INDIAN WELLS VALLEY
GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES

Indian Wells Valley Water District
500 W Ridgecrest Blvd, Ridgecrest, CA 93555
Wednesday, January 4, 2018, 1:00 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order by TAC Chair Bingham at 1:11 p.m.

Roll Call TAC:
6 Present – Earl Wilson, Eastern Kern County Resource Conservation District
Don Decker, Domestic Well Owners
Scott O'Neil, Small Agriculture
Eddy Teasdale, Large Agriculture Meadowbrooke
Adam Bingham, Wholesaler and Industrial User
Wade Wilson, Large Agriculture Mojave Pistachios
1 Absent - Michael Powell, Rand Community Water District

Non-Voting Members
2 Present – Stephan Bork, Navy
Tim Parker, Indian Wells Valley Water District (IWVWD)
1 Absent – Michelle Anderson, Kern County Water Agency (KCWA)

Stetson Engineers Inc. (Stetson) representatives present – Jean Moran
Stetson representatives participated by phone – Steve Johnson the Water Resources Manager (WRM), Steve Reich, Jeff Helsley, and Miles McCammon
21 members of the public present

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS
Judie Decker informed the TAC that Michael Powell may be absent for some time.

3. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES
a. December 6th TAC meeting

Motion by Mr. O'Neil and second by Mr. Teasdale to accept the minutes
Passed – 6 Ayes
Decker, Teasdale, Major, Wilson, Bingham, O'Neil
No – None, Absent – Powell

4. ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES
a. TAC – Ethics Training and form 700 Documents reminder to be submitted
Chair Bingham reminded TAC members to complete ethics training and form 700s. Chair Bingham requested that TAC members update him on what they have completed.
Public Comments

Ms. Decker expressed concern regarding completing form 700 as it is now a new year and suggested making sure that the TAC members do not have to fill out a new one.

5. WATER RESOURCES MANAGER (WRM) REPORT OF TAC PRIORITY PROJECTS/TASKS

Ms. Moran introduced members of Stetson who participated by phone who gave updates and input on the following items.

a. Data Management System (DMS) – Database Development Status and Discussion

Mr. Reich and Mr. McCammon gave an update on the DMS following the 28 comments they received from TAC members. Mr. Reich summed up the comments into three categories: database filling, feature selection tools and search tools, and button to access the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) and its requirements. Mr. Reich clarified that comments that fell into the first category were more related to Phase II of database construction and that they intended to focus on Phase I in this review.

<u>Committee Comments</u>

Mr. Teasdale requested a comments matrix for the benefit of the public. Mr. Reich assured that one will be sent to the TAC for distribution. Mr. Teasdale brought up that four distinct databases (or DMS) for the Indian Wells Valley (IWV) basin now exist, one made by each of the following: KCWA, the Department of Water Resources (DWR), Geo GIS from the SkyTEM work, and now Stetson. Mr. Teasdale expressed concern about how all those databases can be integrated into one for the GSP and feels that Phase II of the DMS development should start soon.

Chair Bingham mentioned that the central valley decided to make their GSP first and then create a DMS. Chair Bingham feels it may be a good idea to get the GSP out first and worry about the DMS later. Mr. Reich expressed that the DMS will support the GSP.

Mr. Parker pointed out that since three databases already exist, a DMS created by Stetson may be a duplication of effort. Mr. Parker also expressed the need to be thoughtful about how the basin spends money.

Mr. Reich responded to these comments by reminding that currently Stetson is in Phase I, which involves building the infrastructure of the DMS, not populating it with data. Mr. Reich assured that this DMS Stetson has made will be compatible with that of DWR. Mr. Reich also pointed out that the database Stetson is making is specifically designed for the purpose of the GSP and that the other three existing databases were created for specific purposes of their own, which may differ from that of the GSP.

Chair Bingham proposed the idea of putting together an ad hoc committee tasked with comparing the existing databases. Ms. Moran agreed and suggested putting a matrix together to make sure efforts are not duplicated. Mr. Reich agreed with the idea of the matrix. The idea of putting together an ad hoc committee was dropped and instead Chair Bingham asked Stetson to make a decision matrix for evaluating the existing databases and the TAC will review it.

Mr. Major feels that defining sustainability criteria needs to happen before the database is constructed. Mr. Parker added to this by saying that the sustainability goals are the meat of the GSP and that sustainability criteria need to be defined. Mr. Decker also expressed concerns about the tasks being out of sequence and feels that the database should be built on the GSP. Mr. Decker added that the data that is already readily available in existing databases is enough for the GSP and Mr. Wilson agreed. Mr. Decker also feels that the cost for additional information is not justified. Mr. O'Neil expressed concern about starting a database without first deciding on GSP sustainability criteria. Mr. Teasdale feels that the discussion on sustainability criteria should begin sooner than is proposed in the POAM; Mr. O'Neil, Mr. Bork, and Mr. Parker agreed with this. Ms. Moran recommended changing the POAM.

<u>Public Comments</u>

Ms. Decker asked if Stetson is developing the GSP. The WRM and Mr. Parker explained that Stetson will draft the GSP and the TAC and PAC will provide input along the way.

Derek Hoffman expressed concern about competing databases and asked which database will be used for the GSP. Mr. Hoffman also asked if there is a data storage issue. Mr. Hoffman feels that the people involved with the GSP are not here to do the bare minimum to fulfill GSP requirements. Mr. Hoffman reminded the TAC that the Groundwater Authority (GA) said it was fine for the TAC to have ad hoc committees.

West Katzenstein feels it is important for the TAC to discuss GSP criteria.

b. Well Database Ground Truthing Study

Ms. Moran explained that Mr. Bork has gathered well information together and removed duplicate wells in an effort to clean up the database.

No further comments.

c. DRI Model Review

Ms. Moran explained that she had received 30 comments regarding the DRI model review paper she presented to the TAC at the previous meeting. Ms. Moran went on to say that she spoke with Commander Longbottom who informed her that the Navy requested cost estimates from DRI for updating the model; no timeline is set at the moment. Ms. Moran ensured everyone that progress has been made on the required elements of the model. The Navy is still working on a full review of the draft report of the DRI model.

<u>Committee Comments</u>

Mr. Teasdale expressed concerned about incorporating the SkyTEM data into the DRI model. Ms. Moran said that the cost of putting the SkyTEM data into the DRI model would have to be determined, and then who would pay for that work? Mr. Teasdale was also concerned about the DRI model not being transparent and not vetted. Ms. Moran was not sure what the best way to work such details through would be whether it was in a TAC meeting, ad hoc, or other. Mr. Decker agrees that the DRI model should be vetted.

Mr. O'Neil requested that at the next meeting Ms. Moran give a talk about how the DRI model is calibrated and Ms. Moran confirmed that she would.

Public Comments
Stan Rajtora asked if the 2017 version of the DRI report was released. Ms. Moran replied that it has not been released because it is still being internally reviewed by the Navy

Pat Ferris is concerned about the uncertainty surrounding the direction the model is taking. Ms. Ferris is also concerned that some of the information that could be useful to add to the model, such as the USGS recharge study data, is not being included. Ms. Moran responded by stating that enough data exists for the GSP but the model could be refined over time as new data is added.

d. Updated Plan of Actions and Milestones (POAM)
Mr. Helsley gave an overview of the POAM Stetson put together and mentioned that Commander Longbottom of the Navy suggested some revisions.

No further comments.

6. CURRENT TAC DISCUSSION AND REVIEW ITEMS

a. POAM and Potential Action Schedule (PAS) for TAC
Mr. Helsley gave an overview of the PAS and explained that it was derived from the POAM and serves as an action register for the TAC.

Committee Comments
None.

Public Comments
Mr. Hoffman feels that these action items are too big to be tackled in one month and feels the PAS needs to be more of a timeline with a beginning and an end date. That way, the TAC will have more than one meeting to think about the action item at hand and allow the committee members to come to the meeting prepared with recommendations. Mr. Hoffman went on to say that the TAC needs clear timelines and due dates so that they know what is coming and have time to prepare. Ms. Decker, Mr. Decker, and Mr. Katzenstein agreed with Mr. Hoffman. Mr. Katzenstein added that start dates and due dates would also benefit the public so that the public may be more prepared and thus more inclined to participate. Mr. Bork added to this discussion by addressing the next up and coming item on the PAS and asking if the TAC will get homework in order to prepare before the next meeting. Ms. Moran clarified that the next two items on the PAS will kick off at the next TAC meeting.

b. DMS Development review
Mr. Teasdale requested to see a document containing the comments that were submitted regarding the DMS. Mr. Reich said that Stetson would compile the comments into a document.

Public Comments
None.

c. Model Review

Mr. Teasdale requested to see the comments on this topic as well and Ms. Moran said Stetson can put that document together. Mr. Decker mentioned that there was a limited time to review the model and that Stetson is new to the basin so there may be some aspects that they are unfamiliar with. Mr. Decker would like to see a stronger technical connection between Stetson and the TAC.

Public Comments
None.

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS SCHEDULE

This time is reserved to inform the Committee of any items that are anticipated to be on the next agenda. No action may be taken unless authorized by law and public comments are limited to three minutes per person.

a. PAS Items

i) February – Initial Groundwater Levels/Water Budget Elements

ii) March – Imported Water Opportunities and Constraints

Mr. Teasdale wanted clarification that Stetson was going to make a decision matrix. The WRM suggested that Chair Bingham make a request to the GA to have Stetson make a matrix. Mr. Teasdale feels that the PAS should be a live document and requested that a progress update on PAS items be a standing item on the TAC agenda. Mr. Bork agreed.

Committee Comments
Mr. Wilson would like to stop using acronyms on the agenda so that new people will know what is being discussed. Mr. Wilson also mentioned that he has not been able to access all the paperwork sent to him because the files are too large. Mr. Don Zdeba kindly offered to print files at the Indian Wells Valley Water District.

Public Comments
Ms. Thomas asked about the February item (listed above) and if the data from USGS recharge study will be available in time for that discussion. Ms. Moran clarified that the data will not be available by then, but it will be discussed when the data becomes available. This means the discussion in February will be more conceptual.

Mr. Hoffman would like a timeline that reflects when initial discussions will happen and when actions will happen.

8. FUTURE TAC MEETING DATES

a. Next meeting date: February 1st, 2018, 1pm

b. March 1st, 2018, 1pm

No comments.

9. COMMITTEE MEMBER ANNOUNCEMENTS OR COMMENTS

Mr. Parker presented seismic data from the El Paso range and explained that by reprocessing this seismic data it could be used to refine the flow model. Mr. Parker asked the TAC if reprocessing this data was something the TAC would like to pursue.

Mr. Wilson feels that the SkyTEM group should reprocess the seismic data in order to help verify that data.

Mr. Decker mentioned a Mr. Frank Monastero who did seismic in the 1990's and that he may still have access to the shallow seismic analyses he worked on. Mr. Decker suggested maybe obtaining this seismic information. Mr. and Ms. Decker also mentioned Hunter Oil and their seismic studies. Ms. Moran mentioned that the Hunter Oil data was on their comprehensive list of studies.

Mr. Teasdale feels that a line needs to be drawn on adding data.

Public Comments

Ms. Decker asked how the seismic data relates to water supply. Mr. Parker explained that the model estimates storage and this seismic data would help refine the model. Ms. Decker expressed concern that there was no mention of water quality feels that options need to be looked at accurately. Ms. Decker also feels that TAC needs to be more open and educate the public and that ad hoc committees will not achieve that.

10. ADJOURN

With no further comments or discussion to come before the Committee, motion was made by Don Decker and seconded by Earl Wilson to adjourn the meeting at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jade Brush

Jade Brush
Recording Secretary
Searles Valley Minerals

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE (TAC) – POTENTIAL ACTION SCHEDULE (PAS)

TAC MEETING TOPICS DISCUSSION ITEMS

(JANUARY 2018)

JANUARY 2018

Well Database GW Truthing Study

a. Description of the Work(Jean Moran)
b. Relevance to GSP
c. Recommendation to Authority

JANUARY 2018
(AGENDA)

DMS Database Development Status Discussion

a. Steve Reich Update/Discussion
   i. Schedule for Work

JANUARY 2018
(AGENDA)

DRI Model Review (Numerical)

a. Jean Moran Update/Discussion
   i. Coordination Meeting with Navy/Longbottom et al
   ii. Minimum Required Model Upgrades/Additional Upgrades
   iii. Decision Points with Model/Navy – Costs and Schedule (GSP)
   iv. Schedule for Reporting Back to TAC (Jean)

JANUARY 2018
(AGENDA)

Updated POAM

a. Jeff Helsley to Review Updated Schedule
   i. Review Schedule to Status
   ii. Review Any Schedule Concerns

Schedule and Status for

Current Authorized Tasks from the POAM

January 3, 2018

Task	Schedule	Status
Data Compilation and Analysis		
• Establishing Monitoring Protocols	3/1/2018-6/29/2018	Not-Started
• Populate Database	7/2/2018-1/31/2019	Not-Started
Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model	1/1/2018-4/30/2018	On Schedule
Identify and Evaluate Hydrogeologic and Data Gaps	1/1/2018-4/30/2018	On Schedule
• Monitoring Wells	3/15/2018-7/31/2019	Not-Started
• Stream Gages	3/30/2018-10/29/2018	Not-Started
• Weather Stations	3/30/2018-9/28/2018	Not-Started
• Water Quality and Stable Isotope Sampling	6/01/2018-4/19/2019	Not-Started
• Aquifer Tests	5/01/2018-7/30/2018	On Schedule
Imported Water Study	1/1/2018-10/31/2018	On Schedule
Recycled Water Study	1/1/2018-5/31/2018	On Schedule
SDAC Water Conservation and Rebate Program	1/1/2018-3/9/2020	On Schedule
SDAC Water Audit Leak Detection, and Repair Program	1/1/2018-3/9/2020	On Schedule