

INDIAN WELLS VALLEY GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

City of Ridgecrest, Kern County, Inyo County, San Bernardino County, Indian Wells Valley Water District

POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC) MINUTES

Thursday, June 6, 2019, 6:00 p.m.

PAC Members Present:

Tim Carroll, Edward Imsand, Renee Westa-lusk, Judie Decker, David Janiec, Patricia Quist, Joshua Nugent, West Katzenstein, Lyle Fisher, Don Zedba, Lorelei Oviatt

Time values indicated in blue (0:00:00) reference the video recording available at iwvga.org

1. CALL TO ORDER

- Called to order by Chairperson David Janiec at 6 PM at the Ridgecrest City Hall. A quorum was present.

2. OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT (5:30)

- None

3. REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY, MARCH, APRIL AND MAY PAC MEETINGS (8:25)

- Approved February, March, amended April, and May minutes with corrections. Motion made by Judie Decker, seconded by Patricia Quist, to approve February, March, and April minutes. Unanimous approval. Motion made by Renee Westa-lusk, seconded by Patricia Quist, to approve May minutes. Unanimous approval with Lyle Fisher abstaining.

4. DRAFT GSP UPDATE AND REVIEW (16:00)

- Comments from David Janiec explaining how there have been delays, so no draft is available to review

5. REVIEW POA&M ITEMS #35 and #49 - PROGRESS ON MANAGEMENT SCENARIO MODELING (19:30)

- Introduction and overview by David Janiec
- Comment from Judie Decker and Don Zedba about TDS in drinking water (41:00)
- Comments from Joshua Nugent regarding the model runs and decisions being made in closed sessions, additional comments from Judie Decker and David Janiec (42:50)
- Comment from Judie Decker on the southwest domestic wells being adversely impacted by the model runs, additional comments from David Janiec (48:00)
- Comment from Lorelei Oviatt on the amount of recharge in the various model runs, additional comments from Joshua Nugent and David Janiec (54:10)

- PUBLIC COMMENT from Don Decker about how the model runs were structured, additional comments from Joshua Nugent, David Janiec, and Judie Decker (1:05:20)
- Comment from Patricia Quist on running a model that spread pumping across the basin, additional comments from David Janiec, Don Zdeba, and Judie Decker (1:11:45)
- Comment from Renee Westa-lusk about cost to mitigate wells, additional comments from David Janiec, Lorelei Oviatt, Don Zdeba, West Katzenstein, and Lyle Fisher (1:15:00)
- Comment from Patricia Quist on spreading water pumping across the basin, additional comments from Don Zdeba, Judie Decker, and David Janiec (1:20:00)
- Comment from West Katzenstein on model runs being complex and iterative, additional comments from David Janiec (1:22:40)
- Comment from Judie on additional model run, additional comment from David Janiec, Renee Westa-lusk, and Lyle Fisher (1:26:00)
- PUBLIC COMMENT from Derek Hoffman (Meadowbrook) regarding model runs originating from closed session and adverse impacts on the southeast from the model runs (1:29:40)
- PUBLIC COMMENT from Don Decker lack of TAC review of the model runs and the failure to engage the PAC and the TAC, additional comment from David Janiec (1:35:00)
- Comment from West Katzenstein on achieving sustainability and how water levels make take time to equalize across the basin (1:41:20)
- PUBLIC COMMENT from Don Decker about water levels, plant communities, and prior model runs, additional comments by David Janiec (1:42:10)
- PUBLIC COMMENT from Derek Hoffman (Meadowbrook) regarding falling water levels in the southeast and DWR regulations related to SGMA, additional comments from David Janiec and Joshua Nugent (1:44:30)

6. SHALLOW WELL MITIGATION PLAN AD-HOC SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT (1:46:30)

- Overview and report from Judie Decker, additional comments from David Janiec and Joshua Nugent
- Comment from Lorelei Oviatt regarding replacement water for impacted homeowners (1:52:10)
- Comment from Joshua Nugent on impacts of pumping on local areas and providing assistance to the indigent, additional comment from David Janiec and Judie Decker (2:02:15)
- Comment from Patricia Quist on ways to assist a homeowner who needs replacement water from a well failure, additional comments from Joshua Nugent, and Judie Decker (2:05:05)
- Comment from West Katzenstein about how the GA is responsible for mitigating shallow wells, additional comments from Judie Decker and Patricia Quist (2:10:00)
- Comment from Lyle Fisher about his own well failing and how he dealt with it (2:15:20)
- Comment from Renee Westa-lusk about the need for a valley wide mitigation fund, additional comments from Judie Decker and Joshua Nugent (2:16:00)
- Comments from David Janiec, Patricia Quist, Lorelei Oviatt, and Judie Decker on approving the report (2:19:40)

- The Shallow Well Mitigation Plan ad-hoc committee report was approved, with a no vote from Ed Imsand and no abstentions. Motion by Patricia Quist, seconded by Renee Westa-lusk. (2:25:30)

7. MANAGED GROWTH POLICY CONSIDERATIONS (TASKED BY IWVGA)

(2:28:45)

- Introduction by David Janiec
- Comment from Lorelei Oviatt clarifying land use authorities and their responsibilities, additional comments from David Janiec and Judie Decker (2:32:15)
- Comment from Lorelei Oviatt volunteering to frame the question next meeting, additional comments from Judie Decker, Joshua Nugent, and David Janiec (2:38:30)

8. IMPORTED WATER UPDATE (IF AVAILABLE) (2:41:00)

- Comment from David Janiec that there is no update available, additional comments from Judie Decker, Don Zdeba, and Renee Westa-lusk

9. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (JULY PAC) (2:43:30)

- Overview by David Janiec, comment from Lorelei Oviatt

10. FUTURE PAC MEETING DATES (2:44:45)

a. Next Three Months: June 27 (replacing July 4), August 1, September 5.

- Comments from David Janiec

11. MEMBER COMMENT (2:46:15)

- Comment from Ed Imsand thanking the ad hoc committee for their efforts (2:46:30)
- Comment from Judie Decker regarding the well registration postcard, additional comment from Don Zdeba, Lyle Fisher, and Lorelei Oviatt (2:47:15)
- Comment from Lyle Fisher about speaking into the microphone (2:49:40)
- Comment from Don Zdeba about an informative IWV Water District meeting (2:50:45)

12. ADJOURN (2:51:30)

- Meeting was adjourned at 8:50

INDIAN WELLS VALLEY GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

City of Ridgecrest, Kern County, Inyo County, San Bernardino County, Indian Wells Valley Water District

POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC) MINUTES

Thursday, June 27, 2019, 6:00 p.m.

PAC Members Present:

Tim Carroll, Edward Imsand, Renee Westa-lusk, Judie Decker, Patricia Quist, David Janiec, Joshua Nugent, Nick Panzer, West Katzenstien, Lyle Fisher, Don Zdeba, John Kersey, Thomas Bickaaskas

Time values indicated in blue (0:00:00) reference the video recording available at twvga.org

1. CALL TO ORDER

- Called to order by Chairperson David Janiec at 6 PM at the Ridgecrest City Hall. A quorum was present.

2. OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT (3:15)

- None

3. REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES FOR JUNE 27 PAC MEETING (3:35)

- Request from Judie Decker to use first and last names
- Request from Renne Westa-Lusk to correct name, motions recording on past minutes
- Motion by Renne Westa-Lusk, second by Pat Quist, to move approval of the June 6 minutes to the next meeting. Unanimous approval, no abstentions or recusals.

4. DRAFT GSP SECTION 3 REVIEW (7:45)

- Comment from David Janiec regarding comments from Nick Panzer and Don Zdeba; Judie Decker is working on comments.
- Comment from West Katzenstien about what sustainability will look like in the future, additional comments from Judie Decker and David Janiec.
- Comment from Lyle Fisher about the importance of having a good historical perspective
- Comment from Renee Westa-lusk on the procedure for submitting comments and the lack of finished figures; additional comments from David Janiec
- Comment from John Kersey on the importance of submitting before the deadline
- PUBLIC COMMENT from Derek Hoffman (Meadowbrook) regarding Nick Panzer's comments on imported water reliability

5. PROGRESS ON MANAGEMENT SCENARIO MODELING (19:15)

- a. WRM (Stetson Engineers) Presentation

- Comment from David Janiec on a new schedule for reviewing the modelling scenarios and the possibility for an extra meeting to meet the new distribution schedule
- Comment from Judie Decker on the next scheduled PAC meeting on August 1; additional comments from David Janiec
- Comment from Joshua Nugent on how closed sessions and the lack of transparency has hurt the process
- Comment from Renee Westa-lusk on clarifying there will not be a special TAC meeting in July; additional comments from David Janiec and Joshua Nugent
- Comment from Judie Decker on having a sole subject meeting

6. IMPORTED WATER UPDATE (32:00)

- Update from Dan Zdeba on the efforts of Capital Core Group and their planned legislative efforts; additional comments from David Janiec
- Comment from West Katzenstein on making sure water banking is good for the local water levels as well as any banking partner; additional comments from Don Zdeba and David Janiec
- Comment from Lyle Fisher on the importance of including the water district in the future management of a water bank; additional comments from West Katzenstein and David Janiec
- Comment from West Katzenstein on Inyo County and major obstacles to imported water; additional comments from Don Zdeba and David Janiec
- Comment from Patricia Quist on high flow years and the need to deal with very wet years
- Comment from David Janiec on the impact of state legislation and climate change on imported water and what is possible
- Comment from Renee Westa-lusk on the Water Smart Grant; additional information provided by Don Zdeba
- Comment from Ed Imsand on the USGS study and how it should be examined
- PUBLIC COMMENT from Don Decker on his observations of stream flows in canyons around the basin
- PUBLIC COMMENT from Pat Farris on the volume of water in the canyons and how it is underreported
- PUBLIC COMMENT from Anita Imsand on her personal observations of stream flows
- Comment from Judie Decker on her personal observations of the local canyons
- PUBLIC COMMENT from Tim Parker about managed groundwater recharge

7. MANAGED GROWTH POLICY CONSIDERATIONS (01:01:00)

- Update from David Janiec on moving this topic to a future agenda due to timing and scheduling conflicts; additional comments from Judie Decker and West Katzenstein
- PUBLIC COMMENT from Norman Alexander requesting to see the document; additional comment from David Janiec

8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (AUGUST PAC) (01:10:00)

- a. Draft GSP Update and Review
- b. Management Scenario Modeling Progress
- c. Managed Growth Policy Considerations

d. Imported Water Update

- Comment from Joshua Nugent on the compressed time schedule and the lack of ability to have input; additional comments from Ed Imsand, Judie Decker, and Tim Carroll
- Comment from Don Zdeba on the difficulty of scheduling with the 4th of July holiday

9. FUTURE PAC MEETING DATES (01:23:00)

a. Next Three Months: August 1, September 5, October 3

10. MEMBER COMMENT (01:25:00)

- Comment from West Katzenstein on his support for finding additional water sources
- Comment from Joshua Nugent on how other GSA Boards have released drafts
- Comment from Patricia Quist on how it is difficult to run a business without public direction
- Comment from Ed Imsand on the importance of farming and the need for a science-based solution
- Comment from Tim Carroll on the need for a positive solution
- Background and introduction from Thomas Bickauskas
- Comment from David Janiec on the importance of coming together to find a solution

11. ADJOURN (01:34:50)

- Meeting was adjourned at 7:35

INDIAN WELLS VALLEY GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

City of Ridgecrest · Kern County · Inyo County,
San Bernardino County · Indian Wells Valley Water District

Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)

MINUTES

Thursday, August 1, 2019, 6:00 p.m.

PAC Members Present:

Tim Carroll, Edward Imsand, Camille Anderson, Renee Westa-lusk, Judie Decker, Patricia Quist, David Janiec, Joshua Nugent, Nick Panzer, West Katzenstein, Lyle Fisher, Don Zdeba, John Kersey, Thomas Bickaaskas

Time values indicated in blue (0:00:00) reference the video recording available at iwvga.org

1. CALL TO ORDER

- Called to order by Chairperson David Janiec at 6 PM at the Ridgecrest City Hall. A quorum was present.

2. OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT (8:00)

- None

3. REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES FOR JUNE PAC MEETINGS (8:15)

- Comments from Joshua Nugent regarding bringing the PAC minutes back for review at the next PAC meeting

4. DRAFT GSP UPDATE AND REVIEW (8:30)

- Comments from Jeff Helsley (Stetson Engineering) regarding Chapter 3 and Chapter 2
- Question from Renee Westa-lusk regarding the completeness of Chapter 3; comments from Jeff Helsley and David Janiec
- PUBLIC COMMENT from Derek Hoffman, Meadowbrook, regarding Capital Core imported water status

6. IMPORTED WATER UPDATE (if available) (13:30)

- Comments from Don Zdeba and David Janiec regarding the Capital Core memo being delayed due to a grant application taking priority

5. PROGRESS ON MANAGEMENT SCENARIO MODELING REVIEW (16:00)

a. WRM (Stetson Engineers) Presentation

- Summary of Scenario 6 development by Jeff Helsley (Stetson Engineering)

- Comment from West Katzenstein regarding future water for growth of the Navy
- Comment from Judie Decker regarding municipal and domestic water use classifications as well as growth for small domestic pumpers
- Comment from Lyle Fisher regarding the 2010-2014 time period for pumping
- Comment from Joshua Nugent regarding the time frame when ramp downs would occur
- Comment from West Katzenstein regarding getting a bond to purchase the leased water
- Comment from Tim Carroll regarding the cost of leased water
- Comment from Judie Decker on growth potential being reflected in the model
- Comment from West Katzenstein regarding water quality changes over time
- Comment from Joshua Nugent expressing concern with model run 6
- Comment from Ed Imsand regarding agriculture, sustainability, and the importance of food production as a beneficial use of water
- Comment from Tim Carroll supporting the prior two comments
- PUBLIC COMMENT from Don Decker regarding potential dust concerns
- PUBLIC COMMENT from Sophia Merk regarding the BLM needing to be included and questioning why the city water use was considered domestic
- PUBLIC COMMENT from Tom Bunn (Searles Valley Minerals) regarding the importance of allowing water users to keep water in the basin longer than 2040; additional comments from Jeff Helsley
- PUBLIC COMMENT from Derek Hoffman (Meadowbrook) requesting the assumptions for the model runs and the location of pumping; additional comments from Jeff Helsley
- PUBLIC COMMENT from Anita Imsand regarding the appraisal of Meadowbrook's land
- PUBLIC COMMENT from Tim Parker regarding total water in storage, costs, and risks
- Presentation on Sustainable Management Criteria by Jeff Helsley (01:34:00)
- Comment from Judie Decker on using water levels as a proxy for other sustainable criteria; additional comments from Jeff Helsley
- Comment from West Katzenstein regarding using water quality as an additional indicator
- Comment from Joshua Nugent regarding the compressed time frame for reviewing these issues; additional comments from Camille Anderson and Ed Imsand
- Comment from Ed Imsand regarding water levels in his wells
- Comment from Thomas Bickauskas regarding the importance of considering the impact on the entire basin, not just one region at the expense of another
- Comment from Tim Carroll regarding the need to bring in more water to support the economy and local populations
- Comment from Judie Decker requesting the origin of the questions being presented; additional comments from Joshua Nugent
- PUBLIC COMMENT from Derek Hoffman (Meadowbrook) regarding the importance of using the Department of Water Resources' Best Management Practices for SGMA
- Comment from Judie Decker on whether the GA Board met to approve these questions
- Comment from Joshua Nugent on the lack of transparency
- Questions from GA Board read by David Janiec

- Comment from Joshua Nugent questioning who drafted the questions; additional comments from Jeff Helsley
- Comment from Ed Imsand questioning if wells would go dry based on the model scenario; additional comments from Jeff Helsley
- Comment from Camille Anderson regarding the incorrect use of the term "M&I" since the model run put Searles Valley Minerals in the "ag" pool; additional comments from Jeff Helsley, West Katzenstein, and Judie Decker
- Comment from Judie Decker regarding how these are technical issues that should be discussed in the TAC; additional comments from Joshua Nugent
- Comment from Don Zdeba questioning the difficulty of determining what the total water in storage is; additional comments from David Janiec and Judie Decker
- Comment from Joshua Nugent on how the wells that have historically gone dry is an estimate; additional comments from Lyle Fisher, Jeff Helsley, and David Janiec
- Comment from Renee Westa-lusk regarding the cost of mitigation; additional comments from West Katzenstein, Joshua Nugent, Judie Decker, and Renee Westa-lusk
- Comment from David Janiec on the importance of not mining the basin; additional comments from Joshua Nugent and Judie Decker
- Comment from Tim Carroll that the wrong question may have been asked; additional comments from David Janiec recommending bringing new questions to the group
- Comment from Joshua Nugent regarding the compressed schedule to bring these questions to the PAC; additional comments from Judie Decker
- Discussion about having a special PAC meeting on August 7th to continue discussion
- PUBLIC COMMENTS from Doreen Conway-Baker on the percentage of uncertainty in the GSP and what DWR will accept; additional comments from Jeff Helsley and David Janiec

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (SEPTEMBER PAC) (02:50:00)

- a. Draft GSP Update and Review
- b. Management Scenario Modeling Progress
- c. Managed Growth Policy Considerations
- d. Imported Water Update

8. FUTURE PAC MEETING DATES (02:50:30)

- a. Next Three Months: September 5, October 3, and November 7

9. MEMBER COMMENT (02:51:00)

- Comment from Judie Decker on the short timeframe to get documents
- Comment from West Katzenstein on progress being made by the GA Board
- Comment from Nick Panzer on Capital Core update
- Comment from Renee Westa-lusk on desire to move ahead
- Comment from David Janiec on the desire to move forward

10. ADJOURN (02:55:00)

- Meeting adjourned at 8:55

INDIAN WELLS VALLEY GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

City of Ridgecrest · Kern County · Inyo County,
San Bernardino County · Indian Wells Valley Water District

Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)

MINUTES

Wednesday, August 7, 2019, 1:00 p.m.

PAC Members Present:

Tim Carroll, Edward Imsand, Camille Anderson, Renee Westa-lusk, Judie Decker, Patricia Quist, David Janiec, Joshua Nugent, Nick Panzer, West Katzenstein, Lyle Fisher, Don Zdeba, John Kersey, Lorelei Oviatt

Time values indicated in blue (0:00:00) reference the video recording available at iwvga.org

1. Call to Order

- Called to order by Chairperson David Janiec at 1 PM at the Ridgecrest City Hall. A quorum was present.
- All members were present with the exception of voting member Pat Quist (attending by phone from Colorado and ineligible to vote), and non-voting member Thomas Bickauskas.

2. Open Public Comment (Not Related to Other Agenda Items)

- None Received.

3. IWVGA Board Tasked Policy Questions, Discussion and Issues regarding Management Action Scenario 6, Continued from August 1 PAC meeting Agenda Item #5

- Jeff Helsley representing the WRM and Stetson Engineers, presented a summary matrix slide of the 7 management action modeling scenarios completed to date, not including the baseline model.
- Lyle Fisher calculated that it represents just over 2 years of normal pumping in the he basin, which equates to a 3 foot drop in his well depth to water as measured over a 30 year time frame of his experience at ~1.5ft/yr. His written comments on all the questions are attached to this report.
- West Katzenstein discussed the research he did to estimate the replacement value of the "pool", first in a basin where their aquifer had been exhausted and imported water was now the only source (i.e. the Ogallala Basin, Wyoming). From that basin the estimated cost for delivery here was \$282K/AF. He also contacted a water hauler more locally in Acton, CA with a resultant calculated rate of \$48,877/AF, delivered. The total value of the "pool" in local terms would be over \$3B. He also noted that there is also

risk in assuming the potability of the water as the level is lowered. He thought the "pool" was a generous amount.

- Nick Panzer noted that the "pool" represents 8.3 years of the TAC estimated natural recharge in the basin, and seemed like a lot. He stated that it could be a reasonable risk, but would need to be adjusted if minimum sustainability thresholds were exceeded.
- Judie Decker supplied a written statement on each question. She stated that SVM should be separated from agriculture given their origin and industrial nature.
- Lyle Fisher agreed. Water quality should also be a part of this question, specifically in locations where pumping from any user (not just AG) affects shallow wells. Decisions must be based on sound science and the TAC needs to address this.
- Camille Anderson stated that for SVM the "pool" number is unacceptable and should be reviewed and determined by the TAC. She also noted that SVM is an industrial user and should not be in the same pool with AG. More work needs to be done to determine the most accurate number for the total storage in the basin.
- Ed Imsand stated that the idea of totally deleting AG from the basin is not in the cooperative spirit and approach defined in SGMA. The term "mining" should not be attached to AG alone, all pumpers in the valley share that definition. We should come up with a cooperative, science-based decision. He requested more definition and data on the shallow wells that have already failed, including location data and questioned the data, if shallow well mitigation is to be the driving factor in this decision.
- Jeff Helsley described the TAC-approved methodology used to both estimate past well failure due to water level, and the analysis data presented for each future scenario model run. Ed requested more information and will involve his hydrogeologist.
- Lyle Fisher stated that the methodology prediction aligns accurately with the long history on his own well.
- Judie Decker noted that several of the wells that the Kern County Water agency has been monitoring for 30 years have gone dry. Water quality has also declined.
- Tim Carroll noted that from a policy perspective, the valley economy needs to be diverse and that eliminating AG compounds the problem.
- Renee Westa-Lusk agreed that the decision must be based on sound science, and stated that only Scenario 5, Immediate Halt to Pumping, would result in less negative impact to the basin.
- Josh Nugent clarified that under scenario 6, pumpers that did not have continuous pumping during the prescriptive period from 2010-2014 would not be allocated any water from the pool and would be required to cease pumping when the GSP was submitted. The "pool" allotment would also begin and Mojave Pistachios would only have 3-8 months of pumping available at current usage rates, based on their lowest annual usage during the prescriptive period. He also pointed out that the 90KAF of storage loss between scenarios 6.1 and 6.2 is due to the difference in additional imported water to offset evapotranspiration, and that amounts to 150% of the total "pool" allocation for AG and Industrial. Josh also cited experience in some other Central Valley GAs that also do not have access to imported water, similar to our basin. When

Mojave Pistachios moved here the land was ag-zoned, and that they did not support the "white paper" scenario, as defined.

- Pat Quist provided written comments attached to this report. Regarding SVM, she asked what San Bernardino County was going to do to address the water removed from our basin and used there. There should be an approach and agreement between the counties. She also noted that the plan addressed AG but did not limit or address municipal and domestic user actions. Smaller family-owned farms would be better off under the acreage construct for AG, as opposed to historical pumping. She also noted that we need to address the ET on the playa and how we can reduce that if possible. Pat requested information for the county on what other uses they may be able to pursue under their existing zoning after SGMA. Farming was accepted when they began here, what use will be outlawed in the future?
- Don Zdeba agreed with Lyle regarding the impact of the "pool" pumping across the basin and pointed out that the shallow well analysis for scenarios 6.1/6.2 is in work and should provide good information for this decision. He also stated that the "pool" number for scenario 6 was reasonable as a good balance between the economic impact and uncertainties. He clarified comments from the August 1 meeting, noting that he agreed that the current total basin storage estimate is the best available now and should be used to inform this decision, but that work is needed to continue to take information potentially available from the recent studies and translate that data to inform and adjust the estimate, if required.
- David Janiec noted that the economic contributions of the Navy in the value is well above 80%, our sole source of water is groundwater and we have all been mining it in excess of known recharge since the '60s. Currently we are pumping 3 times the natural recharge. We cannot "fallow" homes, but how do we mitigate the financial impact for AG? The "pool" number seems to be a reasonable floor amount in order to mitigate that impact, while addressing the shallow well mitigation costs, and allowing for uncertainties (including national emergency) to ensure the long-term future of the valley.
- Lorelei Oviatt, representing Kern County Planning, reminded the PAC that the Kern County Board of Supervisors commissioned and funded an environmental impact report on appropriate land use in the IWW. After the report was received they took the position that AG was not an appropriate use of land in the IWW. The 2014/15 determination to leave the existing AG entities as is, was to allow for this very process we are now in under SGMA, and time for the owners to evaluate what other uses they may have for their property.
- Judie Decker stated her main concern was the future use of water in the valley and how we can survive until imported water is available, and noted that as the EKRCD representative, she represents all users in the valley.
- West Katzenstein suggested that the economic impact issue could be looked at in light of uses and users as defined in SGMA, and that prioritizing uses by infrastructure required, jobs generated, livelihoods impacted and other criteria could provide a more level basis for comparison of uses and users.

- Public Comment – Don Decker noted that the groundwater storage estimate that Stetson is using is probably reasonable, but not particularly conservative given the portion that may be potable.
- Public Comment – Doreen Conaway-Baker asked if the costs of connecting the Brown road area to city water was considered in mitigation cost alternatives for shallow well impact. She wants to be part of the solution but suggested that the plan implementation should start in 2025 so that they have time to plan adequately.
- Public Comment – Dereck Hoffman referred to the letter he sent to PAC members and attached to this report. Meadowbrook should have a permanent allocation and objected to the premise that only AG should be called on to solve the problem. He again requested the assumptions for scenario 6. Greater understanding of the groundwater in storage is required to ensure a science-based solution in the GSP. The sustainable management criteria are just now being addressed in the TAC and the process is not consistent with SGMA. The location of past and future shallow well impacts needs to be presented.
- Public Comment – Elaine Mead suggested the PAC members consider the unintended consequences of statements and positions as we advise the GA Board.
- Public Comment – Pat Farris expressed concern regarding AG being targeted in this approach. She questioned the influence that the Todd report has had on the AG rezoning decisions and informing the modeling and GSP development. She stated that it is not a proven fact that the basin is closed and in critical overdraft. This seems to be a politically-driven approach based on assumptions with too many unchallenged assumptions.
- Public Comment – Larry Mead would like to know what alternatives the AG landholders have for alternative land uses under A zoning.
- Public Comment – Claudia Ethun from Simmons Farm noted that while they purchased and operate an established ranch, since they did not pump for 2 of the years in the prescribed period (they did not start pumping until 2012) and have no allocation in the pool. This was their retirement and they are currently paying the pumping fees, but won't have water after January. She requested consideration to change the qualification period for the 3-4 farmers that might fit into this 2010-14 period with a year or more of zero pumping.
- Public Comment – Frank Bellino noted that as a small farmer, this is actually a "taking" rather than buying us out. He asked if the Navy or Congressman McCarthy have been approached to consider allocating the funds to buy out the few farms? Eliminating AG in the valley would still not fully solve the overdraft and he is prepared to join with the other farmers to oppose this. If the GA wants to take our livelihood away, buy us out.
- Public Comment – Larry Mead questioned the effect of 3000 acres of blowing sand will create with respect to damaging the Navy mission.
- Public Comment – Don Decker stated that historically, this valley has been known to have a water shortage for over 100 years, and cited the history of a proposal to import water from Mono into the valley 10 years before the LA Aqueduct was started.

- Camille Anderson requested clarification as to what dust is intended to be mitigated. Jeff Helsley clarified that it would be the dust resulting from management actions proposed under this scenario, most likely fallowed AG lands rather than existing dust sources.
- Judie Decker noted that both scenario 6 variants show continued pumping in the northwest region and continued drawdown there will cause more dust exposure from the China Lake playa. Changing the location of that pumping should be modeled. She noted that there are several methods of dust mitigation already used by local agencies that do not require water. Water use for dust mitigation should be minimized. She stated that if any was allocated for this and it must be minimum.
- Lorelei Oviatt agreed and stated that rather than allocate water for this use, the GA reach out to the several known agencies and groups (including the AV Dustbusters) that already have these programs and include these mitigation methods in the GSP.
- Lyle Fisher agreed that an allocation should not come from this "pool", but should be addressed as recommended above.
- Pat Quist noted that Quist Farms has already dealt with this without water use.
- Josh Nugent indicated that working more closely with land owners well in advance of these current issues could likely have resulted in alternate land uses and minimized impacts that may have allowed some longer-term water use in the valley.
- Public Comment – Earl Wilson cited his 18 years experience on the Owens Lake playa dust issue and suggested there are non-water intensive solutions that are working there that should be considered here.
- Public Comment – Dereck Hoffman stated that as one of the valley's largest land owners, dust mitigation on Meadowbrook properties would be a moot point with a permanent water allocation.
- PAC Chair David Janiec summarized the sense of some of the PAC members expressed above. We do not know how much water might be required, and there are viable alternatives to mitigate dust and minimize water use to accomplish that. The GSP should reflect collaboration with entities experienced in alternatives to this and address it separately in the GSP. The "pool" should not have a separate allocation for dust mitigation that would further reduce the size for allocated users.
- Josh Nugent disagreed, stating that he disagreed with the premise within scenario 6, and that dust mitigation should not be a problem since the goal of the GA should not be to turn AG land into a dust bowl in 5 years.
- Nick Panzer also disagreed stating that someone has to pay for whatever dust mitigation may be required, and it should be directly or indirectly related to the allocation in the "pool".
- Renee Westa-Lusk stated that we should not assume that dust mitigation entirely water-free should not be assumed as part of the plan and that it must be part of the GSP.
- Josh Nugent suggested that a vote be held on each question so that member name-to-vote would be on the record. Tim Carroll agreed. Judie Decker stated that we needed more technical data to vote.

- Chair Janiec reiterated that the PAC process in meetings to date had been to summarize the views of members, often conflicting, so that the GA Board and staff got the full sense of the issues and differences. Votes had only been held on those items that achieved consensus, such as committee reports. It was recognized when the PAC was created that the intent was to encourage a forum that could fully air the issues from the perspective of each group that the PAC members represent, as well as the public. Given the often opposing interests, unanimous consensus was not expected often on these issues. A consensus was not achieved on this question.
- Chair Janiec noted that scenario 6 was modeled using the irrigated acreage method to achieve what was viewed as the most equitable for all pumper in the pool, compared to past pumping. Tables were referenced that indicated the differences for each pumper in the pool.
- Josh Nugent rejected the premise that the question is based on: defining the prescriptive period from 2010-14 was adjudication case law and jurisprudence and not SGMA. He proposed that a better question should be: "How should the total volume of water that can be safely extracted from the basin while avoiding undesirable results, be allocated between domestic, non-domestic, AG, and industrial users. If there is not enough water, what should be done to meet that shortfall." "SGMA was not written to be a way to do administrative seizure of land without compensation." Camille Anderson, Judie Decker and Tim Carroll and Ed Imsand agreed.
- Judy Decker stated that there needs to be some kind of buyout of some kind or not use the allocation method.
- Lyle Fisher noted that the Domestic Well Owners have a market based plan that they have previously submitted under the Question B, Part 2: "Other thoughts that the Authority Board should consider". He would like it added to the agenda at some later time.
- Lorelei Oviatt pointed out that the language posed in the questions refers to the lowest water use during the 2010-2014 prescriptive period, not the lowest continuous water use. That could be of interest for the few farms that were previously identified as having no allocation within the pool. If they pumped two out of the five years, the lowest of any year in which they pumped with the 5 years could be recommended by the PAC for consideration by the GA. Josh Nugent agreed.
- Judie Decker noted there are many small 5-10 acre family pistachio (and other) farms or ranches that would also fit in that group, mostly current employees or retirees from the base, and more research is required. Lyle Fisher also agreed.
- Chair Janiec summarized the discussion noting that there seemed to be a sense that the prescriptive period should allow: A. eligibility for the pool based on the lowest of any of the years that were actually pumped during the 5 years (including only 1 year of pumping), and B. that irrigated acreage was the most equitable method, if this pool were implemented, as proposed. Pat Quist agreed. Ed Imsand, Nick Panzer, Judie Decker and Josh Nugent disagreed, noting that this should be more properly determined by the attorney team.

- Renee West-Lusk noted that from the tables presented, the irrigated acres method reduced the largest GA pumper by one year of operation, but expanded all the smaller AG length of pumping in the interest of equity.
- Josh Nugent stated for the record that they had over \$25M invested in their pistachio fields and 8 months of future allocation would not do anything for them.
- Pat Quist noted that different farms are impacted in different way by this, but thought that the acreage method was best for their and most other small farms, but each farm should be asked. If this allocation pool is announced, we will see many farms that have not yet been identified, come forward. A consensus on these questions was not achieved.
- Public Comment – Dereck Hoffman noted that these are legal issues not policy issues, and unfair to ask the PAC to address them. These concepts have been used to determine permanent allocation and Meadowbrook Farms should have a permanent allocation. He also noted no proposals or limitations have been made with regards to allocating domestic use and exempt for ramp down. Scenario 6 was developed in closed session and this highlights the legal issues involved.
- Public Comment – Larry Mead suggest that serious consideration must be made for mitigation costs and water required based on his experience.
- Don Zdeba provided cost estimates for these methods based on IWWWD experience. A 10x30ft billboard costs \$405/mo, with setup cost of \$5-600. A simple message is required given traffic speeds. It would likely have to remain in place at least until the GSP submission. An 8.5 x 5.5" postcard costs about \$1300 for printing a mailing of ~3K. There was no experience with a letter mailing.
- Lyle Fisher noted that the issue of mandatory well registration should have been a PAC agenda item well before the consideration of such a decision. Any mailing should be by personal letter to all APN addresses rather than postcard and include all the information necessary to register on a simplified form. Any communication will result in resistance, unless individual benefit can be perceived or major "hammer" clearly communicated.
- Nick Panzer did not support a simplified registration form, stating that it included necessary information.
- Judie Decker noted the resistance and alienation that has been developed with previous unsuccessful communication attempts. She suggested an informal face-face meeting to sit down with the well owners and discuss this at length. We need to get them onboard as part of the solution. Discussion about the accuracy of the APN list was discussed and it was noted that there are duplicates, out of state owners, well owners who also have municipal service, outdated addresses, and the addresses on record are based on the county property tax address on file. These need to be taken into account and the message simplified to maximize probability of response.
- Lorelei Oviatt agreed to look into providing the most accurate list possible, given all these limitations.
- Camille Anderson advocated for a billboard campaign that would highlight the delivery of letters that would address the registration requirement, as well as informal public meetings.

- Pat Quist suggest a long-term approach via the counties requiring well registration documentation if any changes take place regarding a property such as change in ownership, improvements, etc.
- Public Comment – Don Decker noted that posting notices at the Inyokern hardware store is by far the best way to reach most of the small well owners as it serves as an old fashioned general store for that community. Public and PAC member exchange discussion then ensued regarding simplified versus full registration form as the first method to maximize the probability of response.
- Public Comment – Earl Wilson recommended sending a Certified letter with “Return Receipt Required” after a publicity campaign to enhance the response after the ordinance is in effect.
- Public Comment – Elaine Mead suggested multiple communication methods as previously discussed, as well as social events such as Petroglyph Festival, Fair, etc, with registration booths to discuss and encourage registration.
- Chair Janiec summarized the issue stating that multiple communication methods should be pursued. These include a letter (not postcard) with simplified registration form to begin, billboards, Inyokern hardware community notices, and public meeting(s).

4. Future Agenda Items (September PAC)

- Draft GSP Section Review
- Management Scenario Progress and Policy Issues
- Managed Growth Policy Considerations
- Imported Water Status Update

5. Future PAC meeting dates

- Regular meetings: September 5, October 3, November 7.

6. Member Comment

- Camille Anderson noted that other GSA’s are taking a more general plan for their GSP, defining the details later, and wondered why this GA is focused on providing a more detailed plan.
- Judie Decker agreed with Camille Anderson’ comment.
- West Katzenstein noted that perhaps we should again be tasked to look at allocation concepts such as the Domestic Well Owners Plan and weigh in on the approach that could be taken.
- Josh Nugent thanked the PAC non-voting members for attending and providing important context to these issues. He also thanked the PAC Chair for efforts in consolidating the results of the meetings.
- Pat Quist requested that Lorelei Oviatt forward any new well registration to the GA.
- David Janiec thanked Stetson for supporting this meeting, as well as all those who attended.

7. Meeting Adjourned