

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*
Lynn Maulhardt, *Director, United Water Conservation District*
Bert Perello, *Councilperson, City of Oxnard*
Carmen Ramirez, *Supervisor, County of Ventura*

EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Jeff Pratt, P.E.

MINUTES

Minutes of the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency's (FCGMA) Operations Committee Special meeting held **Thursday, October 6, 2022, at 1:30 p.m.** in the Pacific Conference Room at the Ventura County Government Center, Hall of Justice, 800 South Victoria Avenue, Ventura California.

Members: Chair Lynn Maulhardt
Vice Chair Kelly Long

A. Call to Order / Introductions

Chair Maulhardt called the meeting to order at 1:34 p.m.

B. Introductions:

In attendance were: (1) Lynn Maulhardt, FCGMA Operations Committee Chair; (2) Kelly Long, FCGMA Operations Committee Vice Chair; (3) Arne Anselm, WPD, Deputy Director; (4) Kim Loeb, FCGMA, Groundwater Manager; (5) Keely Royas, FCGMA Clerk of the Board; (6) Jason Canger, Assistant County Counsel; (7) Shiri Klima, City of Oxnard; (8) Joseph Marcinko, City of Oxnard; (9) John Lindquist, United Water Conservation District (UWCD); (10) Steve Nash, Self; (11) Jurgen Gramckow, Southland Sod; (12) Martin Gramckow, Southland Sod; (13) Jared Bouchard, Pleasant Valley County Water District (PVCWD); (14) John Mathews, PVCWD Counsel; (15) Maureen McGuire, VC Farm Bureau; (16) Jodi Switzer, VC Farm Bureau; (17) Terry Foreman, Camrosa Water District (Camrosa); (18) Ian Pritchard, Camrosa; (19) Sam Collie, OPV Coalition.

C. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

D. Approval of Minutes – August 1, 2022

Vice Chair Long voted to approve the minutes. Chair Maulhardt seconded the motion, and the motion was approved.

E. Water Supply and Infrastructure Projects

Kim Loeb introduced the item and went through a summary of what was discussed at the May 2, 2022, and August 1, 2022, Operations Committee meetings. He said that the goal is to have objective criteria to evaluate all projects submitted. He then presented a draft of project ranking criteria.

Mr. Loeb stated that the Department of Water Resources (DWR) just announced that they are opening round 2 of the Sustainable Groundwater Management (SGM) Implementation Grant. He said that this round will be more competitive and there will need to be very good projects.

Vice Chair Long asked what operations the money from the DWR Round 2 Grant could be used for, plan development or physical projects.

Mr. Loeb said that the money will be going toward physical projects, but possible first steps for projects such as feasibility studies or engineering studies.

Chair Maulhardt stated that the overall goal is to have a process and that it be fair and equitably logical. He said that he wants everyone to question if the draft project ranking criteria in and of itself is sufficient or if there needs to be more in-depth sub-questions.

Director Long asked if a currently approved project was run through the draft criteria as it was being created.

Mr. Loeb said that it would be a good next step to do.

Chair Maulhardt and Vice Chair Long agreed that they do not want to take too long to get to a usable form that could be modified in the future if needed. He asked for input from the attendees if any topics are redundant, not needed, or items to add.

Jurgen Gramckow asked if the scoring criteria is applicable if not seeking funding.

Mr. Loeb said that it is applicable if there is a project being implemented by another agency that is fully funded, whether it should be relied upon in the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) to achieve the sustainable yield target.

Ms. Klima stated that there could be scenarios where the Agency should be concerned if two projects are impacted by each other if one is funded by the grant and one is not. She also said that she would suggest weighting topics differently. She said that Topic 7, Water Cost, should be worth more points as the region is cost sensitive.

Mr. Bouchard stated that he understands the urgency, but it should be compartmentalized into grant funded projects and replenishment fee projects. He said that there might be a different set of criteria for replenishment fee projects.

Chair Maulhardt suggested changing the title of the document to "GMA Grant Funding Project Ranking Criteria".

Martin Gramckow stated that the three main criteria that the Board should be looking at are cost, benefit, and time.

Chair Maulhardt said the other criteria is feasibility. He said that these could be the four lead categories that would be the first step in organizing these items.

Mr. Loeb stated that we know what the grant criteria is from the DWR and staff's idea was to rank projects on a master list and as grant funding becomes available there is a list with the next projects ready to go.

Mr. Lindquist stated that Items 7 and 18 seem a lot alike. He also stated that he was curious about Item 11 O&M Funding. He said that he really likes Item 14. He stated that a lot of these items aren't relevant to projects that are feasibility studies.

Mr. Loeb said that it might be better to create a different category for feasibility studies.

Chair Maulhardt said that if we add subcategories, we could possibly move some of the topics into those subcategories under a lesser amount of lead categories.

Vice Chair Long said that the State just updated their criteria.

Chair Maulhardt stated that we need to look at the State's revised criteria and figure out how we can make our criteria to help feed the States.

Mr. Mathews asked what triggers the project to come to the GMA. He also asked who would do the ranking.

Chair Maulhardt stated that projects should come to the Agency if they need funding and they will go through the criteria. He also said that projects that are not requesting funding should also be evaluated by the Agency to ensure it will not be harmful to the aquifer or other projects.

Vice Chair Long suggested that the weighing of the projects involve stakeholder input. She said that she also likes the idea of having an ad-hoc committee help rank these.

Mr. Loeb asked that if anyone has suggestions about the scoring criteria that those be emailed to him over the next week so he can synthesize them.

Vice Chair Long suggested that items 3, 7, and 9 be weighted higher.

Chair Maulhardt stated that item 6 should be considered higher also.

The next Operations Committee meeting is November 7, 2022.

E. Adjourn Operations Committee Special Meeting

Chair Maulhardt adjourned the Operations Committee meeting at 3:23 p.m.