

AGENDA

Borrego Valley Groundwater Basin: Borrego Springs Subbasin Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) Advisory Committee (AC)

October 4, 2018 @ 10:00 AM – 3:00 PM

Location: UCI Steele Burnand Research Center: 401 Tilting T, Borrego Springs CA 92004

Remote Access: <https://csus.zoom.us/j/849707204> **Call-In:** 646-876-9923 **Meeting ID:** 849707204#

- I. OPENING PROCEDURES [10:00 am – 10:30 am]**
 - A. Call to Order
 - B. Pledge of Allegiance
 - C. Roll Call of Attendees
 - D. Review of Meeting Agenda
 - E. Approval of August 30, 2018 AC Meeting Minutes
 - F. Updates from the Core Team
 - a. Transitions in Core Team Membership and AC Representation
 - b. Brief Report-out on August 31st Technical Meeting with Consultants
 - c. Metrics on Responses Received to Draft-Baseline Pumping Allocation Letters sent to Pumpers
 - d. Consideration for Formation of Ad Hoc Committee for Emerging Constituents of Concern
 - e. Consideration of SB 1000 as it Relates to SGMA Process
 - G. Updates from Advisory Committee Members
 - H. As Needed Opportunity to Clarify Technical/Informational Material presented on 08/30/2018
- II. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS [10:30 am – 10:55 am]**
 - A. Socioeconomic Efforts: Community Engagement Efforts Update – *LeSar Development Consultants*
 - B. Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Process Overview – *Core Team*
- III. GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY PLAN: REVIEW OF DRAFT CHAPTERS [10:55 am – 2:40 pm with lunch approximately 12:00 – 12:30 pm]**
 - A. Chapter 1: Introduction to GSP
 - B. Chapter 2: Plan Area and Basin Setting
 - C. Chapter 3: Sustainability Management Criteria
- IV. CLOSING PROCEDURES [2:40 pm – 3:00 pm]**
 - A. Correspondence
 - B. General Public Comments (comments may be limited to 3 minutes)
 - C. Review Action Items from Previous AC Meetings, Next AC Meeting Date(s), and Next Steps

The next regular meetings of the Advisory Committee are scheduled for **October 25, 2018** and **November 29, 2018**, at the UCI Steele/ Burnand Anza-Borrego Desert Research Center (*subject to change).

Please be advised that times associated with agenda are approximations only. Public comment periods will be accommodated at the end of each item listed for discussion and possible action. The duration of each comment period will be at the discretion of the meeting Facilitator. Any public record provided to the A/C less than 72 hours prior to the meeting, regarding any item on the open session portion of this agenda, is available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Office of the Borrego Water District, located at 806 Palm Canyon Drive, Borrego Springs CA 92004.

The Borrego Springs Water District complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Persons with special needs should call Geoff Poole at 760-767-5806 at least 48 hours in advance of the start of this meeting, in order to enable the District to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility. Borrego SGMA Website: <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/SGMA/borrego-valley.html>

MINUTES

**Borrego Valley Groundwater Basin: Borrego Springs Subbasin
Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA)
Advisory Committee (AC)**

August 30, 2018 @ 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Location: UCI Steele Burnand Research Center: 401Tilting T, Borrego Springs, CA 92004

I. OPENING PROCEDURES

A. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Borrego Water District (BWD) General Manager Geoff Poole.

B. Pledge of Allegiance

Those present stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. Roll Call of Attendees

Committee members: Present: Jim Seley, Rebecca Falk, Dave Duncan, Bill Berkley, Gina Moran, Diane Johnson, Jack McGrory, Ryan Hall

Absent: Jim Wilson

Core Team members: Leanne Crow, County of San Diego Jim Bennett, County of San Diego
Geoff Poole, BWD

Staff/Consultants: Meagan Wylie, Center for Collaborative Policy Trey Driscoll, Dudek, GSP Consultant (via teleconference)
Wendy Quinn, Recording Secretary Rachel Ralston, LeSar Development (via teleconference, Item III.A.b only)
Hugh McManus, Dudek Consulting Team Jay Jones, Environmental Navigation Systems, Inc. (ENSI)

Public: Michael Sadler, *Borrego Sun* Linda Haneline
Stephen Ballas Bill Haneline
Martha Deichler Kathy Dice
Betsy Knaak Suzanne Lawrence

D. Review of Meeting Agenda

Meagan Wylie reviewed the meeting ground rules and Agenda.

E. Approval of July 26, 2018 AC Meeting Minutes

Upon motion by Member Seley, seconded by Member Berkley and unanimously carried by those present, the Minutes of the July 26, 2018 AC Meeting were approved as written.

F. Updates from the Core Team

Jim Bennett reported that the main activities since the last AC meeting focused on completing the draft Chapters of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP). Dudek has completed Chapters 1 and 2 and expects to complete the remaining chapters within several weeks. A detailed overview of the draft GSP components will be presented over the course of the next three AC meetings.

Mr. Bennett also recalled that letters were sent to pumpers regarding their respective proposed Baseline Pumping Allocations (BPAs) in mid-July, and several responses have been received. The responses are currently being reviewed and analyzed. Some farmers also submitted pumping data based on metered use. Member Falk asked how many pumpers had not responded to the provided letter, and Mr. Bennett agreed to obtain the number. Member Seley asked whether, if a pumper does not respond to the proposed BPA, he/she is assumed to agree with it. Geoff Poole felt a confirmation of receipt of letter would be beneficial, and agreed to discuss with the Core Team. Mr. Bennett clarified that the letters went out certified mail which includes return receipts. Member Hall asked whether the BPAs took

into account water use other than irrigation, such as people living on the property and maintenance. Mr. Poole replied that the core team should look into this.

Mr. Poole reported that in response to Member Seley's request made at the July AC meeting to have the Agricultural Alliance for Water and Resource Education's (AAWARE's) technical expert review Dudek's BPA report, a meeting has been scheduled for tomorrow, August 31. This will be the first of a series of meetings.

G. Updates from Advisory Committee Members

Member Duncan reported that there had been no ratepayers' meetings since the last AC meeting. However, a question was raised as to how close the projected water table levels at the end of the GSP implementation period would be to the screening levels in the production wells, as there are concerns being expressed regarding future water quality values as water table levels decline. Trey Driscoll replied that this topic would be addressed in Chapter 3 of the GSP.

Member Johnson reported that the Stewardship Council had been considering the water quality component of the GSP. Pesticides that are currently regulated will be monitored, but concerns are emerging about substances that are used in the Valley for agriculture activities, but not yet regulated. She suggested creating a working group to look at these potential contaminants/constituents of concern and report back findings to the AC and Core Team. The Core Team agreed to consider and discuss it at the next AC meeting.

Member Falk asked about the Borrego Springs line item in the Proposition 3 bond measure, coming up on the November ballot. Specifically, if the bond measure passes, and the money is used to purchase farmland or water, will it belong to BWD? If someone subsequently purchases land or water credits from BWD, will BWD get the money? Mr. Poole indicated discussion on this topic is premature, but will be necessary if the bond measure passes.

H. As Needed Opportunity to Clarify Technical/Informational Material presented at July 26, 2018 Meeting
None

II. TECHNICAL AND POLICY ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION OR INTRODUCTION

A. Baseline Pumping Allocations & Reductions

Mr. Bennett explained that the Core Team was reviewing BPAs and proposed reductions per Member Falk's concern regarding the effect of the Human Right to Water Law on the BPAs. The Core Team's current approach is instituting proportional reductions across sectors, with consideration of the Human Right to Water allocated in order to allow that portion of the municipal sector to be exempt from any reductions. Mr. Poole added that although the proposed BPAs contemplate a 75 percent reduction in water use over the 20-year timeframe, consideration of the Human Right to Water may lessen municipal reductions to roughly 50 percent. More information on this estimate is expected to be presented at the next AC meeting. Member Falk felt this was a critical issue. She reiterated the Sponsor Group's position that they strongly prefer municipal users be exempt from any and all future water use reductions. Members Duncan, Moran and Johnson concurred.

III. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

A. Socioeconomic Efforts: Proposition 1 Grant Tasks Update

a. Tasks 2 and 3 Draft Report

Jay Jones presented an overview of the socioeconomic efforts funded by the Proposition 1 grant, focusing on the area's Severely Disadvantaged Community (SDAC) status. Dr. Jones' company, Environmental Navigation Services, Inc. (ENSI) has been working on this along with LeSar Development Consultants and Dudek. He reviewed that Task 1 is the SDAC engagement, Task 2 is the baseline data compilation (SDAC data, groundwater quantity and level, groundwater quality and overall BWD

infrastructure and costs), and Task 3 is management analysis (how the aquifer will respond to pumping reductions, how BWD operations will be affected, and SDAC impacts).

Dr. Jones presented charts showing inflows (groundwater recharge and return flows) and outflows (pumping and evapotranspiration). He explained the overdraft analysis methodology, assuming the current pumping rate of 5,700 acre-feet per year and calculating the overdraft over time using the methodology. The model provides a statistically based analysis that can be used to assess differing pumping rates.

Member Falk asked whether any projections were based on climate change, and Dr. Jones replied that they were not. However, Mr. Driscoll reported that he was addressing climate change within the GSP water budget calculations, and would be presenting more information in the future. Member Seley pointed out that the 2015 United States Geological Survey (USGS) report showed a return flow of 20 percent, whereas Dr. Jones' data showed 10 percent. Dr. Jones explained that the range was 10 to 30 percent, and it is continually reducing. His models utilize the USGS data. Mr. Bennett pointed out that irrigation practices are getting more efficient, so the long-range estimate average 20 percent but currently with efficient irrigation is estimated at 10%. Member Berkley asked if there were any plans for bioretention basins or injection wells. Dr. Jones replied that bioretention basins could potentially be feasible on State Park land, but was unsure if the State Park would consider it. Dr. Jones indicated injection wells have been a viable option in other basins and wasn't sure of its applicability in this basin.

Member Johnson brought up the notion that Borrego Springs differs from other SDACs due to various factors such as small population and remote location. Dr. Jones explained that he was trying to break down community data in terms of jobs, and whether water use reduction would create a problem. Public member Martha Deichler pointed out that if enrollment declines, the schools would lose money. Mr. Poole asked how many students would have to leave Borrego Springs before a school closed, and Ms. Deichler agreed to find out. Member Seley noted that if farmers leave, so do their workers and their children.

b. Community Engagement Efforts Update

Rachel Ralston reported she had gained important information from the business survey. One of the biggest issues is the potential income shift and how that affects the SDAC. She invited the AC's attention to the revised residential survey report, included in the Agenda package. On September 19, there will be two community meetings at the Borrego Springs High School Community Room, 5:00 – 6:30 in English and 6:30 – 8:00 in Spanish.

Ms. Ralston reported that 247 responses were received from the English residential survey, and 54 responses from the Spanish residential survey. Fifty percent of both English and Spanish responders indicated they would be willing to pay up to \$25 more per month for water. There was a discrepancy in income between the two demographics, English speaking earning \$36,000 to \$150,000 annually while the Spanish speaking were \$36,000 or less. Ninety-five percent of English speakers owned their homes, while eighty-three percent of the Spanish speakers rented. The Spanish speaking community is concerned about having to leave Borrego Springs if jobs in agriculture and golf course maintenance become unavailable.

Ms. Ralston announced that the new Borrego GSP Facebook page would be launched soon, and an e-mail contact list was being developed.

c. New Well Site Feasibility Study

Mr. Poole introduced the presentation on the new well site feasibility study, another project funded by the Proposition 1 grant. He explained that BWD needs to replace five of its wells over the next five years, and Dudek has been investigating which wells should be replaced first, and where the new wells should be placed. Hugh McManus of Dudek pointed out there were two approaches to locating an optimum well site: identifying existing wells and reviewing the distribution system. He then prepared a well location ranking matrix and estimated the remaining useful life of the wells being considered for

replacement. The saturated thickness of the aquifer and water quality were reviewed, as well as potential interference from nearby wells. Four sites were recommended, the best choice being Well 4 and second best near the airport. Mr. Poole pointed out that Well 4 needs to be replaced anyway. Member McGrory recommended considering the Pivot Well site for second choice.

Member Berkley asked whether the well sites in the study were interconnected. Mr. McManus thought well options 1, 2 and 3 were, but that the last well, in the South Management Area, was separate. Mr. Poole agreed to confirm. Public member Betsy Knaak asked whether the second choice well site would affect native plants in the area, such as the mesquites in the sink. Mr. McManus replied that effects on Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems would be studied when BWD is ready to locate a well on the site. Member Berkley asked why only the middle and lower aquifers were analyzed in the study, and not the upper aquifer. Mr. McManus replied that the saturation thickness of the upper aquifer was limited, but Dr. Jones felt it was not much different from the middle. Member Falk asked Mr. McManus to include a map of the saturation thickness of the upper aquifer in his finalized presentation.

B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Process Overview

This item was continued to the next AC meeting.

IV. CLOSING PROCEDURES

A. Correspondence

The correspondence was included in the Agenda package.

B. General Public Comments

Suzanne Lawrence asked the Core Team to evaluate new legislation and report back. SB 1000 was passed in 2016, signed in 2017 and became effective in 2018. It requires every city and county in the State to review and address environmental components in its master plan.

Member Falk requested copies of slides to be used in the CEQA process overview in advance of the next meeting.

A letter in the Agenda package from the *Borrego Sun* brought up property values in Borrego Springs and the fact that they could be impacted by SGMA.

C. Review Action Items from Previous AC Meetings, Next AC Meeting Date(s), and Next Steps

Ms. Wylie summarized today's action items. The next AC meeting was scheduled for October 4, 2018.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

September 27, 2018

TO: Borrego Advisory Committee

FROM: Core Team

SUBJECT: Item I.F.a: Transitions in Core Team Membership and AC Representation

Due to the upcoming retirement of Beth Hart from the BWD Board of Directors, BWD's representation on the Core Team and, resultantly the BWD Ratepayer Representative on the GSP Advisory Committee, has been amended.

Core Team Representation: At the September 18, 2018 BWD Board of Directors meeting, Dave Duncan was appointed to the Core Team to replace Ms. Hart. This change will be made official at the October 4th AC Meeting. Mr. Duncan is highly familiar with the SGMA process from his service as the BWD Ratepayer Representation on the AC; his experience in this capacity will be greatly beneficial as the process moves forward. Mr. Duncan will officially join the BWD as a Director in November 2018.

BWD Ratepayer AC Representative: As Dave Duncan now participates on the Core Team, his vacated position on the AC needs to be filled. BWD conducted an application and interview process for this vacancy in September. The Board approved the nomination of Gary Haldeman at its September 26th meeting. Mr. Haldeman has assisted BWD on the current GSP SDAC outreach effort as translator and interpreter for the recent Spanish speaking events. He is also a long-time resident of Borrego Springs. The County of San Diego will be issuing an endorsement letter in support of Mr. Haldeman assuming the position of Ratepayer Representative on the AC.

The Core Team would like to issue its deepest thanks to Ms. Hart for her invaluable contributions to the GSP development process for the Borrego Valley Subbasin.

September 27, 2018

TO: Borrego Advisory Committee

FROM: Core Team

SUBJECT: Item I.F.d: Consideration for Formation of Ad Hoc Committee for Emerging Constituents of Concern

There is a robust process in California for regulating potable water quality promulgated in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations. Emerging chemicals of concern (ECCs) are currently unregulated and include pharmaceuticals, pesticides, and industrial chemicals. The detection of many of these chemicals is so recent that robust methods for their quantification and toxicological data for interpreting potential human or ecosystem health effects are unavailable.

An example of a recent ECC is 1,2,3-trichloropropane (TCP). In July 2017, the State Water Resources Control Board voted unanimously to implement a maximum contaminant level of 5 parts per trillion (ppt) in drinking water for TCP. TCP is a man-made, chlorinated hydrocarbon typically found at industrial or hazardous waste sites and has been used as an industrial solvent and as a cleaning and degreasing agent; it has also been found as an impurity resulting from the production of soil fumigants, distributed starting in the 1950s by Shell and Dow. TCP was removed from pesticides in the 1980's, however, due to its prevalent use in the prior 30 years; it has become a water quality concern for drinking water systems relying on groundwater in areas where it was applied. Drinking water suppliers across the state were required to begin testing for TCP in their wells starting in January 2018.

The Borrego Water District (BWD) tested nine wells (ID1-8, ID1-10, ID1-12, ID1-16, ID4-4, ID4-11, ID4-18, ID5-5 and Wilcox well) for TCP in January/February 2018. Results indicate that TCP was not detected in any of the nine wells above the reporting limit of 0.005 micrograms per liter (5 parts per trillion) (SWRCB 2018).¹

As Borrego Springs has limited industrial activity, potential ECCs in the Subbasin are likely limited to pharmaceuticals and pesticides. The source of pharmaceuticals is septic recharge and effluent discharge at the Rams Hill Wastewater Treatment Facility. Pesticides sources include application for agriculture, golf courses and residential use. All these sources of return flow to the Borrego Springs Subbasin (Subbasin) generally increase mineral concentrations such as total dissolved solids and nitrate. Nitrate is a widespread contaminant found in groundwater and is a reasonable surrogate to identify areas of the Subbasin that may be impacted by ECCs. No additional water quality sampling for ECCs is recommended in the Subbasin at this time. Both the BWD and Borrego Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) will track the development of new regulatory requirements for ECCs. In the future, areas of the Subbasin

¹ (SWRCB 2018) https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/drinking_water/certlic/drinkingwater/123TCP.html

identified to be impacted by nitrate may undergo additional testing for other constituents of concern including regulated pesticides listed in Title 22 and potentially ECCs. The Core Team is amenable to responding to additional questions specific to ECCs but has determined that it is unnecessary to form an Ad Hoc Committee for ECCs at this time.

September 27, 2018

TO: Borrego Advisory Committee

FROM: LeSar Development Consultants

SUBJECT: Item II.A: Socioeconomic Efforts: Community Engagement Efforts Update

Borrego Springs Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) Community Meeting Summary

September 19, 2018

English: 5:00-6:30 p.m.

Spanish: 6:30-8:00 p.m.

Borrego Springs Unified School District, Community Room
2281 Diegueno Rd, Borrego Springs, CA 92004

- **Borrego SGMA Advisory Committee Present:** Diane Johnson
- **GSP Core Team:** Geoff Poole
- **GSP Consultant, Dudek:** Trey Driscoll
- **Borrego Water District (BWD) Board:** Joe Tutusko
- **LeSar Development Consultants:** Rachel Ralston
- **Members of the Public:** 34 attendees
- Interpretation/translation services provided by the Borrego Water District

Meeting Agenda and Format

- Welcome and Introductions – 10 minutes
- Overview: The Need to Regulate Groundwater – 5 minutes
- What is the Groundwater Sustainability Plan? – 10 minutes
- How Might the Plan Affect Borrego Residents and Businesses? – 5 minutes
- Listening Session and Q&A – 45 minutes
- Wrap-up and Report Back – 15 minutes

The following meeting format was used for both English and Spanish sessions:

The meeting began with introductions of the Borrego Water District board members and staff, as well as members of the Borrego SGMA Advisory Committee's Ad Hoc Committee on SDAC Engagement and the outreach consultant firm, LeSar Development Consultants.

The facilitator encouraged meeting attendees to ask clarifying questions during the brief presentation on water-related issues in the Borrego Valley and the need to regulate groundwater. Attendees were then encouraged to ask additional questions, voice any concerns about water issues and/or the GSP, and suggest ideas for the plan to consider and for additional stakeholders to include in the outreach process.

Rachel Ralston of LeSar Development Consultants facilitated the English session. Esmeralda Garcia of the Borrego Water District facilitated the Spanish session.

Community Input/Listening Session

Summary of Issues and Concerns			
Topic	Comments, Questions	ENG	SP
Rising water rates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will residents have to reduce water usage? Will we receive more water? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The measures addressing resident water use have not yet been developed. • Why have our water bills increased? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The main reason is to cover the cost of repairing aging infrastructure. This will continue for a five-year period. 		X
Economic impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns were raised about local families, jobs, and school district viability if families move away because economic sectors change. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The GSP is looking into both conservation measures and job retraining programs. 	X	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We feel that that nobody is looking out for us; not looking out for our jobs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, there will be changes to the types of jobs available. There are efforts underway to plan for alternative job opportunities. 		X
Water use allocations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why aren't the farmers fined? If they use more than they should, why are the not fined? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The GSP will empower BWD with more enforcement powers. 		X
Sustainability strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation to explore variety of permaculture strategies for water-use reductions. 	X	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50% of farmers should leave the valley to balance water use. • There was a 20% water-use reduction in Valley Center that seems to be working. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Valley Center has outside water available, whereas Borrego Springs does not. Importing water to Borrego is prohibitively expensive. • Recommendation was made for the GSP to include conservation education components, particularly for youth, who can then share the information with their families. 		X

Summary of Issues and Concerns			
Topic	Comments, Questions	ENG	SP
GSP development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If water use is brought into balance (i.e., GSP sustainability goal reached), will water fees be reduced or eliminated? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is likely fees will continue as part of overall management and operations budget. • How will Proposition 3 (the Water Infrastructure and Watershed Conservation Bond Initiative, 2018) impact GSP implementation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If Proposition 3 passes the funds would likely be used to buy out farms, for land acquisition, and for environmental mitigation, transportation costs, and conservation programs. ○ If the bond does not pass, other funding mechanisms will have to be identified, e.g., fees, grants, etc. • Will the Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) structure (i.e., how the County of San Diego and the BWD will be sharing responsibilities to run the agency) be included in the GSP? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The structure of the agency is still under development and likely will not be in the GSP. However, all documents related to the GSA will be publicly available. • Once approved, how long until GSP implementation begins? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some parts of it will be implementable early, but some may take years to get underway – particularly if there is litigation involved. 	X	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What will be the effects and costs of these reductions? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Water must be potable so there will be water-treatment costs. ○ The GSP will require the agricultural sector to pay for and install meters. 		X
Community meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation to bring GSP educational materials to local events, such as Borrego Days. 	X	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most meeting attendees learned about the meeting from the school district liaison and the promotoras program. • Too many people talk about the issue outside of the meetings, but they refuse to get involved. • We come to these meetings and then nothing changes. • Hold future community meetings with both English and Spanish attendees (simultaneous translation). There is more energy in the room that way, more information is shared. • Advisory Committee Meetings take place in the mornings, and we all work. It's not possible for us to come to these meetings. Suggest an evening timeframe and for all materials to be translated into Spanish. 		X
Communication Preferences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preference to receive emails for GSP updates. • Little interest in community meetings in person. 	X	

Summary of Issues and Concerns			
Topic	Comments, Questions	ENG	SP
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting attendees learned about the meeting through door-to-door flyering and BWD mailers. One person heard about the meeting from the Borrego 92004 Facebook page. 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More information in writing, via email, and all materials translated into Spanish. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BWD is developing the Borrego GSP Facebook page as well. Additionally, open your water bill for additional information. If you do not receive a water bill, stop by BWD for more information. 		X

Additional Comments Received (Comment Cards, Emails, Etc.)	
Issue/Concern	Additional Details
GSP development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can you tell me what the impact would be for the people of Borrego Springs if the Proposition 3 water bond passes in November 2018. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question is addressed in the English meeting summary above.

Next Steps

- Summary of outreach presented at the October 4, 2018 Borrego SGMA Advisory Committee Meeting
- Advisory Committee to consider changes to meeting times to accommodate request for evening meetings, as well as the request for all materials to be translated into Spanish.
- Socioeconomic data gathering and analysis to be completed in October-November 2018.
- Next community meetings to take place in mid-November 2018, prior to draft GSP release.
- Draft GSP issued in December 2018.
- Community engagement for feedback on draft GSP to begin via email and social media in December 2018 and via in-person meetings in January 2019.
- Final outreach report submitted to BWD in February 2019.

September 28, 2018

TO: Advisory Committee

FROM: Core Team

SUBJECT: Item III Groundwater Sustainability Plan: Review of Draft Chapters

The Core Team has presented background information regarding the required components of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP or Plan) at previous Advisory Committee (AC) Meetings. The Core Team will present a summary of working draft GSP content to obtain stakeholder input. The GSP chapters to be discussed at the October 4, 2018 AC Meeting are as follows:

- A. Chapter 1: Introduction to GSP
- B. Chapter 2: Plan Area and Basin Setting
- C. **Chapter 3: Sustainability Management Criteria (October 4, 2018 Meeting Focus)**

Chapter 1 Introduction to the GSP provides Plan information specific to the Borrego Valley Groundwater Basin including the following:

Purpose: Is to “manage and use of groundwater in a manner that can be maintained during the planning and implementation horizon without causing undesirable results”.

Sustainability Goal: This GSP is intended to meet the overarching sustainability goal of SGMA to operate the Borrego Springs Subbasin within sustainable yield without causing an undesirable result. GSAs must achieve their sustainability goal within a maximum 20 years of GSP implementation.

Formation of a Groundwater Sustainability Agency: The GSA is comprised of the County and the District, which have designated a Borrego Basin Plan Core Team (Core Team) and an Advisory Committee (AC) made up of stakeholders.

Legal Authority: On September 16, 2014, Governor Jerry Brown signed into law Senate Bills 1168 and 1319 and Assembly Bill 1739 as part of SGMA legislation, which provides local groundwater agencies the authority and the technical and financial assistance necessary to sustainably manage groundwater.

Chapter 2 Plan Area and Basin Setting provides detailed information on the Borrego Valley Groundwater Basin (Basin), Borrego Springs Groundwater Subbasin (Subbasin) and contributing watershed areas. This chapter presents all the technical information developed for the Basin and Subbasin based on previous studies, data compilation, and current and ongoing work from the Subbasin monitoring network. The primary sections presented in Chapter 2 Plan Area and Basin Setting of the GSP include the following:

- Description of Plan Area
 - Jurisdictional Areas and other Features

- Water Resource Monitoring and Management Programs
- Land Use
- Additional Components
- Notice and Communication
- Introduction to Basin Setting
 - Management Areas
 - Current and Historical Groundwater Conditions
 - Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model
 - Water Budget

Chapter 3 Sustainability Management Criteria establishes the sustainability goals. The GSA must adopt a non-quantitative sustainability goal, or goals, that set the framework for determining what is significant and unreasonable for each sustainability indicator. These goals are primarily policy statements that communicate the GSA's vision for sustainable management of the Subbasin. The overarching sustainability goal is to maintain a viable water supply for current and future beneficial uses and users of groundwater within the Plan Area by curtailing groundwater production in a manner that brings groundwater use to within the Subbasin's estimated sustainable yield within 20 years, and by maintaining groundwater of suitable quality for current and future beneficial uses.

The GSA must define undesirable results in the Subbasin by determining what condition(s) in the Subbasin would be significant and unreasonable for each applicable sustainability indicator. This determination will be based on both a technical assessment of the sustainability indicators and an analysis of how the minimum thresholds may affect the interests of beneficial uses and users of groundwater, or land use and property interests.

The minimum thresholds are the quantitative measure of undesirable results and are set at individual monitoring sites or combination of monitoring sites. These thresholds will be established, based on an analysis of how they would impact beneficial uses and users of groundwater in the Subbasin and the determination of undesirable results for each sustainability indicator. Just as the minimum thresholds are the quantitative measure of undesirable results, measurable objectives are the quantitative measure of the sustainability goal. They are set at individual representative monitoring sites that are, preferably, the same as those selected for the minimum thresholds. If conditions at the monitoring sites meet or exceed the measurable objectives, the Subbasin is at the desired groundwater condition.

Specific working draft sustainability goals, undesirable results, minimum thresholds and measurable objectives will be presented at the AC meeting.

Borrego SGMA Advisory Committee (AC) & Core Team (CT)
Work Planning & Timeline Chart

Draft Version 09/27/2018

Date	Meeting / Milestone / Action	Topics to Discuss / Notes
October 2018		
October 4, 2018	Borrego AC Meeting #14 Location UCI 10:00am – 3:00pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive Overview of Elements of the GSP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapters 1 – 3. • A series of three AC meetings will be held in October and November to allow the AC to review the key components of the GSP prior to public review. • After a comprehensive overview by Core Team and consultants, the AC will be able to highlight any issues of concern and identify aspects that they would like further discussion on.
October 25, 2018	Borrego AC Meeting #15 Location TBD 10:00am – 3:00pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive Overview of Elements of the GSP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapters 3 (continued) and 4. • GSP review meeting in October will focus on the issues highlighted by AC in the September meeting • Discussion of SDAC Components Incorporated into GSP
November 2018		
November 29, 2018	Borrego AC Meeting #16 Location TBD 10:00am – 3:00pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive Overview of Elements of the GSP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapters 4 (continued) and 5. • The AC and Core Team will have additional time to work through any remaining items of concern and/or to discuss any aspects of the GSP that still need clarification. • AC straw poll consensus recommendation to support the adoption of the GSP as a whole.
December 2018		
December	Draft GSP made available for 60-day public review and comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Estimated date subject to change</i>

January through May 2019		
January through April/May 2019	GSA Development of Responses to Public Comments and Preparation of Final GSP	
Spring 2019	Borrego AC Meeting #17 Location TBD Time TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting to discuss any changes made to the GSP in response to public comments • The AC will provide formal consensus recommendation to support the adoption of the GSP as a whole.
Summer 2019		
	GSP Adoption by BWD and County Boards of Supervisors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Estimated date subject to change</i>