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SUMMARY:
At the Board’s meeting on August 6 the following discussions of interest to the TAC occurred:

1. The Board rejected the TAC’s recommendation to send an updated letter regarding the Wang Subdivision wells. The Board instead felt that since other agencies (MCWRA, MPWMD, and MoCo Health) were commenting on the updated hydrogeologic information provided by the project proponents, and since the recent Laguna Seca modeling indicates that other pumpers to the east of the Laguna Seca subarea are already impacting ground water levels there, that no updated letter was needed.

2. Regarding the evaluation of the Groundwater Model’s accuracy there were a number of questions posed to Derrik after he made his presentation, but the Board accepted his findings and conclusions as presented, including not performing any recalibration work at this time.

3. Regarding the updated Laguna Seca Subarea modeling there was extensive discussion on this and numerous questions posed to Derrik following his presentation on this topic. These included:
   • What would it take to better define the eastern boundary of the Basin? Derrik’s response was that it would take the installation of multiple additional monitoring wells, since in the NISA there are few wells and little hydrogeologic information that provide data to better define that part of the Basin’s boundary.
   • Would it be possible to install wells in the Northern Inland Subarea (NISA) just to the north of the Laguna Seca Subarea (LSSA) in order to provide addition water supply to the LSSA to help mitigate the declining water levels there? Response from Derrik was that this would eventually reduce the amount of water flowing from the NISA to the ocean and thereby lower the level of protection it currently helps to provide against sea water intrusion, and that he did not see any way to stabilize groundwater levels in the LSSA short of significant reductions in pumping or finding a new source of replenishment.
   • Couldn’t well owners who will experience water levels falling below the top of their well screens just drill deeper wells and keep pumping? Derrik’s response was that this would be a temporary fix but would not prevent the water levels from continuing to fall.
   • The findings of this modeling work could have significant political and legal ramifications. The Board was interested in seeking ways of addressing the findings without having to revise the Basin boundaries.
   • At its next meeting the Board will probably discuss retaining an attorney to prepare a submittal to the Court explaining what the modeling has found, and to potentially indicate that the Watermaster will evaluate options and then report what action the Watermaster proposes to take. Any proposed actions
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- The Board was concerned about publicity of the modeling report (HydroMetrics’ Technical Memo), and directed that it be marked “Draft” in its posting to the Watermaster’s website. I obtained specific wording for that purpose from Don Freeman (attorney) and have added it to the posting of this document. I also asked if the Board expected the Technical Memo to be revised for some reason, and pointed out that Derrik had properly and thoroughly completed the work that we had asked him to do and that any further work would require additional scope and cost authorization. The Board simply stated that the report should be considered to be a “draft” until it was actually accepted by the Board.
- Board members seemed to be in search of clarification of what the purpose of the Watermaster was, i.e. was it limited to protecting the Basin against sea water intrusion (in which case the Laguna Seca modeling info would not be applicable) or was it also to prevent pumpers from experiencing Material Injury. They will likely seek this clarification at their next meeting.
- The Board stated that at this point in time they do not need the TAC to take any action or do any further studies or evaluations.

ATTACHMENTS: None
| RECOMMENDED ACTION: | None required – information only |