

TAC Action Items

COMMENT/QUESTION	CLARIFICATION
<p>1. There is nothing in the GMP about water sold to Marin County.</p>	<p>Section 2.3.1.1 mentions water deliveries to Marin County. The potential for groundwater exports from Water Agency wells to areas outside of Plan Area are discussed in Section 2.5.5.</p>
<p>2. Section 2-6 (Section 2.3 in Final version of GMP) contains some inaccuracies (distorted statistics, such as an inflated number for the amount of water used by rural residents)</p>	<p>Water demand estimates were developed by the USGS using a surface water/groundwater flow model and assumptions regarding land uses, crop types and population estimates. These figures are cited in the GMP and are the best available estimates. Further refinement of these estimates can be conducted during implementation.</p>
<p>3. Arsenic in the groundwater is just referred to blandly in the document – contamination should be a high priority.</p>	<p>Information on arsenic in groundwater provided in GMP is based on information reported in the USGS study. Naturally occurring arsenic is common in groundwater in the region. Monitoring, protecting and improving groundwater quality is a priority in the Plan, as described in BMO-5</p>
<p>4. Water conservation – document stresses engineering projects rather than the importance of reducing demand.</p>	<p>Expanding conservation is one of the main objectives and recommended actions in the Plan.</p>
<p>5. Groundwater banking as a recommended</p>	<p>The recommended actions described in the Plan, including groundwater banking, were discussed with Panel and TAC members during the development of the Plan and incorporate</p>

TAC Action Items

<p>action is only presented in a positive light when it's actually very controversial.</p>	<p>the range of perspectives from TAC and Panel members. As described in the Plan, pilot-scale testing of groundwater banking methodologies and technologies will be needed in order to assess the feasibility, including potential water quality interactions.</p>
<p>6. There is no mention of sewer lines sucking up groundwater.</p>	<p>Inflow and Infiltration into wastewater collection systems could be assessed and discussed during implementation of the Plan, if such data and information is available.</p>
<p>7. Surface water and groundwater is a single source - there is no differentiation between the two.</p>	<p>The GMP does acknowledge the interconnectedness of surface water and groundwater within the Plan Area. Monitoring of surface water and groundwater interaction is one of the recommended actions.</p> <p>2.4.5 Groundwater-Surface Water Interaction includes a few paragraphs describing the current understanding of groundwater-surface water interaction in the Santa Rosa Plain. One of the objectives of the Plan is as follows:</p> <p><i>BMO-4 Surface Water-Groundwater Interaction - Evaluate surface water and groundwater interactions and protect against adverse impacts</i></p> <p>The GSFLOW dynamically simulates surface water-groundwater interaction and is described in Section 2.8.</p> <p>Section 5.2.1.4 proposes a program of surface water-groundwater interaction monitoring as one of the Plan monitoring elements.</p> <p>Section 5.3.2 proposes actions to Prevent Adverse Interactions Between Groundwater and Surface Water.</p>
<p>8. There is no mention of Water Agency wells below 100 ft drawing from the basin, and we have to look at groundwater movement from elsewhere.</p>	<p>A description of Water Agency diversion facilities, which includes the Water Agency's collector wells beneath the Russian River and located outside of the Santa Rosa Plain Watershed, is included in Section 2.3.1.1. Inflows and outflows from Plan area to and from neighboring basins are discussed in 2.7.1. Recommended actions are included to monitor groundwater levels near and across Plan area boundaries.</p>

TAC Action Items

<p>9. Unclear as to how GMP can be exempt from CEQA, and also there has been no notification as to whether or not the Panel is a Brown Act body.</p>	<p>The Water Agency’s Board of directors determined that the adoption of the Plan was categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because the implementation of the Plan contemplates basic data collection and research that will not result in a serious or major disturbance to an environmental resource and are for information gathering purposes which will help meet the objectives of the Plan. While the adoption of the Plan is categorically exempt from CEQA, any specific recommendations included in the Plan that promote the undertaking of future projects, such as, but not limited to construction activities would be subject to future evaluation under CEQA.</p> <p>The Brown Act applies to legislative bodies of local agencies. The Basin Advisory Panel is not a legislative body for Brown Act purposes because it was not created by formal action of the Water Agency’s Board of Directors. Nor does the Board of Directors make any appointments to the Basin Advisory Panel.</p>
<p>10. The GMP should address anadromous fish.</p>	<p>While anadromous fish are not specifically referenced, the Plan contains many objectives and recommend actions to protect the ecosystem environments which support anadromous fish. Surface water and groundwater interaction monitoring is a recommended action for the Plan area. Preventing adverse surface water-groundwater interactions that could impact groundwater-dependent ecosystems is also a recommended action.</p>