Comment Number	Document	Chapter	Section	Figure	Table	Page	Comment	Commenter	Date	Response
I-1	ISP						Include any changes to 180/400 report in the ISP	DW notes from 11/2018 PC meeting	11/6/2018	Changes made in the 180/400 will be carried over to the ISP report
I-2	ISP						Be sure data and model are consistent	DW notes from 11/2018 PC meeting	11/6/2018	Will check for consistency when model becomes available
I-3	ISP					34	Find data for PS-1, PS-2, PS-3	DW notes from 11/2018 PC meeting	11/6/2018	Text revised to include summaries of these plan elements.
I-4			3.3			9	Update descriptions of jurisdictional areas; verify text and figures match	Tamra Voss	11/14/2018	Text and figures revised
I-5			3.3.3			9	Describe County land adjacent to Fort Ord	Tamra Voss	11/14/2018	The land in question is the Laguna Seca Recreation area
I-6			3.4.2			15	Clarify that MCWRA reports groundwater withdrawals for Zones 2, 2A, and	Tamra Voss	11/14/2018	Text revised
I-7			3.4.2			15	GEMS distinguishes between industrial and agricultural groundwater pumping	Tamra Voss	11/14/2018	The 2015 MCWRA groundwater extraction summary report (most recent available) groups industrial use with urban. The report provides an average water use per connection (by category, including industrial); but does not indicate how many industrial connections exist.
I-8			3.6				Revise monitoring program descriptions to reflect current number of wells in each program; update descriptions of monitoring programs. Update description of frequency of CASGEM data collection and submittal.	Tamra Voss	11/14/2018	Same as comment P-32; text revised
I-9				3-10			Revise map to show correct locations of all piezometers.	Tamra Voss	11/14/2018	Map removed based on subsequent discussions
I-10			3.2				Describe what an adjudicated basin is; provide additional details about the Seaside basin.	Robert S. Jaques	11/16/2018	Text revised
I-11			3.6.1				Mention Seaside Basin Watermaster monitoring and management plan	Robert S. Jaques	11/16/2018	Text revised
I-12			3.6.2				Mention that the Seaside Basin Watermaster compiles extraction data.	Robert S. Jaques	11/16/2018	Text revised
I-13			3.10.3		3-6		Reference to Land Use Element: LU-8.3.3 should be LU-8.3.2	Harold R Wolgamott / City of Gonzales	11/19/2018	Text revised; also applies to the 180/400-Foot plan
I-14			3.10.3		3-6		Housing Element: HE-9.4 should be HE-9.2	Harold R Wolgamott / City of Gonzales	11/19/2018	Text revised; also applies to the 180/400-Foot plan
I-15			3.10.3		3-6		The paragraph about water quality should show it is from Community Health and Safety Element and Section reference is H-Water Quality	Harold R Wolgamott / City of Gonzales	11/19/2018	Text revised; also applies to the 180/400-Foot plan
I-16						v	The acronym SVRP is for the Salinas Valley Reclamation Project	Advisory Committee meeting minutes	11/15/2018	Text revised; also applies to the 180/400-Foot plan
I-17							The document should reference data sources and indicate that other data sources may be available.	Advisory Committee meeting minutes	11/15/2018	Text revised; also applies to the 180/400-Foot plan
I-18							Comments should reference the page or paragraph to facilitate review.	Advisory Committee meeting minutes	11/15/2018	Comments are referenced by multiple categories
I-19							Many general plans are being updated, how will this be handled?	Advisory Committee meeting minutes	11/15/2018	Agreed, the GSP was developed using the general plans as they existed during preparation. Future revisions to the GSP will incorporate changes to general plans.
I-20							How will recommendations from the 2017 study conducted by the Water Resources Agency be addressed?	Advisory Committee meeting minutes	11/15/2018	The GSP will be coordinated with regulations stemming from the study.
I-21			3.6				This section implies that the existing monitoring programs have already been decided (determined).	Advisory Committee meeting minutes	11/15/2018	The text will be revised to indicate that the descriptions of the monitoring programs are based on information provided by each agency conducting the monitoring; and that individual monitoring programs can and may
I-22							Additional comments will be provided on non-managed wetlands.	Advisory Committee meeting minutes	11/15/2018	Waiting on additional non-managed wetlands
I-23	ISP		3.2				The document should provide a definition of the term "adjudicated basin"	Advisory Committee meeting minutes	11/15/2018	Text revised
I-24	ISP		3.6				A description of the Seaside subbasin monitoring program should be	Advisory Committee meeting minutes	11/15/2018	Text revised
I-25							Clarify how the document addresses water quality	Advisory Committee meeting minutes	11/15/2018	The GSP is not intended to solve water quality problems. Actions or recommendations presented in the GSP must not make water quality worse; but they do not have to make it better.
I-26				3-1			Cities should be labelled in this figure	Advisory Committee meeting minutes	11/15/2018	Figure revised
I-27			3.4.2				Some industrial groundwater use is grouped with agricultural water use; some processing plants use potable water.	Advisory Committee meeting minutes	11/15/2018	Data are not available from MCWRA on the quantity of industrial water used.
I-28							The Davis Road discharge ponds should be considered as a water resource.	Advisory Committee meeting minutes	11/15/2018	Text will be revised to mention that these ponds may be a water source in the future.

Comment Number	Document	Chapter	Section	Figure	Table	Page	Comment	Commenter	Date	Response
I-29			3.8.2				The description of the Agricultural Order should note that negotiations are underway and that the agreement may be substantially revised.	Advisory Committee meeting minutes	11/15/2018	Written comments requested.
I-30			3.4.2				Irrigation water provided by CSIP should not be included in this section	Advisory Committee meeting minutes	11/15/2018	No action
I-31			3.8.2				Expand discussion of the Agricultural Order, update list of acronyms	Norm Groot / Monterey County Farm Bure	11/16/2018	Text revised
I-32			3.6				The document should mention nitrates and discuss how the GSA will address elevated nitrate concentrations; either by itself or in conjunction with the RWQCB. Include a map showing nitrate concentrations in			

Number	Doc.	Sect.	Page	Fig.	Commenter	Comment	DW response	Status
4-1	ISP	4.1				Have you done evaluation of the age of deep ground water in various locations?	No, but we will be including all data from the USGS GAMA program	Comment Noted
4-2	ISP				Public	How will the individual GSPs address principal aquifers? Are there adequate data to assess the deep zone? There needs to be adequate information in the individual GSPs about principal aquifer zones.	Principal aquifers are defined for individual GSPs. Limited data are available for the deep aquifer. The aquifer systems vary throughout the valley.	Comment Noted
4-3	ISP	4.4.4			Adam Secondo / SVBGSA Board	Map shows recharge through the river. MCWRA states that there is little recharge below Quail Creek. Need to reinforce that the map shows potential recharge.	There is a requirement to include the recharge map. These maps are not intended to necessarily show where recharge gets to deep aquifers. We will strengthen the statement that in the Northern part of the Valley, not much recharge will get to the important aquifers.	Additional Text Added
4-4	ISP				Tom Virsik	Details need to be in the individual GSPs, not in the ISP.	Good point, the ISP could be updated with additional detail after the individual GSPs are developed.	Comment Noted
4-5	ISP	4.2.2			Public	Are geological formations defined based on permeability?	We identify formations whether they are permeable or not. A later section about principal aquifers they talk about which part of the geology moves the water.	Comment Noted
4-6	ISP	4.4.3.2	7		Nancy Isakson (Public)	Some of the citations to Durbin (1978) incorrectly reflect "	We likely confused two citations: Durbin (1978) and Durham (1974)	Citations now differentiate between Durham (1974) and Durbin (1978)
4-7	ISP				Public	Add references at the end of each chapter.	We will add a reference list at the end of each chapter. Standard format in the groundwater business is to cite by author's last name and date instead of footnotes.	Reference list is now attached.
4-8	ISP				Public	Include a symbol for references.		References are cited in line without symbols
4-9	ISP	4.4	17		Vera Nelson / EKI for MCWD	2nd paragraph - clay layers also present in Monterey, not just 180/400; they aren't only in the 180.400		Monterey Subbasin added to text
4-10	ISP	4.4.1			Steve McIntyre /	This was a good section		Comment Noted
4-11	ISP				Tamara Voss / MCWRA	Mention that clay layer is missing, pinched out, not continuous in 180/400		Text added to both the ISP and GSP
4-12	ISP	4.4.2			Tom Virsik	Mention difference between surface water and groundwater		Comment Noted
4-13	ISP				Public	Does the report address the impact of natural gas and oil in the southern aquifers?	Bottom of aquifer defined by water quality. Deeper units with gas and oil are not part of the aquifer	Question answered in meeting
4-14	ISP			4-7		Figure 4-7 very impressive		Comment Noted
4-15	ISP				Public	Difficult to zoom in on Figure 4-7; visually difficult. Is there a way to make them available?		We will make these available on line.
4-16	ISP	4.4.2			Public / Lawrence	Can we get information on how this matches up with what is going on in Paso Robles?	This will be addressed in the GSP for the Upper Valley Subbasin	Question answered in meeting
4-17	ISP	4.4.2			Public	What about the rest of the valley?	The report must focus on the DWR-defined basin	Question answered in meeting
4-18	ISP	4.4.2			Nancy Isakson (Public)	What one basin does impacts the other. Need to see what Paso Robles is doing; what is the potential for influencing / impacting	We don't need a formal agreement with Paso Robles. Need to state that their plan won't impact us and that we won't impact them.	Question answered in meeting
4-19	ISP	4.4.3			Janet Brennan/LandWatch	What hydrologic model was used to model CalAm project and impact from pumping slant wells	Separate model just for the project.	Question answered in meeting
4-20	ISP	4.4.3			Nancy Isaccson (Public)	The conclusions of the CalAm model may be different from what is/was stated in other meetings.		Comment Noted

Number	Doc.	Sect.	Page	Fig.	Commenter	Comment	DW response	Status
4-21	ISP			4-7	Heather Lukacs / Community Water	Why was this particular cross-section selected, why weren't there perpendicular cross-sections depicted?	We will add more cross-sections to the ISP	One additional Cross-Section is included
4-22	ISP				Heather Lukacs / Community Water	How similar is the geology in the other direction throughout the valley		See other cros sections
4-23	ISP	4.4.3.1			Steve McIntyre /	Explain storativity		Text added to both the ISP and GSP
4-24	ISP	4.4.3.2			Public	Need a better title than "conveyance properties"	Mr. Willams agreed. We will add clearer descriptions for the lay person. Mr. Williams asked Ms. Voss to provide feedback on this section due to limited data for long term aquifers Valley wide.	Transmission has replaced conveyance in both the ISP and GSP
4-25	ISP	4.4.4			Adam Secondo / SVBGSA Board	GDEs: Where did it come from, what is the definition, what will it be used for?	The phrase is in the regulations and references wetlands, springs, etc. We only identify POTENTIAL GDEs. Whether it is a true GDE reuqires more study. These are the areas that have plants that indicate it might be a GDE. They must be identified in a way the DWR requires, and the DWR has approved the Nature Conservancy approach. The graphic will be updated to see all along the Salinas River. He proposes they focus on the dependent systems that are important to the	The graphic in the ISP covers the entire Salinas river
4-26	ISP	4.4.4			Steve McIntyre / SVBGSA Board	Map does not accurately locations of GDEs		These are the potential GDEs identified by TNC. Others can be added if stakeholders provide their locations.
4-27	ISP	4.4.4			Les Girard	Need to be careful about affecting personal properties		Comment Noted
4-28	ISP	4.4.4			Public	Need to consider public history of GDE areas. Also need to consider animals, not just plants.		Animals are important when deciding which GDEs to protect. The approach for identifying GDEs is set by
4-29	ISP	4.4.4			Heather Lukacs / Community Water Center	A lot of work has been done on beneficial uses and users of groundwater according to SGMA; environmental is one of them. Need to consider them when setting sustainability indicators		Comment Noted
4-30	ISP	4.4.4		4-10	Public / Eenvironmental Justice	Are the wells on the map? Maps that can be overlayed are desired.	This is a question for the Board and staff. Mr. Petersen w	Mr. Petersen will look into this
4-31	ISP	4.4.4			Nancy Isakson (Public)	Mention water rights, beneficial use should also be considered	Mr. Petersen will coordinate a presentation on the topic of dependent ecosystems. Mr. Williams stated that the GSP does not quantify, define or change water rights.	Question answered in meeting
4-32	ISP	4.4.4			Public	Need to mention that there are multiple types of wells (Abandoned, sewer injection, un-used, active). Need to differentiate these on maps.		We will address this in future chapters when we talk about wells
4-33	ISP	4.5			Adam Secondo /	What level of detail will be used on maps?		The level of detail is the level availalble from source
4-34	ISP	4.7			Steve McIntyre / SVBGSA Board	Piper plots are great, but would be better on a map basis. Would be useful to look at spatial changes in water levels. Na/Cl ratios; also nitrates	Mr. Williams will consider whether those comments belong here or in the next Chapter.	Water Quality maps are included in Chapter 5

Number	Doc.	Sect.	Page	Fig.	Commenter	Comment	DW response	Status
4-35	ISP	4.7			Public	Water for ag use, human consumption, and animals. What are the differences in levels for different types of beneficial uses?	The Plan will not solve water quality but they will not make it worse. They want to look at constituents that may have an impact on drinking water or ag irrigation that has been identified at those levels that could be harmful, e.g. nitrate infilitration for drinking water. So they will say that nitrates are a concern and they will not do anything to actively move nitrate concentrations that would cause harm for another well. Projects would have	Question answered in meeting
4-36	ISP	4.7			Janet Brennan/LandWatch	What about disadvantaged communities? Recent resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors regarding water as a human right.	Mr. Girard stated it is a high level water policy declaration, but does not impose any additional water duties or responsibilities. The primary responsibility for water quality resides with the Regional and State Board.	Question answered in meeting
4-37	ISP	4.7			Heather Lukacs / Community Water Center	Is there consideration for "drinking water management zones" in areas with public water supply systems, private domestic wells, or mutual water systems.	There should be a future discussion on whether to include the management zones, but the focus is on what is required to get the report done in a timely manner.	Question answered in meeting
4-38	ISP	4.7			Janet Brennan/LandWatch	It would be helpful to mention that water quality will be addressed in future planning		Comment Noted
4-39	ISP	4.8			Adam Secondo / SVBGSA Board	People are expressing differences between aquitards in their wells and what is on the map.	Need to focus on more data gaps	To be done
4-40	180/400	4.3.2			Adam Secondo / SVBGSA Board	Some stakeholders are indicating that there are different water qualities in the deep aquifer	We will check into this.	No public data exist on this that we can put into this report. However, this statement is now included.
4-41	180/400	4.5			Tom Virsik	The chapters present the system as it exists today, which is not necessarily the natural system. Checklist approach vs what is actually needed for sustainability.		There is no intention to attempt to re-create the natural groundwater system.
4-42	180/400	4.4.1			Vera Nelson / EKI for MCWD	Need to be clear about what aquifers are called principal aquifers, particularly the deep aquifer. Also the 180/400. Need to specifically state which ones are principal aquifers.		The deep aquifers are currently identified as principal aquifers. Text has been added to state that the deep aquifers exist in the Monterey subbasin. The extnet of the deep aquifer is now identified as a specific data gap
4-43	180/400	4.4.1			Vera Nelson / EKI for MCWD	Deep aquifers not shown in cross-sections; need to identify data gaps		Deep aquifers are now included in data gaps
4-44	180/400	4.4.2			Vera Nelson / EKI for	Include tables summarizing K and T for each zone		To be done
4-45	ISP	4.2.2	8		Chevron	Please clarify what is meant by the Paso Robles Formation being the deepest unit in the Basin. The Paso Robles is is not the deepest aquifer in the entire stratagraphic column. Do you mean the that Paso Robles formation is the deepest strata that contains “fresh water”?		Tex has been added to clarify that the Paso Robles is the deepest uint containing fresh water
4-46	ISP	4.2.2	8		Chevron	Please clarify, is the top of the Pancho Rico being recommended as bottom of the Basin in the Upper Valley Sub Basin? We note that water quality at the base of the Paso Robles may not meet fresh water standards in some areas.	The bottom of the basin is based on groundwater quality or well yeild as determined by Durbin (1978). There is no assertion that the Pancho Rido Formation is the bottom of the basin.	Question answered
4-47	ISP	4.3.1	12		Chevron	delete “aka”		Done

Number	Doc.	Sect.	Page	Fig.	Commenter	Comment	DW response	Status
4-48	ISP	4.3.1	13		Chevron	It is unclear how USGS (Durbin et al., 1978) was extrapolated South to County Line. Although data is spotty, to define the “Bottom of Basin” in the large regional southern portion of Upper Valley Subbasin, DWR Well Completion data could help by understanding the depth of existing water wells. How was the extrapolation performed, and how/why does this differ from USGS	Currently there is no extrapolation. Areas where the USGS data were missing are labeled as "no data".	Question answered
4-49	ISP	4.3.1	13		Chevron	On November 21, 2018 an “Aquifer Exemption” for the San Ardo oil field (Aurignac and Lombardi aquifers) was approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The aquifer exemption had previously been approved by both the California Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR), and the California State Water Board (SWB). The San Ardo oil field aquifer exemption is part of the public record, and that data may be helpful. At the October 18, 2018 Advisory Committee Meeting, Slide #45 of the packet showed a map of the Upper Valley Subbasin clearly marked with Bottom of Basin being 200 feet. Questions includ: • What level of salinity or well yield is considered unviable? (e.g., more than 1,000 micro-siemens?); • What criteria will be used in the areas of "no data"? • What is the plan for filling in the data gaps? • Is there a budget for collecting data in areas of “no data”? • What is the plan to determine whether wells in the "no data" zones are in-scope for regulation? • Will wells completed beneath the base of the basin		To be done
4-50	ISP	4.3.2		4-5	Chevron	Data for this area exists (the USGS map extends further to the south). Why has it not been included?		To be done
4-51	ISP	4.3.2		4-5 4-6	Chevron	We note that Figure 4-5 shows no data in and surrounding the San Ardo oil field, but Figure 4-6 shows 0-300 contour in the San Ardo area. Why do the two figures show different regions of “no data”?		To be done
4-52	ISP	4.4.3.3			Chevron	Chevron formally request access to the model as soon as possible. At a minimum a map clearly showing the aquifer boundaries being used in the model should be released now. Table 4-1 does NOT show the horizontal and vertical conductivity. • Are the boundaries aligned with what's being described in Chapter 4? • What are the aquifer properties being used in the		Text has beed edited regarding Table 4-1. We will address the aquifer properties in the model when the model becomes available.
4-53	ISP	4.8			Chevron	Projects timelines, and proposed budget for collecting missing data should be released as soon as possible.	This information is part of the Implementation Chapter that will be released later	Question answered in meeting

Number	Doc.	Sect.	Page	Fig.	Commenter	Comment	DW response	Status
4-54	ISP	4.4.5			Chevron	The "constructed wetlands" in the San Ardo oil field that are associated with the RO Plant are temporary and will be removed when the project is terminated. It should be noted that these wetlands don't create any demand on the watershed. • Please clarify how Potential Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems will impact ground water extraction near these areas?	The text states that the Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems identified in this section are only Potential GDEs. There is no statement that these Potential GDEs are supported by regional groundwater. It is up to the Board of Directors if they want to develop Sustainable Management Criteria that protect these GDEs.	Question answered
4-55	ISP				Norm Groot	Will chapters be updated with more detail at some point?	Details such as water budgets will be added after the GSPs are done because they are working on and incorporating those details.	Question answered
4-56	ISP				Public	What is the deadline for public comments?	We will continue to take comments throughout the process, but they may not be included in the interim chapters after the deadline for written reports passes. However, the entire Plan would be released for a 90 day public comment period after all of the draft Chapters	Question answered
4-57	GSP				Emily Gardner	Why was the response to her comment on section 3.4.2 regarding the location of the irrigated cease of water, "no action"?	This may have been a mistake. We should revisit this.	To be done
4-58	ISP				Dallas Tubbs	Chapter 4 Should give a clearer definition of the Basin boundary and basin bottom or to include some absolutes.	More definitive information would come from the model. They have adopted Durbin's assessment of where the transition from good aquifers to lower quality aquifers is. It would not change how the Basin is managed. He does not believe Durbin's approach includes absolutes, but he will confirm that.	To be done
4-59	ISP				Dallas Tubbs	Is a plan to collect data for areas where there currently are none	Chapter 8 will include monitoring plans and will state there are holes in the data that need to be fixed.	
4-60	ISP				Dallas Tubbs	EPA has approved the aquifer exemption for the San Ardo oil field.		Comment Noted
4-61	ISP				Nancy Isakson	When the input/output data from the SVIHM be available, and will everybody have access to the information.	Mr. Franklin stated that Monterey County is working hard with the USGS to ensure that the model represents the Valley. USGS' internal review could take up to a year. What can be made available is the configuration files, which is the data built into the model.	Question answered
4-62	ISP				Dallas Tubbs	Table 4-1 does not coincide with the text		See comment 4-52
4-63	ISP				Emily Gardner	There is a data gap on recharge. It is unclear as to what is being defined as a data gap		Comment Noted
4-64	ISP				Tom Virsik	It may be good to look at the model trajectory date and whether it will meet the regulation standards and	We will do this when the model becomes available	Question answered
4-65	ISP				Dallas Tubbs	Chapter 4 should remain in draft form.	All chapters will remain in draft form until the GSP is	Question answered

Number	Document	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	DW response	Status
5-1	180/400					2/7/19	Director Secondo	Would like to see in full each Hydrographs...all 2/7/19 comments saved as [Comments-Feb 7 2019 Planning Committee]	Yes, they will be added	Individual groundwater level hydrographs have been added after the hydrograph maps.
5-2	ISP					2/7/19	Chair McIntyre	Requested between the GSP and ISP be highlighted to allow to see the difference btw them both for the evaulation purpose.	Yes, good idea to highlight areas that are unique between both	This will be implemented in future chaptes as possible.
5-3	180/400				5-2	2/7/19	Director Granillo	The contour data do not extend all the way to the mountain ranges-there should be a note explaning the gaps, where/why exist.		An explanation has been added.
5-4	180/400				5-10	2/7/19	Director Granillo	It is difficult to see changes over time in the hydrorgraphs for the 180/400 aquifers.	Copies of the hydrographs will be added immediately following the maps.	Individual groundwater level hydrographs have been added after the hydrograph maps.
5-5	180/400					2/7/19	Public Comment/Mr Horacio with San Gerardo Community	How is water quality going to be monitored?	This will be detailed in the monitoring chapter.	Question answered
5-6	180/400					2/7/19	Public Comment/Mr Horacio with San Gerardo Community	When is the assessment going to start?	D Williams replied that's for the implementation once the plans are approved the 180/400 should be approved by December of this year	Question answered
5-7	180/400				5-26	2/7/19	Public Comment/Heather Lukas with Community Water Center	Why do the nitrates concentrations end in 2007?	D Williams indicated it was based on existing maps which were a series of maps that ended in 2007	Question answered
5-8	180/400					2/7/19	Public Comment/Heather Lukas with Community Water Center	Asked if the County data can be added as its been updated through fall of 2017. The data missing is the state data & county from private domestic wells. Does GSA consider private wells in terms of monioring water quality?	Les Girard replied only on new wells as part of the new process	These data will be identified in the monitoring chapter as a source for filling data gaps.
5-9	180/400					2/7/19	Public Comment/Patrick (Marina Coast Water)	How wil DWR handle the existing conditions to change the plans of the permiters on the overdraft?	D Williams said it will not change the Plan due to the existing conditions. The conditions are inherit in the Plans are conditions that can change in the future	Question answered
5-10	180/400					2/7/19	Public Comment/Tom Virsik	What does SMC stand for?	It stands for Sustainable Management Criteria	Question answered
5-11	180/400					2/7/19	Public Comment/Tom Virsik	Indicated he wrote a letter sent Feb 6, 2019 via email with details comments on the ISPs. Also commented on the lack of focus of fish flows, reservoir's and environmental aspects	D. Williams that these comments will be addressed in the SMC and fish flows will be addressed and other river rights not in detail only on requirement basis	The acronym is defined in its first usage.
5-12	180/400					2/7/19	Public Comment/Bill Lipe	Inquired about level of seawater intrusion	D Williams clarified that the current esitmate is approximately 14,000 acre-feet per year.	Question answered
5-13	180/400					2/7/19	Public Comment/Bill Lipe	Asked if the remainder is throughout the valley outside the 180/400?	D Williams advised there is a table in the ISP that lists the assumed overdrafts by subbasins based on groundwater levels. (The table refered to by D. Williams is Tablve 5-2 of the ISP)	Question answered
5-14	180/400	5.1.1				2/7/19	Chair McIntyre	Commented on the charts need little more explanation of what the contours mean	D. Williams replied it's a great suggestion to make this more readable	More explanation has been added in the text regarding the meaning of the contours and the contour interval
5-15	180/400	5.1.1				2/7/19	Director Secondo	Added that it could be less scientific	D Williams agreed this needs to be written less scientific and understandable	Not addressed in this draft. This will be addressed in the final document.
5-16	180/400	5.1.2		17		2/7/19	Chair McIntyre	Addressed a typo on page 17: the 2007 should be 20017	D. Williams advised that it will be corrected if wrong	Corrected
5-17	180/400	5.1.3				2/7/19	Chair McIntyre	Asked if groundwater levels were recovered in 1983 & why they can't be recovered today?	D. Williams said there is no indication that water levels can be recovered to 1983 levels	Question answered

Number	Document	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	DW response	Status
5-18	180/400	5.1.3				2/7/19	Director Brennan	Added it would be helpful to collaborate on the findings	D. Williams agreed	Question answered
5-19	180/400	5.1.4			5-13	2/7/19	Heather Lukacs	Asked what is represented on figure 5-13	D. Williams indicated these are graphs that are developed by the Water Resource Agency. Graphs that are to represent an average water level in a subbasin	Question answered
5-20	180/400	5.4				2/7/19	Heather Lukacs	What is represented on figure 5-10	D. Williams replied it's the cumulative total of water that has been lost from storage over time since the early 1940's	Question answered
5-21	180/400	5.6				2/7/19	Heather Lukacs	Regional Water Boards required ag water collection on farm domestic wells data is an additional source of groundwater quality data	D Williams replied that the current plan is to monitor groundwater quality it will be collected through the ILRP and Division of Drinking Water	These data will be identified in the monitoring chapter as a source for filling data gaps.
5-22	180/400	5.6				2/7/19	Mr. Horacio	Asked how much of the water quality are from the agency? Or, if the agency is only checking water levels and not the quality of the water	D. Williams indicated the water agency data in this chapter is water levels that will be used to develop a monitoring plan	Question answered
5-23	180/400	5.6.3				2/7/19	Director Brennan	How do you differ from seawater and chloride intrusion?	D. Williams pointed out they are related. It is a secondary MCL that needs to meet regulations with the GSA	Question answered
5-24	ISP	5.1				2/7/19	Chair McIntyre	Comment operation of reservoir water project	D. Williams indicated we need to focus on groundwater; however, we will look into how reservoir operations fit in the groundwater management discussion	Question answered
5-25	180/400	5.7				2/7/19	Tom Virsik	May be better to avoid the term 'underflow' due to legal implications	D. Williams advised he may have used the wrong term and meant to say 'subterranean stream' and will correct	Underflow has been replaced with suberranean stream.