

GSP Comments 11-20-18

<u>Comment Number</u>	<u>Document</u>	<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Figure</u>	<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Commenter</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Response</u>
P-1	180/400					1	Clarify that the 180/400 subbasin is a subbasin.	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Page 1 of the PDF and Word document both refer to the 180/400-Foot Aquifer <u>Subbasin</u> .
P-2							Rename the Valley Wide GSP to the Integrated Sustainability Plan (ISP) .	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Text will be revised
P-3							Clarify what a subbasin is and what a GSA is.	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Additional explanation added to text.
P-4			Section 1.2				Change description of Eastside boundary to "... between this subbasin and the 180/400..."	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Text revised
P-5			Section 1.2				Correct text to state that the Forebay Subbasin starts at Gonzales	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Acknowledged, text revised
P-6					Table 3-1		Explain where the Table 3-1 data come from. Describe Idle Cropland (from LandIQ)	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Text revised; figure and table will be updated
P-7					Table 3-1		Can we discriminate permeant crops from other crops on Table 3-1. Maybe stop differentiating between vineyards and other crops.	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Text revised; figure and table will be updated
P-8				3-1	Table 3-1		Change the land use to match model land use. Both figure and Table 3-1	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Text and table will be revised to be consistent.
P-9			3.4.1				Acknowledge the recycled water used in Las Palmas	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Text revised
P-10	180/400					10	the last paragraph Figure number is wrong	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Should refer to Figure 2-1; text revised
P-11	180/400					13	Names of Jurisdictions still don't match between map and text	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Text and figures will be checked for consistency
P-12	180/400					18	When talking about water sources, refer to the SVWP, not just CSIP	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Added description of SVWP
P-13	180/400		3.5				When we talk about the number of existing wells, state that this is from DWR. State that there are other data sources.	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Text revised
P-14	180/400		3.6.1.1				Eliminate the "As of 2018".	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Text revised
P-15	180/400			3-4			Remove Cal-Am from the figure	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Text revised, figure will be updated.
P-16	180/400			3-4			Add Pajaro Sunny Mesa to the figure	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	The Pajaro Sunny Mesa CSD will be added to Figure 3-4.
P-17	180/400						Always identify data sources throughout the document	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Text has been revised to more clearly attribute data sources.
P-18	180/400		3.7.1				Find citation for Monterey GMP	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Comment refers to the Monterey Groundwater Management Plan. Citation added.
P-19	180/400		3.7.3.2				This section should reference MCWD, not City of Marina	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Text revised
P-20	180/400						Where does MCWD's "allocation" com from on the table that discusses their UWMP	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	MCWD has an allocation from the Fort Ord Reuse Authority. Text revised.
P-21	180/400		3.8.7				The second bullet, last sentence is confusing	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Text revised
P-22	180/400						Ask all agencies about the status of the policies in the general plans.	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	The text was revised to note that plans were summarized based on publically available info at time of GSP preparation.
P-23	180/400				3-4		AMBAG just updated this, are we showing the latest.	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Yes, table shows the most recent data.

GSP Comments 11-20-18

<u>Comment Number</u>	<u>Document</u>	<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Figure</u>	<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Commenter</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Response</u>
P-24	180/400		3.10.6				3.10.6 references Greenfield as a member. It's not.	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Correct, Greenfield is not a member. This section addresses all land use plans, not just members.
P-25	180/400					55	Page 55 references zone 2c. Remove that statement	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	The reference to Zone 2C is a direct quote out of the Monterey County General Plan
P-26	180/400						Extraction data only applies to Zones 2, 2A, and 2B. Not 2C or other areas. These will be low estimates. Be sure we state this. These are the ONLY extraction numbers, but they are not complete.	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Text revised to indicate that MCWRA groundwater extraction data are reported for a different area than the 180/400-Foot Aquifer subbasin
I-1	ISP						Include any changes to 180/400 report in the ISP	DW notes from November planning committee 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 November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Will check for consistency
I-3	ISP					34	Find data for PS-1, PS-2, PS-3	DW notes from November planning committee meeting	11/6/2018	Text revised to include summaries of these plan elements.
P-27	180/400					v	SVRP acronym not fully defined	Tamra Voss	11/14/2018	Text revised
P-28	180/400		1.1			1	Add "groundwater basin" to the end of the last sentence in Section 1.1	Tamra Voss	11/14/2018	Text revised
P-29	180/400		3.2			10	Figure number is incorrect in the last paragraph	Tamra Voss	11/14/2018	Same as comment P-10; text revised
P-30	180/400		3.3			13	Maps do not show all items referenced in text; map labels differ from text	Tamra Voss	11/14/2018	Text and maps revised
P-31	180/400		3.4			16	Provide additional explanation(s) of the land use categories; cite data sources; review Ag Commissioner crop reports	Tamra Voss	11/14/2018	Table and map updated based on revised land use categories; data sources cited
P-32	180/400		3.6.1			25	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	Text revised
P-33				3-10			Verify/update the position of the indicated piezometers	Tamra Voss	11/14/2018	Map revised
P-34			3.6.3.1			27	Revise description of how seawater intrusion monitoring program data are used	Tamra Voss	11/14/2018	Text revised
P-35			3.6.4				Expand description of location of Salinas River Lagoon monitoring point	Tamra Voss	11/14/2018	
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 2B	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.

GSP Comments 11-20-18

<u>Comment Number</u>	<u>Document</u>	<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Figure</u>	<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Commenter</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Response</u>
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	
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 change.
I-22							Additional comments will be provided on non-managed wetlands.	Advisory Committee meeting minutes	11/15/2018	
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 included	Advisory Committee meeting minutes	11/15/2018	Text revised

GSP Comments 11-20-18

<u>Comment Number</u>	<u>Document</u>	<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Figure</u>	<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Commenter</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Response</u>
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.
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	