

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OF THE
SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER

DATE: Wednesday, March 12, 2014

MEETING TIME: 1:30 p.m.

Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency Offices
5 Harris Court, Building D (Ryan Ranch)
Monterey, CA 93940

If you wish to participate in the meeting from a remote location, please call in on the Watermaster Conference Line by dialing (877)810-9415. Use the Access Code of 4560043. Please note that if no telephone attendees have joined the meeting by 10 minutes after its start, the conference call will be ended.

OFFICERS

Chairperson: Eric Sabolsice, California American Water Company
Vice-Chairperson: Rob Johnson, MCWRA

MEMBERS

California American Water Company	City of Del Rey Oaks	City of
Monterey	City of Sand City	City of Seaside
	Coastal Subarea Landowners	
Laguna Seca Property Owners Agency	Monterey Peninsula Water Management District	Monterey County Water Resources

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
1. Public Comments	
2. Administrative Matters:	
A. Approve Minutes from the February 12, 2014 Meeting	2
3. Continued Discussion of HydroMetrics Modeling of Laguna Seca Subarea (Bob Jaques and Derrik Williams)	8
4. Schedule (Bob Jaques)	12
5. Other Business	17
6. Set Next Meeting Date	
The next regular meeting will be held on Wednesday April 9, 2014 at 1:30 p.m. at the MRWPCA Board Room.	

**SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
* * * AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM * * ***

MEETING DATE:	March 12, 2014
AGENDA ITEM:	2.A
AGENDA TITLE:	Approve Minutes from the February 12, 2014 Meeting
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager
SUMMARY: Draft Minutes from this meeting were emailed to all TAC members. Any changes requested by TAC members have been included in the attached version.	
ATTACHMENTS:	Minutes from this meeting
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	Approve the minutes

D-R-A-F-T
MINUTES

**Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
February 12, 2014**

Attendees: TAC Members

City of Seaside – Rick Riedl
California American Water – No Representative
City of Monterey – Norm Green
Laguna Seca Property Owners – Bob Costa
MPWMD – Joe Oliver
MCWRA – Howard Franklin
City of Del Rey Oaks – No Representative
City of Sand City – Leon Gomez
Coastal Subarea Landowners – Paul Bruno

Watermaster

Technical Program Manager - Robert Jaques

Consultants

HydroMetrics - Derrick Williams

Others

MPWMD - Jon Lear
Dale Ellis – on behalf of Peter and Grace Wang

The meeting was called to order at 1:38 p.m., once a quorum was present. Due to the absence of both the Chair and the Vice Chair, Mr. Franklin served as the initial Chair of this meeting.

1. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

2. Administrative Matters:

A. Approve Minutes from the January 8, 2014 Meeting

On a motion by Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Gomez, and with Mr. Bruno abstaining, the minutes were unanimously approved as presented.

B. Elect Chair and Vice Chair Positions

Mr. Franklin reported that he will probably become MCWRA's regular representative to the Watermaster TAC in the near future.

Mr. Bruno nominated Mr. Hulbert for the position of Chair and the nomination was seconded by Mr. Riedl. Mr. Franklin nominated Mr. Oliver for Chair and the nomination was seconded by Mr. Riedl. There were no further nominations for Chair, so a vote was taken with the following results: 4 members voted in favor of Mr. Hulbert and 3 members voted in favor of Mr. Oliver. Therefore, Mr. Hulbert was elected to the position of Chair.

Mr. Bruno nominated Mr. Oliver for the position of Vice Chair and the nomination was seconded by Mr. Franklin. There were no further nominations for Vice Chair and the vote was unanimous for Mr. Oliver. Therefore, Mr. Oliver was elected to the position of Vice Chair.

At this point in the meeting, Mr. Franklin turned the chairmanship of the meeting over to Mr. Oliver.

C. SWRCB Groundwater Concept Paper

Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet material for this item. He said he would provide the Final Concept Paper to the TAC for its information when it is released by the SWRCB.

Mr. Riedl asked if comments could be submitted and Mr. Jaques noted that he had submitted his comments to the SWRCB when the initial comment period was held in the fall of 2013. He went on to note that the SWRCB's in-person comment workshop was held in January 2014. Mr. Williams pointed out that the SWRCB is still open to receiving comments at this point in time. Mr. Riedl commented that his biggest concern was with regard to any unfunded mandates that might result from the Concept Paper being adopted by the SWRCB.

3. Discussion of New Survey Information on the Wang Subdivision Wells

Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet material for this item.

Mr. Oliver reported that MPWMD had recently received a revised report but has not yet reviewed it, so he had no additional comments to provide. He said that MPWMD plans to submit comments on the revised report once it has completed its review.

Mr. Ellis reported that he was attending the meeting on behalf of Peter and Grace Wang. He felt Mr. Jaques had accurately characterized the updated report. He is okay with the TAC forwarding this information to the Board. He said they will be measuring water levels again in the Wang wells in the near future.

Mr. Franklin noted that a review of the Wang subdivision project with regard to consistency with Title 19 of the Monterey County Land Use Code will be conducted by MCWRA. Long-term water supply will be the main area of review.

Mr. Jaques suggested obtaining the review comments from MPWMD and MCWRA and providing them to the TAC for future discussion. There was consensus to defer making any recommendations to the Board at this time, pending receipt of those review comments.

Mr. Bruno stressed that the boundary issue was the main basis for the Board's prior decision regarding the Watermaster's lack of jurisdiction with regard to the Wang wells, and that the Board may therefore not need any other information on this.

4. Continued Discussion of HydroMetrics Modeling of Laguna Seca Subarea

Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet material on this item.

[At this point in the meeting (2:11 p.m.) Mr. Bruno departed the meeting due to other commitments.]

The numbered items below correspond to the numbered items on pages 37 through 39 of the agenda packet.

1. **Material Injury.** Mr. Franklin questioned whether just having to lower a pump to lower elevation would constitute a Material Injury. Mr. Oliver commented that this would not be a Material Injury, but for some wells it may not be feasible. Mr. Riedl questioned the presumption of a cost threshold to determine material injury and that Material Injury can occur, recognizing that it might result in only a negligible cost to the well owner.

Mr. Williams noted that in order to determine the Operational Safe Yield of the subarea, one needs to know what would constitute imposing Material Injury on any producer.

Mr. Green noted that the Watermaster could set parameters to determine Material Injury, but others might challenge these.

Mr. Riedl said he preferred to determine what adverse effects there might be, and then determine whether the effects constituted Material Injury.

There was a short discussion with regard to water levels following below the top of the well screen and what consequences this might lead to. According to Mr. Riedl well screen degradation could be caused by a variety of things, not just lower water levels.

Mr. Franklin asked Mr. Williams whether the issue had come up in the context of determining the Operational Safe Yield. Mr. Williams responded yes, that water level falling below the elevation of the well screen was one threshold that HydroMetrics had used in establishing the Operational Safe Yield.

Mr. Oliver commented that a different term could be used rather than Material Injury in this context.

Mr. Williams pointed out that the Adjudication Decision says that the Operational Safe Yield is to be revised if Material Injury will occur if pumping continues at the original Operational Safe Yield, i.e. Material Injury is a "trigger" for the Watermaster to revise the Operational Safe Yield.

Mr. Jaques suggested perhaps setting aside the second half of the agenda packet recommendation and focusing on only the first half of the recommendation at this time. He stressed that the Watermaster needs to be able to determine what Material Injury is in order to take the actions required of it under the Adjudication Decision.

Mr. Green commented that if a well could no longer pump due to a falling water level, that would in his opinion clearly constitute Material Injury.

Mr. Lear commented that all wells lose capacity overtime for a variety of reasons, not just because of falling water levels. Mr. Franklin noted that loss of productivity, such as inability to maintain historic pumping rates, could be used as a trigger for Material Injury.

Mr. Oliver noted that loss of pumping rates could be caused by other factors besides falling groundwater levels.

Mr. Williams said that in order to determine the Operational Safe Yield, one needs some means of determining when Material Injury is occurring.

Mr. Oliver suggested setting a certain percentage of water level lowering as an indication that there are potential adverse effects that could result in Material Injury. There was much discussion of the

consequences of water levels following below the top of the well screen. Mr. Oliver commented that water levels falling below the top of a well screen could simply be used as a threshold for modeling purposes. Mr. Lear noted that the Watermaster could have a "response plan" like the Seawater Intrusion Response Plan, to be used when water levels fall to below the top of the well screen.

Mr. Williams said that in his opinion if a screen is already partially exposed it would not be Materially Injured by further falling water levels.

Mr. Williams questioned what would be a reasonable cost for a well owner to incur as part of normal well operation and maintenance, and that this could be used by the Watermaster in determining whether Material Injury was occurring.

Mr. Oliver suggested that a percentage decline in the theoretical well yield, or a percentage decline in ground water level, could be used as trigger points. These thresholds could then be used to investigate the well to track the actual impacts.

Mr. Williams asked whether the thresholds should pertain only to production wells, or to all wells including monitoring wells. Also, whether only active production wells should be looked at or whether standby wells should also be looked at. Mr. Franklin commented that monitoring wells are important and that he felt they should also be protected.

Mr. Oliver suggested checking with other agencies for their well ordinances and other types of regulations to see how they determine Material Injury. He noted that San Diego County uses a loss of saturated thickness of 5 percent as a threshold for impact significance. Mr. Franklin said that Monterey County uses a five foot elevation drop as a threshold. Mr. Oliver noted that Department of Water Resources Bulletin 118 has a list of adjudicated basins. Mr. Jaques said he would contact other adjudicated basins to see if they have quantitatively or otherwise defined Material Injury. Mr. Riedl asked Mr. Franklin if the five foot elevation drop was used to determine Material Injury. Mr. Franklin said that it was not.

There was consensus to continue discussion on this topic at a future meeting.

[At this point in the meeting (3:10 p.m.) Mr. Gomez had to depart due to other commitments]

2. Groundwater Levels Falling below Well Screens.

Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet material on this item. Mr. Riedl asked if the "Laguna Seca Golf Resort Racetrack" well was the well used to supply water to the Laguna Seca Golf Resort. Mr. Costa responded that the Racetrack well has been abandoned, and that Laguna Seca Golf Resort – New No. 12 is the active supply well.

3. Reducing Pumping by Alternative Producers. Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet material on this item. There was little further discussion on this topic.

4. Material injury by 2041. Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet material on this item. There was little further discussion on this topic.

5. Extending the Model into the Future. Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet material on this item. Mr. Jaques asked Mr. Oliver if wells for which data was not available, i.e. those showing as "n/a" could have the missing information provided by performing further field evaluation of them. Mr.

Oliver said that possibly well contractors could be contacted to see if they can provide the missing information. Prior research on existing well logs and owner contacts had been made in preparing the data, but no effort at this point had been made to go directly to the well contractors to seek information.

6. Changes in NSY for the Laguna Seca subarea. Mr. Jaques and Mr. Oliver summarized the agenda packet material on this item. There was little further discussion on this topic.

7. Benefit of Evaluating the Impacts of Reducing Pumping outside the Boundary. Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet material on this item and asked for TAC input on it. Mr. Costa said he would like to see the degree of impact on the Laguna Seca subarea from wells pumping outside the Basin boundary.

There was consensus to continue discussion on these topics at a future TAC leading.

5. RFS No. 2014-03 to HydroMetrics to Update and Check Accuracy of Groundwater Model, and Perform Recalibration if Necessary

Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda packet material on this item. On a motion by Mr. Franklin, seconded by Mr. Green, HydroMetrics RFS No. 2014-03 was unanimously approved by the TAC, and recommended for approval by the Board.

6. Schedule

Mr. Jaques reported that there were no unusual items to discuss under this agenda item, and there was no further discussion.

7. Other Business

There was no other business.

8. Set Next Meeting Date

The next regular meeting will be held on Wednesday March 12, 2014 at 1:30 p.m. at the MRWPCA Board Room.

The meeting adjourned at 3:34 p.m.

**SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
* * * AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM * * ***

MEETING DATE:	March 12, 2014
AGENDA ITEM:	3
AGENDA TITLE:	Continued Discussion on HydroMetrics Modeling of Laguna Seca Subarea
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager

**SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
* * * AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM * * ***

SUMMARY:

We have discussed this agenda item at our two most recent TAC meetings (January and February). From those discussions it is clear that is difficult to reach consensus on what “triggers” to use to determine when Material Injury has occurred, or is likely to occur. Making this determination is key to knowing when the Watermaster should take any of the actions the Adjudication Decision requires the Watermaster to take when Material Injury has occurred, or is likely to occur. For example the Adjudication Decision states that the Watermaster is to revise the Operational Safe Yield if Material Injury will occur by continuing to pump at the original Operational Safe Yield established by the Decision.

The Seaside Groundwater Basin Adjudication Decision defines the term “Material Injury” to mean “... a substantial adverse physical impact to the Seaside Basin or any particular Producer(s), including but not limited to: seawater intrusion, land subsidence, excessive pump lifts, and water quality degradation.” In the context of the Laguna Seca subarea (LSSA) it appears that seawater intrusion, land subsidence, and water quality degradation are not currently of concern, so excessive pump lifts (and other consequences) resulting from falling groundwater levels should be the focus of determining whether material injury is occurring or is likely to occur. Excessive pump lifts could cause well owners to incur increased pumping costs, and/or costs to install new pumping equipment. One other consequence of falling groundwater levels would be exposing portions of well screens that were previously continuously submerged. This can reportedly result in more rapid corrosion of the well screen material which would eventually cause well owners to incur repair costs that they would not otherwise incur.

A number of possible “triggers” to determine if Material Injury is occurring were proposed or discussed at these two TAC meetings, including the following:

1. Groundwater levels falling below the top of the well screen. The following questions were raised during discussion of this type of trigger:
 - Does just having to lower a pump to a lower elevation because of falling water levels constitute a Material Injury? This might not constitute Material Injury for some wells, but for some wells lowering the pump may not be feasible.
 - Should cost impacts be a consideration in establishing a threshold to determine the occurrence of Material Injury? For some wells a declining water level might result in only negligible costs to the well owner, whereas for some wells it might result in a more significant cost.
 - Would it be helpful/useful to establish what a reasonable cost would be for a well owner to incur as part of normal well operation and maintenance, and to use this as a factor in determining whether Material Injury is occurring?
 - Would it be better to first determine what adverse effects there might be due to falling water levels, and then determine whether those effects would constitute Material Injury? For example water levels falling below the top of a well screen could simply be used as a threshold to undertake further modeling, and the Watermaster could develop a "response plan" like the Seawater Intrusion Response Plan, to be

AGENDA ITEM:

3 (Continued)

**SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
* * * AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM * * ***

used when water levels fall to below the top of a well screen.

- Is it reasonable to conclude that well screen deterioration due to exposure to air (rather than being continuously submerged) has been caused by falling water levels when other factors may have been the cause of the deterioration, e.g. age, material of construction, etc?
- If a well screen is already partially exposed, would the well be Materially Injured by further falling water levels?

2. Groundwater levels falling to the point that a well can no longer pump at its historic pumping rate.

The following questions were raised during discussion of this type of trigger:

- Since all wells lose pumping capacity over time for a variety of reasons, such as pump wear-and-tear and screen clogging not just because of falling water levels, would this be a reasonable trigger to use?

1. Groundwater levels falling by a certain percentage as an indication that there are potential adverse effects that could result in Material Injury. A percentage decline in the theoretical yield of a well, or a percentage decline in ground water level at the location of a well, could be used as trigger points to investigate the well to track the actual impacts in terms of pumping capacity and/or cost impacts to the well owner.

The following related issues were also raised during those discussions:

1. Should the Watermaster try to prevent groundwater levels from declining altogether, or only try to prevent levels from declining to the extent that Material Injury would occur?
2. Should Material Injury be considered to apply only in areas where wells are located, or should it apply to all parts of the Basin regardless of whether or not there are wells in the affected area? [Editorial note: it may be very difficult to establish that Material Injury has occurred in an area if no wells are impacted by a decline in water levels in that area].
3. Should Material Injury only apply to active production wells or should it also apply to standby wells and monitoring wells?

As a followup to the February 12 TAC meeting, I requested information from the Watermasters of 20 other adjudicated groundwater basins in California to learn whether or not they had developed criteria to establish when Material Injury occurs. Here are the responses that I received as of the date of preparation of this agenda item:

Central Basin: That term “Material Injury” is not used in the Adjudication Decisions for the Central Basin or for the West Coast Basin, but the following term was added recently to the Central Basin Adjudication in conjunction with groundwater storage: “*Material Physical Harm*’ means material physical injury or any material diminution in the quality or quantity of groundwater available within the Basin to support extraction of Total Water Rights or Storage Water; that is demonstrated to be attributable to the placement, recharge, injection, storage or recapture of Storage Water in the Central Basin, including, but not limited to, degradation of water quality, liquefaction, land subsidence and other material physical injury caused by elevated or lowered groundwater levels. Material Physical Harm does not include ‘economic injury’ that results from other than direct physical causes, including any adverse effect on water rates, lease rates, or demand for water. Once fully mitigated, physical

***SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
* * * AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM * * ****

AGENDA ITEM:

3 (Continued)

**SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
* * * AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM * * ***

or is likely to occur they are to notify the Court and explain the relevant facts then known to them relating to the Material Physical Harm, or imminent threat thereof, including without limitation, the location of the occurrence, the source or cause, existing and potential physical impacts or consequences of the identified or threatened material Physical Harm, and any recommendations to remediate the identified or threatened Material Physical Harm. They went on to say that determining if Material Physical Harm has occurred, or is likely to occur, seems in their Adjudication Decision to have been left open for determination, and could likely be argued by opposing sides. They felt the term may have been intentionally left vague because of all the complexities that can occur in a basin, and what might be alarming short term (i.e. falling water levels), may just be temporary during a drought and recoverable over the long term.

Chino Basin: The Chino Basin's Adjudication Decision contains the term "Material Physical Injury" which is defined as follows: " *'Material Physical Injury' means material injury that is attributable to the recharge, transfer, storage and recovery, management, movement, or production of water, including but not limited to degradation of water quality, liquefaction, land subsidence, increases in pump left (lower water levels) and adverse impacts associated with rising groundwater. Material Physical Injury does not include 'economic injury' that results from other than physical causes. Once fully mitigated, physical injury shall no longer be considered to be material.* " Their Engineer (Wildermuth Environmental Inc.) uses this definition to analyze proposed actions, primarily using a groundwater model which has been widely accepted in their Basin. They have not developed any quantitative criteria to use in determining when Material Physical Harm has occurred.

Goleta Basin: No such term exists in the documents governing the Goleta Groundwater Basin.

Mohave Basin: There is no term similar to, or anything related to, "material injury" in the Judgment or Rules for the Mojave Basin Area.

In summary no specific quantifiable criteria to determine when material injury has occurred appear to have been developed by the agencies that were contacted.

At the February 12 TAC meeting Mr. Oliver reported that San Diego County uses a loss of saturated thickness of 5 percent as a threshold for impact significance. At that same meeting Mr. Franklin said that Monterey County uses a five foot elevation drop as a threshold, but that this was not used to determine Material Injury.

It appears clear that there are both technical and policy aspects involved in making a determination of Material Injury. In order to effectively work on the technical aspects, I believe the TAC needs some direction from the Board regarding the policy aspects, in what may end up being a somewhat iterative process. To move forward on the issue of defining Material Injury I recommend that the TAC present the following request for direction to the Board:

Request for Direction

1. For some wells a declining water level might result in only negligible costs to the well owner, whereas for some wells it might result in a more significant cost. Should the level of cost impact to

**SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
* * * AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM * * ***

AGENDA ITEM:

3 (Continued)

water levels falling below the top of a well screen could be used as a trigger point to initiate an evaluation of adverse impacts that would likely occur to that well with a continued decline in water levels.

1. Should the Watermaster try to prevent groundwater levels from declining altogether, or only try to prevent levels from declining to the extent that Material Injury would occur?
2. Should Material Injury only apply to active production wells or should it also apply to standby wells and monitoring wells?

I also recommend that the TAC provide the following information to the Board:

Technical Recommendations

There is currently approximately \$8,000 left unspent in HydroMetrics' contract to perform modeling of the LSSA. Use some or all of this unspent amount to conduct additional modeling to better determine:

1. Whether reducing or eliminating pumping by Alternative Producers in the LSSA would appreciably reduce the rate at which groundwater levels are falling in the LSSA.
2. The impact on groundwater levels in the LSSA of pumping from outside the eastern and southeastern boundaries of the LSSA.
3. Have MPWMD, working as a subcontractor to HydroMetrics, do further research on wells for which well drawdown and casing elevation data was not previously available for use in HydroMetrics' modeling of the LSSA, and if such data can be obtained provide it to HydroMetrics for inclusion in the final modeling report.

Non-Technical Issues the Board May Wish to Consider

1. Should Producers in the LSSA be notified of the findings of HydroMetrics's modeling work at this time, or should the additional recommended modeling first be performed in order to provide a clearer understanding of the situation, and a decision then made regarding notifying Producers?
2. What additional information would the Board need in order to make a determination regarding whether or not Alternative Producers in the LSSA should be directed to reduce their pumping?
3. The findings from this modeling work indicate that the Seaside Basin's true hydrogeologic boundary of the LSSA area is further to the east and southeast than the boundary shown in the Decision. What additional information would the Board need in order to make a determination as to whether or not to request that the Court provide direction regarding reestablishing the boundaries of the Seaside Groundwater Basin in the LSSA to address the discrepancy.

**SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
* * * AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM * * ***

ATTACHMENTS:	None
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	Approve or modify the recommendations of the Technical Program Manager regarding what requests and recommendations should be made to the Watermaster Board as a result of the HydroMetrics' modeling report

**SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
* * * AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM * * ***

MEETING DATE:	March 12, 2014
AGENDA ITEM:	4
AGENDA TITLE:	Schedule
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager

**SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
* * * AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM * * ***

SUMMARY:

As a regular part of each monthly TAC meeting, I will provide the TAC with an updated Schedule of the activities being performed by the Watermaster, its consultants, and the public entity, MPWMD, which is performing certain portions of the work.

Attached is the most recent update of the Work Schedule for FY 2014.

In this updated version of the Schedule tasks associated with the Laguna Seca Modeling work and deliberations on recommendations to be made to the Board as a result of that work have been added as Task I.3.a.3.

ATTACHMENTS:	Schedule of Work Activities for FY 2014
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	Provide Input to Technical Program Manager Regarding Any Corrections or Additions to these Schedules

Seaside Basin Watermaster Monitoring and Management Program 2014 Work Schedule

ID	Task Name	2014												2015									
		Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
1	CRITICAL PROJECT MILESTONES ASSOCIATED WITH TAC, BOARD, AND/OR CONSULTANT WORK																						
2	2015 Administration, Operations and Replenishment Budgets																						
3	Prepare M&MP Draft Budgets (Same as Task 19)																						
4	TAC Approves M&MP Budgets (Same as Task 20)																						
5	Board Approves M&MP Budgets (Same as Task 21)																						
6	Watermaster Prepares Quarterly Water Production, Water Level, and Water Quality Reports																						
7	Watermaster Prepares Combined Quarterly Water Production, Water Level, and Water Quality Reports for 1st & 2nd Quarters (Same as Task 41)																						
8	Watermaster Prepares Annual Water Production, Water Level, and Water Quality Report for 2013 (Same as Task 42)																						
9	Replenishment Assessment Unit Costs for Water Year 2014																						
10	B&F Committee Develops Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost for 2014 Water Year																						
11	If Requested, TAC Provides Assistance to B&F Committee in Development of 2014 Water Year Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost																						
12	Board Adopts and Declares 2014 Water Year Replenishment Assessment Unit Cost																						
13	Replenishment Assessments for Water Year 2014																						
14	Watermaster Prepares Replenishment Assessments for Water Year 2014																						
15	Watermaster Board Approves Replenishment Assessments for Water Year 2014 (At November Meeting)																						
16	Watermaster Levies Replenishment Assessment for 2014																						
17	Monitoring & Management Program (M&MP) Budgets for 2015 and 2016																						

Seaside Basin Watermaster Monitoring and Management Program 2014 Work Schedule

ID	Task Name	2014												2015									
		Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
18	Preliminary Discussion of Potential Scope of Work for 2015 M&MP												◆ 8/13										
19	Prepare Draft 2014 and 2015 M&MP O&M and Capital Budgets												■										
20	TAC approves Draft 2015 and 2016 M&MP O&M and Capital Budgets													◆ 9/10									
21	Board approves 2015 and 2016 M&MP O&M and Capital Budgets													◆ 10/1									
22	2013 Annual Report (Note: Schedule Reflects Court Approval of Later Submittal Date for Annual Report)																						
23	Prepare Preliminary Draft 2014 Annual Report													■									
24	TAC Provides Input on Draft 2014 Annual Report																						
25	Prepare Revised Draft 2014 Annual Report (Incorporating TAC Input)																						
26	Board Provides Input on Revised Draft 2014 Annual Report (At November Board Meeting)																						
27	Prepare Final 2014 Annual Report (Incorporating Board Input)																						
28	Watermaster Submits Final 2014 Annual Report to Judge																						
29	MANAGEMENT																						
30	M.1 PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION (All Work Performed by Watermaster Staff)																						
31	Prepare Initial Consultant Contracts for 2015													■									
32	TAC Approval of Initial Consultant Contracts for 2015																						
33	Board Approval of Initial Consultant Contracts for 2015 (At November Board Meeting)													◆ 10/8									
34	IMPLEMENTATION																						
35	I.2.a DATABASE MANAGEMENT																						
36	I.2.a.1 Conduct Ongoing Data Entry/Database Maintenance																						

ASSUME NOV. BOARD MEETING ONE WEEK AFTER NOV. TAC MEETING

Seaside Basin Watermaster Monitoring and Management Program 2014 Work Schedule

ID	Task Name	2014												201									
		Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
37	I.2.b DATA COLLECTION PROGRAM																						
38	I.2.b.2 Collect Monthly Water Levels (MPWMD)																						
39	I.2.b.3 Collect Quarterly Water Quality Samples (MPWMD)																						
40	I.2.b.6 Reports (from MPWMD)																						
41	Watermaster Prepares Combined Quarterly Water Production, Water Level, and Water Quality Reports for 1st & 2nd Quarters																						
42	Watermaster Prepares Annual Water Production, Water Level, and Water Quality Report for 2014																						
43	I.3.a ENHANCED SEASIDE BASIN GROUNDWATER MODEL																						
44	I.3.a.1 Update (and Potentially Recalibrate) Existing Groundwater Model																						
45	Prepare RFS for HydroMetrics to Update Model and Check Accuracy																						
46	TAC Approves RFS to HydroMetrics																						
47	Board Approves RFS to HydroMetrics																						
48	HydroMetrics Updates Model and Checks Accuracy																						
49	HydroMetrics Presents Draft Model Update Report to TAC																						
50	HydroMetrics Presents Model Update Report to Board																						
51	Prepare RFS for HydroMetrics to Recalibrate Model																						
52	TAC Approves RFS to HydroMetrics																						
53	Board Approves RFS to HydroMetrics																						
54	HydroMetrics Recalibrates Model																						

**SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
* * * AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM * * ***

MEETING DATE:	March 12, 2014
AGENDA ITEM:	5
AGENDA TITLE:	Other Business
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager
SUMMARY: The “Other Business” agenda item is intended to provide an opportunity for TAC members or others present at the meeting to discuss items not on the agenda that may be of interest to the TAC.	
ATTACHMENTS:	None
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	None required – information only