

Los Osos Basin Management Committee Regular Meeting, August 16, 2023
(PFOS section only)

Transcription of participants, in order of appearance:

MZ=Mark Zimmer (Golden State), Chair

DH=Daniel Heimel, BMC Executive Director

CC=Chuck Cesena (LOCSD)

BR=Beth Reineke (S&T Mutual)

LD=Laura Durban (LOCSD, assistant)

TS=Terry Simons

BM=Becky McFarland

MZ: Good afternoon. We're gonna call to order the Los Osos Groundwater Basin Management Committee Meeting. We're gonna start off with Item 2 roll call. Dan?

DH: Yes, Director Cesena (here), Director Gibson (here), Director Reineke (here), Chair Zimmer (here). Great, all four parties represented.

MZ: Thank you. We're gonna move to Item 3, the Pledge of Allegiance.

(All recite the Pledge of Allegiance)

MZ: Okay, moving along to Item 4, Board Member comments. Do we have any comments from the board?

CC: Probably hear enough of them today.

MZ: Right. So a couple things we do have. One of the board members needs to leave early today, so we're going to try to move the meeting along, and I think the goal is to be out by three today if we can, if possible. Okay. So I just wanted to give a heads up on that part of it. Then, I did want to bring up a comment from Golden State regarding some UCMR sampling that we've been doing in Los Osos, more of a volunteer state at this point. I think all groundwater, I don't know who's familiar with it, but it is a regulation that is, um, where the primarily, the focus right now is the PFOS that we've been hearing about. So, we've done some preliminary samples in Los Osos. We have detected in one of our entry points into our system, so coming from our tank, that there is a contaminant, it's called perfluorohexane sulphonic acid and the abbreviation for that is PFHXS. It's at the notification level. So these are unregulated constituents at these points. So we don't have an MCL or a contamination level that really determines that we have to take this source offline or have a treatment mechanism. They're in the early stages of defining what this MCL...we're gonna have a lot more information. For those that aren't familiar with it, it's going to be all across California. All groundwater basins are going to be faced with dealing with it. I'm sure that at some point on some level everybody's heard about it. We at Golden State have been dealing with it extensively down south. So the goal of the state was to really target areas that they felt were highly contaminated or highly populated and then move to other areas as they migrate through their testing requirements. So Golden State, primarily down south, we've been dealing with it in a number of our systems, pretty familiar with it over the last couple of years, implemented actually some treatment. On the scale of treatment, treatment's not as bad as some of the other contaminants. You know, it's more of a filtration with carbon targeted specifically for this constituent. So right now, the goal is for Golden State, we've reached this notification level, this contaminant PFHXS has a notification level of three nanograms per liter, and then an action level of 20 nanograms per level. And our detection was, we've sampled it twice. We did a confirmation sample after the first one. So the first one was 8.8. The second one was 7.3. We're going to continue to monitor this additional sampling. This is such new information for us right now. I felt it was important to

bring it before this group because this is what we do is we manage the groundwater basin. We're interested in it. We want to know what's happening. But literally just got this information last week, we're required to notify, and so this is going to go on the EPA website very soon. I didn't want somebody to pick up the information coming off a meeting like this. I just didn't think that that was fair for me to do so. Wanted to bring it out there right now. But I do want to clarify this is new information for us. So right now we're going to continue to analyze the data, the results, we don't even have all the results back from all of our sample points yet. Those are, some of them we have to resample. Overall on the scale of things, it's not good to have this in our groundwater. Nobody wants any of this to be in our groundwater, but it's not, compared to what we saw down south, it's better. So we're not in a level of severity that we are in some of the systems down south as far as the contamination level. The treatment for this, as I mentioned, it's fairly straightforward treatment. Filtration, and moving forward, there's going to be a lot more discussion on this. I think every purveyor and every source of supply will need to be sampled at some point moving forward, and I'm not really sure on the dates of that, but I know we have some orders to do the sampling in 2024. As I mentioned earlier, this is more of a we want to get ahead of the game and see what we have out there. So, all of the purveyors are going to be responsible for sampling this, and I know it's...wastewater has been dealing with with some of the sampling requirements. We're just going to make, this is going to be part of our world, as far as utilizing groundwater, and we're going to need to have just open, up front, honest discussions how we move forward. So I wanted to make that announcement to the group.

CC: I'm glad we don't have an airport nearby.

MZ: Yes, yes. Like I say, it's definitely better than some areas that we've seen, in most of the airports and things like that. Sure...

BR: Yeah. So my question is, for starters, it's so good to know that you guys are staying ahead of it and Golden State is being proactive about it. Is there any possibility that we could know, maybe location-wise in Los Osos, like what area the tank was that you guys...?

MZ: Yeah, sure. No problem. So that was in our Los Olivos tank up by our office on Los Olivos. It was, that tank has two sources of supply. So we didn't, we didn't take analysis from each source of supply. It was more the entry into the system. We wanted to know what was going out to our customers. And so Los Olivos. Our South Bay well, that is a direct pumping into the system. That one was non-detect at that point, so, or below the notification level, very low, if it was, I don't think that there was anything found in that one. Our other tanks, those are the two that we haven't got, received the analysis result yet. All right. We're gonna go ahead and open this up to public comment, if there's no further questions from the Directors. If you have a comment, please come up to the podium.

(Unidentified person asked an inaudible question)

MZ: So yeah, Golden State Water serves water all over California, all throughout California. Our, we serve over a half a million customers and predominantly our systems, we have at least 30 water systems down south, so it's more in the desert, easterly portion of Los Angeles, those kind of areas. And like I said, it's pretty much LA area down south. I mean, if there's a specific neighborhood you're asking about, I can probably answer that. I don't really. I don't know them that well. I can't really list them off my head, but it's LA area.

(Inaudible Public question)

MZ: We haven't sampled for Santa Maria yet. Yeah, so that's coming down the road. (Multiple voices) Go ahead, Laura.

LD: Yeah, I was going to say, we're not supposed to have crosstalk because I cannot hear it. It needs to be a public comment at the podium. And if you'd like to make a public comment and you're online, please raise your hand. Thank you. And if you're in the Board room, come up to the podium. Thanks.

MZ: Okay, thank you, Laura.

TS: Good afternoon. My name is Terry Simons. In the context of the sampling that you're doing for this PFHXS I noticed in the agenda that you seem to be having difficulty getting permission to sample wells that are part of the S&T program. Has that permission issue been resolved? Are they required to do their own sampling? How is that working?

DH: Let's just have all their public comment and then we'll answer it.

MZ: Right. They'll answer that question at the end of public comment.

TS: Okay. And then my next question was, further, going through the agenda. The agenda,

MZ: I'm sorry, we can't go further on the agenda. This is just for the comment...

TS: I understand that. These are questions that are raised by reading the agenda, but are not on your, not on your agenda per se.

MZ: So this is just for the board member comment. So we'll open it up to general public comment later down on the Agenda.

TS: Okay. That wasn't clear to me.

MZ: Sorry. Gotta follow the format.

BM: Becky McFarland, and I wanted to thank you for giving us that information. Being a stockholder and shareholder in Golden State Water's parent company, that concerns me not only for Los Osos, but our whole area. Thank you.

MZ: Okay, that concludes public comment and the board, will bring it back to the board of directors.

BR: I can address the comment related to S&T. At this point, S&T has not received any orders to sample, so no, we are not required to yet, but we will once after, probably after the UCMR. S&T won't fall into the UCMR category because it's too small of a system. So we will probably be sampling once there's an actual MCL assigned to any of the PFOS.

MZ: Thank you, Beth. Okay, that concludes Item 4.