

**UPPER VENTURA RIVER GROUNDWATER AGENCY**

**NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING**

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that the Upper Ventura River Groundwater Agency (“Agency”) Board of Directors (“Board”) will hold a **Regular Board Meeting at 1 P.M. on Thursday, July 12, 2018 at the Casitas Municipal Water District Meeting Room, 1055 Ventura Ave., Oak View California 93022.**

**UPPER VENTURA RIVER GROUNDWATER AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**REGULAR MEETING AGENDA**

**July 12, 2018**

**1. MEETING CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

**2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**3. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT APPEARING ON THE AGENDA**

The Board will receive public comments on items not appearing on the agenda and within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Agency. The Board will not enter into a detailed discussion or take any action on any items presented during public comments. Such items may only be referred to the Executive Director or other staff for administrative action or scheduled on a subsequent agenda for discussion. Persons wishing to speak on specific agenda items should do so at the time specified for those items. The presiding Chair shall limit public comments to three minutes.

**4. CONSENT ITEMS**

- a. Approve Minutes from June 14, 2018**
- b. Approve Financial Report for June 2018**
- c. Approve Outstanding Invoices**

**5. DIRECTOR ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**6. GSP PROJECT MANAGER REPORT**

**7. GSP ACTION ITEMS**

**a. GSP Task 1 – Data Quality Control Review**

The Board will discuss draft data quality control review procedures and provide feedback to staff.

**b. GSP Task 2.2 – Update on Surface Water-Groundwater Study (a.k.a. Wet-Dry Interface Monitoring)**

The Board will receive an update on the surface water – groundwater interface monitoring task and provide feedback to staff.

**c. GSP Task 3.1 - Technical Advisory Committee Discussion**

The Board will discuss whether to pursue formation of a technical advisory committee, discuss technical advisory committee structure options, and will provide feedback to staff.

**d. GSP Task 3.1 – Fee Consultant**

The Board will consider approving professional services to advise the Agency concerning fee development.

**8. OTHER ACTION ITEMS**

**a. Policy re Signature of Checks and Approval of Warrants**

The Board will consider amending Article 7.2 of the Agency's bylaws to add an invoice review procedure.

**b. Support Letter for Bureau of Reclamation Assistance**

The Board will consider a request from the City of Ventura for a letter from the Agency supporting the City's application for assistance to plan, design and construct an innovative water recycling project under the Title XVI Program.

**9. COMMITTEE REPORT**

**a. Ad Hoc Stakeholder Engagement Committee**

The committee will provide an update on implementation of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

**10. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

The next scheduled Board meeting will be on August 9, 2018 at 1pm at the Casitas Municipal Water District Meeting Room, 1055 Ventura Ave, Oak View, CA 93022

**UPPER VENTURA RIVER GROUNDWATER AGENCY  
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING JUNE 14, 2018**

The Board meeting was held at Casitas Municipal Water Districts meeting room at 1055 Ventura Avenue, Oak View, CA 93022. Directors present were: Bruce Kuebler, Mary Bergen, Diana Engle, Emily Ayala and Larry Rose; alternate director present was: Susan Rungren for Kevin Brown. Director Glen Shephard was absent. Also present were: Executive Director Cece Vandermeer, Attorney Jena Acos, and GSP Project Manager Bryan Bondy. Public present were; Mike Hollebrands, Bert Rapp and Jennifer Tribo.

**1) CALL TO ORDER-** Chairperson Bruce Kuebler called the meeting to order at 1:01 P.M.

**2) PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – Led by Chairperson Bruce Kuebler.

**3) PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT APPEARING ON THE AGENDA** – None

**4) CONSENT ITEMS**

**a. Approve Minutes from May 3, 2018**

Director Engle moved to receive and file the May 3, 2018 minutes. Seconded by Director Ayala.

Ayes: Bruce Kuebler, Emily Ayala and Larry Rose. Rungren, Bergen and Engle abstained because they were not in attendance at the May 3, 2018 Board Meeting. Absent: Glenn Shephard.

**b. Approve Minutes from May 10, 2018**

Director Engle moved to receive and file the May 10, 2018 minutes. Seconded by Director Bergen

Ayes: Bruce Kuebler, Mary Bergen, Diana Engle, Susan Rungren and Larry Rose. Ayala abstained because she was not in attendance at the May 10, 2018 meeting. Absent: Glenn Shephard.

**c. Financial Reports for May and June 2018**

Vandermeer presented the Financial Report for May and June 2018. There was discussion about how Directors could review invoices before Board approval and it was noted that legal invoices would not be made public because of attorney-client privilege. As a result, the Board requested staff to prepare an amendment to the Bylaws to provide a procedure for approval of invoices at the next meeting. It was also noted that there should not be a ending balance for the current month because additional financial transactions would occur between Board meetings and the end of each month. Director Bruce moved to approve the May 2018 Financial Report and the June 2018 expenditures for Bondy Groundwater, Kear Groundwater and Brownstein Hyatt Farber & Schreck, pending review by the Directors who will be signing the checks, with the understanding that any questions will be resolved in discussions with the contractors and if un-resolved, the invoice would be brought back to the Board next month. Seconded by Director Engle.

Ayes: Bruce Kuebler, Mary Bergen, Diana Engle, Susan Rungren, Emily Ayala and Larry Rose.  
Absent: Glenn Shephard.

**5) DIRECTOR ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Director Engle reported that she had attended the Democratic Club of Ojai panel discussion of Ojai Valley water supply security. CMWD was criticized for its delay and lack of commitment to bring SWP water to the valley.. She attended an ACWA webinar on groundwater where Bondy was a presenter with The Nature Conservancy's on groundwater dependent ecosystems. There are data

sets showing plant communities commonly associated with groundwater. Engle also attended the Groundwater Resources Association of California's First Annual Groundwater Sustainability Agency Summit, a three-day conference in Sacramento. Important items included the relationship between GSPs and county general plans, stakeholder engagement, and data from Northern California showing interaction between pumping and streamflow. Director Kuebler mentioned Ventura County's General Plan update and suggested that Susan Curtis, one of the leaders in the update, be invited to one of our meetings when more detail is known about portions of the plan what will address groundwater management. Kuebler will contact her to discuss timing.

Director Bergen stated that CMWD is hiring a consultant to prepare a comprehensive water plan and has hired Rincon Consultants to assist with public communications.

## **6) GSP PROJECT MANAGER COMMENTS**

Bryan Bondy noted that DWR intends to reclassify the Lower Ventura River Groundwater basin to medium priority which will result in a GSP being required.

He met with Director Engle to address her questions about Task 2.2. It is focused on monitoring movement of the surface water - groundwater interface.

Bondy will be co-chairing a committee of ACWA dealing with groundwater dependent ecosystems. He attended the GRAC First Annual Groundwater Sustainability Agency Summit in Sacramento and emphasized the importance of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan having policies for engagement, speakers, and an administrative record of engagement activities. He also highlighted adaptive management as Plan, Do, Evaluate, and React.

On the grant status, he mentioned we had met the 14-day requirements and the 45 day requirements are due tomorrow, June 15. This will be discussed under another agenda item.

Bryan Bondy talked to Eddie Pech, our DWR point of contact, regarding updating the budget and how to reflect the time prior to the GSA formation. The Board discussed gathering time spent on UVRGA from January 1, 2015. Chair Kuebler stated that he had a spreadsheet with the Director's time and would provide it to Vandermeer. Jena Acos stated that she would have her assistant get past agendas to add to the spread sheet that Vandermeer would be preparing. Bryan Bondy stated that meetings and workshops need to be included in the time keeping spreadsheet and the Board member's rates would be determined in consultation with DWR.

## **7) GSP ACTION ITEMS**

### **a. GSP Task 1- Options for Data Quality Control Review (Time: 2:01 to 2:40 pm)**

The Board considered options for implementing a data quality assurance review process and provide feedback to staff.

Bryan Bondy, project manager, described how and where data quality control review fits into the GSP development process and provided potential options for implementing a data quality control review process.

Public comments. Bert Rapp recommended not spending too much time and money on this issue because data being collected are basic with standard procedures, e.g., flow measurements and water levels using data loggers.

Directors discussed the three data reviewer options and there was consensus for option 3 whereby data quality control review would be incorporated into the GSP workflow under direction of the GSP PM. The Board discussed how the criteria for data performance/acceptance would be developed. The Board settled on asking Bondy and Kear to prepare draft criteria and engage one or more independent technical experts to peer review the draft data performance/acceptance criteria. There was consensus for this approach.

Director Bergen made a three-part motion to:

- 1) approve Jordan Kear and Bryan Bondy to jointly draft review criteria for data performance/acceptance, at a cost to be negotiated with Chair Kuebler within Chair Kuebler's \$5,000 authorization limit;
- 2) request Bryan Bondy to bring back the draft review criteria to the next Board meeting with a list of recommended third party technical consultants to evaluate the draft review criteria whom the Board will engage; and
- 3) request Bondy to bring back the revised draft incorporating the third party technical consultant's comments for Board consideration and approval of the review criteria for data performance/acceptance.

Seconded by Engle.

Ayes: Bruce Kuebler, Mary Bergen, Diana Engle, Susan Rungren, Emily Ayala and Larry Rose.  
Absent: Glenn Shephard.

**b. GSP Task 3.1 (Time: 2:40 to 3:08)**

**i. GSP Grant Work Plan Update**

The Board discussed the GSP Grant Work Plan and will provide feedback to staff concerning potential changes for discussion with the Department of Water Resources (DWR) during Sustainable Groundwater Planning Grant agreement negotiations.

No Public Comments

GSP PM Bondy outlined his suggested changes to the grant work plan as part of the 45-day response to DWR required by June 15. These included modifying task dates to provide more flexibility in GSP preparation and to reflect current scheduling and progress; and to negotiate a reduction in the total cost share from 53% to the minimum required 50% to help speed reimbursement. Alternate Director Rungren suggested incorporating a TAC for data quality control review into the GSP work plan. Bondy recommended against doing so because DWR would require documentation of TAC activities and the Board has not approved a TAC. After discussion there was consensus on Bondy's suggestion. Bondy also mentioned the importance of gathering supporting data for Board costs in creating the JPA and GSA going back to January 1, 2015. Chair Kuebler has a matrix showing attendance at all formation committee and JPA meetings until the GSA was formed on July 20, 2017 including estimates for hourly rates for each participant and he will provide that to Vandermeer and Bondy.

Director Engle motioned to approve the proposed GSP Grant schedule and to authorize the GSP Project Manager to work with DWR for a reduction in cost share from 53% to 50% between cost share and grant share to expedite reimbursement. Seconded by Ayala.

Ayes: Bruce Kuebler, Mary Bergen, Diana Engle, Susan Rungren, Emily Ayala and Larry Rose.  
Absent: Glenn Shephard.

**ii. GSP Task 3.1 – Appoint Ad Hoc Stakeholder Engagement Committee to Implement the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Time: 3:08 to 3:11)**

The Board considered creating an Ad-hoc committee to implement the Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

GSP PM Bondy emphasized the importance of an aggressive, well documented stakeholder engagement program and the need to develop specific actions to implement the Agency's Stakeholder Engagement Plan. He recommended the Board take the following actions:

- 1) Create an Ad Hoc Stakeholder Engagement Committee consisting of no more than three directors with a termination date of January 31, 2022;
- 2) Direct the committee to develop a project management tool for Plan implementation;
- 3) Direct the committee to perform Plan implementation;
- 4) Direct the committee to provide monthly updates to the Board during which it will seek Board guidance on Plan implementation;
- 5) Direct the committee to perform ongoing review of the Plan and provide recommended Plan updates to the Board no less frequently than each May; and
- 6) Direct the committee to perform other stakeholder outreach-related tasks as determined by the Board from time to time.

No public comment.

Chair Kuebler recommended the Committee be chaired by Director Rose with Director Ayala and himself as the other members. Director Bergen motioned to accept the recommended actions as listed with Kuebler's recommendations for membership. Seconded by Director Engle

Ayes: Bruce Kuebler, Mary Bergen, Diana Engle, Susan Rungren, Emily Ayala and Larry Rose.  
Absent: Glenn Shephard.

**8) OTHER ACTION ITEMS**

**a. Fiscal Year 2018/2019 Budget**

The Board considered approving the draft fiscal year 2019 budget prepared by the Ad-Hoc Budget Committee.

No public comment.

Director Engle motioned to adopt the fiscal year 2019 budget increasing "accounting" line item by \$4,000 to \$10,000 and decreasing the "reserve" line item by \$4,000 to \$41,000, and to add a note to the budget stating the Board's intent to implement an extraction fee program during the year that may result in the Board deciding to return a portion of Member Agency contributions pursuant to Article 14 of the JPA. Seconded by Rungren.

Ayes: Bruce Kuebler, Mary Bergen, Diana Engle, Susan Rungren, Emily Ayala and Larry Rose.  
Absent: Glenn Shephard.

**b. Basis of Accounting**

The Board considered adopting a resolution modifying the bylaws to specify the Agency's basis of accounting.

No public comment.

Director Bergen motioned to adopt Resolution 2018-2 modifying the bylaws to establish a cash basis of accounting. Seconded by Ayala

Ayes: Bruce Kuebler, Mary Bergen, Diana Engle, Susan Rungren, Emily Ayala and Larry Rose.  
Absent: Glenn Shephard.

**c. Financial Audit Period**

The Board considered specifying either an annual or biennial financial audit period.

No public comment.

Director Engle motioned to approve Resolution 2018-3 establishing an annual financial audit. Seconded by Bergen.

Ayes: Bruce Kuebler, Mary Bergen, Diana Engle, Susan Rungren, Emily Ayala and Larry Rose.  
Absent: Glenn Shephard.

Director Ayala excused herself and left the meeting at 3:35.

**d. Liability Insurance**

The Board considered approving the Executive Director's recommendation to purchase liability insurance.

Vandermeer recommended purchasing general liability and worker's compensation insurance from the Special District Risk Management Authority (SDRMA). During Board discussion, a question was raised about cost of the compensation insurance because the Agency' actual payroll is about twice the amount in SDRMA's quote. The Board's intent was for approval provided the total cost doesn't increase to more than \$5,000. Also, the agreement requires the Agency to designate a person responsible for risk management and for safety.

Director Engle motioned to approve and sign the six recommended actions included in the agenda, provided the total fee doesn't exceed \$5,000 and to designate the Executive Director, Vandermeer, as Risk Manager, as Safety Officer, and as any other role that need to be fulfilled. Seconded by Bergen.

Ayes: Bruce Kuebler, Mary Bergen, Diana Engle, Susan Rungren, Emily Ayala and Larry Rose.  
Absent: Emily Ayala and Glenn Shephard.

**9) COMMITTEE REPORT**

**a. Ad Hoc Funding Options Committee**

Director Bergen reported on a committee meeting with legal counsel to plan for extraction fee program. Counsel is soliciting proposals from potential fee consultants to assist in developing the program.

**10) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Vandermeer stated that the office moved on May 18, 2018 and the new address is: 417 Bryant Circle. Vandermeer stated that she received the May 2018 time sheets; Director Engle suggested that they review the time keeping process.

- 11) ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm. The next regular Board meeting will be July 12, 2018 at 1:00 pm at the Casitas Municipal Water District Meeting Room, 1055 Ventura Ave., Oak View, CA 93022.

Action: \_\_\_\_\_

Motion: \_\_\_\_\_ 2<sup>nd</sup>: \_\_\_\_\_

B. Kuebler\_\_\_\_ M. Bergen\_\_\_\_ G. Shephard\_\_\_\_ D. Engle\_\_\_\_ K. Brown\_\_\_\_  
E. Ayala\_\_\_\_ L. Rose\_\_\_\_



**UPPER VENTURA RIVER GROUNDWATER AGENCY Item No. 4(b)**

**DATE:** July 12, 2018  
**TO:** Board of Directors  
**FROM:** Cece Vandermeer, Executive Director  
**SUBJECT:** Approve Financial Report for June 2018

---

May Bank Balance: \$102,266.15

**JUNE 2018 ACTIVITY:**

Revenues:

City of Ventura \$16,302.94

Total Received \$16,302.94

June Expenditures Paid:

1090	Bondy Groundwater	May 2018 Invoice	8,864.89
1091	Kear Groundwater	May 2018 Invoice	7,470.00
1092	Brownstein Hyatt Farber & Schreck	May 2018 Invoice	10,809.76
1094	Cece Vandermeer	Medical 6/18	150.00
1096	OBGMA	Office Share Expense 6/18	697.42
1097	Cece Vandermeer	Payroll 6/18	1,100.41

Total Expenditures Paid June 2018 \$ 29,092.48

June Ending Bank Balance \$ 89,476.61

Action: \_\_\_\_\_

Motion: \_\_\_\_\_ Second: \_\_\_\_\_

B. Kuebler\_\_\_ M. Bergen\_\_\_ G. Shephard\_\_\_ D. Engle\_\_\_ K. Brown\_\_\_ L. Rose\_\_\_ E. Ayala\_\_\_

**UPPER VENTURA RIVER GROUNDWATER AGENCY Item 4(c)**

**DATE:** July 12, 2018  
**TO:** Board of Directors  
**FROM:** Cece Vandermeer, Executive Director  
**SUBJECT:** Approve Outstanding Invoices

---

Expenditures for Approval for June 2018:

1093	Brownstein Hyatt Farber & Schreck June 2018 Invoice	9,475.15
1095	Kear Groundwater June 2018 Invoice	1,200.00
1098	Bondy Groundwater June 2018 Invoice	6,331.42
1099	Ojai Digital March – June 2018	675.00
Total Expenditures for approval		\$ 17,681.57

Action: \_\_\_\_\_

Motion: \_\_\_\_\_ Second: \_\_\_\_\_

B. Kuebler\_\_\_ M. Bergen\_\_\_ G. Shephard\_\_\_ D. Engle\_\_\_ K. Brown\_\_\_ L. Rose\_\_\_ E. Ayala\_\_\_

## **UPPER VENTURA RIVER GROUNDWATER AGENCY Item No. 7(a)**

**DATE:** July 12, 2018

**TO:** Board of Directors

**FROM:** Agency Staff

**SUBJECT:** GSP Task 1 – Data Quality Control Review

### **SUMMARY**

The GSP PM will describe draft data quality control review procedures.

### **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

It is recommended that the Board discuss the draft data quality control review procedures and provide feedback to staff.

### **BACKGROUND**

During its June 14, 2018 discussion of options for a data quality control review process, the Board reached as consensus for implementing data quality control review as part of the GSP workflow under the direction of the GSP PM. In terms of data performance/acceptance criteria, the Board requested that Bondy and Kear prepare draft criteria and engage one or more independent technical experts to complete a peer review.

Subsequent to the June 14, 2018 Board meeting, staff was able to speak with its contacts at the United States Geological Survey (USGS) and obtain more information about its data quality control review process. USGS staff shared the attached Data Review Checklist, which UVRGA staff was unable to identify prior to the June 14, 2018 Board meeting. The Data Review Checklist is used by USGS staff to review and approve USGS data products prior to public release. The highlighted portions of the Data Review Checklist contain the most relevant information for the Board's discussion.

The Data Review Checklist also mentions metadata, which is information about the data such as coordinate systems, units, etc. The USGS metadata requirements go far beyond UVRGA needs because many of the requirements pertain to USGS's data products, which UVRGA will not be producing. Nonetheless, USGS's Guidelines for Metadata Review is attached for your reference, with potentially relevant metadata highlighted. Applicable metadata elements will be stored in UVRGA's forthcoming data management system (DMS).

As can be seen upon inspecting the Data Review Checklist, the USGS data quality control review process relies heavily on the use of professional judgement, rather than specific, prescriptive data acceptance criteria. Instead of specific data acceptance criteria, the USGS provides a list of questions that the review is expected to consider when performing data review.

Staff recommends that the USGS Data Review Checklist (highlighted elements) be utilized for UVRGA data review.

Staff has incorporated and adapted the highlighted elements of the USGS Data Review Checklist into a draft UVRGA Data Quality Control Review Procedures for Board review and feedback. Because the UVRGA procedures are based on the USGS procedures, which have already been subjected to considerable peer review, staff does not believe peer review of UVRGAs procedures is necessary. For this reason, staff has held off on pursuing a peer reviewer.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

Not applicable

**ATTACHMENT**

None

**ATTACHMENTS**

- A. USGS Data Review Checklist
- B. USGS Guidelines for Metadata Review
- C. Draft UVRGA Data Quality Control Review Procedure

Action: \_\_\_\_\_

Motion: \_\_\_\_\_ Second: \_\_\_\_\_

B. Kuebler\_\_\_ M. Bergen\_\_\_ G. Shephard\_\_\_ D. Engle\_\_\_ K. Brown\_\_\_ L. Rose\_\_\_ E. Ayala\_\_\_

## Data Review Checklist

Data releases require a minimum of one review of the data and one review of the accompanying metadata. The special focus of the data reviewer is the accuracy, completeness, and usability of a data product. The following checklist is provided for the assistance of data reviewers who are experienced in working with the particular type of data being reviewed. It is assumed that data reviewers have the expertise and tools to access and assess both the data and the metadata, and are familiar with standard practices within the relevant discipline for the formatting and presentation of data. The data reviewer may also serve as the metadata reviewer; the checklist for metadata review can be accessed here:

<http://www.usgs.gov/datamanagement/share/datarelease.php>.

In some cases, it will be unreasonable to actually check every data value, so a spot check or a check of a carefully selected sample may need to suffice. In this case, the data review report should indicate that a spot check or selected sample was examined.

A data review should consider the following:

- Are the data what the author says they are?
- Are data values reasonable? Do they meet specifications for quality, accuracy, and completeness as identified by both the author and the approving official? This might include specific checks such as:
  - Are they in a valid range for that measurement?
  - Do they display seasonal or daily trends that are expected? Is there consistency between adjacent or otherwise related datasets, within the product?
  - Are the geographic locations given for the data reasonable? (e.g., are ocean data points actually showing in the ocean?)
  - Is the accuracy claimed for the data reasonable?
  - Are data anomalies or gaps explained in the metadata? Are “no data” values accurately defined?
  - Do analysis values add up?
- Consider any other requirements that the science center or program may have.
- Although not part of the formal data review process, the following should also be addressed prior to release of the data product:
  - Does the product as a whole, through its design or documentation, provide enough information so that the data and metadata can be easily accessed and used?
  - Is versioning information provided, if warranted?
  - If the data are released on a web page, does the page have useful discovery metadata? For example, the web page clearly identifies the contents, keywords and metadata tags are provided, and geospatial attributes are presented?

Once the review is complete, return comments and suggestions to the author for updates and improvements.

## Item 7a, Attachment B - July 12, 2018

### Guidelines for Metadata Review

A data product may require more than one metadata record – for example, a metadata record for each dataset in a collection of datasets, and another metadata record for the collection as a whole. Metadata records are best reviewed alongside the data, because metadata describe data and there are some points at which it will be helpful to compare what is stated in the metadata record to what the dataset actually includes.

It is helpful if associated science products (reports or publications) are available for reference during metadata review.

The role of the metadata reviewer is to ensure the accuracy, completeness, and usefulness of the metadata for USGS data products. If the metadata reviewer is also serving as data reviewer, see the additional guidelines for data review (<https://www2.usgs.gov/datamanagement/share/datarelease.php>).

The following checklist is provided for the assistance of metadata reviewers who are familiar with metadata standards. The checklist provides general guidelines and can be customized, as necessary, for use in specific USGS programs or science centers.

### Review Process Checklist:

Check compliance with the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) Content Standard for Digital Geospatial Metadata (CSDGM) or International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standards using a recommended metadata validation tool (<https://www2.usgs.gov/datamanagement/describe/metadata.php>). Currently, USGS recommends using the Metadata Parser (<https://geo-nsdi.er.usgs.gov/validation/>) to validate the FGDC CSDGM metadata standard.

Make note of any compliance issues from the error report issued by the validation tool. (Examples of errors include dates in non-compliant format, omission of required information, etc.)

Because validation tools are unable to check the quality of information in the metadata, perform quality checks on the metadata to confirm the information. For example, verify that:

- the title conveys the “what, where, when, who, and (if applicable) scale” of the data;
- the abstract provides a short statement that allows users to quickly evaluate the content of the dataset;
- if applicable, the coordinate system and datum are defined appropriately (both horizontal and vertical);

- the metadata matches the data and its correct version (e.g., is this metadata record describing the correct dataset? Sometimes existing metadata records are used as templates and some old information carries over to the new record);
- links to data, publications, and services function properly (links that are not yet known or defined should have clearly marked placeholders that will be replaced later);
- data tables, fields, and values must be explained clearly so that a non-specialist can understand them; verify that entity and attribute content of metadata corresponds to data set;
- as warranted, geographic coordinates are provided, and they match location keywords in metadata and also agree with the data;
- keywords accurately represent the data and include terms from standard vocabularies whenever possible (such as the USGS Thesaurus, <https://www2.usgs.gov/science/services.html> or Biocomplexity Thesaurus, [http://www.usgs.gov/core\\_science\\_systems/csas/biocomplexity\\_thesaurus/](http://www.usgs.gov/core_science_systems/csas/biocomplexity_thesaurus/));
- information about data processing steps, methodology, and lineage are included in the record and match any associated publications; in particular:
  - could a scientist or technician recreate the final data set from the descriptions?
  - can documentation about methodology be easily found and used?
  - are processing software and versions identified?
- the metadata provides complete and current information about how to use the data files – access instructions, unusual software requirements, data models, definitions of terms, size of the data, etc;
- the data quality section adequately describes the procedures used to ensure the quality of the data;
- access constraints, use constraints, and distribution liability statements are included and are consistent with USGS policy (see: [https://www2.usgs.gov/fsp/fsp\\_disclaimers.asp](https://www2.usgs.gov/fsp/fsp_disclaimers.asp));
- if the data or metadata has been revised, correct version identification is provided (see: [https://www2.usgs.gov/fsp/data\\_versioning.asp](https://www2.usgs.gov/fsp/data_versioning.asp));
- content is written in a way that is usable and helpful, without use of special formatting or characters that will fail to be transferred to XML (generally metadata should be encoded using UTF-8).

Once the review is complete, return comments and suggestions to the metadata author for updates and improvements.

**DRAFT VERSION 1, 6-30-18**

**UVRGA**

**DATA QUALITY CONTROL REVIEW PROCEDURES**

**ADOPTED** \_\_\_\_\_

DRAFT



## Contents

Introduction .....	3
Relationship to GSP Monitoring Network Requirements.....	3
Applicability .....	4
Data Reviewer Qualifications .....	4
Data Quality Control Review .....	4
Review Procedures .....	4
Review Documentation .....	6

DRAFT

## Introduction

This document describes the procedures that Upper Ventura River Groundwater Agency (UVRGA) staff and consultants will follow when performing data quality control review of groundwater and surface water data collected within the Upper Ventura River Basin (UVRB) and surrounding areas within the Ventura River watershed for use in the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP). The procedures contained in this document adapted from United States Geological Survey (USGS) data review procedures.

## Relationship to GSP Monitoring Network Requirements

Pursuant to Subarticle 4 of the GSP Emergency Regulations, the GSP must include a monitoring network that includes monitoring objectives, monitoring protocols, and data reporting requirements. Suggested practices for developing the monitoring network are provided in Department of Water Resources (DWR's) Best Management Practice (BMP) titled *Monitoring Networks and Identification of Data Gaps*, dated December 2016.

The required components of the monitoring network are:

1. **Monitoring Objectives:** The GSP must include a description of the monitoring network objectives for the basin, which will be developed in conjunction with the sustainable management criteria during the planning process. In general, the network will need to be capable of capturing data on a sufficient temporal frequency and spatial distribution to demonstrate short-term, seasonal, and long-term trends in basin conditions for each of the sustainability indicators, and provide enough information to evaluate GSP implementation. DWR's monitoring network and monitoring protocols BMPs suggest using the Data Quality Objective (DQO) process laid out in the U.S. EPA Guidance on Systematic Planning Using the Data Quality Objectives Process to develop the DQOs. One of the last steps in the DQO process is to determine what quality the data must have to achieve the monitoring objectives.
2. **Monitoring Protocols:** UVRGA adopted the Monitoring and Data Collection Protocols on May 10, 2018.
3. **Data Reporting Requirements:** Pursuant to GSP Emergency Regulations § 354.40, the Agency must store monitoring data in a data management system (DMS) that is capable of storing and reporting information relevant to the development or implementation of the GSP and monitoring of the basin. Monitoring data must be included in the required annual reports and submitted electronically on forms provided by DWR. The data management system will be created during the GSP development.

Data quality control is not explicitly required by the GSP Emergency Regulations but is mentioned in the BMP summary of the suggested EPA DQO process (see Monitoring Network Component No. 1). One of the last steps in the suggested in the BMP is to "Specify performance or acceptance criteria – Determine what quality the data must have to achieve the objective and provide some assurance that the analysis is accurate and reliable." DWR suggests that the data performance or acceptance criteria be defined relative to the quantitative measurable objectives and minimum thresholds for each applicable sustainability indicator that will be included in the GSP.

## Applicability

The data review procedures contained in this document shall be applied to all data stored in the UVRGA DMS, regardless of the data source and regardless of whether the data is ultimately utilized to develop the GSP.

Data shall be reviewed prior to storage in the DMS and/or use in developing the GSP. Data obtained from the USGS shall be considered to have met already the requirements of this section without further review, provided any USGS data qualifiers are included in the DMS (e.g. provisional status, etc.).

## Data Reviewer Qualifications

An overarching requirement of SGMA is for all personnel to be fully trained and working under the supervision of a California Professional Geologist, Certified Hydrogeologist, or Professional Civil Engineer (herein referred to as the “responsible professional”). Additionally, the USGS requires that data reviewers be experienced in working with the particular type of data being reviewed and possess the expertise and tools to access and assess both the data and associated metadata.

## Data Quality Control Review

The following data quality control review procedures are adapted from the USGS Data Review Checklist [https://www2.usgs.gov/datamanagement/documents/DataReviewChecklist\\_2014.pdf](https://www2.usgs.gov/datamanagement/documents/DataReviewChecklist_2014.pdf). Language taken directly from the USGS checklist is indicated by italic font.

Prior to storing data in the DMS or using data for GSP purposes, data and associated metadata shall be approved by a data reviewer. Review is necessary to ensure that the data are well documented and are complete, consistent, accurate, and precise as needed to achieve the goals for which they were created. Data review may be carried out by one or more qualified reviewers, but reviewers will need to examine both data and metadata in order to understand the data and to ensure that the metadata accurately describe the data. To maintain objectivity, reviewers should not be chosen from the people who collected the data. Following review, the data, metadata, and data quality control review results should be loaded into the DMS.

## Review Procedures

The review procedures consist of implementing the USGS Data Review Checklist.

*Data releases require a minimum of one review of the data and one review of the accompanying metadata. The special focus of the data reviewer is the accuracy, completeness, and usability of a data product. The following checklist is provided for the assistance of data reviewers who are experienced in working with the particular type of data being reviewed. It is assumed that data reviewers have the expertise and tools to access and assess both the data and the metadata, and are familiar with standard practices within the relevant discipline.*

*In some cases, it will be unreasonable to actually check every data value, so a spot check or a check of a carefully selected sample may need to suffice. In this case, the data review report should indicate that a spot check or selected sample was examined.*

*A data review should consider the following:*

- *Are the data what the author says they are?*
- *Are data values reasonable? Do they meet specifications for quality, accuracy, and completeness as identified by both the author and the approving official? This might include specific checks such as:*
  - *Are they in a valid range for that measurement?*
  - *Do they display seasonal or daily trends that are expected? Is there consistency between adjacent or otherwise related datasets, within the product?*
  - *Are the geographic locations given for the data reasonable?*
  - *Is the accuracy claimed for the data reasonable?*
  - *Are data anomalies or gaps explained in the metadata? Are “no data” values accurately defined?*
  - *Do analysis values add up? (where applicable)*
- *Consider any other requirements.*
  - Other requirements include but are not limited the following:
    - Adherence to UVRGA’s Monitoring and Data Collection Protocols (which satisfies GSP Emergency Regulations § 352.2)
    - GSP Emergency Regulations § 352.4 Reporting Standards, which will be appropriately documented in the metadata:
      - Units:
        - Water volumes shall be reported in acre-feet.
        - Surface water flow shall be reported in cubic feet per second
        - Groundwater flow shall be reported in acre-feet per year.
      - Units and Accuracy:
        - Field measurements of elevations of groundwater, surface water, and land surface shall be measured and reported in feet to an accuracy of at least 0.1 feet relative to NAVD88, or another national standard that is convertible to NAVD88, and the method of measurement described.

- Reference point elevations shall be measured and reported in feet to an accuracy of at least 0.5 feet, or the best available information, relative to NAVD88, or another national standard that is convertible to NAVD88, and the method of measurement described.
- Geographic locations shall be reported in GPS coordinates by latitude and longitude in decimal degree to five decimal places, to a minimum accuracy of 30 feet, relative to NAD83, or another national standard that is convertible to NAD83.
- Monitoring sites shall include the following information:
  - A unique site identification number and narrative description of the site location (for wells – CASGEM well identification number if available);
  - A description of the type of monitoring, type of measurement taken, and monitoring frequency; and
  - Location, elevation of the ground surface, and identification and description of the reference point.

## Review Documentation

The data reviewer shall document the data quality control review results using the following DMS database fields:

- Reviewer – Name of the data reviewer
- Review\_Date – Date of review
- Review\_Batch – A unique identifier that will be assigned to all records in a particular data review batch
- Review\_Result – The data review result:
  - Approved – data approved without condition
  - Qualified – data approved for use with caution or with data use limitation(s)
  - Rejected – data not approved for GSP use
- Review\_Flag – A code that describes the reason for qualified or rejected status (applies only to qualified or rejected data)
- Review\_Comment – Optional field, used as needed to provide information deemed relevant by reviewer, e.g. elaborate on reason for qualified or rejected status

## **UPPER VENTURA RIVER GROUNDWATER AGENCY Item No. 7(b)**

**DATE:** July 12, 2018

**TO:** Board of Directors

**FROM:** Agency Staff

**SUBJECT:** GSP Task 2.2 – Update on Surface Water-Groundwater Study (a.k.a. Wet-Dry Interface Monitoring)

### **SUMMARY**

The Board will receive an update on the surface water – groundwater interface monitoring task and provide feedback to staff.

### **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

It is recommended that the Board receive an update on the surface water – groundwater interface monitoring task and provide feedback to staff.

### **BACKGROUND**

Continuous flow of the Ventura River across the Upper Ventura River Basin ceased in late May and Kear Groundwater began monitoring the location of the northern edge of surface flow in the gaining reach of the Ventura River on June 1.

#### Field Protocols

On June 22, Director Engle and GSP PM Bondy accompanied Kear Groundwater on the weekly field visit. The purpose of the field visit was to fulfill the June 14, 2018 Board direction to Director Engle and GSP PM Bondy to evaluate whether 24-hour or daytime high frequency surveys of the edge of surface flow should be. Another second purpose of the field visit was to address Director Engle's questions about criteria for determining what constitutes flowing vs. non-flowing surface water. The field visit was very instructive in addressing both issues.

Based on the field visit and discussions between Director Engle, GSP PM Bondy, and Jordan Kear, the following was agreed to:

- High-frequency survey:
  - It was agreed that an initial dawn-to-dusk survey would be completed instead of a 24-hr survey due to safety concerns and anticipated difficulty in seeing the edge of flow at night. Results of the daytime survey will be evaluated and a final decision will be made whether to forgo the 24-hr surveys and update the Monitoring and Data Collection Protocols.

- Determination of northern edge of surface flow in the gaining reach:
  - Kear Groundwater staff will hike north along river bed from Confluence Preserve parking by Sulphur Mtn. Rd observing continuous surface water flow and record a GPS waypoint at end of observed continuous flow. It is noted that flow may be difficult to detect near the northern edge of flow, so we are considering this to be the end of continuous daylighted water in the channel.
  - This above-described approach is consistent with the language in the UVRGA Monitoring Protocols; thus, no changes to the protocols document are needed.
  
- Other:
  - Disconnected pools of daylighted groundwater located upstream of the edge of continuous flow:
    - It was agreed that it would be helpful to track the northern extent of any disconnected pools present upstream of the northern edge of flow. Kear staff will typically hike south from an upstream access point in the dry reach to record a GPS waypoint of the northern extent of daylighted groundwater (first appearance of actively flowing or ponded daylighting groundwater).

City of Ventura Request for Additional Groundwater Level Monitoring

During the May 10, 2018 Board Meeting, Alternate Director Rungren expressed a concern that the groundwater level monitoring well being used to correlate with the edge of flow surveys may be too far away to provide a meaningful correlation and requested monitoring of additional wells. City staff also provided the GSP PM with a list of wells for consideration. Following the May 10, 2018 Board meeting, the GSP PM forwarded Alternate Director Rungren’s concern and the City’s well list to Kear Groundwater for evaluation and recommendations. Kear Groundwater’s evaluation of the City’s request is in progress.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

Not applicable

Action: \_\_\_\_\_

Motion: \_\_\_\_\_ Second: \_\_\_\_\_

B. Kuebler\_\_\_ M. Bergen\_\_\_ G. Shephard\_\_\_ D. Engle\_\_\_ K. Brown\_\_\_ L. Rose\_\_\_ E. Ayala\_\_\_

## **UPPER VENTURA RIVER GROUNDWATER AGENCY Item No. 7(c)**

**DATE:** July 12, 2018

**TO:** Board of Directors

**FROM:** Agency Staff

**SUBJECT:** GSP Task 3.1 - Technical Advisory Committee Discussion

### **SUMMARY**

The GSP PM will describe the purpose of a technical advisory committee and options for establishing one.

### **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

It is recommended that the Board discuss whether to pursue formation of a technical advisory committee, discuss technical advisory committee structure options, and provide feedback to staff.

### **BACKGROUND**

Some Board members have expressed an interest in forming a technical advisory committee (TAC) to weigh-in on the data gap tasks and GSP.

#### TAC Purpose and Duties

TACs are typically employed to develop consensus on data interpretation and analysis methods and other complex issues that involve scientific interpretation.

Based on Board member comments to date, the primary goal for the TAC would include:

- Review scopes for data gap tasks prior to Board approval (scopes already approved may be reviewed too);
- Review draft reports for data gap tasks; and
- Although not discussed to date, it is reasonable to assume the TAC would provide input on data analysis methods and review analysis results to be included in the GSP.

The above-listed duties are consistent with the duties assigned to the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency's (FCGMA's) Technical Advisory Group (TAG), which was formed to advise on the development of three GSPs within its jurisdiction. The UVRGA GSP PM is an appointed member of the FCGMA TAG.



### TAC Qualifications

Establishing minimum qualifications for TAC members is highly recommended. Consistent with the FCGMA, the TAC members should be technical professionals with a degree from a state-accredited college or university and possess educational background and experience in hydrogeology or hydrology, applicable to the Upper Ventura River Basin. As required by SGMA and the California Business and Professions Code, practicing professionals must possess a State of California professional license (Professional Geologist, Certified Hydrogeologist, or Professional Engineer [Civil]).

### TAC Design Options

Staff researched the makeup of a number of different technical advisory groups. Several different models were identified and are briefly described below, keeping in mind that there is no requirement to follow any particular model.

- Representative Model: Under this model, TAC members are selected to represent the various interests within the Agency. The FCGMA TAG follows this model, having a one member appointed by each Board member (representing Cities, County, agriculture, small water districts, and United Water Conservation District) and two additional members to represent the public and environmental interests. TAC appointees may be either paid or unpaid depending on the arrangement made with the appointor. Some agencies have TACs that consist of one staff member from each member agency (in which case the TAC members are paid by their agency). This is most common in situations where the member agencies already have qualified professionals on staff.
  - Pros:
    - Provides perceived stakeholder representation. However, the reality is the technical professionals participating in the TAC are supposed to be focused on technical realities, not advocacy.
  - Cons:
    - Would result in a large committee.
      - Large committees are inherently inefficient, which could impact schedules.
      - Larger committees increase administration costs.
    - For UVRGA, the agencies/groups represented by some Board members may not have the resources to sponsor a TAC representative, resulting in vacancies that would defeat the perception of balanced stakeholder representation.
- Subject Matter Model: Under this model, TAC members are selected to provide specialized expertise on different aspects of the project. The National Water Research Institute uses this model for its advisory panels that are developed to review various water issues. This model is useful for projects that include a variety of highly specialized subject matters (for example the West Basin MWD seawater desalination subsurface intake project panel dealt with a wide range of issues including nearshore geology, intake design, underwater construction methods, non-conventional drilling techniques, marine organism entrainment/impingement, etc.) By contrast, GSPs are focused on a

comparatively narrow range of issues. For this reason, the subject matter model is not particularly applicable to GSP development for most GSAs.

- Open Model: Under this model, the TAC is open to any interested person who meets the minimum qualifications. Prior the SGMA, the FCGMA's TAG used an open model.
  - Pros:
    - Creates the opportunity for maximum input
  - Cons:
    - Could result in a large and difficult committee to manage, which would increase the likelihood of delays and increase administration costs
    - Lack of accountability
      - Participation may be inconsistent
      - No guarantee the committee will meet the Board's objectives
- Other Models: Not all TACs necessarily fit into one of the above-listed models.

As mentioned above, there is no requirement to follow any particular model. In fact, SGMA does not require implementation of a TAC. However, implementing a TAC may serve to increase stakeholder buy-in on the GSP.

If the Board desires to move forward with developing a TAC, staff offers the following design suggestions:

1. Keep it small. A smaller committee will minimize administration costs, will minimize TAC member costs (if the agency ends up paying for TAC member time), and will reduce the potential for delays.
2. Focus on needs. The primary need is consensus on hydrogeology issues, including groundwater-surface water interaction. It would be good to have multiple opinions on these issues throughout the GSP development process. Specialized issues, such as biology questions (groundwater dependent ecosystems) do not require a standing committee member<sup>1</sup> and can be addressed with a temporary member or specialty consulting services.

Based on the foregoing, if the Board desires to move forward with developing a TAC, staff would recommend a four-person committee, including the GSP PM, Jordan Kear, and two other members to be approved by the Board. The two unidentified members would be selected from a pool of candidates generated by responses to a request for qualifications issued by the Agency. In order to generate interest and ensure long-term participation, it is recommended that the Agency compensate the TAC members for their time.

---

<sup>1</sup> Some technical issues may fall outside of the licensing scope (e.g. biology questions related to groundwater dependent ecosystems). In these cases, the professional licensing requirement would not apply.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

Not applicable

Action: \_\_\_\_\_

Motion: \_\_\_\_\_ Second: \_\_\_\_\_

B. Kuebler\_\_\_ M. Bergen\_\_\_ G. Shephard\_\_\_ D. Engle\_\_\_ K. Brown\_\_\_ L. Rose\_\_\_ E. Ayala\_\_\_

**UPPER VENTURA RIVER GROUNDWATER AGENCY Item No. 7(d)**

**DATE:** July 12, 2018

**TO:** Board of Directors

**FROM:** Ad Hoc Funding Options Committee

**SUBJECT:** GSP Task 3.1 - Fee Consultant

**SUMMARY:** Jena Acos requested proposals from contractors with experience in providing services needed to establish fees for a groundwater management agency. The Ad Hoc Funding Options Committee reviewed proposals from Robert D. Niehaus, Inc., Raftelis, and Hildebrand Consulting. The proposal from Robert D. Niehaus, Inc. was found to be non-responsive. The Committee felt that both Raftelis and Hildebrand Consulting would provide the information needed for establishing defensible fees. However, Hildebrand Consulting would provide information more specifically tailored to the UVRGA. The Committee was unanimous in recommending Hildebrand Consulting.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Authorize Jena Acos to develop a contract with Hildebrand Consulting for services needed to establish fees in the amount of \$19,800 with the options of requesting a survey of fee activity of other GSAs in California in the amount of \$1,200 and an additional stakeholder meeting for a negotiated amount within Board Chair's discretionary authority.

**BACKGROUND:** To have a legally defensible fee structure, professional services are needed to review legal options and available data, and to develop, evaluate and select options for a fee structure. Jena Acos requested proposals from contractors with appropriate experience and received responses from Robert D. Niehaus, Inc., Raftelis, and Hildebrand Consulting.

The proposal from Robert D. Niehaus was deemed non-responsive because it did not recognize the particular requirements for setting fees for a groundwater management agency and did not include specific tasks or costs.

Both Raftelis and Hildebrand Consulting have the necessary qualifications and the not-to-exceed costs were similar (\$19,979 for Raftelis and \$19,850 for Hildebrand). Both proposals outline tasks that will result in defensible options for a fee structure. However, Hildebrand Consulting included additional services, including materials needed for stakeholder meetings and options for post-plan fees. Hildebrand principals will work directly with the UVRGA whereas most of the work proposed by Raftelis would be done by unidentified staff. Hildebrand also included an optional survey of other GSA activity in fee setting which could help in decision making and stakeholder communication. The Committee felt that Hildebrand Consulting would have stronger stakeholder engagement and be interactive and responsive, producing a product specifically tailored to the UVRGA.

The Ad Hoc Funding Options Committee unanimously recommends using Hildebrand Consulting.

**FISCAL SUMMARY:** The recommended action commits the agency to an expenditure of \$19,850 and the Board could approve the optional survey for \$1,200 and an additional stakeholder meeting provided the total cost does not exceed the currently budget amount. The 2018/2019 budget includes \$25,000 for a fee consultant.

Action: \_\_\_\_\_

Motion: \_\_\_\_\_ Second: \_\_\_\_\_

B. Kuebler\_\_\_ M. Bergen\_\_\_ G. Shephard\_\_\_ D. Engle\_\_\_ K. Brown\_\_\_ L. Rose\_\_\_ E. Ayala\_\_\_

**UPPER VENTURA RIVER GROUNDWATER AGENCY Item No. 8(a)**

**DATE:** July 12, 2018

**TO:** Board of Directors

**FROM:** Agency Staff

**SUBJECT:** Policy re Signature of Checks and Approval of Warrants

**SUMMARY**

The Agency Bylaws do not currently specify check signing authority or staff invoice review responsibilities.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION**

It is recommended that the Board adopt Resolution 2018-4 Designating Check Signing Authority and Establishing Invoice Review Procedures, attached hereto.

**BACKGROUND**

The Board has expressed a desire for the Groundwater Sustainability Project Manager (GSP PM) review of consultant and other SGMA-related warrants prior to Board approval. Agency Counsel recommends that invoice review procedures be memorialized in the Agency Bylaws, specifically Article 7.2.

Article 7.2 is also amended to designate check signing authority on behalf of the Agency.

Resolution 2018-4, designating check signing authority and establishing staff invoice review procedures, is attached to this staff report.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

GSP PM warrant review prior to Board approval is not anticipated to increase the Agency's project management costs because it will simply shift the timing of the reviews (GSP PM would be coding invoices for quarterly grant invoices anyway).

**ATTACHMENT**

Draft Resolution 2018-4 A RESOLUTION OF THE UPPER VENTURA GROUNDWATER AGENCY (AGENCY) DESIGNATING CHECK SIGNING AUTHORITY AND ESTABLISHING INVOICE REVIEW PROCEDURES

Action: \_\_\_\_\_

Motion: \_\_\_\_\_ Second: \_\_\_\_\_

B. Kuebler\_\_\_ M. Bergen\_\_\_ G. Shephard\_\_\_ D. Engle\_\_\_ K. Brown\_\_\_ L. Rose\_\_\_ E. Ayala\_\_\_

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**UPPER VENTURA RIVER GROUNDWATER AGENCY**  
**RESOLUTION NO. 2018-4**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE UPPER VENTURA RIVER GROUNDWATER AGENCY  
(AGENCY) DESIGNATING CHECK SIGNING AUTHORITY AND ESTABLISHING  
INVOICE REVIEW PROCEDURES**

**WHEREAS**, Article 7.2 of the Bylaws of the Agency requires the Board of Directors (Board) to approve all warrants and authorize issuance of checks in payment thereof; and,

**WHEREAS**, Article 4.4 authorizes the Board of the Agency to direct the actions of the Executive Director; and,

**WHEREAS**, Article 4.10 authorizes the Board of the Agency to hire and engage a consultant to serve as the GSP Project Manager for the purpose of assisting in the preparation and implementation of a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP); and,

**WHEREAS**, the Agency executed a professional services agreement with Bondy Groundwater Consulting, Inc. on August 25, 2017 to perform the GSP Project Manager duties; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Board did thoroughly discuss and determine need for GSP Project Manager review of warrants for consultant and other GSP-related expenses at its July 12, 2018.

**NOW, THEREFORE**, the Board of Directors of the Upper Ventura River Groundwater Agency does hereby resolve, find, determine and order as follows:

Article 7.2 of the Bylaws is hereby repealed in its entirety and replaced as follows:

7.2 Signature of Checks and Approval of Warrants. The Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary shall have authority to sign checks on behalf of the Agency. Following GSP Project Manager review of all warrants for consultant and other GSP-related expenses, other than those warrants submitted by the GSP Project Manager, the Board shall approve all warrants and authorize issuance of checks in payment thereof. Two of the three board members with check signing authority shall review all of the GSP Project Manager’s warrants prior to submitting them for Board approval. Checks for payment of utility bills, postage, payroll, payroll taxes, credit union collections, petty cash, emergency repairs, invoices subject to discount and interfund transfers, and similar payments may be disbursed prior to Board approval; such items shall be presented to the Board at its next meeting.



PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 12th day of July, 2018.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bruce Kuebler, Board Chair

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cece Vandermeer  
Executive Director

APPROVED AS TO FORM

\_\_\_\_\_  
Upper Ventura River Groundwater Agency  
General Counsel

**UPPER VENTURA RIVER GROUNDWATER AGENCY Item No. 8(b)**

**DATE:** July 12, 2018

**TO:** Board of Directors

**FROM:** Agency Staff

**SUBJECT:** Support Letter for Bureau of Reclamation Assistance

**SUMMARY**

On May 30, 2018, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) announced a funding opportunity for Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Projects. The Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Projects funding opportunity allows for sponsors of water reclamation and reuse projects that are congressionally authorized or are eligible under section 4009(c) of the WIIN Act to request cost-shared funding for planning, design and/or construction of those Projects. Applications are due on July 27, 2018.

The City of Ventura was included in the list of project sponsors eligible for federal assistance to plan, design and construct an innovative water recycling project under this Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Projects funding opportunity. The City is requesting letters of support for its application.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION**

It is recommended that the Board authorize the Board Chair to sign a letter from the Agency supporting the City of Ventura's application for assistance to plan, design and construct an innovative water recycling project under the Title XVI Program.

**BACKGROUND**

The City of Ventura's proposed project is critical to the region's environmental protection and economic sustainability given the fact that its water supply is wholly reliant on local sources. It will provide a safe and reliable water supply to the more than 112,000 residents within their service area and ensure compliance with water quality mandates identified as part of a settlement agreement. Under the feasibility study, the City's objectives focus on expanding recycled water for the purpose of offsetting potable uses, recharging groundwater basins, and creating wetlands that would serve as a public amenity and environmental enhancement to the community.

Water reclamation and reuse projects provide improved efficiency, flexibility during water shortages and diversify the water supply. Reclamation is making up to \$20 million available for those projects authorized under the WIIN Act and \$34 million for the congressionally authorized Title XVI projects.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

Not applicable

**ATTACHMENT**

Draft Letter of Support

Action: \_\_\_\_\_

Motion: \_\_\_\_\_ Second: \_\_\_\_\_

B. Kuebler\_\_\_ M. Bergen\_\_\_ G. Shephard\_\_\_ D. Engle\_\_\_ K. Brown\_\_\_ L. Rose\_\_\_ E. Ayala\_\_\_



P.O. Box 1779, Ojai, CA 93024  
(805) 640-1207

The Honorable Brenda Burman  
Commissioner  
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
1849 C Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20240

Dear Commissioner Burman:

On May 30, 2018, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation announced that a number of sponsors of water recycling projects successfully completed feasibility studies and met the criteria of the Title XVI Program demonstrating the feasibility of a project to provide sustainable water supplies. I am pleased that my constituent, the City of San Buenaventura (City of Ventura), was included in the list of project sponsors eligible for federal assistance to plan, design and construct an innovative water recycling project under the authorities provided in the WIIN Act. I strongly support the City of Ventura's application for federal assistance and hope that your office will positively review the application for assistance.

The City of Ventura's proposed project is critical to the region's environmental protection and economic sustainability given the fact that its water supply is wholly reliant on local sources. It will provide a safe and reliable water supply to the more than 112,000 residents within their service area and ensure compliance with water quality mandates identified as part of a settlement agreement. Under the feasibility study, the City's objectives focus on expanding recycled water for the purpose of offsetting potable uses, recharging groundwater basins, and creating wetlands that would serve as a public amenity and environmental enhancement to the community.

In 2015-16, the City unveiled a potable reuse demonstration facility to gather site specific data on the performance of purification facilities and to provide a platform for public outreach and education. The facility included a system of multiple barriers (treatment components) and extensive testing to prove the performance of the system in meeting all drinking water goals as well as potable reuse goals for pathogen and pollutant removal. The facility exceeded expectations and more than met all the water quality goals as well as provided an opportunity for the public to come and see the technology. Based on the positive outcomes of the demonstration, the City is now proceeding forward with implementation of this project.

Again, I strongly support the City of Ventura's application for federal assistance. I look forward to learning of USBR's review and decision on the proposed project's request for assistance. If you have any questions, please contact me at (805) 798-3695.

Sincerely yours,

Bruce Kuebler, Chair  
Upper Ventura River Groundwater Agency