

**MID-KINGS RIVER GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY
JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 2019**

Chair McCutcheon called the regular meeting to order at approximately 1:10 p.m.

DIRECTORS PRESENT: Art Brieno; Steven P. Dias, Barry McCutcheon, Chair;

DIRECTORS ABSENT: Michael Murray, Vice-Chair

OTHERS PRESENT: Dennis Mills, GM and Board Secretary Soua Lee, KRCD
Ray Carlson, Legal Counsel Shawn Corley, LIWD
Mary Lou Silveira Julianne Phillips, Kings County
Rebecca Quist, KRCD Bill Giacomazzi
Jim Maciel, Armona CSD Michael LaSalle
Ceil W. Howe, Westlake Farms

ESTABLISH QUORUM

It was determined that a quorum was present at the meeting.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 18, 2019 MEETING

Chair McCutcheon asked if there was a motion regarding the minutes circulated in this month's Board packets. Director Dias made a motion to approve the April 18, 2019 meeting minutes as presented. Director Brieno seconded the motion and the Board unanimously approved the meeting minutes of April 18, 2019. The vote for all of the Directors was as follows:

AYES: Art Brieno, Steven P. Dias, Barry McCutcheon

NOES: None

ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT: Michael Murray

COMMUNICATIONS

Manager Mills reported that on behalf of the Mid-Kings River (MKR) GSA he had sent a comment letter to the State Board conveying the impacts of the proposed Semitropic WSD project that would move Kings River floodwater into northern Kern County. The letter

specifically stated the GSA's opposition to opening a hearing on the Fully Appropriated Streams designation on the Kings River.

Manager Mills reported that the El Rico GSA sent a response letter to Kings CWD on their letter relating to Sustainable Management Criteria and copied several parties. It was described that El Rico GSA didn't disagree with any of the SMC descriptions communicated in the Kings CWD letter. Instead they commented on a sentence about well fields impacting groundwater levels in the Kings CWD area. The El Rico GSA also pointed out that the Kings CWD doesn't have groundwater pumping records available for defense of the position. That the El Rico GSA didn't disagree with the substance of the letter on SMC descriptions generally seemed pretty positive to Manager Mills. It was relayed that Kings CWD plans to respond to the letter as time allows.

Manager Mills reported that DWR recently sent out a draft Prop 68 SGM Grant Program 2019 Guidelines and Planning Grant – Round 3 PSP and requested comment on the package.

Manager Mills reported that the Tulare Basin Watershed Partnership emailed a 2020-2022 Strategic Plan Draft for our information.

Manager Mills reported that he attended a presentation on Nuclear Magnetic Resonance by a firm called Visa-Clara. The technology uses similar principles to MRI imaging and can directly measure water in storage, while differentiating water bound in clays versus more available water in sands.

Manager Mills reported that the South Fork Kings GSA manager, Charlotte Gallock, requested information on how much “seed funding” the Tulare Lake GSAs would receive back over the next fiscal year. She requested the information to help her develop the SFK GSA budget for next year.

Manager Mills reported that he had received a survey request from a PhD student at USC who was tracking the “challenges and best practices that are unfolding under SGMA throughout the state”.

GSP DEVELOPMENT

Update MKR GSA Union Bank Account Signature Cards

Manager Mills reported that a new Union Bank signature card was being processed for Director Brieno. This had been underway with Union Bank for several months.

2019 Water Supply Update

Manager Mills reported the Kings River was projected to be in Flood Release through the end of June and was currently at roughly 850,000 acre-feet in storage. The peak Kings River runoff may have recently appeared at over 19,000 second-feet days. Manager Mills also reported that groundwater recharge efforts will likely continue through most of the summer.

GSP Development Budget Update

Manager Mills reported that Tulare Lake GSP Development expenses through the end of May total \$1.244 million. Also, Wood has recently made Manager Mills aware that their estimates now indicate they will exceed their \$1.5 million budget by \$500K. Manager Mills had scheduled a meeting to discuss if there are ways to avoid the overrun. After that meeting Manager Mills will review the contract with our consultants and begin to discuss the matter with the other Tulare lake GSAs.

Discussion of GSP Schedule and Outreach

Manager Mills reported that on the status of several GSP chapters and explained their current review schedule. He again reported that the current plan is to hold a public hearing on the Tulare Lake GSP the first week in December at the Kings County government complex. Associated with this public hearing a notice would be published on September 1, 90 days prior as per DWR regulation and other legal requirements. The plan is for the public hearing on the draft GSP in December to not be a GSA Board meeting, but to have a Board member present to hear firsthand the tone of the comments.

Wood now believes that the Tulare Lake GSAs may not have their reviews of the draft GSP and comments incorporated into the Draft GSP before the Public Hearing notice is circulated. It was also noted that there is a planned presentation to the Kings County Board of Supervisors in September which will likely focus on the GSP Executive Summary in layman's terms. Also outreach events are planned in Hanford and Lemoore in early October as well as presentations to Armona CSD and Home Garden CSD in this fall.

Given the available time left for review of the Draft GSP chapters, Manager Mills asked if there was anything specific that the Board members wished for him to present or make available for their review prior to the 90 day Public Hearing notice being released. Chair McCutcheon asked that Manager Mills make time for individual meetings with Board members if they requested to go through the information. Manager Mills agreed.

Update from recent Tulare Lake GSA Parties Meetings

Manager Mills reported that the Tulare Lake GSA parties had met on May 28th and June 14th. At the May 23 meeting there was discussion of the Draft Monitoring Chapter comments and review of the model projections that included potential projects. There was also a budget update and discussion of the 2020 Annual Report due in April 2020 and DMS development. Lastly a DMS proposal was distributed, the draft SMC chapter was distributed, and there was a discussion of GSA specific GSPs.

At the June 14th meeting there was a discussion of required monitoring. The Consultant team presented new Management Areas to account for the area in the south of the subbasin where there is groundwater, but it is not used. DWR staff has communicated that they will want to see monitoring in the area of poor quality and low yield in order to prove that conditions are not changing. The same kind of information will be required in the clay plug area of the Lake Bottom. Both will be monitored as funding becomes available. Monitoring for MKR and South Fork Kings GSA does not change. Previously there had been one management area per GSA.

With this change there will be three management areas for the southern three GSAs, and a total of eleven management areas in the subbasin.

At this meeting there was also a discussion of draft SMC Chapter comments from Ken Schmidt on behalf of the Tri-County Water Authority and initial comments from Manager Mills on behalf of MKR. At this meeting none of the GSA managers had reviewed the DMS proposal yet. There was some discussion of Projects and Management Strategies in the subbasin. Manager Mills explain what is envisioned for the MKR voluntary fallowing program.

Discussion of Monitoring Chapter and Comments

Manager Mills reported the following information from the Draft Monitoring Chapter and the comments he planned to share on behalf of the MKR:

- Groundwater Levels
 - Directly measuring groundwater level elevations at 18 Representative Monitoring Sites (RMSs). Five of these RMSs the subbasins understands the construction of the facility.
 - Data Gaps – add Groundwater Pumping, Coordination with Adjacent Subbasins, Recharge/Conveyance Loss Measurements, Aquifer Characteristics, Geology
- Groundwater Storage
 - Using groundwater elevations monitored at RMSs and developing groundwater contour maps for comparison to previous year to estimate storage change
 - Data Gaps – Temporal data gaps, Spatial data gaps, Insufficient Quality of Data
- Groundwater Quality
 - Directly measuring groundwater quality constituents and comparing to previous data to determine trends
 - Frequency – Annually rather than every 3-5 years
 - Which constituents – discussion of drinking water standards and ag suitability, but no list developed yet
- Subsidence
 - Directly measuring surface elevations and developing surface with comparison to previous readings to establish subsidence rates. Also INSAR mapping.
 - Recommend there needs to be some description of why no monitoring is described near the CA Aqueduct and the CHSRA alignment.
 - Recommend that if there is unreasonable subsidence, say around 12 inches per year, there should be GPS surveys of well heads. This along with meters of wells and well construction could lead to a broader understanding of the zones that are subsiding and identifying where management actions could be taken.

Manager Mills discussed these topics and recommended comments with the Board and there was general agreement.

Discussion of Sustainable Management Criteria Chapter and Comments

Manager Mills reported the following information from the Draft Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) Chapter and the comments he planned to share on behalf of the MKR:

- Groundwater Levels
 - Measurable Objective (MO) – Forecast Model hydrographs to 2035 (for wells above or below the Corcoran Clay) then maintain that elevation to 2040 as the MO, prior to the programs and projects.
 - Minimum Threshold (MT) – One standard deviation below the 2040 MO, or 50 feet whichever is greater.
- Groundwater Storage
 - Measurable Objective – Groundwater Levels MOs are being used as a proxy. Manager Mills thought this would need revision, because the evaluation is on groundwater contours not groundwater levels at wells. Same for the MT.
 - Minimum Threshold – Groundwater Levels MTs are being used as a proxy
- Subsidence
 - Measurable Objective– Modeled subsidence elevations at RMSs at 2040 from “no project” groundwater level forecasts
 - Minimum Threshold – Same as MO
- Groundwater Quality
 - It was highlighted by Manager Mills that he believed that this issue could not be addressed through reductions to groundwater pumping
 - Measurable Objective
 - Ag Water
 - Nitrate as Nitrogen = –10 mg/L
 - Total Dissolved Solids = –1,000 µmhos/cm
 - Arsenic = –10 µg/L
 - Minimum Threshold – not listed

CA Resources Corp. Effort to Develop County Regulatory Permit Process

Manager Mills reported that an initial notice went out from Kings County to local agencies that they were beginning to develop a permit process for Oil & Gas development. Manager Mills contacted County Planning Department staff and they explained that currently the Oil & Gas process only goes through the State and the County thought a local process would be more protective. After the notice was circulated, City of Hanford staff communicated their concern about a County effort, but the concern really centered on risks to groundwater quality from oil production. Later Manager Mills was contacted by the consultants for the oil industry that are pursuing Oil & Gas environmental permitting (EIR and water supply) in Kings County. Manager Mills relayed that GSAs would be concerned about water quality risks, the amount of water pumped by potential oil fields and how they would contribute to local subsidence.

Attorney Carlson suggested that water develop as a byproduct from oil production likely was not connected to a usable aquifer.

GSA Funding and Prop 218 Related Consultant Services

Manager Mills reported that he had several discussions with Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group staff regarding a future Prop 218 effort to establish the revenue system for the MKR in 2020 and beyond. He reported that P&P had provided him rough estimates of costs to develop the engineer's report, accomplish outreach and election balloting for \$50,000-60,000. Manager Mills asked for guidance from the Board on whether they were comfortable using Provost & Pritchard or whether they wanted him to obtain proposals from other firms. Manager Mills added that P&P was the consultant for the other four GSA Prop 218 efforts in the Tulare Lake subbasin. The Board expressed that they believed Provost & Pritchard was well qualified to take on the work and had worked well with Kings CWD and the City of Hanford in the past.

Renegotiating the 2017 "Interim Operating Agreement for the Tulare Lake Subbasin to Develop and Implement a Groundwater Sustainability Plan"

Manager Mills reported that it was likely that the GSA Parties would renegotiate this agreement later this fall.

UPDATE ON ONGOING EFFORTS

This item was tabled until the next meeting.

SET NEXT MEETING DATE

The regular July Board of Directors meeting was set for July 9, 2019 at 1 p.m.

CLOSED SESSION

This item was tabled until the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:50 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Mills
MKR MIN 190619