

# FOX CANYON GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AGENCY

A STATE OF CALIFORNIA WATER AGENCY



## BOARD OF DIRECTORS

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

**EXECUTIVE OFFICER**  
**Jeff Pratt, P.E.**

## MINUTES

Minutes of the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency's (FCGMA) Technical Advisory Group (TAG) meeting held **Friday, November 18, 2016** in the Atlantic Conference Room, at the Ventura County Government Center, Hall of Administration, 800 South Victoria Avenue, Ventura California.

### **A. Call to Order**

TAG Chair Kim Loeb called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Chair Loeb had everyone in the room introduce themselves.

In attendance were: (1) Chair Kim Loeb, Groundwater Manager; (2) Keely Royas, Clerk of the Board; (3) Kathleen Riedel, Groundwater Specialist; (4) Vice-Chair Tony Morgan, UWCD Representative; (5) Terry Foreman, Districts and Mutuals Representative; (6) Bryan Bondy, Agricultural Representative; (7) Jim O'Tousa, Ventura County Board of Supervisors Representative; (8) E.J. Remson, The Nature Conservancy; (9) Tony Stafford, Camrosa Water District; (10) Dan Detmer, UWCD; (11) Matt Naftaly, Dudek; (12) Claire Kouba, Dudek; (13) Ron Schnabel, Dudek; (14) Greg Schnaar, Daniel B. Stephens & Associates (DBS&A) (15) Steve Cullen, DBS&A; (16) Mike Cruikshank, DBS&A; (17) Steve Bachman, Public Representative; (18) Mike Mishler, General Public; (19) Carol Schoen, Zone Mutual Water Co. and (20) Lynn Jensen, VC COLAB.

### **B. Approval of Minutes**

Bryan Bondy recommended and the TAG agreed changing the last sentence of page three of the 10-07-2016 minutes from "...perched zone should not be part of the water balance" to "...perched zone would be calculated separate from the water balance."

Mr. Bondy made a motion to approve the minutes as corrected. Tony Morgan seconded the motion and the motion was passed unopposed.

### **C. Agenda Review**

The agenda was approved as written.

### **D. Draft DWR BMPs**

Ron Schnabel, Dudek, gave a brief overview of the DWR workshop that he attended covering draft BMPs. He stated that DWR stressed that BMPs are not required in the GSPs, yet could be used for assistance in developing the plans. He stated that DWR will be providing information on data management requirements. He also informed the TAG that climate change scenarios will be provided and that the DWR would be providing the data sets so that everyone would have the same data. A question was voiced as to when and Mr. Schnabel stated that they were hoping for January 2017.

---

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

Item B - Page 1 of 6

Mr. Foreman thought that the BMPs were good, but said there were some inconsistencies and that if you didn't have your own model by January then you would have to use one of the public domain models. He also stated that he was curious how they would view the work that DBS&A was doing. Mr. Loeb commented that the public-domain requirement does not apply to watershed models. Mr. Foreman commented that DWR has made it difficult to prepare a plan without a model based on the criteria, especially if the basin is subject to seawater intrusion. Mr. Naftly and Dr. Cullen agreed that it would be a good idea to engage the DWR soon to get feedback about the technical approach being taken.

Mr. Schnabel said that the DWR stated that they were not as far along with climate change information as they predicted and they didn't have a specific date as to when this would be completed. Mr. Foreman stated that they are also supposed to give us water year types and asked Mr. Schnabel if they talked about that at all. Mr. Loeb also stated that the third thing was the parameters or scenarios for deliveries of State Water Project and Federal Central Valley Project water and what the end numbers were going to be. Mr. Schnabel answered that it was discussed and they would be available December 31, 2016.

Mr. Foreman commented that they define overdraft as when the recharge and discharge are out of balance over a period of time. They require an average historical period of ten years. The consultants are currently looking at the time period 1985-2015, which has not been determined to be "average." Dr. Schnaar commented that the process is not too far along that the dates could not be altered. He also stated that he thought that they would find a period of precipitation within the time period that would be a good representation. Mr. Foreman suggested revisiting it during an ad hoc meeting. Dr. Bachman and Dr. Schnaar agreed that the period should start and end with the same type of cycle, wet or dry. It was suggested 1989 to 2015 would work better.

Mr. Bondy suggested looking at the BMPs as a group when embarking on different pieces of the GSPs so that what is produced will fall into what DWR expects.

#### **E. Draft GSP Development Schedule**

Claire Kouba from Dudek presented a detailed schedule to help explain how they are going to stay on track for the May 2017 expected completion of the draft GSPs. Mr. Schnabel stated that there is not a lot of time for review and the schedule is to help the TAG members know when to expect documents so they can adjust their schedules accordingly to allow time to review. Mr. Naftly stated that there are many simultaneous tasks so the review workload may differ depending on how many tasks going on at same time. Mr. Schnabel also explained that whenever possible, they are going to try to get documents out earlier than scheduled to allow more time for review.

Mr. Morgan observed that the schedule appears to only allow nine days to review of the "hydrogeological model" of four different basins along with other items. He asked how the other work groups fit into the schedule (allocation work group, marketing work group). He was also concerned about not seeing anything on the schedule about stakeholder input and public outreach. Mr. Naftly explained that they have an ongoing process for the inclusion of stakeholder input. He also stated as they prepare sections, work groups will come more into play. Ms. Kouba pointed out that there is a 90 day comment period at the bottom of the schedule after a completed draft of all four GSPs. The TAG members agreed that the 90 day review is too late.

Mr. Bondy stated that it is still unclear where the stakeholder engagement is taking place. Ms. Kouba responded that there is a second public outreach meeting planned for the spring and there is an email address where the public can ask questions and those on the email list will be getting monthly GSP updates. Mr. Bondy responded that he thinks it is too much information to take on in one meeting.

Mr. Foreman expressed his concern about making changes from stakeholder comments. There may be too many changes if stakeholders have to wait until documents are finished to comment. Mr. Bondy said that additional public workshops should be planned for each basin about the sustainability criteria and the projects.

Mr. Morgan stated that he thinks it is overly optimistic to be able to come up with a yield number and roll it out and have everyone agree. He thinks that stakeholders are going to want projects because they will ultimately be dissatisfied with the yield number. Mr. Loeb stated that he believes that we are talking about working through the existing stakeholder groups as well as the new Oxnard/Pleasant Valley group, which hopefully the allocation groups will fold into. Dudek confirmed that they are on the same page. Dr. Bachman stated that the groups need to know when the consultants need to have comments/suggestions back in order to not draw out the process longer.

Mr. Bondy agreed with using the existing stakeholder groups. He pointed out the resources that Dudek has in the TAG members to help facilitate. Stakeholders need to know when they can give their input so they know when to schedule their resources. Mr. Foreman agreed with Mr. Bondy and added that he thinks the real action item is when the historical analysis is completed and we announce what we think the yield is. He thinks that is when a lot of stakeholders are going to come forward with comments and questions.

Mr. Bondy stated that the schedule implies one opportunity to review documents. If major comments are made, then he proposes a second opportunity needs to occur in order for the TAG to view the changes/revised version.

Mr. Foreman asked Mr. Schnabel if DWR defined what the "current" time period means? Mr. Schnabel answered that he understood that it began in January 2015.

Mr. Bondy commented that after looking at chapters 1 and 2, there is a fairly sizable gap before chapter 3 documents will be released. He asked whether things can be stretched out more within the current schedule. Mr. Schnabel said they are hoping to get comments as soon as possible to address and give back for more review. He also addressed Mr. Bondy's concerns by stating the possible need for more ad-hoc groups. Mr. Foreman said there needs to be more clarification on when the TAG can review and how the exchange between the TAG and the consultants is going to work.

Mr. Bondy and Dr. Bachman said their respected stakeholder groups would be open to discussing sustainability criteria during their meetings. Mr. Bondy stated that LUPG would likely create a committee structure to discuss the sustainability criteria. It was agreed that the meeting will not take place before the TAG starts its discussion.

Mr. Remson said that according to the schedule section 2.3, Groundwater Conditions, was supposed to be done by November 17, 2016, and has not been completed. Ms. Kouba responded that they have been working on it and should be completed by the end of December.

TAG members said that a reasonable time frame is to review documents depends on the length of the document and what advance notice was given so that the members can plan their schedules accordingly to allow time for review. Mr. Loeb then confirmed with Dudek that they will keep TAG members updated on when to expect items on a short term basis. The long term goal is to try to commit to keeping to the schedule as best as possible, but recognize that there will be things that may come up that can cause delays. The TAG consensus was that a realistic time frame needs to be brought to the Board extending the current schedule. Mr. O'Tousa mentioned to Ms. Kouba that when she sends documents out to the members to include a reasonable time frame that she would like it

returned by. TAG members asked Dudek to revise the schedule and bring it back to the December 16 TAG meeting for further discussion.

Mr. Loeb summarized the TAG comments into the three biggest things that can slow progress: when the UWCD modeling effort becomes available, when DWR publishes its parameters and guidance documents, and the stakeholder interaction regarding the undesirable results and sustainable yield.

#### **F. GSP Review Process**

Ms. Kouba asked the TAG members to use the Excel file titled GSP Review Tracking on the SharePoint site to track comments. She explained that it will help keep track of when someone starts looking at a document and finishes reviewing a document for the GSP, but she is open to other methods or suggestions. Ms. Kouba wants to make sure that everyone has had a chance to review and make comments on the submitted documents so that their revision efforts are not completed prior to receiving all comments. Mr. Foreman stated that the start date is not really important, but the finish date is and asked whether the TAG members are supposed to fill the start and finish date out. Ms. Kouba answered that it is both for her use when letting TAG members know that new documents are now available and also for the use of the TAG members informing her that they have reviewed the documents. Mr. Foreman also confirmed that Ms. Kouba would be the person to receive all comments for revisions. Ms. Kouba asked if it is helpful to get emails with status updates. All were in agreement that they are helpful.

Mr. Bondy asked whether after revisions are made if they are going to continue to work with the same Word document or if new versions will be sent out. Ms. Kouba commented that her vision was to send out new clean versions. Mr. Bondy wanted to make sure that the new draft shows that the previous version's comments were addressed. Ms. Kouba said she will add a column with the Word file name to help members keep track of the old and revised documents. Mr. Bondy also stated that there needs to be a simpler path to find documents when they are moved. Mr. Foreman mentioned that he thought historical comments should be noted, but might be a waste of Dudek's time since they were from the previous consultant's work. Dudek agreed, but also agreed with the TAG members that the old comments needed to be addressed. Ultimately, the TAG members just want to know that the old comments were read and taken into consideration when drafting the new documents. Mr. Bondy made the suggestion to grey out the old comments.

Ms. Kouba said that TAG members can either return the redlined Word documents to SharePoint or email them to her. She also said to include comments regarding the PDF figures on the respective Word placeholder page. In the program that they use to show comments it uses bubbles and won't be reflected with redline except in the master copy.

There was a request to discuss Item H prior to Item G due to Dr. Bachman having to leave the meeting at 10:45 a.m.

#### **H. Water Balance Update**

Greg Schnaar from DBS&A started the discussion by stating that he can give an overview of the progress update that they sent out or he can ask the TAG three main questions that they had for them. Due to time restraints it was decided that the three main questions would be best to start with so that Dr. Bachman could provide his input. Dr. Schnaar directed attention to Figure 1 showing basin boundaries and asked what basin boundaries they should be using as they are planning on going with the basin boundaries laid out by DWR. Mr. Loeb confirmed that the DWR boundaries are we needs to be used. Mr. Bondy pointed out that the Las Posas basins boundaries have recently been updated, so that needs to be reflected. He also said that he would find that and send it to DBS&A. Ms. Kouba brought up a question about the Oxnard Forebay boundary. She pointed out that there is a sizable

difference between the historical GMA boundary and the DWR boundary. She wanted to know which one they should be using when it comes to the water budget because it would have a noticeable effect. Dr. Bachman commented that he has been using the old boundaries, but he will be switching over to the DWR boundaries. He said he expected to be done next week. Mr. Morgan said that a decision cannot be made today based on the fact that more boundaries are going to be changing shortly. As for now, the consensus was to stick with the DWR boundaries. There was some concern keeping the current layout of the GSA boundaries on the map, but Dr. Schnaar felt it helpful to have it as an overlay.

Dr. Schnaar stated that historical land use is important for water budget modeling. Through their research they have various data sets back to 1985 with land use. He mentioned that Mr. Detmer has been very helpful, but they do not have anything with specific crop coverage older than 2004. They have farming maps that go back to 1984 that shows that there are crops, but the specific crop coverage is not detailed. Dr. Bachman stated that he has some that go back a ways that he has done himself. Mr. Foreman stated that DWR has general maps that go back to the 1950's. The TAG members stated that the DWR maps should be good enough.

Mr. Cruikshnak with DBS&A asked if the HSPF model is accurate for Calleguas Creek. Mr. Foreman said he would work with DBS&A regarding flows in Calleguas Creek.

Dr. Schnaar notified the TAG that they had PRISM results in the progress report. He stated that the gage data that they have is close to the PRISM data. He also stated that they are using a 30-year PRISM average. Mr. Foreman suggested using a PRISM monthly average. Mr. Morgan asked if they are using the 30 x 60 minute quads for the geology. Dr. Schnaar commented that this information is from the GIS and that they pieced together smaller quads to create a larger one.

## **G. Draft GSP Chapter Review**

Ms. Kouba started the discussion off with explaining that this is an opportunity to talk about the bigger picture approaches. Mr. Morgan stated that he is unclear what the GSP guidance is for urban water management plans and thinks it best to point at those documents instead of repeating the same information. Mr. Naftly commented that this is probably the best place within the GSP to educate DWR on how this area works and how projects interact. Mr. Bondy questioned what other information we need to have in there to provide solid foundation and context for what's being proposed in the plan. Ms. Kouba proposed that DWR left the requirements vague because it has to cover a range of different size basins.

Mr. Bondy had a difference of opinion from Dudek when it came to the existing management plan. He stated that it just has a table, but it needs to have context for people to understand what's where and how water is moving around.

Mr. Bondy commented that he had read through draft chapters 1 and 2 and although DWR's outline is not mandatory, it might be a good idea to follow it. He also commented that it is not that different to expect in the front they have the purpose and the goal. Ms. Kouba agreed that it would be a good idea to make it as standardized as possible so it is easily followed by DWR. Mr. Morgan said to at least hit the major headings. Mr. Bondy pointed out that while reading through chapter 1, he had the list of regulations out and he doesn't think they have been met. He also stated that he was caught off guard with all of the technical information in the administration chapter and that it should be moved to chapter 2 and maybe just focus on climate.

Mr. Bondy brought up the monitoring and management programs again and explained that the regulations ask for a discussion so there needs to be some text describing the key things from the

table. In regards to the section on operational flexibility his understanding of what DWR is asking for is a description of how existing programs will limit the ability to achieve sustainability or serve as an external constraint so it is an important section on providing context on the obstacles that might limit the flexibility. He also mentions that conjunctive use should be described.

Mr. Bondy complimented Dudek on their initial chapters being far superior to the previous consultant's work. Mr. Morgan pointed out that personal communication should not be used as references. Mr. Bondy commented that in the references there are a few instances of not using the most current reports.

#### **I. Public Comments**

Public comments were heard from (1) Lynn Jensen, VC CoLAB; (2) Mike Mishler, Self; (3) Carol Schoen, Zone Mutual.

#### **J. TAG Member Comments**

Mr. Foreman suggested that Dudek prepare figures and tables, and bring those to TAG for discussion prior to preparing the text for the documents.

Mr. Bondy requested that a calendar invite be sent out for the next six months.

Mr. Morgan asked if the future TAG meeting could be held at the Saticoy Operation's Yard.

#### **K. Future Agenda Items and Adjourn TAG Meeting**

- Update on groundwater model
- Revisit GSP schedule
- DBS&A update

Chair Loeb adjourned the meeting at 11:58 a.m.