

**Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency**

# **FULL AGENDA PACKET**

**TAG Committee Meeting  
of  
August 26, 2016**



# 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.

## NOTICE OF MEETING for FCGMA TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP (TAG)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency (FCGMA) will hold a **Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Meeting** at **9:00 A.M.** on **Friday, August 26, 2016** in the **Atlantic Conference Room**, at the Ventura County Government Center, Hall of Administration, Main Level at **800 South Victoria Avenue, Ventura, California.**

## TAG MEETING AGENDA August 26, 2016

- A. Call to Order
- B. Approval of Minutes - Consider approval of the minutes from the July 29, 2016 TAG meeting.
- C. Agenda Review
- D. Water Budget Discussion - Discussion of the water budget
- E. Public Comments - Audience members may speak about FCGMA TAG related matters on today's Agenda
- F. TAG Member Comments - TAG members may provide comments about FCGMA TAG related matters on today's Agenda
- G. Future Agenda Items and Adjourn TAG Meeting - Discuss meeting agenda topics for the next TAG meeting scheduled on Friday, September 23, 2016

## NOTICES

*The FCGMA TAG Committee strives to conduct accessible, orderly, and fair meetings where everyone can be heard on the issues. The Committee Chair will conduct the meeting and establish appropriate rules and time limitations for each item. The Committee can only act on items designated as Action Items. Action items on the agenda are staff proposals and may be modified by the Committee as a result of public comment or Committee member input. Additional information about Committee meeting procedures is included after the last agenda item.*

**Administrative Record:** Material presented as part of testimony will be made part of the Agency's record, and 10 copies should be left with the Board Clerk. This includes any photographs, slides, charts, diagrams, etc.

**ADA Accommodations:** *Persons who require accommodation for any audio, visual, or other disability in order to review an agenda or to participate in the Board of Directors meeting per the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), may request such accommodation in writing addressed to the Clerk of the FCGMA Board, 800 South Victoria Avenue, Location #1610, Ventura, CA 93009-1610, or via telephone by calling (805) 654-2002. Any such request should be made at least 48 hours prior to the meeting so staff can make the necessary arrangements.*

\*\*\*

**Availability of Complete Agenda Package:** *A copy of the complete agenda package is available for examination at the FCGMA office during regular working hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday) beginning 72 hours before the Committee meeting. Agenda packet contents are also posted on the FCGMA website as soon as possible, and left there for archival retrieval in case reference is needed on previously considered matters. Questions about specific items on the agenda should be directed to the Agency's Clerk of the Board.*

\*\*\*

**Continuance of Items:** *The Committee will endeavor to consider all matters listed on this agenda. However, time may not allow the Committee to hear all matters listed. Matters not heard at this meeting may be carried over to the next Committee meeting or to a future Committee meeting. Participating individuals or parties will be notified of the rescheduling of their item prior to the meeting. Please contact the FCGMA staff to find out about rescheduled items.*

\*\*\*

**Electronic Information and Updates:** *Visit <http://www.fcgma.org> (for home page information) or Facebook (for meeting updates). Information available online includes the Committee's meeting schedule, a list of the Committee members and staff, weather station data, general information, and various Agency forms. If you would like to speak to a staff member, please contact Clerk of the Board at (805) 654-2014.*

# 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, July 29, 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 Tully Clifford called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

In attendance were: (1) Chair Clifford, Director, Watershed Protection District (WPD); (2) Erin Rodgers, FCGMA Clerk of the Board; (3) Kathleen Riedel, FCGMA Staff; (4) Alma Quezada, FCGMA Staff; (5) Bryan Bondy, Agricultural Representative; (6) Curtis Hopkins, Five Cities Representative; (7) Terry Foreman, Districts and Mutuals Representative; (8) Tony Morgan, UWCD Representative and Co-Chair; (9) Jim O'Tousa, Ventura County Board of Supervisors Representative; (10) Steve Bachman, Public Representative; (11) Sally Liu, Environmental Representative; (12) EJ Remson, The Nature Conservatory; (13) Ron Schnabel, Dudek; (14) Claire Kouba, Dudek; (15) Matt Naftaly, Dudek; (16) Peter Quinlan, Dudek; (17) Dan Detmer, UWCD; (18) Jeanette Lombardo, CFAA; (19) Mark McKee, Thorn Hill Companies; and (20) Lynn Jensen, CoLAB.

### B. Approval of Minutes

The minutes were approved with the following corrections: (1) Ms. Sally Liu requested that what was worded as a stakeholder meeting in Item G be rephrased to a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting to discuss the GDE mapping; (2) Mr. Bryan Bondy requested that a description of the Ad-Hoc meeting be added. The meeting was to review the flows between basins. He also noted that it was not just the GMA maps being used that needed to be reviewed. (3) Mr. Tony Morgan noted that he was not in attendance at the last meeting and that Dan Detmer sat in his place. Mr. Morgan made the motion to approve the minutes as revised and Mr. Bondy seconded.

### C. Agenda Review

Mr. Tully Clifford noted that Item I (Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems) should be moved to the next appropriate meeting. No opposition was heard.

### D. Adoption of 2016/17 TAG Schedule

After a brief discussion, the 2016/17 TAG schedule was approved as written.

### E. Discussion with Dudek

Mr. Ron Schnabel introduced himself and the Dudek team. The schedule of the project was discussed. Both TAG members and Dudek agreed that comments require interaction and open dialogue, whether

---

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 3

they are Ad-Hoc meetings or phone communication. Mr. Clifford echoed these sentiments and wanted to ensure that the Board is staying up to date with what is going on. Comments and documents had been uploaded to the Share Point website should Dudek not have everything from the previous consultant. Dudek plans to build a master copy of everyone's comments. Mr. Clifford requested that going forward, the following occur when addressing the Board: (1) Mr. Clifford would present on behalf of all GSP groups; (2) the consultant present their information; and (3) have one TAG Member present on behalf of the rest of TAG. It was a well-received idea and will be implemented going forward.

Two workshops were scheduled to be held on Monday, August 8, 2016. The meetings will be with the Ad-Hoc Water Budget group and the Ad-Hoc Boundary Flow group.

Mr. Clifford proposed that if/when a conflict arises, a TAG majority vote would decide on the action/direction to be taken and to make the Board aware of what transpired. The Committee and Dudek believed that this was the fairest option. Mr. Clifford also noted that he meets with DWR around twice a week so if the Committee, Dudek and/or Staff get hung up on something, they could assist with coming to an agreed resolution. Dudek noted that they have a Public Facilitator who would attend any public workshops and/or meetings and could assist with any conflicts or escalated issues.

TAG members requested that any documents or handouts that are posted to the FCGMA Website include a disclaimer that they are draft documents that are under review. Mr. Clifford advised that Board letters going forward will have the 3 parts as discussed earlier (Staff report, Dudek report, and TAG report). Mr. Bondy clarified that the TAG's role is to review information and to not do technical work.

**F. Draft Task 1 – 5 GSP Sections**

Mr. Clifford would eventually like to see Dudek lead the discussions for this item along with Tasks 6-10. The TAG Committee voiced their questions/concerns with Tasks 1–5. TAG members noted that the previous attempt included references that were not appropriate for all basins and that mapping was incorrectly identified. Dudek assured the TAG that they will be engaged and keep lines of communication open to avoid the mistakes that were previously made. Mr. Clifford agreed with the TAG and reiterated that he would keep the Board engaged as well.

**G. Review Task 6 – 10 Report Sections**

Dudek noted that they are still in the process of reviewing the previous consultant's information and that the workshops being scheduled on August 8, 2016 will be a big help with their understanding and the sorting of that information.

It was agreed that the August 26, 2016 TAG Committee meeting would focus specifically on the water budget. Mr. Bondy encouraged everyone to read Chapter 7 prior to the next meeting. Should Dudek have any major concerns once attending the workshops on August 8<sup>th</sup>, they will alert the TAG prior to the next TAG Committee meeting on August 26<sup>th</sup>. Dudek plans to meet with basin representatives in the future and was invited to attend basin meetings.

**H. Present List of Management Alternatives**

Mr. Clifford requested to put this item on hold and push it to a future meeting when appropriate. No objections were made.

**I. Public Comments**

Ms. Jeanette Lombardo, CFAA, questioned if the DWR's GSP rules have been written yet. TAG noted that the regulations are out now, but the rules won't be published until January 2017. She also asked if climate change has been factored into the water budget. Mr. Clifford responded that they will have to wait to see what DWR has to say about it.

Ms. Lynn Jensen, CoLAB, thanked the TAG Committee for their efforts and participation.

**J. TAG Member Comments**

Mr. Steve Bachman gave an update regarding the Oxnard plain and Pleasant Valley allocation.

Mr. Foreman questioned if discussion could occur in regards to what is a significant and unreasonable/undesirable result from the stakeholder stand point.

Mr. Bondy noted that the first sections of the reports need to provide a solid foundation to build upon.

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

The next TAG Committee meeting has been scheduled for Friday, August 26, 2016 in the Atlantic Conference Room and it will focus on the water budget.

Mr. Clifford adjourned the meeting at 11:28 a.m.

Submitted by:

---

Erin Rodgers  
Clerk of the Board

---

**Prepared For:** Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency  
**Prepared By:** Dudek Project Team  
**Subject:** Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency – GSP Project Strategy  
**Date:** August 17, 2016

---

*At last month's TAG meeting, Dudek was asked to describe, with more specificity than that discussed in the proposal, our strategy for accomplishing the complex tasks required by the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) and the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency (FCGMA) toward completion of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP). The details of such a strategy are dependent on multiple variables such as the status of existing work products, the TAG review of work products, the availability of the pertinent data and information, and the condition of tools to assess the physical water budget and management alternatives of the basins. Dudek is now acquiring and assessing the information related to those variables. Therefore, this memo focuses on the task management process in general and discussion of the key components necessary for successful completion of the project.*

#### Task Management Process

*The attached flow diagram depicts the general process for producing and reviewing the work associated with each task listed in the scope of work. The process includes the evaluation and adjustment of the task's scopes and cost when appropriate. Note that the diagram does not portray all of the components included in the project such as Dudek internal reviews, QA/QC procedures, and data management.*

#### Key GSP Components

*There are 22 tasks listed in the FCGMA Scope of Work. These are similar, but not identical, to the requirements of the SGMA Guidelines. Dudek will adhere to the SGMA guidelines and incorporate the FCGMA requirements (see Draft GSP Outline attached). There are four key, interrelated components of the project that are necessary for the successful completion of the GSP. The other GSP tasks and requirements are dependent on these:*

- 1) Sustainability Management Criteria (SGMA Guidelines Section 354.24, FCGMA Task 11)*
- 2) Water Budget (SGMA Guidelines Section 354.18, FCGMA Task 7)*
- 3) Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model (SGMA Guidelines Section 354.14)*
- 4) Sustainable Yield (SGMA Guidelines Section 354.18, FCGMA Task 12)*

**Sustainability Management Criteria:**

*SGMA requires the establishment of basin-specific “undesirable results,” as well as “sustainability goals” and “minimum thresholds” that result in the absence of undesirable results by the year 2042 (2040 for the Oxnard Plain Sub-basin and Pleasant Valley Basin). At its October 28, 2015 Board meeting, the FCGMA established a similar set of Planning Goals to use as a guide for early plan development. Dudek will collaborate with the FCGMA staff, the TAG, and stakeholders to establish specific undesirable results for each basin. Using the tools, processes, and parameters described below, Dudek will then develop minimum thresholds designed to avoid undesirable results, and will assess the level of certainty associated with each minimum threshold. These results will, in turn, be used to inform the development of measurable objectives and interim milestones to monitor progress toward sustainability.*

**Water Budget:**

*The water budget is central to the GSP as a whole and the ability to evaluate the basin under variable climate and land use conditions. Dudek has reviewed the preliminary water budget reports and comments from the Technical Advisory Group (TAG). While the existing work provides necessary data and components of a conceptual model, Dudek recommends the following revisions:*

- *A basic conceptual model showing all parts of the water budget should be revised and fully diagrammed for each basin to ensure that the models are as thorough as possible (e.g., to reflect low permeability in the Upper Aquifer System (UAS) in the Las Posas basin).*
- *The method in the existing water budget for calculating deep percolation should be revised to incorporate information regarding land use.*
- *The annual time step used in the existing water budget is too coarse to adequately calculate recharge to deep groundwater.*
- *Hydraulic gradients used to calculate underflow between basins should be recalculated using heads in individual wells, rather than general gradients from contoured water elevations.*
- *Some assumptions made for the existing water budget appear to be incorrect and need to be checked and verified (e.g. percent return flow from urban landscape irrigation).*
- *Change in aquifer storage should be calculated in order to assess the accuracy of the other estimated water budget components.*

*Dudek is currently discussing schedule and budget revisions with FCGMA staff for a rework of the existing water budget. As part of this rework, Dudek will:*

- *Create a revised conceptual model for each basin including cross sections and boundary conditions.*
- *Investigate use of the Department of Water Resources’ (DWR) Irrigation Demand Calculator model (IDC) and other methods to improve calculation of return flow.*
- *Use a daily time step to calculate recharge.*



- *Coordinate water budget preparation with DWR to ensure buyoff on an “equally effective method” for development of GSP components in areas where numerical models are unavailable, or until numerical models currently under development are available for use by FCGMA staff and the consulting team.*
- *Analyze available well completion information to assess potential for calculating aquifer-specific hydraulic gradients and flows.*

*One potentially “equally effective method” currently under discussion would be to build empirical relationships between water year type (30% of mean PPT, 60% mean PPT), pumping rates, and the rate of change in water elevation in individual wells, and use these relationships to make predictions of water level change based on hypothetical hydrologic scenarios (e.g., a 7-year drought scenario).*

*With these changes, the reworked water budget will allow for estimation of the impacts of varying water levels relative to proposed minimum water level thresholds for each of the basin sustainability indicators. It will be used to identify water budget assumptions and uncertainties that can be refined throughout the 20-year applicable statutory deadline period to better predict water budget impacts to water levels for each applicable sustainability indicator. Groundwater models, as available, will be incorporated during the 20-year applicable statutory deadline period to better refine the overall basin water budget’s predictive effects on water level triggers for undesirable effects. The groundwater models would also be used to develop a more detailed understanding of how the water budget impacts localized basin areas.*

*Dudek will utilize the collaborative process established for this project in moving forward with any water budget alternatives.*

***Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model:***

*Although the Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model is not presented as a separate task in the FCGMA Scope of Work, it is required in the GSP Emergency Regulations (approved May 18, 2016), and it is implicit in the other tasks, particularly Tasks 1 through 5. Development of a hydrogeologic conceptual model for each basin, including the interaction of the ground and surface water between the basins is necessary for the accurate development of the Water Budget. Therefore, Dudek will vet the existing information similarly to that described above for the Water Budget. Of particular importance to the Hydrologic Conceptual Model is the determination of the hydraulic conductivity (K) and storativity (S) as required in section 354.14 of the SGMA Guidelines. In the absence of field determined values of K and S, we will use a reasonable range of values based on review of lithology, well yields, the literature and consultation with the TAG.*


***Sustainable Yield:***

*The sustainable yield cannot be accurately represented by a single number. Therefore, with the input from the FCGMA staff and TAG, Dudek will examine this parameter under a number of scenarios. These scenarios will include the conditions as of the January, 1, 2015 base period specified by DWR, with and without imported water, with and without the water management projects already in place, and with and without the water management projects that are likely to be constructed in the future.*

*Please contact Ron Schnabel or Matt Naftaly with any questions or comments you may have regarding the project strategy or this memo.*

# Task Management

Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency  
Groundwater Sustainability Plan



## DRAFT OUTLINE

---

**Prepared For:** Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency  
**Prepared By:** Claire Kouba and Ron Schnabel, Dudek  
**Subject:** Groundwater Sustainability Plan for the Las Posas Basin  
**Date:** August 12, 2016

---

1. Executive Summary
2. Administrative Information
  - a. Sources and references (including table and comments on old groundwater models; RFP Task 3)
  - b. Agency Information (including elements in §354.6)
  - c. Description of Plan Area
    - i. Plan Area Description and Maps (including elements in §354.8.a)
    - ii. General geography of plan area (see RFP Task 4)
      1. Surface water and drainage features
      2. Historic, current, projected climate
      3. Historic, current, projected land use
      4. Historic, current, projected demographics
      5. Historic, current, projected water demands and supplies (including surface water) (summarized from §354.18.(b))
    - iii. Existing monitoring and management plans
    - iv. Operational flexibility limitations due to existing monitoring and management plans
    - v. Existing conjunctive use programs
    - vi. Summary of General Plan land use categories (includes the elements in §354.8.f and §354.8.(g), specifically programs for well permitting/replacement [see RFP Task 17])

- d. Notice and Communication
  - i. Notification and communication summary
  - ii. Summary of beneficial uses and users
  - iii. Public meetings summary
  - iv. Summary of comments and responses (table; see RFP Task 20)
  - v. Summary of initial information on relationships between State and Federal regulatory agencies (See RFP Task 17)
  - vi. Communication section that includes the elements in §354.10.d.
- 3. Basin Setting
  - a. Hydrogeologic Concept Model
    - i. Geology
      - 1. Geologic units and variation
      - 2. Depositional environments
      - 3. geologic structure
    - ii. Boundaries
    - iii. Basin bottom
    - iv. Principal aquifers and aquitards, including the elements in §354.14.(b)(4)
    - v. Data gaps and uncertainty
    - vi. Maps and cross sections that include the elements in §354.14.(c) and §354.14.(d).
  - b. Groundwater Conditions
    - i. Groundwater elevation data (as detailed in §354.16.(a))
      - 1. Elevation contour maps
      - 2. Hydrographs and hydraulic gradients
      - 3. Estimated change in storage
      - 4. Seawater intrusion (baseline; see RPF Task 9)
      - 5. Groundwater quality (baseline; see RFP Task 8; includes
        - a. a map of oil and gas deposits

- b. a map of locations of impacted surface water, soil and groundwater)
  6. Subsidence (baseline; see RFP Task 10)
  7. Groundwater-surface water connections
  8. Groundwater dependent
- c. Water Budget (\$354.18)
  - i. Current water budget (most recent as of January 2015)
    1. Surface water flows
      - a. Map of surface water/groundwater interactions (RPF Task 7)
    2. Inflow to groundwater system by source type (see RFP Task 7 for list of sources)
    3. Outflows from groundwater system by use sector (see RFP Task 7 for list of sources)
    4. Change in annual volume of groundwater in storage
    5. Overdraft
    6. Water year type
    7. Sustainable yield estimate
    8. Identify uncertainties in the groundwater budget (RFP Task 7) and recommend studies to reduce uncertainties (RFP Task 13)
  - ii. Historical water budget (minimum of 10 years base period, likely to extend through 2014)
    1. Quantify, and display in graphics, maps and tables (RPF Task 7)
      - a. Surface water flows
      - b. Inflow to groundwater system by source type
      - c. Outflows from groundwater system by use sector
      - d. Change in annual volume of groundwater in storage
      - e. Overdraft
      - f. Water year type
      - g. Sustainable yield estimate

2. Historical water source reliability
3. Impact of historical reliability on Agency operations
4. Magnitude of diurnal/seasonal/inter-annual fluctuations in water budget components (RFP Task 7)
- iii. Projected water budget (using minimum of 50 years of precip, ET, streamflow; see additional details in RFP Task 7)
  1. Quantify and display in graphics, maps and tables (RPF Task 7)
    - a. Surface water flows
    - b. Inflow to groundwater system by source type
    - c. Outflows from groundwater system by use sector
    - d. Change in annual volume of groundwater in storage
    - e. Overdraft
    - f. Water year type
    - g. Sustainable yield estimate
  2. Future scenarios: climate change and sea level rise
  3. Future scenarios: local land use planning, population growth, climate change
- d. Management Areas (§354.20)
  - i. [Number of Management Areas to be filled in based on future discussions]  
For each management area:
    1. Reason for management area
    2. Minimum thresholds and measurable objectives
    3. Monitoring and analysis
    4. Avoiding undesirable results outside the management area
4. Sustainability Management Criteria
  - a. Sustainability Goal (including FCGMA approved planning goals)
  - b. Undesirable Results
    - i. Cause of groundwater conditions and undesirable results

- ii. Criteria used to define undesirable results (for each relevant sustainability indicator)
- iii. Potential effects on beneficial uses / users
- iv. Determination of whether undesirable result is occurring and/or discussion of whether a certain undesirable result will be unlikely to occur
- c. Minimum Thresholds (§354.28; Monitoring Network requirements listed in §354.36)
  - i. For **each** minimum threshold:
    - 1. Minimum threshold justification
    - 2. Relationship between minimum threshold and sustainability indicator(s)
    - 3. Minimum threshold selection process (avoidance of undesirable results in adjacent basins)
    - 4. Minimum threshold impact on beneficial uses
    - 5. Comparison between minimum threshold and relevant state, federal, or local standards (See RFP Task 11; reference all FCGMA planning goals)
    - 6. Minimum threshold measurement method
  - ii. Minimum Thresholds shall be defined in terms of (as detailed in §354.28.(c)) :
    - 1. Chronic Lowering of Groundwater Levels
    - 2. Reduction of Groundwater Storage
    - 3. Seawater Intrusion
    - 4. Degraded Water Quality
    - 5. Land Subsidence
    - 6. Depletions of Interconnected Surface Water
- d. Measurable Objectives (§354.28.)
  - i. For **each** sustainability indicator:
    - 1. Interim 5-year milestones
    - 2. Measurable objective justification
    - 3. Operational flexibility



5. Monitoring Networks

- a. Monitoring Network (§354.34)
- b. Representative Monitoring
- c. Reporting Monitoring Data to the Department

6. Projects and Management Actions (§354.44)

- a. List and description of projects and management actions (see RFP Task 13; get list of current/planned projects from FGMA)
- b. Ranking scheme based on sustainability objectives and degree of feasibility
- c. For each project:
  - i. Project/Action trigger
  - ii. Public notice process
  - iii. Summary of permitting and regulatory requirements
  - iv. Status / schedule for each project/action
  - v. Expectation and evaluation of benefits
  - vi. Explanation of how project will be accomplished (i.e., reliance on other jurisdictions)
  - vii. Legal authority
  - viii. Groundwater extraction and recharge management
  - ix. Uncertainty

**Supplemental Document 1: Annual Report Template/Requirements (§356.2.)**

- 1. General information (and location map)
- 2. Groundwater elevation data
  - a. Contour maps for each principle aquifer
  - b. Hydrographs of elevations and water year type
- 3. Groundwater extraction for the preceding water year (table and map)
- 4. Surface water supply used or available
- 5. Total water use (table), by use sector, source type, and methods of measurement
- 6. Change in storage

- a. Change in storage maps
  - b. Graph of:
    - i. water year type,
    - ii. groundwater use,
    - iii. annual change in groundwater storage,
    - iv. cumulative change in groundwater storage
7. Description of progress towards implementing the GSP
- a. Interim milestone progress
  - b. Implementation of projects or management actions since previous annual report

**Supplemental Document 2: Annual Monitoring Plan to support Supplemental Document 2**

**Supplemental Document 3: GSP Summary Document/Regional Management Plan**

**Supplemental Document 4: Other Information Requested by FCGMA**

- FCGMA history
- Projected annual (fiscal) budget for GSP implementation
- Potential income streams for funding GSP implementation
- Overall uncertainty summary and recommendations for reducing uncertainty
- Summary of existing/current procedures and protocols under Ventura County's and other City's well permitting programs