From:	Gungle, Ashley
To:	Patrick BROWN (Patrick.BROWN@soitec.com); mlawson@dudek.com
Cc:	Fogg, Mindy; tdriscoll@dudek.com
Subject:	Soitec- Groundwater Comments
Date:	Thursday, November 21, 2013 3:17:59 PM
Attachments:	PDS2012-3910-120005-PDS-PLN-Specialist Checklist-Groundwater_11-21-13.xlsx

Hi Patrick and Megan,

Attached are the County's most recent groundwater comments, including comments on the Pine Valley and Jacumba Groundwater Investigations.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Ashley

Ashley Gungle
Land Use/ Environmental Planner

County of San Diego
Planning and Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, 3rd Floor
San Diego, CA 92123
office: 858-495-5375
fax: 858-694-3373

ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PDS (Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments					
Item	**No.**	**Subject Area**	**Issue, Revision or Information Required**	**Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)**	**Date Identified**
GW Scoping - Water to be Used from Live Oak Springs, Jacumba Community Services District, and Other Imported Sources					
	1	Groundwater-MAJOR PROJECT ISSUE	The project is relying upon a mix of both on-site groundwater resources and imported groundwater resources to meet its water demand for the four project sites. The EIR does not provide analysis of potential impacts to groundater resources from offsite groundwater sources including Live Oak Springs and Jacumba Community Services District. Pursuant to CEQA, impacts to groundwater resources from using these sources must be evaluated now as part of this EIR. The maximum amount of offsite imported groundwater must be quantitied and impacts from imported groundwater sources must be evaluated as part of the EIR.	Live Oak Springs and Jacumba are no longer being proposed as water sources for the Rugged and Tierra Del Sol projects. However, Pine Valley is a new source and separate comments have been provided to the applicant.	5/30/2013
	2	Groundwater	Live Oak Springs, Jacumba Community Services District, or any other offsite groundwater-dependent source, impacts to groundwater resources from using these sources must be evaluated now. A groundwater evaluation must include evaluating short-term and long-term cumulative groundwater impacts through the use of a water balance analysis, potential well yield available, potential offsite well interference, and analysis of potential impacts to groundwater dependent vegetation (if present near the well(s) to be pumped). The evaluation of impacts should be completed using the County's approved Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements which can be found on the World Wide Web at http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/docs/GRWTR-Guidelines.pdf (Guidelines) http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/docs/GRWTR-Report-Format.pdf (Report Formats). Below is a list of items which must be analyzed in the investigation as described in detail in the Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format Guidelines and Content Requirements for Groundwater Resources.	Live Oak Springs and Jacumba are no longer being proposed as water sources for the Rugged and Tierra Del Sol projects. However, Pine Valley is a new source and separate comments have been provided to the applicant.	5/30/2013

ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

	3	Groundwater	1. Water Balance Analysis: Groundwater recharge must be evaluated in two separate analyses for the each offsite area and the basin in which it is located. The tributary watershed to be included in the analysis should be presented in advance for DPLU review. The computer program RECHARG2 or similar and acceptable methodology must be used to calculate groundwater recharge. Estimates of groundwater storage capacity must be estimated for each hydrogeologic unit at the project site and within the project's watershed. Evaluate the long-term groundwater availability for the project's basin which takes into consideration groundwater recharge, estimated groundwater in storage, and groundwater demand under each of the following scenarios: (1) Existing groundwater demand within the basin. (2) Existing groundwater demand plus the Soitec project water demand. if the demand is to be staggered between the projects, include this in the analysis. (3) Existing groundwater demand plus the Soitec project water demand and the water demand of all other reasonably foreseeable projects.	Live Oak Springs and Jacumba are no longer being proposed as water sources for the Rugged and Tierra Del Sol projects. However, Pine Valley is a new source and separate comments have been provided to the applicant.	5/30/2013

	4	Groundwater	2. Well Testing: All wells that will be utilized from each offsite water source need to be identified, and if aquifer testing has not be conducted must tested as part of the groundwater investigation. Each well must include an evaluation of its long-term capacity and evaluation of potential well interference on other well users and/or groundwater dependent habitat (if any is present within the vicinity of the well). The results from each well test will be used to determine whether adequate water exists within the well analyzed without significant well interference/impacts to habitat. If aquifer testing (at least 24 to 72 hours in length) has never been conducted, a meeting will be required between the applicant's hydrogeologist(s) and the County Groundwater Geologist to discuss the well testing requirements including production rate for each test, step-drawdown and constant rate well test requirements, on-site monitoring wells to be included during the well test, and development of a list of off-site well users to contact to request voluntary monitoring of their wells during the on-site well testing.	Live Oak Springs and Jacumba are no longer being proposed as water sources for the Rugged and Tierra Del Sol projects. However, Pine Valley is a new source and separate comments have been provided to the applicant.	5/30/2013
	5	Groundwater	3. Groundwater Report: The report should follow the items outlined in the County Report Formats. The report shall include impacts analysis for 50% Reduction in Storage, long-term well yield, potential offsite well interference, and potential impacts to groundwater dependent vegetation.	Live Oak Springs and Jacumba are no longer being proposed as water sources for the Rugged and Tierra Del Sol projects. However, Pine Valley is a new source and separate comments have been provided to the applicant.	5/30/2013

ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

	6	Groundwater	Tierra Del Sol and Rugged Solar Project, GMMP Proposal Request: For both the Tierra Del Sol and Rugged Solar project, groundwater is being proposed at each site. Please prepare a proposal for the GMMP of the wells to be utilized at each site, the amount of maximum water to be utilized (both short-term and long-term), and the monitoring well network that is proposed to be associated with each well to be utilized. Please also include what monitoring wells will be utillized in which water level thresholds will be established. Include a plan of how the water level thresholds will be determined based on the closest groundwater users near each well to be utlized. Include piezometer(s) for the Rugged Solar project to evaluate water levels in the shallow groundwater adjacent to groundwater dependent habitat near Well 6, 6a, and 6b. This proposal will be reviewed by County staff for its adequacy and additional monitoring wells if needed will be requested.	Resolved. GMMPs have been submitted and comments provided along with groundwater investigation comments for each project in a separate checklist.	5/30/2013
Review of Groundwater Resources Identification and Allocation Plan dated March 2013 and September 2013					
	1		The following comments are provided based on a review of the *Groundwater Resources Identification and Allocation Plan* dated March 2013 by Dudek:	N/A	7/18/2013
	2		Section 1.2 Groundwater Supplies: This project is relying upon Padre Dam Municipal Water District as a backup supplier of all of Soitec's projects. Please discuss this in detail in this section and possibly rename this section as "Water Supplies." Imported water should be included as bullet point below the other three bullets.	Resolved.	7/18/2013

	3		Table 1 Description of Projects in the Cumulative Water Demand Scenario: Please update the project schedule as follows: The Tule Wind Project has been delayed by at least a year and has a start date of September 2014. Please check regarding the Shu'luuk Wind timing as it may have been eliminated. The Rough Acres Campground is likely to delayed until January 2015. The LanEast and LanWest projects are unlikely to start in September 2014 as processing the permits has not yet commenced and should be pushed out at least 12 months. The Buckman Springs Borrow Pit is already permitted and has been mining under a new use permit and Reclamation Plan since 2005. Star Ranch should be added to the cumulative projects list as they are continuing to actively process their project and it has not yet been determined whether or not there is adequate water to meet the demand of the project.	Resolved.	7/18/2013
	4		Page 12: Please delete the following statement: *"The regional fractured rock aquifer has appeared to support existing demands, since no major overdraft condition has been identified by the County in its groundwater limitations map."* The County has not monitored the area in question to determine whether or not the aquifer has supported existing demand. Therefore the Groundwater Limitations Map is not relevant to whether or not there is an overdraft condition or water problems in the subject area. **10/1/2013: Second Request. This comment was not addressed. In the document, this statement has been stricken from the record. Please accept this change to the document.**		7/18/2013 **10/1/2013**

	5		In Section 5, only include sources of water in which impacts to groundwater resources have been adequately evaluated. Please remove Live Oak Springs and Jacumba Community Services District as potential water sources unless there is groundwater investigation work to support the volume of water that could potentially be used. **10/1/2013: Second Request**		7/18/2013 **10/1/2013**
	6		In Section 5, add Pine Valley Mutual Water Company if you have reached agreement with them as a potential source and have analysis that supports additional water production from this source. **10/1/2013: A groundwater investigation has been scoped by the County to be provided by DUDEK. Please update the information regarding PVMWC with the groundwater investigation when completed and found adequate by County staff.**		7/18/2013 **10/1/2013**
	7		Table 4: The San Diego Freedom Ranch Expansion will have a maximum production amount of 10 acre-feet per year and is proposed to met entirely by on-site wells. The Major Use Permit modification for the project is still being processed by the County. The Star Ranch project has a demand of 388 acre-feet per year for 453 residential units and other commercial uses on 2,160 acres of land. The demand is proposed to be met entirely by on-site groundwater wells. The project is still being processed in-house. Please update both projects with this new information.	Resolved.	7/18/2013
	8		Table 5: For the Rugged and Tierra Del Sol on-site wells, 205 acre-feet per year and 98.4 acre-feet per year as listed have not been approved as sustainable by the County of San Diego. This number should be conservatively constrained to the amount that is going to be used just for the Rugged project and just for the Tierra Del Sol project and is subject to change per County comments since the investigations will still undergo County review. **10/1/2013: Second Request.**		7/18/2013 **10/1/2013**

	9		Table 5: For LanWest and LanEast, 80.7 acre-feet per year is speculative since no aquifer testing has been conducted. Without any aquifer testing performed which takes into account well interference including impacts to offsite users and groundwater dependent habitat, perhaps a more conservative approach would be to take the value you have and including perhaps 25% of the value estimated at this point as potentially viable from the sites.	Resolved.	7/18/2013
	10		Table 5: For Jewell Valley it is speculative that water from this ranch could be utilized. Please remove from the report unless a Major Use Permit is applied for a Groundwater Extractive Operation. For Ewiiaapaayp Reservation, use of their wells is also speculative unless an agreement with the Ewiiaapaayp Reservation is reached to utilize the water. Please provide additional information that substantiates that water from this Indian Reservation is possible. Additionally, the aquifer testing was incomplete to bear out the amounts listed. If this source is to be left in the report, I would conservatively assume 25% of the value reported as potentially viable from each well. **10/1/2013: Jewell Valley was removed from the text. Second Request: Ewaiiaapaayp since it remains in the report should be conservatively constraine to assume 25% of the value reported as potentially viable from each well. No aquifer testing is available to substantiate the rates assumed.**		7/18/2013 **10/1/2013**
	11		Table 5: Jacumba Community Services District and Live Oak Springs Water Company should be removed unless impacts to groundwater resources have been adequately evaluated and submitted for County review.	Resolved.	7/18/2013
	12		Table 2, Construction-Related Demands: Tule Wind Project was approved for 56 acre-feet of construction demand not 58.		10/1/2013
Review of Pine Valley Study prepared by Dudek dated July 23, 2013 and October 2013					

ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

	1	Groundwater - Major Project Issue	Jim Bennett, County Groundwater Geologist, has reviewed the letter DRAFT Update Pine Valley Cumulative Groundwater Study – Pine Valley Municipal Water Company dated July 23, 2013 by Dudek & Associates. The report does not adequately assess potential impacts to groundwater resources in Pine Valley. The report's conclusion on adequate groundwater being available is based solely on comparing the potential pumping of 38 acre-feet of additional water to the water balance analysis that was produced by the County for the Pine North basin. This is only a cumulative impacts analysis and does not consider direct impacts from pumping. The production capacity of Well 5 was not analyzed, and direct impacts analysis was not performed for pumping at 38 acre-feet in 4 months. Additionally, trends in PVMWC water demand as documented within the letter report do not take into consideration the uptick in production in 2013 back to historically average rates of production. The following comments are provided for your consideration:	The Draft Update Pine Valley Cumulative Groundwater Study - Pine Valley Municipal Water Company dated July 23, 2013 is inadequate for County use. A new groundwater investigation has been scoped by the County of San Diego in a separate letter. Therefore, the comments below are no longer applicable to the project.	8/9/2013

	2	Groundwater - Major Project Issue	The PVMWC has an obligation to serve its 675 residential well users and 20 commercial entities before considering using excess water for entities outside of their community. The PVMWC must be prepared for the case of going into another extended drought period such as occurred from 1998 to 2004. During that time period, peak drawdown in the pumping wells increased each summer through the drought. Well 1 was pumped dry and utilization of several other wells were required to produce the water needed for ongoing production. Therefore, pumping groundwater at rates higher than historic baseline conditions is not recommended to ensure the water company can withstand the next drought period. As outlined in the next comment, while there was opportunity in 2010 and 2011 to provide additional groundwater to outside entities and to remain within historical baseline pumping conditions, it is unlikely that this will occur in 2014 when this project will require the water. Therefore, it is recommended that this project look for imported water sources at other locations. Any pumping of groundwater above historic average groundwater conditions would require additional groundwater investigation to evaluate these additional impacts to the PVMWC well system as well as other groundwater dependent well users in this basin. This would be similar to the construction demand analysis performed for Tierra Del Sol and Rugged Solar projects. There are groundwater dependent users in both basins that share this resource with the PVMWC including a domestic well user within 615 feet of Well 5.	N/A	

ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

	3	Groundwater	**Water Demand for PVMWC:** County staff advised you in May 2013 that PVWMC may be pumping at rates substantially below their historical average rates and therefore may have the ability to provide excess water to you for your project. In review of the information provided, the below average use of water in Pine Valley occurred between 2010 to 2012 and pumping has increased to historical average rates again for 2013. In 2012, the amount of groundwater used was 248.1 acre-feet and looking at the first five months of use in 2013 indicates that this year's pumping is approximately 10% higher than last year. At a 10% increase, it can be projected that 273 acre-feet of pumping for 2013 will occur. It would be reasonable to assume that pumping in 2014 will continue at 2013 rates and could even possibly continue to increase as it has in the past. Based on a discussion with PVMWC personnel, the decreased pumping from 2010 to 2012 was likely due to the temporary downturn in the economy. Given that the economic conditions have improved, pumping in the Pine Valley area for the foreseeable future would likely fall within historical range of pumping that occurred before the economic downturn.	N/A	8/9/2013
	4	Groundwater	**2000 to 2012 Average Water Demand:** The 2011 dataset in the letter report has an error in it as it shows no groundwater pumping from Sep-Dec. Pumping of wells occurred through this time period as indicated by pumping water levels being recorded by PVMWC during this time period. With pumping being included for these four months (based on the trend of pumping as compared to the prior year), 2011 was estimated to have had about 221 acre-feet of production (compared to the reported 153.9 acre-feet in the report). This changes the 12 year annual average to 270 acre-feet between 2000 and 2012 (compared to the reported 265 acre-feet in the report).	N/A	8/9/2013

ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

	5	Groundwater	**Proposal to utilize 38 acre-feet from Well 5 in four months:** When the Soitec EIR was reviewed, the County provided comments on the elements to be included in a groundwater investigation for offsite water uses. This was to include evaluation of production capacities of any well to be utilized and development of well interference calculations for pumping at the proposed project's rate of production. This was not included in this letter report. Based on the production capacity of Well 5, it is not possible to utilize 38 acre-feet of groundwater from this well without drawing down water levels to the pump intake (pumping the well dry). In the highest four months of production for this well in 2004 water levels were 14 feet above the intake after producing 11 acre-feet of water. Additionally, the highest annual use of this well was 21.3 acre-feet in 2004. Therefore, more than one well would be required to pump groundwater for this proposal.	N/A	8/9/2013
	6	Groundwater	**Groundwater Condition for PVMWC Water Use:** The project could be conditioned to allow the use of groundwater from PVMWC if the last 12 month period does not exceed historical baseline conditions (currently this would be considered to be 270 acre-feet on an annual basis). This would allow for pumping up to the baseline condition as determined by the County Groundwater Geologist provided there are no known or suspect local groundwater conditions that would limit the availability of groundwater to the community at the time the project would request utilizing water from PVMWC. Given the fact that pumping in 2013 is projected to be 273 acre-feet, it is likely that the PVMWC will continue to pump groundwater into 2014 at or above this level. Therefore, there would be no water available for this project to obtain.	N/A	8/9/2013

ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

7	Groundwater	Jim Bennett, County Groundwater Geologist, has reviewed the letter DRAFT Groundwater Resources Investigation Report, Pine Valley Municipal Water Compaany, Pine Valley, San Diego County, California, by DUDEK dated October 2013. Please address the following comments:	N/A	11/19/2013
8	Groundwater	Groundwater Dependent Habitat: The threshold for determining significance for impacts to gw dependent habitat needs to be revised per direction given in the scoping letter. The threshold would be if drawdown as the result of pumping for this project would cause water levels to exceed historical low water levels from baseline conditions of pumping. For analysis, copare historical drawdown underneath groundwater dependent habitat and compare that to theoretical drawdown that was result from pumping. The CEQA threhsold for impacts to groundwater dependent habitat would be if you exceed historical baseline historical low water levels beneath the nearest groundwater dependent habitat, this would be a potentially significant impact.		11/20/2013
10	Groundwater	Provide a Groundwater Monitoring and Mitigation Plan for County review. This would include setting a maximum pumping amount of 16 acre-feet and required monitoring with thresholds in which pumping would cease if groundwater levels drop below established thresholds. This would also included any biological monitoring that would occur.		11/20/2013
11	Groundwater	California Department of Public Health (CDPH): The Jacumba Community Services District is regulated by the CDPH. When the groundwater report is revised and then re-submitted, it will be forwarded to CDPH for any comments they may have. CDPH may apply additional requirements pursuant to the State Waterworks Standards.		11/20/2013
Review of Groundwater Investigation Report for Jacumba Community Services District dated October 2013				

ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

1	Groundwater	Jim Bennett, County Groundwater Geologist, has reviewed the letter DRAFT Groundwater Resources Investigation Report, Jacumba Community Services District, Jacumba Hot Springs, San Diego County, California, by DUDEK dated October 2013. Please address the following comments:		11/20/2013
2	Groundwater	In a telephone conversation with Debbie Trout of Jacumba Community Services District on 11/20/2013, she indicated that their district is currently providing groundwater to SDG&E and has an agreement to provide up to 15,000,000 gallons of water to their project. SDG&E began obtaining water from Well 6 in April 2013 and have been sold 8.8 million gallons through September 2013. Additionally, she indicated there is a potential small project for the Border Patrol that will require water from Well 6. Revise the water demand and analysis for the project to include these additional water demands. This will require both the cumulative and direct impacts analysis to be revised to include this additional water use in the analysis.		11/20/2013
3	Groundwater	Obtain groundwater production reocrds from JCSD to date for the pumping of Well 6 for SDG&E on a monthly basis. Compare the amount of pumping to the water level records in both Well 6 and Well 4. This information should be placed in the existing conditions section of the report.		11/20/2013
4	Groundwater	50% Reduction in Storage Analysis: This project is similar to Tierra Del Sol and Rugged Solar in that the groundwater pumping will be short-term and therefore the watershed analysis should include only the localized area with the same boundaries (one-half mile radius from the well). Revise the groundwater analysis accordingly. Include the 15,000,000 gallons of water from SDG&E and from the Border Patrol proposal.		11/20/2013

ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

5	Groundwater	Well Interference Water Level Threshold: Given the fact that alluvium up to 81 feet deep exists within proximity of Well 6 and that nearby well 4 is shallower and likely obtains its water from the alluvial aquifer, the 5-foot threshold should be used instead of the 20-foot threshold. Please revise the report in all appropriate places.		11/20/2013
6	Groundwater	Provide a Groundwater Monitoring and Mitigation Plan for County review. This would include setting a maximum pumping amount of 16 acre-feet and required monitoring with thresholds in which pumping would cease if groundwater levels drop below established thresholds. This would include the monitoring of the nearest private residential wells. Also, include biological monitoring that would occur.		11/20/2013
7	Groundwater	California Department of Public Health (CDPH): The Jacumba Community Services District is regulated by the CDPH. When the groundwater report is revised and then re-submitted, it will be forwarded to CDPH for any comments they may have. CDPH may apply additional requirements pursuant to the State Waterworks Standards.		11/20/2013
Review of Chapter 2.9 Hydrology and Water Quality - EIR, September 2013				

	1	EIR - Hydrology	General Comment: The Groundwater Resources portion of this section is reliant upon information from four groundwater investigation reports. Two of them were not yet written at the time this section was prepared (PVMWC and JCSD investigations). Additoinally, the groundwater investigation reports for Tierra Del Sol and Rugged Solar projects require revisions that will affect portions of this section. Since sources of water have changed since the time this document was last revised, there are assumptions throughout that require revisions. This is true of the Utilities section of the EIR as well. It is recommended that prior to re-writing this portion of the DEIR (and the Utilities section), that all groundwater investigation reports be reviewed by County staff for adequacy. After each of the four investigation reports are found adequate, it is recommended to make final edits to this document.		10/9/2013
	1	EIR - Hydrology	Please address strikeout-underline comments provided in the EIR.		10/9/2013
	2	EIR - Hydrology	Page 2.9.5 Additional Water Resources: This section needs to be revised to include Pine Valley Mutual Water Company as the supplemental source for Rugged Solar project and Padre Dam being the primary supplemental source for the Tierra Del Sol project and the backup supply for Rugged and other proposed projects.		10/1/2013
	3	EIR - Hydrology	Page 2.8.28 General Plan: It was previously requested to add General Plan goals and policies related to groundwater. Under the Land Use Element, Policy LU-8.1, LU-8.2 and LU-8.3 need to be added to this section. These policies cover Density Relationship to Groundwater Sustainability, Grroundwater Resources, and Groundwater-Dependent Habitat.		10/1/2013
	4	EIR - Hydrology	Page 2.8.52 Rugged: There are additional revisions required to the Rugged Groundwater Investigation dated September 2013 that will change numbers in this section. Please update in accordance with the revised investigation.		10/1/2013

	5	EIR - Hydrology	Page 2.8.52 Rugged: There are additional revisions required to the Rugged Groundwater Investigation dated September 2013 that will change numbers in this section. Please update in accordance with the revised investigation.		10/1/2013
	6	EIR - Hydrology	Section 2.9.4.2 Cumulative Impacts, Groundwater Resources: This section requires a major re-write. It requires to look at the whole of the action for the Rugged Solar project, the Pine Valley Mutual Water Company, and the Tierra Del Sol project. For Rugged, this includes looking at the fact that the wells will be shared by a number of entities including existing conditions use, Tule Wind Farm use, Rugged Solar Farm use, and the proposed Rough Acres Ranch campground use. For Pine Valley, cumulative impacts analysis should be provided once the groundwater investigation report is completed. The cumulative analysis erroneously assumes a 0.5-mile radius spacing of wells will would be adequate to reduce cumulative impacts to less than significant. The sub-basin in which a project is located within would be the appropriate boundary to evaluate cumulative impacts. It was agreed to conservatively constrain the analysis to a 0.5-mile radius of each well to be used. This conservative constraint needs to be expanded. The sub-basin in which each project is located should be discussed and the fact that analysis was biased to maximize evaluation of localized impacts. It is recommended in a meeting with the EIR preparers that this section be re-written.		10/1/2013

ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

	7	EIR - Hydrology	On October 8, 2013, County staff receieved a groundwater investigation report for Jacumba Community Services District. Electronic strikeout-underline comments to the EIR and other documents reviewed to date have been performed under the assumption that PVMWC and Padre Dam Municipal Water District were the final sources of off-site water. The EIR and water supply allocation plan both need to be updated with the information from this groundwater investigation as well as the investigation which has not yet been completed for PVMWC.		10/9/2013

SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SCOPING/ITERATION LETTER		
Date Requested	**Name of Study**	**Number of Copies Required**
	Revised Groundwater Investigation Report	Planner (1); Groundwater Geologist (1)
	Revised Well Test Report	Planner (1); Groundwater Geologist (1)
	Revised Groundwater Information	Planner (1); Groundwater Geologist (1)

	Scoping	Well Test Plan
Date Submitted:		
Date of Study:		
Name of Specialist Reviewing:		
Date of Site Visit (if applicable)		
Enter balance of PDS account (check KIVA financial resp. screen): *If funds are not adequate to complete your review, stop review and email project manager asking how to proceed*		
MOU Required and Submitted? (Yes, No, or N/A) (required if project scoped on or after July 1, 2006)		
Consultant on applicable list? enter "yes", "no" or "N/A"		
Does study comply with applicable Guideline for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirement? (Yes, No, or N/A) *Required if project was scoped after approval of the relevant Guideline*		
Make KIVA entry made in the "comment" field. Enter either "Incomplete","Accepted" or "Accepted with Minor Revisions"		
If study accepted, have you completed Initial Study Responses and provided Project Manager with Conditions and/or Mitigation Measures? w		
Completed Consultant Evaluation Form and emailed to Don Kraft? Always fill out form if Guidelines not followed, for notable poor performance, and when review is accepted.		

First Iteration	Second Iteration	Third Iteration	Fourth Iteration	Fifth Iteration