

## **Cuyama Basin GSA Standing Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes**

October 16<sup>th</sup>, 2017

Skype conference call

### **COMMITTEE ATTENDEES:**

Jim Beck (Executive Director), Brad DeBranch, Louise Draucker, Jacob Furstenfeld, Roberta (Robbie) Jaffe, Brenton Kelly, Michael Post

### **ABSENT:**

Joe Haslett

### **ADDITIONAL PARTICIPANTS:**

- Lynn Carlisle – Cuyama Valley Family Resource Center
- John Coats – Cuyama Community Services District
- Ruth Docert – Local Resident
- Cathy Martin – SLO
- Paul Chounet – GSA Member
- John Ayres - Woodard & Curran
- Lyndel Melton - Woodard & Curran
- Rob Morrow– Woodard & Curran
- Lauren Salberg – Woodard & Curran

### **ACTION ITEMS:**

- Stakeholders to email additional questions/comments to Cathy Martin **by 5 pm today (10/16/2017)**
- Consultants to provide red-line draft of scopes
- Jim Beck to discuss identified policy items with the Ad Hoc Committee including:
  - How to include shallower well users/diminutive users?
  - How much access to provide the public for the database?
  - Should we release draft to the public for review prior to submittal?
  - Can the GSA enforce groundwater monitoring (for private wells)? What is their legal responsibility?

#### *Global Edits to Scopes:*

- Basin name = Cuyama Basin GSA (CBGSA)
- Add outreach activities to subtasks and update budget

### **Edits to Category 2 Scope**

#### **Task 1. Initiate Work Plan and Detail Stakeholder Engagement Strategy**

- Add Cuyama Valley Community Association and GSA Advisory Committee as stakeholders

- Add statement requiring “a minimum of monthly or bi-monthly advisory committee meetings” for:
  - Technical review of GSP progress
  - Add transparency to the process
- Add emphasis on outreach to DACs and bilingual education documents
- Add note to “consider monitoring network data availability”
- Include discussion of the schedule in the first task (‘develop schedule’)
- Add description about a public review/transparent process to be achieved through outreach
- Add to bullet list:
  - Data review and evaluation
  - Public access to data

### **Task 2. Data Management System, Info Gathering, Data Collection & Analysis**

- Fix incomplete sentence on pg. 2, paragraph 2
- Define QC
- Define SB4
- Include statement, “At a minimum, here are the types of data being received in a public/transparent process where all parties interested can provide input”
- Include statement that the advisory committee will provide technical review of the scope (establish their role)
- Add text about differing levels of information (i.e. west basin is under extensive study by USGS and other portions of the basin have less readily available data)

### **Task 3. Description of the Plan Area, Hydro Conceptual Model, and Groundwater Conditions**

- Change “plan area” to “existing B118 boundary for CBGSA” to clarify how boundary is defined
- Add statement about using the most recently available data, including 2015

### **Task 4. Basin Model and Water Budget**

- Describe why basin boundary will not be expanded under this task
- Clarify use of well logs
- 4.2 - Add ecological and environmental water uses to list
- 4.2 - Change language about 2015 data to “the most recently available data, including 2015”
- 4.2 - Add “frost protection practices” to crop acreage use

### **Task 7. Projects and Actions for Sustainability Goals**

- Add to Section 7.2, last line “will include but is not limited to” (to make it less specific)

### **Task 8. GSP Implementation**

- Add DACs and restricted lands//reserved (federal) lands as parties “affected by undesirable results”

### **Task 10. Outreach & Communication**

- Add “state and federal agencies” to bullet under 10.1
- Define this section as: education, outreach, and soliciting input as components of outreach

- Add SGMA education efforts
- Add budget for these outreach activities
- Add note that “strategy will incorporate language barriers and translation requirements”

#### **Task 11. Project Management**

- Increase budget by \$300k
- Increase budget and level of effort for community outreach

#### **Edits to Category 1 Scope:**

##### **Task 1: Water Supply Feasibility Study**

- Add note that “this is not an all-inclusive list”

##### **Task 2: GW Monitoring Network Expansion**

- Add sentence under 2.3 that updating information from well owners is voluntary
- Clarify that no new wells will be drilled

##### **Task 3: SW Monitoring Program**

- Add task of installing new gages
- Develop rating curve for installed equipment
- Update budget to reflect installing gages

#### **MEETING NOTES:**

##### **Item 1 - Receive Update from the Consultant: (presented by John)**

<< John and Lyndel give a high-level summary of the Category 1 and Category 2 scopes >>

#### **Comments on Category 2 Scope – GSP Development Workplan**

- **Item 1. Initiate Work Plan and Detail Stakeholder Engagement Strategy**
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph – where it lays out stakeholder interests --> add CVCA as a stakeholder (local Cuyama Valley Community Association)
  - Make sure the GSA Advisory Committee is listed
  - Lynn – Concerned that there are expectations that must be fulfilled – can we include a “minimum of” – so that DWR holds us to something?
    - Lyndel – Yes, we’ll add statement of “a minimum of monthly or bi-monthly meetings”
  - Robbie– Curious about statement “and the need for strong but transparent facilitation” --> what does “strong” mean in this context?
    - Lyndel – you need to have a facilitation process that moves you towards a decision since there is a definitive timeline. Don’t want facilitation to wander around. Need to listen and respond to items that arise; don’t want to continually be making a decision. Need a strong, definitive answer in order to complete by deadline.
    - Mike – likes “strong management” – please keep as is
  - Jim – As part of this outreach effort and the development of the project schedule, is this a later part of the scope? Include the schedule in the first task so stakeholders know what the deadlines are
    - John –We will add something that outlines the schedule.
- **Item 2. Data Management System, Info Gathering, Data Collection & Analysis**

- Pg. 2, paragraph 2, second sentence - fix incomplete sentence.
- What is QC? Define.
- What is SB4? Define
- **Item 2.1 Develop DMS**
  - Lynn – 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, second line. Will there be public access to this database? If so, how?
    - John – this is a decision to be made by the GSA and advisory committee, not the consultant. Written vague enough so the GSA can decide if this is public in the future?
    - Robbie – Should the advisory committee make a decision now then?
    - Jim Beck – Report from the advisory committee, normal part of the board business. Compile these items and present them to the advisory committee
    - Robbie– incorporate regular advisory committee meeting items is a good idea. But still wondering if we should be making these big decisions now to guide the document?
    - Jim Beck – I’m capturing these items as notes. I talked to Derrick and he wants to specifically review this document, he knows W&C will need to make edits prior to Wednesday’s meetings --> break into policy (for the board to make) vs. technical decisions (W&C to make). I will divide comments into policy and technical decisions, so the board can review the policy decisions and make a decision on this during next meeting
  - Robbie – Are we setting up long term monitoring? Is data used to determine base line data?
    - John – This is the data collection task that covers collection and use and establishment of a monitoring network. Will be used to describe the existing conditions. This is a catch all for data so we can use it throughout the plan
  - Robbie – who decides how data will be used? Who is deciding what past data will be used?
    - Lyndel – any and all data will be used. We don’t want to judge data prior to entering information, but do want to make sure there is some QC//be able to validate the data. Once validation is underway, the consultant would have an analysis of the data available and present the data they found, which data is reliable, and what we would like to pursue adding.
    - Lynn – The validation was called into question by different people at different times. Can we add to the scope that the validation process will be done in a public way? Perhaps under the QC/interpretation area?
    - Lyndel – Sounds like you would like a public/open forum where there could be input received, in an open transparent process.
    - Lyndel - We will include a statement in Outreach and Coordination that “At a minimum, here are the types of data being received in a public/transparent process where all parties interested can provide input”

- Jim Beck – this document is to get DWR funds to implement the GSP. Advisory Committee – once we actually get money to implement and design the GSP, I would expect there would be regular advisory committee meetings to review progress made (i.e. assessment of the data validation) --> then the advisory committee can review outstanding items and provide feedback to the consultant. Please add an item that the advisory committee will provide technical review of the scope to establish their role.
- Lynne – since some of these things are so specific (i.e. collect data), it would be helpful to clarify where things should be done transparently. Wouldn't hinder process and would strengthen application.
  - Brenton – Agreed. Jim was advocating including transparency so that stakeholders are brought into each task item to review as an action item for each task
- **Item 3. Description of the Plan Area, Hydro Conceptual Model, and Groundwater Conditions**
  - Brenton - This is a fairly developed use of data. Is it presumed that these tasks can be performed with existing data?
    - John A. – Things listed in this section are what they want us to develop. When we put this section together, we didn't evaluate what data it/is available. This is what is required for us to do. If we can't do these things, have to identify these as a data gap and identify how we would get the data in the future to achieve these things. We would write down what we don't have, how we would obtain that data
  - **3.1 Description of Plan Area**
    - Lynn - Change "plan area" to "existing B118 boundary for CBGSA" to make it more clear how the boundary is defined.
    - Lynn – the basin is officially called the Cuyama Basin GSA (CBGSA), scopes must be updated
    - Robbie – western part of basin not included in the USGS study. I'd like to see some clarification that not all data --
      - John A. – to clarify, the hydrogeologic is NOT the numeric model, this is a set of words that describes the description of existing conditions. Item 4 is the physical model
      - Robbie – Need to look at and rectify data. SB is starting to collect data to the west and USGS too; need to figure out how all data will be incorporated and that all different regions in the data need to be clarified
        - John A. – We will clarify this in Section 2.2 by adding a sentence on how a portion of the basin is under extensive study by USGS and other portions of the basin have less readily available data
  - **3.2 Develop Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model**
    - Lynne – Is this sentence a SGMA requirement?

- Cathy & Brenton – Yes. Read as “up to and including 2015”
- **3.3 Groundwater Conditions**
  - Brenton – “prepared using existing data from CUVHM” does this exist?
    - John A. – yes. We talk about using this model from USGS (ModFlow model). We are looking at a model that has its own data and we need to evaluate this model (in item 4)
    - Robbie – so this model is a USGS model. In that case the western portion of the model is not included in the model – how do we clarify this??
      - Cathy – Robbie this is a data gap that will be identified later in the task and will be developed. This is addressed in the scope.

<< John asks for editorial comments to be put in writing and sent to us so we can finish going through the documents >>

- **Item 4. Basin Model and Water Budget**

- **4.1 Assessment of Existing Model**

- Robbie – I get that 2015 is required by SGMA. Is this the baseline then? Because there have been some significant changes in land use since 2015
  - John A. – yes we are required to use 2015 data but if we can get more recent data we will absolutely use this
  - Mike – I want to reiterate her point. Since the existence of this process has been known, there have been accelerated developments with high water use in the past 9 months which will have significant impact on water use on years after 2015. How do we ensure this is included and doesn't alter our baseline? 6k acres of vineyards have just come online in previously un-irrigated lands
  - Brenton – Yes, we need to set a historical baseline.
  - John A. – Let's change language about 2015 data **“The most recently available data, including 2015”**
  - Mike – I think you will need to do some modeling for vineyard uses for 2017 – 2020 prior to GSP. This needs to be reviewed in a different way since it's unique
    - John – this will be included in “updating the modeling” --> however we are NOT re-doing the model to expand the basin boundaries. If the vineyards aren't in the model boundary it won't be included
    - Lyndel – but it will affect the basin water budget and addressed through this. These conditions will be represented. There are 2 concerns here: 1. What's in the model? 2. What's the baseline to evaluate the model? These are related but separate use; we want to make sure the data in the model is the most up to date. For basin conditions we will work with stakeholders to identify the

- correct baseline to capture the snapshot of water use at the appropriate
      - Lynn – Please add this discussion to scope text.
    - 1<sup>st</sup> bullet on pg. 5 --> well logs were not comprehensive and might not be useful
      - Lyndel – we’re looking at the well logs to see if the model is comprehensive. Just trying to gather data – clarify this statement.
    - 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet about crop acreage --> Include “frost protection practices”
  - **4.2 Update CUVHM Model**
    - Mike– the list of types of usage to be used in the mode don’t include ecological. I represent the ecological reserve (far west of the basin). Include those (ecological and environmental water uses) in your list.
    - Mike – Why can’t the whole basin be added as part of the updated?
      - John A. & Lyndel – another coworker did this for DWR and found that it would require a complete overhaul of the entire model. Why can’t we just expand the model basin? This is a huge task and you would also lose the data put into the model. We don’t have the time or the money to make this a cost/time effective task
      - Mike – ok. I think what you just said is an important point to add to the scope. Clarify in the scope *why* we are not updating/expanding the model to fill the basin boundaries
  - **4.3 Historical and Current Water Budget**
    - Louise – by excluding the western end of the basin and considering the drawdown caused by these new developments, how does this affect the water budget and will it make it invalid?
      - John A. – no. there will be two water budgets (1. Within the model, 2. Outside of the model). We will be using DWR’s water budget to calculate water use outside of the model boundary.
      - Lyndel – this is part of the update the water budget
    - Robbie – wait so there are 2 separate water budgets?
      - Lyndel – no, we are using 2 strategies (inside and outside model boundaries) to come to 1 concise budget
- **Item 5. Establish Basin Sustainability Criteria**
  - **5.2 Establish Undesirable Results**
    - Brenton - Undesirable results aren’t already decided by the state?
      - John A. – No, these are vague and left to be defined by people in the area “local control”
    - How quantitative are the undesirable results for the SOW? Is there a threshold? Or is it just a description right now? How in-depth are these parameters
      - John A. – this is subtask 5.4. We describe what we don’t want to happen (just a narrative), establish a monitoring system, then add thresholds that monitor where an undesirable result may occur.

This is very numerical. All of the thresholds identified in 5.3 & 5.4 are very quantitative

- **5.6 Develop Interim Milestone**
  - Robbie - With the different sustainability thresholds and establishing criteria – I’m assuming these all interact. Is there an integrative way to see how these all interact? I.e. how does subsidence interact with GW levels
    - John A. – Yes, we have to explain why we selected these thresholds are set and how they interact with one another and how they represent reality
    - Lyndel – a great ex. Is gw levels and gw storage
    - Robbie – so ultimately there will be an integrative way to measure these thresholds?
    - John & Lyndel – Yes
  - Robbie – But also how do you ensure one threshold can’t impact another area’s sustainability?
    - Lynn - TOP of Page 12. “draft of GSP document” – would this have different sustainable thresholds for different management areas?
    - John – if you decide to have different management areas, then yes. The GSA board and advisory committees will decide the management areas. Could also be based on a technical management area (i.e. an aquitard)
    - Brenton – yes the Cuyama looks like a series of cascading basin with flows next to one another
    - Brenton – I understand objectives and goals. What is margins of operational flexibility?
      - John – Space between min. threshold and
      - Brenton - And then interim milestone ties it to a time frame?
      - John - yes
- **Item 6. Monitoring Networks**
  - Lynne – will there be transparency of the monitoring networks? i.e. can public determine monitoring area
    - Cathy – This is up to the ad hoc committee to decide.
    - Mike – I don’t want to specify that we have to publish, notice, and disclose all data that we are using. Way too cumbersome.
    - Brenton – right, presumably this DMS will have a transparency where the public can view it. How do we establish monitoring and how do we make it clear how data is being monitored?
    - John – Yes, we will add something to outreach – “we will consider monitoring network data availability” (something to ensure that this process is transparent to the public)
- **Item 7. Projects and Actions for Sustainability Goals**
  - Brenton - Bullet points under task 7 seem to be a bit broader. Should we flesh this out more//or broaden it more? Where are these ideas specifically coming



from? There are a number of things that have been discussed. How broad of a net is this?

- Lyndel – this is a representative list. Stakeholders - Please email Cathy Martin at SLO a list of ideas if you would like them to be included in here as a potential (today!)
- Mike – add to Section 7.2, last line “will include but is not limited to” (to make it less specific)
- **Item 8. GSP Implementation**
  - Lynn - 8.2, second paragraph – the grant is requesting funds to help develop a budget?
    - John – Yes. Part of the plan is the cost to implement the plan. This grant helps us figure out the budget for the plan
  - Cathy Martin – like a feasibility study? Cost analysis?
    - John – Not really since we aren’t deciding not to do it. Really just a cost study --> we will do this, and it will cost this much. This is a requirement
    - Lyndel – this is why we included the economics in the plan so that there is context on how extremely expensive water could impact local economies, etc.
  - Lynn – In 8.3, states “Parties affected by undesirable results” – there are 3 DACs in the basin. Is this section addressing these disadvantaged communities? If not, then where?
    - John A. – Yes, I believe DACs should be included here. Add DACs “as parties affected by undesirable results”
    - Also add restricted lands//reserved lands as parties affected by undesirable results
- **Item 10. Outreach & Communication**
  - Lyndel - Under meetings, add “state and federal agencies” to bullet under 10.1
  - Robbie – I want to call this “Education and Outreach.” Please include “education” somewhere in here (see Lyndel’s definition below)
    - Cathy – I agree with using the word “education”
    - Brenton – yes, education is KEY
    - Lyndel – there are 3 things here: education, outreach, and soliciting input --> these are all effective components of outreach
  - Lyndel – we would like to talk through strategy of maybe asking for more money than you think you might need
  - Brenton – Shallow well land users, diminutive users – is there any component that addresses them? Not covered by water basin or governed by SGMA since under 2 AF of water. Should outreach target them also?
    - Cathy – I think this would go through the committee or Ad Hoc. Then reach out via flyers. This is part of stakeholder engagement process.
    - Lyndel – We would define this under the outreach strategy in Task 1 and then here they would actually be pulled in/talked to, etc.
- **Item 11. Project Management**
  - Lynn – Will we have to write another grant to write the GSP?

- John – this is the only grant available for preparing the plan. May be future grants available to help implement the plan, but this is the only for actually GSP implement
- Cathy – I agree with what John said. I haven't heard of something else
- Lyndel – We have proposed \$800k for this grant. If you want to apply for more (i.e. \$1.2M) you could receive more for a buffer/additional activities
- Lynne - What is the cost share for this?
  - John – I'm expecting 0 cost share. If over 50% of your basin is EDA/DAC you have a 0 cost share
- Jim B. – is it appropriate to identify this as contingency? How to handle identifying how to spend that extra \$300k
  - John – best way to incorporate this is to add subtasks to the tasks we have as "optional tasks" – additional items that aren't critical path but we can add extra flexibility
  - Lyndel – Jim I'm concerned about adding this as contingency, think it's better to have specific tasks. OR could just add 30% to each task
  - Brenton – Add "outreach" to almost every task and add a budget for all those efforts – "Strategy will incorporate language barriers and translation requirements"
  - Lyndel – yes, some other GSAs have enormous outreach budgets. We could easily increase the LOE to outreach and increase the budget
  - Brenton – yeah, definitely all for increasing outreach budget
  - Lynne – you may need to do a lot of translating which could also increase budget for these efforts in the DACs and SDACs
- Lynne – if we're getting a zero cost share b/c of our DACs won't the state be looking for greater impact to DACs than what is shown in this draft?
  - Lyndel – We will add more local notes/flavor on reaching out and contacting DACs. We can add a greater emphasis to in Task 1 to outreach SDACs and DACs

<< Everyone agrees to walk through Cat. 1 and extend meeting, Mike is calling in >>

### **Comments on Category 1 Scope:**

#### **Task 1: Water Supply Feasibility Study**

- Lyndel – In 1.2 we will add the note that "this is not an all-inclusive list"

#### **Task 2: GW Monitoring Network Expansion**

- Louis – 2.3 - are there any enforcement for that? Under 2.3 where you are updating information from well owners – is there any enforcement? Or is this voluntary?
  - John – Yes this is entirely voluntary -- add a sentence that this is voluntary
- Louis – SB county is monitoring wells on the west end, will we be able to overlap with them?
  - John & Lyndel – Yes. We would pick up these wells with existing monitoring
- Cathy – in 2.4, why do we clarify that we are not drilling new wells?
  - John – not included because it's not specified (omission is assumed absence of task). We will add a sentence about this.

### **Task 3: SW Monitoring Program**

- John – Add install gages
- Cathy – Please add an item about establishing a rating curve for the equipment once it's installed
  - Lyndel – Yes, you need an initial rating curve that translates depth to flow, this will need to be regularly updated depending on installation and how the stream channel changes.
- John Cook - Does this target DACs in a specific way?
  - Lyndel - The application has to tie back to the DACs to show we are demonstrating benefits, but other benefits in other areas can be shown too
- John Cook - Do you need any specific details//information from us to include?
  - Lyndel - Address what you find useful directly in the work plan, but then a letter of support for the entire work plan suffices
- Robbie – it would be good to add more details about transparency and education to this scope as well (clarify within the stakeholder/outreach task)

### **Budget**

- Brenton - is stakeholder/outreach task in the budget?
  - John – made the assumption would be done by the project management criteria
- Robbie - Also, SB has started to monitor wells but they are unable to release information about it. They only give them data specific to their wells but not others. Is this a problem we might run up against?
  - John – if we're using it for SGMA compliance then at a minimum it's public data. Any data we use in the plan is public, just an accessibility problem. Ties back to how we deal with accessibility in Cat. 2
- Cathy - Cat. 1 budget draft total --> is this in addition to funds from Cat. 2?
  - John – Yes, and at 0 local cost share
  - Lyndel – Budget will increase due to adding in SW metering stations (add to budget)
  - John – also increase due to education & DAC focused outreach (add to budget)
- Cathy - Could we add a task about website maintenance or something to include that all info will be bilingual?
  - John – yes, we will add info about everything being bilingual
- Louis – who pays for maintenance once this is all established?
  - Lyndel – the GSA and/or will be identified in the final GSP

### **Schedule**

- Brenton - Does Ad Hoc get to see a red-lined version?
  - Cathy – red-line version would be preferred
  - John – Noted. We will provide a red-line version on the next draft to view changes made
- Cathy – what is the schedule for getting this out? Will this committee get to review again?
  - John – I don't know if another review cycle will be ready....
  - Lyndel – we will have this done by mid-next week and reviewing and revising the week of the 30<sup>th</sup>. We can't send out to the committee members.

- Cathy – we meet again on Nov. 1<sup>st</sup> --> can we provide input on Nov. 1<sup>st</sup>? Ad Hoc Committee will decide Wednesday.
- Brenton – will the board have time to review this for approval?
- Cathy – it possibly could be posted to the SB website....Ad Hoc has to decide.
  - Jim - I don't know the specific action taken...need to get clarity from board meeting to give the Ad Hoc Committee approval
- Jim - Add to notes for Ad Hoc Committee --> questions to add to the board questions
  - 1. Should we release for the public to review prior to submittal (after Ad Hoc Review)?
  - 2. Public access to database – for existing and future monitoring.....what should be allowed? How much access?
  - 3. Can the GSA enforce monitoring? What is their legal responsibility?