M E E T I N G N O T I C E A N D A G E N D A

SPECIAL MEETING

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OF THE
SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER

DATE: Wednesday, October 29, 2008
TIME: 1:30 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

LOCATION: City of Seaside City Hall – Portable Buildings Conference Room
440 Harcourt Avenue
Seaside, CA 93955

If you wish to participate in the meeting from a remote location, please call in on the new Watermaster Conference Line by dialing (877)810-9415. Use the Access Code of 4560043.

OFFICERS
Chairperson: Diana Ingersoll, City of Seaside
Vice-Chairperson: Tom. Bunosky, California American Water Company
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	Monterey County Water Resources Agency	
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District	Public Member (John Fischer)	

Agenda Item	Page No.
1. Administrative Matters:	
A. Approve Minutes from October 8, 2008	2
2. Laguna Seca Subarea Request to be Excepted from the 10% Cut in Operating Yield (Bob Jaques and Stan Powell)	9
3. Review Meeting Schedule (Bob Jaques)	13
4. Discuss the Recommended Management Strategies and Executive Summary Sections of the Draft BMAP, and Other HydroMetrics Documents (if time allows) (Derrik Williams)	15
5. Discuss Request of MPWMD to Conduct Injection Testing (Joe Oliver)	16
6. Other business	
7. Set next meeting date for Wednesday November 12, 2008 at 1:30 p.m. This meeting will be held at the Seaside City Hall Portable Office Buildings Conference Room	

SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**** * * AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM * * ****

MEETING DATE:	October 29, 2008
AGENDA ITEM:	1.A
AGENDA TITLE:	Approve Minutes from October 8, 2008
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager

SUMMARY:

Draft Minutes from this meeting were emailed to all TAC members. Proposed changes 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
Special Meeting
October 8, 2008

Attendees: **TAC Members**
City of Seaside – Rick Riedl (Carole Dawson replaced Mr. Riedl when he had to depart at approximately 4:00 p.m.)
California American Water – Tom Bunosky, Craig Anthony
City of Monterey – Les Turnbeaugh
Laguna Seca Property Owners – Stan Powell
MPWMD – Joe Oliver
Public Member – John Fischer (arrived at approximately 3:20 p.m.)
MCWRA – Kathy Thomasberg
City of Del Rey Oaks – No Representative
City of Sand City – Steve Matarazzo
Coastal Subarea Landowners – No Representative

Watermaster
Technical Program Manager - Robert Jaques

Consultants
HydroMetrics LLC - Derrik Williams and Georgina King

Others:
Laguna Seca Property Owners (or their representatives) - Eric Robinson (attorney), John Fio (Hydrogeologist consultant), and Leonard McIntosh (Laguna Seca Golf Ranch)

The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m.

1. **Administrative Matters:**
   A. Approve Minutes from September 9, 2008 and September 22, 2008
   Mr. Riedl requested the following revisions to the draft Minutes from the September 10, 2008 TAC meeting:
   Item 3, para 5: Revise the language in this paragraph to read as follows, with Mr. Riedl's requested deletions shown in ~~strikethrough~~, and his requested addition shown in *italics*:
   "Mr. Riedl asked why unit costs of replenishment water should be inflated to future years, if ~~the Replenishment Assessment Account money is earning interest~~ *money is being paid now for water that is over pumped now, not in the future. Mr. Riedl also pointed out that the Assessment can only be inflated for payments that are made in the future.* There was discussion referring to discussions at prior TAC meetings that it is the TAC's understanding that the funds deposited in the Replenishment Assessment Account currently do not accrue interest to the benefit of the Watermaster. *Mr. Riedl noted that it is irrelevant whether the money collected in the account is accruing interest."*

   Item 3: Mr. Riedl requested adding paragraphs right after para 5 reading as follows:

Mr. Riedl asked if it was reasonable to add 50 percent contingency to Conceptual Level cost estimates when concept level cost estimates should be in the range of plus or minus 30 percent.

Mr. Jaques stated his past experience is that conceptual cost estimates are in the range of minus 30 percent to plus 50 percent. Mr. Riedl noted that this would support the contention that the proposed estimated costs would be overly conservative, since it was not expected to exceed the imposed 50 percent contingency but was expected to be less than 50 percent.

Mr. Riedl asked if the Watermaster had looked into purchasing replenishment water from entities such as MCWD.

Item 4, para 5: Mr. Riedl requested that the 3rd sentence in this paragraph be revised to read as follows:

There was agreement that money should be included *as line items* in the 2009 budget for additional follow-up work from the various reports currently being prepared by HydroMetrics.

On a motion by Ms. Thomasberg, second by Mr. Bunosky, the minutes from both meetings were unanimously approved with the revisions requested by Mr. Riedl to the minutes from the September 10, 2008 meeting.

B. Progress Reports from Consultants

Mr. Bunosky asked Mr. Oliver if the Quarterly reports were due by specific dates. Mr. Oliver said he believed they were due as soon as possible after the data was available, but he said he would research this in the Decision and respond separately by e-mail.

There was no other discussion under this agenda item.

2. Revised Proposed M&MP Scope of Work for 2009

Mr. Jaques summarized the agenda material on this item.

Mr. Bunosky said he believed calibration of water meters was the responsibility of the well owners, not the Watermaster. Mr. Jaques said his review of the Decision left him with the impression that the Watermaster had some responsibility, but he agreed to research this further to insure the correct interpretation was being made.

Mr. Riedl noted that a recent Watermaster data request from Producers for production volumes asked for the production volumes to be reported in cubic feet, whereas his wells are measured in gallons. Mr. Oliver pointed out that the data request states that the data can be submitted in any of three forms: cubic feet, gallons, or acre feet.

Mr. Jaques highlighted the principal changes that he was proposing for the Scope of Work for 2009. During this discussion the following main questions and topics were discussed:

I.2.a.2 - it was agreed to check to see if the Watermaster has any responsibilities to perform the water meter calibration work and to adjust the scope of work and budget accordingly, if necessary.

I.3.a - with regard to the model, Mr. Bunosky expressed the opinion that it would be good to proceed with developing the enhancements to the Model. Mr. Williams said he felt there was sufficient data at this point to make modeling worthwhile.

I.3.a.1 - Mr. Powell asked Mr. Williams which of the "certain" issues would be addressed in updating the Model. Mr. Williams said he would look into this and advise.

Mr. Bunosky asked the TAC hydrogeologic technical experts what their opinions were with regard to proceeding with enhancements to the Model. Mr. Oliver said he felt it would be good to determine what questions the model will be asked to answer in conjunction with making any enhancements to it.

Mr. Turnbeaugh asked if this Scope of Work item could be listed as an "optional" task. Mr. Jaques said it is a significant budget item, and he would prefer for the TAC to make a decision on this to either include it or not include it in the Scope of Work and Budget for 2009, rather than putting such a large item in the budget only as an "optional" item.

Mr. Williams said he felt we are getting into questions for which the Model would be helpful in developing answers. He also noted that it will take some months to get the Model ready to run, so it would be good to start performing the enhancements so the Model can be ready to use when questions arise. He also recommended that the TAC discuss with him refinements to the scope of work to be done and the questions to be answered, before any work to enhance the Model is undertaken.

Mr. Riedl asked Mr. Williams if the Model could help determine the best locations for monitoring wells. Mr. Williams said yes the Model would be helpful with that. Mr. Jaques commented that it would also be helpful in evaluating supplemental water supply projects that propose to recharge the basin, such as the MRWPCA Ground Water Replenishment Project.

There was further discussion on the benefits of having an operational Model.

Mr. Williams said it would be important to decide if the Model would be expected to evaluate flow only, or also transport of chemicals, and whether the Model should break the Basin up into multiple units, and other issues which would affect the scope of work for the modeling to be undertaken.

Mr. Oliver again said it would be important to determine what types of questions we want the Model to help us answer, before undertaking work to the enhance the Model.

Mr. Williams said since there is currently no seawater intrusion being detected, seawater intrusion cannot be modeled at this time.

Mr. Matarazzo asked if the Model could help determine how much water the Basin can store from various supplemental water supply projects. Mr. Williams responded that the Model would be able to help answer that question.

Mr. Bunosky noted that many projects are covered in the PUC's EIR for the Regional Water Supply Project and Coastal Water Project, and this EIR work is expected to be completed in mid-2009. At that point he felt it would be very beneficial to have the Model ready for immediate use, because the selected project(s) would be expected to begin moving forward more rapidly at that time.

Mr. Powell recommended developing the questions we would want the Model to answer as an initial step in developing a scope work for HydroMetrics to perform this work.

Mr. Riedl asked if Scope of Work item I.2.b.5 could be deferred until the updating of the Model was done. Mr. Oliver responded that he felt that it would be better to proceed with the monitoring well, since desirable locations have already been determined, rather than deferring this until the modeling work has been done.

A number of editorial corrections were recommended to the language in the draft Scope of Work to improve accuracy and/or clarity. Mr. Bunosky recommended including wording saying that the Basin Management Action Plan serves as the sea water intrusion prevention plan for the Watermaster. Mr. Williams commented that that he could edit that language into the "Background and Purpose" section of that document, and Mr. Jaques will also note this in the revised Monitoring and Management Program Scope of Work.

There was agreement to consolidate items I.3.b.1 and I.3.b.2 into a single item I.3.b.

Is it was also pointed out that in 2009 it would be good to update the supplemental water project information in conjunction with performing the Replenishment Assessment calculations toward the end of water year 2000 8-2009.

With the revisions described above, there was consensus that the Scope of Work was acceptable. Mr. Jaques will make these revisions and e-mail out the revised Management and Monitoring Program 2009 Proposed Scope of Work to TAC member for final review before finalizing it and providing it to the Board for the consideration of approval at the Board's October 23, 2008 meeting.

3. Proposed M&MP Budgets for 2009 and 2010

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

Mr. Bunosky recommended in that in the presentation of the Board, last year's budget amounts be noted for comparison to the proposed budget for the upcoming year.

Mr. Bunosky asked Mr. Jaques if there were any details on how the costs for the MPWMD and MCWRA budget amounts were calculated. Mr. Jaques responded that these amounts were based on the actual contract amounts authorized for the current budget year, and that formulas for these are included in the Excel spreadsheet cells for these items.

Mr. Riedl commented that the meeting was now past 3:00 p.m., and that his understanding was that under the Brown Act, no action could be taken beyond this point because the meeting had only been proposed to last until 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Williams and Mr. Anthony recommended proceeding with the agenda as presented, noting that if an objection was received by someone, a special TAC meeting might be needed to re-act on items acted on after 3:00 p.m. Mr. Robinson commented that under the Brown Act it was permissible to proceed with action items as long as they were listed on the agenda, regardless of whether they occurred after the expected end time for the meeting.

Mr. Bunosky recommended lowering the Contingency amount by not applying the 20 percent Contingency to the cost for developing the model under Scope of Work item 1.3.a.

Mr. Jaques will revise the Budget to reflect the various recommended changes discussed at today's meeting, and will provide the TAC with a final review of the Budget before it goes to the Board for action at the Board's October 23, 2008 meeting.

Mr. Bunosky recommended including comments to the Board with regard to what our budget forecast was for 2008, and what actual expenditures for 2008 are.

Mr. Bunosky asked Mr. Oliver if a monitoring well could conceivably be installed offshore in the Bay. Mr. Oliver responded that the Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute is currently examining the

possibility of doing this very thing for some research they want to do. He noted that it was expected to be a very expensive undertaking.

With the revisions discussed at today's meeting as noted above, the TAC on a motion by Mr. Turnbeaugh, second by Ms. Thomasberg, unanimously approved the four budgets for the 2009 and 2010 time periods.

4. Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report

Mr. Williams provided a brief overview of the Seawater Intrusion Analysis Report (SIAR). He noted that this time three time periods were analyzed, including fall of 2007.

In the interest of time it was agreed that minor editorial comments could be e-mailed directly to Mr. Williams rather than being discussed at today's meeting.

On page 14 Mr. Oliver requested rewording item No. 2 to reflect that some of the data now does exist.

Mr. Williams and Ms. King said that more analytical data will be included in the final version of the SIAR, noting that some data from the Database had not been included in the current version.

There was discussion of numerous items with agreement to provide revised language for clarity.

There was discussion of providing 15 printed and bound copies to Mr. Evans to arrive at the Watermaster office by the morning of October 16, 2008 so Mr. Evans can distribute them to the Board for their review prior to their October 23, 2008 Special meeting.

[Note: After the meeting Mr. Jaques reviewed the scope of work in the HydroMetrics contract, and found that 15 printed and bound copies of both the final and the draft SIAR were to be provided to the Watermaster. Since the draft version was not provided in printed and bound fashion, but rather was e-mailed, it is hoped that 25 copies of the final version can be provided, so that there will be sufficient copies to also provide bound copies to each of the TAC members in addition to the Board members.]

5. Laguna Seca Subarea Request to be Excepted from the 10% Cut in Operating Yield

Mr. Bunosky opened discussion on this item. At this point Mr. Fischer requested deferring this item to a future meeting, because of the fact that the requesting parties had not provided many of the documents pertaining to this item in time for them to be included with the agenda packet.

Ms. Dawson also requested that the item be deferred to a future meeting, because of the late hour. It was 5:20 p.m.

Mr. Powell explained that the Laguna Seca Alternative Producers had brought Mr. John Fio to the TAC meeting for purposes of explaining the technical basis for their request and answering any questions of the TAC members. Mr. Powell further explained that Mr. Fio was soon scheduled to be outside of the country, working in China, and that he may be unavailable if the item were continued to a later TAC meeting.

Mr. Robinson requested that the meeting continue on for consideration of this item.

Mr. Bunosky explained that the TAC had been working diligently and that the meeting had already lasted approximately four hours with only one very brief break. Mr. Bunosky added that he would be unavailable for the next two weeks because he will be working on the Cal Am rate case.

Ms. Dawson reported that the building had to be locked up.

Mr. Bunosky asked if there was a motion to adjourn today's meeting. A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Fischer, seconded by Mr. Turnbeaugh, and the motion to adjourn passed with no dissenting votes.

6. Other business

There was no discussion under this item, as the meeting was adjourned as noted above.

7. Set next Special meeting date for Wednesday October 29, 2008 at 1:30 p.m.
Set next Regular meeting date for Wednesday November 12, 2008 at 1:30 p.m.
Both of these meetings will be held at the Seaside City Hall Portable Office Buildings Conference Room

There was no discussion under this item, as the meeting was adjourned as noted above.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

** * * AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM * * **

MEETING DATE:	October 29, 2008
AGENDA ITEM:	2
AGENDA TITLE:	Laguna Seca Subarea Request to be Excepted from the 10% Cut in Operating Yield
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager

SUMMARY:
[Note: This item was originally agendized for the October 8 meeting, but was carried over to today's meeting for the reasons discussed in the Minutes from that meeting]

The Laguna Seca Alternative Producers' has submitted a request that the Laguna Seca Subarea be excepted from the 10 percent cut in operating yield, as explained in the attached letter sent to Dewey Evans. This subject was presented to the Board at its October 1, 2008 meeting by Eric Robinson. The Board passed a motion directing the TAC to discuss the request and to provide to the Board its recommendations, for the Board to consider at its Special meeting scheduled for October 23, 2008.

As noted in the letter, the request is based on the Watermaster making a technical finding that is based on groundwater elevations and conditions that have recently been under discussion with HydroMetrics in conjunction with preparation of the BMAP and the SIRP. Information on those topics has also been discussed to some extent in other reports prepared for the Watermaster.

The Laguna Seca Alternative Producers are asking the TAC to review and confirm the groundwater elevations supporting their request to the Watermaster.

Mr. Powell, whose firm represents the Laguna Seca Alternative Producers, has provided additional documentation in support of this request directly to members of the TAC for their review prior to today's meeting. This material is included for the TAC's review. The material was provided in the form of three separate .pdf attachments to the email that sent out this Agenda packet.

Based on my preliminary consultations with those TAC members who are specialists in groundwater hydrogeology here are some issues for TAC members to consider regarding this request:

- It may be possible to make a case that the water levels in the Southern Coastal subarea are protective of seawater intrusion. However, it may be difficult to determine whether or not reducing pumping in the Laguna Seca area will help water levels in the Northern Coastal Subarea.
- The *Laguna Seca Study* by Yates and Feeney for MPWMD apparently states that the Laguna Seca Area is in overdraft.

SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**** * * AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM * * ****

AGENDA ITEM:	2 (Cont'd)

- Hydrologic studies apparently have concluded that there is hydrologic connectivity in the aquifers between the Laguna Seca Area and the rest of the Seaside Basin. If this is correct, then it would appear that the Laguna Seca Area pumping has hydrologic influence on the Coastal area(s) of the Seaside Basin.

- Some of the reports that have been prepared appear to indicate that some amount of water flows in a generally westerly direction toward the Bay in the southern portion of the Basin, but that at some point a portion of that water then flows in a generally northerly direction into the northern portion of the Basin. If this is correct, then that flow would appear to have the potential to help with mitigating, in part, the pumping depression that exists in the northern part of the Basin.
- If the Laguna Seca Area is already in a documented "overdraft" condition, should water levels alone be the determining factor in responding to this request? That is to say, the non-technical findings may be more important than the technical findings - such as "what is the intent of the Amended Decision", or "Does the Amended Decision attempt to prevent overdraft regardless of the threat of seawater intrusion". While these are not decisions for the TAC to make, they should at least be pointed out to the Board in any recommendations the TAC makes to the Board.

The TAC is asked to discuss this topic and, if possible, to prepare its recommendations to be sent to the Board via the Technical Program Manager, for the Board's consideration at its November 5, 2008 regular meeting.

ATTACHMENTS:	1. Letter dated September 19, 2008 from Eric Robinson, attorney representing the Laguna Seca Alternative Producers 2. Three documents in support of the Laguna Seca request, attached as separate .pdf files to the email which sent out this Agenda packet.
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	Discuss this topic and provide recommendations and/or input to be presented by the Technical Program Manager to the Watermaster Board at its November 5, 2008 Regular Meeting

ERIC N. ROBINSON

KRONICK MOSKOVITZ TIEDEMANN & GIRARD
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

September 19, 2008

Mr. Dewey Evans, Chief Executive Officer
Seaside Basin Watermaster
2800 Garden Road, Suite 228
Monterey, CA 93940

Re: Agenda item request for October 1, 2008, Regular Seaside Basin Watermaster Meeting

Dear Mr. Evans:

The Laguna Seca Alternative Producers—York School, Pasadera Country Club, Bishop, McIntosh & McIntosh and Laguna Seca Resort—understand that the agenda for the October 1, 2008, regular meeting of the Seaside Basin Watermaster will include an item concerning the 10 percent reduction in Operating Yield that takes effect in 2009 unless the Watermaster makes certain findings.

The Monterey County Superior Court's Amended Decision specifies an Operating Yield for the Laguna Seca Subarea and provides that the 10 percent reduction can be avoided if "[t]he Watermaster has determined that Groundwater levels within the Santa Margarita and Paso Robles aquifers are at sufficient levels to ensure a positive offshore gradient to prevent seawater intrusion." Amended Decision, § III.B.2.d at p. 18 (filed February 9, 2007).

In fact, groundwater elevations within the Santa Margarita and Paso Robles aquifers have been, and remain, at more than sufficient levels to ensure a positive offshore gradient to prevent seawater intrusion into the Southern Coastal Subarea and Laguna Seca Subarea. Accordingly, the Laguna Seca Alternative Producers will be submitting a formal request that the Watermaster make the above Section III.B.2.d finding to except the Laguna Seca Subarea from the Operating Yield reduction scheduled to take effect in 2009.

The Laguna Seca Alternative Producers request an agenda item that: (1) provides time to briefly describe our forthcoming request and its basis; and (2) provides Watermaster direction on how our request will be reviewed and decided. The Watermaster's Technical Advisory Committee ("TAC") and its groundwater consultant, Hydrometrics, already are familiar with the data showing the existence of protective groundwater elevations preventing seawater intrusion in the Southern Coastal Subarea and in the Laguna Seca Subarea. That familiarity is the result of the TAC and Watermaster consultant's work on the Monitoring and Management Plan, Seawater Intrusion Response Plan and Basin Management Action Plan. Accordingly, we request that the Watermaster direct the TAC to review the technical basis for

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
400 CAPITOL MALL, 27TH FLOOR SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814-4416 TELEPHONE (916) 321-4500 FAX (916) 321-4555

our request upon its submittal and confirm whether groundwater levels are sufficient to ensure a positive offshore gradient to prevent seawater intrusion in the Southern Coastal Subarea and the Laguna Seca Subarea.

We anticipate submitting the technical documentation supporting our Section III.B.2.d exception request to the TAC for review at the October 8, 2008, regularly scheduled TAC meeting. The technical basis for our request can be confirmed based on existing data that the TAC and Watermaster consultant already have reviewed in connection with preparing the above-mentioned plans. Accordingly, we request that at the Watermaster's October 23, 2008, special meeting: (1) the TAC report on whether the technical basis for the Section III.B.2.d finding is confirmed; and (2) the Watermaster approve the Section III.B.2.d exception request for the Laguna Seca Subarea.

Sincerely,

KRONICK, MOSKOVITZ, TIEDEMANN & GIRARD
A Law Corporation

Eric N. Robinson

Eric N. Robinson

cc: Vidhya Prabhakaran (Pasadera Country Club)
Elizabeth Gianola (York School)
Leonard McIntosh (Bishop, McIntosh & McIntosh)
Gary Cursio (Laguna Seca Resort)
Robert Costa (Watermaster Representative for Laguna Seca Alternative Producers

900181.1

KRONICK MOSKOVITZ TIEDEMANN & GIRARD
A LAW CORPORATION
400 CAPITOL MALL, 27TH FLOOR
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
TEL (916) 321-4500
FAX (916) 321-4555
www.kmtg.com

SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**** * * AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM * * ****

MEETING DATE:	October 8, 2008
AGENDA ITEM:	3
AGENDA TITLE:	Review Meeting Schedule
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager

SUMMARY:
At a recent TAC meeting a proposed meeting schedule, including topics/issues to be discussed at those meetings, was provided to the TAC for its review and comment.

The updated table is attached for the TAC's information and possible further discussion.

ATTACHMENTS:	Proposed Meeting Schedule
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	Provided for information, but the TAC may provide direction regarding revisions to the schedule and/or the topics/issues to be discussed at those meetings

MEETING	DATE	TOPICS	DESIRED OUTCOME
Regular TAC	10/8/08	Due to other more pressing issues, discussion of topics and materials to be included in the Annual Report was not put on the agenda for the 10/8/08 TAC meeting as originally planned. The Annual Report will be prepared in the same format as the 2007 Annual Report.	None
Special TAC	10/29/08	1. The Water Year 2007-2008 Replenishment Assessments are still being prepared, as all Production data for 4th Quarter had not been received in time to prepare the Assessments for TAC review at the 10/29/08 meeting. The Assessments will be prepared using the Production data and the Unit Cost that was approved by the TAC and the Board at their recent meetings. The Assessments will go directly to the Board for approval at the Board's November 5, 2008 meeting. 2. Discussion of Draft Recommended Management Strategies and Executive Summary sections of the BMAP	1. TAC approval of the approach to be used to prepare the Replenishment Assessments and move to Board for approval at its November 5 meeting 2. Complete discussion of these sections of the BMAP, so the full BMAP can be completed and assembled for TAC review at its next meeting.
Regular Board	November 5	1. Replenishment Assessments 2. Draft Annual Report	1. Board approval of the Replenishment Assessments 2. Board approval of the Annual Report
Regular TAC	November 12	1st discussion of completed Draft of the full BMAP and SIRP documents with continued discussions of these documents, including additional Special TAC meetings if necessary, to ensure the documents are completed by December 10, 2008 TAC meeting	Complete discussions on the BMAP and SIRP documents so they can be printed in Draft form for presentation to the Board in January, 2009
Special TAC Meeting	TBD	Continued discussions of Draft of the full BMAP and SIRP documents	Complete review either at this meeting or a meeting to be subsequently scheduled
Regular TAC	12/10/08	Complete review of the full BMAP and SIRP documents and direct HydroMetrics to print them for Board review at the Board's January, 2009 meeting	Start the final editing and printing process for these documents

SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

** * * AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM * * **

MEETING DATE:	October 29, 2008
AGENDA ITEM:	4
AGENDA TITLE:	Discuss the Recommended Management Strategies and Executive Summary Sections of BMAP Report
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager

SUMMARY:

HydroMetrics has prepared a Draft Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP) and the TAC has been reviewing and discussing sections of this document at previous meetings. Various sections of the Draft document were previously sent directly to TAC members by HydroMetrics for review prior to today's meeting.

Representatives from HydroMetrics will attend today's TAC meeting to discuss the Recommended Management Strategies and Executive Summary sections of the report.

If time allows review and discussion of other portions of the BMAP may also be undertaken.

ATTACHMENTS:	None (the Draft BMAP sections for discussion at today's meeting were emailed directly from Mr. Williams to members of the TAC)
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	Discuss and provide recommended edits and other changes to these sections of the Draft BMAP

SEASIDE BASIN WATER MASTER TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

** * * AGENDA TRANSMITTAL FORM * * **

MEETING DATE:	October 29, 2008
AGENDA ITEM:	5
AGENDA TITLE:	Discuss Request by MPWMD to Conduct Injection Testing
PREPARED BY:	Robert Jaques, Technical Program Manager

SUMMARY: MPWMD would like to conduct some injection testing in the Basin using MCWD potable water, starting in November, 2008. They plan to seek Board approval to do this. I anticipate the Board may want the TAC's recommendations on this before they act. In order to facilitate approval of MPWMD's request, I have placed this item on today's agenda, so Mr. Oliver can brief us on the proposal. Here is a brief description of their proposal:

Background: Over the last year and a half, the MPWMD has been working with the Marina Coast Water District (MCWD) staff to develop a plan to utilize MCWD system water for a one-time, short-term injection test at the Phase 1 ASR facility in the Seaside Basin near the intersection of GJM Blvd and Eucalyptus Road. The purpose of the test is to collect data from simultaneous operation of both wells in injection mode at their design capacity, which has not been tested at this facility to date. Currently, the California American Water (CAW) delivery system is not sufficiently equipped to provide the full design injection capacity (i.e., 3,000 gallons per minute flow rate). Such improvements to the CAW system are in the planning and design phase, but these improvements will not be in place for this next year. We have recently completed a temporary tie-in to the MCWD system to support this test, and are close to completing improvements to the second ASR well at the site to facilitate this testing, which could be up to three weeks in length and up to 300 acre-feet injected and stored in the basin.

Test Agreement: Earlier this year, we prepared a three-agency coordination agreement between MPWMD, MCWD and Monterey County Water Resources Agency for this testing. The agreement includes the provision that the Watermaster board shall approve this test prior to conducting the test. We are currently planning to conduct this test in November or early December, so the Board's approval in early November would be timely.

Short-term Injection Test vs. Long-Term Storage: At the June 11, 2008 TAC meeting, the agenda included an item regarding the legal question whether a formal Storage Agreement is needed for the MPWMD ASR program to store water in the basin. The TAC's recommendation on this was to ask for Board direction as to whether MPWMD should be required to have a Storage Agreement, adding that the TAC feels that any party that is storing water should have such an agreement to assist the Watermaster in properly managing the basin. Although this matter has not yet gone before the Watermaster Board, I believe this matter is a different issue and should be treated separately from the approval request for the short-term injection test.

The proposal does not appear to pose anything adverse to the Basin, and I recommend that it be approved.

ATTACHMENTS:	None
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	Discuss the proposal and if the TAC is comfortable with it, recommend approval to the Board