

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 **Monday, August 1, 2022, at 2:00 p.m.** in the Multipurpose Room at the Ventura County Government Center, Hall of Administration, 800 South Victoria Avenue, Ventura California.

Members: Chair Carmen Ramirez
Vice Chair Lynn Maulhardt

A. Call to Order / Introductions

Chair Ramirez called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m.

B. Introductions:

In attendance were: (1) Carmen Ramirez, FCGMA Operations Committee Chair; (2) Lynn Maulhardt, 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) Maryam Bral, UWCD; (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) Lisa Marie Ruiz, Student Intern.

C. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

C. Approval of Minutes – May 2, 2022

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

E. Water Supply and Infrastructure Projects

Kim Loeb introduced the item and went through a recap of what was discussed at the May 2, 2022, Operations Committee meeting. He then presented a list of previous criteria for project prioritization for consideration.

Vice Chair Maulhardt stated that he appreciated the work that staff had done thus far, and that the Agency was moving in the right direction. He also said that the lessons learned from the current project selection process should be applied to future processes. He said that it was important to

review what the goal is and he said that the Agency should create a mission statement. He also stated that he thinks that project selection should be a two-step process. First step, a high-level pitch of the project idea to staff to see if it is worth looking into further. The second step, scoring it with the criteria established.

Mr. Mathews asked how often projects would have to be brought before the committee. Vice Chair Maulhardt stated that a project would only have to be brought before the committee if they were looking for funding from the Agency.

Mr. Mathews stated that it seems like replenishment fees are going to be established and he wants to make sure that outside agencies have equal footing and the same review criteria when coming to the Agency for funding consideration.

Mr. Bouchard stated that there needs to be a large part of stakeholder input in the replenishment fee use and who decides which projects are worth funding. He also suggested coordinating with the Integrated Regional Water Group when it comes to finding grants.

Mr. Loeb stated that there has been and will continue to be a large amount of stakeholder input. He also said that funding could come from surcharges collected for over-pumping and that would be up to the Board's discretion.

Mr. Lindquist asked if this review process would be for new projects or for projects that were already added to the GSP Annual Report.

Mr. Loeb said that the projects that were added into the GSP were not fully reviewed and evaluated and that the whole suite of projects will be reviewed to be eligible for grant funding.

Ms. Klima stated that there might be two projects that are side-by-side that can't both be accomplished where one may be more beneficial, the other less expensive, so there may be preference for one even without funding. She said that if the commitment for inclusion into the GSP is loose, then we should encourage the more projects the better. She also suggested to include projects that could be done within the next decade, not only shovel-ready projects.

Vice Chair Maulhardt stated that there should be a 5-10 year rolling lookout at what can be accomplished in five years, ten years, and further into the future. He listed the mission of the Agency along with elements that need to be included in the process. The elements include to do no harm, to have a reasonable projected timeline, go with projects that impact early while others are being developed, there are multiple forms of funding and each has its own form of problems and that each applicant needs to be treated fairly.

Ms. Klima stated that funding is not infinite, so she suggested doing projects that are most efficient.

Vice Chair Maulhardt said that projects that come forward with no funding mechanism from the submitting agency might not get done if it wipes out all Agency funding.

Mr. Marcinko stated that there needs to be a process that everyone follows. He said that smaller entities need a resource where they can go to get assistance. He also said there needs to be a third-party scoring team that has no bias.

Mr. Mathews stated that he thinks there should be a broad-based stakeholder committee because some areas could benefit more than others.

Mr. Jurgen Gramckow stated that there needs to be some sort of measure of equity. He said that there needs to be a fundamental principle that things must be done equally as everyone will be paying replenishment fees.

Mr. Canger stated that different sources of money could be subject to different restrictions.

The committee discussed the need for things to be equal amongst stakeholders.

Dr. Bral stated the three criteria she believes should be considered for any project that is coming up for immediate implementation. The three criteria include projects that must have a feasibility study, requires funding from other sources and is multi-beneficial and multi-agency.

Ms. Klima said that she agreed with Dr. Bral's recommended criteria, apart from the funding as it would be difficult for disadvantaged communities to rely on other funding sources.

Dr. Bral stated that projects to served disadvantaged communities should be supported.

Vice Chair Maulhardt stated that he thought the discussion was great and asked what the next steps are. He said that the battle is not about the money, it is about the control, the process, and how it is doled out equally.

The next committee meeting was scheduled for Monday, August 29, 2022.

E. Adjourn Operations Committee Special Meeting

Chair Ramirez adjourned the Operations Committee meeting at 3:34 p.m.