papers of the engineers (as referenced in Paragraph 2 of the Engineering Appendix of the Judgment).

In April 1980, Rubidoux CSD made the first delivery of treated wastewater to the regional treatment plant at Riverside. Prior to that time, Rubidoux CSD had discharged to the River upstream of the Riverside Narrows gaging station. Treated wastewater from Rubidoux CSD during Water Year 2020-21, in the amount of 1,894 acre-feet, has been added to the Base Flow as measured at the gaging station. A summary of Rubidoux CSD discharges is contained in Appendix G.

TABLE 8

COMPONENTS OF FLOW AT RIVERSIDE NARROWS
WATER YEAR 2020-21
(acre-feet)

	Month	USGS Measured Flow	Storm Flow	Rubidoux Waste-water	Base Flow [1]
2020	October	2,165	0	164	2,329
	November	2,734	184	158	2,708
	December	4,830	2,042	161	2,949
2021	January	8,751	5,867	160	3,044
	February	3,506	551	142	3,097
	March	4,677	1,387	159	3,449
	April	2,957	0	153	3,110
	May	2,487	0	162	2,649
	June	1,929	0	156	2,085
	July	1,976	75	162	2,063
	August	1,637	0	160	1,797
	September	1,662	0	157	1,819
Total		39,311	10,106	1,894	31,099

(1) Base Flow equals USGS measured flow, minus storm flow, minus transferred water (when applicable), plus Rubidoux Wastewater.

Water Quality Adjustments

The determination of water quality at the Riverside Narrows Gaging Station was made using periodic grab samples taken and analyzed for TDS by the USGS and the City of Riverside. A summary of TDS and EC data of the River at Riverside Narrows is contained in Appendix H.

In October 2013, the City of Riverside changed the TDS and EC location for sampling. That new sampling location was further upstream and was not representative of stream flow at the Riverside Narrows. Beginning October 2016, the City of Riverside again changed its sampling location and its TDS and EC data are again representative of stream flow at the Riverside Narrows. The City data are used in the water quality adjustments for Water Year 2020-21.

Adjustment for Nontributary Flow

During Water Year 2020-21, there was no Nontributary Flow. Therefore, no water quality adjustment was required.

Adjustment for Treated Wastewater Discharges from the Rubidoux Community Services District

The flow-weighted quality of treated wastewater from Rubidoux CSD was 767 mg/L. A monthly summary of discharges and quality is contained in Appendix G.

The Base Flow quality adjustments resulting from exclusion of the Nontributary Flow and inclusion of the Rubidoux CSD treated wastewater are shown in the following table, and resulted in a Base Flow TDS of 623 mg/L.

Flow Component	Annual Flow (acre-feet)	Average TDS (mg/L)	Annual Flow x Average TDS
1. Base Flow plus Nontributary Flow	29,205	614	17,931,870
2. Less Nontributary Flow	0	---	---
3. Plus Rubidoux CSD Treated Wastewater	1,894	767	1,452,698
4. Base Flow (line 1 less line 2 plus line 3)	31,099		19,384,568
Average TDS of Base Flow		19,384,568 ÷ 31,099 = 623 mg/L	

Adjusted Base Flow at Riverside Narrows

The Judgment provides that the amount of Base Flow at Riverside Narrows credited during any year shall be subject to adjustment based on weighted average annual TDS in the Base Flow as follows:

If the Weighted Average TDS in Base Flow at Riverside Narrows is:	Then the Adjusted Base Flow shall be determined by the formula:
Greater than 700 mg/L	$Q - \frac{11}{15,250}Q(TDS-700)$
600 mg/L to 700 mg/L	Q
Less than 600 mg/L	$Q + \frac{11}{15,250}Q(600-TDS)$

where Q = Base Flow actually received.

From the previous subsection, the weighted average annual TDS in the Base Flow at Riverside Narrows for Water Year 2020-21 was 623 mg/L. Therefore, no adjustment is necessary, and the Adjusted Base Flow for Water Year 2020-21 is 31,099 acre-feet.

Entitlement and Credit or Debit

Paragraph 5(b) of the Judgment states that "SBVMWD shall be responsible for an average annual Adjusted Base Flow of 15,250 acre-feet at Riverside Narrows. SBVMWD each year shall be responsible for not less than 13,420 acre-feet of Base Flow plus one-third of any cumulative debit, provided, however, that for any year commencing on or after October 1, 1986, when there is no cumulative debit, or for any year prior to 1986 whenever the cumulative credit exceeds 10,000 acre-feet, said minimum shall be 12,420 acre-feet."

Findings of the Watermaster concerning flow at Riverside Narrows for Water Year 2020-21 required under the Judgment are as follows:

1.	Base Flow at Riverside Narrows	31,099 acre-feet
2.	Annual Weighted TDS of Base Flow	623 mg/L
3.	Annual Adjusted Base Flow	31,099 acre-feet
4.	Cumulative Adjusted Base Flow	2,181,690 acre-feet
5.	Cumulative Entitlement of IEUA and WMWD	777,750 acre-feet
6.	Cumulative Credit	1,403,940 acre-feet
7.	One-Third of Cumulative Debit	0 acre-feet
8.	Minimum Required Base Flow in 2021-22	12,420 acre-feet

CHAPTER IV

HISTORY AND SUMMARY OF THE JUDGMENT in the case of Orange County Water District v. City of Chino, et al. (Case No. 117628-County of Orange)

History of Litigation

The complaint in the case was filed by Orange County Water District on October 18, 1963, seeking an adjudication of water rights against substantially all water users in the area tributary to Prado Dam within the Santa Ana River Watershed, but excluding the area tributary to Lake Elsinore. Thirteen cross-complaints were filed in 1968, extending the adjudication to include substantially all water users in the area downstream from Prado Dam. With some 4,000 parties involved in the case (2,500 from the Upper Area and 1,500 from the Lower Area), it became obvious that every effort should be made to arrive at a settlement and physical solution in order to avoid enormous and unwieldy litigation.

Efforts to arrive at a settlement and physical solution were pursued by public officials, individuals, attorneys, and engineers. Attorneys for the parties organized in order to facilitate settlement discussions and, among other things, provided guidance for the formation and activities of an engineering committee to provide information on the physical facts.

An initial meeting of the engineers representing the parties was held on January 10, 1964. Agreement was reached that it would be beneficial to undertake jointly the compilation of basic data. Liaison was established with the Department of Water Resources, State of California, to expedite the acquisition of data. Engineers representing the parties were divided into subcommittees which were given the responsibility of investigating such things as the boundary of the Santa Ana River Watershed and its subareas, standardization of the terminology, the location and description of wells and diversion facilities, waste disposal and transfer of water between subareas.

In response to a request from the attorneys' committee at a meeting held April 17, 1964, on April 30, 1964, the joint engineering committee prepared a list of preliminary engineering studies directed toward settlement of the Santa Ana River water rights litigation. Special assignments were made to individual engineers on selected items requested by the attorneys' committee.

The attorneys and engineers for the defendants then commenced a series of meetings separate from the representatives of the plaintiffs in order to consolidate their positions and to determine a course of action. On October 7, 1964, engineers for the defendants presented the results of the studies made by the joint engineering committee. The defendants' attorneys requested that additional information be provided on the methods of measuring flow at Prado Dam, the historical supply and disposal of water passing Prado Dam, segregation of flow into components, and determination of the amount of supply which was usable by the downstream area. On December 11, 1964, the supplemental information was presented to the defendants' attorneys.

During 1965, engineers and attorneys for the defendants held numerous conferences and conducted additional studies in an attempt to determine their respective positions in the case. Early in 1966, the plaintiff and defendants exchanged drafts of possible principles for settlement. Commencing March 22 and ending April 13, 1966, four meetings were held by the engineers to discuss the draft of principles for settlement.

On February 25, 1968, the defendants submitted a request to the Court that the Order of Reference be issued requesting the California Department of Water Resources to determine the physical facts. On May 9, 1968, the plaintiffs' attorney submitted motions opposing the Order of Reference and requested that a preliminary injunction be issued. In the meantime, every effort was being made to come to an agreement on the Judgment. Commencing on February 28, 1968 and extending until May 14, 1968, six meetings were held to determine the scope of physical facts on which agreement could be reached so that if an Order of Reference were to be approved by the Court, the work under the proposed reference would not repeat the extensive basic data collection and compilation which had already been completed and on which engineers for both plaintiffs and defendants had reached substantial agreement. Such basic data were compiled and published in two volumes under date of May 14, 1968, entitled "Appendix A, Basic Data."

On May 21, 1968, an outline of a proposal for settlement of the case was prepared and a committee of attorneys and engineers for the parties commenced preparation of the settlement documents. On June 16, 1968, the Court held a hearing on the motions it had received requesting a preliminary injunction and an Order of Reference. The parties requested that the Court delay the preliminary hearings on these motions in view of the efforts toward settlement that were underway. The plaintiff, however, was concerned regarding the necessity of bringing the case to trial within the statutory limitation and, accordingly, on July 15, 1968, submitted a motion to set the complaint in the case for trial. On October 15, 1968, the trial was commenced and was adjourned after one-half day of testimony on behalf of the plaintiff. Thereafter, the parties filed with the Court the necessary Settlement Documents including a Stipulation for Judgment. The Court entered the Judgment on April 17, 1969, along with Stipulations and Orders dismissing all defendants and cross-defendants except for the four major public water districts overlying, in aggregate, substantially all of the major areas of water use in the watershed. The districts, the locations of which are shown on Plate 1, "Santa Ana River Watershed", are as follows:

(1) Orange County Water District (OCWD), representing all lower basin entities located within Orange County downstream of Prado Dam.

(2) Western Municipal Water District (WMWD), representing middle basin entities located within Riverside County on both sides of the Santa Ana River primarily upstream from Prado Dam.

(3) Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA), formerly Chino Basin Municipal Water District (CBMWD), located in the San Bernardino County Chino Basin area, representing middle basin entities within its boundaries and located primarily upstream from Prado Dam.

(4) San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District (SBVMWD), representing all entities within its boundaries, and embraced within the upper portion of the Riverside Basin area, the Colton Basin area (being an upstream portion of the middle basin) and the San Bernardino Basin area, being essentially the upper basin.

Summary of Judgment

Declaration of Rights

The Judgment sets forth a declaration of rights. Briefly stated, the Judgment provides that the water users in the Lower Area have rights, as against the water users in the Upper Area, to receive certain average and minimum annual amounts of non-storm flow ("Base Flow") at Prado Dam, together with the right to all storm flow reaching Prado Dam. The amount of the Lower Area entitlement is variable based on the quality of the water received by the Lower Area. Water users in the Upper Area have the right as against the water users in the Lower Area to divert, pump, extract, conserve, store and use all surface and groundwater supplies originating within the Upper Area, so long as the Lower Area receives the water to which it is entitled under the Judgment and there is compliance with all of its provisions.

Physical Solution

The Judgment also sets forth a comprehensive "physical solution" for satisfying the rights of the Lower Area. To understand the physical solution, it is necessary to understand the following terms that are used in the Judgment:

Storm Flow – That portion of the total flow which originates from precipitation and runoff and which passes a point of measurement (either Riverside Narrows or Prado Dam) without having first percolated to groundwater storage in the zone of saturation, calculated in accordance with procedures referred to in the Judgment.

Base Flow - That portion of the total surface flow passing a point of measurement (either Riverside Narrows or Prado Dam) which remains after deduction of storm flow, nontributary flows, exchange water purchased by OCWD, and certain other flows as determined by the Watermaster.

Adjusted Base Flow - Actual Base Flow in each year adjusted for water quality pursuant to formulas specified in the Judgment. The adjustment of Base Flow for water quality is intended to provide an incentive to the Upper Area to maintain a better quality of water in the River. When the TDS is lower than a specified value at one of the measuring points, the water quantity obligation is lower. When the TDS is higher than a specified value, the water quantity obligation is higher. This is the first comprehensive adjudication in Southern California in which the quality of water is taken into consideration in the quantification of water rights.

Credits and Debits - Under the accounting procedures provided for in the Judgment, credits accrue to SBVMWD in any year when the Adjusted Base Flow exceeds

15,250 acre-feet at Riverside Narrows and jointly to IEUA and WMWD when the Adjusted Base Flow exceeds 42,000 acre-feet at Prado Dam. Debits accrue in any year when the Adjusted Base Flows falls below those levels. Credits or debits accumulate year to year.

Obligation at Riverside Narrows

SBVMWD has an obligation to assure an average annual Adjusted Base Flow of 15,250 acre-feet at Riverside Narrows, subject to the following:

(1) A minimum Base Flow of 13,420 acre-feet plus one-third of any cumulative debit.

(2) After October 1, 1986, if no cumulative debit exists, the minimum Base Flow shall be 12,420 acre-feet.

(3) Prior to 1986, if the cumulative credits exceed 10,000 acre-feet, the minimum Base Flow shall be 12,420 acre-feet.

(4) All cumulative debits shall be removed by the discharge of a sufficient Base Flow at Riverside Narrows at least once in any ten consecutive years following October 1, 1976. Any cumulative credits shall remain on the books of account until used to offset any subsequent debits or until otherwise disposed of by SBVMWD.

(5) The Base Flow at Riverside Narrows shall be adjusted using weighted average annual TDS in such Base Flow in accordance with the formula set forth in the Judgment.

Obligation at Prado Dam

IEUA and WMWD have a joint obligation to assure an average annual Adjusted Base Flow of 42,000 acre-feet at Prado Dam, subject to the following:

(1) Minimum Base Flow at Prado shall not be less than 37,000 acre-feet plus one-third of any cumulative debit.

(2) After October 1, 1986, if no cumulative debit exists, the minimum Base Flow quantity shall be 34,000 acre-feet.

(3) Prior to 1986, if the cumulative credit exceeds 30,000 acre-feet, the minimum Base Flow shall be 34,000 acre-feet.

(4) Sufficient quantities of Base Flow shall be provided at Prado to discharge completely any cumulative debits at least once in any ten consecutive years following October 1, 1976. Any cumulative credits shall remain on the books

of account until used to offset any debits, or until otherwise disposed of by IEUA and WMWD.

(5) The Base Flow at Prado during any year shall be adjusted using the weighted average annual TDS in the total flow at Prado (Base Flow plus Storm Flow) in accordance with the formula set forth in the Judgment.

Other Provisions

SBVMWD, IEUA and WMWD are enjoined from exporting water from the Lower Area to the Upper Area, directly or indirectly. OCWD is enjoined from exporting or "directly or indirectly causing water to flow" from the Upper Area to the Lower Area. Any inter-basin acquisition of water rights will have no effect on Lower Area entitlements. OCWD is prohibited from enforcing two prior judgments so long as the Upper Area Districts are in compliance with the physical solution. The composition of the Watermaster and the nomination and appointment process for members are described along with a definition of the Watermaster's duties and a formula for sharing its costs. The court retains continuing jurisdiction over the case. There are provisions for appointment of successor parties and rules for dealing with future actions that might conflict with the physical solution.

History of the Watermaster Committee Membership

The Santa Ana River Watermaster is a committee composed of five members nominated by the parties and appointed by the court. SBVMWD, IEUA (formerly CBMWD), and WMWD nominate one member each and OCWD nominates two. The Watermaster members annually elect a Chairman, Secretary, and Treasurer.

The original five members were appointed at the time of entry of the Judgment. They prepared a *pro forma* annual report for the 1969-70 Water Year. The first annual report required by the Judgment was prepared for the 1970-71 Water Year, and reports have been prepared annually since then.

The membership of the Watermaster has changed over the years. The historical listing of members and officers shown in Table 9 reflects the signatories to each annual report.

TABLE 9

HISTORY OF THE WATERMASTER COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Water Year	SBVMWD	IEUA	WMWD	OCWD	OCWD
1969-70	Clinton O. Henning	William J. Carroll	Albert A. Webb [2]	Max Bookman [1]	John M. Toups
1970-71 through 1973-74	James C. Hanson	William J. Carroll	Albert A. Webb [2]	Max Bookman [1]	John M. Toups
1974-75 through 1977-78	James C. Hanson	William J. Carroll	Donald L. Harriger	Max Bookman [1]	John M. Toups [2]
1978-79 through 1981-82	James C. Hanson	William J. Carroll	Donald L. Harriger	Max Bookman [1]	William R. Mills, Jr. [2]
1982-83 through 1983-84	James C. Hanson	William J. Carroll	Donald L. Harriger	Harvey O. Banks [1]	William R. Mills, Jr. [2]
1984-85 through 1988-89	Robert L. Reiter	William J. Carroll	Donald L. Harriger	Harvey O. Banks [1]	William R. Mills, Jr. [2]
1989-90 through 1994-95	Robert L. Reiter [2, 3]	William J. Carroll	Donald L. Harriger	Harvey O. Banks [1]	William R. Mills, Jr.
1995-96	Robert L. Reiter [2] [3]	William J. Carroll [1]	Donald L. Harriger	Bill B. Dendy	William R. Mills, Jr.
1996-97	Robert L. Reiter [2] [3]	William J. Carroll	Donald L. Harriger	Bill B. Dendy	William R. Mills, Jr. [1]
1997-98	Robert L. Reiter [2] [3]	Robb D. Quincey	Donald L. Harriger	Bill B. Dendy	William R. Mills, Jr. [1]
1998-99 through 2000-01	Robert L. Reiter [2] [3]	Richard W. Atwater	Donald L. Harriger	Bill B. Dendy	William R. Mills, Jr. [1]
2001-02 through 2002-03	Robert L. Reiter [2] [3]	Richard W. Atwater	Donald L. Harriger [1]	Bill B. Dendy	Virginia L. Grebbien
2003-04 through 2005-06	Robert L. Reiter [1] [3]	Richard W. Atwater	John V. Rossi	Bill B. Dendy [2]	Virginia L. Grebbien
2006-07 through 2007-08	Samuel H. Fuller [2] [3]	Richard W. Atwater	John V. Rossi	Bill B. Dendy [1]	Craig D. Miller
2008-09	Samuel H. Fuller [2] [3]	Richard W. Atwater	John V. Rossi	Robert C. Wagner	Craig D. Miller [1]
2009-10	Samuel H. Fuller [2] [3]	Thomas A. Love	John V. Rossi [1]	Michael R. Markus	Roy L. Herndon
2010-11	Samuel H. Fuller [2] [3]	Thomas A. Love [1]	John V. Rossi	Michael R. Markus	Roy L. Herndon
2011-12	Samuel H. Fuller [2] [3]	Thomas A. Love	John V. Rossi	Michael R. Markus	Roy L. Herndon [1]
2012-13 through 2015-16	Douglas D. Headrick [2] [3]	P. Joseph Grindstaff	John V. Rossi	Michael R. Markus	Roy L. Herndon [1]
2016-17 through 2017-18	Douglas D. Headrick [2] [3]	Halla Razak	Craig D. Miller	Michael R. Markus	Roy L. Herndon [1]
2018-19 through 2019-20	Wen B. Huang [2] [3]	Shivaji Deshmukh	Craig D. Miller	Michael R. Markus	Roy L. Herndon [1]
2020-2021	Heather P. Dyer [2] [3]	Shivaji Deshmukh	Craig D. Miller	Michael R. Markus	Roy L. Herndon [1]

Footnotes:

(1) Watermaster Committee Member serving as Chairman during the Water Year.
(2) Watermaster Committee Member serving as Secretary during the Water Year.
(3) Watermaster Committee Member serving as Treasurer during the Water Year.

Santa Ana River Watershed



Plate 1

Path: I:\Watermaster\GIS\Plate1.mxd

Santa Ana River Watershed Wastewater Treatment Plants and Salt Export Pipelines



Path: K:\SAR\SARWMMXD\SARWM_Plate2_2017.mxd

Plate 2

PRECIPITATION AT SAN BERNARDINO STARTING IN 1934-35



Plate 3

2020-21 SAN BERNARDINO PRECIPITATION
USGS GILBERT STREET GAGE
TOTAL = 8.19"

INCHES

0.00" 1.07" 1.64" 3.12" 0.30" 1.35" 0.00" 0.02" 0.08" 0.39" 0.00" 0.22"

X: Missing Data

PERIODS OF WATER STORAGE GREATER THAN 100 ACRE-FEET BEHIND PRADO DAM

CUBIC FEET PER SECOND

STORM FLOW

INFLOW TO PRADO DAM LESS SAN JACINTO WATERSHED DISCHARGES AND NONTRIBUTARY FLOWS REACHING PRADO

USGS MEASURED OUTFLOW

SAN JACINTO WATERSHED WATER ARRIVAL AT PRADO GAGE

October November December January February March April May June July August September

DISCHARGE OF THE SANTA ANA RIVER AT PRADO DAM & SAN BERNARDINO PRECIPITATION
WATER YEAR 2020-21

Plate 4

DISCHARGE OF SANTA ANA RIVER AT PRADO STARTING WITH 1934-35



Plate 5



DISSOLVED SOLIDS IN SANTA ANA RIVER BELOW PRADO DAM
WATER YEAR 2020-21

Plate 6

2020-21 SAN BERNARDINO PRECIPITATION
USGS GILBERT STREET GAGE
TOTAL = 8.19"

INCHES

0.00" 1.07" 1.64" 3.12" 0.30" 1.35" 0.00" 0.02" 0.08" 0.39" 0.00" 0.22"

X: Missing Data

CUBIC FEET PER SECOND

STORM FLOW
USGS MEASURED FLOW

OCTOBER NOVEMBER DECEMBER JANUARY FEBRUARY March April May June July August September

DISCHARGE OF SANTA ANA RIVER AT RIVERSIDE NARROWS & SAN BERNARDINO PRECIPITATION
WATER YEAR 2020-21

Plate 7

DISCHARGE OF SANTA ANA RIVER AT RIVERSIDE NARROWS STARTING WITH 1934-35



Plate 8