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

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

Location: County Operations Center
5510 Overland Drive
San Diego CA 92123

Purpose: Advisory Committee Meeting

Attendees:	Advisory Committee (AC) • Carole Berkhard • Eric Larson • Frank Konyn • Lisa Peterson • Mark Dederian • Matt Witman • Rikki Schroeder • Trish Boaz	City of San Diego (City) • Sandra Carlson • Karina Danek • Nikki McGinnis • Mike Bolouri • Delaney Sisk County of San Diego (County) • Leanne Crow
	Public • Brad Blaise, Pinery • Dustin Meads, Pinery • Marisa Potter, SFID • Mark Stadler, SDCWA • Whitney Blackhurt, Rancho Guejito • Rania Amen, SFID	Consultant Team • John Ayres, Woodard & Curran • Rosalyn Prickett, Woodard & Curran • Patsy Tennyson, Katz & Associates • Nate Brown, Jacobs (by phone)

Roll Call and Introductions

Patsy Tennyson, meeting facilitator, welcomed the group and invited everyone to introduce themselves.

Review

Patsy reviewed the meeting agenda and meeting objectives.

The AC reviewed the summary of its last meeting and had the following comments:

- Meeting Summary: Sandra's email address will be corrected in the summary.

GSP Content Review

John Ayres, consultant team, provided an overview of Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA), reviewed GSP components, and proposed a work plan. John gave an overview of the Plan Area maps via a PowerPoint presentation. The AC had the following comments and questions:

- *Water Quality*: AC member asked whether SGMA addressed the issue of water quality. John explained that water quality was part of the GSP, and that the team was working on creating maps of water quality. He noted that water quality would be part of the undesirable results agenda item.
- *Basin Priorities*: AC member asked about the different DWR-assigned priorities for groundwater basins throughout San Diego County. Leanne Crow, City of San Diego, clarified that the San Luis Rey Valley Groundwater Basin was medium priority, Borrego Valley Groundwater Basin was high priority, San Pasqual Valley Groundwater Basin was medium priority, and in December 2019, the San Diego River Valley Basin was downgraded to very low priority.
- *Land Use*: AC member noted that there are inaccuracies in certain land use maps, and that certain areas had been recently planted in orchard crops. John asked all AC members to submit comments and any suggested changes in map format no later than Thursday, January 23, 2020.

AC member asked if the maps showed existing or proposed/planned land use. John responded that the land use maps are existing, but the methodology for providing that data to SANDAG varied from agency to agency.

AC member suggested that, since orchard crops use more water than vineyards, they need to be clarified in land use maps. AC member will provide comments to project team for orchards vs. vineyards in current use.

AC member asked about what time range of data would be used. John responded that the GSP needs detailed land uses over a 10-year hydrologic period for the hydrogeologic conceptual model (HCM), but wasn't exactly sure what that time period would be yet.

AC member also noted that Safari Park was designated as having urban land use, which seemed incorrect, and that a clear definition of land use types needs to be included in GSP.

John then provided an overview of HCM maps and groundwater conditions, including hydrographs. The AC had the following comments and questions:

- *Hydrographs*: AC member asked if more hydrographs were available for more wells, of if there were more hydrographs available over a longer span of time (existing data spans a 12-year timeframe). John explained that the team has old report data that will be used to better understand groundwater conditions, but these hydrographs and their timeframe would be used to establish the sustainable management criteria for the basin.
    - AC member noted that this information was key, and wanted to make sure the team has as much information as possible so the GSP takes a longer historical view and was not basing the sustainable management criteria on short-term data.
    - AC member noted the hydrographs all looked similar, and asked how these would be turned into a basinwide plan. John responded that this issue would be addressed at length during GSP development. He noted that, in general, water levels in wells shifted seasonally, responding to drought and then recovering in wet years.
    - AC member noted that there was a spike in the 2014 hydrograph data that appeared to be human error. John agreed that this spike was most likely a human error, and that some wildcard measurements may be thrown out during analysis. This is not a concern, as the team is more interested in understanding long-term trends.

Undesirable Results Breakout Exercise

John reviewed the six SGMA sustainable management criteria that must be addressed in the GSP with undesirable results statements. He explained that the AC would break out into groups for a team

exercise to develop these statements. John qualified that this exercise was to understand what the AC's concerns were; it was not meant to determine any specific effect in or out of the basin.

John then reviewed how the sustainable management criteria concepts include five components as follows: undesirable results, minimum thresholds, measurable objectives, interim objectives, and margin of operational flexibility. The AC had the following comments and questions:

- AC member asked how minimum thresholds would be established. John responded that it would depend on what AC members determined to be undesirable results.
- AC member asked how sustainable management criteria would be set for the basin if there were only 12 years of recorded data. Again, this will be part of the GSP development process and discussed with AC at length at a future AC meeting. John explained that the GSP would be updated every five years (or more frequently), that the sustainable management criteria could be revisited based on any new data.
- AC member asked if there were any State requirement for monitoring and sharing well information. John responded that, before SGMA, there were no State monitoring requirements. In the basin, the City of San Diego monitors 9-10 wells and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) monitors three wells.
    - AC member noted that there was one monitoring well on conservancy lands, and they would share the Initial Study document that was prepared before the well was constructed. Leanne noted that to drill a well within the County, a Well Construction Permit is required from County Dept. of Environmental Health.

The AC members and public participants divided into two groups to discuss "What do you want and <u>not</u> want to happen with groundwater in the future?" Following the breakout groups, one member of each group reported out on their discussions. The following page has a summary of the report-outs.

Public Comments

A member of the public said they would like to see a natural sampling site included for study (i.e., a monitoring well that was not actively pumped) to better understand groundwater elevation data. John noted that this information was in the hydrographs from the three USGS monitoring wells.

Next Steps

The next AC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 14, 2020 from 2:00 to 4:00 pm

The AC shall submit comments on today's meeting subjects by Thursday, January 23, 2020.

The AC meeting ended at 3:45 pm.

Breakout Group 1

Wants

- Ability to stay in agriculture business over a long period of time
- Create a lean and efficient management system
- Consistent, reliable supply of water
- Use recycled water for recharge or direct use
- Seek grant funds and related partnerships to underwrite conservation improvements
- Help farmers establish their own best management practices (BMPs)
- Maintain ability to market crops
- Manage streambeds to maximize infiltration (i.e., need a flatter cross section and lower velocity flow)
- Maximize stormwater capture in the basin and in the watershed (i.e., no reduced stream contributions based on upstream developments)
- Ensure the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) allows maximum runoff into the basin for recharge
- Limit new users if restrictions are placed on pumping
- Allow alternate dust control methods (other than watering dirt roads)
- Maintain and sustain water quality (no PFAS)
- Sustain natural habitat

Do Not Want

- No unmanaged open space (potential fire hazard)
- Avoid having to purchase imported water
- No wells going dry

Breakout Group 2

Wants

- Protect native plants and species, especially habitat restoration areas
- Maintain and improve water quality (for agricultural use and ecosystem health)
- Sustain agricultural uses – protect the San Pasqual Agricultural Preserve
- Sustain and restore the natural environment
- Maintain productivity of existing wells (existing users shouldn't have to drill more wells)
- Collaborate and cooperate – work together on these outcomes!
- Protect drinking water quality
- Ensure adequate water supply for animals (including rare and threatened/endangered species)
- Incorporate the ephemeral nature of streams into methodology/philosophy (this minimizes growth of invasive species)
- Maintain stable groundwater levels for pumping

Do Not Want

- Don't delete groundwater supplies
- Don't impact downstream neighbors – both groundwater and surface water
- Don't deplete east end wells with increased west end pumping
- No dry wells (i.e., protect property values)
- No wildfires
- No economic impacts (i.e., to Safari Park employees)
- No unreasonable minimum thresholds (i.e., those that might require capital investment such as a new wells)
- No transport of contaminants from stormwater to groundwater (or other sources)
- No invasive species that affect water supply