


Facilitated Process Discussion Framing

Developed and Maintained by the Consensus Building Institute (CBI)
 Updated: 9.23.2020

This document will serve as tool to document the overarching “road map,” meeting plan, and topics under consideration. CBI will track this document in consultation with the Core Stakeholder Group and technical staff.

Road Map



Core Stakeholder Group Bodies of Work

GSP Implementation					
Basin Optimization	Refining Sustainable Yield	Ramp Down Allocation	Projects	Replenishment Fees	Project Governance / Implementation

Core Stakeholder Group Meeting Framework	
1 6.25.20	Framing Success in 2040 Charter and Meeting Plan Prepare for Basin Optimization Work
2 7.16.20	Refine Charter, Discuss Group Composition Basin Optimization
3 8.4.20	Charter Next Steps Frame Issues on Ramp Down Discuss Legal Ad Hoc Committee Purpose and Objectives
4 8.18.20	Managing Basins Collectively Frame Issues on Allocation and Discuss Ramp Down Criteria and Options Begin discussing Purpose and Objectives for Projects Ad Hoc Committee
Aug 26	FCGMA Board Briefing - Process Update
5 9.1.20	Basin Optimization Scenarios (Decision Criteria and Feedback on Proposed Scenarios) Review Refinements on Legal Committee Charge, Purpose, and Objectives <i>Decide to proceed...</i> Discuss briefing talking points and spokespeople for GMA Board and other constituent organizations <i>Time permitting: Charter</i> Back-Up Voting
6 9.15.20	Managing Basins Collectively Review Project Committee Composition and Charge Review Talking Points for GMA Board Meeting
Sept 23	FCGMA Board (deadline ~9.10.20) Seek policy discussion on Managing Basins Collectively
7 9.29.20	Ramp Down
8 10.13.20	Ramp Down Options and Decision Criteria
9 10.27.20	Ramp Down Options If ready, develop plan to vet Ramp Down Options with public, constituents, Board, etc.
10 11.10.20	Ramp Down Projects
11 12.8.20	Ramp Down Projects

Contents

Managing Basins Collectively4
Basin Optimization6
Ramp Down9
Allocation..... 11
Projects..... 13

Managing Basins Collectively


Problem to be Solved	Are we managing Oxnard Subbasin and Pleasant Valley Basin as one basin or separately? Should the West Las Posas Subbasin be included? What aspects of management should be done together or separately? (replenishment fees, allocation systems, ramp downs, final sustainable yield allocations, etc.) How will the costs of projects be shared across the basins?
Existing Policy	<u>Allocation Ordinance</u> : The ordinance allocates pumping across the two basins. California Proposition 218 and Proposition 26 require voter approval on taxes and fees, including analysis of associated benefits.
Resources	Sustainable Groundwater Management Act California Department of Water Resources <u>Bulletin 118</u> defines the boundaries of groundwater basins in California <u>Groundwater Sustainability Plans</u> <u>One Water Roadmap Executive Summary</u> Core Stakeholder Group Meeting 4 Notes (8.18.20) Link
Key Term Definitions	
Stakeholder Interests + Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SGMA requires ▪ Basin management boundaries should be based on the hydrology of the region ▪ Basins are connected across the lower aquifer system ▪ Differential between basins and aquifer systems in pumping reductions required to achieve sustainability ▪ Management and operational efficiencies ▪ Shared funding for projects that benefit the region ▪ Cost and benefit of projects and amount that entities have to pay ▪ Optimization of the combined sustainable yield ▪ Pumping end points have a significant impact on decisions
Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Manage basins together; coordinate and optimize pumping between basins and aquifers; consider GSP management areas or zones ▪ Manage basins separately ▪ Manage aspects uniquely – e.g. replenishment fees ▪ For the first 10 years, treat all pumpers (vertical, horizontal) the same on any ramp down or curtailment

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop an applied water average cost framework that equalizes the price of water whether pumped or delivered
Concept Proposals	<p>From a technical perspective, manage the basins collectively to optimize pumping and sustainable yield. A tentative management goal would be to minimize flux across the basins and coordinate basin activities so conditions improve together.</p> <p>From an equity (end-point), political feasibility, and financial perspective, the basins and aquifer systems may need tailored approaches.</p> <p>Seek GMA Board direction on whether the Oxnard Subbasin and Pleasant Valley Basins (or aspects of management) are being managed together or separately and to assess whether West Las Posas Subbasin should be included.</p>
Decision Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Management and operational efficiencies ▪ Pathway to achieve sustainability ▪ Maximize potential sustainable yield optimization
Preliminary Recommendation	<p>1.1 FCGMA is tasked under its enabling legislation to manage all the basins.¹</p> <p>1.2 For technical and administrative intent, manage Oxnard, Pleasant Valley, and West Las Posas together. (Note: The modeling analyzes the basins collectively.)</p> <p>1.3 Strategies to achieve sustainability may differ by basin.</p> <p>1.4 The West Las Posas is being adjudicated; the adjudication will set management in West Las Posas.</p> <p>1.5 The GSA must report on each basin separately as SGMA requires.</p> <p>1.6 Explore a shared replenishment fee structure contingent on Prop 218 and 26 assessment studies.</p>
Agreements / Recommendations	

¹ The FCGMA's statutory authority is found in its enabling legislation, FCGMA Act, Assembly Bill (AB) No. 2995 passed on September 13, 1982 (now contained in the State Water Code Appendix, Chapter 121). The Legislature expressly found and declared that the preservation of the groundwater resources within the territory of the FCGMA for agricultural and municipal and industrial uses is in the public interest and the creation of the FCGMA pursuant to AB 2995 is for the common benefit of water users (Imbrecht, 1982).

Other Notes + Considerations The group may have to refine its recommendations once the West Las Posas Basin is adjudicated. An inter-basin coordination agreement may be necessary

Basin Optimization



Problems to be Solved How do we create the highest yield by shifting pumping physically around the basins and between the upper and lower aquifer systems?
 What scenarios do we want to consider or model to analyze the basin yield?
Future Questions
 What projects or infrastructure are necessary to optimize the basin?
 What is feasibility of those projects? What are the costs? What are the economics of the projects? What provides the best cost/benefit?
 How do we pay for these projects?
 Based on what we have learned on basin optimization scenario modeling, what is the impact on sustainable yield?

Existing Policy None at this time

Resources See **Optimization Technical Memo**, United, John Lindquist [[Link](#)]

Redistribution of pumping between upper and lower aquifer systems

- United's Groundwater Planning document ([GSP-Lite Open-File Report and Addendum A](#)) preceded GSP and modeled uniform cut approach, yielded imbalance (surplus in upper and deficit in lower). Frames the question do we need to balance between the upper and lower.

Redistribution of water

- United completed related analysis as part of ASSAP project design. (Proposed pipeline to provide water to the southern parts of the
-

	basin; on hold due to high costs.) Link to Report.
	Seawater intrusion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coastal brackish water treatment ▪ Injection barrier (no source of water) ▪ Creating cone of depression
Key Term Definitions	Optimization: creating highest yield by shifting pumping management, volume, and location (geologic or geographic) to maximize yield
Stakeholder Interests + Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reducing seawater intrusion ▪ Increasing supply ▪ Costs and how to pay for projects ▪ Monitoring and data verification to validate model inputs
Decision Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reducing seawater intrusion ▪ Increasing supply ▪ Cost / benefit ▪ Financial feasibility: funding, financing
Concept Proposals	<p>Core Stakeholder Group discussion held 7.16.20</p> <p>How do we create the highest yield by shifting pumping physically around the basins and between the upper and lower aquifer systems?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the maximum yield that we can achieve? ▪ Redistributing pumping between the upper and lower aquifer systems – United GSP “light” and GSP – looks at sustainable yield – we need to do more work on this ▪ Shifting supply by distributing water to vulnerable areas ▪ Managing seawater intrusion <p>What scenarios do we want to consider or model to analyze the basin yield? (Note: Inputs = assumptions about supplies; Outputs = impact on basin yield)</p> <p>Shifts in Pumping: geographic or geologic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How will shifting pumping away from the coast affect us? (From United Tech Memo) ▪ Shifts to address seawater intrusion ▪ Redistributing pumping between the upper and lower aquifer systems. Potentially need to factor in <i>differences in water quality which differs between upper and lower basins.</i> <p>Reducing Groundwater Pumping</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Purchasing surface water (State Water Project or Article 21) ▪ Increasing agricultural irrigation and industrial water use

efficiency

Changing Volume of Water

- Options for wastewater reuse and stormwater capture; consider emphasis on local solutions
- Consider impact of water savings due to Arundo and invasive species removal
- Trade-off between pumping / cost of wells, and other infrastructure to transport
- Climate scenarios
- Timing – when do we realize benefit – does it help us achieve sustainability?

The GSPs discusses several management actions that should be considered. They include the following:

- Restrictions on water transfers to the salinity, pumping trough and Oxnard pumping depression management areas. (GSP Sec. 2.5)
- Temporary ag land fallowing program (Sec. 5.6)
- Reduction in groundwater production (Sec 5.7)
- Water market (Sec. 5.8)

Preliminary Recommendation *2. As of 9/1/20, the Core Stakeholder Group recommends developing a suite of projects before proceeding with additional modeling.*

Agreements / Recommendations

Ramp Down

DISCUSSION TOPIC SEQUENCE: Interests > Decision Criteria > Options

-
- | | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Problem to be Solved | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ How do the basins ramp down or reduce extraction to the sustainable yield by 2040? SGMA requires basins to achieve sustainability by 2040.▪ What makes a smarter ramp down?▪ What concerns do you personally or do others have associated with a ramp down? |
|-----------------------------|---|
-

Existing Policy	Allocation Ordinance (does not stipulate a minimum allocation or ramp down method)
------------------------	--

Resources	Oxnard GSP and Pleasant Valley GSP OPV White Paper [Link] Example: California Emergency Drought Regulation 25% Reduction Regulation (Fact Sheet Link and Resource Page) and Governor Executive Order Example: Borrego Water District Example Stipulated Judgment Core Stakeholder Group Meeting Summaries #6 (9/15/20)
------------------	--

Key Term Definitions	Ramp Down: <i>end point = sustainable yield</i> Allocation Reduction Method: <i>how you get there</i> Minimum Allocation: “Sustainable Yield means the maximum quantity of water, calculated over a base period representative of long-term conditions in the basin and including any temporary surplus, that can be withdrawn annually from a groundwater supply without causing an undesirable result.” [Water Code § 10721(w)]
-----------------------------	--

Stakeholder Interests + Issues	<i>Issues identified to date.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ GMA Board has requested a minimum threshold per acre to avoid stranding land with no water.▪ Responsive to different needs and constraints of high-water users and low-water users▪ Move away from CombCodes towards land-based management of allocation as part of reduction strategy▪ Treat surface water and groundwater together▪ Manage water rights questions to create a legally defensible, durable approach.▪ Limit cut-back requirements in short term (5 years) to allow time for
---------------------------------------	---

	<p>project plans to materialize & inform long-term cut-back needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop multiple ramp-down pathways based on different degrees of success with water projects and basin optimization. I.e. Best-case scenario ramp down with significant new water; middle option and worst-case option.
Decision Criteria	<i>To be developed: What variables does the Core Stakeholder Group use to consider and evaluate ramp down options?</i>
Options and Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce by % from the base period ▪ Establish minimum allocation or acre-foot per acre of land ▪ OPV White Paper Hybrid Method: % reduction and AF/acre ▪ Others?
Concept for Proposals	<p>3. <i>Topics to be addressed in ramp down / allocation</i></p> <p>3.1. Assume that ramp down and associated reductions might link Oxnard and Pleasant Valley via joint management and sharing responsibility for reducing pumping (i.e. PV may commit to additional reductions beyond what might be needed if PV were managed as a single basin).</p> <p>3.2. End Point(s): define the end point and characterize how surface water is factored in to the end point</p> <p>3.3. Consider a Minimum Allocation, recognizing that it must be supportive of the sustainable yield over the 20-year period.</p> <p>3.4. Do the ramp down elements treat high water and low water users differently?</p> <p>3.5. Consider inter-play of GSP management areas.</p> <p>3.6. Establish a strategy for reducing pumping (timing and location) that might have a greater impact to realize management objectives and achieve sustainability goals</p>
Preliminary Recommendation	<i>To be developed</i>
Agreements / Recommendations	<i>To be developed</i>

Allocation

Facilitators' Note: The facilitators would like to acknowledge the history, work, and extensive conversations that have gone into developing the allocation plan, culminating with the adoption of the allocation ordinance. The facilitators acknowledge that the GMA and some stakeholders do not want to reopen the allocation ordinance. The facilitators acknowledge that the allocation plan is a primary driver for other stakeholders' participation in the facilitated process. However, given the articulated goal of avoiding adjudication and given that the ordinance left open some issues to be addressed, the Core Stakeholder Group will consider and decide which issues merit group discussion.

Problem(s) to be Solved	What are the elements of the Allocation Plan that need to be developed or merit attention or refinement? What are the key issues that the group needs to tackle to fully implement the allocation ordinance, specifically, or an allocation plan, more generally?
Existing Policy	Allocation Ordinance Groundwater Market Pilot Project in Oxnard Subbasin
Resources	Trading Sustainably: Critical Considerations for Local Groundwater Markets under SGMA, Nysten et al, Wheeler Water Institute (June 2017) Orange County Water District Allocation Annual Application Process (<i>check with Alden</i>)
Key Term Definitions	
Stakeholder Interests + Issues	<i>Ideas expressed during stakeholder assessment process</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Incentivize conjunctive use ▪ Clarifications on carryover ▪ Avoid penalizing farmers who were early adopters of conservation measures ▪ Avoid big winners and losers—everyone “feel some pain” ▪ Avoid zero allocations ▪ Address issues of poor historical data on water use ▪ Base period and initial allocation ▪ Equitable partitioning of water between M & I and Ag ▪ Move to land-based (vs. wellhead-based) system)
Decision Criteria	
Concepts for Proposals	4. Allocation Proposal Topics

-
- 4.1. **Land-based system:** Support exists for moving to a land-based system. GMA is working to put that in place and anticipates realizing this around the GSP update (5 years).
 - 4.2. Treatment of surface water and carryover: what are the provisions in periods of extended drought?
 - 4.3. Landowners who receive water from United and PVCWD – do they receive an allocation? What are the provisions in periods of extended drought?

**Preliminary
Recommendation**

**Agreements /
Recommendations**

Projects

Problem(s) to be Solved	Align projects with GSP objectives & regional water needs. Develop cohesive strategy stemming from needs & GSP objectives. What projects or infrastructure are necessary to optimize the basin? What is feasibility of those projects? What are the costs? What are the economics of the projects? What provides the best cost/benefit? What are opportunities for multiple benefits? How do we pay for these projects?
Existing Policy	Projects in GSPs
Resources	Projects in GSPs Projects submitted for consideration to include in the GSPs United Water proposals (See Projects on web site and recent Water Summit information (Link) Incorporating Multiple Benefits in Water Projects: A Guide for Water Managers (Link)
Key Term Definitions	
Stakeholder Interests + Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Driven by regional leadership to develop projects with region-wide benefits. ▪ Focus on “low hanging fruit” (e.g. increase capacity of GREAT project) ▪ Consider prioritizing multiple-benefit focused projects ▪ Water quality considerations ▪ Prioritize most cost-effective projects ▪ Replenishment fees are equitable, logical, and transparent ▪ Explore creative financial solutions to incentivize basin recharge
Decision Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Results of cost-benefit analysis ▪ Ease / feasibility of implementation ▪ Impacts to the price of water ▪ Impacts to water quality ▪ Drought resilience ▪ Legal Constraints
Concept Proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Run groundwater models assuming that we advance basin optimization plans ▪ Refine “sustainable yield” based on optimization-enhanced model results ▪ Conduct feasibility and cost-benefit analysis of projects targeted