

Tahoe Valley South Subbasin (6.5.01) Groundwater Management Plan

MEETING NOTES

Friday, December 21st, 2018 1:30-4:30 p.m.

Location: 1275 Meadow Crest Drive, South Lake Tahoe CA

ATTENDEES:

Jason Burke (City of South Lake Tahoe); Jeff Brooks (Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board); Bob Loding (Lakeside Park Water Co.); Jennifer Lukins (Lukins Brothers Water Co); Rick Robillard, P.E. (Tahoe Keys Water Co.); Paul Nielsen (Tahoe Regional Planning Agency); Michelle Sweeney (Allegro Communications); Christina Boggs-Chavica (California Department of Water Resources-NCRO); Ivo Bergsohn, P.G., HG (South Tahoe PUD); Shannon Cotulla, (South Tahoe PUD); Richard Solbrig (South Tahoe PUD); John Thiel (South Tahoe PUD); Starlet Glaze (South Tahoe PUD) Harold Singer (public); Sachi Itagaki (Kennedy Jenks-Via Teleconference).

BASIN MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES:

Ivo opened the meeting with a brief explanation of the workshop objectives.

1. Maintain a sustainable long-term groundwater supply.
2. Maintain and protect groundwater quality.
3. Strengthen collaborative relationships with local water purveyors, governmental agencies, businesses, private property owners and the public.
4. Integrate groundwater quality protection into local land use planning activities.
5. Assess the interaction of water supply activities with environmental conditions.
6. Convene an on-going Stakeholders Advisory Group (SAG) as a forum for future groundwater issues.
7. Conduct technical studies to assess future groundwater needs and issues.
8. Identify and obtain funding for groundwater projects.

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

OBJECTIVES

1. Learn about the progress of the on-going Off-Site Groundwater Investigation conducted for the former Lake Tahoe Laundry Works site (SL0601754315).
2. Learn about the findings from the 2017 TVS Basin Survey of Well Owners.

DISCUSSION

TVS Basin (6-5.01) - Open Forum

Ivo asked if there were any topics outside of the Agenda outline that anyone wanted to discuss now or bring up for another meeting.

- Shannon Cotulla reported that he had attended a meeting with EDCWA last week on their efforts to put together a water management and development plan for El Dorado County. They are looking at water resources in the Tahoe Basin as well as the West slope. The plan is to look at demand and existing supply to develop the program over the next 6 months. Stantec is the firm doing the work.

South Y Activity Updates

South Y Activity Updates

- **former LTLW Off-Site Investigation (J. Brooks, LRWQCB)**
- Jeff Brooks gave a slide presentation prepared by Brian Grey on what the responsible parties (RP), Lake Tahoe Laundry Works (LTLW), are doing with regards to their offsite investigation and remediation. (See Attached Presentation).

- All of the relevant documents and reports are available on GeoTracker for review.
- LRWQCB staff assigned to LTLW and the South Y PCE issues are Scott Ferguson, P.E., Division Manager; Jeff Brooks, P.G., Unit Chief of the Cleanup Investigation and Enforcement Unit; Brian Grey, P.G., Case Manager; Abby Cazier, P.E.
- Abby Cazier, P.E. will probably lead the SB445 effort once it gets funded. The Department of Financial Assistance is supposedly transferring funds to the Department of General Services who does the contracting for the State.
- PCE concentrations in shallow groundwater are lower on site and immediately downgradient from the site but that is not entirely surprising since LTLW has been doing remediation since 2010. PCE concentrations are still over the MCL level of 5 micrograms per liter (equivalent to 5 parts per billion (ppb)) that were put in the CAO as a delineation requirement.
- LRWQCB staff has been talking to LTLW about remaining levels of PCE contamination in their middle zone leaving the property. This is despite their on-site soil vapor extraction/air sparge (SVE/AS) system.
- Lahontan is relooking at some of the files for older cases that were closed to see if further contaminant investigation work is warranted at these sites.
- LTLW installed 3 new monitoring wells (MWs) with well pairs for shallow (30') and middle (50') zone testing. Testing behind Big O on Tucker showed high levels of PCE in groundwater back there are pretty hot (1580 ppb).
- On the shopping center property by the former LTLW showed Stage 1 Passive Vapor Soil Sampling Results in mass per sampler (nanograms per sampler units). The highest PCE concentrations were found in samples collected in the main source area (Sample 9 at 10,095 nanograms per sampler) where the solvent truck unloaded, storm water drain inlets and outside the back door. Common areas for this type of business to dump waste.
- Ivo asked if this was evidence of LTLW dumping waste on the property. Jeff B. said yes.
- Lahontan has continued to tell the working parties to step out and step down when doing the groundwater assessment. They came back and said that they would like to try to understand what was going on historically and look at some of the historical MTBE remediation sites. Their raw conclusion were that they only affected the area where the remediation was going on and the groundwater is controlled by topography.
- Ivo asked if LTLW had generated any groundwater elevation maps as part of their historical assessment. Brian Grey has looked at the report but Jeff B. has not. It is available on GeoTracker.
- LTLW wants to do groundwater modeling but Lahontan as an agency wants to keep moving forward and stepping out. If LTLW wants to parallel that work with the modeling that would probably be fine as long as the project keeps moving on a timely schedule.
- LTLW is planning on doing the proposed locations for Phase III in February 2019. Right now they are focusing on up-gradient and cross-gradient transects.
- There has been some disagreement between LTLW and Lahontan regarding other potential sources, comingling and phasing and what that means. Lahontan's take has been that these are no reasons to stop moving forward. LTLW's has argued that they don't want to keep paying if there are other potential contributors. Lahontan will continue to investigate other parties but does not agree that this is a reason for extensive delays.
- They have access to the Lakeside Napa and a permit from the City for their work on Glorene. They also have access to Tucker Pond but it is full of water and frozen so that won't be done until in the Spring. Big O is currently denying access to their property so Lahontan may have to step in to assist with obtaining access.
- Jason B. advised that the City received a Public Records Request (PRR) from the RP for everything up gradient, including drainage and maintenance logs. In responding to the PRR it was determined that the City doesn't have good historical records of where the storm drains exit

the property. It would be good to find the preferential pathways as part of the process to complete the picture.

- LTLW has been told in writing that Comingling is not a reason to stop the current requirements of the court order. There may need to be an amendment or new order to enforce the order, but that would require upper management approval.
- The first major technical summary report is due by the end of March, 2019. This will be a good opportunity for everyone to comment on what is going on. Each individual comment will be taken under advisement but not necessarily responded to.
- Richard S. advised the group that the RP had sent a PRR to STPUD for a large number of maps and data of their system. While compiling the documentation they asked that STPUD clean the sewer lines and allow them to TV them. STPUD has declined to do this. (Following further discussion between the District and LRWQCB staff, the District later agreed to perform a sewer line survey as part of the RPs preferential pathway evaluation).
- A report (1997-1998) on the investigation of the STPUD sewer lines that was done to determine preferential pathways was found during the PRR response preparation. The work, managed by Ivo prior to him coming to work at STPUD, included coring and sampling. The report has been provided to the RP and copied to Brian G.
- The conclusion of the investigation was that the STPUD sewers are not preferential pathways.
- Jeff B. advised the group that Lahontan will ultimately make the decision on if the preferential pathway investigation is sufficient. He requested a copy of the STPUD report.

South Y Feasibility Study (S. Itagaki, KJC)

- The Feasibility Study Work Plan were finalized and submitted to the State Water Board as part of the grant agreement.
- KJC is Continuing to work on finishing the pre design investigation. They are fairly close to getting a draft done and out in January to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).
- A lot of time and effort in the last few months has gone towards advancing the understanding of the model and trying to use it to develop alternatives for modeling evaluation.
- Various modeling scenarios were discussed. The next phase of modeling will include simulations using future pumping rates and potential replacement well locations.
- KJC is also working with Lukins and Tahoe Keys to look at some possible replacement wells outside of the plume. They will continue to work to develop that model alternative but will need to verify that future pumping would not move the plume.
- Updates to follow regarding modeling results.

Discussion

2017 Survey of Well Owners Report

- Ivo advised the group that in 2017, as part of the outreach for the Groundwater Management Plan, STPUD did a well owner's survey.
 - There were a number of objectives for the survey, one of which was to reach out to private and small community well owners to advise them that STPUD was a Groundwater Sustainable Agency (GSA) and explain what that means to them.
 - Another of the objectives was to confirm, through a door to door survey, whether there was actually a well on the property or not and to understand how it was being used.
 - Once the complete technical report is complete it will be posted on the STPUD website.
- Michelle Sweeney from Allegro Communications Consulting gave a power point presentation on the finding of the TVS Groundwater Basin Survey of Well Owners Project (See Attached Presentation).
 - The survey team consisted of a 3 person team with boots on the ground and one person at STPUD fielding calls.
 - A letter was sent out initially explaining the survey to the well owners and requesting that people participate online. For those who did not participate on line a member of the team went door to door to walk-through the survey with the well owner.

- In many ways the survey was a big public relations project to open the doors of communication and let the well owners know that the groundwater is a shared resource.
- The survey was also meant to answer very fundamental questions such as how many private wells were actually out there.
- It is worth noting that when the other stakeholders have access to the report through STPUD's website that they should get the word out that it is a really great resource.
- It is also worth reminding people that groundwater is our primary source of drinking water in the Basin.
- There were 600 well locations identified in Tahoe Valley South. Of that number there were 375 respondents to the survey with 66% of those indicating that there were wells on the property.
- Group discussion was had regarding the potential of testing the private wells.
- There was potential interest from some of the well owners to be included in the SAG group and to receive additional information on groundwater management.

2018 Closing Items

- **2018 Basin Prioritization Update**
 - Ivo gave an update on the 2018 preliminary results from the Basin Prioritization and how it affects our groundwater management going forward.
 - A letter sent to DWR after the last SAG meeting in response to the preliminary prioritization findings and a report from DWR are attached for review.
 - The latest from DWR is that we should hear something in early 2019 as far as whether we will continue as a Medium Priority Basin or will be lowered to a very low priority.
- 2014 GWMP Status
 - We should hear from DWR in early 2019 on whether the alternatives that were submitted at the end of 2016 are accepted or not.
- 2019 SAG
 - After we get word from DWR on the prioritization and the decision on the alternatives we will schedule another meeting to discuss how we move forward.
 - The feasibility study is scheduled to be completed by the middle of 2019 so we will have a recommended remedial action plan on the table as for as how to manage the groundwater contamination issue.
 - The next thing will be what our options are on how to actually implement the remedial actions.
 - Representation from private well owners is on the list of something to add to the SAG group next year.