



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
San Diego CA 92123

Purpose: Technical Peer Review Group Meeting #1

Table with 3 columns: Attendees, Technical Peer Review Group, City of San Diego (City), Advisory Committee, County of San Diego (County), Public, Consultant Team.

Welcome and Introductions

Patsy Tennyson, the meeting facilitator, welcomed the group, 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 members who were hired via the Consultant Team and one TPR group member nominated by Advisory Committee (AC) member Rikki Schroeder, Rancho Guejito.

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, provided an overview of the *Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP)* outline, described the three-phase approach to TPR group 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 group will also be able to submit written comments 2 weeks after a TPR group meeting.

TPR member noted that another consultant is working on monitoring and aquifer testing, 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 update with likely times field data results could be provided to the TPR group.
- Sandra Carlson, City of San Diego, noted that City processing of contracts takes time, so the team may not be able to have that data in time enough to integrate to the GSP.
- Leanne Crow, County of San Diego, noted that the GSP will proceed as scheduled, and field data will be used if possible. If it is too late, the data will be used in the GSP's 5-Year Update.

TPR group members will not be involved in field work, and will focus on the GSP and related content. Before the next AC meeting, TPR group members will have an opportunity to review GSP content before the AC reviews contents.

A TPR group member noted that a 1985 work by John Izbicki of the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) should be integrated to the GSP (<https://pubs.er.usgs.gov/publication/wri854032>).

TRP 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 also noted 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 needed revisions. For example, the groundwater dependent ecosystem (GDE) plot along Bandy Canyon is actually Arroyo Toad habitat and is dry most of the year.

Proposed Monitoring Well Sites

John gave an overview of a Kleinfelder siting study for two nested monitoring wells in the basin. Sandra summarized the two key goals of this field program, which were to 1) evaluate surface/groundwater interaction, and 2) better understand water in alluvium versus water in residuum vs water in the wells' basement.

In 2013, the City installed three monitoring wells (three nested piezometers monitored by USGS) and want to add two more now.

- Sandra noted that the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) also has four monitoring wells with pressure conductors and TDS monitors. The City's EMTS also collects data, but the sampling was irregular, and there was an inconsistent list of analytes, so those wells do not appear on maps.
- Sandra explained 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 Rancho Guejito area.

TPR group 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 Well MW-9 in the Bandy Canyon/County area may be in bedrock.

John noted that the Consultant Team would be reporting on pumping well data, seal depth, well construction, and screen intervals once the monitoring well was installed.

- Sandra noted that the 2013 USGS wells were installed specifically to better understand this data.
- Leanne also noted that the County will provide well logs for wells under County jurisdiction, but Bandy Canyon was not in the County's jurisdiction.

Karina Danek, City of San Diego, noted the City is only permitted to drill outside of 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 data request; there are no available data in Rancho Guejito area. Consultant Team will be using a *Salt and Nutrient Management Plan* (SNMP) model with solute transport capabilities to evaluate this issue, since groundwater quality is a key concern in the basin.

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.

- John explained that we will be using the existing SNMP model with solute transport capabilities to evaluate this issue, since groundwater quality is a concern in the basin.

TPR member also noted that the San Pasqual Valley is a very well-studied basin, and that we need to make sure to integrate the objectives/information already available in the basin into this GSP.

- John 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 noted that 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 bedrock in wells, 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 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.

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 group 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.