

COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM JUNE 3, 2020 TO JULY 20, 2020

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
1	ES	3				6/5/20	CCWG	The Salinas Valley GSA should join GMC-IRWMP as a voting member to increase collaborative opportunities with partner agencies/stakeholders and to participate in the development of multibenefit projects for state funding.	Comment received	
2	ES	3				6/5/20	CCWG	Review 2019 IRWMP Stormwater Plan as a valuable analysis of watershed opportunities to retain and reuse winter stormwater resources. Management concepts within the Stormwater Plan that could benefit GSA goals should be identified within the plan.	Comment received	
3	ES	4.4.4				6/5/20	CCWG	Develop/prioritize a pilot project focused on identifying infiltration potential of areas identified in various geologic surveys and maps (see Pajaro GSA model).	Comment received	
4	ES	4,9				6/5/20	CCWG	Recognize in the Plan the likelihood that GSA infiltration opportunities lie outside (east) of the GSA boundaries.	Comment received	
5	ES	4.4.4, 9				6/5/20	CCWG	Recognize in the Plan the value of infiltration opportunities in this basin even though direct quantification of benefits is challenging.	Motion received	
6	ES					6/3/20	Robin Lee	The hydrology cross section demonstrates discontinuity from North to South, what about East to West?	Comment received	
7	ES					6/3/20	Robin Lee	The tributaries need to be reflected as flowing into the Rec Ditch	Comment received	
8	ES					6/3/20	Robin Lee	Should include more landmarks on maps for orientation	Comment received	
9	ES					6/3/20	Robin Lee	Landuse maps should include the upper watershed areas which aren't in the subbasin	Comment received	
10	ES					6/3/20	Chris Bunn	Are we going to prohibit the export of water out of the subbasin?	Comment received	
11	ES					6/3/20	Chris Bunn	If we don't know if Eastside pumping effects seawater intrusion or cone of depression, we should take it into account.	Comment received	
12	ES					6/3/20	Chris Bunn	Need photo from Eastside, not 180/400	Comment received	
13	ES					6/3/20	Amezquita	Will the compliance of each of the drinking water systems be noted?	Comment received	
14	ES					6/3/20	Amezquita	Do you have info on how much water has been extracted? (Future Chapter)	Comment received	
15	ES					6/3/20	Amezquita	Will you know how much water goes to the river and to the ocean? (Future Chapter)	Comment received	
16	ES					6/3/20	Amy Woodrow	The MCWRA has data from CASGEM wells that they are able to share	Comment received	
17	ES	4.4.4				6/5/20	CCWG	Chapter 4.4.4 states that "Natural groundwater recharge occurs through infiltration of surface water from the streams originating in the Gabilan Range" and that "Areas with excellent recharge properties are shown in green", and that "areas with the highest potential for recharge are along tributary streams." These statements are in line with other investigations and plans. The value of these findings, however, are countered by the next paragraph which states: "Although Figure 4-8 shows some areas of good potential recharge in the Eastside Aquifer Subbasin, actual recharge to the productive zones of the Sub-basin could be limited because the discontinuous sediments of the alluvial fans may not provide a continuous path for recharge, and the interfingering clay lenses may retard or prevent deep recharge. This demonstrates the limited utility of potential recharge maps that are solely based on surficial soil properties. This map should not be used exclusively to identify recharge areas that will directly benefit the aquifers in the Eastside Aquifer Sub-basin. Rather, it should be used in conjunction with additional research and investigation tools." It is my opinion that the second paragraph disproportionately deemphasized the potential value of these infiltration opportunities to increase water supply to the sub-basin. I recommend that additional information be presented (i.e. another paragraph) that reviews what additional research and investigation tools are available and reference how the Pajaro basin (and others) has already utilized these tools to identify, design, and construct infiltration projects within their basins.	Comment received	
18		2&4				6/5/20	CCWG	Parallel efforts that should be documented in this report (likely Chapter 2 but referenced in Chapter 4) include the City of Salinas stormwater protection program, flood management by the City of Salinas and Monterey County Water Resources, riparian conservation efforts in the upper Gabilan watershed by Big Sur Land Trust and The Nature Conservancy, Historical ecology work by San Francisco Estuary Institute, Watershed studies and planning completed by CSUMB, CCWG and the IRWMP (Figure 1. Excerpt of Salinas Valley Stormwater Plan), and coordination efforts led by the Monterey Grower Shippers Association to develop agriculture industry led compliance pathways to meet soon to be adopted Regional Water Board Agriculture Order 4.0 (please see below listed references). Each of these efforts supports the enhancement of water resources within this Sub-basin and should be recognized as resources in the design and implementation of the East Side GSP.	Comment received	

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
19						6/5/20	CCWG	Loss of surface water hydrologic processes in the Gabilan foothills and eastern side of the East Side Groundwater sub-basin should be recognized as one factor which has led to a reduction in recharge and thus, the classification of the sub-basin as highly vulnerable. Much of the floodplain areas below the Gabilan range have been channelized, reducing the natural infiltration potential to this groundwater basin. Without recognizing this significant reduction in infiltration, any restrictions on groundwater pumping to increase groundwater sustainability will unfairly restrict some farming activities (pumping) while not recognizing and/or managing the impacts of other farming activities (channelization of natural waterways). If future water budget findings suggest that some irrigation pumping must be reduced (leading to a reduction in agriculture) then integrating reduced farming with reclamation of flood plain areas (and hence infiltration) would be the most efficient method to meet water budget needs.	Comment received	
20	ES	2&4				6/5/20	CCWG	The current document does not recognize (in addition to the planning efforts) the skills and capacity of partner agencies and stakeholder groups. These skills and capacities can be leveraged to increase the scope and breadth of groundwater management and project development. Two examples of this were noted in the Sub-Committee meeting. Amy from the Monterey County Water Resources Agency noted that they monitor many wells not listed within the report and have made these data available to the GSA. Similarly, the consultant noted that the GSA does not own land nor has regulatory authority of the lands within this sub-basin. This is true, but fails to recognize partner groups that do have these capacities and are interested in developing multi-benefit projects within this watershed. Limitations of the GSA should not limit the opportunities identified within the plan but should be rectified through identifying others that have those capabilities and initiate partnerships to benefit from those skills and abilities.	Comment received	
21	ES	4.4.4				6/5/20	CCWG	Surface water management and groundwater infiltration can be accomplished in unison, and if successful, will lead to numerous benefits to landowners, agriculture industry, adjacent municipalities, county agencies, down stream flood prone communities and the East Side Groundwater Sub-basin. Because of the unique character of the geology in this area, these multibenefit opportunities should be fully recognized and integrated into this planning process. Projects should be identified that help increase our understanding of this sub-basin and the benefits such multibenefit projects can have on GSP success. The GSA should develop/prioritize a pilot project focused on identifying infiltration potential of areas identified in various geologic surveys and maps (see Pajaro GSA model).	Comment received	
22	ES					6/17/20	Robin Lee	We need to treat this as a watershed, not as a receiving basin from upstream, since so much water does come from upstream.	DW: The watershed is something we want to acknowledge. GSA only has the authority to implement and take actions within the subbasin. We don't have authority to upper areas. We can make recommendations, but can't take action for upper watershed. These recommendations can be to county, or other groups that do have authority in these areas.	
23	ES					6/17/20	Robin Lee	Would like to know about implications on water rights from Rec Ditch. Will it affect programs and actions for infiltration?	Donna: We will do some follow-up with Les on this to get additional clarification. Derrick: RE: Whether water rights from Rec Ditch will impact future projects. If water rights in Rec Ditch are established, then yes they will come up in our projects Whole question of GW and right you hold in common with everyone else, if someone established water in Rec Ditch is theirs by right, will come up in projects. It will go into Projects chapter, and what projects we can implement.	
24	ES					6/17/20	Ross Clark	Appreciate comments record, helps us feel our contributions are integrated. On comments #1, mine, to have GSA join GMC IRWMP, administrative or strategic?	Emily: We would have to be invited. Is more administrative, not strategic for the plan.	
25	ES					6/17/20	Chris Bunn	Recommend the use of water export outside basin at large be sent to ISP committee sooner for honest discussion. If this is not tackled honestly, opens up to lawsuits more later. Entire subbasin, but really whole Salinas Basin. Referring specifically to GW. Sometimes there are regulations in place that aren't followed through.	Comment received	
26	ES					6/17/20	Colby Pereira	Is goal to get these remarks added to document today and sent to Advisory Committee?	Emily: Yes, and also categorizing comments based on type.	
27	ES					6/17/20	Colby Pereira	I think there need to be more opportunities for BOD education and public education. There is need for further information on the SW/GW subject.	Comment received	

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
28	ES	3	Table 3-2			6/17/20	Amezquita	Want to comment on table 3-2, well count, I think it will be a good idea to have a real count of domestic wells, small and state water systems, industrial, etc... If you have the correct count of all these wells and water systems, will be helpful to know where all water is going. If possible, recommend to have this in table.	DW: I'll take a closer look at that; administrative comment.	
29	ES					6/17/20	Emily Gardner	The East Side Subbasin Committee provided the following motion regarding the strategic direction for the draft Chapters 1, and 4: Recognize in the Plan the value of infiltration opportunities in this basin even though direct quantification of benefits is challenging. Recommend to the County of Monterey that land use planning for the upper watershed of the East Side Subbasin take into account the value of the upper watershed surface water and infiltration to groundwater which ultimately impacts the East Side Subbasin.	Motion Received	
30	ES	3	3-2			7/16/20	Heather Lukacs	We request that this table include all Monterey County regulated drinking water systems and clearly distinguish between type of drinking water system. Local small water systems serve 2-4 connections, state small water systems serve 5-14 connections, private domestic wells serve 1 connection. In addition this table should list agricultural and industrial users as separate well types. This distinction is made in Figure 3-6 but not in this Table. It is important to distinguish between well type here in order to set the stage for good water budget estimates, for the monitoring network, and throughout the plan. This data is all readily available to the public and GSA.	Comment received	
31	ES	3				7/10/2020 email	Heather Lukacs	Revise the description of the plan area to include the type and location of all water systems and private domestic wells that serve drinking water users, their current groundwater quality conditions, and the number of people served. All public water system service areas and state and local small service areas should be included in this chapter as well as a list of all these system names, water system ID numbers, and number of service connections (or population served). Private wells should also be identified as being groundwater-dependent drinking water supplies. All public water systems and state/local small water systems are important to identify and include in this chapter because all are reliant on groundwater, many are highly vulnerable to water level and water quality changes, and all will be impacted by the way groundwater is managed in the basin. Adequately characterizing the public water systems, state and local small water systems, and domestic wells in the GSP is important to set the stage to: (1) better identify areas that are vulnerable to groundwater level, groundwater quality, or seawater intrusion challenges, (2) quantify drinking water demand in the subbasin for both the current and projected water budget, (3) provide a basis for the monitoring network of drinking water supplies, and (4) ensure inclusive and representative engagement of drinking water users in the planning process.	Email Received	
32	ES	3				7/10/20 email	Heather Lukacs	Revise Chapter 3 to include a specific discussion, supported by maps and charts, of the spatial or temporal water quality trends for all constituents that have exceeded drinking water standards and may affect drinking water beneficial users, as required under 23 CCR § 354.16(d). In the 180/400 Foot Aquifer GSP, Tables 8-6 through 8-9 for all public drinking water wells (including those listed in Appendix 7E), state and local small water system wells, and private domestic wells were included which indicate that the consultant has this data available. It is important to include all water quality data (both in map and tabular form) for all constituents that will have minimum thresholds later. Water quality is an important part of the basin setting. See map viewer from Greater Monterey County RWMG of all available water quality data for state and local small water systems in Monterey County: http://www.greatermontereyirwmp.org/documents/disadvantaged-community-plan-for-drinking-water-and-wastewater/	Email Received	
33	ES	3				7/10/2020 email	Heather Lukacs	List domestic water use and/or rural residential water use under the Water Use Section (Section 3.2.2). This section indicates that, "Domestic use outside of census-designated places is not considered urban use." Even if the Monterey County Water Resource Agency (MCWRA) does not report rural residential use, it is an important beneficial use and should be listed as a "water use sector." Water use estimates for state and local small water systems could be based on the number of connections served by each water system (which Monterey County has on file).	Email Received	
34	ES	3				7/10/2020 email	Heather Lukacs	Revise Chapter 3 to include a map of the service areas of all of the state and local small water systems like in the 180/400 foot aquifer subbasin. The 180/400 Foot Aquifer GSP mentions 136 small water systems in Chapter 7, page 7-20 of the 180/400-Foot Aquifer GSP (January 3, 2020) which indicates that the consultants have this data. We recommend that this data for all Salinas Valley subbasins be included in a map in Chapter 3 of each GSP, be clearly labelled, and have an associated table with key information. The Monterey County Environmental Health Bureau (EHB) maintains publically available data which includes shape files of state and local small water system service areas (e.g. polygons of all parcels served by each state or local small water system) to water system IDs. Lists of state and local small service areas and out-of-compliance water systems are available online on their state and local small water system webpage. Monterey County EHB also maintains individual files for each SSWS and LSWS in the County, which often contain well completion reports for each system. All water quality data, location data, and well completion reports are publically available upon request from the Monterey County EHB.	Email Received	