

Date	Commenter	Comment	DW response	Status
7/10/19	Isakson	asked if slides will be posted on website	not at this time but once finished	Question answered
7/10/19	Isakson	all cost must be combined in one financing system? Or depending on the project how will the funding system will be done.	setting up a financing structure, the mechanism hasn't been set. Mr. Petersen added there will be a couple of mechanism. Mr. Williams also added that there is several tier's and one tier cost are regulatory fees other cost will be based on area of benefit.	Question answered
7/10/19	Secondo	fee collection, if it will be collected on the property tax or separate group?	Mr. Girard replied it depends on what you allow to be charged on the property tax along with the special assessments on property tax. Mr. Williams emphasized there are several options.	Question answered
7/10/19	Brennan	Water Charges Framework is based on pumping is it subject to the 218?	Mr. Girard replied no it's not since it's not a special benefit, it's the activity of pumping water, what it's been charged for.	Question answered
7/10/19	Brennan	asked how is the funds going to be collected?	Mr. Williams clarified the mechanism for collecting the Water Charges Framework the mechanism is yet to be decided. Mr. Petersen added there will be some projects that need a 218 vote.	Question answered
7/10/19	Secondo	advised on the need to coordinate on the invasive species eradication since there has been issues taking out invasive species	agreed	Question answered
7/10/19	Secondo	who will handle the funding for the CSIP Project?	Mr. Petersen indicated it will be researched first before its set after the modeling is done and negotiations.	Question answered
7/10/19	Brennan	suggested for the CSIP Projects to be organized as four projects under a major heading as CSIP Projects. And define SRDF (Salinas River Diversion Facility) Mr. Williams indicated all acronyms will be defined on the final report.		Text modified
7/10/19	Isakson	asked for the Expanded CSIP Area, what is the water source for the Expanded CSIP Area; water right would be needed	indicated the water source for the Expanded CSIP Area is the Monterey 1 Water to some degree and river water. Trying to get away from the supplements water wells; agreed and advised that would be a legal matter	Question answered
7/10/19	Girard	clarified on the water rights associated with the water project. The Salinas Valley Water Project didn't grant to the agency any additional water rights, it changed the point of diversion to the SRDF. The original water rights were when the reservoirs and dams were constructed.		Comment noted
7/10/19	Franklin	asked for clarification regarding pumping on the CSIP Area is covered in zone 2b ordinance . For CSIP to be successful you need the supplement wells during the dry periods when needed.	indicated there is a zone that has limitations and there are growers that have the right to pump wells to supplement from CSIP.	Text clarifies that circumstance for implementation is that a year round supply of water is available to CSIP
7/10/19	Brennan	asked for clarification the CSIP Projects need to go forward before the Management Actions.	clarified it does indicate under Management Actions this will be implemented after the CSIP project and will clarify on the report. Mr. Petersen added there is number of Management Actions that will happen simultaneously with project development. Clarify that there are some Projects and Management Actions that are related to the point that one needs to happen before the other. Mr. Williams advised there will be an Implementation Schedule on Chapter 10.	Question answered

7/10/19	Lukacs	how was the cost benefit analysis done for all projects; asked for visual of the cost per project	indicated it's a rough draft per acre foot, based on the capitol cost will be, annual will be and a 25-year annexation. Looking into each project since some are expensive and others less expensive; will be added in a future chapter	
7/10/19	Lukacs	how the projects were selected, process and presented to the stakeholders	was decided after speaking with various Ag Groups and stakeholders.	Question answered
7/10/19	McIntyre	asked on the cost per acre foot, is it per acre feet of all the water in the basin; requested for a clearer description of the cost per acre foot	indicated it's the cost per acre foot of delivered water to that project to the area of its benefit; description will be provided in the funding mechanism	Question answered
7/10/19	Isakson	will be helpful to have a better understating of the cost and be presented in a future the presentation	it will be added and presented in the funding structure; Girard added general operations can't be funded with the benefit assessment. Benefit assessment are defined special benefits and determined by an engineer. Mr. Williams indicated this is the reason we need the mechanism of these projects.	Question answered
7/10/19	Isakson	commented on the Seawater Extraction there is several reports on this and can be used for this project to expedite things	agreed it was a good suggestion and will look into.	Comment noted
7/10/19	McIntyre	asked if this was presented to the 180/400 Group and what was the reaction	indicated they were satisfied and received good feedback. Mr. Williams continued with 11043 Water Right is a wet water right with two existing diversion points one in Chualar and Soledad. It mainly benefits the eastside.	Question answered
7/10/19	Brennan	asked if this conflicts with phase 2 of the Salinas Valley Water project and is the water right in relocation proceedings	Girard informed it's still active and it's at the State Water Board for renewal. Mr. Williams advised he doesn't believe it conflicts with phase 2	Question answered
7/10/19	Lukacs	asked what authority GSA has on the plans with the water rights and the Water Resource Agency.	Girard indicated it has the ability to come up with a plan with GSA Agency. Clarification on how to get access on the 11043 Water Right	Question answered
7/10/19	Brennan	commented water from the Carmel River doesn't look like a valuable project if this is a decision from CalAm Water, is the water right to the district.	Mr. Williams indicated they made an agreement with CalAm to run the water through their pumps. One vote against that	Project removed from Chapter 9
7/10/19	Secondo	asked if any word on the Jarrett Dam	indicated he doesn't have much information on the Jarrett Dam. Potential on the Jared Dam.	Not included in Chapter 9
7/10/19	McIntyre	asked on Alternative Projects the Recharge winter Salinas River flow	it needs to be looked into since it has a diversion point	Question answered
7/10/19	Isakson	on two votes on Recharge winter water right from Carmel River and find out more on the water rights and permits		Project removed from Chapter 9
7/10/19	Franklin	commented on the 11043-water right caution during the wintertime the southern Gonzalez there is an environmental component and to please consider	agreed; Isakson added the diversion season isn't winter it was the irrigation time	Comment noted
7/10/19	McIntyre	suggested to propose a two-year period ordinance and consider making a permanent ordinance		Section 9.3.6 modified to reflect extension of two-year oridnance.
7/10/19	Brennan	what's the status of the deep aquifer study	Franklin replied this agency funding, it's not a priority unless the funding structure changes; Williams indicated this will be a funding questions for the future and will make a recommendation if needed	Question answered

7/10/19	Brennan	added on the propose for landowners to retire their land or pumping allowances	Williams indicated it will be said a restriction will be placed for irrigated land. Director Brennan requested to rephrase Change convert land to be consistent with the general plan	Section 9.3.2 modified so that it is consistent with the County General Plan
7/10/19	McHatten	added on retirement land between Soledad and Gonzalez there is purposed annexation that is going forward with LAFCO that can be replaced urban residential that can affect the General Plan with the County	indicated they will only be taking Ag sellers that are willing to give up their land but can live on the land.	Question answered
7/10/19	Brennan	asked for the language to be changed on the rural development plan of the Monterey County General Plan	Williams indicted will be done	Section 9.3.2 modified so that it is consistent with the County General Plan
7/10/19	McIntyre	pointed out a typing error on section 9.3.3.8 \$50,0000 a year for two years should be \$100,000	Williams indicated it will be corrected	Text modified (Section 9.3.5.8)
7/10/19	Brennan	in terms to comments on registered wells how will it be enforced? Can you transfer between sub-basins? Will it require flow meters? Are you directly pumping to the MWRA or GSA is it a duplication of reporting? What kind of comments are you expecting?	Williams said these are details that must be worked out	Question answered
7/10/19	McIntyre	pointed out with the recharge credits does it have return flow	indicated no it doesn't have because of the allowances. Recharge credits have return flow.	Question answered
7/10/19	Secondo	do you encourage high water use	if you have a water right it can be done but it's not encouraged	Question answered
7/10/19	Secondo	regarding the ground been farmed before 2017, is that the cutoff date?	its legal question with a cutoff date saying you only have up to a certain date.	Question answered
7/10/19	Isakson	on developing GSA approval for credits or transferring should be added to the list and will there be a limitation on how much any one can pump? Based on the base allowance if you go over then a fee needs to be paid. Isn't the goal of GSA sustainability?	a water right isn't been established. The idea of paying an additional fee if your pumping over the allowed amount those funds will be used for projects. The purpose of the higher cost tier so you can achieve sustainability	Question answered
7/10/19	Virsik	based on an adjudication. The proposal is heading that route. There is a huge emphasize on disclosure and how this look on GSA when setting allowance and have history or not and have been or not it can be irrelevant to your allowance's and have been publicly reporting and then after the fact you might have legal actions. Making it public might get the process faster it could be all the pumping in the sub basin numbers correct. Should pumping data be made public to move forward in the project. And on regulatory requirement on the 180-400 get rid of the overdraft and on the leap of faith on the client's perspective what this might look at this time, some kind of assurance that might cause less worry. Mr. Virsik will provide further information at a later time	asked for him to provide and will consider	Question answered
7/17/19	Virsik/Orradres & Scheid	DRAFTS LACK MANDATORY REGULATORY CONTENT; the GSP for the 180/400 fails to quantify the overdraft to be mitigated to achieve sustainability (does not refer to Reg 354.44(b)(2) or 354.18; The word "overdraft" is used in text a single time in Chapter 6 but no number/figure/quantity in any table is so labeled. The 180/400 basin is designated by the DWR as in a critical condition of overdraft, of course.		Text added to section 9.6
7/17/19	Virsik/Orradres & Scheid	The current iteration of Chapter 9 also recites "overdraft" a handful of times -- section 9.7 is prominently labeled as a list of projects and actions for the "mitigation of overdraft" but one cannot find the quantity of overdraft to be mitigated, which renders of questionable value any projection of how much water is provided or mitigated by a given action or project. The current draft GSP for a basin in critical overdraft does not disclose the current quantity of overdraft. That lacuna will make the Plan non-compliant, no matter its other merits.		Text added to section 9.6. Section 9.7 deleted.
7/17/19	Virsik/Orradres & Scheid	Chapter 9 (including the oral presentations at the Planning Committee) is explicit that the priority projects may be insufficient to meet sustainability and one or more alternative projects are needed. The total amount of water just CSIP Projects 2, 3, 4, and 5 may develop appears to be 40,300 AF. By force of logic, one can guess the current overdraft in the 180/400 exceeds that 40,300 AFY figure. But the public should not need to guess or rely on back of cocktail napkin calculations. The total amount of overdraft to be mitigated to achieve sustainability must be explicitly identified for the GSP to meet minimum requirements.		Text added to section 9.6

7/17/19	Virsik/Orradres & Scheid	ACCEPTING THE "FRAMEWORK" IS NOT APPROVAL OF THE LATER DETAILS; partial or full acquiescence to the proposed "framework" may be perceived or taken as a willingness to accept the later "details." Well before any GSP chapter was drafted, they reminded the GSA that in 2003/04 they and certain others from the southern parts of the Valley obtained judgments based on hard-fought settlements in multiple validation actions. Those validation judgments limit the fiscal contribution of certain lands to efforts addressing the northern coastal overdraft and seawater intrusion issues. That the GSA was created after the date of the judgments does not immunize it from honoring the judgment terms. To put in somewhat practical terms, while the proposed slate of CSIP projects/actions in Chapter 9, may have certain merit, their fiscal aspects remain subject to the limitations of the prior judgments/settlements. The list of "details to be developed" may be expanded to include the "detail" that the Valley is not a tabula rasa when it comes to determining which lands are legally obligated/exempt from paying for what projects/benefits.		Sentence added to Section 9.2 that, "The fee structures in each subbasin will be developed in accordance with all existing laws, judgements, and established water rights."
7/18/19	Gardner	would like to include information on backup projects that were not included in the GSP and why		To add later
7/18/19	McCullough	would like to highlight management actions that will have Valley-wide benefit		Sentence added to Section 9.3.1
7/18/19	Lee	would like projects rated according to cost effectiveness	responded that the cost per acre foot is estimated and there will be a map for each project that will show the water level rise	Question answered
7/18/19	Adcock	wondered why all winter flows are not being treated and stored	Mr. Williams stated the nondiurnal water would require enormous storage, and advance water purification is expensive. It is an alternative project for winter flows.	Question answered
7/18/19	Lee	would like information on how much more beneficial one project is over another	does not have an answer currently, because it depends on how much water we can get at a lesser cost	Question answered
7/18/19	Lee	asked if it is less costly to run the treatment plan than injecting fresh water into aquifers.	stated he would look into the cost of a scalping plant where Salinas is expanding	To add later
7/18/19	Frus	wondered about an investment risk analysis and which projects would show resilience in the face of extreme climate change; presented the possibility of analyzing feasibility considering a range when predicting climate change	responded the analysis includes predictable climate change but not an excessive drought of proportions not yet seen	Question answered
7/18/19	Franklin	expressed concern that the cost of the extraction barrier is high for capital costs could make the problem worse.	stated the cost of the extraction barrier is high for capital costs, roughly tens of millions of dollars; Mr. Williams included it because it is definitive, but there is some flexibility based on the success of other projects.	Question answered
7/18/19	Isakson	stated more information is needed about the implications of requesting changes to Permit 11043 or its possible revocation.		Comment noted
7/18/19	Lee	the scalping alternative would be drought proof and keep the hydrological cycle intact.		Comment noted
7/18/19	Adcock		In response to Tom Adcock, Mr. Williams stated that they need to review the water rights for the Alisal and Gabilan Creeks to determine if they are fully allocated.	To add later
7/18/19	Lee	stated that the Gabilan range should be looked at for climate and ecological system changes because of the large potential to impact groundwater ecosystems	stated that the diversion rights would be difficult to get so this would be put from a primary to alternative project	Question answered
7/18/19	Gardner	suggested looking at using tile drain water more effectively		To add later
7/18/19	Isakson	stated that some people would rather pay per acre instead of per acre foot	stated that the cost is per acre foot because charging per acre would not result in controlling extraction	Comment noted
7/18/19	Tubbs		In response to Dallas Tubbs, Mr. Williams stated that a water marketplace is not the focus on the water charges framework but would be an outcome that would take a long time and require an impact	Question answered

7/18/19	Breen	asked for the nexus between the different fees. Mr. Petersen responded that the administration fee, pumping charge and Proposition 218 projects can be thought of in terms of tiers. Mr. Breen stated the GSP assumes there will be projects which means all users will have tier 2 or 3 charges or fees.	Williams stated that would only be accurate for sea water intrusion projects. All other projects balance inputs and outputs. Mr. Williams stated this is an innovative viable framework that will require negotiations and studies	Question answered
7/18/19	Isakson	stated that there have been comments from the Upper and Forebay Subbasins that they do not prefer fees based on extraction, and it is not clear that Chapter 9 is not cast in stone. Mr. Petersen stated that the GSP is adaptive for each sub-basin.		Comment noted
7/18/19	McCullough		In response to Mike McCullough, Mr. Petersen stated that the Board can reconsider how to fund administration fees if necessary. Mr. Williams stated that the water charges chapter is not discussing specifics yet but outlines a structure.	Question answered
7/18/19	McCullough	suggested including some clarifiers, e.g. this would be the fee if utilizing four out of five best management practices. If they are using efficiency as the driver, they should not be punished if being really efficient	Williams stated they would only be paying large fees if they are pumping outside of what we think is sustainable, and we have to decide what is sustainable. And these questions need to be answered for every sub-basin.	Question answered
7/18/19	Jacques		In response to Bob Jaques, Mr. Williams stated that the financial structure is to establish bonding capacity for projects	Question answered
7/18/19	Tubbs		In response to Dallas Tubbs, Mr. Williams stated that municipalities may be treated differently than outliers when setting base allowances, but that will be discussed in another forum.	Question answered
7/18/19	SVWC	How do we "re-operate"	Mr. Williams state that the reoperation plan had to come out of the HCP. Derrick said the reservoirs should recharge the basin every year – the WRA didn't want every –Derrick said he is committed to making it clear that releases every year is the objective	Question answered
7/18/19	SVWC	AS to the Arundo removal program – will landowners/growers be charged twice? Derrick said landowners/growers will be charged only if program is expanded beyond what is being done today	Derrick said landowners/growers will be charged only if program is expanded beyond what is being done today	Question answered
7/18/19	SVWC	MCWRA owns the assets for some of the projects, how will this be addressed?	Mr. Petersen stated that there are many such issues that he is currently negotiating with MCWRA	Question answered
7/18/19	SVWC	Coordination between agencies will be important to ensure there is no duplication of cost	Derrick said fees will be structured to capture what is being paid for already	Question answered
7/18/19	SVWC	Doesn't it matter where reduced pumping occurs and who is responsible?	Derrick said he wasn't going to address who is responsible, but reducing pumping will not solve seawater intrusion along – the problem of seawater intrusion must be actively addressed.	Question answered
7/18/19	SVWC	Are seawater intrusion barriers being considered and are they injection or pumping based?	Our primary choice is a pumping-based seawater intrusion barrier. Injection requires water we don't have.	Question answered
7/18/19	SVWC	Permit 11043's point of diversion is above the confluence of the Arroyo Seco – [it was stated that there is only one point of diversion and not a second one at chualar – this needs to be confirmed]	We will investigate the points of diversion	Question answered
7/18/19	SVWC	Why aren't the existing reservoirs on the project list?	Mr. Williams stated that only projects that directly benefit groundwater are on the list. We avoided projects that simply increase the available water supplies	Question answered

7/18/19	SVWC	What about a retro fit at Naci to increase the outflow capacity below 755 elev?	Mr. Williams admitted this was a good idea	To add later
7/18/19	SVWC	Are water charges based on gross pumping?	Generally yes, but there will be opportunities to refine water charges based on local conditions	Question answered
7/18/19	SVWC	Will CSIP be subsidized by everyone?	The overall sustainability program will be paid for by everybody, but individual projects will not be singled out.	Question answered
7/18/19	SVWC	Benefits are not the same in all sub-basins?	Mr. Williams stated that different areas will pay different amounts	Question answered
7/18/19	SVWC	How do the charges affect water rights? Are fees/taxes on water extractions a limiting factor on one's water rights?	The fees do not affect water rights	Question answered
7/18/19	SVWC	Are those operating costs or project costs?	Both! The idea is to eventually replace the administrative fee with a baseline tiered fee, with projects and O&M built on top of those.	Question answered
7/18/19	SVWC	Who will be 'watching' out for landowners/growers?		Comment noted
7/18/19	SVWC	Will structure fee be implemented with the 180/400 plan	Derrick – No, this will be a multi-year negotiation.	Question answered
7/18/19	SVWC	Not everyone is in favor of an extraction fee basis	Derrick – Baseline rates will be different in different areas. If there is no extraction fee, then there will be no limits on pumping. If there is a per acre fee, then there will have to be other caps on how much one can pump.	Question answered
7/18/19	SVWC	Will there be more influence on the MCWRA to fix the dams?	Mr. Petersen stated that the MCWRA is working on funding these projects now.	Question answered
7/18/19	SVWC	How do you factor recharge of extracted water in to the fee?	Derrick – It could be factored in to the 1st tier charge, based on sub basin.	Question answered
7/18/19	SVWC	Who established baseline for pumping?	It is based on our assumed sustainable yield	Question answered
7/18/19	SVWC	Water Budget – how much is based on assumed reservoir releases/operation?	Derrick pointed out this is an excellent question that he cannot answer at this time. We will address it while we develop the Upper Valley and Forebay GSPs over the next two years	Question answered
7/18/19	SVWC	Extraction fees are they reasonable or unreasonable?	Derrick believes they will be reasonable	Question answered
7/18/19	SVWC	Cost incurred by FB/UV landowners for maintaining their own wells, energy, etc., is different than CSIP where they get delivered water		Comment noted
7/18/19	SVWC	Need to consider contribution to basin from recharge		Comment noted
7/18/19	SVWC	Should pumping allowances account for different soil-climate conditions?	Derrick said this was certainly possible	Question answered
7/18/19	SVWC	Basin/sub-basin limitations?	Derrick said every subbasin will need a limit on how much can be pumped. But some subbasins may not have reached that limit yet.	Question answered