

**Borrego Springs Watermaster  
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting  
July 1, 2024 @ 10:00 a.m.**

**Meeting Available by Remote Access Only\***

Please join my meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone.

<https://meet.goto.com/133229165>

You can also dial in using your phone.

United States (Toll Free): [1 866 899 4679](tel:18668994679) or United States: [+1 \(571\) 317-3116](tel:+15713173116)

**Access Code:** 133-229-165

New to GoToMeeting? Get the app now and be ready when your first meeting starts: <https://global.gotomeeting.com/install>

**AGENDA**

*Items with supporting documents in the TAC Meeting Package are denoted with a page number.*

- I. Roll Call**
- II. Public Comments**  
*This is an opportunity for members of the public to address the TAC on items included on the agenda. Comments will be limited to three minutes per commenter.*
- III. Review Results of Task 4 – Model Recalibration to Redetermine the Sustainable Yield by 2025**  
.....Page 2
- IV. Update: 5-Year Groundwater Management Plan Assessment Report .....Page 10**
- V. Public Comments (time permitting)**  
*This is an opportunity for members of the public to address the TAC on items discussed during the meeting. Comments will be limited to three minutes per commenter, time permitting.*
- VI. Future Meetings**
- VII. Adjournment**

**Borrego Springs Watermaster  
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting  
July 1, 2024  
AGENDA ITEM III**

**To:** Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**From:** Andy Malone, PG (West Yost), Technical Consultant  
**Date:** June 20, 2024  
**Subject:** Review Results of *Task 4 – Model Recalibration* to Redetermine the Sustainable Yield by 2025

### **Background**

Section II.E of the Judgment requires the Sustainable Yield to be redetermined by January 1, 2025 through a process that includes: collecting additional data, refining the Borrego Valley Hydrologic Model (BVHM), and using model runs to update the Sustainable Yield. The Watermaster Board approved a scope of work and budget for water year (WY) 2023 and 2024 to update the BVHM and Redetermine the Sustainable Yield by 2025.<sup>1</sup> The scope of work includes the following tasks:

- Task 1 – Compare FMP-estimated Pumping to Actual Pumping for WY 2022
- Task 2 – Update Water-Use Factors in the FMP
- Task 3 – Correct Errors Identified in the 2021 BVHM
- Task 4 – Model Recalibration
- Task 5 – Determine the Sustainable Yield

To-date, West Yost has completed Tasks 1 through 3 of the scope of work and is finalizing Task 4 – *Model Recalibration*. Efforts completed to-date and shared with the TAC related to Task 4 – *Model Recalibration* include:

- Prepared and distributed a memorandum describing the preparatory work performed for BVHM recalibration.<sup>2</sup> The TAC met on March 29, 2024 to discuss the memorandum and provided comments and recommendations to West Yost before continuing with the recalibration.
- Based on TAC feedback, developed a methodology for using OpenET as a validation check on the ability of the FMP to estimate evapotranspiration (ET). The TAC met again on May 1, 2024 to discuss the proposed methodology and, ultimately, agreed-upon a methodology

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://borregospringswatermaster.com/technical-advisory-committee-meetings/>

<sup>2</sup> <https://borregospringswatermaster.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/20240329-Ad-Hoc-TAC-Agenda-Package.pdf>

that uses select OpenET models (geeSEBAL and eeMETRIC) as a validation check on the FMP.<sup>3</sup>

- Recalibrated the Farm Process (Calibrated FMP). The results of the FMP calibration were distributed to the TAC via email on June 11, 2024 (see attached) and included a summary of the following comparisons:
  - Compared FMP-estimated groundwater pumping to Actual pumping in WY 2021 and 2022. An 'acceptable' calibration result was defined as FMP-estimated pumping within +/-10% of Actual pumping. The ability of the FMP to estimate groundwater pumping was improved during the recalibration—the percent difference between FMP-estimated pumping and Actual pumping was -1.7% (underestimated) in WY 2021 and 0.5% (overestimated) in WY 2022.
  - Compared FMP-estimated ET to OpenET models selected by the TAC as the most appropriate for Borrego Springs (geeSEBAL and eeMETRIC). No metric was established as an 'acceptable' calibration result. Instead, the OpenET models were used as a validation check on ET estimates made by the FMP. The selected OpenET models generally underestimate ET compared to the Calibrated FMP during the early period of 2016-2019, but more closely match the Calibrated FMP during the more recent period of 2020-2022.

## **Discussion and Next Steps**

Using the Calibrated FMP, West Yost has proceeded with the recalibration of the BVHM using the methodology described in the December 11, 2023 TAC memo titled: [Task 4 to Redetermine the Sustainable Yield by 2025 – Model Recalibration Methods](#).

At the July 1, 2024 TAC meeting, West Yost staff will:

- Summarize the methods and results from the FMP recalibration
- Present the preliminary results from the BVHM recalibration
- Solicit TAC input and feedback on the preliminary results of Task 4

Following the TAC meeting, TAC members are invited to provide written comments to Andy Malone ([amalone@westyost.com](mailto:amalone@westyost.com)) and Lauren Salberg ([lsalberg@westyost.com](mailto:lsalberg@westyost.com)) by **Friday, July 12, 2024**. Simultaneously, West Yost will prepare a technical memorandum (TM) that describes the entirety of Task 4 – *Model Recalibration*. The Task 4 TM will be distributed to the TAC for review and comment in mid-July.

The next step for the Redetermination of the Sustainable Yield by 2025 is to proceed with [Task 5 – Determine the Sustainable Yield](#).

## **Enclosures**

Results of FMP Calibration (email to the TAC on 6/11/2024)

---

<sup>3</sup> Available at: <https://borregospringswatermaster.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/VF.-SYR-Status-Update.pdf>

## Lauren Salberg

---

**From:** Andy Malone  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 11, 2024 2:35 PM  
**To:** Jim Bennett; John Peterson; Robert Wagner; Russ Detwiler; Tom Watson; Trey Driscoll  
**Cc:** Leonardo Urrego; Samantha Adams; Lauren Salberg; Eric W.H. Chiang  
**Subject:** FW: FMP Calibration Results  
**Attachments:** Figure 1. FMP-Estimated vs. CIMIS Precipitation.pdf; Figure 2. FMP-Estimated vs. Actual Pumping.pdf; Figure 3. OpenET vs. FMP ET.pdf

Good afternoon TAC members,

This email is an update on progress and preliminary results for Task 4 to Redetermine the Sustainable Yield by 2025 – *BVHM Recalibration*. We believe these are encouraging results that represent progress.

We have manually re-calibrated the Farm Process (FMP) and believe we have achieved an acceptable calibration and further improved the ability of the FMP to estimate groundwater pumping. A summary of the methods and results are presented below and in the attached figures.

We will discuss these results at the July 1, 2024 TAC meeting to receive your input and feedback. If you have immediate questions or feedback, please **Reply All** to this email so the entire TAC can benefit from the exchange.

### FMP Calibration Methods

1. Adjusted parameters in the FMP, including:
  - **On-Farm Efficiency (OFE).** OFE values for irrigated crops in the FMP were adjusted within the acceptable ranges defined in the TM [Preparatory Work for Task 4 – Model Recalibration](#), which relied on a literature review and interviews with farmers in Borrego Springs to identify reasonable irrigation efficiencies for the crops and irrigation methods employed in the Basin.
  - **Crop Coefficient (KC).** Monthly KC values for selected irrigated crops in the FMP (row crops, citrus, palms, potatoes) were adjusted to better match seasonal patterns in crop demands and values of KC recommended by the USGS based on crop stage (early, mid, or late).
  - **KC scaling factors.** Monthly KC scaling factors in the FMP were adjusted to better match monthly FMP-estimated pumping with monthly Actual pumping in WY 2021 and 2022.
  - **Transpiration Fraction of Consumptive Use (FTR).** FTR values for two crop types in the FMP (golf and potatoes) were increased to more closely match USGS-recommended values and to better match monthly FMP-estimated pumping with monthly Actual pumping in WY 2021 and 2022.
2. Ran the FMP from WY 1930 through WY 2022.
3. Reviewed calibration results by:
  - a. Comparing FMP-estimated groundwater pumping to Actual pumping in WY 2021 and 2022. An ‘acceptable’ calibration result was defined as FMP-estimated pumping within +/-10% of Actual pumping.
  - b. Comparing FMP-estimated evapotranspiration (ET) to OpenET models selected by the TAC as the most appropriate for Borrego Springs (geeSEBAL and eeMETRIC). No metric was established as an ‘acceptable’ calibration result. Instead, the OpenET models were used as a validation check on ET estimates made by the FMP.

### FMP Calibration Results and Conclusions

As shown in the table below, the results of the Calibrated FMP show that the percent difference between FMP-estimated pumping and Actual pumping is **-1.7% (underestimated) in WY 2021 and 0.5% (overestimated) in WY 2022:**

WY	Actual Pumping (af)	FMP-Estimated Pumping (af)	Difference (af)	% Difference
	(a)	(b)	(c) = (b) - (a)	(d) = (c) / (((a)+(b))/2)
2021	12,124	11,920	-204	-1.7%
2022	10,848	10,902	54	0.5%

The following OFE values were derived through the manual FMP calibration:

- Flood and furrow: 0.50
- Broadcast sprinkler: 0.70
- Micro-drip: 0.74

The attached figures further describe the results and conclusions of FMP calibration:

**Figure 1. *Precipitation vs. FMP-Estimated Evapotranspiration and Groundwater Pumping*** – This figure explains how the FMP estimates ET (by its individual components) and groundwater pumping on a monthly time step from 2020-2022. The figure shows: (i) monthly precipitation measured at the CIMIS station in Borrego Springs; (ii) monthly precipitation from the Basin Characterization Model (BCM) input to the FMP; (iii) monthly FMP-estimated ET terms for irrigated farms; and (iv) monthly FMP-estimated groundwater pumping. The main takeaways from Figure 1 are:

- Monthly precipitation in the BCM matches the monthly patterns of precipitation measured at the CIMIS station.
- During wet months, the FMP simulates that most of the precipitation is lost to evaporation, and the remainder is transpired by crop uptake which reduces the need for irrigation water.
- During dry months, the FMP simulates an increase in crop transpiration of irrigation water as groundwater pumping is the only source of water to meet crop demands.
- Monthly FMP-estimated groundwater pumping varies on a reasonable seasonal pattern in response to seasonal crop demands and precipitation.

**Figure 2. *Comparison of Monthly FMP-Estimated Pumping vs. Actual Pumping (WY 2021 and 2022)*** – This figure compares monthly FMP-estimated pumping from the Calibrated and Pre-calibrated FMP with Actual pumping for WY 2021 and 2022. FMP-estimated pumping from the Calibrated FMP is 2% lower than Actual pumping in WY 2021 and nearly the equal to Actual pumping in WY 2022. This represents an improvement in the calibration of the FMP and its ability to estimate groundwater pumping.

**Figure 3. *Comparison of Total Monthly ET from Farms in the FMP: FMP vs. OpenET Models*** – This figure compares the FMP estimates of ET to OpenET models (geeSEBAL and eeMETRIC) as a validation check. The figure includes four charts that compare ET estimated by the Calibrated FMP to: (A) ET estimated by the Pre-calibrated FMP; (B) ET estimated by eeMETRIC; (C) ET estimated by geeSEBAL; and (D) the mean and range of ET estimated by the geeSEBAL and eeMETRIC models. Inspection of these charts indicate that eeMETRIC and geeSEBAL generally underestimate ET compared to the Calibrated FMP, especially during the early period of 2016-2019. OpenET has acknowledged that its models (specifically geeSEBAL) underestimate ET in agricultural regions in very arid environments (such as Borrego Springs). Specially, the geeSEBAL model tends to yield lower ET estimates in desert and arid regions and the eeMETRIC model has uncertainty associated with atmospheric interference, particularly during cloudy conditions. These observations made by OpenET might explain why FMP-estimated ET are higher than the selected OpenET models. OpenET and the FMP estimates of ET match more closely during the more recent period of 2020-2022. The greatest exception occurred in March 2020 when the FMP estimated relatively high ET. Figure 1 showed that most of the FMP-estimated ET in March 2020 was due to evaporation of the high volumes of precipitation. In general, the FMP generates ET estimates that are similar in the seasonal pattern and magnitudes as OpenET.

**Next steps**

West Yost will review these results at the July 1, 2024 TAC meeting and will solicit TAC input and feedback. West Yost plans to proceed with the recalibration of the BVHM using the Calibrated FMP following the methodology described in the December 11, 2023 TAC memo titled: [Task 4 to Redetermine the Sustainable Yield by 2025 – Model Recalibration Methods](#). A more fulsome discussion of the FMP calibration process will be documented in a technical memorandum that describes the entirety of Task 4 – *Model Recalibration*.

Please let us know if you have any comments or questions regarding the calibration of the FMP.

**Andy Malone**


Principal Geologist II


JOIN OUR TEAM

**WEST YOST**

direct: 949.600.7503

Figure 1. Precipitation vs. FMP-Estimated Evapotranspiration and Groundwater Pumping






Prepared by:



Figure 2. Comparison of Monthly FMP-Estimated Pumping vs. Actual Pumping WY 2021 - 2022





Prepared by:



Figure 3. Comparison of Total Monthly ET from Farms in the FMP: FMP vs. OpenET Models

**Borrego Springs Watermaster  
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting  
July 1, 2024  
AGENDA ITEM IV**

**To:** Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**From:** Andy Malone, PG (West Yost), Technical Consultant  
**Date:** June 20, 2024  
**Subject:** Update: 5-Year Groundwater Management Plan Assessment Report

**Background**

The Borrego Springs Watermaster submitted to the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) its Judgment and Groundwater Management Plan (GMP) as an alternative Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) for the Borrego Springs Subbasin (Basin) on June 25, 2021 to comply with the requirements of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act of 2014 (SGMA). Together, the Judgment and GMP represent the Physical Solution for the Basin to achieve its Sustainability Goal by 2040, which is defined as operating the Basin at its Sustainable Yield without causing Undesirable Results.

Title 23 § 356.4 of the California Code of Regulations requires an assessment of GSPs once every five years (5-year Assessment Report). The Judgment requires compliance with SGMA and calls for the redetermination of the Sustainable Yield once every five years. The redetermination of the Sustainable Yield and the 5-year Assessment Report may necessitate updates to the GMP. Watermaster Staff has begun the process of redetermining the Sustainable Yield by 2025.

The 5-year Assessment Report is meant to evaluate whether the groundwater sustainability program is progressing towards meeting the Sustainability Goal of the Basin and in compliance with SGMA and the GSP Regulations. During the December 13, 2023 TAC meeting, the TAC discussed the process and report outline for the 5-Year Assessment Report.<sup>1</sup>

**Discussion and Next Steps**

The Watermaster has not received the DWR's comments and/or corrective actions on the Judgment/GMP that was submitted to the DWR as an alternative GSP in June 2021. The delay in the receipt of DWR's comments has resulted in a delay in the proposed process and schedule. Despite the delay, West Yost has continued to make progress on the development of the 5-Year Assessment Report. At the July 1, 2024 TAC meeting, West Yost staff will: (i) summarize the work performed to-date, such as the evaluation of Sustainable Management Criteria in the GMP and review of new information and (ii) solicit TAC input and feedback.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://borregospringswatermaster.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/VII.-5-Year-GMP-Assessment.pdf>