MEETING SUMMARY | December 12, 2012
Santa Rosa Plain Technical Advisory Committee

Meeting in Brief

Reporting TAC Progress to the Basin Advisory Panel
The TAC has contributed significantly to the development of section 1 (Introduction and Purpose); section 2 (Water Resources); part of section 4 (4.2 – Monitoring and Modeling) and an early draft of section 5 (Groundwater Management Plan Implementation). The group's efforts to date will be reported back to the Basin Advisory Panel (Panel) in early 2013 for review and further input.

Ongoing TAC Revision of GMP Sections 1, 2 and 5
The TAC provided remaining substantive comments for sections 1, 2 and the early draft of section 5. Due to meeting time constraints, the TAC did not have the opportunity to revisit the monitoring program. The group agreed to email additional feedback on the monitoring program or other sections in the week following the meeting.

http://www.scwa.gov/srgroundwater/

Next Meetings
Upcoming TAC Meeting Dates: February 27 and March 27, 2013 at the Sonoma County Water Agency office, 404 Aviation Blvd, Santa Rosa. No January 2013 meeting.

Action Items

Timeframe	Name	Action Item
January	Project Team	Distribute latest iterations of the GMP based on December TAC feedback

TAC Progress to Date
The TAC has contributed significantly to the content, level of technical detail and readability for various sections of the GMP. Since August 2012 the group has discussed, deliberated and refined section 1 (Introduction and Purpose); section 2 (Water Resources); part of section 4 (4.2 – Monitoring and Modeling) and an early draft of section 5 (Groundwater Management Plan Implementation). Members noted positively that since its inception the TAC has engaged in a free exchange of ideas, stayed focused, cultivated a convivial environment and collaborated well with a responsive Project Team. While the development process for each section of the GMP remains iterative, the group's efforts in the latter part of 2012 will be reported back to the Basin Advisory Panel in early 2013 for review and further input.

Introduction and Purpose of the Groundwater Management Plan
The TAC revisited section 1 of the GMP and built upon previously shared feedback. The group decided to focus on remaining substantive comments, rather than stylistic suggestions, for section 1 and other sections reviewed during the meeting. Members continue to refine the vision statement in order to provide a clear and concise description of the groundwater management planning effort. Additional considerations for section 1 include the following:

Section 1.2: Continue to define the TAC role as "developers" versus "reviewers" of the GMP.

Section 1.4: Include discussion of the Alexander Valley and the Lower Russian River Valley groundwater basins. Ensure that text in this section (and all sections) aligns with any referenced maps (e.g. Figure 1-1 and Figure 2-2).

Table 1.1 (Section C – numbers 5, 10, 11 and 12): Refine language taken directly from the California Water Code to differentiate between required, voluntary and applicable GMP elements. Further clarify the contents of table 1.1 in the section 1.6 narrative.

Figures: Show any numerical indicators within the legend for each figure.

General comment: Ensure all iterations posted in Dropbox include a version date.

Management Plan Implementation

At the November meeting the Project Team provided section 5 to the TAC in a preliminary, partial draft form to give the group some sense of how the GMP provides a roadmap and plan for implementation once the Plan is adopted. Section 5 will be completed following completion of Sections 1 through 4 later in 2013. Due to time constraints at the November meeting, the TAC took a closer look at section 5 during the December meeting and noted the following considerations:

Section 5.1: Note that the collaborative GMP process -- including the work of the TAC and the Panel -- is designed to encourage proactive management and coordination. Be clear that both the TAC and Panel will continue. This is implied for the Panel but needs to be described more explicitly for the TAC.

Section 5.4: The TAC expressed overall satisfaction with this section. Remove the word "general" so it doesn't get confused with "general plan".

General comment: Explore the nexus of biology and groundwater dependent ecosystems. Highlight the relationship of ecosystems to surface water protection, surface water/groundwater interaction and recharge.

Water Resources

The TAC has also contributed significantly to development of the Water Resources Section (Section 2) of the GMP. The Project Team -- following the September and October TAC meetings -- refined or added the following sections based on member inputs and suggestions:

- Added an introductory paragraph in the Climate Section
- Added paragraphs on climate change studies in the Climate Section
- Updated profiles for the Water Agency, Sebastopol, Town of Windsor and Cal American in Section 2.3.2
- Added Relative Recharge Potential Mapping and associated figure in Groundwater Recharge and Discharge Section
- Added contaminant sites description and map in Groundwater Quality Section

Upon review of the latest iteration, TAC members noted outstanding considerations in the following areas:

Figure 2-18: Provide additional explanation and characterization of contaminant sites. Clarify what *is* of concern versus what *is not* of concern and figure out a non-resource intensive way to incorporate this information into the Plan. Integrate factual information so the map is not open to interpretation and doesn't cause undue concern or misunderstanding among the wider public. The TAC agreed on the benefit of setting up a meeting between the Sonoma County Water Agency and the Regional Water Quality Control Board to foster inter-agency communication and improve understanding of contaminant issues. Some TAC members expressed interest to contribute to this conversation.

Figures following figure 2-21: Correct numbers. Numeric figures cited in narrative sections do not currently align with included maps.

Figures 2-19, 2-20 and 2-21: Consolidate these figures.

Figures 2-23, 2-24, and 2-25: Ensure legends align so that various flow records can be cross-referenced.

Subsection 2.3: Differentiate between the previous study area and current USGS efforts. Add a table to indicate area of coverage.

Subsection 2.5.2.2: Include discussion of flood control projects for major creeks. Consider additional topical information not just on reservoirs, but also connected drainages and stream maintenance.

Subsection 2.95: Include discussion of reclaimed water issues.

Subsection 2.5: Include some information on non-point source water pollution, surface water permits, TMDLs, and the relevance of the Endangered Species Act to groundwater management.

General comment: Consider inclusion of the Pays Program (investment fund for water conservation measures)

Global document change recommendation: At the beginning of the Plan, the Santa Rosa Plain Watershed (SRPW) should be defined geographically, along with the explanation that the Groundwater Management Plan Area (Plan Area) is the SRPW. Throughout the GMP, the Plan Area should be referenced as Plan Area, except in certain instances where the term "Santa Rosa Plain Watershed or SRPW" is more appropriate from a geographic context. Inclusion of a list of acronyms and definitions will provide additional clarity to ensure proper use of terms throughout the document. In addition, the GMP should clearly distinguish the terms Santa Rosa Plain groundwater subbasin, and reconcile the fact that the DWR and USGS recognize different boundaries. A map may be inserted early in the document to demonstrate differences between DWR and USGS maps.

Of note, the publication of the USGS report in early 2013 will enable further updates and refinement of the GMP relative to water use and water quality, the hydro-geologic

conceptual model, groundwater/surface water interaction, groundwater recharge and discharge, and future supply and demand.

Due to meeting time constraints, the TAC did not have the opportunity to revisit the monitoring program. The group agreed to email additional feedback on the monitoring program or other sections in the week following the meeting.

TAC Meeting Attendees

TAC Members	**Project Team**
Matt O'Connor	Project Manager, Marcus Trotta
Mark Calhoon	Technical Consultant, Tim Parker
Brock Dolman	TAC Facilitator, Rich Wilson
Kevin Cullinen	
Rocky Vogler	
Dawna Gallagher	
Jane Nielson	
Joe Gaffney	
Michael Burns	
Bob Anderson	
Jay Jasperse	