



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 May 14, 2020 from 2:00 to 3:30 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 Konyon (FK) • Lisa Peterson • Matt Witman (MWit) • Rikki Schroeder • Trish Boaz (TB) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandra Carlson (SC) • Niki McGinnis • Mike Bolouri • Sarah Brower • Ally Berenter, Mayors Office
		County of San Diego (County)
	Public	Consultant Team
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anita Regmi, Dept of Water Resources • Pat McTigue, San Diego Safari Park • 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 • Hank Rupp, Rancho Guejito • Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority 	<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, reviewed the list of participants signed onto GoToMeeting and asked all other phone participants to identify themselves. Patsy Tennyson, meeting facilitator, welcomed the group and reviewed basic instructions for GoToMeeting user tools. Sandra Carlson, City of San Diego, announced that Karina Danek’s baby boy was born on April 27, 2020 and introduced Niki McGinnis as the City’s replacement on the Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) Core Team (consisting of the City and the County).

Review

Patsy reviewed the meeting agenda and meeting objectives, and gave a brief overview of the January 7, 2020 Technical Peer Review meeting so the members of the AC are kept up to date.

GSP Content Review

John Ayres, Consultant Team, provided an overview of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA), reviewed GSP components, and explained why the San Pasqual Valley Groundwater Basin (Basin) was designated as a medium priority basin by DWR. The AC had the following comments and questions:

- AC Member (FK): Based on DWR's prioritization criteria, is it safe to say that water quality was not a contributing factor to San Pasqual Valley Basin becoming a medium priority basin – that it was more based on groundwater dependence and irrigated acreage?
 - (JA) Yes – there are enough points based on number of wells, groundwater dependence and irrigated acreage to make the Basin medium priority alone. One thing the evaluation tells us is that DWR is not terribly concerned about water quality in the Basin. If DWR had given 5 points in the prioritization for groundwater quality, the GSA would have to do something significant about it. Instead, we get to consider surface water quality, groundwater quality and water use in determining sustainability thresholds in the Basin. This is something we will get into more detail about in the next meeting.

Refined Analysis - Basin Definition

John presented the definition of basin statement that was developed for the San Pasqual Valley Basin. We are using the DWR Bulletin 118 definition of the basin. He also acknowledged that we do not understand the interaction of the Basin with underlying granitic rock. If groundwater conditions require the implementation of management actions, additional data collection, studies, aquifer testing and/or surveying may be recommended to improve understanding of this interaction,

- AC Member (MWit): The paradox is how this information is collected and analyzed. We recognize that data gaps exist, but we don't appear willing to address those.
 - (JA) We recognize there are data gaps, but the GSP process is moving quickly so we will decide later in the GSP process whether we need to fill that gap in Plan implementation. If filling that gap is critical to managing the Basin, we will include it; if not, then we will decide whether to spend resources there.
- AC Member (FK): New monitoring wells were installed on Matt Witman's/West Coast Turf's and Frank Konyn's properties. Will those wells help us gain a better understanding of alluvium, residuum, and bedrock?
 - (JA) Yes, those wells will help us to understand how the Basin works. But because they vary spatially, we will need more information to fully understand the Basin.
- AC Member (FK): Why wouldn't we use the new monitoring wells to inform the GSP, since those two wells will help us better understand the bedrock influence?
 - (JA) The well construction information from all five multi-completion wells (three USGS and two City wells) is being used to develop the HCM, and all five wells will be in the GSP monitoring well network to collect and analyze data in detail during GSP implementation.
- AC Member (FK): The bathtub analogy is not a good analogy for the San Pasqual Valley Basin because some of the water may be lost out the bottom of the basin. Why wouldn't we use the new monitoring well data to help us understand the bottom of the basin during Plan development?
 - (JA) The groundwater model does estimate this interaction because it is bigger (deeper) than the Basin definition as included in the GSP – the model will estimate and simulate all inflow and outflow.

Undesirable Results

John explained how the information from the January AC meeting breakout groups and January TPR meeting discussion was used to develop the Undesirable Results matrix in Handout 2. The undesirable results matrix explains the “bad” Basin conditions and defines how they can be measured.

The AC had no comments or questions on the Undesirable Results matrix. This information will be revisited in a future AC meeting.

Field Program Update

John provided an update on the field program. Two triple-completion monitoring wells were installed as part of the City’s DWR grant. Isotope sampling for groundwater and stream gages has already occurred.

- AC Member (FK): What information from the isotope sampling will be provided to the AC?
 - (JA) The surface water gages are useful for understanding how much water is discharged into the Basin; that will contribute to the groundwater model. The water quality information will also help us to set sustainability thresholds for water quality.
- AC Member (FK): Please add acreage/watershed area for each of those stream gages. Winter 2020 has been an extremely wet season, yet only some of the streams appear to be flowing. That is surface water recharging the San Pasqual Valley Basin. It is interesting that some seasonal streams are flowing, and some are not.
 - (JA) Surface water flow amounts are important, but catchment is not as important.
- AC Member (FK): I disagree – the catchment may potentially indicate if a certain alluvial area was over drafted more than others and that is why more percolation would occur, the catchment may dictate whether the seasonal streams flow (depending on how big they are).
 - (JA) Understood. We will follow up with you on catchment size after this meeting. The City has some watershed information that can be provided.

Commented [CS1]: Changed per Frank Konyin’s comment that is was incorrect

Public Comments

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

- Alicia Appel, City of Escondido: Undesirable Results: the matrix has “TBD” categories for interim milestones and projects/management actions. Will those be filled in at some point?
 - (JA) Yes, we will continue discussing the Undesirable Results for rest of the calendar year. We are looking for agreement on the Undesirable Results statements today.
- Alicia Appel, City of Escondido: From the notes for last AC meeting – many people expressed concern about water quality, but the Undesirable Results statements do not appear to distinguish between drinking, ground, and surface water quality. I would like more clarity in the statements.
 - (JA) Surface water is managed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). SGMA has jurisdiction only over groundwater. We are tasked with managing the 6 sustainability indicators associated with groundwater. Another consideration is whether the GSAs can actively manage the topic (e.g., TDS)? We must consider the costs of implementation in comparison to the Undesirable Results.
- AC Member (FK): We are an advisory committee, but who do we advise?
 - (JA) The AC and TPR both advise the GSA Core Team (City and County together).

- AC Member (FK): As a member of the AC, I want to remind other members that a large landowner has a toe in our Basin and has refused to provide their well data. The City has provided all leasehold data to the GSP team. The groundwater model needs a lot of estimation and our livelihood depends on that estimation. Please support me in advising the GSA Core Team to use the data from the two new monitoring wells so that we can better understand the interaction between the alluvium, residuum, and bedrock. This is critical for the GSP. It seems as if someone is trying to protect that single large landowner.
- AC Member (MWit): I agree with what Frank has said. Transparency is good for all of us. I am disappointed in the large landowner in that they have not been transparent with their data. I hope that lack of transparency would not benefit them in any way.
- AC Members (CB, TB, EL): I was unaware that our large landowner has been uncooperative and agree with Frank and Matt that we should all be as transparent as possible to create the best possible GSP for San Pasqual Valley.
- Jim Bennett, County of San Diego: Can John provide a summary of the data that Rancho Guejito has provided? I believe they have provided quite a bit of information including aquifer testing data, water level data, and possibly groundwater production well data. Also, there is data from DWR records on the fractured rock wells. I am not aware of any data the GSA is missing. John, can you elaborate?
 - (JA) Rancho Guejito gave us construction information for 5 wells at the south end of Guejito Creek, as well as aquifer testing for 2 of the 5 wells. Water level data for these 5 wells has been provided for levels collected from about the past three years. Peter Quinlan (TPR member) offered data at the May 14, 2020 TPR meeting (this morning) on a monitoring well farther upstream, though it has not been provided yet.
 - The City (SC) noted that no deep well information was provided.
 - The County (JB) noted that John should have the deep well information; they are publicly available on the DWR website.
- AC Member (FK): Notes from the January TPR meeting say, “Rancho Guejito representative will check with their Counsel on providing this data.” Was it provided? I would like to revisit this discussion with more information from the Core Team for the AC members to weigh in.
- AC Member (FK): I care about the life and blood and water on this Valley. At the last TPR meeting, I felt that the majority of the professionals (TPR hydrogeologists) felt that we should include bedrock in the Basin definition. Since then, the Core Team has determined that we will follow Bulletin 118. But we have so many data points available to better understand the bedrock – why aren’t we using them? Are data being withheld to hide something?

<< Errata – After the AC meeting, the following correction was sent to AC members by Sandra Carlson, City of San Diego, via email: “I have one correction from the AC meeting today, that I wanted you all to know sooner rather than later. The City and County do have three DWR well logs from Rancho Guejito that were drilled and sealed with cement through the alluvium/residuum. Each well is open to the fractured rock beneath the alluvium and residuum. The good news is that I was the only one who was mistaken on this information. John Ayres from Woodard & Curran used the information in the cross sections presented at the Technical Peer Review meeting this morning shown on the last page of Handout 2. So please forgive my mistake. >>

Next Steps

The next AC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, July 9, 2020 from 2:00 to 4:00 pm

The AC shall submit comments on today’s meeting subjects by Thursday, May 28, 2020.

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

- AC Member (FK): When we do submit written comments, what happens with them?
 - The City (SC) explained that every comment is logged, and those comments will all go into a matrix in the GSP. How we will respond to those comments is still to be determined and is being discussed by the Core Team.

The AC meeting ended at 3:24 pm.

GoToMeeting Chat Log from AC Meeting

Nicole Poletto (to Everyone): 2:00 PM: If anyone is having technical difficulties, feel free to message me directly, or give me a call at 858-875-7405

Nicole Poletto (to Everyone): 2:05 PM: If you just joined us, feel free to contact me if you have technical difficulties. You can send me a message directly or give me a call at 858-875-7405.

Eric Larson (to Everyone): 3:14 PM: I'd like to comment

Patricia Tennyson (to Everyone): 3:14 PM: You are next

Lisa Peterson (to Everyone): 3:19 PM: That is a good idea

Carole (to Everyone): 3:24 PM: Thanks to all!

Image from AC Meeting

