

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, August 01, 2019** in Room B, Saticoy Operation's Yard, 11251 Riverbank Drive, Ventura, CA.

A. Call to Order

TAG Chair Kim Loeb called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

In attendance were: (1) Chair Kim Loeb, Groundwater Manager; (2) Keely Royas, FCGMA Clerk of the Board; (3) Kathleen Riedel, Groundwater Specialist; (4) Bryan Bondy, Agricultural Representative; (5) Sally Liu, The Nature Conservancy (TNC); (6) Curtis Hopkins, Five Cities Representative; (7) Dan Detmer, United Water Conservation District (UWCD); (8) Terry Foreman, Special Districts & Mutuals Representative; (9) Steve Bachman, Public Representative; (10) Peter Quinlan, Dudek; (11) Trevor Jones, Dudek; (12) Tony Goff, Calleguas Municipal Water District (CMWD); (13) Jodi Switzer, The Farm Bureau VC; (14) Bert Perello, City of Oxnard; (15) E.J. Remson, TNC; (16) Thien Ng, City of Oxnard; (17) Michael Esteban, Naval Base Ventura County (NBVC); (18) Chris Weber, NBVC; (19) Jason Sun, UWCD; (20) Burt Handy, Self.

B. Public Comments

E.J. Remson commented that the word "inspirational" should be changed to "aspirational" in his public comment in the May 02, 2019 TAG meeting minutes.

C. Approval of Minutes – May 2, 2019 TAG Meeting

Mr. Bondy wanted the word "analysis" added to the second sentence under Item G clarifying that he supported the analysis approach by Dudek.

Ms. Liu made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Bondy seconded the motion, and the motion was approved.

D. Agenda Review

No changes were made to the Agenda.

Dr. Bachman wondered why there wasn't an item on the Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSPs) status.

Chair Loeb stated that the GSPs were posted on July 24, 2019, the Board opened a 60-day Public Comment period set to close September 23, 2019, and that there will be two Public Workshops, one

on September 21st for the Oxnard and Pleasant Valley (OPV) basins and the other on September 22nd for the Las Posas Valley basin.

E. Calleguas Groundwater Flow Model Peer Review

Trevor Jones presented the results of the three key components in the peer review of the Calleguas Groundwater Flow Model for the East Las Posas Management Area (ELPMA). The three key components were a global sensitivity analysis of the model, characterization of uncertainty in the sustainable yield, and characterization of uncertainty in predicted groundwater elevations under the future baseline conditions.

Mr. Bondy stated that the 15,000 acre-feet (AF) of water in storage needs to either be taken out of the sustainable yield sum or at least noted that the water is not available to be allocated to others.

Dr. Jones said that the key take-aways from the global sensitivity analysis are that parametric characterization of the Upper San Pedro formation strongly influences the root mean square error (RMSE) and model estimates of recharge to the Fox Canyon Aquifer; the RMSE is most sensitive to vertical conductivity of the Upper San Pedro underlying the Arroyo Las Posas; and recharge to the Fox Canyon Aquifer is most sensitive to the vertical conductivity overlying the Moorpark Anticline. Uncertainty in key model metrics from historical realizations are $\pm 1,700$ AF per year (AFY) for average annual change in storage; $\pm 2,500$ AFY for infiltration from the Arroyo Las Posas; and $\pm 1,300$ AFY for recharge to the Fox Canyon Aquifer. The estimate of sustainable yield is $17,800 \pm 2,300$ AFY based on regression and basin-wide changes in storage, and $17,000 \pm 1,300$ AFY based on minimum thresholds and avoiding significant loss of storage.

Mr. Bondy asked if there was a reason why the analysis was done on the minimum thresholds (MTs), but not on the measurable objectives (MOs). He said that to him the MOs are as or more important than the MTs. He said that SGMA says that in 20 years the basins are supposed to be hitting the MOs and not just staying above the MTs.

Mr. Quinlan stated that the plan is to stay above the MTs.

Chair Loeb stated that there are a lot of data gaps in the basin and the analysis helps to know where to focus further analysis going forward on the mandatory 5-year updates to reach our goals over the next 20 years.

Mr. Hopkins said that the presentation shows that the plan doesn't reach any of the MOs set for the basin. Dr. Jones stated that at 17,000 AFY with no projects hovers right around the MOs.

There was a discussion about the possible need to lower the MOs in this basin to avoid undesirable results, due to this basin not being climate driven.

Dr. Bachman stated that he needed to reiterate comments made before about the assumptions in the analysis are not supportable and that the MTs and MOs are based on speculation of what happens to the Arroyo in the future. He said that the future flows in the Arroyo are speculative at this point. He said that the MTs and MOs should be adjusted based on what the flows end up being in the Arroyo. Chair Loeb stated that the MTs and MOs are independent of what happens in the Arroyo.

Mr. Bondy asked what scenario is in the GSP today. Mr. Quinlan stated that there is a scenario of the sustainable yield with projects and one without projects. Mr. Bondy asked if there was a recommendation given in the GSP.

Chair Loeb stated that the next step in the process after GSP adoption is identification, feasibility analysis, and cost-benefit analysis of projects with stakeholder input.

Mr. Quinlan stated that this analysis was to identify and quantify uncertainty.

F. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

G. TAG Member Comments

Mr. Bondy stated that stakeholders are going to want to know what the plan is going forward.

Mr. Quinlan stated that the GSP lays out two plans moving forward, one with and without projects.

Dr. Bachman said that the yield numbers are looking at future modeling that has decreases in the Arroyo flow. He stated that the plans should point out that if these decreases don't occur then the yield number will be affected.

Mr. Foreman stated that he learned recently that the cuts that are being talked about are total water cuts and not just pumping cuts.

Ms. Liu stated that she had done a quick read of the GSPs and one of the issues from the environmental point of view is that the Las Posas GSP does not consider the environmental beneficial users in the Arroyo Las Posas. She said that there was always a discussion of the potential future decreases in the groundwater levels in the shallow aquifer not being due to pumping, but the loss of water sources from Simi Valley. She said that the language had been taken out of the draft GSPs.

Mr. Hopkins said that if nothing is done, the bottom line doesn't look good. He said that if Simi Valley takes their water out, something needs to be done to replace it.

Mr. Bondy said that he disagrees and that the water is not equal across the basin and that there are declining groundwater levels in the northeastern portion of the basin and the Simi Valley water does not stop the decline.

Ms. Liu asked if there are different management areas, can there be different pumping reductions.

Chair Loeb replied that SGMA allows management of different management areas differently.

H. Future Agenda Items

Mr. Bondy suggested holding the meeting date as a topic may come up for discussion.

I. Adjourn TAG Meeting

Chair Loeb adjourned the TAG meeting at 10:34 a.m.