

| Date | Commenter | Comment | DW response | Status |
|--------|----------------|--|---|--|
| 8/1/19 | Adcock | asked if the State Water Resource Control Board has an understanding there will be basins where there is GSA's and a separate water resource agency, and will it be accepted | indicated its relatively unique as having two agencies with overlapping authorities and understand that if there are activities in a basin, yes it will be accepted to reach sustainability. | Question answered |
| 8/1/19 | Brennan | asked how is the Deep Aquifer study going be done financially | indicated as of today there is no agreement for GSA to take it over and is not committing the GSA to work on this | Question answered |
| 8/1/19 | Public Comment | Howard Franklin added the agency is not currently funded to complete the deep aquifer study, and asked Mr. Williams if he has a monitoring program in the deep aquifer and planning to expand it. | All the data currently being collected from the Deep Aquifer will be used in future assessment of the Deep Aquifer conditions. There is no plan to expand the monitoring program until we assess what data are already available. | Question answered |
| 8/1/19 | McIntyre | Chair McIntyre asked if there is a proposal. Mr. Franklin indicated not until the funding is identified. Once finalized then a proposal will be developed. | Mr. Williams pointed out the tools are in place and have an approachable plan. All GSPs will end up with a flexible plan knowing they are difficult to implement but need to be negotiated. | Question answered |
| 8/1/19 | McIntyre | asked in terms of implementing groundwater monitoring system what is the timeline | indicated his guess will be in two or three year | Question answered |
| 8/1/19 | Brennan | indicated a number of issues have been identified that need to be addressed one is USGS Historical Model that doesn't fall under a data gap definition. The big issue is the double counting issue and it isn't addressed as a data gap. | Clarified the issue of double counting by pointing out that historical pumping was estimated from the Water Resource Agency records of what is self-reported. The amount of diversions of the river were based on the State records. There are growers that report the same amount of water use to both groups. In our historical budget there is some amount of water that is therefore double counted as both groundwater pumping and river diversion. This double counting does not show up in the future water budget which is derived from the groundwater model. When the historical groundwater model is made available, it will avoid the double counting problem | Question answered |
| 8/1/19 | Brennan | asked what's the implication of having the historical model | clarified the Historical Model and the USGS Model will not have the double counting. Based on the best data and tools | Question answered |
| 8/1/19 | McIntyre | added for clarification regarding the data that was used from the county and state needs to be stated in Chapter 6; Need edits in chapter 6 that clarifies the source of double counting and it will be irrelevant once the Historical Model is in place. | | Text added to Chapter 6 |
| 8/1/19 | Public Comment | Heather Lukacs agreed that the double counting does need to be more clarified on Chapter 6. With basic links or references that were used for that data. | | Comment noted |
| 8/1/19 | Public Comment | Howard Franklin: two questions one on the model and one on the cost. It should be noted some stakeholders are already paying a portion of the cost to the agency. Moving forward integrating this data collection program, monitoring program with the agency programs will be key that the stakeholders are not paying twice for the same thing. The model, currently the agency has provided the USGS data to update has provided the USGS will be the historical model of spring 2020, the agency has made a commitment that the USGS will be updated yearly. | | Comment noted |
| 8/1/19 | Brennan | asked the fee collected in water charges framework will also be used in the projects | indicated yes, details need to be worked with the Board and Legal counsel. His preference, first tier is money that is used in operational charges the projects are funded by higher tiers. Higher charges raise more money per acre foot. Pumping that is outside the sustainable yield that goes to the projects | Question answered |
| 8/1/19 | Brennan | in terms of the cost that will be refined, to address the duplicated counting data. Clarify that cost will not be duplicated. | | Sentences added to Section 10.8 clarifying that no duplicate fees will be assessed |

| Date | Commenter | Comment | DW response | Status |
|--------|------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------|
| 8/1/19 | Adcock/Peterson | Adcock asked is January 31, 2022 the deadline for the refining projects and agreeing on funding details; asked if the State will be holding the date. Mr. Petersen added once the plan is updated the date might change until 2025. | indicated it should be January 2023; indicated if more time would be needed the State will likely allow as long as the SVBGSA is showing substantial progress. | Question answered |
| 8/1/19 | Virsik | Chapter 10 of the 180-400 CSIP modification projects, shouldn't there be more specific of those projects, those cost for implementation. Chapter 6 says this is what needs to be done. Potentially money numbers more specific the amount of water changes how will it affect. For that subset it should be more define. For the State to see how the process will work. On the water charges framework is the first tier, how does the first-tier work for CSIP? | Indicated that the first tier costs will need to account for fees already paid into CSIP | Question answered |
| 8/1/19 | Girard | commented CSIP is an agency project. A decision will be made if GSA will take ownership of any expansion of CSIP. Or if it's going to be a project of the agency to expand CSIP. If they keep ownership of that expansion project how they finance will be CSIP issue not GSA's. CSIP may choose to finance it based on benefit assessment. GSA doesn't own the means of production. He added there is several options of financing. | | Comment noted |
| 8/1/19 | McIntyre | added facilitated process will accomplish funding | indicated that is correct the facilitated process will show how all is incorporated, with a timeframe of three-years. | Question answered |
| 8/1/19 | Brennan | asked Mr. Girard if the water charges framework will require protest votes and if other funding mechanisms will be needed. | Mr. Girard indicated that is correct due to regulatory fees. | Question answered |
| 8/1/19 | McIntyre | added this needs to be as flexible as possible due to all the pro and cons. Mr. Girard added who pays for an expansion of CSIP is to be determined in the future. | agreed with Chair McIntyre indicated we do have options and look for funding mechanisms and emphasize funding options | Comment noted |
| 8/1/19 | Brennan | added water charges framework is a big selling point of the funding | indicated it is appealing with the practical aspect, however flexibility is needed for funding purposes | Question answered |
| 8/1/19 | Brennan | asked the water charges framework can be funded with an extraction fee or some other kind of fee. Is that where the option is | Yes, the option is to fund with an extraction fee, a flat fee, a land-based fee, or some other type of fee | Question answered |
| 8/1/19 | Peterson | answered water charges framework isn't been excluded. The water charges framework remains an option along with other more traditional funding options, including protest votes or 218's. It might not work in all sub-basins it is important to understand that Chapter 9 will have the projects. The biggest cost and funding needed is on the 180-400. | | Comment noted |
| 8/1/19 | Brennan | indicated the discussion needs to be expanded to clarify, because at this point this is the only option | Offerend to look at test and recognize other options for funding open | Text revised |
| 8/1/19 | Girard | added GSA has the ability to require pumpers to pay for a measuring device on the well. GSA doesn't have to pay for it the owners will. Using water charges gives you data. In his opinion, two things do you do that for the purpose of data or to raise revenue Greenfield or combination of both. Recognizing the revenue you raise has to be committed to the program for funding. There is a number of limitations and GSA Board needs to understand there is a variety of ways to make revenue before making a plan to raise revenue. Menu of options for raising revenue. | | Comment noted |
| 8/1/19 | McHatten/Girard/Adcock | McHatten requested clarification on the 218 process what does it look like and what does the process include. Will it include Gonzales, Soledad and King City, since there isn't enough people or benefit assessment district? Is it 66% of people? the Board of Directors need to know all the options in implementing a fees, assessments or tax. | Mr. Girard indicated a 218 is majority protest for a vote for a property related fee, the 2/3 has to do with a tax fee. Director Adcock added in a plan once decided the State would understand. Mr. Girard said yes, | Question answered |
| 8/1/19 | Public Comment | Heather Lukacs commented, the biggest issue for her because projects are so uncertain. A measure of allowable pumping for or sustainable yield that doesn't assume new projects that is needed to know for the whole Valley. Chair McIntyre indicted that would be different for each sub-basin. She indicated then for each sub-basin for the public to see the numbers and avoid political issues. Her concern is seawater intrusion. Chair McIntyre indicated that was provided already. | indicated the only thing he doesn't have is if pumping would be cut off completely on the 180-400 would it reverse the seawater intrusion, will it push it back and what will it look like. He also added, seawater intrusion you end up with two time periods getting to sustainability and maintain it. Getting there is difficult you need to raise water levels, sustaining it isn't so difficult since you just need to maintain it there. | Question answered |
| 8/1/19 | Brennan | asked the 7% percent reduction on the 180-400 that doesn't include sweater intrusion | indicated no, The 7% cut only balances the water budget. He added he will ask DWR to clarify what is the definition of the sustainable yield number. There is a strict reading of the regulations saying the sustainable yield doesn't get any sweater intrusion. | Waiting for response from DWR |
| 8/1/19 | Brennan | Are we looking into interim to sustainability or maintain sustainability? It becomes a complicated problem due to no guidance from DWR. | indicated to Heather Lukacs point there is a question of what sorts of cutbacks might be necessary if there weren't no projects, what might our future in 20 years would look like. | Question answered |

| Date | Commenter | Comment | DW response | Status |
|---------|-----------------|--|--|---|
| 8/1/19 | Lukacs/Peterson | Heather Lukacs also added in terms to interim GSA is committed to holding the seawater intrusion line and will not include it through pumping but through projects. The projects won't be implemented in several years and it's a disconnect. Mr. Petersen added it's important to remember we have 20 years to get to sustainability because it acknowledges how much effort it will require to get there | | Comment noted |
| 8/1/19 | Public Comment | Walter commented doesn't see in the plan the development of Deep Aquifer study. Aseked if SVBGSA plans to take over or develop it. What will happen to the 180-400 in the interim period? | indicated GSA is supporting the extension of the emergency ordinance until there is a better understating of the deeper aquifer. At the same time, it's understood the farmers can't be cut off of a water source | Question answered |
| 8/1/19 | Public Comment | Walter added there is no 180 foot wells in the area and no replacement opportunities. Walter asked how it is going to be handled in the interim period. | recognized the interim period is a problem | Comment noted |
| 8/1/19 | Peterson | added it's needed categorize the sub-basin as soon as possible to have the data to make a good decision | | Comment noted |
| 8/1/19 | Public Comment | Patrick asked will you be categorizing a replace well not a deeper well | Petersen indicated the only deep well allowed is if you have a well that is in the 400 and it goes bad and decide to replace it there is an agreement that if you take it out of commission and replace it in accordance with the requirement. Drinking portable water is acceptable as well. Franklin indicated the agency will use the best data available to determine if the well will be in the deep aquifer and verify based on the logs | Question answered |
| 8/1/19 | Peterson | Petersen commented the \$1,200,000 a year is for the entire Valley. And this GSP is for the 180-400? Is it needed to say this much comes from this fee and this from this fee? Mr. Girard replied yes, if portion of the fee that only benefits the 180-400. Providing it can be identified for other benefits the sub-basins, forebay or upper valley | indicated to look at the table and see if this is supporting the 180-400 or is it a valley wide implementation | Tables modified to differentiate between Valley-Wide and Subbasin costs |
| 8/1/19 | Brennan | asked this implementation fee does not include developing the other GSP yet the \$1,200,000 million a year is collected to the GSA. | clarified yes it goes to GSA not to develop the GSP. Mr. Petersen indicated because of matching funds our grants require 50% matching funds. All cost that goes to operating the GSA are used as the matching funds on the grant to cover our 50%. DW encouraged the Committee and public to look over the list and provide suggestions. He stated this is the implementation cost not the project cost. | Cost tables now divided into Subbasin and Valley-Wide costs |
| 8/1/19 | Public Comment | Tom Virsik on the cost fees as Director Brennan pointed out the regulatory fee of \$1,200,000. His impression was for regulatory fee for those who are not in 180-400 and will get you to the others end in the GSP's. If the message is, we need more money to finish the GSP's you will have fight. Regarding the Chapter and presentation policy issues. There are two one is weather the Board should be focused on the minimum of what DWR wants under any circumstances or should it be focused on something other than that. In particular in the interim period one of the best management practices, documents from DWR that explains the regulatory content and shows examples on a metric this is a way the plans can be implemented. The Board policy decision is if they will go with it and that's with seawater intrusion particular. | | The cost tables do not include the costs of developing additional GSPs |
| 8/1/19 | Public Comment | the agency will move forward with revising GEMS ordinance with data collection addressing the boundaries under the GSA | asked Mr. Franklin to write /email him directly with details of this information to make the appropriate changes | Question answered |
| 8/1/19 | Public Comment | Mr. Franklin continued with the groundwater level seen it was based under CASGEM is a small subset of the agency in the monitoring program. To participate in the CASGEM you need full disclosure and redacted information. | Williams indicated he wasn't sure if that was needed for SGMA but would look into it. | Requirements for SGMA are similar to CASGEM requirements |
| 8/1/19 | Public Comment | Heather Lukacs asked for clarification under communication and outreach related to the monitoring in a well how is the GSA tracking the groundwater levels or how the public can obtain that information | indicted with transparency of the data that is been used and obtained it will be released in the next Board meeting next week | Data portal is now active |
| 8/1/19 | Peterson | added this is a continued effort to obtain as much as information as legally as possible to provide to the public | | Comment noted |
| 8/15/19 | Groot / Ward | expressed concerns about meeting the three-year water charges framework. | | Comment noted |
| 8/15/19 | Girard | Girard responded that generally, absent an allegation of illegality, the Agency would not be prohibited from going forward with the Plan unless the plaintiff received a preliminary injunction | believes the legislation includes a tolling provision in the event of litigation. | Question answered |
| 8/15/19 | Girard | Girard stated that the DWR's ability to declare our Basin probationary would be tolled by litigation preventing filing of the Plan. | | Comment noted |

| Date | Commenter | Comment | DW response | Status |
|---------|-----------|--|---|---|
| 8/15/19 | Johnson | stated that Chevron would like an outline for an appropriate well test for the upper Valley so that they may provide the Agency with the information they need. He referenced Section 10.4.4, Water Quality Monitoring Network and asked whether the GSA would expand the scope of water systems in the fee structure. | Mr. Williams stated the negotiations would begin with seeking financial contributions for all non de minimis systems and could include non-community water systems. | Outline has been provided to Chevron |
| 8/15/19 | Wolgamott | expressed surprise at the increase in the fee from \$1.2 million to \$2.1 million | stated that a fee structure for operational costs is needed going forward, including new commitments that were not contemplated in the \$1.2 million such as the USGS model and expanding monitoring systems and gets the projects going. There will be costs on top of that. | Question answered |
| 8/15/19 | Peterson | stated that some of these costs may be covered by grants. The cost framework is being approved as required, not the fees | stated the Plan estimates what it would cost to implement the Plan, and we did not know what the costs were until the Plan was developed. By approving the Plan, we are saying we are committed to finding the funding | Question answered |
| 8/15/19 | Adcock | | In response to Tom Adcock, Mr. Williams stated that the additional costs may not be spread throughout the Basin; valley-wide project costs would be spread throughout the Basin | Question answered |
| 8/15/19 | Virsik | Tom Virsik stated that flexibility would not be found in the water charges framework. Mr. Williams' comments are good but not written into the Plan. He questioned how the charges framework concept can work in the most critical area where pumping needs to stop. His memory is the \$1.2 million administrative fee was to include preparation for other parts of the Basin. It lays the foundation for litigation by people who believe they would pay twice. | | People will not pay twice. Either pumpers pay for the water they pump, or they pay for the water they import. |
| 8/15/19 | Franklin | stated it is apparent that more education is needed on how water is used in the 180/400 sub-basin and options for water demands and developing fees | | Comment noted |
| 8/15/19 | Lukacs | asked how the Agency could work with environmental health and agencies that collect water quality data on obtaining information when new data is available to inform groundwater decisions | SVBGSA decision was to set the number of groundwater quality monitoring wells and only change the monitoring network every 5 years | Question answered |
| 8/15/19 | Tynan | | In response to Eric Tynan, Mr. Williams stated that seawater intrusion will be impacted by our approach to the deep aquifer and the approach taken to promote the interim ordinance that allows replacement wells in the deep aquifer until we understand how much pumping it can support. Mr. Petersen confirmed that he is having discussions with other GSAs. Mr. Johnson agreed it would be valuable to compare critical data gaps. | Question answered |
| 8/15/19 | Amezquita | Horacio Amezquita asked what the GSA will do if systems' nitrates continue going up due to overdraft. | Mr. Williams responded that the GSA will look at overdrafting, but is not taking on the role of providing drinking quality water to everyone in the Valley. Quality has a sustainability aspect, but there are other programs to address this issue. | Question answered |