



A Tradition of Stewardship  
A Commitment to Service



GRAC  
04-26-12  
Item 5.a

December 12, 2011

Updated April 26, 2012

## COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS RECEIVED REGARDING GROUNDWATER CONDITIONS

### Overview of This Document

Members of the Napa County Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC) were asked at their October 27, 2011, meeting to review and provide comments on Chapter 4, Groundwater Conditions, of the *Napa County Groundwater Conditions and Groundwater Monitoring Recommendations* final report, produced by Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting Engineers. The comments were solicited to help develop presentation materials for the GRAC's December 12, 2011, meeting. Additional comments were submitted through January 15, 2012.

Five members submitted comments and questions on a range of topics. Speaking generally,

1. Several comments and questions were covered during the December 12, 2011, presentation on groundwater conditions.
2. Other comments and questions are likely to be addressed as the GRAC assists the County staff and technical consultants with recommendations regarding (A) the further synthesis of existing information and identification of critical data needs; (B) the conceptualization of hydrogeologic conditions in various areas of the County, and an assessment of groundwater resources as data becomes available; and (C) the development and implementation of an ongoing groundwater monitoring program.
3. Other comments and questions focus on planning questions (e.g., future demand and supply estimates), and are thus beyond the purpose of the GRAC.
4. Other comments and questions concern the GRAC collaborative process.

The full list of actual questions and comments submitted is provided below.

**This document presents an initial sorting of comments and questions, developed by staff and technical consultants into the four categories described above. The sorting serves as a recommendation of whether, and if so when, to best address the comments and questions provided, and was initially presented to the GRAC for discussion following the groundwater conditions presentation on December 12, 2011. The document has been updated to address additional questions submitted in February as well as March and April, and will be presented to the GRAC at their April 26, 2012, meeting.**

## **1. Topics Covered on December 12, 2011**

- The integration of city wells in the County's monitoring program
- The range of wells historically and currently being monitored by the County and others, and the duration they have been monitored
- Extraction in different parts of the County
- The factual basis (or lack thereof) for public perceptions of groundwater conditions (further discussion is also planned as part of Category 2)

## **2. Topics to be Covered on February 23, 2012/April 26, 2012**

- The relationship between groundwater conditions and environmental conditions, particularly groundwater/surface water interactions (including available data and information)
- The location of primary areas of groundwater recharge, and the relationship between groundwater basins and recharge sources (including available data and information)
- The geographic emphases of the monitoring program, including the Valley floor and mountainous areas
- Factors relating to assessment of groundwater elevations
- Differentiation of spring and fall well levels and trends in Valley subareas (partly covered on December 12, 2011)

## **3. Topics Likely to be Addressed during Future GRAC Activities**

- Funds available for new monitoring wells, and the reuse of retired wells

## **4. Planning Topics beyond the Charge of the GRAC**

- The relationship between groundwater conditions and home construction in hillside areas
- The use of water by wineries and trends in winery construction
- Trends in the use of drain tile and relationship to groundwater
- Future demands for urban, residential, and agricultural water use, and potential mismatches with future supplies (except to the extent this concern drives the development of "sustainability objectives" towards the end of the GRAC's work)
- The relationship between agricultural and residential groundwater use in rural areas
- The use of recycled water to replace demands on groundwater

## **5. Questions concerning the GRAC Collaborative Process**

- The definition and scope of the problem that GRAC is seeking to address
- The County budget and detailed information of funds available to support the GRAC
- The need for detailed presentations on County water and groundwater regulations and policies

- The need for the GRAC to hear from a wide range of experts with practical and theoretical experience
- The need to assess the level of confidence/uncertainty associated with specific concepts

### List of Comments and Questions Submitted by GRAC Members

#	Comment	Member	Date	Initial Response
1	The St. Helena General Plan Update (October 2010 draft), not yet adopted, states that the City will "collaborate with Napa County to establish an ongoing monitoring program to assess the long-term viability and recharge capability of the North Basin aquifer that supplies the City's wells." The City has two monitoring wells at/near its Stonebridge Well Complex (which contains its two production wells, as well as a small water treatment plant) near the Napa River south of the Pope Street Bridge. Has the County requested the spring/fall elevation data from the City's monitoring wells? If so, what tentative conclusions has it drawn if any? If not, does the County plan to make the City's monitoring wells part of the County monitoring program? If not, why not?	Alan Galbraith	11/21/11	To be covered on December 12. The County is willing to include cities subject to their permission and willingness to provide data.
2	In the 2006 ground water study the county had 30 or so wells that they had water level readings on twice a year. The records went back a number of years. Is the county still taking those yearly? All the well reporting that the consultants are looking into, how many have been continually monitored for the last 10 years with readings each one of those years.	Steve Soper	11/16/11	To be covered on December 12.
3	How many homes have been built in the unincorporated county over the last ten years? How many in the hills, and what impact do they have on ground water supply? In general, what is the impact of ground water usage in the hills as compared to the valley floor?	Michael Haley	11/16/11	Specific numbers and the relative importance of recent housing developments are beyond the purpose of the GRAC, which is charged with monitoring, data collection, and analysis. The GRAC is not charged with assessing or estimating historical or future groundwater demands although it may consider these issues when developing "sustainability criteria" and next steps.
4	How many brick and mortar wineries have been added in the last ten years, and how much water do they use on average per winery, per size of winery, etc.	Michael Haley	11/16/11	Same as previous.

#	Comment	Member	Date	Initial Response
5	Even if it is determined that there are plentiful groundwater resources in a particular area, what impact does a large draw down have on the environment?	Michael Haley	11/16/11	The general relationship between groundwater conditions and environmental conditions, including groundwater-surface water interactions, is likely to be covered by the GRAC's hydrogeologic conceptualization effort.
6	In reviewing the Final August 2010 Report entitled "Assessment of the Feasibility of a Collaborative Groundwater Data Gathering Effort in Napa County" ("CCP Report") prepared by the Center for Collaborative Policy at Sacramento State University ("CCP"), there were a number of questions that arose from my reading of the Report covering the interviews conducted by CCP and the conclusions that they reached as a result of those interviews. It seems that the interviews identified a number of key perceptions regarding the use and status of groundwater resources in Napa County, some of which may be true and some of which may not be true. It seems that the NCGRAC, in order to adequately fulfill its responsibilities, needs to understand and agree on which of those perceptions are true (based upon good science) and which are not. Luhdorff & Scalmanini ("LS") potentially has the facts and science from their work to assist the members of the NCGRAC in determining which of those perceptions are supported by facts and science and which are not. Below is a series of questions that I would like to have input from LS on with regard to statements and conclusions from the CCP Report:	Jim Verhey	11/17/11	For context: The assessment documented issues of concern to stakeholders. It was not a technical assessment of groundwater conditions, and did not attempt to substantiate the concerns raised by interviewees. One of its key recommendations was to gather and synthesize existing scientific data.
7	"NC Groundwater is being extracted at unsustainable rates": a. Is that a true statement for Napa County as a whole? b. Is that a true statement for each of the water basins in Napa County or is it true for only certain basins? Which ones and why for those basins?	Jim Verhey	11/17/11	Groundwater data are not available for all subareas of the county, as such Part "a" cannot be fully addressed. Part "b" is likely to be covered on December 12. Based on available groundwater data, chronically declining groundwater levels and evidence of groundwater deficiency appears largely limited to the Milliken-Sarco-Tulocay area.

#	Comment	Member	Date	Initial Response
8	<p>“Potential for urban and residential use to diminish the groundwater available for agriculture”:</p> <p>a. Is there sufficient groundwater, over the long-term, for both urban and residential and agricultural uses?</p> <p>b. If not, how much is the likely shortfall in water resources and when is it likely to first occur? What are some of the options available to address such a shortfall?</p> <p>c. Is recycled water a viable option for agriculture? How about for Urban and residential uses?</p>	Jim Verhey	11/17/11	Estimating future demands and supplies, associated contingency planning, and evaluating the use of recycled water as an alternative supply is beyond the charge of the GRAC, although these issues may inform development of “sustainability objectives” and next steps.
9	<p>“Drawing down of groundwater could noticeably reduce streamflows, and thus threaten aquatic and riparian habitat, stimulate creekbank erosion and weaken fish populations”:</p> <p>a. Is that true? If yes, how much is the impact likely to be and over what period of time?</p>	Jim Verhey	11/17/11	<p>As with #5, the general relationship between groundwater conditions and environmental conditions, including groundwater-surface water interactions, is likely to be covered by the GRAC’s hydrogeologic conceptualization effort.</p> <p>Estimating future demands and corresponding relationships with the surrounding environment is beyond the charge of the GRAC.</p>
10	<p>“Agricultural overdraft is causing problems for [non-agricultural] rural areas [such as MST]”:</p> <p>a. Is this a true statement and supported by LS’s investigation/analysis? How significant is the impact of agricultural use?</p> <p>b. If agricultural use is not the primary cause of problems in the MST or Carneros basins, what is?</p>	Jim Verhey	11/17/11	Estimating the relative importance of agricultural groundwater use is beyond the charge of the GRAC, which is charged with monitoring data collection and analysis.
11	<p>“Use of drain tile in vineyards is impacting the recharge of the water basins in Napa County”:</p> <p>a. Where, actually, are the primary areas of recharge for the water basins in Napa County?</p> <p>b. How extensive actually is the use of drain tile in vineyards in Napa County?</p> <p>c. Is it possible that the use of drain tile could have a material impact on the recharge of the water basins in Napa County?</p>	Jim Verhey	11/17/11	<p>Identification of recharge areas is likely to be covered by the GRAC’s hydrogeologic conceptualization effort.</p> <p>Estimating the use of particular technologies and their relative importance for recharge is beyond the charge of the GRAC.</p>
12	After the introductory meeting in October and after reviewing the documents distributed at that meeting, here’s my response to the County Staff’s request for Questions and Requests from the committee members:	Tucker Catlin	11/21/11	Not applicable.

#	Comment	Member	Date	Initial Response
13	THE PROBLEM. After reading through all of the materials, I'm still not sure that I have a crystal clear idea of what the problem is that we're being tasked to solve. So my first request is that we invest some time at the outset developing some committee consensus on a simple and clear DEFINITION and SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM. A thorough Problem Definition can lead to a quicker and clearer Solution.	Tucker Catlin	11/22/11	The Board of Supervisors established the GRAC to provide recommendations on a series of topics. Each topic will require its own discussion to clarify its importance, scope, and intended use.
14	THE COSTS AND FUNDING. According to the documents, this committee is being asked to make recommendations regarding monitoring wells in Napa County. In order to do that responsibly, we need to START with a clear context of the resources available to accomplish (and ultimately influence) the scope of this task. A good introduction would be: A short presentation of the COUNTY BUDGET for the next fiscal year(s) showing SOURCE OF FUNDS (pie chart with a detailed list in \$ and % of total) and USE OF FUNDS (same), along with comments about the Source and Use of Funds for this particular project. This key element of COSTS and FUNDING needs to be at the beginning instead of at the end (or entirely absent from) our considerations and deliberations.	Tucker Catlin	11/23/11	The Department of Conservation Development and Planning has budgeted sufficient resources to support the next phase of LSCE's work through June 2013. The County has also devoted staff time to support the GRAC and has a grant from DWR for facilitation support through June 2012. Additional grant funding to support the GRACs efforts will be identified and pursued in 2012 and future years. DWR still has very limited grant funding available.
15	THE LAW. Before making any new regulations, we should have a fairly thorough presentation of the various Water and Groundwater Regulations (AND Policies) already in effect in Napa County.	Tucker Catlin	11/24/11	The County General Plan's water resources policies were presented on October 27, 2011. Additional detail will be provided on specific topics as needed to support GRAC discussions (e.g., for revising the County's groundwater ordinance). A detailed presentation on the County's groundwater ordinance is anticipated for the fall of 2012. The GRAC will not be developing any regulations except that it is expected to recommend changes to the County's groundwater ordinance needed to update pump test procedures.

#	Comment	Member	Date	Initial Response
16	THE EXPERTS. Locating and assessing groundwater has long been a topic with many unknowns, and (therefore) a very broad range of interpretations and opinions. The only reliable truth about wells is that you won't know if there's any water down there until you dig the hole and drop a pump in. We should minimize our inevitable mis-conceptions by hearing from a wide range of experts with the greatest practical and theoretical and local experience. For this topic, one voice is not enough.	Tucker Catlin	11/25/11	The County selected Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE) through a rigorous, competitive process. LSCE will serve as the primary technical support to the GRAC. Additional expert support or review will require the Board of Supervisors to allocate additional funds. Professionals with relevant subject matter expertise are invited to attend GRAC meetings and share their experience.
17	THE CONFIDENCE FACTOR. Finally, we need to ask each of the various Experts to elaborate on the predictive uncertainties inherent to "Hydraulic Concepts", especially under different scenarios, and especially in earthquake country. We need to know what is the Confidence Factor that we're investing in (eg how many test wells are required for a reasonable statistical confidence to draw a conclusion?).	Tucker Catlin	11/26/11	Clarifying the assumptions, uncertainties, and confidence levels associated with specific concepts and approaches will be an important part of LSCE's presentations and communication with the GRAC.
18	I found the power point frame from Ludhorf Scalmanini's presentation which shows a total of 181 Level Monitor Wells and 182 Quality Monitor Wells under "Current Groundwater Monitoring". Apparently before the cost cuts in 2005 there were 382 Level Monitor Wells and 211 Quality Monitor Wells. That's a lot more than I expected. Question for Patrick's list: If there were funding cutbacks in 2005, do we have any new funds for new monitor wells?	Tucker Catlin	12/2/11	To be covered on Dec. 12. The numbers relating to the historically and currently monitored wells referenced in the cited slide include wells that have been monitored by a number of entities, including the County. Special studies such as the USGS study of the MST area included increased monitoring during that study period (and later reduction in the number of monitored wells when the study was completed).
19	If so, how much and what's the finding source?	Tucker Catlin	12/2/11	See previous.
20	If funded, can any of the retired wells be brought back to useful life?	Tucker Catlin	12/2/11	See previous.
21	In reviewing the proposed Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Program that was distributed at the December 15, 2011 GRAC meeting in more detail, I would like to have input from Luhdorff & Scalmanini ("LS") and/or Napa County Staff with regard to the questions listed below. My primary concern is that	Jim Verhey	1/12/12	Groundwater monitoring data do need to be complemented by other information (ex. precipitation, production estimates, etc.) to determine whether and to what extent

#	Comment	Member	Date	Initial Response
	monitoring, by itself, won't provide the information necessary to understand whether or not there are groundwater quantity and quality issues in Napa County beyond just the MST and Carneros water basins.			groundwater quantity and/or quality issues (natural or otherwise) exist.
22	Given that the LS Napa County ("NC") Ground Water Conditions February 2011 Report indicated that the only water basins in the County that were shown to have significant declining groundwater levels were the MST and Carneros water basins, why shouldn't the proposed monitoring program be focused primarily on augmenting the number of monitoring wells in those areas rather than throughout the entire County? If the other NC water basins are stable, why not continue to monitor them with the existing monitoring wells unless and until future water levels show signs of decline?	Jim Verhey	1/12/12	To be covered 2/23/12; also relates to new work on the Updated Hydrogeologic Conceptualization and & Supplemental Monitoring Recommendations, especially for the NVF Subareas. The groundwater monitoring network needs to be designed to sufficiently address groundwater level and quality monitoring objectives as preliminarily summarized in the LSCE 2011 report and/or as may be supplemented by the GRAC.
23	It seems that having accurate well locations and well monitoring data are critical, so wouldn't the County be better off to encourage those current monitoring well owners to formerly allow the County to accurately show the location of their wells rather than trying to "mask" the locations? Can the County provide some indemnification or assurance to monitoring well owners that their participation would not, at some future date, be used to negatively impact those participating well owners? If not, why not?	Jim Verhey	1/12/12	Accurate well locations are important; see Dec. 8, 2011 Memo. The groundwater monitoring data are collectively intended to be indicative of and beneficially used to track groundwater conditions on a large/regional scale (e.g., these data are generally not intended to track long-term conditions for a single property). The County cannot offer assurances or indemnifications related to actions by third parties over which it has no control (To be covered 2/23/12).
24	The last page of the LS memorandum on the Groundwater Elevation Monitoring Program refers to "requiring" accurate data for the purpose of determining "surface water/groundwater interactions". What scientific evidence has LS assembled that accurately explains the relationship between surface water flows and groundwater levels in the various Napa County water basins? There was no information presented at the last GRAC meeting relative to that statement. To what extent is the level	Jim Verhey	1/12/12	To be covered 2/23/12. To be addressed as part of new tasks for the Updated Hydrogeologic Conceptualization and & Supplemental Monitoring Recommendations project. See also above comments relating to groundwater data use in conjunction with other data.

#	Comment	Member	Date	Initial Response
	of groundwater in the various water basins impacted by surface water flows? How does a water level monitoring program by itself provide answers to that question?			
25	How will the monitoring program provide data to help LS analyze groundwater flows between water basins and recharge sources? Won't that require more extensive geological information and analysis that is not a part of the monitoring program? Why not focus on acquiring that information rather than merely expanding the groundwater level monitoring program? It seems that there is a major deficiency in the information available and necessary to accurately understand the status of groundwater in Napa County and I question whether the proposed groundwater monitoring program will provide that information.	Jim Verhey	1/12/12	To be covered 2/23/12. To be addressed as part of new tasks for the Updated Hydrogeologic Conceptualization and Supplemental Monitoring Recommendations project, including evaluation of current groundwater monitoring, the extent to which the current monitoring meets groundwater level and quality monitoring objectives, and recommendations to augment the network to meet those objectives.
26	The mountains of Napa County are a major source of water replenishment for the valley groundwater basins. It appears the GRAC focus, if not its entire effort, is the valley groundwater basins. Many properties and some specific regions in the mountains are water challenged, if not entirely waterless during certain periods of time. What, if anything, is GRAC's mission and focus to understand and enhance the groundwater resources of properties in the mountains of Napa County?	Duane Wall	1/13/12	The current focus is the main Napa Valley Floor (including the MST). However, 2011 report recommendations include addressing additional data needs elsewhere in the County. The future recharge analysis work will include mountainous regions that provide water to the valley floor, but insufficient monitoring exists to aid in identifying mountainous areas with supply issues and is not currently a high priority area to increase monitoring.
27	How was it determined that groundwater elevations are generally stable in most of the Valley floor areas? Was any kind of mathematical analysis (e.g., fitting a least squares regression line through the data) conducted, or was the assessment qualitative?	Susanne von Rosenberg	1/17/12	Assessment of groundwater level and quality data has been qualitative on a larger scale (regional and countywide); mathematical analysis of the level data in isolation from consideration of other factors would have limited utility.
28	If the assessment was only qualitative, what was the basis for limiting the analysis?	Susanne von Rosenberg	1/17/12	To be covered 2/23/12. The initial scope (2009-2011 work) focused on gathering, organizing, assessing the quality

#	Comment	Member	Date	Initial Response
				of the data, and providing a preliminary analysis of countywide conditions. The new tasks for the Updated Hydrogeologic Conceptualization and Supplemental Monitoring Recommendations project addresses the additional information needs for monitoring in high priority subareas (particularly the NVF), including linking well construction information to wells with historical groundwater measurements.
29	Looking at the data from representative wells in the Northern Napa Valley subarea (Figure 4.2 of Tech Memo 4) and the Southern Napa Valley subarea (Figure 4.2 of Tech Memo 4), it seems as though there may be some wells that actually do show some decline over time, although the annual changes in water levels may mask this trend (e.g., well 129 and possible 138 in the Northern subarea and 134/135 in the Southern subarea). It would be great to see the data at a larger scale and perhaps to have the spring and fall data separated. In each case, it would be very helpful to have a curve fit to the data to get a better sense of whether there is a trend.	Susanne von Rosenberg	1/17/12	To be covered 2/23/12. Groundwater levels for 129, 138, 134, and 135 presented on 12/12/11. Additional discussion to occur on 2/23/12, including presentation of data on a larger scale and with spring and fall data differentiated.
30	Well 138 seems to be showing increasing stress (greater and greater water level declines spring to fall) and to a lesser degree well 132 appears to be as well. 138 seems to be responding more and more strongly to drought years, as well (it's hard to tell at the scale of these diagrams, but it seems as though spring recovery during drought years is decreasing each decade), which suggests the well is strongly reliant on adequate rainfall to sustain its yield at the current level of demand. It would be helpful to get some added input on how sensitive the wells in various sections appear to be to drought, and whether the sensitivity to drought is increasing, because if drought is in fact increasingly stressing wells, that may increase the demand on the river as a source of recharge, and would affect groundwater well reliability in dry years.	Susanne von Rosenberg	1/17/12	To be covered 2/23/12. Groundwater levels for 138 and 132 presented on 12/12/11. Additional discussion to occur on 2/23/12, including presentation of data on a larger scale and with spring and fall data differentiated. Overall, spring groundwater levels in well 138 show full recovery (a spring 2008 measurement is atypically lower than other spring measurements; spring 2009, 2010, and 2011 measurements are consistent with spring measurements in the 1960s).

#	Comment	Member	Date	Initial Response
31	<p>Although Pope and Berryessa valleys are within Napa County, they are basins within the Sacramento River Hydrologic Regions and lie within Region 5 of the State Water Resources Control Board. They also are part of the Westside Subregion of the Sacramento River Funding Area, of which Napa County agency is a partner for integrated regional water planning grants. ES.9.4.2 notes that no current data or investigations are available for Pope Valley. To make sure that these areas do not get lost within the Napa County Monitoring Program, should this plan contain language that future monitoring in Pope Valley and Berryessa basins may come about through a partnership or under oversight of one of the above efforts? Or is there some other way to initiate monitoring in these outlying areas?</p>	Marilee Talley	2/21/12	<p>To be covered 4/26/12. Yes, the Napa County GW Monitoring Plan, 2012 Update, should contain language relative to monitoring recommended in the Pope and Berryessa Valleys. This recommendation is also made in the report for the 2009-2011 studies and in the CASGEM Plan.</p>
32	<p>The LAO 2011 report on Improving Management of the State's Groundwater Resources notes that "groundwater law does not reflect scientific reality." It recommends modernizing groundwater law to accurately reflect the physical interconnection of surface water and groundwater. Will the data and deliverables outlined in Tasks 2 and 3 help show such interconnections? If not, can we add such data and analysis to the monitoring program?</p>	Marilee Talley	2/21/12	<p>To be covered 4/26/12. The objectives of the recent work that LSCE is doing for the County, especially Tasks 1 and 2, are focused on improved understanding of the physical conceptualization of the aquifer system, particularly in the main Napa Valley Floor, along with improved information concerning the "representativeness" of the current monitoring network. Correspondingly, emphasis is on the adequacy of monitoring facilities to evaluate the interaction of sw and gw. Task 3 is focused on further characterization of recharge. Recommendations will be provided as applicable and needed to address questions relating to sources of recharge.</p>
33	<p>In Climate Change Handbook for Regional Water Planning, EPA and the Department of Water Resources note the importance of protecting regional water resources (quality and quantity). Could the advisory committee receive as background information current research on climate change and its potential regional impacts. The discussion may</p>	Marilee Talley	2/21/12	<p>This is a good question for the Committee's consideration, particularly with respect to specific questions/objectives for the gw monitoring program (2012 Update). It is important to recognize that some</p>

#	Comment	Member	Date	Initial Response
	lead the AC to identify groundwater data that can be indicators of climate change patterns and their effects, e.g., rising sea level, increased flooding, warming temperatures, changes in wet-dry seasons, etc. I believe such monitoring will help short-term and long-term decision-making.			questions may require a long period of gw observations in conjunction with other data to evaluate the uncertainty associated with those observations and to determine whether the specific question/objective is being addressed.
34	What was the cost of the initial LSCE Study presented February 2011, and what is the contracted cost for their "Next Steps" work? Basically, how much has the county committed to spend on the consultant work YTD?	Tucker Catlin	4/16/12	<p>LSCE 2009-2011</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2+ years: 7 documents (TMs/Report) and DMS; \$230,394</li> </ul> <p>LSCE 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 16+ months (in progress); report and also guidance document (planned); \$312,258</li> </ul>
35	The Sonoma Well Monitoring project seems to be a good reference for the Napa project. Please give us a rough comparison of the # of wells used in the Sonoma project divided by the surface land area covered in the 3 watersheds/basins that they studied vs the # of wells used in the 2011 work divided by the surface area covered in the Napa River basin. Basically, compare the density of wells monitored in Sonoma vs Napa (eg acres per well or something like that). Hopefully, this will give us some perspective on the size of a good well monitoring program.	Tucker Catlin	4/16/12	To be covered 4/26/12. It is understood that the focus of the SCWA presentation was on gw monitoring in the Sonoma Valley Subbasin. Total number of wells monitored is 141 in this subbasin; area is 44,674 acres. Roughly, 1 well/317 acres. In the main Napa Valley Floor and corresponding subareas, there are ~ 161 monitored wells (or sites where there are GeoTracker wells). The area of the NVF is about 57,798 acres, or roughly 1 well/359 acres. Notably, the monitoring objectives and other factors about the "representativeness" of the monitored well relative to the aquifer system are very important.
36	Could staff give a short response at the April 26 meeting regarding SB 1146 and how it might dovetail with our proposed language regarding confidentiality? That is, if eventually signed into law,	Marilee Talley	4/16/12	To be covered 4/26/12. The proposed language of SB 1146 would, in the future, lessen the difficulty of coordinating

#	Comment	Member	Date	Initial Response
	would its provisions govern the language we would drafting regarding confidentiality?			<p>monitoring information (levels and quality) with well construction information and also well location information. The more accurate the data (x/y/z along with the time factor associated with the measured data), the more informative the data will become. The committee's input will be sought relative to the policy aspects relating to Napa County gw data.</p>