

MINUTES

**Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster
Technical Advisory Committee
Special Meeting
September 3, 2008**

Attendees: TAC Members

City of Seaside – Rick Riedl
California American Water – Tom Bunosky, Craig Anthony
City of Monterey – Les Turnbeaugh
Laguna Seca Property Owners – Stan Powell (by telephone)
MPWMD – Joe Oliver (first portion of meeting only)
Public Member – No Representative
MCWRA – No Representative
City of Del Rey Oaks – No Representative
City of Sand City – No Representative
Coastal Subarea Landowners – No Representative

Watermaster

Technical Program Manager - Robert Jaques

Consultants

HydroMetrics LLC - Derrik Williams

Others:

None

The meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m.

1. There was no set agenda for this Special meeting. Its focus was to continue discussions on the reports being prepared by HydroMetrics. The TAC resumed discussion of BMAP Section 2, p. 7 (paragraph 2.2).
2. Mr. Oliver and Mr. Williams explained that the term "deep" aquifer can mean the Santa Margarita or the Purisima aquifer, so it would not be good to do a global word change to try to more clearly define what the actual name of the aquifer is. Mr. Williams will add definitions for the terms "shallow" and "deep" to verify this.
3. Figures will be improved for readability.
4. There was much discussion about having a more readable Basin boundary map than the one contained in the Decision Exhibit "B". Mr. Williams is trying to get the original map from CH2M (Terry Foreman) who prepared the original map. Mr. Bunosky suggested that the TAC recommend to the Board to have a better Basin boundary map prepared.

The one that Mr. Williams will prepare could serve this purpose, and he will make it available to the Watermaster electronically.

5. Mr. Williams will expand the language describing the significance of a hydrologic boundary, and the fact that it can move with time depending on pumping and recharge rates. There was consensus to show both the Basin (Decision) and the hydrologic boundaries in Figure 4 only, and in the other figures to just show the Decision boundary. There was also agreement that the boundary lines should terminate at the coastline and not extend out into the bay.
6. Mr. Williams will use figures to clarify the locations of wells for which data is shown in Figures 9 and 10.
7. There was consensus to remove the intermediate (10 foot) contours from the maps, since the data upon which the contours are plotted is limited.
8. Mr. Williams said that hydrologically the aquifers in the Seaside and Salinas groundwater basins are assumed to be "in communication", i.e., water can flow between the aquifers in the two basins. The hydrologic boundary of the basins will change with time depending on such factors as pumping and recharge. The pumping depressions in the Seaside and Salinas basins have created this hydrologic boundary.
9. Mr. Jaques stressed to Mr. Williams that writing the Executive Summary will be critical to the understanding of most readers. As much "lay language" and as little "technical terminology" as possible should be used in the Executive Summary. Mr. Powell cautioned against watering down the technical depth of Section 2, but agreed that using more lay language for the Executive Summary was appropriate.
10. Mr. Bunosky recommended breaking up paragraph 2.2 into two subsections—one for shallow and one for deep aquifer discussions.
11. Mr. Jaques will contact Central Coast Surveyors to get elevation information for Mean Sea Level on the NGVD-88 data, so Mr. Williams can make the contour maps depict elevations based on Mean Sea Level.
12. Mr. Jaques asked whether the tidal fluctuations shown in Figure 10 demonstrated that the deep aquifer was connected to the ocean. Mr. Williams responded that this was not necessarily the case. Rather, this could simply be due to pressure from tidal changes being reflected from the shallow to the deep aquifer, due to leakage between the two aquifers. Mr. Williams will clarify this in the text or Figure 10.
13. There was consensus to add the term "Storage Capacity" in the first paragraph of Section 2.3.1, with Storage Capacity being the sum of Total Stored Groundwater plus Total Usable Storage Space.

14. There was discussion of the meaning and intent of the wording from the Decision which states "... less storage space which may be reserved by the Watermaster for its use in recharging the Basin." There was consensus that at this point in time the Watermaster does not have to reserve any storage space for itself. However, each year the Watermaster will be redetermining the Total Usable Storage Space, and at that time each year the Watermaster can make such a reservation if it deems appropriate.
15. There was discussion about the allocating the Total Usable Storage Space of 52,153 acre feet (p. 28)" between the Coastal and Laguna Seca subareas. Mr. Williams will recommend the allocation quantities to each subarea.
16. There was much discussion of Net Safe Yield (page 37). Mr. Williams will correct the language in this Section to make it clear that the most recent data does not change the range of values for the Net Safe Yield as discussed in the Decision. Therefore, continuing to use 3,000 acre foot per year Net Safe Yield is still a reasonable decision, and no change to this is warranted.
17. There was discussion about how and whether the Watermaster needs to define Material Injury.
18. It was apparent that there are a number of topics and issues still to be discussed, and that time is running out to get the documents (BMAP and SIRP) perfected at the TAC level, in time to have the documents ready to provide to the Board for approval at their October Board meetings. For this reason there was consensus to have the TAC complete its work by the end of 2008, rather than on the currently proposed schedule, and to provide the full documents to the Board for their review in early 2009, with Board approval targeted to occur by March, 2009.
19. Mr. Bunosky recommended setting up some more Special TAC meeting dates in the near future to continue discussions of the completed draft documents and the remaining sections that have yet to be reviewed by the TAC. There was consensus to continue with plans for making two Board PowerPoint presentations in October, but that the full documents would not be delivered to the Board until after the TAC completes its review and editing of them later in 2008.
20. There was consensus that for the September 22nd Special TAC meeting the topics of discussion will include: Conclusions and Recommendations Section, Executive Summary, and Section 4 of the SIRP.

The meeting adjourned at 1:20 p.m.