

FOX CANYON GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AGENCY

A STATE OF CALIFORNIA WATER AGENCY



BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Eugene F. West, Chair, Director, Camrosa Water District
David Borchard, Vice Chair, Farmer, Agricultural Representative
Steve Bennett, Supervisor, County of Ventura
Charlotte Craven, Councilperson, City of Camarillo
Robert Eranio, Director, United Water Conservation District

EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Jeff Pratt, P.E.

MINUTES

Minutes of the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency's (FCGMA) Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Meeting held **Thursday, February 1, 2018** in Conference Room B at the Ventura County Saticoy Operations Yard, 11251 Riverbank, Saticoy, CA 93004

A. Call to Order

TAG Chair Kim Loeb called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

He announced that Jim O'Tousa, Ventura County Board of Supervisors Representative will not be in attendance.

In attendance were: (1) Chair Kim Loeb, Groundwater Manager; (2) Keely Royas, FCGMA Clerk of the Board; (3) Kathleen Riedel, Groundwater Specialist; (4) Tony Morgan, Vice Chair, United Water Conservation District, (UWCD); (5) Bryan Bondy, Agricultural Representative; (6) Terry Foreman, Special Districts & Mutuals Representative; (7) Sally Liu, The Nature Conservancy (TNC); (8) Curtis Hopkins, Five Cities Representative; (9) Steve Bachman, Public Representative (10) Dan Detmer, Alternate, UWCD; (11) Peter Quinlan, Dudek; (12) Ron Schnabel, Dudek; (13) Jill Weinberger, Dudek; (14) John Lindquist, UWCD; (15) Jason Sun, UWCD; (16) Susan Pan, VCWWD; (17) Steve Hickox, Port Hueneme Water Agency (PHWA); (18) Lucia McGovern, City of Camarillo; (19) John Grether, Grower; (20) Thien Ng, City of Oxnard; (21) Amanda Fagan, Navy Base Ventura County (NBVC); (22) Henry Graumlich, Calleguas Municipal Water District (CMWD).

B. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

C. Approval of Minutes – November 2, 2017 TAG Meeting

Mr. Foreman had a correction on Item E. The sentence "Mr. Foreman had questions on if Daniel B. Stephens & Associates (DBS&A) can find area recharge as included in the water budget" was changed to "Mr. Foreman had questions on if Daniel B. Stephens & Associates (DBS&A) final recharge estimates were used as the basis of the water budget". He wanted the minutes to reflect that Mr. Schnabel answered yes to this question. He also wanted the statement added that he asked if Dudek stands behind the numbers used in the water budget, to which Dudek answered yes.

Mr. Foreman also saw that there was an error in the title of "Camrosa Municipal Water District." The word "Municipal" was taken out. In the top paragraph on page three Mr. Foreman added the sentence "Mr. Foreman asked Mr. Detmer what UWCD's model shows as far as the water balance'."

Dr. Weinberger had a small change to the first sentence under Item F. She wanted it specified that she was speaking about the Oxnard Basin only.

800 South Victoria Avenue, Ventura, CA 93009-1610
(805) 654-2014 FAX: (805) 654-3350
Website: www.fcgma.org

Item D - Page 1 of 6

Mr. Bondy added more specifically to that same sentence that she was speaking to the coastal seawater minimum thresholds.

Mr. Foreman also wanted a sentence added about half way down under Item F: "Modeling will likely be required based on the complexity of seawater intrusion."

Mr. Foreman made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Ms. Liu seconded the motion. The minutes, as amended, were unanimously approved.

D. Agenda Review

There were no changes made to the agenda.

E. Basin Minimum Thresholds and Measurable Objectives

Mr. Quinlan started with a discussion on minimum thresholds for the Oxnard subbasin focusing on seawater intrusion. He said setting minimum thresholds for seawater intrusion addresses the other sustainability indicators. He showed a PowerPoint presentation dividing the coastal area into three regions/analysis zones. Mr. Quinlan's presentation showed seawater flux versus groundwater elevation.

Mr. Detmer said the Point Mugu Aquifer is in direct contact with the Fox Canyon Aquifer and that is why the Mugu water levels are so low. He stated that the minimum threshold of about -5 feet in the northwest would be okay because it recovers.

Mr. Bondy cautioned calling it all seawater intrusion, rather it is flux and need to understand how much offshore fresh water flow there is.

Mr. Quinlan stated that what are called minimum thresholds for seawater intrusion in the draft GSP should be considered measurable objectives.

Mr. Foreman stated that the presentation was excellent because it shows how management affects the basin and illustrates the need to conduct simulations to determine the minimum thresholds.

Dr. Bachman stated that simulation needs to be done with different management scenarios with no net seawater intrusion. Both Mr. Bondy and Mr. Foreman stated that they liked that approach.

Mr. Morgan pointed out that the gradient pushes the intruded seawater down the coast. He said that you cannot set a threshold without forecasting the future conditions in terms of the Santa Clara River spreading.

TAG members agreed that as shown on the slide denoting regions/analysis zones, that the southern boundary of the northern region, between the coastal flux to Channel Islands Harbor and from Channel Islands Harbor to Arnold Road, needs to be moved northward.

Mr. Bondy pointed out that, during the 30-year period, pumping moved away from the coast as the PTP came online. He also pointed out that historical pumping was not static, pumping shifted from the upper aquifer system to the lower aquifer system.

Chair Loeb stated that the Operations Committee would be putting together a process for prioritization of water supply and infrastructure projects. The process will identify those projects which are to be included in the model forecast simulations.

Mr. Hopkins stated that there are not only problems related to shifting pumping, but that there is a need to identify thresholds for unique areas of the basin. He said that thresholds will not be the same everywhere.

Mr. Quinlan said that there is a minimum threshold in the Draft GSPs for chronic water levels at Hueneme Road and Highway One, and for water quality in the Forebay. He commented that in the Draft GSP may have too narrow a focus on nitrates in the Forebay, as they are not due to pumping.

There was additional conversation between Mr. Bondy, Mr. Foreman, and Chair Loeb on the project prioritization process and how to categorize the projects.

Dr. Weinberger led a discussion on minimum thresholds for water quality.

Mr. Bondy stated that significance and unreasonableness needs to be looked at. He said that pumping does spread the TDS (total dissolved solids), and that the TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) restrictions will help to reduce salts coming into the basin. The trough in the middle of the East Las Posas Basin keeps TDS from moving to the north side of the basin.

Mr. Graulich, CWMD, asked Chair Loeb if he could speak to the TAG regarding TMDLs. Mr. Graulich talked about the Calleguas Creek Watershed Salt Nutrient Management Plan TMDL group letter to the FCGMA requesting coordination with the FCGMA, and that they want the TMDL effort to be recognized in the GSP. Chair Loeb mentioned the possibility of discussing GSP coordination with the TMDL compliance monitoring program at an ad-hoc meeting.

Ms. McGovern, City of Camarillo, stated that there is a draft Basin Plan amendment out. She also said that high TDS in the groundwater impedes the City's wastewater treatment plant from meeting discharge requirements.

Dr. Weinberger moved on to discuss minimum thresholds in the West Las Posas Management Area. She said that the Draft GSP minimum thresholds are lower than historical lows.

Mr. Bondy pointed out that dewatering the Fox Canyon Aquifer could result in wells going dry.

Dr. Weinberger talked about how saltwater intrusion is not a minimum threshold in Pleasant Valley and the Las Posas Valley basins, but it needs to be addressed in the coordination agreements between the basins and could affect the minimum thresholds in those basins. She said basins cannot impede adjacent basins from meeting their goals. She also talked about how UWCD model Scenario F indicates that there is a need for water levels to be higher at the Oxnard – Las Posas Valley Basin Boundary.

Mr. Bondy said that these minimum thresholds at the boundary need to be set last.

Mr. Quinlan pointed out that operational flexibility is that volume between minimum thresholds and measurable objectives. He also said that it is largely driven in the Oxnard Basin by seawater intrusion.

F. Groundwater Flow Model Update

Mr. Morgan provided an update on the UWCD model and discussed the "Somis Triangle,"

Dr. Sun talked about the boundary issue between the United and CALLEGUAS models. He said that water is really moving from East Las Posas to West Las Posas, but it goes through the tip of the

Pleasant Valley Basin. He said that there is no flux in the Fox Canyon Aquifer or in the Upper San Pedro, but water in the shallow alluvial aquifer represents about 200 acre-feet of flux.

Mr. Morgan stated that there is something geologic going on in that area. He requested TAG's thoughts regarding a reasonable way to deal with the "Triangle".

Mr. Bondy said that there is sometimes flow in the upper San Pedro Formation.

Mr. Hopkins pointed out that 200 acre-feet is not too much to worry about. Mr. Bondy agreed that it is within the noise level of the models.

Mr. Morgan said that the UWCD model is on track with the documentation, but it may be slipping a couple of weeks. That would move completion into April.

Mr. Morgan asked Mr. Bondy how TAG should engage with regards to the CALLEGUAS model. Mr. Morgan said trial forecast scenarios would be helpful, which Mr. Bondy said they can do providing that there is an agreement on the scenarios that should be run as there is a limit to the budget.

Ms. Liu said that she feels comfortable with the model and was impressed at the CALLEGUAS workshop. She recommended using the model in the GSP. She also asked if Mr. Bondy had specific questions for the TAG. Mr. Bondy said that they can put together a list of "head scratchers."

Mr. Detmer asked if the TAG would be comfortable with the different approaches used by the models. Mr. Bondy said if significant differences go beyond the range of uncertainty, then we should look at them. Mr. Hopkins said that the differences are important if they impact future scenarios.

Mr. Bondy asked for input on trial scenarios. Mr. Morgan suggested a scenario of Arroyo-Simi flows cut in half.

Mr. Bondy said that CALLEGUAS has a budget for scenarios, but want to be far along in review process before running the scenarios.

Chair Loeb suggested TAG members review the documentation provided by CALLEGUAS and get questions to Mr. Bondy before the next TAG meeting.

G. Consider Forming Ad Hoc Subcommittees

Mr. Foreman stated that there is a need to evaluate future hydrology conditions for the scenarios.

Mr. Quinlan stated they will be looking at land use and populations changes in terms of planning agencies and urban water management plans.

The TAG members engaged in a discussion regarding what subcommittees are needed. They ultimately agreed that they would reconvene the previous ad-hoc subcommittees for the Oxnard, Pleasant Valley, and Las Posas Valley Basins. Subcommittee members are:

Oxnard – Tony Morgan, Steve Bachman, Curtis Hopkins
Pleasant Valley – Tony Morgan, Steve Bachman, Terry Foreman
Las Posas Valley – Bryan Bondy, Sally Liu, Jim O'Tousa

H. Preliminary Draft GSP Public Workshops

Dr. Weinberger gave a brief overview on what she will be presenting at the public GSP workshops.

I. Public Comments

Public Comments were heard from:

- (1) John Grether, grower, commented that it was an interesting meeting because there was a lot of discussion about the models. He cautioned the TAG on how they use the models because they should not be used as a substitute for analyzing the data. He used the example of the UWCD showing the difference of flow into the West Las Posas. He stated that it can have big effects on water use and allocations.
- (2) Steve Hickox, PHWA, stated that he would like the Port Hueneme Water Agency's Urban Water Management Plan identified in the GSP. He said that because other water agencies plans were referenced, he would like theirs referenced also. He also asked the time and location of the OPV Stakeholder GSP Workshop.
- (3) Amanda Fagan, NBVC, suggested that the Naval Base Ventura County Joint Land Use Study be used as a source document.
- (4) Susan Pan, VCWWD, stated that data in the ASR report indicates the salt plume has drastically expanded and that continued Simi discharge recharging the basin will cause the salt plume to become larger. She mentioned that with the topic of supplemental water supply projects one thing that could be done is to pay Simi Valley to divert some of their water to Las Posas or build a pipeline to directly bring the water to Las Posas.
- (5) Lucia McGovern, City of Camarillo, asked if someone at the public workshop could explain the differences between measurable objectives and minimum thresholds. She also asked how many ad-hoc committees were formed, what topics will be discussed, and how they report back to the TAG. She stated that it seems like one of the critical undesirable results is lowering of water levels and she wanted to know if the measurable objectives changed parameters to focus on water quality, then it may have some positive effects on the other water issues. She also suggested a future agenda topic to discuss extending the ramp down period.
- (6) Henry Graumlich, CMWD, commended the TAG for dealing with all of the different elements. He commented that it would be helpful for stakeholders if there were a chart showing a logical sequence on how the Agency is going to address issues and how they interrelate so stakeholders would know when their input would be most helpful.

J. TAG Member Comments

Chair Loeb responded to a couple of the public comments by stating that the differences between minimum thresholds and measurable objectives will be discussed at the public workshops. He stated that there were two ad-hoc subcommittees that were formed and they will report back to the entire TAG at the following TAG meeting. He also stated that he appreciates the identification of the additional planning documents.

Mr. Detmer responded to Mr. Grether's comment by explaining that the reduced flow estimate was a result of using a more sophisticated tool.

Chair Loeb also reminded everyone that the ramp down is headed to a sustainable yield, but they are not there yet.

K. Future Agenda Items

The items suggested to be discussed at the next TAG meeting were:

- Updates from the Ad-Hoc Subcommittees
- Modeling Updates

L. Adjourn TAG Meeting

Chair Loeb adjourned the TAG meeting at 12:09 p.m.