



San Pasqual Valley (SPV) Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP)  
Technical Peer Review (TPR) Meeting  
Meeting Summary

*The following is a summary of the TPR discussion, comments, and questions. This summary reflects the general content and spirit of each discussion point, but is not a verbatim recording.*

Date: Thursday July 9, 2020 from 9:00 to 12:00 am

Location: GoToMeeting

Purpose: Technical Peer Review Meeting

Attendees:	Technical Peer Review (TPR)	City of San Diego (City)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Matt Wiedlin (MWied), Wiedlin &amp; Assoc</li> <li>• Will Halligan (WH), Luhdorff &amp; Scalmanini</li> <li>• Peter Quinlan (PQ), Dudek</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sandra Carlson (SC)</li> <li>• Niki McGinnis</li> <li>• Mike Bolouri</li> </ul>
	Advisory Committee (AC)	County of San Diego (County)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frank Konyon (FK)</li> <li>• Matt Witman (MWit)</li> <li>• Rikki Schroeder (RS)</li> <li>• Dave Toler</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leanne Crow (LC)</li> <li>• Jim Bennett (JB)</li> </ul>
	Public	Consultant Team
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anita Regmi, Dept of Water Resources</li> <li>• Dustin Meador, The Pinery</li> <li>• Brad Blaes, The Pinery</li> <li>• Alicia Appel, City of Escondido</li> <li>• Hank Rupp, Rancho Guejito (RG)</li> <li>• Lani Lutar, Responsible Solutions, RG</li> <li>• Andres Monette, Best Best &amp; Krieger (BBK), RG</li> <li>• Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel, Milk Producers Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• John Ayres (JA), Woodard &amp; Curran</li> <li>• Rosalyn Prickett, Woodard &amp; Curran</li> <li>• Nicole Poletto, Woodard &amp; Curran</li> <li>• Micah Eggleton, Woodard &amp; Curran</li> <li>• Patsy Tennyson, Katz &amp; Associates</li> <li>• Emily Michaelson, Katz &amp; Associates</li> <li>• Nate Brown (NB), Jacobs</li> <li>• Paula Silva, Jacobs</li> </ul>

### Roll Call and Introductions

Rosalyn Prickett, Consultant Team, greeted participants as they signed onto GoToMeeting and asked all others participating via telephone and computer to identify themselves. Patsy Tennyson, Meeting Facilitator, welcomed the group and reviewed basic instructions for GoToMeeting user tools.

### Review

Patsy reviewed the meeting agenda and meeting objectives. She directed participants to Handout 1, the summary of the last meeting; no one had any comments or revisions.

### TPR Comments

John Ayres, Consultant Team, reviewed the comments we have received to date from TPR members, along with how the Consultant Team is planning to respond.

## AC Comments on TPR Comments

AC members provided the following comments/questions:

- RS: What do the construction problems with Monitoring Well 129 mean?
  - JA: The well is constructed and there are only 2 sub-well completions, which is contrary to the recommended three sub-wells. When Frank pumps his well, this monitoring well would have given us data on aquifer properties in the 3 formations. Without the alluvium completion, we cannot learn as much about the relationship between all 3 layers. Also, because the gravel pack is high in one of the layers, it could allow crossflow between formations and the results from an aquifer test will be less than ideal. We can still use the lithology and geology information; but the aquifer tests will not be as helpful.
- MWit: High total dissolved solids (TDS) in 2011 was likely a result of the 2007 Witch Creek fire. That year was the first high flow event we had in the Valley after the fires. There was easily 2 feet of sand and ash deposited in the Valley. This was the last time that Lake Hodges spilled.
  - JA: This is noted and we will look into more detail on this.

## Technical Input – Approach

### *Groundwater Model*

Nate Brown, Consultant Team, provided an overview of the flow model domain and model inflow points. Consultant Team is using the One-Water flow model code for the SPV Groundwater Basin (Basin) and the USGS Basin Characterization Model (BCM) for the outlying watershed. TPR members discussed the model approach:

- PQ: BCM is great for understanding general characterization of the watershed, but it is not calibrated. When using it, USGS needs to do post-processing and change the data to use it. Since the recharge term is over the entire watershed and not really flow into/out of sub-watershed, how are you going to use BCM for the GSP?
  - NB: We have historical streamflow data at three USGS gauges over our 15-year calibration period, so we plan to compare actual historical streamflows at these gauges against BCM estimates at the same locations as these gauges. Based on our preliminary assessment, it would appear that the BCM tends to over-estimate streamflows. We plan to use the historical comparisons at these three gauges to develop factors to reduce the mismatch between BCM estimates and historical streamflow data.
  - PQ: For Year 2005, BCM gives runoff for January and February, but not the rest of the year. But the RG gauge shows flow for the rest of the year. You not only need to reduce streamflow volumes, but also may need to adjust timing of BCM flows.
- PQ: How will you deal with recharge term for entire Santa Ysabel sub-watershed for example?
  - NB: We would expect the recharge term to be relatively small, given the low-permeability material outside of the Basin. We will ratchet down subsurface inflow terms, and possibly eliminate them if the model calibration guides us there. Unfortunately, it is not possible to get field estimates of subsurface inflow. This must be estimated as part of the calibration effort.
  - PQ: We are not looking at well data in outer watershed areas. If BCM says 23% recharge, we not looking at well data to correlate. There is a lot of uncertainty. Seems reasonable for Cloverdale and Sycamore, but is not eliminating uncertainty – you still have a lot of it
- WH: Sounds like there will be some calibration to existing flow gauges. You will need to scale up and down, and there will be impacts to the overall watershed budget. At some point, will there be watershed information provided?

- NB: Model will have the watershed budget and regression factors. We can, if requested, share that information with the TPR members as it is developed; however, water budget information outside of the Basin is not a requirement for GSP reporting.

Nate continued his presentation on the planned model domain and codes. He noted everything we have been talking about to this point is history matching, but that model projections that incorporate climate change are more important. A benefit of using BCM to estimate runoff from the surrounding watershed is that the USGS will have already run the relevant global climate models for California. Therefore, we can use the same BCM approach for the projection simulations, which will already incorporate climate change.

- PQ: You are using One-Water to get a runoff and infiltration. You should do a cross-check on what BCM gives you for runoff in that Basin model area to see how One-Water and BCM compare.

Nate discussed land use in the groundwater model and requested feedback. He also reviewed consumptive use approach in the numerical model.

- WH: In the farm process, are you assuming that there is applied water only during times of consumptive use or is there applied water during months when there is very little consumptive use?
  - NB: Applied water demand is based on land use, California Actual Evapotranspiration (CalETa) Mapping Program, reference evapotranspiration (ET), and crop coefficients.
  - WH: I understand that demand is based on land use, but if you have farming practices that apply water in the off-season, that off-season application can have a large influence on groundwater level calibration. Examples would include groundwater pumping for frost protection.
  - NB: We will keep that in mind if during model calibration there are obvious mismatches among boundary conditions, water-use assumptions, and calibration targets.
  - NB: Slide 21 shows the interrelationship between the different model blocks (surface water system, land system, and groundwater system). This will allow the model to calculate ag pumping and we can compare pumping rates with metered pumping data where and when such comparisons are appropriate. Where we have CalETa data, that will give us a direct picture of where crops consumed groundwater each month.
  - WH: On groundwater pumping data – if there is a situation where pumping data for a particular area is greater than ET demand, what are you going to do in that situation? Folks are pumping groundwater for a reason.
  - NB: Irrigation efficiencies will also be considered to account for additional water used beyond consumptive use. We will respond on a case-by-case basis.
- WH: Where demands appear high, look at uptake and rainfall, then groundwater left to make up difference. But what if it does not make sense when compared to metered data?
  - NB: In those cases, we would look at whether that portion of the domain has lower groundwater elevations, so the crops aren't accessing groundwater within their rooting depths. If there are remaining irrigation deficits for a given month in some subarea, then we would review the assumed rooting depths and, if justified, deepen them to get access to subsurface water. First, we are trying to build work flow ("the plumbing"). Once the model is running and converging, then we'll revisit the assumptions/parameters and move forward. Currently we are still trying to build the farm process and land use from a workflow perspective.

- MWied: Will brings up a good point. Your inquiry is premised on the basis that we have flow meters for groundwater pumping. John said earlier that we have some metered data. How comprehensive is that data?
  - SC: We have monitoring back to 2017, monitored every 6 months, which covers half of the City's leased land.
  - JA: Coverage is maybe 45% of the Valley (the City owns 90% of Valley).
  - WH: That is pretty recent data, as compared to the calibration period.
- PQ: There is groundwater pumping to spray citrus and avocado trees during the winter that will not show up in crop demand for ET. It may be a small amount, but they will pump through the night sometimes to protect the crops.
- PQ: You check the meters every 6 months. Are they totalizers? Or do they record pumping by day/month?
  - SC: No, the City just reads the meters every 6 months. It is a simple process.

### *Monitoring Networks*

John provided an overview of the proposed monitoring networks. He briefly reviewed sustainable management criteria and how the monitoring networks will help us to address those criteria. Two new monitoring wells will be included in the GSP monitoring network, but we will not establish thresholds on them since we have no data.

### *Sustainability Criteria*

John provided an overview of the terms for sustainability criteria – undesirable results, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, and interim milestones. SGMA requires that we meet the measurable objective by 2042 – we want to target the measurable objective so there is adequate storage in the case of a future drought. Today, we are seeking input from TPR members on setting minimum thresholds. The Consultant Team reviewed groundwater elevations at January 1, 2015 (SGMA baseline), historic low, number and depth of well completions near each monitoring well, and Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems (GDEs) (evaluated separately). John walked the TPR members through several hydrographs with potential minimum thresholds analysis – considering 2015 groundwater level, historic low, shallowest nearby well, and 10<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> percentile of nearby wells. It is difficult to evaluate what is “significant and unreasonable” in the western Valley with its extremely shallow groundwater. The Margin of Operational Flexibility (MoOf) is the buffer of storage above the minimum threshold to set the measurable objective. For this draft, 5 years of storage is shown. TPR discussion follows:

- PQ: This is good work. 2011 was our high in this record, but that was a 140% rainfall year. 2008 was a 200% rainfall year. By using the 5-year storage, we are not seeing just how much the Basin fills up in really wet years. I prefer the comfort of the 25% percentile to make sure we are not considering old abandoned shallow wells that are still lingering in the DWR database. We need to take actions to avoid the minimum threshold, not pursue actions to get to the measurable objectives.
  - JA: Agree – whichever approach we take will depend on input from the TPR and AC members. I have seen this tackled in a variety of ways in other GSPs. In this draft analysis, we are more focused on the draw-down that occurs in dry years, rather than the recharge that happens in the wet years.
  - PQ: In another GSP, we tentatively set measurable objective at where we are above it 50% of the time. We need to have adequate storage to stay above the minimum threshold.
  - JA: Agree – this hydrograph is tough because we do not know if there is a discharge point above some hydrographs, so we do not know if they can even achieve the measurable

objective. If there is a 5-year decline in the record, we will use that. In wells with only 1-year decline, we will use that and multiply by 5. We need input from TPR and AC members – we want to make sure people can live with it and meet SGMA requirements. There is also the option to include “if/then” statements when setting thresholds strategies: “If a strategy needs to be refined for a particular kind of well condition, then use this modified approach for calculating the threshold.” That way we can apply this methodology for all wells in the proposed monitoring network.

- JA: Will makes great point in the Chat – the measurable objectives and minimum thresholds may be easier to develop once we see water budget results and sustainable yield information and what is needed to be sustainable in the future. That information will be useful in developing/finalizing methodologies in developing thresholds. This is intended to be the start of this conversation. At the next meeting we will talk about the Projects & Management Actions, and how those relate back to these thresholds.
- MWied: With respect to the 5-year period of storage, my comment is directed more to AC members: in my experience looking at rainfall records and hydrographs, a 5-year drought covers most periods of drought over the last 40 years, though some extend 6-7 years (1997-2004).

### AC Comments on Technical Approach

AC members provided the following comments:

- MWit: For 10% percentile, why was depth below the alluvium being used?
  - JA: The brown line on the hydrograph represents the ground surface, not the alluvium. Some wells extend below the alluvium and some do not. We are not deciding at this time about what wells are in or out of the Basin – we are focused on geographic inclusion in the Basin. We went through the available well completion reports (WCRs), but we do not have the ability to determine if a well is active or abandoned. We are not focused on whether they are in the alluvium or not.
- MWit: The differences between east and west portions need to be worked into these discussions. The west portion of the Valley is more stable and less frequently recharges; the east is less stable and more frequently recharged. These differences need to be considered in margin of flexibility.
  - JA: Agree, we need to do something different about the west Valley conditions. The well in the hydrograph shown did recede over the drought, but only 20 feet over 5 years.
- RS: When looking at different hydrographs, if there differences in various locations throughout the Valley, how do you pull all of this together in a comprehensive program?
  - JA: We might use “if/then” statements in setting the thresholds. “If depth to water is less than 30 feet, then we’ll do this.” This will give us flexibility, without having to delineate separate management areas.
- PQ: Do we have an undesirable result from having water within 1 foot of ground surface in the west Valley in terms of liquefaction?
  - JA: We have not established an undesirable result for this, as this is not specified as a required in the regulations. However, if this could be an issue, we are looking for input from stakeholders in western end.
- JB: On 10% and 25% thresholds, those are pulled from WCRs and we do not know if they are active or abandoned, or if they are in the Basin. Is that correct?
  - JA: Yes, that is correct. In another GSP, we wanted to set the threshold at 25% and said we are willing to dewater up to 25% of wells before taking action. In this case, by including all wells and if we do pick 10%-25%, we are not necessarily dewatering shallow wells because some of those wells may be old and destroyed. And those wells are not necessarily near the

- monitoring wells (that are up to 1/2 mile away). But we need to take a stab at it, which is why we are presenting the data we have even if it is not perfect.
- JB: When the County provided Department of Environmental Health (DEH) well log data, we went through information and removed wells that are considered outside the Basin. It did not take a tremendous amount of effort. When looking at using 10% or 25% thresholds, we want to make sure we are protecting wells inside the Basin. The County recommendation is to work through well logs to remove wells not in the Basin.
  - JA: The compiled Well Log database includes DWR, City, and County well logs and the logs were screened so that the database only includes well logs for wells inside the Basin.
  - JB: Does the City have good inventory of who is actively producing on City-owned land in the Basin? That would cover 90% of Basin.
    - SC: The City does have information about which wells are active. I am not sure we have well logs for all wells. There are domestic wells in the Basin too.
  - LC: Have you considered just using key indicator wells instead of percentiles? Do we want to set thresholds at percentiles?
    - JA: The monitoring wells in the monitoring well network are the key indicators. The purpose of the percentiles is to better understand where the surrounding wells fall. If all of the wells are shallow, we need to set minimum thresholds higher so that we're not dewatering too many wells. If surrounding wells are deeper, then the minimum thresholds can be deeper. We will also update the GSP in 5 years and will have better/more data then.
  - PQ: I agree with Jim and Leanne. In the presence of uncertainty – if we are not sure if wells are inside or outside of the Basin – that argues for a higher percentile. We will give feedback on the Rockwood Canyon wells. One of the Rockwood Canyon monitoring wells may be destroyed for infrastructure; its redundant anyway.
  - MWied: Matt Witman's comment about wells below the alluvium is good. We should use cross sections to consider where the bottom of the alluvium is and use the granite layer as the deepest depth.
    - JA: We have not determined if wells completed in all 3 layers are not affecting the Basin, so I would prefer to include them in this analysis.
  - PQ: It skews the analysis if wells are only completed in the fractured granite. We should only include the wells completed in the Basin. Taking those out will probably raise the minimum thresholds. Including the deep wells will allow for a minimum threshold that could make all of the shallow alluvium wells run dry.

## Preliminary Analysis Results

### *Groundwater Model*

Nate reviewed the climate year analysis that was completed for the calibration period. He presented the cumulative departure from the mean annual precipitation. TPR members discussed the model results:

- WH: The climate analysis indicates a slightly downward trend, which indicates a slightly dry period.
  - NB: Yes, that is also indicated in the table above. If you start to extend back further beyond 2005, there is another long dry period.
  - WH: We want to get a sense on how the selected period looks: does it represent the long-term annual average versus a dry period? This will affect the water budget results. What you may come up with for Basin storage may not be indicative of the long-term historical

average, but rather it is representative of the 2005–2020 drier conditions. This should inform how we interpret the result.

- PQ: I agree with Will. We should look at this with caution. This is a drier period that does not have the years that will fill up the Basin. We may want to focus more on 2009–2019 which starts at mean, goes wet and then dry, and then ends up back at mean. In prior years, there has been more amplitude.
- MWied: This seems like a reasonable selection of time for calibration.

Nate continued with discussion of how the Consultant Team is mapping wells to parcels and requested feedback on Handout 2.

- PQ: I do not see parcel numbers for the floor of Rockwood Canyon. Parcels 27 and 37 are outside of the Basin; they are Gidachi property. I will provide feedback.
- PQ: How are septic leach fields addressed; are they considered return flow?
  - NB: Yes. This is why we are asking for clarification of domestic vs. irrigation pumping. We want to have a better sense of indoor vs. outdoor water use.
- JA: We are asking for input on Handout 2 from TPR members in one week, that is by July 16<sup>th</sup>.

#### **AC Comments on Preliminary Analysis Results**

No AC members provided comments.

### Refined Analysis

#### *Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems (GDEs)*

John reviewed the site surveys completed for GDEs. The Consultant Team reviewed the Natural Communities Commonly Associated with Groundwater (NCCAG) dataset, aerial imagery, and USGS mapping. Site surveys identify a broad array of riparian and wetland habitats throughout the Valley. Those habitats may be fed by surface water, shallow perched aquifer, or mountain-front recharge and not the groundwater Basin. TPR members discussed the GDEs analysis:

- WH: What is the time snapshot of the depth to water map for GDEs?
  - JA: Timeframe for depth to groundwater is 2018.
  - WH: Should we use a different year, such as January 1, 2015, for this analysis?
- MWied: I worked on a site south of Cloverdale Creek where there appears to be wetland species in the drainage, but groundwater levels vary from 10 ft to 40 ft and they still survive. Are these species groundwater dependent? They use groundwater when it's there, as the levels fluctuate over time. Can we provide the biologist with data on how often the Basin refills over the historical period?
  - WH: Could this be a factor in “significant and unreasonable” regarding undesirable results?
  - JA: The GSP commits the Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) to doing management for any undesirable results. I am reluctant to do this if the GSA does not have effective authority to manage this issue. GSAs have authority to manage pumping and implement projects to import water into the Basin. They do not have ability to manage land uses outside of the Basin. If there are areas that are labeled as GDEs in the east Valley where groundwater levels are far below surface, GSAs could be held accountable for habitats they cannot effectively manage. We can monitor GDEs in the east Valley (e.g., shallow piezometers) and consider how we might try to manage those areas over time.
- PQ: I agree that we should not commit GSAs to managing something they do not have the tools to manage. If shallow piezometers were to confirm the theory of mountain-front recharge, the GSA

does not have tools to manage that. Stay focused on the west Valley where the GSAs can manage groundwater levels.

- JA: This issue is similar to groundwater quality, where we are only going to establish thresholds on constituents where GSAs have ability to manage loading.
- MWied: You did not incorporate topography into depth to water maps. You should do so.
  - JA: The result ends up looking more like a topographic map than anything else. Is not productive to show in a presentation.
  - MWied: If this becomes criteria, you should take caution in using this approach.
- PQ: Is the model farm package how we simulate direct transpiration of groundwater from these riparian plants in the western end of the Basin?
  - NB: Yes.

### AC Comments on Refined Analysis

AC members provided the following comments:

- RS: It's worth explaining to the AC that just because GSAs are not managing these habitats, it doesn't mean they aren't important habitats and still subject to state and federal laws.
- RS: When you talk about managing groundwater levels for GDEs, what does that mean?
  - JA: We could use the habitat's rooting depth as the minimum threshold for the areas that underly the GDES (30 feet is considered rooting depth for GDES). This would be a different approach from using well infrastructure as the basis for thresholds.
- MWit: There is a fundamental flaw in the GDE mapping: the difference between elevation of ground surface and the creek is closer to 30 feet. They are much closer to surface than shown. Water runs from winter into July to allow for those plants to establish. The riparian plants root into the creek bank and rob irrigation water from the crops. It is clear that those are NOT GDEs; nothing grows in the center of the channel where irrigation water cannot be used.
  - JA: Plants that use irrigation return flows are not GDEs.
  - MWit: In wet years, more plants get established and then they die off in the dry cycle.

### Field Program Update

John provided a brief update on the field program.

- PQ: I wrote comments last time about Monitoring Well 128.
  - JA: We did not get comments from Kleinfelder that their stabilizers are pipes. We can send you a photo as follow-up.
  - PQ: The proof is going to be if they have different water levels or if they installed seals that allowed for leaking. If they are the same, it will call into question the relationship between the 3 layers.

### Public Comments

Public comments provided in the "Chat" during the meeting are listed in the GoToMeeting Chat Log below. Public comments provided verbally by meeting participants follow:

- Andre Monette, BBK for RG – I want to offer clarification on the Basin boundary. We agree that Bulletin 118 is the appropriate legal basis for the GSP. Future actions to try to regulate areas outside of the Basin will be as illegal then as they are now. The reason DWR has defined the Basin the way they have is because fractured bedrock behaves very differently from alluvium; it is not as



predictable. DWR has removed bedrock layers from other Basins too (e.g., Jamul). I caution this group against using wells screened in bedrock to establish thresholds.

- Andre Monette, BBK for RG –On measuring TDS in the GSP: there was a slide early on related to fire runoff after Witch Creek Fire and study after study documents very high TDS levels in this Basin. There is a smoking gun that needs to be investigated further. SGMA requires a closer look at groundwater quality.
- Andre Monette, BBK for RG –The 25% percentile approach to setting the minimum thresholds makes sense. We support this approach, as it allows for at least 75% of wells to continue operating. Operators can plan ahead and drill wells at an adequate depth.
- Hank Rupp, General Manager, RG – I am glad that Bulletin 118 is being proposed to define the Basin boundary. That is established by DWR and limits the overreach of the managed area. This is not the forum to expand on the definition.
- Hank Rupp, General Manager, RG – There is high TDS in the western portion of the Basin. Multiple RWQCB reports document this. I am concerned about how that will be addressed, as TDS is not good for agriculture.

## Next Steps

The next TPR meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 8, 2020 from 9 to 11:30 am.

Comments about the land use maps and well mapping (Handout 2) must be received by Thursday, July 16, 2020. All other comments about today's meeting must be received by Thursday, July 23, 2020.

The TPR meeting ended at 11:53am.

## GoToMeeting Chat Log from TPR Meeting

**Rosalyn Prickett, Woodard & Curran (to Everyone):** 8:52 AM: All handouts are located on our website: <https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/SGMA/san-pasqual-valley.html>

**Rikki (to Everyone):** 9:13 AM: What do these problems mean?

**Will Halligan (to Everyone):** 9:15 AM: No comments yet from Will on responses to comments

**Matt Witman (to Everyone):** 9:15 AM: 2011 was the first high flow event in the watershed after the Witch creek fire. Huge amounts of sediment washed in during that event. This is the last time that lake Hodges spilled

**Will Halligan (to Everyone):** 9:22 AM: How come this slide is not included in the handout?

**John Ayres (to Everyone):** 9:23 AM: Will, we had a few last-minute updates to the powerpoint

**Will Halligan (to Everyone):** 9:24 AM: Thanks

**Will Halligan (to Everyone):** 9:28 AM: Will watershed budget data be provided for review

**Matt Wiedlin (to Everyone):** 9:51 AM: Nate and John, Will brings up a good point. But it is based on having measured groundwater production data. How much of the Basin do we anticipate having metered data at this point?

**Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel (to Everyone):** 9:55 AM: I think your approach is very valid. Crop ET as the indicator of ag consumption is the best approach at this point.

**Peter Quinlan (to Everyone):** 9:55 AM: There is pumping to spray trees for frost protection.

**Peter Quinlan (to Everyone):** 9:56 AM: Are the City meters totalizers, or do they record pumping by day or month?

**Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel (to Everyone):** 9:56 AM: whatever water the crop doesn't use either goes back into the ground or finds its way as runoff into the surface water system.

**Dustin Meador (to Everyone):** 9:57 AM: Irrigation efficiency should consider some crops are being underirrigated if you compare Crop ET with Ref. ETo.

**Dustin Meador (to Everyone):** 10:04 AM: Is there an interest among the Technical experts regarding Ag. Water Quality and an interest in helping farmers ensure they have access to appropriate sources of better quality water?

**Matt Witman (to Everyone):** 10:16 AM: why is depth below the alluvium being used?

**Patricia Tennyson (to Everyone):** 10:21 AM: A reminder: Advisory Committee members will have an opportunity to ask questions after this section of slides is complete. Members of the public in attendance will have an opportunity to provide comments at the end of the meeting (approximately after slide 61).

**Will Halligan (to Everyone):** 10:25 AM: MOs and MTs may be easier to develop once we see water budget results and sustainable yield info and what is needed to be

sustainable in the future. That info will be useful in developing/finalizing methodologies in developing MOs and MTs

**Will Halligan (to Everyone):** 10:56 AM: I switched from computer audio to my phone.

**Will Halligan (to Everyone):** 11:22 AM: What is the time snap shot of the depth to water map for GDEs?

**Rikki (to Everyone):** 11:26 AM: it's important to note that just because GDE may not be managed, it is still covered under State and Federal wetland regulations.

**Matt Witman (to Everyone):** 11:39 AM: i have some comments

## Images from TPR Meeting

The screenshot shows a GoToMeeting interface with a presentation slide. The slide title is "Agenda and Meeting Objectives" with a San Diego logo. The agenda items are:

1. Roll Call and Introductions
2. Review
  - Agenda
  - Meeting Objectives
  - Previous Meeting Summary
3. TPR Comments
  - Overview and Responses
  - AC Comments
4. Technical Input on Approach
  - Groundwater Model
  - Monitoring Networks
  - Sustainability Criteria – Levels and Quality
  - AC Comments
5. Preliminary Analysis Results
  - Groundwater Model
  - AC Comments
6. Refined Analysis
  - Cross Sections
  - AC Comments
7. Field Program Update
8. Public Comments
9. Next Steps & Closing Remarks

Three landscape images are shown on the right side of the slide: a vineyard, a field with a large metal wheel, and a field with a large metal structure. The slide footer includes "6", "Draft Work Product", and "sandiego.gov". The meeting interface shows participants: Rosalyn Prickett, Wood..., John Ayres, Nate Brown/Jacobs, Patricia Tennyson, Will Halligan, Matt Wiedlin, and Micah Eggleton. The system tray at the bottom shows the time as 9:06 AM on 7/9/2020.

GoToMeeting | REC | Talking: Nate Brown/Jacobs | View Active Cameras | 26

Rosalyn Prickett... | John Ayres | Nate Brown/Jac... | Patricia Tennyson | Will Halligan | Matt Wiedlin | Micah Eggleton | Peter Quinlan | geoffrey vanden..

### Technical Input – Approach

#### 2005 Land Use

**Feedback Needed**

- Revisions/Mark-ups (if needed) to 2005 & 2018 land use classifications (e.g., crop type)
- Revisions/Mark-ups (if needed) to 2005 & 2018 land use classification boundaries
- The year at which the land use classification changed from 2005 to 2018 conditions (if applicable)

18 | Draft Work Product | sandiego.gov

John Ayres is presenting

Mic | Camera | Screen | Leave

Type here to search | 9:37 AM 7/9/2020

GoToMeeting | REC | Talking: John Ayres | View Active Cameras | 26

Rosalyn Prick... | John Ayres | Nate Brown/J... | Patricia Tenny... | Will Halligan | Rikki | Matt Wiedlin | Micah Eggle... | Peter Quinlan | Frank Konyh

### Sustainable Management Criteria

#### Term Diagram – Showing Two Conditions

28 | Draft Work Product | sandiego.gov

John Ayres is presenting

Mic | Camera | Screen | Leave

Type here to search | 10:07 AM 7/9/2020