

## MEETING NOTES

DATE	Wednesday, June 4, 2014, 9:00-12:00
LOCATION	South Tahoe Public Utility District Offices, Board Room, 1275 Meadow Crest Drive
STRATEGIC ADVISORY GROUP CORRESPONDENCE LIST	Robert Lauritzen (El Dorado County), Jason Burke (City of South Lake Tahoe), Scott Carroll (CA Tahoe Conservancy), Brian Gray and Tom Gavigan (Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board), Paul Nielsen (TRPA), Jennifer Lukins (Lukins Water Co), Steve Morales (LT Unified School District), Harold Singer (Community Rate Payer), Richard Solbrig, Ivo Bergsohn (STPUD), Mike Maley (Kennedy/Jenks), Michelle Sweeney (Allegro Communications)
MEETING HOSTS	Ivo Bergsohn (STPUD), Mike Maley (Kennedy/Jenks)
FACILITATOR	Michelle Sweeney (Allegro Communications)

### GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE GOALS

1. Update the Groundwater Management Plan to meet CA legislative requirements and DWR guidelines
2. Update the District ordinance for protecting and monitoring groundwater quality
3. Develop Groundwater Basin Management Objectives (BMOs) to provide a framework for maintaining a sustainable and reliable groundwater supply
4. Create a plan for collecting, compiling and reporting regional groundwater management data
5. Establish a stakeholder forum to host discussion about groundwater topics and facilitate collaborative action toward resolution of groundwater issues

### JUNE 4 MEETING GOAL & OBJECTIVES

#### GOAL

Clarify through discussion, a plan of action for building collaborative capacity that can reduce risk to groundwater while expanding opportunities to protect groundwater.

#### OBJECTIVES

1. Discuss opportunities to better protect water supply
2. Describe and discuss a course of action regarding the District's Early Detection and Response Ordinance
3. Further refine discussion on the topic of coordinated land use planning and permitting
4. Consider potential projects that would realize SAG-recommended actions and Basin Management Objectives
5. Summarize findings of existing reports on stormwater-groundwater relationship

### OPPORTUNITIES TO BETTER-PROTECT GROUNDWATER

#### Source Water Protection Map

The concept of a Lake Tahoe Basin-wide source water protection map arose in group discussion at several points during workshop #2. Such a map was referred to 1) as a tool in the context of mapping private well and associated water system vulnerability and 2) as a tool for triggering project review by water purveyors where re/development projects may have connectivity to source waters 3) as a mechanism for expanding source water protections vis-à-vis land use, development, redevelopment and Tahoe Regional

Planning Agency policy and project certifications and 4) as a means of working with the city, county and Lahontan to identify instances where source waters are at risk due to exposure to contaminants via stormwater infrastructure.

In this, workshop #3, Bergsohn shared the recently-updated District Groundwater map and Maley presented several individual layers of maps that will be incorporated into the plan document. The group looked at the map and asked some questions. The group observed that the best source water resources correspond geographically to where there is the densest development. Bergsohn cited hydrogeology, cost and potential contaminant avoidance as the primary drivers of well placement.

The map presented is a map of only the District wells. Lukins has indicated they would like to collaborate on a map reflecting their wells also and Trischler has indicated the Keys is willing to consider it.

**Existing Programs with a Nexus in the GWMP**

The group reviewed the table “GWMPUP Agency Programs”. The following adjustments to page 2 were provided:

AGENCY	PROGRAM	SUB-PROGRAM
TRPA	Add Environmental Improvement Program	
	Add Chapter 60 – Source Water Protection	
LRWQCB	Characterize the Basin Plan as a key document – not as a program	
	Underground Storage Tank Program has 3 Components	
		Leak Prevention
		Leak Detection
		Site Cleanup
	Watershed Management Initiative has become part of the Integrated Regional Water Management Plans	
	Site Cleanup Program - PCE	
		Waste Discharge Requirement
	Land Disposal	

**Education**

Members of the SAG emphasized (as in workshops 1 and 2) that the District could gain a lot of ground in raising awareness about groundwater and educating a variety of user groups about stewardship by collaborating and leveraging existing programs – education programs, permitting programs, and others. Singer suggested, “The District should strategically put itself out there. And say, ‘we want to work with other entities’, maybe not even the ones that are in this room, but others, and ‘we are willing to do some training that might be appropriate to help them be our eyes and ears’. Not from a regulatory perspective, but education. I think that again sets that signal from the District that they want to work together with

people and we are all in this together. You know the saying, “it takes a community to raise a kid”. Well, it takes a community to protect your groundwater.

## EARLY DETECTION IMMEDIATE RESPONSE ORDINANCE

The District requested input from the Strategic Advisory Group regarding the fate of the District’s Early Detection Immediate Response Ordinance.

### **IN THE POST-MTBE TAHOE BASIN, “IT’S PRETTY MUCH A BULLETPROOF SYSTEM UNDERGROUND”**

#### **Present and future risk to groundwater from fuel underground storage tanks in operation – qualitative group consensus - LOW**

Ivo Bergsohn asked Greg Daum, “Is there a real need for the extensive and detailed groundwater monitoring in the ordinance?” to which Daum replied, “After the MTBE issue, it is pretty much a bulletproof system underground.” Daum and Lauritzen in particular, and others generally, described how all underground fuel storage tanks are double walled and alarmed. The alarmed systems are automatic—not under human control. Service station staff are notified regarding procedures in the event the alarm sounds. The County requires monthly spill and emergency response training at the service stations. The general consensus of the group is that adequate protections are in place to prevent underground fuel leaks and to respond to them in the event of an occurrence.

#### **Present and future risk to groundwater from trace fuel remaining underground after closure of cleanup sites – LOW but the District should retain the right to place sentinel wells where there is concern**

Continuing the focus on risk associated with fuel to groundwater the discussion shifted to scenarios other than underground storage tank leaks that might pose a threat. The State of CA and the District do not have the same numeric standard for MTBE detection. This means that the state fund supporting site cleanup requires closure of the cleanup site at a point that may in some cases be in advance of when the District would close the cleanup proceedings. Because the District has a no detect policy for MTBE in groundwater the District has concern that some closed cleanup sites could pose a future risk to water supply. The SAG generally indicated that for specific instances where this is the case the District should retain the right to place sentinel wells that would signal whether these sites were in the present or future able to impact source water.

It was noted that there are a few instances where service stations that are closed and have not been in operation for some time have not cleaned up or closed the sites according state protocol. These could be future potential contaminant sources. The state is actively litigating these cases. These are another example of a scenario that merits the District maintaining the right to place sentinel wells.

#### **Maintain provision enabling District observation/sentinel wells near potential contamination sources**

There are potential contaminant sources in the Basin other than fuel. The SAG advised the District to modify the current ordinance language to allow the District to use sentinel wells in *any* scenario where there is concern about potential contamination from *any* potential contaminant.

#### **Create a mechanism enabling the District to create and implement Emergency Response Plans at the time of an incident of release of any potential contamination in any scenario**

Underground fuel storage tank emergency response procedures are in place, quite robust and have the confidence of those who know them (Daum, Lauritzen).

However, there are other emergency scenarios—where fuel could be a potential contaminant—that deserve the District’s attention.

The group indicated there is substantial risk that fuel-in-transport poses a risk to source water. The group suggests a District review of existing emergency response protocols for fuel transport emergencies.

The group also suggests a the District prioritize a long-term coordination effort between the District, County, City and Lahontan to prepare for targeted source water protection response to fuel transport emergencies: create a GIS layer on the SWP map indicating what kind of stormwater BMPs are located where, creating generic emergency response plans that can be tailored quickly to the specific site of an incident, creating a list of qualified and ready emergency response contractors, etc.

While fuel transport was identified as a high risk scenario that should be prioritized, the SAG recommended that a similar emergency response mechanism be created by the District to anticipate emergency response in the event of contamination by non-fuel contaminant sources.

It was noted that the District should collaborate with emergency first responders to determine in advance what the right interface should be between the District and these agencies during emergencies.

Risk scenarios are of a wide variety. Create a mechanism that will be relevant given this variability. The SAG indicated that the District maintaining an emergency response policy and creating the mechanisms to tailor response to a wide array of scenarios should be a high priority of the groundwater management plan. The SAG deferred to the District to determine whether such a policy ought to be in an ordinance.