

**BASIN MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

**Agenda Item 5a: Minutes of the Meeting of November 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Agenda Item	Discussion or Action
<b>1. CALL TO ORDER</b> <b>2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE</b> <b>3. ROLL CALL</b>	<p>Chairperson Ochylski called the meeting to order at 1:30 pm and led the Pledge of Allegiance.</p> <p>Mr. Miller, acting Clerk, called roll to begin the meeting. Director Zimmer, Director Cote, Director Gibson and Chairperson Ochylski were all present.</p>
<b>4. Board Member Comments</b>	<p>Director Zimmer: I have a brief comment on our pumping strategy. We've talked a lot about the nitrate removal system for the Skyline and Los Olivos 5 Well. We're adjusting the pumping and moving some additional pumping away from Rosina to our Los Olivos 5 Well. As we go through this data you might see some of those differences.</p>
<b>5a. Minutes of the Meeting of August 30<sup>th</sup>, 2018</b>	<p>Director Zimmer: There are a couple typos in the minutes.</p> <p>Mr. Miller: if you pass those to me, we can get those corrected.</p> <p><b><u>No Public Comment</u></b></p> <p>Director Cote: Motion to accept the consent agenda and minutes.</p> <p>Director Ochylski: Second the Motion.</p> <p><b>Ayes:</b> Director Gibson, Director Zimmer, Director Cote and Chairperson Ochylski  <b>Nays:</b> None  <b>Abstain:</b> None  <b>Absent:</b> None</p>
<b>5b. Approval of Budget update and Invoice Register through October 2018</b>	<p>Executive Director, Rob Miller, provided a verbal overview of the written content of the Executive Director's report.</p> <p><b><u>No Public Comment</u></b></p>
<b>6. Executive Director's Report</b>	
<b>7a. Update on Status of Basin Plan Infrastructure Projects</b>	<p>Mr. Miller: Gave a detailed overview of the Update on Status of Basin Plan Infrastructure Projects.</p> <p>Director Ochylski: I know there are some people here to talk about the East Side Well. I don't know if we want to talk about this under this item or the next item. I feel there is some background information in the Cleath Harris Report that we should probably go over before we talk about that East Side Well.</p> <p>Mr. Miller: I don't think that's a bad idea. If you're here to talk about that East Side Program C Well, you are free to talk about it now, but you will get some more background on that during our next item.</p> <p><b><u>Public Comment</u></b></p> <p>Ms. Owen: Could we get a description of the Creek Discharge Program?</p>

	<p>Mr. Miller: The concept for the Creek Discharge Program was to take highly treated recycled water and to introduce it south of Los Osos Valley Road in Los Osos Creek, where the sediment is permeable and there's communication with the Lower Aquifer. We did have a consultant perform a study to look at the feasibility and the regulatory environment for that project. It's a significant effort in terms of monitoring for the baseline, dealing with the constituents in the water, and the additional treatment that would be required to make it work. The feasibility of it had a price tag of about \$600,000. That report is posted online with our previous meetings, if you're not able to obtain it let me know and I can make sure you get a copy.</p>
<b>7b. Discussion of CHG Report on Los Osos Basin Plan Metric Trends Review and Infrastructure Program C Evaluation</b>	<p>Mr. Miller: Gave a detail on the CHG Report on the Los Osos Basin Plan Metric Trends Review and Infrastructure Program C Evaluation.</p> <p>Director Zimmer: Regarding the Program C Well we talked in other discussions that it would be Monitoring Well and I'm just not clear on how that was determined. I think renaming the Wells as you mentioned in this item is great idea and I support it. I appreciate the District taking initiative on this well the Basin Plan lists this as a joint effort since this is outside Golden State service area would this well be more in line with being a District Well at the end of the process? I'm just hoping to gain a littler clarity on how we're moving through this whether it will be joint or more of a District effort. If it is a joint effort how does the BMC fit into that role?</p> <p>Director Ochylski: From the CSD's standpoint all we're proposing to do at this point is to get proposals. It's a step by step process, and all we did was authorize Rob to go out and get a proposal before the drilling of the well. My understanding is that due to the uncertainty of the yields of that well, we've gone this route.</p> <p>Mr. Miller: Right, it was primarily looking at the capacity available at that location, we just don't have enough information that a full scale well would even be worth it. If everything did work out, then we would have the public discussion of what it would mean to drill a full-scale well at that location. Regarding the funding of the well, I suppose it was the District's acknowledgement of Golden State's efforts to fund its expansion well and take our fair share of the burden to fund the first steps of this well. Depending on its location the regional intertie would be available to move water around if that was prudent for the Basin. There are no final arrangements in our minds at this point.</p> <p>Director Zimmer: I appreciate those comments because the information that we've talked about and have before us today is just the beginning of the trail, and I don't want to start down a trail without fulling understanding what those commitments are and trying to provide assistance and resource as we move through that.</p> <p>Director Gibson: All the wells and water resources are to be managed in a cooperative manner to provide water for this community.</p> <p>Director Ochylski: If you look at the chart it talks about cooperative funding. Golden State took the lead on the first well so now we are trying to do our part. After the workshop this location out of all the options seemed to have the biggest concerns about its viability and ability to provide the amount of water that would be required.</p> <p>Director Cote: I have many comments on this document but if we aren't approving this right now, I can just talk to staff about them.</p> <p>Director Ochylski: I don't see us approving this today, so you may just want to submit those comments in writing. If there's something you feel we need to discuss then bring it</p>

up, otherwise you can just forward those on to Rob. When we bring it back for adoption than we can talk in more detail.

Director Cote: I do have a couple of comments I feel we should discuss. On page 5, PDF 41, second paragraph, I have an issue with it talking about possible/probable problems with Chloride Metric data from one of these wells. I don't know if the committee should talk about funding a special study for this, but it is fundamental for what we're doing here. On Page 4, PDF 39, regarding the talk about the Sandspit Wells having some issues measuring density and Spencer is suggesting we have a surveyor go out. So, do we need to fund a study to take a look at those Sandspit Wells?

Director Ochylski: I think when we talk about Work Program, we may want to bring that discussion up because that is a later agenda item.

Mr. Miller: Those are not huge ticket items. We already have some well surveying proposed for next year and access to the Sandspit is a little challenging. Regarding the potential problems of Chloride Metric data, perhaps there's some more analytical signatures we can get that we haven't obtained yet, if there is a way to do that cost effectively.

Director Cote: On Page 5 paragraph 4, there's a mention that the nitrate levels observed in a 30-day average in September were 2ppm which is low and is good news. However, it's interesting that the WWTP permit allows much higher nitrate than that.

#### Public Comment

Mr. Walker: When the chairman says it's incremental the 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> time it's important for a trial since we sometimes get committed to increments. The estimated 2 costs of a monitoring well and full-time production well. Is there huge savings? I know we talked about them, but I couldn't understand the merit of each of those.

Mr. Cesena: Representing the CSD's Utility Advisory Committee, I think this is a very thorough report. We shared some of the same concerns as Charlie mentioned with the chloride contamination and Sandpit water level criteria reevaluation. Some other minor comments about reference to tables that weren't included in this on page 7 the recycled water distribution discussion also maybe the mitigation factors for each of the 6 different options for disposal could be included. The key thing is that discussion about the need for the additional well and the flexibility that it will add to the operations, particularly that concept of increasing sustainable yield even though you're really using the same run times.

Mr. Margetson: The mitigation factors are very important to be in that report. When other agencies/boards are looking at this and we as the public are talking about the mitigation factors, they look at us like they have no idea what we're talking about.

Ms. Owen: Regarding the letter that was drafted by the Los Osos Groundwater Committee, it mentions that "additional wells will not reduce seawater intrusion..." could you please clarify whether we pump out of the back end of the basin or out of the front end we have a limited supply unless we get some more rainfall. The letter later reads "this could lead to the completion of new residential developments..." we should not be talking about development at this time. Also, we have no idea how much water the private wells are using.

Director Ochyłski: I'm not sure of the letter Ms. Owen referenced.

Mr. Miller: They were comments from a community group that drafted a letter under Mr. Goodrich.

Mr. Brannon: I'm looking at the Cleath Harris report under the Los Osos Valley Ground Water Basin Modification Request, it appears there seems to be an eastward creep of the boundary. I'm looking at Page 23 of the report and it shows that the eastward line is on the other side of the cemetery mesa. I'd like to point out a report that was done by the USGS in 1988 that talks about the hydrology and water resources of the valley. In the report they say that there is little to no groundwater entering the basin from the east end of the valley for two reasons: the first being shallow slopes and thin clay soils hinder the horizontal movement of water, and second is the mesa-like terrace at the east end of the basin creates a local ground water mound. You've drawn the eastern boundary outside of the basin and it may need to be reevaluated.

#### Board Comments

Mr. Miller: For the contrast between a permanent well and a monitoring well, it's probably a factor of 10 between those two. Where a monitoring well in this case might be \$60,000 and a permanent well would be about ten times that.

Director Gibson: The action that is being taken is to test this location for a production well. So, if the test well is sufficient a production well could be pursued, and if not, then it could become a monitoring well.

Mr. Miller: Regarding mitigation factors and some of that background into the report, I think that would strengthen the report and I agree with that. In regard to shifting water productions to enhance yield, it's one of the most hotly contested issues, but note we are starting to see some physical data supporting the conclusion that recovering water levels on the west side results in a retreat of the chloride and in turn a better yield of the Basin.

Director Gibson: I think people visualize pumping from the Basin is like pumping from a bathtub. In terms of this physical effect we're pumping from a running stream. Down near the front of the Basin it does make a difference where you pump the water.

Mr. Miller: Regarding the Basin boundary I think we'll follow up on that offline and take a look at that report.

Director Ochyłski: I think also in that regard, DWR is the controlling agency there, we can't set the boundary. We'll be discussing this again at our next meeting.

Director Gibson: As I look at the intention of this report it's to describe the trends of the metrics and to talk about evaluating the Program C Infrastructure. I think that the report does that. I think the addition of the mitigation factors is fine, but it is describing the reality. I think the one thing that I'm curious about is the question of the chloride metric and the extent that well bore flow is going to affect that. I think we need to resolve that issue. How soon can that issue be resolved?

Mr. Miller: I would have to get back to you on that, there could be some chemical signatures that we could look for.

Director Gibson: I think we need to resolve this before we issue the final report.

<b>7c. Los Osos Seawater Intrusion Imaging – Partnership with Cal Poly</b>	<p>Mr. Miller: Gave a detailed presentation of the planned Los Osos Seawater Intrusion Imaging – Partnership with Cal Poly.</p> <p>Director Ochylski: My question was that this isn't public property, so how would you get permission from the underlying property owner?</p> <p>Mr. Miller: Two of the owners I know personally so I might be able to help.</p> <p>Director Gibson: I'm also willing to help since the County is in the center of all of this.</p> <p>Director Ochylski: My second question was with the snail and Fish and Wildlife I don't know how we could get them to agree to this, I imagine we would have to have monitoring while this happens.</p> <p>Director Gibson: I think it's worth exploring.</p> <p>You mentioned doing this year after year. Is the data only good after a couple years or would we get something good back after doing this the first time?</p> <p>Mr. Miller: I think after the first time, and I think you were going to do it twice a year Mr. Jasbinsek?</p> <p>Mr. Jasbinsek: I think twice a year is a reasonable imposition on the land owners, but more is always better. We would get good data every time and we would see how things are changing over time. We would need about a kilometer line to get reliable readings, but saltwater is a very easy target for this type of testing.</p>
<b>7d. Discussion of 2019 Priorities and Budget</b>	<p>Mr. Miller: Gave details on the 2019 Priorities and Budget.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p>Ms. Owen: Rob has done a great job and if we get one more year out of him that would be wonderful. The enhanced rebates for conservation, I feel there is zero information available to the community. How can we alert the community to get involved for some of these conservation rebates and assistance? Regarding the septic tank conversions, how many tanks are waiting for conversion? What will the conversion look like?</p> <p>Mr. Miller: We did send out a postcard and invited everyone to a conservation workshop which was well attended. We also had a flyer that was sent out talking about the different programs, we probably need to do that again. As far as the pilot program for the septic tank conversions I still think there are hundreds of septic tanks that were cleaned and closed but never converted. If the committee is interested in making some funding available this would be an opportunity to do that as part of this budget cycle.</p> <p>Director Gibson: There is draft of the Los Osos Community plan available for review right now. There is also an EIR coming as well, we hope to get it in front of our planning commission in the first part of next year, which I hope is by the end of the first quarter. We hope to get it to the coastal commission by the end of the year. One of the key parts of this will be getting the Coastal Commission staff up to date on our water management activities.</p>

	<p>Mr. Miller: Just to be clear these are the regular annual items that aren't associated with our 2019 work program, such as the annual report that's not listed here, and we have to administer our meetings as well.</p> <p>Director Zimmer: Would this budget put us in a better position for some grant funding for this project? If not, what is our next step? I think you also mentioned a consultant.</p> <p>Mr. Miller: I will bring all those details back. In essence, of the \$600,000 total, some of the initial tasks were low lying like the baseline monitoring. You already attracted some additional funding for that. Since there are other groups that do monitoring, our hope is as we step out and do some, we can encourage some potential partners. The soil aquifer treatment was one of the initial tasks to look at, and how that column of sand in the creek bottom could help remove carbon from the water. The \$5,000 would be a subset of that to have a consultant do a formal grant search quarterly and to reach out to partner entities and do a brief write up to the committee.</p> <p>Director Zimmer: The flow from the Wastewater Project has that changed since we looked at it before?</p> <p>Mr. Miller: In our last meeting we talked about that 500,000 gallons per day and staff perspective is that augmenting that flow should be a committee priority. We'll put some seed money in for storm water recovery, many communities in California are jumping on that process and getting grant funding for it.</p> <p>Director Zimmer: On conservation communication the Golden State web site has a lot of information on it.</p> <p>Director Ochylski: We also have the same thing on the CSD website.</p> <p>Director Gibson left the meeting.</p> <p>Director Cote: So, is this \$200,000 additional above the normal budget? All of our entities have budgeted for 2019. I'm curious if S&amp;T MWC has budgeted enough? I like all these additions here, are we looking at an additional \$200,000 budget?</p> <p>Mr. Miller: No, if you look at last year, we were carrying the \$110,000. If you look at last years budget it was \$300,000 including contingencies and including 115,000 for the Cuesta by the Sea Monitoring Well and that is a carry forward, about \$60,000 to do the annual report, \$50,000 for administration and the contingency was about \$30,000. A lot of the budget would be absorbed into these items, so it's about a 20% increase and your portion would be about 4% of that.</p>
<b>8. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT APPEARING ON THE AGENDA</b>	<p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p>Ms. Owen: Can we talk about the nitrate treating and blending with the upper and lower aquifer, it gives us access to water we don't talk about very much. Will we be doing more of that?</p> <p>Mr. Miller: It's an astute comment, Program B was enhancing and expanding the use of that upper aquifer water. It's expensive to do the denitrifying but it is an available resource that we have not fully utilized.</p>
<b>9. ADJOURNMENT</b>	<p>Meeting was adjourned at 3:07 pm.</p> <p>The next meeting will be on January 16<sup>th</sup> at the South Bay Community Center in Los Osos at 1:30 pm.</p>