Public Utilities

San Pasqual Valley (SPV) Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP)
Technical Peer Review (TPR) Meeting #1
Meeting Minutes

Date: Thursday November 7, 2019, 9:00 to 11:00 am

Location: County Operations Center
5510 Overland Drive, 3rd floor conference room
San Diego CA 92123

Purpose: Technical Peer Review Meeting #1

Attendees:

City of San Diego (City)
- Sandra Carlson
- Karina Danek
- Amy Dorman
- Delaney Sisk

County of San Diego (County)
- Leanne Crow
- Jim Bennett

Advisory Committee
- Frank Konyn
- Rikki Schroeder
- Matt Witman

Technical Peer Review Team
- Will Halligan (Luhdorff & Scalmonini, GSA)
- Matt Wiedlan (Wiedlan & Associates, GSA)
- Peter Quinlan (Dudek, Rancho Guejito)

GSP Consultant (Woodard & Curran)
- John Ayres
- Rosalyn Prickett

GSP Consultant (Katz & Associates)
- Patsy Tennyson

Public
- Hank Rupp, Rancho Guejito

Welcome and Introductions

Patsy Tennyson, the meeting facilitator, welcomed everyone, made introductions, and reviewed the agenda.

Review

Mission Statement and Principles of Participation

Patsy reviewed the draft Technical Peer Review (TPR) Mission Statement and Principles of Participation. All TPR members were comfortable with the Mission and Principles of Participation that will guide the work of this group.

As of Meeting #1, the TPR is composed of two independent review members who were hired by the Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) consisting of the City and the County (and hired under the Consultant Team's contract with the City). These two TPR members are Will Halligan and Matt Wiedlan. Then per the Advisory Committee (AC) bylaws, any AC member can bring their own TPR member to any of the TPR meetings (after screening approval by the GSA). For this first meeting, one AC member, Rikki Schroeder representing Rancho

Guejito, nominated their own TPR member, who was approved. This was Peter Quinlan from Dudek & Associates.

AC Comments

It was noted that if a TPR member provides information to Sandra Carlson, City of San Diego, that information is considered public.

Technical Input

John Ayres, the Consultant Team (Team), provided an overview of the *Groundwater Sustainability Plan* (GSP) outline, described the three-phase approach to TPR meeting topics (i.e., outline/approach, analysis results, refined analysis), and then discussed GSP sections with the group.

GSP Overview, TPR Meeting Topics, and Draft Section Outlines

TPR member asked if there was a planned date for circulating draft materials. Typically, content will be available 2 weeks in advance of all meetings, but since the next meeting is close to the holidays, the Team will try to circulate draft materials before Christmas. The TPR will also be able to submit written comments up to 2 weeks after a TPR meeting. It was also decided to extend the TPR meetings to three (3) hours instead of the current two hours due to the absolute deadline of the GSP and scheduled material to cover in each meeting. Sandra will extend the meeting notices to 3-hours when she sends to the members.

TPR member asked and the City confirmed that another consultant is working on monitoring and aquifer testing (which the City is completing as part of a grant and will be discussed later in the meeting), but did not appear to be on schedule, and wanted to know how that information would be included in the GSP. John said he knew that work was ongoing, but the Team can't know exactly when well installation permits will be granted.

TPR member noted that it might be worth slowing down the GSP development schedule to wait for monitoring and aquifer testing data. John replied that, with a 2022 deadline for GSP, there were few opportunities to delay work. However, if information from field studies are contrary to what the Team knows, the information will be incorporated. For example, the schedule could be updated with likely times field data results could be provided to the TPR.

Sandra noted that City processing of contracts takes time, so the Team may not be able to have that data in time to integrate to the GSP.

Leanne Crow, County, asked and the City confirmed that the GSP will proceed as scheduled, and field data will be used if possible as it is completed. If it is too late, the data will be used in the GSP's 5-Year Update.

TPR members will not be involved in field work (only reviewing the results, when available) and will focus on the GSP and related content. Before the next AC meeting, TPR members will have an opportunity to review GSP content before the AC reviews contents.

A TPR member indicated that a 1983 work by John Izbicki of the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) should be integrated to the GSP (https://pubs.er.usgs.gov/publication/wri854032).

TPR member asked about historical water budget information, and whether it would be used to calibrate the hydrogeologic conceptual model (HCM) for the GSP. John told the group he would present information about the HCM at the next TPR meeting.

John explained that the GSP's HCM section will discuss background/natural constituents, while the GSP's Groundwater Conditions section will discuss anthropogenic sources (such as nitrate or totals dissolved solids [TDS]) in groundwater.

TPR member noted that natural communities commonly associated with groundwater (NCCAG) information datasets needed revision. For example, the groundwater dependent ecosystem (GDE) plot along Bandy Canyon is Arroyo Toad habitat and dry most of the year.

Proposed Monitoring Well Sites

John gave an overview of the draft Kleinfelder well siting study that the City completed for two nested monitoring wells in the San Pasqual Groundwater Basin (Basin). Sandra then explained that last year the City received a $1M grant from California Department of Water Resources (DWR) to assist with GSP development and the grant included two monitoring wells and aquifer testing in the Basin. The two key goals of this DWR grant/field program are to 1) evaluate surface/groundwater interaction, and 2) better understand how groundwater in the alluvium, residuum and bedrock layers of the Basin interact.

Sandra then gave a summary of the City's current groundwater monitoring wells. In 2013, the City installed three monitoring wells (three nested piezometers which City pays USGS to continuously monitor). Previously, the City paid DWR to install four additional monitoring wells in the Basin with pressure conductors and TDS monitors. The City currently has approximately 50 active production wells in the Basin. The City Public Utilities Department Environmental Monitoring and Technical Services Division collects water quality data from ten production wells in the Basin, but the sampling is irregular, and the analytes vary. City Lakes staff monitor the level of 9 production wells whenever they get the chance and send the info to Sandra to record. Finally, the City records the levels of six California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring wells on a semi-annual basis to comply with DWR requirements.

To select the two new monitoring well locations, Sandra described the process by which the City's consultant (Kleinfelder) started with nine potential locations that were each located by an existing production well to complete aquifer testing. The wells were narrowed down by a ranking system and two locations were potentially chosen.

Sandra noted the City selected Well MW-3 on the west side of the Basin to help fill a data gap associated with groundwater quality (i.e., nitrate and TDS). The City also selected Well MW-5 on the east side of Basin to collect northeastern information; they currently have no data for the Rockwood Canyon area and would gain information from that area and the eastern portion of the Basin using this well location.

TPR discussed wanting to better understand the hydraulic connectivity between bedrock and alluvium. TPR member asked if there were any wells in bedrock. AC member explained that he believed there were one or two wells in bedrock in the County's jurisdiction in the southeastern side of the Basin to the south near Bandy Canyon Ranch Road.

John discussed that the Consultant Team would be reporting on pumping well data, depth, and screening once the monitoring well was installed, and Sandra explained that the 2013 USGS wells were installed specifically to better understand this data. Leanne also said that the County will provide well logs for wells under County jurisdiction, but that the Bandy Canyon Ranch Road well discussed earlier is not on County-owned land.

Karina Danek with the City explained that due to environmental constraints, the City is only permitted to drill outside of the bird nesting season, which begins in February; field work (drilling for the monitoring wells) needs to be completed as soon as possible.

John reviewed the "Call for Data" request; as stated previously, there are no available data in the Rockwood Canyon area. Consultant Team will be using a *Salt and Nutrient Management Plan* model with solute transport capabilities to evaluate this issue, since groundwater quality is a key concern in the Basin. A TPR member noted that it may be possible to submit data but to obscure confidential images and maps by changing the resolution.

TPR member offered additional comment related to water quality – that Nitrate does break down in groundwater and can be measured via Nitrate-reducing bacteria. Relatively inexpensive sampling can be done to understand whether Nitrate is being consumed in the subsurface.

TPR member also noted that the San Pasqual Valley is a very well-studied Basin, and that the Consultant Team needs to make sure to integrate the objectives/information already available in the Basin into this GSP. Consultant Team agreed, noting that the GSP will consider goals/targets from other plans in establishment of the GSP sustainability criteria, as well as recommendations from other plans in GSP projects and management actions. Another TPR member noted that this GSP may have different focus from other Statewide GSPs – this Basin empties out and fills back up, which is different from other basins, and may focus more on water quality (Nitrate and TDS) than water elevation.

AC Comments

AC member asked if the GSP process would address the presence of alluvium, residuum, and bedrock in wells, and how would the City and County ensure this process complies with the provisions of *Bulletin 118* and the law. Leanne explained that the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) requires managing the Basin as defined by *Bulletin 118*, which does not include bedrock in its description of a basin. The new monitoring wells should help understand how bedrock interacts with alluvium pertaining to groundwater wells in the SPV Groundwater Basin, and what level of mountain-front recharge is received into the Basin. John explained that DWR may have to determine, via policy, how SGMA might regulate a well that is screened only in bedrock. For the GSP, the Consultant Team would give this issue a good faith answer with input from TPR and AC members, and that it may be possible to have a DWR representative meet with the Team to discuss the issue.

John also explained that the GSA does not have the authority to manage groundwater usage outside of the Basin.

AC member asked if TPR members would receive individual chapters during the TPR process or at the end. John explained that initial review of GSP content will occur via handouts and presentations as the GSP is developed, and the TPR will review the full GSP once complete. The TPR will have three opportunities (phases, above) to discuss approach/analysis along the way.

Next Steps/Actions

Consultant Team action items include:

- Extend meeting time—Since the TPR will be reviewing more information in the future, meetings will be extended to 3 hours.
- Share presentation—The Consultant Team will distribute a copy of the presentation shared at this meeting. The presentation will also be added to the County's GSP website in a couple of days.

The TPR meeting ended at 10:20 am.