



**San Pasqual Valley (SPV) Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP)
Basin Advisory Committee (AC) Meeting 2
Meeting Minutes**

Date: Thursday October 10, 2019 from 2:00 to 4:00 pm

Location: San Diego County Farm Bureau
420 S. Broadway, Ste. 200, Escondido, CA 92025

Purpose: SPV Groundwater Basin AC Meeting 2

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>Attendees: City of San Diego (City)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandra Carlson • Karina Danek • Niki McGinnis • Delaney Sisk <p>County of San Diego (County)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leanne Crow <p>GSP Consultant (Woodard & Curran)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Ayres • Rosalyn Prickett <p>GSP Consultant (Katz & Associates)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patsy Tennyson | <p>Advisory Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trish Boaz San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy • Carole Burkhard Small land Owner • Frank Konyn Agricultural/Animal • Eric Larson San Diego County Farm Bureau • Lisa Peterson San Diego Zoo Safari Park • Rikki Schroeder Rancho Guejito • David L. Toler Jr. San Pasqual Tribe • Matt Witman Agricultural/Crop <p>Public</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alicia Appel, City of Escondido • Bill Hunter, Santa Fe Irrigation District • Mark Lindshield • Mary Montgomery, Santa Fe Irrigation District • Marissa Potter, Santa Fe Irrigation District • Hank Rupp, Rancho Guejito • Jose Tosteow, Gilemerre |
|--|--|

Welcome and Introductions

Patsy Tennyson, the meeting facilitator, opened the meeting and gave an overview of the meeting’s objectives. Karina Danek of the City welcomed attendees and thanked the Farm Bureau for hosting the meeting.

AC members had no comments on the minutes from the June meeting. Patsy reviewed the agenda for today’s meeting with the group.

Patsy then reviewed key discussion items from the draft AC by-laws, including that they are focused on the future, that all perspectives are valuable, that everyone had equal opportunity to participate, that it was important to avoid ulterior motives and set aside judgment, and represent the AC as a group.

AC By-Laws Review

The meeting facilitator reviewed changes to the AC by-laws that had been recommended by AC members and/or the Core Team before the meeting. These included:

- Adding a sentence at the end of Article 1, Section C and adding two words in the middle of Article 3, (2) as shown in the attached **By-Law Handout**
- Deleting Article 5 Section A paragraph on Robert's rules
- Modifying Article 6 – the paragraph about the qualified specialist, allowing only one Technical Peer Review (TPR) member per AC member and allowing a professional Geologist to be from any state of the USA

Additional discussion about the by-laws is summarized below.

- In Article 3, Section C of the by-laws, “non-profit” could be interpreted to have a legal connotation; AC member suggested a change to “non-partisan, non-sectarian, collaborative organization.” The AC agreed to this change.
- AC member asked for clarification about the responsibility to disseminate information to those referred to by “member's-own stakeholder constituents that they represent”. The AC determined that it is not required for AC members to convey the information discussed in Advisory Committee meetings to affiliated parties, and that any interested parties can be added to the existing email list to receive all meeting information. The AC agreed to delete Article 5, Section A, Covenant 13 from the by-laws in accordance with this.
- AC member asked how votes will be handled if conflicts arise. AC is intended as forum for hearing opinions, advice, and suggestions; no formal voting. Consultant team will document all positions.
- AC member asked for clarification about why AC members could have their own TPR member; he felt this might introduce bias into the GSP process.
 - Karina Danek of the City explained that when City Council approved establishment of the SPV GSA, they directed that a transparent AC and TPR process be used and that staff doesn't really have a choice about how to manage the process at this point. It has been decided at the Council level and staff is following their directions. Both the City and County agencies developed the proposed structure together.
 - John Ayres, Consultant Project Manager, emphasized that it is the duty of the Consultant team to be objective when writing the GSP, and that the comments from TPR members will be considered but won't necessarily be incorporated into the final GSP.

TPR will vet the GSP's general approach and how data will be analyzed. Proposed structure attempts to level bias by allowing only one TPR member per AC member. It was also noted that there are two independent reviewers in the TPR group.
 - Another AC member commented that he too was concerned about an AC Member being able to create a large impact on the GSP development if only one AC member hired a technical reviewer. He also noted that the leaseholders in the Basin would have different goals/concerns/needs than the landowners and that this should be considered in the GSP.

Due to concern for running out of time, this topic was tabled for further discussion until after agenda item No. 7, *Technical Peer Review purpose and composition*.

GSP Overview and Call for Data Request

John Ayres, Consultant Project Manager, gave an overview of SGMA terminology, consulting team members and roles, discussed the GSP document's sections and process, and basin settings information. He also noted that the Consultant team has received City and County data, California Department of Water Resources (DWR) data, and previous reports and studies. The Consultant team is looking to compile any well data, monitoring data, or any other information AC members may have.

It was requested that all AC members send any pertinent data they have about the San Pasqual Valley Groundwater Basin, whether it be well information, water quality data or anything else that could help the GSP development, **send the data to Sandra Carlson at the City. Her email is carlsons@sandiego.gov.**

John explained that the Consultant team was developing a list of frequently asked questions (FAQ), and asked if any AC members had any specific questions they wanted answered.

AC members asked about or noted the following:

- FAQs on the County website are several years old; they will be updated before next AC meeting
- Explain why we are developing a GSP
- Ask people to share their data (including those who are not AC members)
- Explain where the data goes
- Describe the timeline for GSP development, post a flow chart
- State the DWR deadline of January 2022
- Share work plan information

Questions About the Brown Act

Patsy Tennyson, the meeting facilitator, explained that Core Team meetings are not subject to Brown Act, but AC and TPR meetings are subject to the Brown Act and are being noticed per the Act.

TPR Purpose and Composition

Patsy Tennyson reviewed the draft TPR mission statement, the TPR's proposed composition, and schedule with the AC, along with a proposed change to AC by-laws, Article 6 (i.e., allow a Professional Geologist to be from any US State). The AC approved this change to the by-laws.

AC member suggested that AC members be allowed to comment during TPR meetings. John Ayres of the Consultant team said that these meetings were technical in nature and that it would be counterproductive to the purpose of the TPR. As a compromise, Patsy suggested a change to the AC by-laws to allow AC members to speak to each TPR meeting agenda item after it had been discussed by the Technical Reviewers. Patsy summarized that only the TPR members would be allowed to engage in meeting discussions, but there would be an opportunity for AC members to ask questions after each agenda item, with each comment limited to 3 minutes, per AC member. Only AC members would be able to comment during

this period and all other members of the public would be able to speak only at the end of the entire meeting. John Ayres expressed his concern that the TPR meetings would be very long if we included a comment period after each agenda item but tentatively agreed. Patsy asked if this was a solution that all the AC members could live with, and all agreed they could.

Leanne Crow of the County noted that they were working per direction from the County Board and the City Council to establish the TPR. Karina Danek further stated that executive management teams met many times to agree on the structure of two independent reviewers and AC nominees. It was noted that the TPR is not a voting body, and that John Ayres of the Consultant team will decide about what is technically appropriate because he will stamp the GSP with his professional license (California registered professional geologist) before submission to the California Department of Water Resources. John Ayres noted that the consultant's job is to prove conclusions through data and analysis, which will be fully documented, so it can be replicated and is accessible.

AC member suggested an addition to the TPR mission and principles of participation, stating that independent consultants would remain independent, and that their role would be to check not only Consultant's work, but also TPR members' contributions.

Action Items

AC Members:

- Send data to Sandra Carlson at the City. Her email is scarlson@sandiego.gov or call her at (619) 533-4235.

Sandra Carlson of the City will:

- Send out revised TPR screening form and request return in one week for first TPR meeting (Nov 7th)
- Send AC members information about the upcoming TPR meeting via email

Consultant team will (via Sandra):

- Share a project schedule/flow chart of the GSP with AC members
- Share a work plan of the GSP at the next AC meeting on January 9, 2020
- Send information about the TPR's mission and principles before the first TPR meeting on November 7, and AC members will be invited to comment
- Update the meeting sign in sheet with an area to add attendees' affiliations

Future Meeting Dates

The next AC meeting will take place on January 9, 2020.

The first TPR meeting will take place on November 7, 2019. The TPR will meet at the County Operations Center at 5510 Overland Drive.

Public Comments

- Can a TPR member be hired later if the process appears to be going sideways? Yes, AC members would be permitted to add new TPR members as desired; the TPR screening

form will be on the website. It is requested that if an AC member wishes to do this that ample time should be given to process the screening form.

- Please add a space for AC members and all other meeting attendees to write in their affiliation on the sign in sheet for meetings; please add this information in future meeting notes.
- The City owns Lake Hodges, and Santa Fe Irrigation District uses water from Lake Hodges, which is a major source of water supply. The Santa Fe Irrigation District is interested in water quantity and quality information for areas upstream of Lake Hodges.
- There is a real estate transaction for local private property under way, and this groundwater basin is not disclosed in their sales information; they should have disclosed this basin and GSP regulations. The AC meeting ended at 3:50 pm.