

# Las Posas Valley Groundwater Basin Technical Advisory Committee Regular Meeting

Meeting Minutes  
for  
May 19, 2026

## A. Call to Order

Chair Taylor called the regular meeting of the Las Posas Valley Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to order and welcomed all attendees at 2:01 pm.

## B. Roll Call

All TAC members were present (via Zoom):

- Dr. Bob Abrams – Present
- Vice Chair Tony Morgan - Present
- Chair Chad Taylor - Present

All non-voting TAC members were present (via Zoom):

- Bryan Bondy – Present
- Kimball Loeb – Present

Chair Taylor reported a quorum with all three voting members of the Las Posas Valley Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) present.

## C. Agenda Review

Mr. Taylor indicated the agenda for the regular meeting was published and notified by the Watermaster. He asked for comments on the agenda from TAC members or the public. No comments were presented.

## D. Public Comments

Chair Taylor offered an opportunity for members of the public to raise items not on the agenda; no comments were made.

## E. TAC Member Comments

Mr. Taylor asked if TAC members had comments on items not on the agenda; none were raised.

## F. Regular Agenda

### 1. Approve Minutes from Previous Meeting

Chair Taylor asked the TAC to discuss the draft minutes from the April 21, 2026 regular TAC meeting, which were included in the agenda packet.

Mr. Bondy identified edits and clarifications to improve the technical accuracy of the minutes. The changes Mr. Bondy identified were made by Mr. Taylor during the discussion and the TAC was open to accepting the minutes as edited.

No additional TAC or public comments were received regarding the minutes.

**MOTION:** Dr. Abrams moved to accept the revised minutes of the April 21, 2026 meeting

**SECOND:** Mr. Morgan seconded the motion

**VOTE:** Unanimously approved

## 2. Discussion of East Las Posas Management Area Groundwater Model Update

The TAC resumed discussion of the updated East Las Posas Management Area (ELPMA) groundwater model update following the presentation by Intera in the previous meeting. Chair Taylor confirmed that Dr. Abrams had reviewed the recorded presentation and supporting materials from the previous meeting. Mr. Loeb indicated that he had also reviewed the recording and supporting material as he was also absent.

Dr. Abrams asked why the MODFLOW MNW package was not utilized given that some wells are screened across multiple aquifers.

Mr. Bondy explained that this question had also been raised during previous reviews of the ELPMA model during preparation of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) for the basin. He stated that during that review the advisory group found that use of the MNW package was unnecessary because:

- Most pumping occurs within the Fox Canyon Aquifer
- Areas where multiple aquifers are present are relatively limited, and in most of the affected locations and wells the second aquifer is the low-permeability Upper San Pedro Formation
- The standard well package was considered sufficient for basin-scale analysis
- Previous model revisions already introduced increased computational complexity and convergence challenges when convertible layers were implemented
- Use of the MNW package would have added further computational burden without sufficient supporting data to justify its use.

Dr. Trevor Jones (Intera, groundwater consultant to Calleguas Municipal Water District, CMWD) added that implementation of MNW would require additional parameters governing wellbore flow and aquifer-head relationships, introducing additional complexity that was not supported by available data.

Dr. Abrams stated that he was satisfied with the explanation and indicated that if Intera observed that wellbore flow effects do not appear significant, then he agreed there was no need to use the MNW package.

Mr. Morgan stated that the updated model appeared appropriate for basin-scale evaluations but may be less suitable for highly localized or well-specific analyses. He recommended that the final documentation include additional discussion regarding the assumptions, strengths and limitations, intended applications, and appropriate use cases of the model for basin management decisions.

Mr. Morgan noted that the model would likely be used beyond ASR evaluations and suggested clearer documentation of its limitations for future groundwater management applications.

Chair Taylor agreed that additional documentation regarding model limitations and utility would be beneficial, particularly because the TAC had been asked by the Watermaster to assess the model's suitability for broader basin-wide management purposes.

Dr. Abrams commented that the revised and updated model appears to adequately simulate hydrologic responses associated with ASR operations. He also stated that the updated model is the most current and appropriate tool available for evaluating ASR operations and represents an improvement over the previous version due to improved calibration and conceptual representation. Dr. Abrams supported replacing the prior model version with the updated model.

Chair Taylor similarly stated that the revised model appears better calibrated and more consistent with the conceptual hydrogeologic understanding of the basin.

Mr. Loeb asked follow-up questions regarding the revised specified-flux boundary condition used after removal of the Happy Camp Canyon area from the model domain. Specifically, he asked whether the Underflow from Grimes Canyon Aquifer shown in Table A5 of Attachment A represented the revised boundary flux.

Dr. Jones responded that he believed this was correct but stated he would verify the information following the meeting and provide clarification to the TAC via email. Chair Taylor requested that the clarification be distributed to all TAC members. Dr. Jones emailed confirming that the boundary flow from the Happy Camp Canyon area was represented as Underflow from the Grimes Canyon Aquifer in Table A5 of Attachment A. The email from Dr. Jones is attached to these minutes.

Chair Taylor stated that the TAC is expected to provide a recommendation report to the Watermaster regarding the updated groundwater model by June 5. TAC members discussed preparation of the report and agreed to provide comments and recommendations to Chair Taylor for compilation into a draft recommendation report prior to the next TAC meeting scheduled for June 2.

No public comments were received.

### **3. Update on Upcoming Committee Consultation Review Requests**

Chair Taylor reviewed the TAC consultation tracking schedule and noted that the TAC Recommendation report regarding the consultation request for the ELPMA model update remains scheduled for submittal by June 5. He went on to ask Mr. Loeb for an update on the monitoring network review and evaluation consultation request previously identified and/or any other upcoming consultation requests the Watermaster expected to be forthcoming.

Mr. Loeb confirmed that the monitoring network review request was still anticipated and likely to be submitted within the month. He also noted that Watermaster staff were not currently aware of any additional consultation requests expected within the next several months.

Chair Taylor offered an opportunity for the TAC and public attendees to provide comments on upcoming committee consultation review requests. No items were raised.

### **4. Schedule for Completing Current Committee Consultations and Recommendation Reports**

Chair Taylor confirmed the Recommendation Report for the revised ELPMA model is the only active TAC consultation and that report is due on the Watermaster June 5, 2026.

Mr. Taylor asked for comments or questions from TAC members or the public; no comments were provided.

#### **G. Items for Future Agenda**

Chair Taylor offered an opportunity for TAC members and public attendees to bring up items to for future TAC meeting agendas; none were raised.

#### **H. Adjourn**

Chair Taylor noted that the TAC appreciated the attention of all those in attendance and motioned to adjourn the meeting.

**MOTION:** Chair Taylor moved to adjourn the meeting at 2:30 pm

**SECOND:** Dr. Abrams seconded the motion

**VOTE:** Unanimously approve

## **Attachment 1**

**Intera Response to ELPMA Model Water Budget Question from LPV TAC**

**From:** [Trevor A. Jones](#)  
**To:** [Chad Taylor](#)  
**Cc:** [Tyler Hatch](#)  
**Subject:** Las Posas Valley TAC Follow Up Response - East Las Posas Water Budget Term  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 20, 2026 9:11:47 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)  
[image006.png](#)

---

You don't often get email from [tajones@intera.com](mailto:tajones@intera.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi Chad,

Tyler and I have had a chance to follow up on Kim's question that he raised during yesterday's LPV TAC meeting.

The water budget term in Table A-5 titled "Underflow from Grimes Canyon Aquifer" represents subsurface inflows from the Happy Camp Canyon area. As discussed in the model report, this is the part of the model that was converted from active to inactive and replaced with a set of specified flux boundary conditions in the Grimes Canyon aquifer.

Hope that is helpful.

Thank you,  
Trevor



**Trevor Jones**  
Senior Water Resources Engineer  
INTERA Incorporated  
📞 949-637-0447 🌐 [www.INTERA.com](http://www.INTERA.com)



---

IMPORTANT: The contents of this email and any attachments are confidential. They are intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you have received this email by mistake, please notify the sender immediately and do not disclose the contents to anyone or make copies thereof.