

COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM JULY 1, 2020 - August 20, 2020

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
1	Forebay					7/1/20	Steve McIntyre	Which workshop topic would explain the whole basin and subbasin and reservoirs connectivity? Even though there is an ISP workshop later there is an opportunity for an educational opportunity where everyone can get on the same page about how the basin works. An overview of whole basin, hydrology, how the watershed works, and how the dams and existing projects are all tied together would be helpful.	DW: Good suggestion, and may be a workshop to have earlier than later. Let's discuss later.	Done, August 26th, 2020
2	Forebay					7/1/20	Jason Smith	Maybe move Water Law workshop later	Comment Received	
3	Forebay					7/1/20	Nancy Isakson	Gratitude for materials ahead of time. Stress importance of getting as many people to workshops as possible; we're all responsible for spreading word to get diversity of people to workshops. Work with Ag groups and Advisory Committee to get the word out.	Comment Received	
4	Forebay					7/1/20	Tom Virsik	It's a good direction. 1) Agree with Mr. Smith that water law can wait until there is an explanation of the structure of whole valley, of the projects that exist, and how they are interrelated. People need to understand what is occurring in the valley before water law theory. Possibility to include another topic for ASGSA, ES with management areas.	Comment Received	
5	Forebay					7/1/20	Curtis Weeks	Need to talk about management areas. Concerned about process not including coordination. A lot of coordination going on, we need opportunity to share information. We'll need to modify our GSP. I'm asking planning committee to consider ASGSA as management area and activities.	Donna Meyers: We've been working through established coordination subcommittee, has 2 members from each board. As we initiate Forebay Planning Committee, also working with coordination team. Working towards MOU. Creating parallel process. Agree with Curtis, effort needs to track with our efforts also. We can figure out how to communicate and bring in those discussions, and include ASGSA planning committee.	
6	Forebay					7/1/20	Norm Groot	I imagine there will be a lot of discussion on some topics planned for 2021. May need to call special meetings, encourage more flexibility. Suggest picking each date each month for workshops.	Comment Received	
7	Forebay					7/1/20	Curtis Weeks	I appreciate the explanation and the process	Comment Received	
8	Forebay					7/1/20	Norm Groot	Does it make sense to be congruent with 180/400 subbasin on this?	DW: Not required to have same approach as 180/400. However, the law says, one subbasin may not prevent another subbasin from reaching sustainability. If one subbasin says 4inches subsidence/year and you say 0inches/year, there will be issues of preventing reaching sustainability.	
9	Forebay					7/1/20	Jason Smith	Each surface water body can have its own designation?	DW: Yes, you could say the Min Thresh for Salinas R. is to maintain current rate of depression, and could say increase depletion for Arroyo Seco	
10	Forebay					7/1/20	Steve McIntyre	When do we need to make a decision?	DW: You need to come up with a quantitative description for each SMC. This is an iterative process.	
11	Forebay					7/1/20	Curtis Weeks	Relative to interdependent GW issues, the riparian corridor has adapted, see pic on left of slide. Note no cottonwoods. We noted flashiness of water, sandiness of substrate. Water flows through. In other reaches, cottonwoods have died.	DW: Curtis touched on this, when we set levels of what is significant and unreasonable, we are only talking about where GW and SW levels are similar and connected. Not where GW is disconnected from SW. So think of those locations.	
12	Forebay					7/1/20	Jerry Lohr	Glad you acknowledge difference in Arroyo Seco Cone. I think the idea of not harming neighboring GSAs is good. Looking at whole area as well as ASGSA is appreciated.	Comment Received	
13	Forebay					7/1/20	Steve McIntyre	When we were working on 180/400, we were also working on ISP. Group came up with recommendations for whole basin. Are you going to share those? Or will this committee need to come up with new recommendations.	DW: I'm trying to allow for flexibility and have each committee come up with their own ideas. I can share those recommendations as a starting point.	
14	Forebay					7/1/20	Steve McIntyre	I think that's a great idea, and to emphasize this is an iterative process, and those are just a starting point.	DW: Yes, and while we've changed our whole process to be more inclusive, I don't want those ISP recommendations to be a hard pass. Will send those recommendations within a few days.	
15	Forebay					7/1/20	Jason Smith	Important to emphasize the no-harm principle so we don't have to just go back to the drawing board.	DW: Good point, yes you have to set your own thresholds but not so in a way that will be unreasonable to their neighbors. Some other basins in Cali have submitted their GSPs, and are only *now* reaching out to their neighbors. Don't know how DWR will handle this.	
16	Forebay					7/1/20	Jason Smith	So how will that work?	DW: It goes both ways. The 180/400 may not prevent Forebay or Eastside or Langley from reaching sustainability.	
17	Forebay					7/1/20	Jason Smith	The 180/400 has already created their plan. I understand this will be adjusted.	Emily: M&A and the SVBGSA are involved in the creation of these plans and if we see people talking about SMCs that won't line up, or negatively impact, we're trying to get ahead of that.	
18	Forebay					7/1/20	Victoria Hermosilla	Would like to remind everyone there is an online comment form.	DW: we have released some of the chapters, 1-4, is background information. Comments about style, grammar, etc... please use SVBGSA website. There is button.	
19	Forebay					7/1/20	Curtis Weeks	Getting in to aspects of coordination, we need to make sure we're working together, pulling horse in same direction. Strategically, have to figure out how we're going to eliminate conflict and work together.	Comment Received	
20	Forebay					7/1/20	Tom Virsik	In agenda packet, some language about encouraging voluntary pumping controls, sect. 3.8.5. I have no problem, but upper valley draft has water charges framework at that section. So, there is a distinction now. Not sure if this is iterative phrasing, or on purpose. Didn't see	DW: Yes, this is an iterative change. We're going to take that language out of the Upper Valley. Will say we're going to encourage voluntary pumping reductions.	
21	Forebay					7/1/20	Nancy Isakson	Release public comments	Emily: We are working with M&A to collect comments. We have not decided on the timing of releasing those comments back to the public. DW: We are going to submit the comments to the advisory committee, and probably won't release comments to the public before then. Emily: Categorizing comments in admin, opinion, strategic. Still working through this.	
22	Forebay					7/1/20	Jerry Lohr	Want to know what kinds of things Derrick thinks would be most beneficial for us to participate in.	DW: The July 28 SMC workshop will explain more about what we covered here. It will not deal with data specific to this subbasin, but be more conceptual. The July 9 BOD meeting will cover a GDE/ISW discussion also. If that's what you're interested in, there will be more technical information.	
23	Forebay					7/1/20	Steve McIntyre	I think the GDEs will be a good workshop.	Emily: We do have a followup item to send ISP recommendations out at starting point. In addition, we will reach out with survey in August to make some decisions in September meeting.	
24	Forebay	3	Table 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	

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
25	Forebay	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	
26	Forebay	3				7/10/2020 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	
27	Forebay	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	
28	Forebay	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 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	