



San Pasqual Valley (SPV) Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP)
Advisory Committee Meeting
Meeting Summary

The following is a summary of the Advisory Committee discussion, comments, and questions. This summary reflects the general content and spirit of each discussion point, but is not a verbatim recording.

Date: **Thursday July 9, 2020 from 2:00 to 4:00 pm**

Location: **GoToMeeting**

Purpose: **Advisory Committee Meeting**

Attendees:	Advisory Committee (AC)	City of San Diego (City)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carole Burkhard (CB) • Eric Larson (EL) • Frank Konyn (FK) • Lisa Peterson • Matt Witman (MWit) • Rikki Schroeder • Trish Boaz (TB) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandra Carlson (SC) • Niki McGinnis • Mike Bolouri • Keli Balo • Sarah Brower • Surraya Rashid • Ally Berenter, Mayors Office
		County of San Diego (County)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leanne Crow • Jim Bennett (JB) • Nancy Karas
	Public	Consultant Team
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anita Regmi, Dept of Water Resources • Raj Brown, San Diego Safari Park • Chris Brzezicki, San Diego Safari Park • Robyn Badger, San Diego Safari Park • Alicia Appel, City of Escondido • Brad Blaes, The Pinery • Dustin Meador, The Pinery • Hank Rupp, Rancho Guejito (RG) • Lani Lutar, Responsible Solutions, RG • Andres Monette, Best Best & Krieger (BBK), RG • Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority • Charlie de la Rosa, San Diego Safari Park • Marc Lindshield, SPV City Leaseholder 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Ayres (JA), Woodard & Curran • Rosalyn Prickett, Woodard & Curran • Nicole Poletto, Woodard & Curran • Micah Eggleton, Woodard & Curran • Patsy Tennyson, Katz & Associates • Emily Michaelson, Katz & Associates

Roll Call and Introductions

Rosalyn Prickett, Consultant Team, greeted each of the participants as they signed onto GoToMeeting and asked all others participating via telephone and computer to identify themselves. Patsy Tennyson, Meeting Facilitator, welcomed the group and reviewed basic instructions for GoToMeeting user tools.

Review

Patsy reviewed the meeting agenda, meeting objectives, and previous meeting summary. No AC members had comments on the previous meeting summary.

AC Comments

John Ayres, Consultant Team, provided a summary of the AC comments that have been received from January 2020 to present. No AC members had comments or questions.

GSP Content Review

John provided an overview of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) and reviewed the GSP schedule. No AC members had comments or questions.

Basin Settings Updates

John presented the cross sections prepared for the San Pasqual Valley (Valley), which were based on well completion reports (for geology) and groundwater elevation in Spring 2015. John also reviewed the analysis that has been completed to date on defining groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs) in the Valley, including the Natural Communities Commonly Associated with Groundwater (NCCAG) dataset and biological surveys. Finally, John explained the analysis that was completed on the watershed's stream gauges. That analysis demonstrated that the United States Geological Survey (USGS) average daily flow data (which the City provides for three stream gauges just outside of the San Pasqual Valley Groundwater Basins (Basin)) and the City's instantaneous flow data (which the City also collects on a quarterly basis at these same three stream gauge location points as the USGS is monitoring), cannot be compared or correlated because they are different units of measurements.

- AC Member (MWit): In the Santa Ysabel sub-watershed, Lake Sutherland does affect flow in the Basin. Will you assume that the City will continue to operate the reservoir as it currently does? Historically, that reservoir spilled more often which recharged the Valley more.
 - JA: We will work with our modeler Nate Brown to determine an approach. We will likely use the historical period of recharge from Lake Sutherland.
- AC Member (FK): On stream gauge comparison – those are wonderful maps, but different scales. Do you have any acreage numbers for each sub-watershed?
 - JA: We can provide that data.
- AC Member (FK): On potential GDEs – on the east side of the Valley where its over 30 feet to groundwater, there are a lot of non-native invasive species (Arundo, salt cedar, etc.). Has there been any discussion of removal of those non-native plants?
 - JA: I will pass this along to our wetland biologist. We can address invasive removal in Projects & Management Actions, though we must take care those species are not providing habitat for Threatened and Endangered (T&E) species.

Groundwater Model Update

John provided an overview of the proposed groundwater modeling approach for this GSP. The Consultant Team is using the USGS One-Water model for the Basin area and the USGS Basin Characterization Model (BCM) for the outlying watershed areas. He reviewed the historical simulation period, how land use is used in the modeling process, and how production wells are bring assigned to parcels in the model. John noted that the Consultant Team is requesting comments on Handout 2 (land use and well assignments) within one week, by July 16, 2020.

- AC Member (EL): The number of wells and the size of this AC is a mis-match – how are you going to get accurate data about all the wells for this planning effort? Will you do a field survey?
 - JA: No, we do not have the resources to do a field survey. Assigning parcel irrigation to specific wells is the preferred approach, but sometimes you just assign pumping to a general region. Slide 41 map was developed based on the City's 2014 Salt and Nutrient Management Plan (SNMP) model data and is a good estimate.

Sustainability Criteria

John provided an overview of sustainable management criteria and how the team is going to monitor for them: essentially, we will be monitoring groundwater elevation and groundwater quality.

- AC Member (FK): You have seawater intrusion crossed off. Why?
 - JA: Because we are not near an ocean, bay, inlet, or Delta. This is the official definition from California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and so we do not qualify.
- AC Member (FK): For land subsidence, when you look at 515 groundwater Basins in California and the points that placed each Basin in the medium and high priority categories, land subsidence and groundwater quality were both ranked as “zero” by DWR for the Basin. So why have you removed land subsidence, but not groundwater quality?
 - JA: We are required to monitor for all these sustainability indicators. The monitoring data I have reviewed to date includes elevated total dissolved solids (TDS) levels, and I do not think a DWR reviewer will allow us to adopt a GSP that does not address this issue. We will address thresholds for groundwater quality with a detailed discussion later. TDS levels are high in surface water entering the Basin, so this will be sticky issue for Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs). AC members will get to weigh in on where the thresholds are set and how it affects you all. We are considering thresholds for TDS and Nitrate only because we don't want to try to regulate something in the GSP that the GSAs don't have the ability to manage. We are going to focus on things that are related to more or less manageable groundwater conditions.
- AC Member (FK): Doesn't the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) already monitor and regulate TDS and Nitrates with stormwater and wastewater permits?
 - JA: I agree, though we are stuck with it because it's in the SGMA law. The “nexus of effect” for undesirable results allows us to limit our management actions to these specific constituents. And we can establish thresholds that may be higher than other agencies thresholds (e.g. maximum contaminant levels (MCLs)). We need to make a GSP that is implementable, rather than creating more trouble along the way.
- AC Member (FK): It was disheartening to hear public comments this morning about a “smoking gun” related to TDS loading in the Basin. There are a lot of things contributing to TDS in this Valley. High levels of TDS are a problem for both farmers and for my compost facility. Is there a “smoking gun” or how are we going to work around (mollify, remediate) the situation?
 - JA: I do not believe the thresholds will be problematic for Valley users. The water quality thresholds will require more detailed discussion.

John continued his presentation about the proposed monitoring networks. Each monitoring well will have an established minimum threshold and measurable objective. The groundwater level network could include all 10 of the City's monitoring wells and the three Rancho Guejito wells. John showed examples of the sustainability criteria and how they apply.

- AC Member (MWit): Why would we want to measure the wells below the alluvium? I believe we should measure all wells to fill in the basic math of what is going on with the groundwater in the Basin. It's important that we have access to data about all layers of the groundwater Basin.

- AC Member (FK): I second Matt's comments. We all know that knowledge is power and that if we gather information now, we will have a better understanding of the Basin. If we do not collect the data now, we will have data gaps moving forward. The sooner we start measuring all Basin inflows and outflows, the more knowledge we will have.
- AC Member (FK): Bottom of Slide 50: what are the undesirable results? Are those conceptual or actual?
 - JA: Slide 50 is a diagram and does not represent a specific well. I am not implying we are in an undesirable result in this Basin. My feeling is that we are going to be setting our minimum thresholds in a majority of the existing wells. If you do not have any wells that fall below the minimum thresholds, then you do not have an undesirable result.

Field Program Update

John provided an update on the field program. Available information from the field program will be included in the GSP in the Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model (HCM) section. There were no AC comments on the field program.

Public Comments

Public comments provided in the "Chat" during the meeting are listed in the GoToMeeting Chat Log below. The following public comments were provided verbally by meeting participants:

- Robyn Badger, San Diego Safari Park – I agree with Frank that there are lots of non-native invasive species in that channel that should be removed.
- Andre Monette, BBK for RG – There are a number of studies that have been done in the Basin for the City in the western portion of basin that show high TDS, Chloride, and Nitrogen levels, clearly showing that these are big issues in the Valley. These constituents greatly exceed the drinking water standards and water quality objectives and high groundwater levels in that portion of the Basin – all causing surface waters in basin to have high TDS. Suggest reviewing the 2015 State of the Basin Report.
- Hank Rupp, General Manager, RG – Thank you for highlighting that Bulletin 118 is the appropriate definition of the Basin and limits the jurisdiction of SGMA. Clearly, following the law will help avoid litigation.
- Marc Lindshield, Leaseholder – The Valley is a gathering spot. You have chosen 2005 – 2020 period as the calibration period. We had 2 large fires during that time (Cedar Fire and Witch Creek Fires). The 2009 Study from CCC addresses increased risk for wildfire.
 - JA: We looked at aerial photos, but missed the mark on our analysis. We will re-review. From the data that I have reviewed, the surface water that comes into the Basin is salty. There is a salinity problem and we need to come up with an approach to address it.
 - ML: Southern California Coastal Water Research Project, Technical Report 598 (August 2009) by the Southern California Stormwater Coalition released a detailed report on this topic. The Community Planning Group has long protested Ramona MWD's outfall to Bandy Canyon that carries pollutants into the Valley.
- Marc Lindshield, Leaseholder – On Slide 47, can you share the data available for the monitoring well up Rockwood Canyon? We need all data available from all wells, no matter what depth. This is an area of serious concern. My well is affected every time the well next to me blasts.
- Marc Lindshield, Leaseholder – We have very thirsty invasives that are throughout the Valley. Water is a precious commodity and we need to make sure to protect it for Valley users.

- JA: I was not aware of invasive species issues until today. We could add a Projects & Management Actions to address this.
- Frank Konyn: In reference to the “smoking gun” comment, we need to look at the big picture. When animal operations are done right, they will not affect the Basin. My relationship with the RWQCB can justify this. We receive imported water from Colorado River that brings TDS into the Basin. Are there geological formations in the watershed that deliver TDS to the Basin? The quality of agricultural Bests Management Practices (BMPs) in this Valley by all leaseholders far exceeds the historical practices. There are lots of factors and what we’re seeing today are likely a result of poor BMPs from several years ago. It may be that the levels we are seeing today are practices from 40 years ago, and it may be 40 years before we see the full implications of the BMPs being practiced today.
 - Andre Monette, BBK for RG: The 2015 State of the Basin report (CH2M Hill) that I mentioned previously reports that 90% of Nitrate loading in the Basin is a result of manure operations.
 - Frank Konyn: As a member of the advisory board that helped with that plan, I believe the statistics you are stating have been taken out of context.

<< Clarification Email 1 – After the AC meeting, the following clarification was sent to AC members by Frank Konyn, AC Member, via email: “In the Technical Peer Review Meeting this morning, and again this afternoon in the Advisory Committee Meeting there were references made to the nitrate and TDS levels in the groundwater of the San Pasqual Valley ... Specifically he was attempting to quote from the September 2015, San Pasqual Groundwater Management State of the Basin Report Update, Page 2-6 ... The actual language in the original report (found on page 3-18 and attached to this email) reads as follows, “With over 90 percent of the total nitrogen contributions to the Basin coming from fertilizer and manure use.....” ... The first sentence reads “The single largest contributing source of nitrogen is commercial crop fertilizer use at 56% of the Basin total followed by landscape fertilizer use at 14 percent.” ... on page 3-11 [is] the following statement. “The largest source of nitrogen contribution from fertilizer use was from avocado production due to the large area in production on hillsides surrounding the Basin but within the study area subcatchment.” ...”>>

<< Clarification Email 2 – Additionally, Rikki Schroeder, AC Member, sent the following statement via email: “... The Salt and Nutrient Management Plan (SNMP 2014) stated that Konyn Dairy contributes 12% of the nitrogen load and 1% of salt load to basin. ... It is also important to remember that the SNMP is forward looking and aims to mitigate future loading. It does not seek to directly improve historical impacts. ... The problem is that legacy contributions of nitrogen and TDS continue to haunt the basin. ... For example, the plan mentions the former Verger dairy that ceased operations in 2011, but does not include the historical, cumulative impact associated with the Verger or Konyn operations. ... Avocado and citrus fertilization are assigned approximately 37.5% of the N loading in the SNMP. Again, this ignores historical contributions. When those are taken into account, the dairy loading goes up to 29.8% and the avocado and citrus loading goes down to 21.1%. ... While groundwater quality is the purview of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), it is also the responsibility of the Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA). ... Currently there are at least two major lawsuits involving cities in San Diego County and in Kings County where nitrate contamination of groundwater alleged to be caused by dairies are being litigated. The cases are about current and legacy contributions of nitrogen and phosphorous from dairy operations. ...”

Next Steps

The next AC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 8, 2020 from 2:00 to 4:00 pm

Comments about the land use maps and well mapping (Handout 2) must be received by Thursday, July 16, 2020. All other comments about today’s meeting must be received by Thursday, July 23, 2020.

Please send any comments to Sandra Carlson at the City of San Diego using her email address at carlsons@saniego.gov.

The AC meeting ended at 3:24 pm.

GoToMeeting Chat Log from AC Meeting

Rosalyn Prickett, Woodard & Curran (to Everyone): 1:56 PM: The meeting materials are on our website: <https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/SGMA/san-pasqual-valley.html>

Nicole Poletto, Woodard & Curran (to Everyone): 2:06 PM: If you are having technical difficulties, feel free to chat me directly or give me a call at 858-875-7405

Matt Witman (to Everyone): 2:26 PM: i have a question

Eric Larson (to Everyone): 2:46 PM: have a question

Frank Konyn (to Everyone): 2:51 PM: i have a question on this slide

matt witman (to Everyone): 3:13 PM: I have a comment

Marc Lindshield (to Everyone): 3:24 PM: Marc Lindshield when I can

Dustin Meador (to Everyone): 3:35 PM: Should Irrigation efficiency consider some crops are being underirrigated if you compare Crop ET with Ref. ETo. The assumption is that Ag. is overwatering everything

Images from AC Meeting

The screenshot shows a GoToMeeting interface. At the top, it says 'Talking: John Ayres' and 'View Active Cameras'. Below this is a row of participant video feeds. The main presentation area displays a slide titled 'Cross Sections' with the San Diego County logo. The slide includes a list of cross sections (A-A' and B-B') and a legend for geological features: Alluvium (yellow), Alluvium (wet) (light blue), Residuum (dark blue), and Bedrock (red). Two geological cross-section diagrams are shown, labeled A and B, with vertical axes for 'Feet Above Mean Sea Level' and horizontal axes for 'Feet' and 'Miles'. The diagrams show various geological layers and features like 'San Pasqual Valley', 'San Pasqual River', and 'San Pasqual Valley'. A legend on the right side of the slide identifies symbols for 'San Pasqual Valley deposits (Holocene to Late Pleistocene)', 'Weathered Bedrock (granite/grandiorite)', 'Rhyolite: Mission Mountain granodiorite', and 'Groundwater Surface, Spring 2015'. The bottom of the slide has a 'Draft Work Product' watermark and the 'sandiego.gov' logo. The GoToMeeting interface also shows a 'Type here to search' bar at the bottom left and a system clock at the bottom right indicating '2:19 PM 7/9/2020'.

GoToMeeting REC View Active Cameras 36

Talking: John Ayres

Groundwater Model Update

Example Assignments of Wells to Parcels

Status of Wells Represents Current Conditions (2020)

Map Label	Possible Source Wells	Map Label	Possible Source Wells
1	SP001, SP002, SP003, SP004	23	SP023, SP024, SP025, SP026, SP027, SP028
2	SP005, SP006	24	SP029, SP030, SP031, SP032, SP033, SP034, SP035
3	SP007, SP008	25	SP036, SP037, SP038
4	SP009, SP010	26	SP039
5	SP011, SP012	27	SP040
6	SP013, SP014, SP015, SP016, SP017, SP018	28	SP041
7	SP019, SP020, SP021, SP022, SP023	29	SP042
8	SP024, SP025, SP026, SP027, SP028	30	SP043
9	SP029, SP030, SP031, SP032, SP033	31	SP044, SP045
10	SP034, SP035, SP036, SP037, SP038	32	SP046
11	SP039, SP040, SP041, SP042, SP043	33	SP047, SP048, SP049, SP050, SP051, SP052
12	SP044, SP045, SP046, SP047, SP048	34	SP053
13	SP049, SP050, SP051, SP052, SP053	35	SP054
14	SP054, SP055, SP056, SP057, SP058, SP059	36	SP055
15	SP060, SP061, SP062, SP063, SP064	37	SP056
16	SP065, SP066, SP067, SP068, SP069	38	SP057
17	SP070, SP071, SP072, SP073, SP074	39	SP058
18	SP075, SP076, SP077, SP078, SP079	40	SP059
19	SP080, SP081, SP082, SP083, SP084	41	SP060, SP061, SP062, SP063, SP064, SP065
20	SP085, SP086, SP087, SP088, SP089	42	SP066, SP067, SP068, SP069, SP070, SP071, SP072, SP073, SP074, SP075, SP076, SP077, SP078, SP079, SP080, SP081, SP082, SP083, SP084, SP085, SP086, SP087, SP088, SP089, SP090, SP091, SP092, SP093, SP094, SP095, SP096, SP097, SP098, SP099, SP100
21	SP091, SP092, SP093, SP094, SP095, SP096, SP097, SP098, SP099, SP100		

Draft Work Product sandiego.gov

GoToMeeting REC View Active Cameras 37

Talking: John Ayres

SMC – Stakeholder Input Matrix

- Considerations for the Minimum Thresholds
 - Stakeholder Driven
 - Groundwater Wells
 - Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems

Sustainability Indicator ¹	II. GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
Undesirable Results Consideration ²	Chronic lowering of groundwater levels indicating unreasonable depletion of supply, which results in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Adverse impacts to the viability of agriculture, and the agricultural economy. b. Unusable and stranded groundwater extraction infrastructure. c. Need to deepen or construct new wells. d. Adverse impacts to domestic wells users. e. Adverse impacts on connected ecosystems.
Minimum Threshold Consideration ³	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local well infrastructure depths Groundwater dependent ecosystems

Draft Work Product sandiego.gov