INDIAN WELLS VALLEY
GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES

Indian Wells Valley Water District
500 W Ridgecrest Blvd, Ridgecrest, CA 93555
Wednesday, December 6, 2017, 1:00 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by TAC Chair Bingham at 1:04 p.m.

Roll Call TAC:
6 Present; 1 Absent - Michael Powell, Rand Community Water District

Non-Voting Members
2 Present; 1 Absent – Michelle Anderson, Kern County Water Agency (KCWA)

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Stuart Rajtora feels that the Water Resources Manager (WRM) is doing all the work, specifically in regards to reviewing the DRI model. Mr. Rajtora suggested that the TAC get permission from the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authroity (IWVGA) to do a peer review of the DRI report so that we the TAC can have a vibrant discussion at these meetings.

3. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

a. November 2nd Meeting

Motion by Don Decker and second by Wade Major to accept the minutes
Passed – 6 Ayes
Decker, Teasdale, Major, Wilson, Bingham, O'Neil
No – None, Absent – Powell

Mr. Decker expressed thanks to the secretary.

4. ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

a. TAC – Ethics Training – Constant Reminder

Chair Bingham reminded TAC members to complete ethics training.

No further comments.

b. Tim Ross, DWR Representative – DWR SGMA Activities Presentation then Questions and Comments and Availability for TAC Meetings

i. GSP

Mr. Ross of the Department of Water Resources (DWR) gave a PowerPoint presentation on DWR and Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) activities (see attached document). Mr. Ross described his visit as a "check-in," an opportunity to trade information, and see how DWR may be able to help with things going on in the Indian Wells Valley (IWV). SGMA legislation is written with the intent that sustainable groundwater management be accomplished locally and Mr. Ross expressed that he has seen good involvement here in Indian Wells Valley. Mr. Ross also said that there is good potential for all Prop. 1 applications to be funded. The presentation focused on DWR's move toward a technical assistance focus (versus the financial assistance seen in Prop.1) and sustainable groundwater management criteria. Mr. Ross emphasized that groundwater sustainability is measured by undesirable results, which are determined by minimum thresholds (which are in turn determined by data) and the limits, or what it means to have an undesirable result, are set by the IWVGA.

<u>Committee Comments:</u>
Chair Bingham asked if useable GIS datasets could be downloaded from DWR's database to use in the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) and Mr. Ross assured Chair Bingham that data would be made available, however Mr. Ross was unsure what format the data would be in.

Eddy Teasdale asked for more details on how to apply for technical assistance through DWR and Mr. Ross explained that the application process is not fully set up yet, but will involve a website with instructions and information on how to apply. Mr. Ross informed the committee that DWR has extra transducers and that the use of those transducers would be made available as part of DWR's technical assistance efforts. Mr. Teasdale also asked when Prop. 1 awards will be announced. Mr. Ross responded that the main review deadline is December 15th and awards should be announced in January 2018.

Stephan Bork asked how robust of a plan does DWR need to see to ensure that IWV will not have undesirable trends and does it need to be modeled? Mr. Ross clarified that a groundwater model is not required to be in place for the GSP and that the idea of the GSP at this point is to start gathering data and figuring out where the gaps are. Mr. Ross emphasized that this will be an iterative process with 5 year progress updates in order to help basins stay on track toward their sustainability goal. Mr. Ross suggested that IWV come up with ideas for management programs and predict what is expected to happen if those management programs were implemented. Mr. Ross also suggested defining a window within which to operate.

Mr. Decker expressed concern regarding the need for a model, since a model would help IWV make better predictions. Mr. Ross clarified terms; a hydrogeologic conceptual model is a 3D model of the physical aspects of the basin that includes geology, water quality areas, recharge areas etc. and a digital model is one that calculates how water moves based on input basin parameters. Mr. Decker feels that a digital model is an essential element in our plan, especially if we are to make predictions. Mr. Ross agrees that a digital model is a good management tool. Mr. Decker feels that IWV needs more educational material on the severity of the situation in IWV to be distributed to the public and asked Mr. Ross if DWR had any suggestions for outreach that IWV could take advantage of. Mr. Ross mentioned a document created by the Water Education Foundation.

Tim Parker also clarified the difference between a hydrogeologic conceptual model and a groundwater flow model (previously referred to as a digital model) and suggested the committee consistently use those two terms. Mr. Ross clarified that the groundwater flow model is not required for the GSP, but the hydrogeologic conceptual model is. Mr. Parker asked if logging and video logging resources are available through DWR. Mr. Ross responded that the resources are available through DWR or through the contractor they use. Mr. Bork asked how these services are available and Mr. Ross explained that an application process will be available online; however they are targeting critically overdraft basins.

Earl Wilson likes the idea of operating within a window of acceptable ranges and asked if one well out of compliance with that window would be OK? Mr. Ross clarified that within compliance/out of compliance depends on what the GSP defines as being compliant/not compliant, then DWR will look at the science behind what determines compliance. Mr. Ross feels that a window of compliance is better than aiming for a specific water level.

<u>Public Comments:</u>
Judie Decker asked, "What kind of wells do you want for transducers?" Mr. Ross answered that they would prefer wells without a pump in it that have completion reports such as abandoned wells, monitor wells, etc. During the discussion of undesirable results for sustainability, Ms. Decker asked what if the basin is already below minimum thresholds and experiencing undesirable results. Mr. Ross explained that the objective should then be to raise the basin to a desirable condition as it relates to the measureable objectives.

Elaine Mead asked if this presentation will be available online and Mr. Ross said that it will be in the minutes which will be available online.

Renee Westa-Lusk asked for confirmation that a groundwater flow model was not required for the GSP. Mr. Ross explained that a groundwater flow model is not required because it takes a long time to get all of the necessary data together and refined to build such a model. However, a groundwater flow model is encouraged because it is a good tool. Ms. Westa-Lusk asked how IWV would calculate things like safe yield, minimum thresholds, etc. without a groundwater flow model. Mr. Ross explained that those things could be calculated in other ways.

Pat Ferris asked, "How do we rate with other overdraft basins?" Ms. Ferris also asked what information is used to compare basins and determine the overdraft status. Mr. Ross responded that the amount of water level decline through time is not used to classify critical overdraft basin, it is more about the pattern of decline through time. Mr. Ross said that decline in IWV began in the 1960s without any recovery during wet years, which is why IWV was classified as critically overdraft.

5. DISCUSSION OF PRIORITY PROJECTS/TASKS

a. Water Resources Manager (WRM) Report

Jeff Helsley of Stetson Engineers Inc. (Stetson) attended the meeting on behalf of the WRM along with three others from Stetson to discuss the three items in the WRM Report.

i. Proposition 1 Application: Final Draft submitted November 13th – Status Update

Mr. Helsley explained that the Prop. 1 application has been submitted and is glad to hear that DWR is moving forward on reviewing those applications.

No further comments.

ii. DRI Model Review – Status Update

Mr. Helsley introduced Ms. Jean Moran who gave a PowerPoint Presentation on her review of the status of the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin Model (see attached document). Ms. Moran also provided a draft report of the review (see attached document). Ms. Moran also mentioned that the Navy wrote a memorandum on the new data that has been added to the DRI model and assured the public that though this document has not been made public, she has seen it and incorporated that information into her review. Ms. Jean outlined the review criteria, outlined the next steps, and presented cost information.

Committee Comments:

Scott O'Neil asked for clarification regarding the 38 recommendations Ms. Moran outlined in her presentation. Ms. Moran clarified that they are not recommendations, they are the elements of the review and estimated roughly 15 changes need to be made. Mr. O'Neil asked if the Navy agreed that those changes needed to be made. Ms. Moran said that the Navy was given a copy to review on Monday and is awaiting comments. Mr. O'Neil later asked about Ms. Moran's 6 month plan of next steps in regards to the completeness of the model. Ms. Moran clarified that the next six months is reviewing what gets incorporated into the model. Mr. O'Neil went on to ask how Ms. Moran was going to get the data to support the 15 changes she suggest be made to the model. Ms. Moran clarified that the data is all there and she feels that there should be a working group to analyze that piece of seasonal data the model needs and that group can calculate engineering estimates of pumping curves, etc. and use that information to backfill the model. Mr. O'Neil expressed concern about making the June deadline and Ms. Moran said they could re-evaluate the timeline, but her biggest concern about the timeline is incorporating the Salt Nutrient Management Plan (SNMP) and USGS recharge study. Mr. O'Neil asked if these changes to the model improve the fidelity of the model as it was intended for its original purpose of modeling drawdown. Ms. Moran confirmed that it will improve the fidelity of the model. Mr. O'Neil expressed concern with the inconsistency within the SGMA regulations regarding the need to make models public. Mr. Ross explained that if you have an existing model that is proprietary it can remain proprietary as long as it is a pre-existing model; new models must be released to the public domain.

Chair Bingham asked if Ms. Moran was waiting on more data to complete her review of the model. Ms. Moran clarified that she has seen everything and the review is complete, she is waiting for comments on her report of the review. Chair Bingham later asked if DWR had a checklist of what DWR needs to see done in regards to meeting regulations and Mr. Ross responded by saying that they will follow a checklist of regulation requirements.

Mr. Parker asked if Ms. Moran wanted the TAC to review the report and when she wanted comments. Ms. Moran does want the TAC to review the report and send comments within two weeks.

Mr. Wilson asked how the Brown and Caldwell (BC) model would improve the conceptual model (since Ms. Moran did not have access to the BC model). Ms. Moran explained that she read the BC model report and that DRI was given some of the BC model files to use as a structural footprint. Ms. Moran suggested IWV Water District contact Brown and Caldwell to see about accessing the model files. Chair Bingham offered to contact Brown and Caldwell.

Mr. Teasdale thanked Ms. Moran for her presentation and asked if Ms. Moran looked into the water budget. Ms. Moran did not look at the water budget. Mr. Teasdale asked about incorporating the results from SkyTEM and expressed concern due to the fact that new data coming in means that some things in the model will change. Ms. Moran feels that structural changes to the model could be done soon and any changes could be dealt with in a timely manner. Mr. Teasdale is concerned about review of the model and adjustments to the model happening behind closed doors. Mr. Greg Pohll, who worked on the DRI model, spoke up to explain that the Navy is reluctant to release data that is specific to the base and it is more about accessing data that is confidential such as GPS positions of wells and the like. Mr. Helsley pointed out that this issue is not unique to IWV and that a similar situation arises in regards to tribes who are not required to participate in SGMA. Ms. Moran explained that DRI has no problem with DWR coming and looking at the model, but does not want it to be in the public domain. Mr. Teasdale also wants to work out getting information to the TAC well in advance of meetings and both Ms. Moran and Mr. Helsley agree that the timely sharing of information needs to be improved, but that it will be a struggle. Mr. Teasdale also directed a question to DWR regarding fact checking of models. Mr. Ross said that if necessary, DWR can come in and physically check the model.

Mr. Decker asked when a draft copy of the latest DRI report going to be available and expressed concern in reviewing a draft report that is missing DRI’s memorandum regarding updates to the model. Ms. Moran explained that Stetson is waiting on permission from DRI and will have an answer tomorrow. Mr. Decker also thanked Stetson for their presentation, but was concerned that the timing does not allow for any real evaluation by the TAC and no responsibility has been given to the TAC to go further than these presentations. Mr. Decker thanked Stetson for the action register that was brought to the meeting and for assigning the TAC the task of reviewing the draft report of the DRI model, but feels the action register needs to go further in assigning responsibilities to the TAC. Mr Decker is also concerned about the short timeframe for reviewing this draft report.

Mr. Bork recited his understanding of this draft report review for clarification: the draft report Ms. Moran handed out is a report about her review of the DRI model including the new information that the TAC does not have access to, but it is this draft report that Stetson is hoping to get comments back on in a couple of weeks. Ms. Moran affirmed that everything in Mr. Bork's statement is correct.

Public Comment:
Derek Hoffman had comments about the timeframe of tasks in relation to TAC and IWVGA meetings. Mr. Hoffman was concerned that Stetson would ask for approval on this draft report before the TAC had a chance to review and give comment on it at the next TAC meeting. Mr. Helsley responded that the intent was to have the TAC review and submit written comments directly to Chair Bingham, who would then send all comments to Stetson by December 22nd. Stetson would then make changes to the report as needed, and get it back to the TAC. Mr. Decker expressed concern about having less than three weeks to review this material and feels that an action register is needed with assigned responsibilities for the PAC, TAC, Stetson, and IWVGA. Mr. Helsley thanked Mr. Hoffman and the TAC for identifying a problem with timing. Mr. Hoffman asked about a slide in the presentation with meeting dates and asked what meetings those dates represent and Ms. Moran clarified that those are TAC meetings. Mr. Hoffman went on to ask if those TAC meeting dates are keyed to the POAM that was passed out at this meeting (see attached document). Ms. Moran and Mr. Helsley clarified that yes they are.

Ms. Decker expressed concern that both the PAC and the TAC are not allowed to operate as a committee in terms of taking action and feels this is one of the reasons that these committees are behind schedule.

West Katzenstein asked, "is this model going to show any change in the fundamental assessment that this valley is in overdraft, or is this improving a management tool?" Ms. Moran affirmed that it is the later. Mr. Katzenstein asked for confirmation that there is no confusion about the problem of the overdraft and Ms. Moran said that there is no confusion, the overdraft is there.

iii. Database Development – Status Update

Mr. Helsley introduced Mr. Steve Reich who went through an overview of the status of the database development (see attached document) and gave a live demonstration of the database. Mr. Reich requested input from the TAC on the database structure and how it functions by the January TAC meeting. Mr. Reich posed the question of expanding this database beyond SGMA requirements in order to get the most use out of this tool. Mr. Reich promised to issue usernames and passwords to TAC members after the meeting.

Committee Comments:

Mr. Teasedale asked if Mr. Reich was requesting comments on the memorandum or will the TAC have access to the database and comment on that? Mr. Reich clarified that Stetson wants comments on the database. Mr. Teasedale also asked how new data is integrated and Mr. Reich explained that the database is flexible enough to easily add data. Mr. Teasedale asked if the TAC would have access to review the database and Mr. Reich said yes and that it could be done individually or in a workshop setting. Mr. Bork asked if the public would have access during this review period and Mr. Reich said no because it would be impossible to get through all those comments in a timely manner. Mr. Parker suggested that if this was not open to the public, than the PAC should be involved since they are representative of the public. Wade Major agreed with limiting review to the PAC and the TAC. Mr. Teasedale asked what level of access would the committee members have and Mr. Reich explained that the committee members would have access to everything. Mr. Teasedale asked if Mr. Reich would like some feedback regarding security and Mr. Reich said yes.

Mr. Bork asked for a recommendation on how to go through this database and how should the TAC respond. Mr. Reich recommended going through the database and determining what is liked and disliked about the functionality of the database and how it could be better or modified in terms of meeting GSP goals.

Chair Bingham asked if the CASGEM data are the only data required to be in the database for the GSP and Mr. Ross said that they want to maintain and include the CASGEM data, but would expect the GSP to expand beyond CASGEM data.

Mr. Decker emphasized that CASGEM wells should maintain their function in order to see historic monitoring trends. Mr. Reich agreed.

Mr. Parker asked if DWR is putting out a database management guide and Mr. Ross said that he has seen emails about this, but his group is trying to stay on the technical side.

<u>Public Comments:</u>
Mr. Rajtora asked if it is true that DWR plans to standardize the datasets of all the GSAs. Mr. Rajtora also expressed concern about having to rebuild the database if it did not meet DWR’s standards. Mr. Ross confirmed that yes, DWR is standardizing the data based on the CASGEM platform and Mr. Reich explained that this database is structured in such a way that it could conform to DWR’s standards.

6. CURRENT TAC DISCUSSION AND REVIEW ITEMS

a. SkyTEM Review and Discussion

Mr. Parker gave an update regarding SkyTEM. Mr. Parker mentioned that the project has been fully funded. Mr. Parker explained that Stanford is running the project and it involves an aerial electromagnetic survey, delivery of a comprehensive database and database management system, using geostatistics to determine data gaps, and a 3D hydrogeologic conceptual model.

i. **Flight review, data compilation progress, additional local data requests, GIS and model updates.**

Mr. Parker showed an image of the flight paths made by SkyTEM.

No further comments.

ii. **Additional data requests or assistance outside of TAC members**

The project includes taking driller's logs and drilling information, transforming this data into digital tabular format then using it to calibrate the SkyTEM work and incorporating this data into the hydrogeologic conceptual model. Mr. Parker said that the hydrogeologic conceptual model should be available by Spring 2018 and analyzing datagaps should be completed in a year or two.

No further comments.

b. Salt Nutrient Management Plan Discussion and Review

Mr. Parker presented a PowerPoint (see attached document) on the SNMP. This included results of a salt/nutrient loading analysis and water quality analysis. Mr. Parker explained that this is a "check the box" requirement that needs to be met.

i. **Final Draft SNMP Reports**

Mr. Parker is requesting the TAC comment on this final draft report, which will be submitted December 13th.

Committee Comments:

Mr. Bork asked if the assimilative capacity models assumed steady state and Mr. Parker confirmed that yes it does assume steady state.

Mr. Teasedale asked who comments should be submitted to and Mr. Parker said to submit them directly to Don Zdeba. Mr. Parker said that significant comments need to be in before December 13th.

Mr. Decker feels that the septic loading value presented is higher than it really is. Mr. Parker explained that the model that the data is based on is a conservative approach that makes certain assumptions.

Public Comments:

None

c. GA Requested Items

i. **Discussion of spring or other surface water flows from the El Paso Basin to assist the USGS model**

Chair Bingham mentioned that the USGS received all of the data they needed.

Committee Comments:

. Mr. Teasedale asked for a recap of the data request made by the USGS. Chair Bingham clarified that the TAC was asked to assist the USGS by finding out if there was any spring water data that the USGS did not already have. Chair Bingham confirmed that this request has been fulfilled. Mr. Teasedale was confused as to where this request came from and Chair Bingham confirmed that it came from Indian Wells Valley Water District.

Mr. Decker expressed concern about the quality of data since many of the springs are dry. Mr. Decker would like to see the data.

Mr. Parker mentioned that he has had conversation with the Flints as to where to add stream gauges. The Flints are asking the TAC for recommendations on where to put additional monitoring points and how many of them they should have. Mr. Decker feels this is a non-issue as there is no water in the canyons. Mr. Parker explained that this is looking out ten to twenty years for collecting data over time. Mr. Teasdale pointed out that there is a potential funding available for this.

Public Comments:
Mr. Hoffman asked if the topic of stream gauge locations is going to be a future agenda item and Chair Bingham confirmed that he will request the IWVGA to approve this topic for the next TAC agenda.

.

7. ONGOING TAC ITEMS DISCUSSIONS

a. CASGEM data report

Chair Bingham mentioned that everything is done.

No further comments.

b. Discussion of additional WRM TAC topics as needed – Status update

Chair Bingham explained that no additional data was requested.

Committee Comments:
Mr. Parker asked how many wells did we put in for CASGEM and Chair Bingham answered 38.

Mr. Bork asked how many wells did KCWA monitor and Chair Bingham answered that about 130 were monitored and they include the CASGEM wells.

Public Comments:
None

8. DISCUSSION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

a. POAM Progress Discussion – Items, charts/GANT

Mr. Helsley distributed a draft POAM at the meeting (see attached document). Mr. Helsley explained that Stetson took the POAM that already existed and the Prop. 1 schedule and merged the schedules into one POAM. This POAM incorporates comments made by

Commander Longbottom of the Navy and comments made during the discussion at the previous TAC meeting.

<u>Committee Comments:</u>
Chair Bingham asked if Stetson will provide the TAC with tasks. Mr. Helsley confirmed that they will.

Mr. Teasedale asked if the items on the POAM could be agenda items and if the TAC could get a heads up on items in order to review things in a timely manner. Mr. Helsley said yes these could be agenda items and that Stetson will try to get items for TAC review to members ahead of time. Mr. Teasedale said that this POAM is a good start but feels some of the simple items should be started sooner by TAC members. Mr. Decker agrees that the TAC should not wait to get started on such items. Mr. Helsley explained that major pieces and work will be done and discussed and that this schedule is set up to account for when Stetson thinks certain key items will be completed. Mr. Teasedale feels that the TAC and Stetson need to figure out how to provide comments on items in ways that are efficient. Mr. Helsley agreed. Mr. Decker suggested giving the TAC a preliminary version of the reports in order to get input back sooner. Mr. Parker also brought up the idea of planning a three hour meeting or trying to keep TAC discussions within the meeting timeframe allotted. Mr. Parker suggested putting a timeframe on each agenda item in order to stay on schedule during meetings.

Mr. Bork asked about an item on the POAM regarding the well database ground-truthing study and asked if Stetson needed a report on this study. Ms. Moran responded that only well locations were needed. Mr. Bork has been ground-truthing wells and explained that the effort is nowhere near complete, so Mr. Bork requested to have a meeting about this topic. Chair Bingham said he would put this topic on the agenda. Mr. Bork mentioned that the database he has been working on with Mr. Stoner will be folded into the database management system that Stetson is putting together. Mr. Bork later asked if discussion items will be prepared ahead of the TAC meetings in order for TAC to give input. Mr. Bork also asked if the TAC will be consulted on a subject before the TAC is given an item to review. Mr. Helsley said that for certain things, the TAC will be consulted ahead of time and that Stetson will strive to get material that is up for review to the TAC before the TAC meetings.

Mr. Parker asked if there is anything going on with a rate/fee study. Mr. Helsley says that a rate/fee study is not in Stetson’s scope of work, but IWVGA attorneys have discussed this. Mr. Parker feels that this issue will come up and the public needs to be aware of it.

Mr. Decker expressed that this POAM is a good start. Mr. Decker feels that working on elements of the GSP is good, but that Stetson and the TAC need to make sure that the starting work on the GSP is not put off until the last minute. Mr. Helsley agrees, but reminded everyone that certain steps need to be completed before moving on to other things. Mr. Helsley also explained that Stetson has focused the schedule around a monthly TAC meeting.

Chair Bingham cautioned to not overload TAC agendas with too many items to cover. Chair Bingham expressed appreciation for everyone involved.

Public Comments:
Anthony Brown suggested Stetson and the TAC do a few ad hoc meetings and use those meetings to get certain things done so that TAC meetings do not go beyond the allotted time.

Mr. Hoffman, in looking at the POAM, pointed out that none of the tasks on the POAM are assigned to the TAC under responsibility. Mr. Helsley clarified that the TAC action schedule (see attached document) is extracted from the POAM. Mr. Hoffman also pointed out that the POAM review is listed on the agenda under "Future Agenda Items" and so limited discussion of content should be had today and instead Mr. Hoffman feels that the comments on the POAM needs to be an agenda item on the January agenda. Mr. Hoffman suggested looking at three bylaws regarding engaging the TAC and they are: 5.4, 5.11, and 5.13. These bylaws give direction on giving the TAC information in advance of meetings.

b. Discussion of additional WRM TAC topics as needed – Status Update
No discussion. No further comments.

9. APROVAL OF RECOMMENDED FUTURE TAC MEETING DATES

a. Future meetings to be determined by IWVGA
Chair Bingham announced that meetings will be on the first Thursday of the month.

Committee Comments:
Mr. Teasedale asked if the TAC needed to make a request to the IWVGA for their meeting times. Chair Bingham said he would make the request. Other committee members spoke up at the same time to exclaim that the request for the first of the month has already been made at the previous IWVGA meeting. Chair Bingham then said that he would request an answer from the IWVGA to confirm the first Thursday as the meeting dates.

Public Comments:
Mr. Hoffman suggested Chair Bingham get confirmation from the IWVGA to meet on the first Thursday of the month.

10. COMMITTEE MEMBER ANNOUNCEMENTS OR COMMENTS

Committee Comments:
Mr. O'Neil is worried about the schedule for the model upgrade and would like the IWVGA to get the schedule from the Navy that they are going to use to upgrade the model to see if it will mesh with the schedule that Stetson provided. Chair Bingham will request this at the next IWVGA meeting.

Mr. Teasedale recited a list of action items for clarification which included: discuss, review, and provide comments to Stetson on the groundwater model tech memo; provide feedback on the database functionality; identify future stream gauge locations. Mr. Teasedale asked if the last item on his list was worth considering. Mr. Decker answered by expressing an opinion on how dry the area is. Chair Bingham said that the two places that currently have stream gauges are the best available because there is virtually no water in the El Paso range, which is where they want the stream gauges to go. Mr. Helsley mentioned that it is in the budget to re-evaluate stream gauge locations to fill data gaps. The TAC agreed to possibly have an ad hoc discussion on this topic. Mr. Teasedale then asked if the TAC was OK with the POAM schedule provided by Stetson. Mr. Decker thinks that the TAC should comment on it. Mr. Parker mentioned that upfront dialogues on content need to be had. Mr. Helsley agreed.

<u>Public Comment:</u>
Donna Thomas mentioned that at the Cooporative Groundwater meeting when the idea of additional stream gauges was discussed, the BLM representative brought up that for certain streams environmental reviews would be required because they are in a wilderness area and told the TAC to keep that in mind when deciding on locations. Chair Bingham mentioned that placing stream gauges can get expensive. Mr. Bork mentioned first identifying need for stream gauges.

Ms. Decker brought up that stream gauges tend to get vandalized.

11. ADJOURN
With no further comments or discussion to come before the Committee, motion was made by Don Decker and seconded by Scott O,Neil to adjourn the meeting at 5:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jade Brush
Recording Secretary
Searles Valley Minerals