

MINUTES

Owens Valley Groundwater Authority

Board Members:

INDIAN CREEK-WESTRIDGE CSD	Luis Elias	BIG PINE CSD	BryAnna Vaughan
COUNTY OF MONO	Rhonda Duggan	LONE PINE PAIUTE SHOSHONE TRIBE	Mel Joseph
CITY OF BISHOP	Karen Kong	OWENS VALLEY COMMITTEE	Mary Roper
COUNTY OF INYO	Dan Tothoroh		

December 9, 2021

The Owens Valley Groundwater Authority meeting was called to order at 2:02 p.m. via videoconference.

1. Pledge of allegiance

The Chairperson led the pledge of allegiance.

2. Public Comment

April Zrelak stated she would like to request that participants of the meeting have the ability to view who is in attendance, a list of how many people are attending, maybe phone numbers or name; we've requested this before and there is other county zoom meetings that do that and also the chat. John Vallejo stated it is more of a technical issue, there are some meetings that aren't closed where the public and Board members are all using the same link in that scenario everyone can see who is on the zoom but the scenario that the OVG and Board of Supervisors use is that they call up people to be promoted and when you use that format it doesn't show the attendees so it's more of a software issue. Dr. Steinwand stated a screen shot is taken of the attendee list so it can be provided after the fact but we've never published that and I'm unclear on that with the Brown Act provision about someone identifying themselves and whether that applies here or not but we can talk about that with council. John Vallejo stated that is two different issues and we don't want to get too far off down the road here but maybe we can include a list of attendees on the minutes or something and maybe it's something to put on a future agenda for discussion. Dr. Steinwand stated we can't give direction in public comment but it is available after the fact and it also isn't constant during the meeting, people drop in and drop off but we do have an approximate list. Stacey Simon stated she would like to additionally note that some people don't use their real names or nicknames so it is not always a comprehensive or accurate list. Dr. Steinwand stated right and we don't have anything personal such as phone numbers, that's not available. Kevin Carunchio stated he was actually going to speak on this subject later in the agenda and he thinks he will when there could be a little more discussion other than the constraints of public comment, more of a warm fuzzy so he will stick around until the end of the meeting and offer his comments then.

3. Introductions

The Board introduced themselves with one alternate in attendance for Lone Pine Paiute Shoshone Tribe, Janice Aten.

4. Approval of minutes from the November 18, 2021 Board meeting

The Chairperson requested a motion to approve the minutes of the September 9, 2021 meeting. Motion to approve the minutes by Luis Elias, seconded by Karen Kong. The Chairperson requested a roll call vote; Luis Elias – Y, Rhonda Duggan – Y, Karen Kong – Y, Dan Tothoroh - Y, BryAnna Vaughan – abstain, Janice Aten - abstain, Mary Roper – Y. Motion passed 5 Yes, 2 abstentions.

5. Board Member Reports

The Chairperson opened up Board Member reports and there were no reports or updates provided.

6. Public Hearing pursuant to California Water Code section 10728.4 to consider adoption of the Owens Valley Groundwater Authority Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP). Consider and potentially adopt GSP and direct staff to submit GSP to the California Department of Water Resources in accordance with required procedures. Provide any other desired direction to staff

Dr. Steinwand stated he had an introduction; there was a staff report associated with this item; if you've all had time to read it and if you want to start that way and open it up to the Board you can do that too. BryAnna Vaughan directed Dr. Steinwand to move forward with

the staff report. Dr. Steinwand asked John Vallejo or Stacey Simon if there is anything we need to do to open up the hearing, John Vallejo stated you just called it out so after the staff report we should formally open the public hearing and take public comment. Dr. Steinwand stated it's not very long and mostly some housekeeping issues he'd like to take care of regarding the draft GSP. He stated over the last couple years as you all know, the consultant has prepared GSP components and presented them to the OVGA in draft format for direction and for comment from the Board and the public. The components were assembled into the administrative draft which was circulated internally in August of this year. He stated after the Board meeting to consider the administrative draft in September, the public review draft was released on September 23, 2021 for a 45 day public comment period. This Board held a meeting in November to discuss the comments and subsequently staff have prepared a response to the comments which was released last week as Appendix 6 to the GSP. The final draft of the GSP was also released in a tracked changes version to facilitate the Board and public finding where the document was revised in response to the public comments. Dr. Steinwand stated so today the issue before your Board is to consider whether to adopt the GSP after discussing the draft, the comments, and the responses and he said there are a few housekeeping issues that he would like to put before the Board before they get started. First there is a minor wording correction. He received additional information from the California Dept. of Fish & Wildlife staff regarding the rationale for the minimum threshold at the northeast spring in Fish Slough after the response to the comments and Appendix 6 of the draft GSP were circulated. The minimum threshold value is the same and does not change but the rationale behind it provided to us by CDFW, the folks who actually manage the flows from that spring for the benefit of endangered species. That minimum threshold value represents when habitat degradation was observed by their staff and their scientists which is pretty much what a minimum threshold is supposed to be, it's supposed to be when you start seeing changes that are considered undesirable, obviously impacts too or degradation to habitat for endangered species qualifies so he stated he would like to retain that language and add that to the GSP where relevant instead of the language that's there just to clarify that is exactly why they proposed that value and what it meant. Second, the appendices and the response to comments, Rhonda Duggan stated she is sorry to interrupt but can Dr. Steinwand state where that change will be. He stated it will be in the response to comments because he will correct what he mentioned to their response and it will be in the minimum thresholds for the spring flow in I think that would be section 3.2 for the Tri-Valley area, I can pull it up really quick. Rhonda Duggan stated and what the difference is. Dr. Steinwand stated the difference is just saying the minimum threshold we now say it's from CDFW when they had difficulty managing flows and it will now say that's when they saw degradation or observed it in the field when flows hit that level so we want to stay above that. Rhonda Duggan stated it doesn't define a level it just explains the level? Dr. Steinwand stated yes the number will be the same, they just provided some additional rationale after I responded to their comment. He stated its section 3.3.1, somewhere in that section. He stated there is a table in there where we talk about the spring flow, that's the one threshold that related to surface water capture, so it's just a little clarification of why we set that number, that's where CDFW observed degradation of habitat. That's actually what a minimum threshold is supposed to be so I'd like to retain that description. Dr. Steinwand stated so that's where it will go, just a change in the sentence, I haven't figured out which sentence it actually gets into yet but that's where it will be in that section and also in the Executive Summary. Rhonda Duggan stated it's on page 277 of the version I have. Dr. Steinwand stated really, it could be the track changes version page numbers are going to swap. Rhonda Duggan stated its page 260 at the bottom of the page and 277 in the packet. Dr. Steinwand stated there was only one change in the appendices aside from number 6 which is new, relatively new, but appendices number 7, the hydrogeological conceptual model, in response to a comment we added a figure there of groundwater contra verse for the Owens Valley groundwater basin, all of the other appendices were unchanged, some still say draft such as appendix 8 and 10. I'm still waiting for revisions that change the footer and remove the water mark from the consultant, those are work products from them but those will be added to the final as well without the word draft attached to it but none of the other text has changed in the appendices, I just wanted to point that out that on the website if you had downloaded it, it still might say draft but that's just because we haven't removed that stamp yet but there is no changes to the text expected or made to the written response to comments. Those are the housekeeping things I'd like to bring up and second of all on the staff report there were some policy issues that I just want to run through very quickly. As your aware many of the comments expressed dissatisfaction with the inability to regulate LADWP pumping. We have discussed this issue on many occasions over the last couple years and we also tried to address this in the general comments, number two I believe it is as well as adding text to the final GSP where it was relevant. The particular methods or process to engage with LADWP or any entity that may be responsible for exceeding a threshold in the basin probably can't and probably not wise to prescribe that beforehand but wiser to deal with that on a case by case basis. However, the OVGA could consider adding a policy statement to the guiding principles that you previously adopted and those are also included in the GSP. An example of a potential policy statement or project addition is included in the staff report and I'll read that now. There is one little change in the wording of that I'd like to add to "If undesirable results or minimum thresholds are determined to be triggered by groundwater use or management outside of the Owens Valley Basin or (GSP area), (I'd like to add that so it includes pumpers from within our basin) the OVGA shall engage with the appropriate parties and regulatory mechanisms to coordinate on mitigating and alleviating the impacts caused within the GSP boundaries". So we've provided that as a recommendation or example as a policy statement you could adopt and add to the guiding principles so in the future if we do start to see the cross boundary effects or anything like that, we have a policy that requires the OVGA to engage and try to alleviate and address those. So we have language to that affect in the GSP, however, another statement or principal that could be adopted and it doesn't have to be today would help guide the future Boards when such an activity is detected by our monitoring program. Dan Totheroh asked when do you suggest we add that? Dr. Steinwand stated it could be direction to staff to bring back to add to the guiding principles, council? any advice, yes or no, something we can do today if you want. John Vallejo stated you could add it to the GSP today or it could be brought back as a future policy or agenda item to add to the guiding principles like you mentioned or some other type of policy action your Board could consider. Dan Totheroh stated it seems like an appropriate thing to be adding and gives the plan more understanding of what our intent is if that's indeed the Boards intent. He stated, my preference would be to add it as soon as appropriate. Stacey Simons stated after the hearing when the public action is taking place Board members may direct and agree on any sort of changes or additions that they come up with during today's session to the motion prior to adoption so if staff can keep track of those things, then the motion could be to adopt the GSP with the list of changes. Dr. Steinwand stated he only had a couple more things to say, he wished to discuss the language adopted regarding the adjudicated/non adjudicated lands within the basin. We've replaced non adjudicated with GSP area as a more precise term to not just lump in the tribal lands for example that are also non adjudicated but not subject to the GSP. However, we retained the term adjudicated for the LADWP lands in Inyo County that

are subject to the Inyo/LA Water Agreement because one, there are LADWP lands in Mono County so you can't just swap a simple term and call them LADWP lands, and also more importantly because that is the term that DWR maps and documents use to be consistent with the language in SGMA that they treat as adjudicated. So for example the outline of the GSP says the section where it talks about your adjudicated lands, well if we started substituting new language in there it might be confusing. So recognizing that DWR is also going to be a reviewer of this plan we have to retain that language. We did add a final sentence in the GSP that this is not meant to imply this is a legal term or that this is a legal term meant to imply the entire basin has been fully adjudicated and we added that in several places as well. Hopefully to clarify that we are using the term adjudicated more as a matter of convenience and accuracy rather than referencing another process that has not occurred in the basin. Two other requests that came out of public comment that were related to OVGA advocacy regarding legislation or coordination and engagement with LADWP planning efforts that affect water demand in LA and obviously the supply from our basin. Staff recommends that these be taken up as necessary in the future by the OVGA as policy direction to staff to participate in these organizations or processes as well as any comment letters or statements that the OVGA might make in the future. We don't recommend that these try to be incorporated directly into the GSP now just because again, we are not sure what might happen in the future but a more general recognition that you wish to be engaged can be recognized and can be taken up in the future. Finally, just two minor points, we did discuss at the November meeting two additions to the GSP regarding future projects to refine the GDE map, the groundwater dependent ecosystem map as well as the development of a water monitoring program, and then an outreach program associated with the development of a groundwater model in Tri-Valley if that project proceeds. Those additions were made and I just wouldn't mind if you had any input on whether that was consistent with what we discussed in November or not. As Stacey Simons stated we can make these changes now. So that's it on the staff report about housekeeping issues for you to consider before considering approval of the GSP. BryAnna Vaughan stated she wanted to make sure she's following up with council's direction moving forward for this public hearing and John Vallejo might be there with the siren also. She asked if he could provide some direction so we could move forward. John Vallejo stated to open the public hearing and start taking public comment and testimony. Bryanna Vaughan stated the public vs the Board first? John Vallejo stated it's up to you the process you want but often times Board members want to hear what the public comment and testimony are before they formulate their final opinions but you can do both, have initial reactions and big picture discussion with the Board, go get comment from the public then come back to the Board but it's your process, but at the end of the day, the Board has to weigh in at the end. BryAnna Vaughan stated she appreciated everyone's guidance because she is a non-professional beurocrat and needs all the input she can get. Sally Manning, Big Pine Paiute Tribe, Environmental Director stated I know you would not think it was a meeting if I weren't here but I am and I did go and give some comments at the Board of Supervisors meeting on Tuesday and I expressed disappointment that we feel like the tribes comments were not adequately addressed in this and that the draft GSP is not what it could have been. That said, I understand there has been a lot of work that has gone into it; I do like the website and all the data; I think we've got a lot of information to work with; and I think it's actually sufficient information to even make things a lot better. You know I feel like California, there's plenty of places in California that didn't like SGMA but for our area it was a gift and it was an opportunity to somewhat level the playing field with our colonizers, LADWP, and I feel like we blew it on that opportunity that they are going to continue to do what they do. We have grandfathered in their pumping, their impacts, and as their letter says, they think the GSP is overly stated and to constraining and I would say it basically gives them too much. So there you have it, who knows what will happen. I don't understand the language that Aaron just mentioned that's in this staff report that I just downloaded. If I'm reading it correctly, the bottom of page 1, "triggered by groundwater or management use outside the Owens Valley basin" you know the LADWP lands are within the Owens Valley groundwater basin so I don't understand what we are talking about. Dr. Steinwand stated when he read that, he requested that we add "for the GSP area" to address that particular question, your right, that was an oversight on our part and it should be corrected. Sally Manning stated ok, there's a change in that language. Sally Manning stated Fish Slough, the tribe didn't comment very much on Fish Slough if at all but since this has been released, she did take a closer look at some of the data and it is true, this northeast spring situation is very alarming. If you go onto the OVGA website you will see flows from northeast springs starting at 25/26 cfs and now they are all the way down, crashed down to .1 cfs I mean that's like drops coming out and sorry, I don't know what the Fish & Wildlife people did go walk around on the LADWP land and notice what, wilting grasses, but when you start to see impacts with your own eyes and not measuring them in different ways, it's too late. You know you don't just wait to see something cause then you can't do anything about recovering and I just think that definitely something needs to be done about at least that part of Fish Slough. You know when you look at the data for Fish Slough, different things are happening in different parts of the slough it's not a small area it's fairly large but it is extremely unique and special and it's a jurisdictional mess, nightmare if you will because of straddling two counties, having BLM land, and LADWP land, and Fish & Wildlife. Someone is going to have to take some accountability and responsibility for Fish Slough and right now it seems to be you guys, the Owens Valley Groundwater Authority, so this is going to fall on you. So one last comment, maybe a way to go I understand you would default on your grant if you don't turn this plan in but we are a low priority basin and we did get state money to produce this GSP, I don't think it's our best shot and maybe it can be turned in as a work in progress as a draft since we are low priority we want to continue to make it better so that would be a suggestion. Samantha stated hello, thanks for having me, can you hear me ok, I was kind of concerned about the wording "case by case" kind of what Sally says it kind of seems like if your regulating, once the minimum threshold is met its way to late. I think the DWP should be scheduled monitoring at least quarterly if not monthly. The water is really important in the valley and I think we really need to prioritize it staying here because the sage and the junipers and all the little critters really need the basin replenished and the City of LA just keeps taking and taking and there really doesn't seem to be any justice for the valley and it's just really disheartening, thank you. Dr. Steinwand asked if he could add one comment and stated this is kind of a repeating theme, the minimum threshold is what you are supposed to avoid that's not what you manage too. There are also goals in the plan called measurable objectives, that's what we have to attain in the next twenty years, you just can't hit a minimum threshold or several minimum thresholds. The guidance from DWR on how many thresholds need to be exceeded or how far apart or how severe the basin before you become unsustainable is not entirely clear to me even now, but we are trying to manage to a goal, not to just go down to the minimum threshold and stay there. Northeast spring is a special case in that it would be difficult to try and manage pumping at this point given what we know to arrest the decline but we did set a goal above the minimum threshold and that's also in the report. So, I just want to point that out because I think that several of the public comments were objecting to the minimum threshold as if that is what we are trying to attain and no, we are trying to stay way above that at our goal. For example with subsidence there's a couple

inches or 3.6 inches minimum threshold but our goal is zero change or zero subsidence, so that's what we are trying to attain. I just wanted to point that out in case more comments to that affect come up. Edie Trimmer stated she wished that the Board and the CSD had wished to push the envelope more in establishing its own power to regulate groundwater pumping within the entire Owens Valley those include lobbying for legislative changes that would make so called adjudicated lands more under control of the OVGA. That includes participating on the Long Term Water Management Plan that LA does and I was disappointed by what I feel is kind of a passive response to some of the suggestions to make it a more active Board. The second concern I have is of course the Fish Springs. It is caught between the needs of agricultural people in the Tri-Valley area; how Mono County will handle that; and then the lack of knowledge we have about why those springs are in such trouble, thank you. BryAnna Vaughan stated she will assume that Edie meant the springs out at Fish Slough with her comment just to clarify and are there any other comments; I'm not seeing any from the attendees. Kevin Carunchio stated hi Madam Chair and members of the Board, good afternoon again; I'm appearing before you today on behalf of Terry Plum who is owner of the Pine Creek village in the Round Valley area and a property owner throughout Inyo and Mono counties. I would preface my comments as Mr. Plum did by just commending and thanking your Board for sticking it out and moving forward with preparing the GSP. I think that puts the whole region miles ahead doing it when you're not under order to do it so thank you for that. I also want to commend staff for the heavy lift here, there is so much work involved in this its baffling, I can see that so I just want to recognize that and thank staff for their efforts, I thought the whole process has been fantastic. The reason I'm commenting this afternoon is one of the theme's in Mr. Plum's letter specifically comment 7 had to do with some more affirmative language regarding the GSP not becoming a further impediment to the development of housing in the eastern sierra and I know that some members of your Board sit on other Boards and councils that grapple with the housing crisis on a daily basis. I certainly appreciate and applaud that approaching the GSP basically do what I call a minimum effective dose, do some adaptive management work from a policy perspective but I think a statement in the GSP similar to what Dr. Steinwand was suggesting relative in his staff report would go a long ways towards addressing concerns or fears of the common guy or a few large property owners in the area or the eastern sierra. I think staff's response to comment #7 in Mr. Plums letter sort of missed the point where it speaks to protections for diminimus users, he wasn't referring to diminimus users but was talking about large parcels of land somewhere to 100 plus acres available for development in Mustang Mesa, the 1,000 acres off Mazourka Canyon Rd in Independence; and some lessor properties that he holds in the area. We are all aware of the eastern sierra with the current land tenure patterns is never going to incur significant development pressure. The chance of what I'm suggesting and asking for today is being a Trojan horse and opening the door to unbridled development just isn't a reality given those land tenure patterns. So there is only a limited amount of land available for housing development but it already faces enormous constraints to occurring, so for that reason, I'm asking your Board to consider a very affirmative statement in this GSP and if you could add it to your guiding principles as well, to the effect that this GSP and subsequent management actions will not further hinder the already limited and constrained ability to develop future housing in the basin. I think that's a very clear indication of the intent and I think that's what everyone speaks too, with the sections of the guiding principles and the process outlined in the plan for management actions but a very clear statement that way I don't think it puts the GSP or your Authority at great risk but does go a long way to not having a chilling effect on the development proposals that might be considered right now. Thank you very much for listening to my comments. Bryanna Vaughan thanked Kevin for his comment and asked if there was anyone else from the audience interested in making a comment. Nancy Masters said good afternoon OVGA Board, yes, I would join Kevin in commending you for the incredible amount of work I've witnessed since the beginning of this process and it has been something that you guys have navigated quite well and I look forward to seeing this groundwater sustainability plan be a spring board for further environmental protection. I think we live in a valley that is unique in California; it's unique because it remains undeveloped, and it's unique because it has ecosystems that cover various levels of elevation within just a few miles. We have unique circumstances with land ownership in terms of LADWP and export with LADWP, but using this process to find a way to support the groundwater dependent ecosystems is the primary goal of the GSP or the SGMA process. In so far as surface waters are related to groundwater, I think that the Board using the GSP going forward could begin to identify projects that will restore surface waters that will begin to recharge groundwater ecosystems and support the variety of plant and animals that rely on those. The Nature Conservancy has put together a nice package on their website for identifying endangered species within our area and also other factors around SGMA and I would urge us to begin to think beyond adoption of this and start to think about projects such as removing stream concrete that has prevented recharge in terms of streams that have been concreted in decades ago; looking at diversions on streams in the valley, those diversions affect down water recharge and certainly that's within the Boards capacity to look at to see how that's going to affect groundwater dependent ecosystems. A case in point there would be oak creek and the vegetation that goes all the way to the valley floor which are oaks and unique in the Owens Valley. So again thank you for all of your hard work and I guess my final statement would be is to recognize that this is an environmental document, that we are doing this for the purpose of protecting plants and animals and ecosystems and that we use this opportunity to look for projects that can benefit those things, thank you very much. BryAnna Vaughan thanked Nancy for her comment and asked if there were any more comments from the public. She stated not seeing any we can go ahead and open it up to the Board for discussion and asked if there was anyone that wanted to start. Luis Elias stated he would like to go back on a few things concerning the GSP, to me if we had not been designated a medium priority basin at the start of all this I seriously doubt the effort to develop a GSP on our own or form a GSA would ever have happened. I mean, we had the state on our backs; DWR put that medium priority on us and we were required to develop a GSP. We went ahead and applied for a grant, got it approved, hired a consultant, and then started going on with the GSP and then at least a year later DWR started evaluating our priority designation and one time they even considered labeling us high priority. Eventually we got where we are now, low priority but by that time we were so far along in the process, to me anyway, it didn't make any sense to stop and just throw everything out the window with the knowledge that hey, what's to say DWR in another couple years or less will label us a medium or high priority and then start all over again, makes no sense to me. So in light of that I think it makes sense to develop the GSP and I think we should at least go to the next step of adopting the GSP and submitting it. Now beyond that as far as if it's implemented, we will be talking about that next year. I think the document is in good enough shape to call it as someone mentioned before a working document, a work in progress, I certainly wouldn't call it final and complete, it's going to be updated and needs some more work. As everyone knows there are people that are not thrilled with the document and they'd like to see some other discussion or other things in there but we were under the gun and we are barely making it as it is to get this thing in on time. So the other thing I want to say is to my thinking, the management issues up in Mono County particularly Tri-Valley, I would be in favor of next year having

those discussions of changing the boundaries, putting that area under Mono County, have Tri-Valley work together with Mono County and address those issues together with DWR, that's just my feelings on the GSP at this point. I think it is good enough, what comes out of this meeting today, make those changes and clarifications, and then move forward, thank you. BryAnna stated Dan Totheroh looked like he wished to go next. Dan stated he wasn't ready but will if she wants him too. He stated I certainly go along with what Luis Elias is saying; there's been a lot of hard work put into this; it's a good document; there's no doubt that we will need to make some changes as we learn from it; but I think we should adopt it and I would like to see us make the changes that Aaron was talking about earlier. My recollection in relationship to what Kevin Carunchio was saying is that our guiding principles talk about a balanced approach, and if it's not adequate in the way it's stated now, I would think some language that says we certainly will carefully consider regulating anything that would limit further development of housing and the impacts that would have on our area before we set any regulations, but I think we should adopt the plan and as we need to, change it. BryAnna Vaughan thanked Dan Totheroh. Rhonda Duggan stated she appreciated her colleague's comments; they follow a little along her thinking. Just a couple of housekeeping things, in the table of contents you might want to check the spelling of Stacey Simon's last name, it's incorrect. Dr. Steinwand stated, you're kidding. Rhonda stated no I wish I was; only someone that has their name frequently misspelled can be sensitive to this. Stacey Simons asked how it was spelled. John Vallejo stated it's as if she's coming to save us all, like Symon's ambulance. Dr. Steinwand apologized to Stacey Simon and stated his name is never spelled right and he's beginning to wonder which list he's on in the junk mail because it's misspelled different ways. Stacey Simons stated as long as you didn't call me Tracy. Rhonda Duggan stated the other thing that struck her was and she believes it starts on page, where is it, it's in section 3 which is sustainable criteria management, they are talking about each of the areas and it starts with ES 3.2 but the last part of each one of those sections there's a paragraph that is has, let me see if I can find it, it's a good example of information that you want to call out and even too, this is on page 23 of it where it starts severe pumping overdraft resulting in land subsidence which does not presently exist could cause general infrastructure damage or water quality decline but these are unlikely to occur at the current rate of groundwater level decline. It's a really important statement and you have made a similar statement in all three areas, consider bolding that. That's going to be something that people then go back and it gives context to the rest of the document. Dr. Steinwand stated bolding in each section; you want to keep repeating it or just bold it. Rhonda Duggan stated yes. She stated the first one is on page 23, ES 3.2.1 Tri-Valley groundwater management area and the last you say about it is that particular statement, when you move on to Owens Valley on the next page you have a similar statement but it does draw conclusions there that are important for anyone reading that, and then later your whole document substantiates that. It says that severe pumping overdraft it's just bolding that and you do have some redline in there, and then the final one is in the 3.2.3, there's three of them, it's just important, they are all similar and drew conclusions from your earlier documents that I think you want to call out, I would do that. Again these documents are very difficult to prepare and I assume there is a format of things that you follow and sometimes it can feel repetitive but it's been very important the key concepts have held and continued on. I take it that the revenue assumptions, you did represent them to be should you particularly have an opportunity for implementation, this is what it costs and I appreciate the conciseness of that and the same thing that Luis Elias had talked about is we need to start somewhere, we need to turn it in and as DWR will comment and send it back if it is inadequate because they are already doing with higher rated basins and I don't see that pattern here. The important thing is yes, we can do better with more information but you have stated that is one of the goals is to get more information in the area so we can be more definitive when it comes along, but this is what you call a living document. The more information that comes around, the more you'll know, the more you'll be able to address it because you've built in the flexibility to do so. I agree with Terry Plums information that we need to make sure that our goals are not to prohibit growth where it can grow by not restricting certain things because the GSP can't impose a hardship on housing development where it's appropriate and where there is land to do it. We have so little private land here and it's very difficult to exchange that for other lands that are more buildable and resources there and I think that would be appropriate in the guiding principles that we want to make sure that development and land conservation can co-exist and that's the goal here. So I would say to move forward in submitting it and we will await what DWR says there and I appreciate moving to the next step that's what Luis was talking about to allow the areas that are willing to work like in Tri-Valley to start addressing the projects and move us to the next level to get this done. BryAnna Vaughan thanked Rhonda. Karen Kong stated unlike most of you I joined this three quarters of the way through it and so her learning curve has been a little slower than the rest of you. First I'd like to say like everybody else I super appreciate the staff and all the hard work you guys did in setting this all up before I even arrived. Second I will echo what Rhonda said about Terry and Kevin's comments, it would be nice if we could look at them and at least have a discussion about putting them in the guiding principles if not in this actual document, put it in the guiding principles because from the City of Bishop's perspective we are constantly looking at housing issues so it would be lovely to be able to add that in there. As far as the document itself goes, I really respect all the people who have been sitting in on this long before I joined to share their opinions and tell us about their deeply felt thoughts about water in the Owens Valley and about making sure that we keep ourselves and our plants and our animals safe. And so I think that although this is not a perfect document, I'm not even sure how we can make one because things change so quickly, but I think it's a great place to start. To submit it would be fabulous and then as Rhonda said, let's see what we can do moving forward. BryAnna Vaughan thanked Karen Kong. Bryanna Vaughan told Janice Aten it is a hard day to step in for Mel Joseph but inquired if she had any comments. Janice Aten said at this point no not really. She said she knew the Board and staff worked very hard on the document, she hasn't read hardly any of it but believes they should definitely move forward. BryAnna Vaughan stated she wished to take a moment and echo what other Board members have said, she wanted to appreciate all the time and effort that the staff and Board members have put in; it hasn't been easy; it's been a long road and we've been doing this for a long time, we are friends now right. She stated she really wanted to thank the public because there is a lot of knowledge and local intelligence that you all brought to this process. She stated she really does appreciate it and being a volunteer in this position she knows the time that it takes to put in. She stated she has missed one meeting she believes in this process and some of you have not even missed that. Folks showing up to the meeting and providing your input to keep us all honest and in line, so she did thank the public all very much. She stated is this document perfect, nope, could we ever please all the stakeholders involved, no way, Owens Valley water, not going to happen. The limitations that were put onto us for this process from DWR were not easy to work with and I think the staff did a really good job staying in those lines, doing what we could with those requirements so I thank them very much for doing that. The political boundaries in this region are not ideal especially considering the hydrology among other factors. Is this the best at the time we could do with the funding, data, and other resources we have, I'd say it's pretty close. She stated she thinks they have all done a very

good job, she's proud of the group and what has been produced. This is a living document so she doesn't see this being the end of anything and hopefully it's a start of good because she does believe that each and every one of us that is involved is involved for the right reasons. She thanked everyone for the time that they put into this and stated, I'm in support of adopting this document. BryAnna Vaughan stated she would open it up to any staff members to provide any comments. Keith Rainville stated we should take a moment to let Mary Roper speak as well. Mary Roper stated she wished to echo all the sentiment that our Board has made today and she'd been a member of the audience watching this play out for a long time and later as an Interested Party on the Board, and she thinks probably the Owens Valley Committee is a little unique because we are basically an environmental group so I come at it from a different perspective and I certainly understand the frustration by the commenters in the public about the elephant in the room which is of course the big adjudicated area that isn't covered by this plan. However, I know how hard, starting with Dr. Harrington and now Dr. Steinwand and all of the staff have worked on this. I guess my only comment is maybe a red flag that I'm always a little suspicious of LADWP and also I think we need to be really keyed in on any effort to transfer water from this basin to another basin for water banking especially in light of the fact that Indian Wells is in real trouble. One of the things that concerns me and this doesn't need to go in the plan it's just like we all need to be aware. What I find curious now is DWP's mantra that the pumped water is exclusively used for needs in our valley, for mitigation and for ag. The claim is that only surface water goes south in the aqueduct so I'm not sure if they are starting to say this because there is some difference if you don't transfer pumped water to another basin, however, no matter what, if they transfer water from this basin to another basin for water banking we can easily go to a medium or high priority basin and that's my understanding. So again it's just a red flag warning from a person that's been involved with DWP for many years. Mary Roper thanked the Board for all their work. BryAnna Vaughan thanked Mary Roper and apologized for not calling on her sooner. BryAnna Vaughan opened comments for staff discussion. Dr. Steinwand stated he can start with the two comments from Mary, regarding LADWP's claim that pumped water is not exported, I think that's being done on a water balance kind of analysis but I don't have that actual analysis whether the use is downstream from their pumps exceed the pumping amounts. In our response to comments, we asked for that analysis, basically if you're going to say that, prove it. It might be true if you include the amount of water that's dumped on Owens Lake, now that alone almost exceeds Owens Valley pumping in some years. Anyway, that's how we handled that comment was we could spend a lot of staff time trying to track that down but it really is not particularly relevant to the GSP, that's not a consideration in the GSP whether that's true or not, it's not something you have to deal with in the GSP. The other comment about Mr. Plum, he is basically asking for a policy statement from this that we will not interfere with the development of housing. When I was responding to that comment, we responded as much as possible looking back at our guiding principles and components of the GSP and not invent anything new in regard to response to comments, that would be a policy statement by your Board so we couldn't say yes, we will do that, not as a response to comments, that's not appropriate. Our response was this a local Board, you are all aware of the importance of local housing, I don't need to tell you that and you have the discretion when you evaluate a future project if you choose to implement, an ordinance that does this kind of thing. If you evaluate a future project, you can evaluate what groundwater impacts might be and if there are, if there is something you would like to change you have the authority to do so and discretion in your evaluation. So that's basically what the response says now because that's as much policy guidance as we've gotten from the Board. We can wrestle with this issue after it's adopted. I want to mention you all are saying this document is imperfect, I think it's perfect but when you write something this large there is always going to be something that falls through the cracks that we didn't think of but we really didn't talk much about the impact to private housing and there was no intent to write this as a stop growth document, it doesn't say that either. So that's one thing we never got around too. In the future this plan can be amended after it's been adopted with a 90 day notice and hearing, same as this process we are doing now. So if there are additional policy statements, or policy direction you want to include in the GSP, you have the complete latitude to do so. I just wanted to point that out plus there is an annual reporting and evaluation of what conditions are with regard to the criteria as well as a 5 year required plan review by DWR whether you're progressing or maintaining; in a lot of cases, the measurable objectives and staying away from you minimum thresholds. So those are the primary criteria but you have discretion in the evaluating of projects, you have the discretion whether you will even implement that element of the GSP as long as we are low priority. I just wanted to point that out that some things we just haven't discussed and they came up in comments and I think we could address them now or we could recognize that the sentiment of the Board is we come back and make sure we don't lose track of this and bring it up and consider it in the policy decisions later. He wanted to remind everyone that Tony Morgan, Gus Tolley, and Shay Rajagopal wrote 99 % of the GSP and almost all of the technical work and appendices; Keith Rainville and I appreciate all their help. Wendy Sugimura, Michael Draper, and Deston Dishion's advice has been invaluable as well. I know it's more expensive this way to have everybody contributing staff however; it wouldn't have been completed without that. I just wanted to thank all of them and recognize Tony Morgan and Gus Tolley, I don't think they are actually here today; Tony Morgan is available if he would like to say something. Tony Morgan thanked Dr. Steinwand for the kind words and thanked the Board for the opportunity to work with them on creating this document. He stated he believes they have the right sentiment exactly, things are always intended to be a work in progress kind of document, you have five year updates, should you choose to participate, annual status reports to go into DWR so there is lots of opportunity to upgrade and adjust the document as you move along into the future and you get more information and your perspectives on how to treat the achievement of sustainable conditions in the basin evolve over time. He thanked the Board for the opportunity to work with them on this GSP. Bryanna Vaughan thanked Tony Morgan and his staff for their work. Rhonda Duggan stated she just had a question maybe Dr. Steinwand could answer about the timeline. Its 90 days from when it's adopted, is that 90 days before any action should be taken; is that when this Boards adopts it; or is that pending DWR approval? can you just go over that timeline again. Dr. Steinwand stated the Board can adopt the plan, and then you can implement any parts that you wish. In a high priority basin you would be expected to start implementing the plan. We have to submit this plan to DWR by January 20, 2022, technically we don't because we are low priority but our grant states we are to have proof of submission to DWR of an adopted plan for the entire basin and our grant ends approximately April 1, 2022. Basically, we better stay on the schedule. So if it were adopted today, we would begin the process of opening the account and start submitting this document. As I understand it we put it all together and have to take it all apart again for submission. So it's not a straight forward; here's the drop box, here's the plan; you have to do more work than that. I probably will have some requirements with DWR as well, I have to recheck our grant agreement, there's some other deliverables that have to be prepared. Now the 90 day that I mentioned is any time after adopting the plan you can implement it or amend the plan using the same 90 day process, and then 90 days later have a hearing to amend the plan. So it's the same process were doing now, if you remember, we agreed

to send out the notice in September, 90 days is today, and that's the same process you would follow to amend the plan. Rhonda Duggan thanked Dr. Steinwand. Bryanna Vaughan asked if there was anything else from the Board or staff. Stacey Simon stated if there is a motion to adopt the plan she thinks staff would appreciate it if the Board could run through any opposed revisions, there were a few thrown out today in the discussion; the clarification about outside the GSP area; or the clarification regarding residential development; whichever of those the Board as a whole wishes to see added to the plan, we should run through those and make sure everyone is on the same page. Bryanna Vaughan asked anyone who made proposed changes to the plan itself and not necessarily to the guiding principles, I believe the way to do it is, if you could suggest the wording as you would like it in the document. Rhonda Duggan stated the information there that she had suggested be in bold, she forwarded that to Wendy Sugimura and for identification I put it on the pages and I think Wendy wasn't clear on the area because some of it still had redlining in it and needed to be cleaned up. She stated pages 39, 40, and 41. Wendy Sugimura shared a screen and stated this is what she understood from Commissioner Duggan was to check the spelling of Stacy Simon's last name; bold the following sentence per her request and it shows up in a couple different places so bold it throughout the plan; and then Commissioner Duggan or Director Duggan cited this paragraph as well and clarified just the last sentence in that paragraph to be bolded. She asked Director Duggan if she represented it correctly; Director Duggan stated yes. Bryanna Vaughan thanked Wendy Sugimura. Dr. Steinwand stated he wanted to clarify that the track changes will be cleaned up after adoption that was just for the Board's convenience. Rhonda Duggan stated she just didn't want to have to rewrite the whole area there. Dr. Steinwand stated he recognized the sentences. Stacy Simons stated it would be helpful for Wendy Sugimura to share the page again and maybe we can jot down these proposals that came from other Board members and get a complete list. Dr. Steinwand stated just add them to the word document Wendy has, that would be fine. Bryanna Vaughan stated correct me if I'm wrong but the notes that I took I think Dan Totheroh was the one that suggested maybe altering the guiding principles to include the sentiment from Mr. Plums comment. Dan Totheroh stated he would be concerned about adding it as Terry Plum and Kevin Carunchio had said because I think that binds us into something that we should not be bound into, to say that we will not do something that will constrain housing. I believe we should be looking at balancing the needs with impacts to our water relationship with housing and making a rational decision on those when they come up, and the guiding principle as I remember it is we were going to consider all those things. Maybe we need to make that stronger in the way we balance it but I would not be in favor of saying we will not make decisions that will impact housing, if it means the basement is going to go dry, yes I would want to impact housing, that's not going to happen but I would resist an overall statement that says we are never going to do anything that would impact housing. Dr. Steinwand stated a housing project might have a big water feature for example that does affect neighboring wells. You would want the latitude to evaluate I would think. Dan Totheroh stated evaluate and balance the impacts of added water use to the need for added housing. Dr. Steinwand stated there are several places where we could of put it, sustainability and beneficial uses, there are a couple sections in the guiding principles where we could figure out some language and bring it back to you guys rather than wordsmithing it right now. We can leave the plan as it is but the guiding principles, that was a different document actually, we just lifted them out and put them into the GSP as a good reminder and guide of how the GSP was written but you can revise those guiding principles at any board meeting, it's not part of the GSP and you wouldn't have to have a hearing. The guiding principles was the Communication and Engagement Plan which we adopted separately, I don't think, maybe it's part of the GSP as an appendix I guess but it's something we can do after more discussion, it's the Boards preference. Dan Totheroh stated he would like to do something that would give a development some feel of what we are looking at and not scare them to think we are not going to allow any development but I also wouldn't want to go to the other extreme as I said of saying we are not going to do anything that will impact housing. Karen Kong stated she agrees, we should leave the guiding principles as is for right now in the plan and then in the new year we look at figuring out that line between anything goes and complete restriction and figure out how we are going to word that so that they understand the gist of what we are trying to say without us being super black and white about it. John Vallejo stated his only thought on the process here, not the substance is we do site the guiding principles in the introductory paragraph of the GSP. If we later change those guiding principles, I don't really think there is a substantive change going on here in terms of supporting the ability of the housing developments to go in or not unreasonably hindering or adding to the hindrance of those housing projects or potential projects, but that's what comes to my mind as a little hiccup in the process. We do have on page 2 of the red lined GSP, we do quote verbatim the guiding principles or the mission statement. Dr. Steinwand stated the guiding principles is actually an appendix to the GSP now so that's what I meant, I think we might actually have to amend the GSP but the process is fairly straight forward, we have a hearing, you have this discussion you want to amend it and wrestle with this issue, something we haven't fully discussed in detail because there are not a lot of projects on the table but now your aware of one and have a comment to address and the process would be to develop the change or version that you want, and if it's required being low priority, notice the hearing and 90 days later you can adopt or not so it's not complicated. There may be work required with what we submitted to DWR but I'll deal with that. Bryanna Vaughan stated there is something to keep in mind when you deal with it, there is a cost associated so as you said, it's not complicated so probably not a huge cost but something to keep in mind for this group with the tiny little change purse coming up. Dr. Steinwand stated in very short order in January, February, and March we need to discuss composition, what projects you want to do, this issue obviously, a draft budget has to be developed before April 1, 2022, and what is our future staffing plan. This one works for the GSP development but if we change membership or anything else, how do we fit that in and what is an acceptable expenditure for this Board, what staffing level works. So all of that has to be decided very quickly, just part of government formation, not part of the GSP just something you need to get done, something our JPA puts after. So we are not done, we have a few more meetings with some heavy lifting to do early next year so this is one of the topics I guess we will put on the list. Bryanna Vaughan asked if there were any other modifications to the GSP that she missed in her notes. Wendy Sugimura asked what is the Boards pleasure with respect to the proposed policy or project that's indicated in the staff report about if undesirable results and minimum thresholds are determined to be triggered by groundwater use or management outside the Owens Valley basin, Owens Valley or GSP basin the OVGAs shall engage with the appropriate parties and regulatory mechanisms to coordinate on mitigating and alleviating the impacts caused within the GSP boundaries. Stacey Simon's stated she was for putting that in. Dr. Steinwand stated it would be the Owens Valley basin or GSP area and I think you can do that change, we are adopting the Communication and Engagement Plan, that's a guiding principle, that's an appendix, we'll make a change in both places in the plan and in the appendix and then I think we will be covered. Unlike the other policy issue, we have never discussed that but this one we have discussed many times, we have just never put in words what future guidance would be. But I saw a lot of heads nodding about yes; we will add that to the plan and appendix this time. Wendy Sugimura stated she would

share her screen again to show what she has and stated these are the proposed modifications that can be incorporated into a motion and I've listed the other issue about needs of groundwater management as direction to staff, whoever wants to make the motion can wordsmith that as you see fit or maybe it doesn't need to be part of the motion, I don't know, I'll defer to others on that. Bryanna Vaughan stated as usually she thinks Wendy wordsmithed it very nicely and thanked her. Keith Rainville stated did we need to include Aaron's suggested additional text regarding adding Fish & Wildlife's clarification regarding the northeast spring and then also the two potential future actions items, one to refine the GDE map and then also Tri-Valley outreach relating to the groundwater modeling. Dr. Steinwand stated the latter two are already in the plan, it was whether the language was acceptable but your correct about northeast spring, I'd like to add that sentence in the minimum thresholds as far as rationale, it would be a single sentence that the threshold value is based on CDFW staff observation of degradation of habitat when flows reach this level. I don't have the ability to type on Wendy's page, Wendy's asked Dr. Steinwand to send it to her in an email, Dr. Steinwand stated it's very quick, just type the following "when flows approach the minimum threshold, field scientists at CDFW saw degradation of habitat". He stated that a definition of a minimum threshold, beyond that is when undesirable results occur so that language is nice, I'm glad they provided it. He stated he does not have any specifics of how they did it but it's a fairly low number already, I don't think I need to challenge that or need an additional explanation technically to justify almost no flows or very little flows, it's northeast spring. Stacey Simons stated its fine to say "add where appropriate" as long as we have the actual language that's being added in the context so if you can't find it right away it wouldn't be a problem. Dr. Steinwand stated it's in section 3.3, he stated he's having trouble navigating so he's scrolling and that is why it is taking so long, he apologized, it's just being a little clunky here for some reason. He stated it would be in table 3-8, I knew it was in a single table it just wouldn't take me there but yea it's in 3.4.11 or 3.4.1.1 it's associated with table 3-8 so that's specific enough. Bryanna Vaughan asked Wendy Sugimura if she got it all and she said yes. Bryanna Vaughan asked Dr. Steinwand to double check the screen Wendy was sharing to make sure all the changes were listed. Dr. Steinwand stated it's not adding to table 3-8, it's associated with table 3-8 regarding northeast spring to refine the language regarding the minimum threshold as flows approach. He said he will fix that as Stacey Simons said it's not a major change just a nice clarification and I don't want to lose it, they took the time to provide it. Dr. Steinwand stated that's the only thing he has in his notes from today's meeting. Bryanna Vaughan asked if anyone else had anything for this agenda item. The Chairperson requested a motion to adopt the GSP with corrections and direct staff to submit the GSP to the California Department of Water Resources in accordance with required procedures. Motion to approve by Dan Tothoroh, seconded by Karen Kong. The Chairperson requested a roll call vote; Luis Elias – Y, Rhonda Duggan – Y, Karen Kong – Y, Dan Tothoroh - Y, BryAnna Vaughan – Y, Janice Aten - Y, Mary Roper – Y. Motion passed unanimously, 7 Yes.

7. Election of OVGA Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson

Dr. Steinwand stated this is a requirement of our Bylaws to select a Chairperson and Vice Chairperson before the end of the calendar year. Bryanna Vaughan stated nominations were open for Chairperson. Dan Tothoroh stated to get this out of the way, the most appropriate person to be Chair would be BryAnna and stated he has knowledge that may not happen but he is nominating her. Bryanna stated with that being said she would like to nominate Karen Kong. Karen Kong stated she didn't know what to say about that. Bryanna asked if there were any other nominations. Luis Elias asked to nominate Rhonda Duggan. Bryanna stated the Chair position is a lot of work for someone who does not get paid to be in this position, she's really enjoyed this, she's learned a lot, she's messed up a lot, you guys have watched me mess everything up from the Pledge of Allegiance to the roll call votes. She stated she's been super embarrassed in front of all the Board and she appreciates all their support along the way but she would like to not accept her nomination and let someone else serve in the position. BryAnna Vaughan made a motion to elect Karen Kong as Chairperson with a second by Rhonda Duggan. The Chairperson requested a roll call vote; Luis Elias – N, Rhonda Duggan – Y, Karen Kong – Y, Dan Tothoroh - Y, BryAnna Vaughan – Y, Janice Aten - Y, Mary Roper – Y. Motion passed 6 Yes, 1 No.

Karen Kong stated we are looking for nominations for Vice Chairperson Dan Tothoroh made a motion to elect Rhonda Duggan as Vice Chairperson, seconded by Luis Elias. The Chairperson requested a roll call vote; Luis Elias – Y, Rhonda Duggan – abstain, Karen Kong – Y, Dan Tothoroh - Y, BryAnna Vaughan – Y, Janice Aten - Y, Mary Roper – Y. Motion passed unanimously, 6 Yes, 1 abstention.

8. Request that the OVGA adopt findings pursuant to AB 361 that: A) the Board reconsidered the circumstances of the existing State of Emergency issued on March 4, 2020, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic; and B) local officials continue to recommend measures to promote social distancing, and/or the state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of the members to meet safely in person

John Vallejo stated he believes we have been through this before in November, the Brown Act now has a provision to allow for continued remote meetings so long as your Board finds at least every 30 days that there is a public health emergency issued from the state in existence and that there is either a recommendation from a local health official that continued social distancing either recommended or ordered provided and/or there is a finding by your Board that meeting in person would continue to pose a threat to public health and safety. This is just a continual finding for that ability for your Board to continue to meet remotely and I'm happy to answer any questions but there is a continuing emergency from the state, and there are continuing recommendations from both counties, definitely from Inyo County for both practicing social distancing and so the required facts are in place for you to make that finding and we just need a majority vote. The Chairperson asked if there was anyone wishing to discuss this item. Stacey Simons stated she was going to have to jump off the call and said the Board is in good hands, thank you and congratulations. Karen Kong thanked Stacey Simons. Kevin Carunchio stated madam Chair congratulations on your promotion. He stated he wanted to jump in and follow up on the public comment received, he'd love for the Board to get back to meeting in person, don't need to get into opinions and thoughts on that, as long as we are still in the zoom world, a few public meetings I attend really seem to be lacking for the want of knowing who else is in the meeting. He stated he would certainly agree with the prior commenter. He stated you know one of the fun things of going to any public meeting is if you have

to pick out these kernels is you kind of look around the room and say oh, that persons here, this persons here, and who the heck is that guy standing over there in the corner. It was just kind of fun and a little wonkish but I'm sure Mr. Vallejo is correct, it's more of a technical issue but if that can be sussed out, I do think it adds something to the spirit of the open meeting laws in terms of just knowing who is there participating. I've been on some state calls recently and we've certainly been looking at the participant list to get an idea that way, so I was going to make that comment anyway but I thought I'd wait for this agenda item as opposed to public comment for what it's worth, thanks a lot. Karen Kong thanked Kevin Carunchio. She stated as John Vallejo said, I'm sure it's just a technical issue and between Laura Piper, John Vallejo and county IT we can figure it out. She asked if there were any further comments by the public or the Board. Bryanna Vaughan stated she'd just add that she was talking to Aaron about this and you have to do it every 30 days, I think John Vallejo said that which sometimes we don't necessarily meet within a 30 day period so that will make it so you have to have a special meeting just to get through that process, so just keep that in mind. John Vallejo stated the next agenda item will include that, regarding future meeting dates. Karen Kong thanked Bryanna Vaughan and asked for any further comment. Dr. Steinwand stated when he concluded this he got a bunch of public comment he might need to make or circle back around too. He stated lets finish this item and maybe we can go back to Item 6 just to make sure I make certain things submitted part of the record. Karen Kong stated assuming legally that's alright, we can do that.

The Chairperson requested a motion to approve the request that OVGA adopt finding pursuant to AB 361 that: A) the Board reconsidered the circumstances of the existing State of Emergency issued on March 4, 2020, in response to the COVIS-19 pandemic; and B) local officials continue to recommend measures to promote social distancing, and/or the state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of the members to meet safely in person. Motion to approve by Rhonda Duggan, seconded by Dan Totheroh. The Chairperson requested a roll call vote; Luis Elias – Y, Rhonda Duggan – Y, Karen Kong – Y, Dan Totheroh - Y, BryAnna Vaughan – Y, Janice Aten – Y, Mary Roper - Y. Motion passed unanimously, 7 Yes.

Karen Kong asked council if we were allowed to go back to Item 6. John Vallejo stated its sounds like Dr. Steinwand just wants to note for your Board that there have been additional public comments. Dr. Steinwand stated there was an additional public comment submitted by Phil Kiddoo of GBAPCD, there is an attachment of comments I have not read yet. He stated he would like to make that part of public comment and circulate it to the Board. I also want to let you know I neglected to mention this morning we got a letter from State Lands Commission and I've briefly perused that as well, providing comments on the GSP after the date when public comment closed, so those will be included and circulated to the Board as correspondence. He stated he had not read Mr. Kiddoo's comments but looks forward to reading them and if there is something substantive to respond to, we will do so at the next meeting. Luis Elias stated that being that this was advertised as a public hearing could those comments just be incorporated into that and it we will just be done with it. Dr. Steinwand stated we had a public comment period that closed so he didn't want to open it up again as a continuous public comment. He stated we have been pretty transparent. John Vallejo stated were the first two comments you mentioned sent for the agenda item, Dr. Steinwand said yes and it was buried in his email and he did not see it when it was being discussed, it is a comment letter regarding Item #6. Dr. Steinwand stated State Lands comments were just in general and Mr. Kiddoo's were for Item 6. John Vallejo stated he sees Mr. Kiddoo in the attendee list and he thinks it would be helpful to cross the T and dot the I to have him raise his hand and see if he is ok with the Board later considering anything substantive in his comments and if he thinks it important for their vote, maybe we need to revisit the vote in light of his comment. Mr. Kiddoo said Good Afternoon Groundwater Authority Board and stated the comments aren't substantive it's just emphasis on the OVGA's response to DWPs comments on the draft GSP. We just wanted to bring that emphasis and some of that information forward specifically to Owens Lake and the Owens Lake Groundwater Development Program. John Vallejo thanked Mr. Kiddoo and stated we will be sure those comments are part of the record for that agenda item. Mr. Kiddoo stated he would greatly appreciate it. Dr. Steinwand apologized to Mr. Kiddoo stating he just didn't see the email until just now.

9. Discussion regarding future agenda items

Dr. Steinwand stated 30 days from now is actually a week prior to our regular scheduled meeting on the 13th which is every second Thursday of course, so 30 days would be the 7th so we could schedule a special meeting on the 6th I'm not sure how much work we will have to do but at least we can cover this base and I'll be able to give you an update on the submission and progress on that and the next step for staff on that and the posting of the final, but at least if we want to continue meeting with zoom, and again I apologize for not including the Mono County order in the agenda packet. I only got the Inyo one included and did not get in touch with Mono staff in time, that's my fault. But yes, you would need to have a meeting I would suggest on January 6, that's 29 days from now at least to make this finding; we will just agendize it as a special meeting one week before your normal meeting. The Chairperson asked if that date worked for the Board. Karen Kong asked if it would be 2pm and Dr. Steinwand stated yes and it will be brief coming right off the holidays like that, I'll have some time off and have to have another meeting call while I'm on vacation so just to touch base and do this thing. Dr. Steinwand stated maybe our first advocacy for legislation change is this AB361 and change that 30 day deadline. Rhonda Duggan stated join the list of people, they are working on it. She stated so at a minimum this would be a housekeeping item to continue and anticipating our regular agenda on the 13th. Dr. Steinwand stated we could do that or just combine it on the 6th and stated he's not sure how much there will be to report on either date so he suggests we just have one. Karen Kong stated so the 6th may or may not be a replacement for the 13th, Dr. Steinwand stated he is suggesting it is. Bryanna Vaughan asked for updates on allowing the attendants to see who's in the meeting at that time and hopefully that's a quick little agenda item. Dr. Steinwand states yes, we will discuss it further. There may be a way to do it and we will agendize that as a housekeeping item. The next meeting was scheduled for January 6, 2022 at 2 p.m.

10. Adjourn

The Chairperson adjourned the meeting at 3:55 pm.