

COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM October 30, 2020 to January 5, 2021

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
1						11/6/20	Bob Jaques	Re: Action Minutes for Subbasin Committee Meeting: I find the action minutes for the meetings not to be satisfactory in the sense that there is so little information provided about what the discussions were at the meeting.	<p><b>Emily and staff:</b> Action minutes are a particular type of minutes which primarily record meeting motions and votes. Comments from Committee members are recorded in the Comment table and the meetings are also recorded.</p> <p><b>Chair Hardgrave:</b> We have comments captured in the comment table and we have the technical memorandum that provides additional information about motions. My feeling is that we have the comments captured and the information available to support the minutes if needed.</p>	
2	Monterey					11/6/2020	Sarah Hardgrave	Re: Draft Chapters: I have a question about the two management areas, and coordination with the two GSAs. First question is around the federal lands, and the importance of GSA coverage, combined with statement that SGMA doesn't apply to federal lands. Could you say more about this issue?	<p><b>Emily Gardner:</b> It's a grey area we don't yet have clarity on. SGMA doesn't apply to fed lands. However, when a GSP is analyzed, they look at if the whole subbasin is covered. We're trying to find the best approach to this grey area.</p> <p><b>DW:</b> We have received different feedback from different members at DWR. What is more accurate is, we can't tell people on federal lands what they can and cannot do with their water. We do need to cover all the land, including federal land, with the GSP. We just can't tell them what to do. The safest approach is to cover all the land with a GSA. That is what is being done everywhere else.</p>	
3	Monterey					11/6/2020	Sarah Hardgrave	In the areas in the middle, BLM land, they probably don't have much GW extraction. I'm interested in the federal lands in the north. Like Presidio Monterey. Will those lands be transferred to local agencies?	<p><b>Patrick Breen:</b> My understanding is that everything has been transferred that will be transferred, and those areas that you are asking about will not be transferred and will remain federal.</p>	
4	Monterey					11/6/2020	Sarah Hardgrave	Are those federal areas served by Marina Coast?	<p><b>Patrick Breen:</b> Yes, under a contract with the Army. The water use will be captured within MCWD's numbers.</p>	
5	Monterey					11/6/2020	Sarah Hardgrave	It might be worth considering inviting the presidio as a stakeholder.	<p>Comment received</p>	
6	Monterey					11/6/2020	Sarah Hardgrave	I have a question about the water charges framework for the Corral de Tierra area, if that will apply to the 300 domestic wells you've identified. It may be a future agenda item.	<p><b>DW:</b> It's something we've talked about internally, and what are our legal options to do that. That's a great future discussion we will have.</p> <p><b>Abby Ostovar:</b> You'll see in the project and management actions, it is part of pumping controls, and will be a conversation after the allocations workshop. It's very much on our mind, but not something we've worked on and are prepared to talk about today.</p>	
7	Monterey					11/6/2020	Sarah Hardgrave	There was a difference in the discussion about the deep aquifer. The staff report left out a few statements about pumping from the deep aquifer. I assume this discussion would be included in another spot in the document.	<p><b>Abby Ostovar:</b> It's something we'll work with MCWD on. It's a difference of where we talk about it. Some chapters include it in the principal aquifer discussion, but we might have moved it to the water budget chapter.</p>	

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
8	Monterey					11/6/2020	Sarah Hardgrave	Comment about the piper diagrams that were included in one version and not in another. For the lay person who may not understand piper diagrams, perhaps include them in an appendix. That way the information is available for the technical experts, but it's not in the draft and weighing down the draft chapter for the lay person. If they are included, more explanation of what they are depicting. This comment goes for the cross section diagrams as well.	Comment received	
9	Monterey					11/6/2020	Beverly Bean	Re: ISW Input: We have other people who have extensive knowledge, Mike Weaver has extensive knowledge.	<b>Abby Ostovar:</b> Local knowledge would be great. <b>Sarah Hardgrave:</b> I agree	
10	Monterey					11/6/2020	Sarah Hardgrave	You may want to consider talking with representatives from CalAm. They have some facilities near Toro Creek, but I don't know the depth of their wells in those locations.	Abby Ostovar: I think CalAm's wells are much deeper.	
11	Monterey					11/6/2020	Beverly Bean	Re: Domestic Wells: As a former active person in our local domestic water system, the Monterey County Health Dept. closely monitors us. They have considerable information about the small water systems. The reports we have to complete every year were very complete. Have you considered them as a source?	<b>Abby Ostovar:</b> We have reached out to them, we have not heard back. <b>Emily Gardner:</b> We took this approach because getting this information from the Health Dept. was a complex process. They have a lot of the information, but only some files have all the information we need like well logs. It's a variable data source, much of it is in PDF form, and we have to open each file and read it individually. We've spoken with the Health Dept, and we've taken this approach first before we go down that route.. We can do that, if that's the direction you prefer. <b>Abby Ostovar:</b> We have a number of well logs and that's how we've located which aquifer these wells are in.	
12	Monterey					11/6/2020	Tamara Voss	We've been working together to get you data. We have a bit of a well log library. If you had APNs, we could make another go at it. Either APN or quarter section. Maybe there's something we can batch give you. I can't guarantee if it could easily be matched to the map. Isn't there someone on the SWIG? Have you reached out to Roger?	<b>Emily Gardner:</b> Roger and Sheryl Sandoval have both reached out back to us, they're willing collaborate. We have to be focused on our ask, and we have to be prepared to go through the documents and figure out how to match them to the dots on our map.	
13	Monterey					11/6/2020	Beverly Bean	I just want to reiterate the health department does inspect each new well. You'll have current information. These older wells, pre-1995, many are not functional. The health department does inspect when each new well comes online. They do have this information, and it's current. I know it's a lot of work, but it's current.	<b>Abby Ostovar:</b> They continue to inspect the wells? <b>Emily Gardner:</b> You mean taking water quality samples? ( <b>Bev:</b> Yes) <b>Abby Ostovar:</b> Do they take water level information? ( <b>Emily:</b> No) ( <b>Bev:</b> They know how deep they are, and the water level from when it was drilled.)	
14	Monterey					11/6/2020	Janet Brennan	It looks like there's no problem in Corral de Terra based on your data? Am I reading this correctly? Also, you use many acronyms in your slide. It would be helpful for you to be more descriptive in your presentations.	<b>Abby Ostovar:</b> This is the best we've been able to do with the data we've got. Have you heard of a lot of wells going dry that aren't reflective of what is here?	

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
15	Monterey					11/6/2020	Sarah Hardgrave	You're asking, what year would be a good year to set the baseline to measure GW elevations for SMC?	<p><b>Abby Ostovar:</b> Yes, we're looking at what year were the impacts on domestic wells minimal?</p> <p><b>DW:</b> Of the wells we know about, there are 50 on this chart. In 2015 and 2017, we think these wells were operable. We would have to have much lower water levels to have impacts in those wells. Is 2015 or 2017 a safe place to set our water levels? We're looking for feedback from this group that 2015 or 2017 are safe enough? Or do you think there were more wells we don't have data to really say?</p>	
16	Monterey					11/6/2020	Sarah Hardgrave	I'm not sure if Cal Water Service has any comments since they have such a large base of customers, and they have the most familiarity with their well operations during these years. I don't feel able to answer the question about how many wells were impacted. My impression from your chart was that the water level really goes up and down. I would feel more comfortable with a year that has a more average rainfall or a dry year as opposed to a wetter year.	<p><b>Abby Ostovar:</b> I think 2017 is often considered an average year in the valley?</p> <p><b>DW:</b> It was a little wet, and 2015 being extremely dry.</p>	
17	Monterey					11/6/2020	Janet Brennan	The Corral de Tierra is in a B8 Zone which limits pumping. These data seem to contradict the B8 designation. Am I reading this incorrectly?	<p><b>Beverly Bean:</b> The B8 only applies to certain parts of Corral de Tierra and it doesn't restrict pumping. I don't think you legally can restrict pumping. It simply prevents subdivision of legal lots because that is indirectly a way to reduce pumping.</p> <p><b>Sarah:</b> Yes, B8 zoning is a land use zoning, not necessarily an effort to limit pumping with existing users.</p> <p><b>Beverly:</b> Specifically the B8 area, is where the GeoSyntec found the most impact from wells.</p>	
18	Monterey					11/6/2020	Beverly Bean	These well levels relate directly to the drought years. I agree with Sarah. The driest years are the ones you should be measuring from. Also, when I'm talking about wells, I'm talking about small domestic wells and small mutual water systems, when these drought years come and their well goes dry, they just drill another deeper well.	<p><b>Abby Ostovar:</b> This doesn't capture if one well went dry, and they drilled another. We'd have both records. These are the domestic wells.</p>	
19	Monterey					11/6/2020	Sarah Hardgrave	This is a sustainability criteria that is based on the domestic wells. This captures a portion of the domestic wells constructed since 1995, the more recent wells drilled. 2015 is a representative drought year. It may be the best we are going to get. Unless we can do a survey of domestic well owners that would be a work effort in conjunction with Department of Health. We can consider that in the future, but perhaps not now for setting this baseline.	<p><b>Abby Ostovar:</b> We can update this in the future.</p> <p><b>Abby Ostovar:</b> So I understand the MT recommendation is 2015.</p>	

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
20	Monterey					11/6/2020	Bob Jaques	Re: Wallace Group Memo. It says the purpose was to estimate water extractions, and to estimate available recycled water. It seems like they didn't really complete the task. At the end they talk about information gaps that prevented them from getting handles on those numbers. I have a few ideas. Looking at page 6 and 7, they talk about Cal Utility Service. It seems the Regional Water Board would have waste discharge reports because they all have to be permitted. I've been able to get this information. I would encourage looking at that. Second, on page 7, they have a table of estimated WW flows, the figure for residential indoor domestic use looks awfully high to me. The water reuse on that same page, Las Palmas, there may be additional waste water that could be used from that plant elsewhere in Corral de Tierra.	<b>Abby Ostovar:</b> You're right, the WW is high and the Projects document has the updated number.	
21	Monterey					11/6/2020	Sarah Hardgrave	Re: Wallace Group Memo: Las Palmas is within the County service area and they are in the process of updating some of the reports. I think the county will have more information available for the WW capacity for that system in the next few months because of a development proposed in that area and they are reporting to the Regional Board. I can ask county staff to provide that.	Comment received	
22	Monterey					11/6/2020	Janet Brennan	Re: Projects and Management Actions: In terms of use of GW from the Upper Corral Canyon, who would do that? I don't understand who would be doing that? Are we talking about the public water agencies?	<b>Abby Ostovar:</b> The GSA could take actions, we have to figure out who would finance them. I don't know, since it's outside the subbasin boundaries. We could always partner with somebody. <b>Les:</b> The GSA has independent authority to do a variety of things. There are other agencies which have authority. We could form more JPAs, and there are many ways to partner with other entities that have authority.	
23	Monterey					11/6/2020	Beverly Bean	Re: Projects and Management Actions: Encouraging domestic conservation. In my experience, the people who have small systems or their own wells are not amenable to conservation. During the drought, we observed in our group that we were the only ones that reduced our water use. No one else did. Conservation has been successful on the peninsula because they can reduce your water pressure way down. How can we enforce conservation?	<b>Les:</b> In my opinion, the GSA can regulate extractions of de minimis users, but we can't make them report their extractions. MCWRA can regulate extractions, they have never done so, but they have that authority. Monterey County can also regulate extraction under certain circumstances.	
24	Monterey					11/6/2020	Les Girard	The GeoSyntec report was commissioned by Monterey County Resource Management Agency, not MCWRA. And the B8 Zone was adopted from that which is a limitation on development.	<b>Beverly Bean:</b> The B8 overlay was in effect since 1992, the GeoSyntec report supported it and allowed it to continue.	
25	Monterey					11/6/2020	James Sang	I'm really interested in water recharge. I like the use of recycled water instead of GW. It would be dependent on what the residents feel about it. I think it's a good source of water. The use of GW from upper areas, requires a lot of money to build pumps and piping and tanks. Re domestic conservation, I agree with Beverly that people are not willing to do it. I don't like pumping limitations. I like the idea of recharge, but I would like to know exactly where the water is coming from that people are using. If it's coming from wells, we should do collection and recharge around that well.	Comment received	

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
26	Monterey					11/6/2020	Sarah Hardgrave	This exercise and this presentation really reinforced the challenge of this particular area, in terms of options for recharge in particular. I was concerned about seeing more details on the limitations and the physical geology of the area, being limiting factors. The decentralized recharge areas and basins, I think there are opportunities for that, but it will be a drop in the bucket. It wouldn't provide as much as benefit, would not have a significant effect in terms of GW levels. This is a rural residential area, so there isn't infrastructure in place for bioswales and that intentional, "Slow it, Sink it, Spread it concept". It also didn't seem like it would result in a lot of recharge to the aquifers. The recharge from runoff is pretty minimal. I think it would be worth it to look at extensive educational program with homeowners. This area is not part of the county's municipal stormwater program. There is extensive materials and information out there with the county RMA, for collaborative efforts in this area, but I'm not fully convinced it would have big bang for the buck.	Comment received	
27	Monterey					11/6/2020	Beverly Bean	I support what you're saying about recharge. Most of the small users' wells are already at 300-400 feet. Recharge would not be very successful at that depth. The golf course just drilled a new well at 800 feet deep. My strong feeling is enforcing pumping limitations is the only way forward. Legally, we can do it, how do you implement it? I would like to see more details on the last item (pumping limits).	Comment Received	
28	Monterey					11/6/2020	Sarah Hardgrave	I think at this point in time, I would recommend not taking anything off the table entirely. None of these is a silver bullet. There are a lot of challenges. I would like to see how we can incentivize conservation. Maybe now with the GSA, there is more authority to enforce it and maybe we can approach it differently.	Comment Received	
29	Monterey					11/06/2020 Email	Bob Jaques	Re: Project Ideas: Programs and Actions should include: "Coordinate with Seaside Basin Watermaster to mitigate lowering of groundwater levels in the Laguna Seca Subarea"	Comment Received	
30	Monterey					11/06/2020 Email	Bob Jaques	Re: Project Ideas: To meet SMC measurable objectives, should include addressing overdraft in the Seaside Basin Laguna Seca Subarea.	Comment Received	