

FOX CANYON GROUNDWATER FACILITATED PROCESS OXNARD AND PLEASANT VALLEY STAKEHOLDER GROUP MEETING

FEBRUARY 2, 2021

Meeting Minutes

PRESENT:

Anselm, Arne
Bouchard, Jared
Broome, Alden
Detmer, Dan
Dubois, James
Ferro, Terri L.
Gaglione, Rosemarie
Gramckow, Jurgen
Gramckow, Martin
Lewis, Greg
Mathews, John
Munoz-McGovern, Lucie
Prichard, Ian
Remson, E.J.
Tribo, Jennifer

ABSENT:

Krist, John
Meneghin, Candace

1. Introductions

Hallmark Group employee Taylor Blakslee took roll of the Stakeholder Group Members as indicated above and explained the meeting format to participants.

Hallmark Group employee Jim Beck provided background on his and Mr. Blakslee's role as facilitators of the Fox Canyon Facilitated Process for the Oxnard and Pleasant Valley basins.

Mr. Beck and Blakslee introduced themselves and Mr. Beck asked the Stakeholder Group members to introduce themselves and share one thing that they feel is important to understand in the current process.

Following self-introductions by all the attending Stakeholder Group members, Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency (FCGMA) staff Kim Loeb introduced himself and he and Arne

Anselm (FCGMA staff) reiterated their role to support the stakeholder process and follow the mandate instituted by the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA).

2. Purpose

Mr. Beck explained the purpose of the meeting and the overall goal of the OPV Stakeholder Group which is to provide a recommendation to the FCGMA Board on April 28, 2021, principally regarding ramp-down and minimum allocation. In responding to a stakeholder question, Mr. Beck explained that he and Mr. Blakslee have been brought up to speed by FCGMA staff, stakeholder meeting summaries and by reading the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP).

3. Timeline and Schedule

Mr. Beck provided a brief summary on the timeline and schedule and noted that there is a short amount of time to accomplish all of the goals of the Facilitated Process by the FCGMA Board meeting on April 28, 2021.

4. Sustainable Yield

Mr. Loeb provided an overview of the sustainable yield as described in the FCGMA GSP.

Ms. Gaglione noted that she did not agree with the inclusion of 4,600 acre-feet (AF) per year of recycled water since the City of Oxnard's current permit does not allow for this recharge activity. However, she noted that they want to expand the Advanced Water Purification Facility (AWPF) to handle treating additional municipal wastewater which would generate more recycled water.

Stakeholder Member Dan Detmer commented that the schedule for modeling projects is off and asked if that could be adjusted to reflect the actual schedule for United Water Conservation District to complete their analysis. Mr. Beck confirmed that we would update the schedule appropriately.

Stakeholder Member Jennifer Tribo asked if staff could clarify the Santa Clara River delivery assumptions and Mr. Loeb said those are described in a technical memo UWCD developed and staff will distribute that document.

5. Starting Allocation

Mr. Loeb provided a presentation on the starting allocation and discussed the OPV Allocation Ordinance that sets the methodology for determining the starting allocation of 92,500 AF. He noted that the Santa Clara River Flex Allocation allows for conjunctive use but does not provide for additional pumping.

Mr. Loeb provided an overview of the three variances (standard, non-reporting, and new water), and an update on new variance requests and their impact on the starting allocation.

Stakeholder Member Martin Gramckow asked if non-reported pumping would be included in future modeling updates and Mr. Loeb replied that they would be included in the 5-year update.

Stakeholder Member Greg Lewis commented that the basin starting allocation methodology is not agreed upon by all the Stakeholders and the Stakeholder Group was tasked to develop a starting allocation, ramp down, end point allocation and replenishment fee. He said his issue is a legal perspective of allocating on a pure historical basis.

Stakeholder Member Terri Ferro noted that there may be double counting issues from the variance reconciliation process. Mr. Loeb confirmed that there could be, and the Board adopted a resolution establishing a variance review process and Committee to address these types of requests.

Stakeholder Member Alden Broome asked what the timeline is to resolve variance application requests and Mr. Loeb said they are taking a longer than expected and require replies to nearly every applicant to clarify requests and procure additional information. He said the goal is to resolve this in the next couple of months and it is a high priority.

Mr. Beck asked what the magnitude of the variance requests are, and Mr. Loeb said he will provide that information to the stakeholders but noted that he has received roughly an equal request for new water requests between municipal and industrial and agricultural water users.

Mr. Beck suggested parking this topic until the next meeting on February 16, 2021.

6. Ramp Down / Minimum Allocation

Mr. Loeb provided a summary of ramp down discussions from the Stakeholder meeting on October 27, 2021. Mr. Beck reviewed the various ramp down methodologies that were suggested at that meeting and summarized in the meeting documentation and asked the Stakeholders if there were any specific methods they would like to see the group focus on.

Stakeholder Member Broome commented that the agricultural community is working on a solution that he believes will address equity issues and it deals with water users starting with their current use and includes protections for users on the lower use threshold. He said they are envisioning a base allocation that is not reduced and then a supplement allocation that is reduced at an even rate. He said this is a similar structure that was implemented by the State during the drought.

Stakeholder Member Jurgen Gramckow said he has been part of the discussions Mr. Broome referenced and said there is a tension between equal burden and equal outcome. He said the 2005-2014 historic allocation is based on existing beneficial uses. However, if different endpoints are created based on some definition of equity that results in an un-proportional equal burden, but a reallocation that assume a lower water user has already done his share but believes beneficial water use is not a function of how little water use you use, but how much economic value is derived from that water use. He said if you create a safe harbor for lower water users to continue operating at a lesser burden, where the higher water use has to alter their water use or pay more money creates issues of equitability.

7. Next Steps

Mr. Beck encouraged the Stakeholder Group Members and other stakeholders to consider alternative ramp-down options for discussion at the next meeting on February 16, 2021.

8. Public Comment

No additional public comments were made.

9. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:55 am.

To-Dos:

- Update the schedule to reflect the appropriate timing for UWCD to complete their modeling analysis.
- Distribute the Santa Clara River delivery assumptions (UWCD technical memo).
- Distribute variance application summary.