

FOX CANYON GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AGENCY

A STATE OF CALIFORNIA WATER AGENCY



BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Lynn E. Maulhardt, *Chair, Director, United Water Conservation District*
David Borchard, *Farmer, Agricultural Representative*
Charlotte Craven, *Vice Chair, Councilperson, City of Camarillo*
John K. Flynn, *Supervisor, County of Ventura*
Dr. Michael Kelley, *Director, Zone Mutual Water Company*

EXECUTIVE OFFICER
Jeff Pratt, P.E.

Minutes from December 6, 2007 SAG Meeting

A meeting of the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency (FCGMA) **Strategic Advisory Group Meeting** was held at 2:30 P.M. on Thursday, December 6, 2007 in the Multi-Purpose Room, at the Ventura County Government Center, Hall of Administration, Main Plaza Level at 800 South Victoria Avenue, Ventura, California.

- A. **Call to Order** – SAG Chairman Gerhardt Hubner called the meeting to order at approximately 2:30 PM.
- B. **Introductions** – No introductions were made, as the group noted it was familiar with each other. 14 attendees present.
- C. **Public Comment** - None.
- D. **Attending Board Member Comments** – None. Board Member Borchard & Alternate Director McIntyre were in attendance.

FCGMA STRATEGIC ADVISORY GROUP (SAG) MEETING AGENDA

December 6th, 2007

2 pm – 4 pm

- E. **Approval of Minutes from** October 4, 2007 Strategy Advisory Group (SAG) Meeting (Gerhardt Hubner) - As recommended this item was deferred to the January SAG meeting.
- F. **Report from Technical Advisory Group** – Dr. Steve Bachman TAG Vice Chair, reported on the September 6, 2007 TAG meeting He also mentioned the TAG was refining a matrix to more clearly define the steps and sorting needed for each mgmt. strategy. **He also clarified that the effort being performed by TAG was not intended to replace the SAG analysis; it was intended to help the TAG prioritize which strategies to evaluate first. The discussion at the TAG meetings indicated that the members believed it was important to have a prioritization scheme so that their effort could be applied towards projects with the greatest benefits and/or shortest implementation time frame first.**
- G. **Discussion of Scheduled 5% Reduction of Historical Allocation of Groundwater Extraction in Accordance with FCGMA Ordinance No. 8.1 (Sec. 5.4)** – Mr. Hubner introduced the item by first acknowledging FCGMA staff, and thanking them for their efforts. Mr. Hubner stated the reason this particular GMS being discussed today was twofold. First, Ordinance No. 8.1 required it, and the most recent scheduled 5% reduction was postponed in 2005 pending the completion of the updated FCGMA Management Plan. Second, an Agency Board member had requested that the 5% Reduction at a recent Agency Board meeting that it be considered. Chris Laber, Agency Staff Geologist, then provided the group a technical presentation with compiled data from the Agency's database on the value of the proposed 5% reduction in Historical Allocation. The

presentation was divided into four components: 1) Examination of the Value of the Reduction (in terms of acre-feet of extraction that could be saved), 2) Examination of the Aquifer Impacts based on the value of the reduction, 3) Examination of the Potential Impacts to M&I, and 4) the Role of Irrigation Efficiency. Mr. Laber concluded his presentation with the following summary points: 1) Aquifer protection is driving factor in proposed 5% reduction of historical allocation, 2) the Ordinance requires action, 3) the range of savings is 2,000-8,000 AFY, 4) The data supports and shows a significant benefit by the reduction, 5) there is a range of impact to various M&I users, and 6) some agricultural users currently extract greater than their historical allocation by filing irrigation efficiency. Although there has been anecdotal evidence and discussion that reduction in historical allocation will lead to increasingly greater extraction based on Irrigation Efficiency, the analysis of historical data suggests that this has not the case when all Agricultural users are considered as a group. In general, the amount of extraction based on irrigation efficiency has been reasonably consistent from year to year and has not increased with the decrease in historical allocation. Mr. Laber also offered to the group the following questions: Can you do the 5% reduction and how so? Are there combined strategies? Are there conditional strategies? Are there other incentives that could be offered to decrease extraction yet meet the needs of the stakeholders?

With those closing remarks, Mr. Hubner opened the discussion for questions and comments. Comments included:

- Moratorium on further reductions
- Alternative Methods or Projects should be proposed in lieu of reduction, that provide an equivalent quantifiable volume of water
- Cost-Benefit Analysis for all GMS should be finished first
- Reduction will be very difficult for small water districts
- Reduction may be met with more time
- Reduction has already been factored into long range water planning

Action Items:

- Provide copy of material from September SAG meeting to Camarillo
- Individual or agencies consider alternative methods or project
- Group fill out and submit GMS template (approved by Agency Board) for submission of Alternative Methods or Projects. Chris Labor would distribute to the group the templates for those that didn't have them already.

Board member Borchard provided his perspective to the group, and described the need for the proposed 5% reduction in historical allocation, including showing progress to the State and others in dealing with the Agency's overdrafted aquifers. No consensus was reached by the Group for moving forth on item at this time. Chair Hubner thanked the group for their comments and participation.

H. Next Strategic Advisory Group Meeting Agenda – Set for January 24, 2007

I. Adjourn Strategic Advisory Group Meeting – At approximately 4 pm.