

**EXHIBIT 4-B**

**Comparison of ASR Project Injection Capacities with Cal-Am System Delivery Capacities  
Based on 2012 Conditions**

<b>ASR Project</b>						
<u>Name</u>	<u>Site</u>	<u>GPM</u>	<u>MGD</u>	<u>CFS</u>	<u>AFD</u>	
Phase 1 (Water Project 1)	Santa Margarita	3,000	4.32	6.68	13.26	
Phase 2 (Water Project 2)	Middle School	3,500	5.04	7.80	15.47	
Phase 3 (CWP)	Fitch Park?	3,500	5.04	7.80	15.47	
Combined Phase 1 and 2		6,500	9.36	14.48	28.72	
Combined Phase 1, 2 and 3		10,000	14.40	22.28	44.19	
<b>Cal-Am System Production/Delivery Capacities</b>						
<u>Category</u>	<u>Remarks</u>	<u>GPM</u>	<u>MGD</u>	<u>CFS</u>	<u>AFD</u>	
CV Wells						
UCV	not considered	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	
MCV	no treatment needed	2,800	4.03	6.24	12.37	
LCV	BIRP treatment needed	8,828	12.71	19.67	39.01	
Total wells		11,628	16.74	25.91	51.39	
Total wells minus ave winter demand	assume 11.7 MGD mean	<b>3,503</b>	<b>5.04</b>	<b>7.80</b>	<b>15.48</b>	
BIRP Treatment		11,700	16.85	26.07	51.70	
Canada Pipeline		6,735	9.70	15.00	29.76	

**NOTES:**

1. ASR well capacities based on current best available data, subject to change.
2. Cal-Am well capacities based on J. Kilpatrick 3/16/12 table. Data above are for "Total Well Capacity" and have not been reduced for "Firm Well Capacity".
3. Cal-Am assumed winter demand based on draft Phase 2 ASR Project Feasibility Study, prepared for MPWMD by Pueblo Water Resources, July 2010 (draft), see page 9.
4. BIRP treatment capacity based on J. Kilpatrick 3/16/12 table.
5. Canada Pipeline capacity based on system modeling (Sarp Sekeroglu, RBF Consulting, pers com 5/2010). Note that Tom Brunet and Sarp Sekeroglu performed a field capacity test of the Canada Pipeline capacity on 5/20/10 and achieved a maximum of approx. 6,000 gpm flow to the Santa Margarita backflush pit.
6. Based on analysis above, the most pressing existing constraint is CV well capacity (see **bold** values), which is currently only adequate to provide slightly more than Phase 1 ASR Project needs under existing winter system demands.
7. Note that analysis above is based on existing Cal-Am winter demand projections, not on potential future winter demands under post-RWP and additional water rights scenarios.