

COMMENTS RECEIVED JUNE 12, 2020 TO JULY 20, 2020

| Number | Subbasin | Chapter | Table | Page | Figure | Date    | Commenter | Comment  | Response  | Action |
|--------|----------|---------|-------|------|--------|---------|-----------|--|---|--------|
| 1      | UV       | 3       | 3-1   | 3-4  |        | 6/10/20 | SVWC      | Pg 3-4, Table 3-1 provides a land use summary that appears to subsequently be used to identify irrigated lands and their associated amounts of water use. The GSP states that the agriculture lands shown on the table include grazing lands. Recommendation: Grazing lands should either be removed from the table or have a separate water use value because the majority of the grazing lands in the UV Subbasin are not irrigated.   | Comment received  |        |
| 2      | UV       | 3.2.1   |       |      |        | 6/10/20 | SVWC      | <p>We do not believe these statements are factually correct. We have previously raised this issue during your preparation of the 180/400 Aquifer GSP and are unpleasantly surprised to see the inaccurate statements repeated again. We believe that the majority, if not all, of the water used in the UV Sub-basin is in fact percolating groundwater. There has been no determination by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) as to whether any well along the Salinas River is pumping water from underflow/subterranean stream flowing through a known and definite channel (as had been determined for the Carmel River). Unless and until there is such a determination, there is a legal presumption that all wells along the Salinas River are pumping percolating groundwater. It is our understanding that the majority, if not all, of those who file Statements of Water Diversion and Use with the SWRCB, have done so in the event there is a determination that the water pumped is underflow, a subterranean stream, or any other water that is characterized as surface water subject to the SWRCB's jurisdiction in order to take the position that they were exercising their riparian water rights associated with their respective lands. It is also our understanding that the majority, if not all, of the individuals who file these Statements with the SWRCB also file 'duplicate' water use/extraction reports with the Monterey County Water Resources Agency (MCWRA); the Statements and water use/extractions in the filings with the MCWRA are not additive. Simply stated, there appears to be double-counting of water consumption in the UV Sub-basin.</p> <p>Recommendation: This error needs to be corrected as it significantly distorts and misrepresents the actual amount of surface water diverted in the Upper Valley Subbasin. There should be a reconciliation of the Statements filed with the SWRCB and the annual extraction reports filed with the MCWRA, which we believe will confirm that the majority, if not all, of the 'diversion' amounts set forth in the Statements are duplicative of those amounts provided in the extraction reports filed with the MCWRA. It should be noted that the Statements filed with the SWRCB require reporting based on a calendar year, while the extraction reports filed with the MCWRA are based on a water year.</p> | DW: We ave discussed water reported to MCWRA, reported to eWRIMS as SW diversion, water reported to both. We've made statements about water used, and amount that is GW. This is probably inaccurate. Plan is to change language to explain pumping reported to MCWRA, water reported to eWRIMS, and water reported to both, then leave it at that. |        |
| 3      | UV       | 3.4.1   |       |      |        | 6/10/20 | SVWC      | The UV GSP states that the groundwater elevation monitoring programs are operated by an "existing member" of the SVBGSA. Recommendation: The UV GSP should identify the member of the SVBGSA which is operating the programs.  | Comment received  |        |
| 4      | UV       | 3.4.3   |       |      |        | 6/10/20 | SVWC      | The Section 3.4.3 of the UV GSP states that "extraction is self-reported by well owners." Recommendation: Because there continues to be a lack of public understanding of extraction reporting, we suggest that you expand your discussion on this matter to include a statement explaining the percentage of well owners who report their annual extractions to the MCWRA and distinguish the separate reporting requirements between agricultural wells versus other wells   | Comment received  |        |
| 5      | UV       | 3.6.1   |       |      |        | 6/10/20 | SVWC      | The first paragraph of this section includes the following statement: "...some of the existing management plans and ordinances will limit operational flexibility. These limits to operational flexibility have already been incorporated into the projects and programs included in this GSP." This is a surprising statement since only the chapters 1, 3 and 4 of the UV GSP have been prepared and publicly disseminated, and these chapters do not include any discussions of projects and/or programs. It is difficult to fully understand how the operational flexibility of this UV GSP is limited. Recommendation: This paragraph should be revised to state, at the very least, that there 'may' be limitations to operational flexibility because of existing management plans and ordinances in place; and that this will be discussed and analyzed further when considering various programs and projects for the UV GSP.   | Comment received  |        |

| Number | Subbasin | Chapter | Table | Page | Figure | Date    | Commenter | Comment   | Response         | Action |
|--------|----------|---------|-------|------|--------|---------|-----------|---|------------------|--------|
| 6      | UV       | 3.6.1   |       |      |        | 6/10/20 | SVWC      | <p>Recommendation: Sections 3.6.1 and 3.6.2 must be revised to accurately reflect the express language of the Agency Act. That is, the prohibition on exportation of groundwater pertains to the entire Salinas River Groundwater Basin. This is an important distinction as there may be properties/ranches that overlap two sub-basins that utilize one irrigation system to irrigate the ranches. There may also be cases where a well on a property over one sub-basin is used to irrigate an adjacent property located over another sub-basin. The UV Sub-basin GSP should include the above express language from the Agency Act.</p> <p>That said, it is important to point out one subbasin cannot cause injury to another subbasin in the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin pursuant to SGMA. Accordingly, any large project that proposes to export groundwater out of the UV Sub-basin could cause the currently sustainable UV Sub-basin to be unsustainable. In such instances, the prohibition on exportation would apply pursuant to SGMA, but not the Agency Act.</p>  | Comment received |        |
| 7      | UV       | 3.8.3   |       |      |        | 6/10/20 | SVWC      | <p>This section references Monterey County General Plan policies for water supply guidelines applicable to "new lots", and says these guidelines are represented in Table 3-3. This section references Monterey County General Plan policies for water supply guidelines applicable to "new lots", and says these guidelines are represented in Table 3-3. However, Table 3-3 fails to state that these guidelines are only applicable to water supply on 'new lots', i.e., the policies only apply to the creation of new residential or commercial lots. Recommendation: Please correct the language in Section 3.8.3 and Table 3-3 to accurately reflect the limited applicability of Monterey County General Plan policies, specifically Policy PS 1.1 and Table PS-1.</p>  | Comment received |        |
| 8      | UV       | 3.8.3   | 3-4   |      |        | 6/10/20 | SVWC      | <p>The misrepresentation is further exacerbated by the UV Sub-Basin GSP's Table 34. Table 3-4 is taken from the Monterey County General Plan's Table PS-2, which is included in the General Plan to provide a response to, and to clarify, footnote 5 in Table PS1; in other words, the UV Sub-basin GSP Table 3-4 is only applicable to existing residential and/or commercial lots. Recommendation: These guidelines do not apply to irrigation wells used for agricultural purposes and Section 3.8.3 and Tables 3-3 and 3-4 must be clarified and corrected to accurately reflect the limited applicability of the referenced Monterey County General Plan policies.</p>  | Comment received |        |
| 9      | UV       | 3.8.4   |       |      |        | 6/10/20 | SVWC      | <p>This section seems to focus on the lawsuit filed against and subsequent settlement with Monterey County on its General Plan. The SVWC was one of the petitioners/plaintiffs in this lawsuit and a party to the settlement. Unfortunately, the UV Subbasin GSP misstates and misrepresents the elements of the settlement, specifically: A. The UV GSP states, "The settlement agreement requires the County of Monterey to develop a study of a portion of the Basin's water supplies..." [emphasis added] Recommendation: Please clarify that the study is intended to encompass all of Zone 2C which largely overlaps the boundaries of the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin.</p>  | Comment received |        |
| 10     | UV       | 3.8.4   |       |      |        | 6/10/20 | SVWC      | <p>"The settlement agreement furthermore required the USGS to develop the Salinas Valley Integrated Hydrologic Model (SVIHM) that will be used during implementation of this GSP." [emphasis added] This is simply not true. The settlement requires Monterey County to complete an investigation of the Basin, i.e., Zone 2C, as detailed in the amendment to Monterey County's General Plan Policy PS-3.1. It was the County of Monterey which chose to retain the USGS to develop a model that would allow them to complete their investigation and evaluate its conditions against certain criteria set forth in PS-3.1. Recommendation: Policy PS-3.1 of Monterey County's General Plan is enclosed as Attachment A to this letter, and we recommend that the actual policy language be included within your UV Sub-basin GSP should you decide to discuss it.</p>   | Comment received |        |
| 11     | UV       | 3.8.4   |       |      |        | 6/10/20 | SVWC      | <p>"The outcomes from this study (the basin investigation as required in Policy PS-3.1) may affect the GSP implementation. However, the GSP assumes pumping will be limited to the sustainable yield through the measures laid out in Chapter 9. The study and GSP implementation are two parallel efforts, and the results of the County's study will be reviewed when finalized and considered during GSP implementation." It is inappropriate to state the GSP "assumes pumping will be limited...through measures laid out in Chapter 9" when only the chapters 1, 3 and 4 of the UV Sub-basin GSP has been drafted, and all indications to-date show that the UV Sub-basin is sustainable, which is consistent with the statement previously expressed by the your consultant. Recommendation: It is inappropriate to include such statements when the hydrological investigation and modeling for the UV Sub-basin have not been completed, and the sustainability of the UV Sub-basin has not been determined – unless, of course, this GSA is pre-determining the outcome. These types of statements should be omitted and replaced with something that simply states, "the outcomes from various studies, such as the one required with Monterey County's General Plan Policy PS-3.1, and their potential impacts to the GSP will be considered when finalized."</p> | Comment received |        |

| Number | Subbasin | Chapter    | Table | Page | Figure | Date    | Commenter      | Comment  | Response  | Action |
|--------|----------|------------|-------|------|--------|---------|----------------|--|---|--------|
| 12     | UV       | 3.85       |       |      |        | 6/10/20 | SVWC           | "The water charges framework, one of the main implementation measures described in Chapter 9, will promote voluntary pumping controls through a tiered pumping fee structure. Changes in the cost of groundwater may affect whether surface water or groundwater is used." Recommendation: The above statement again indicates a pre-determined outcome. It is inappropriate to discuss an implementation measure when only chapters 1, 3 and 4 of the UV Sub-basin GSP has been drafted and hydrologic investigation and associated modeling have not been completed. It is certainly premature to assume a need for tiered pumping fees to promote voluntary pumping controls when it is likely the Upper Valley Sub-basin is sustainable as asserted by your GSP consultant. This type of statement should be omitted and replaced with one that simply states, 'various implementation actions will be considered in Chapter 9.' | Comment received  |        |
| 13     | UV       | None given |       |      |        | 6/11/20 | Grant Cremers  | In reviewing the materials for our first meeting, the references to additional chapters has raised the question as to if those chapters are already written. If there are other chapters that are written, we would like to see those now and work through this process with as much information as possible.  | We are able to allude to future chapters because we know the structure, so we know where the other information will be held.  |        |
| 14     | UV       | None given |       |      |        | 6/11/20 | Grant Cremers  | Another item that I have received comments on is the surface and ground water use references. These items look to be misleading as written, we look forward to hearing more on this and sharing our firsthand knowledge.   | Yes, see response to SVWC comment on same topic.  |        |
| 15     | UV       |            |       |      |        | 6/12/20 | Nancy Isackson | Will these slide presentations be posted to the website in an area we can find them?   | Yes   |        |
| 16     | UV       |            |       |      |        | 6/12/20 | Tom Virsik     | Based on what we heard at the BOD on the modeling, when will chapters 6, 9, and 10 be realistically available and when will the models be available to cross-check. Raising as continuing concern.   | We are building chapters as we go. This is truly a planning process. Our goal is that you become our advisors in this process, you are really the first step to provide guidance. We do not have written chapters hiding anywhere. We want to honor the process. A committee-based, stakeholder-based process. I appreciate your comment.                             |        |
| 17     | UV       |            |       |      |        | 6/12/20 | Bill Lipe      | <b>I think we need to release all the chapters now.</b> The slow-release underestimates people's ability to take in a lot of information, esp people who have been dealing with these issues for many years. I request all chapters be released so we can know what to expect. We're being told things can be changed down the road, but it's quite a process. Let people know, esp people who will financially be on the hook for these plans, let them see the whole picture. We need to be able to understand what all the moving parts are in these plans. Many people have concerns about the moving parts, the projects, the costs. I think this is the fair thing to do.  | It is true, we have not written other chapters. Emily pointed out we are able to allude to them because we know the structure, so we know where the other information will be held. I will talk to staff about a different approach, possibly about releasing all information at once, 6-8 months. There is a way we can do that, but it won't be for some time. (DW) |        |
| 18     | UV       |            |       |      |        | 6/12/20 | Bill Lipe      | There is concern about how we're going to pay for things. If you wait until the last minute to release the financial obligations with the plan, people are going to have concerns. I don't think we should wait on this, or when all the chapters are available. This started in 2017, and you ran a rigorous process, but I would think you're better at this now. I would hope you would be able to come up with a plan quicker this time.   | Comment received. The plan is to receive direction from the committee on projects in October, the water charges framework in March and implementation direction in May.   |        |
| 19     | UV       |            |       |      |        | 6/12/20 | Grant Cremers  | I've had people reach out to me with similar concerns. They don't want to be at the point where it all comes into full view at the end, leaving a limited amount of time to work on it. I've spoken with business owners. They want to know the big picture and move on.   | Comment received. The plan is to receive direction from the committee on projects in October, the water charges framework in March and implementation direction in May.   |        |
| 20     | UV       |            |       |      |        | 6/12/20 | Jason Smith    | I would add in what this will cost. This is all related to chapters, the models from the USGS, and money we're going to have to spend. I will say, we've all been most concerned about, is the transparency and communication. I don't know any other board or committee or agency with as much transparency as this one. We are a committee to address things to go to the AC to the BOD to go to public comment. I don't know how many more layers we'll need.   | Comment received  |        |
| 21     | UV       |            |       |      |        | 6/12/20 | Grant Cremers  | Will our estimate of current rangeland and crop land diminish the future ability of rangeland to be converted to crop land?  | Comment Received. The estimate of current crop land and current rangeland will be used to estimate the volume of water used at this time for the water budget.  |        |
| 22     | UV       |            |       |      |        | 6/12/20 | Jason Smith    | You said you're not going to make a determination about what is SW and what is GW. This has been a frustrating process because the double-counting has been used against us.   | DW: I forgot to say I am not addressing what is GW and what is SW at this point. Will come back to us later, with attorneys. I am not making that assessment at this point, but we will have to address it later.   |        |

| Number | Subbasin | Chapter | Table | Page | Figure | Date    | Commenter      | Comment   | Response  | Action |
|--------|----------|---------|-------|------|--------|---------|----------------|---|---|--------|
| 23     | UV       |         |       |      |        | 6/12/20 | Nancy Isackson | I submitted comments from the SVWC. I think it's important to present data in factual way. This will come up in water budget. How will you account for different sources and how they're used, will be important for everyone to understand.<br>Second question, comments from letter, how will those be responded to and when? | DW: Comment from your letter, re: water budget. The water budgets for the other subbasins we are looking at now will be divided in a more granular way: stream percolation, reservoir release, irrigation return flow. With water budget, still about accounting. But in plans, will need to be more detailed about what is GW and SW because this will be important in future.<br><br>DW: Most of those comments are factual changes, or what Emily would call Admin comments. We will record them, and respond with how those changes will be made. We will not make the changes until the drafts go through all the committees to prevent multiple versions. We will be keeping a list as we go, then present to BOD how we'll address them. |        |
| 24     | UV       | 1       |       |      |        | 6/12/20 | Tom Virsik     | Page 1-1, many typos.   | Comment received  |        |
| 25     | UV       | 3       |       |      |        | 6/12/20 | Tom Virsik     | Two pages labelled 3-2.   | Comment received  |        |
| 26     | UV       |         |       |      |        | 6/12/20 | Tom Virsik     | On SW/GW issue, potential ramifications. Want to point out, Zone 2C is not entirety of previous Bulletin 118 boundary. I have clients that report to control board. They have extractions just outside the Zone 2C boundary.  | Comment received.   |        |
| 27     | UV       | 3       |       |      |        | 6/12/20 | Tom Virsik     | Also, page 3-18, 3.4.3, MCWRA collects information from all wells. Not true.  | Comment received  |        |
| 28     | UV       | 3       |       |      |        | 6/12/20 | Tom Virsik     | Page 3-2, description of MCWRA structure. Not quite right, not wildly wrong, have Mr. Girard or someone should look and make it accurate.   | Comment received.   |        |
| 29     | UV       |         |       |      |        | 6/12/20 | Nancy Isackson | For 180/400, you did a table of comments and your response. Will you do that as you go through each chapter? What about additional comments posted by the public?   | DW: We try to keep the list as updated as possible to be sent to Adv. Committee. We're working on it now, incl online comment form. This will allow us to create table more automatically. So I will be promoting it more, and hopefully it will be online beginning next week.   |        |
| 30     | UV       |         |       |      |        | 6/12/20 | Bill Lipe      | Will you be taking a closer look at SW/GW reporting? The determination of whether you're pumping underflow vs GW, there's no legal declaration and I haven't seen much science.   | DW: I am simply going to talk about what's reported to state and to MCWRA. The time will come when we will have to make assessments about what water is being pumped. I don't want to discuss underflow at this point. There will be other questions about MCWRA releases, conservation releases. They are releasing diverted water. What is that. Important questions when we start talking about what water and who's water. I don't know if we'll get conclusion during GSP process. We'll address at some time in future.   |        |
| 31     | UV       |         |       |      |        | 6/12/20 | Bill Lipe      | Water is diverted to stop floods and provide conservation. The claims are that the downstream rights supersede the rights of the diverter. Some people would say "if that diversion wasn't there, it'd be natural flow and percolate." We know regionally the water acts different in different areas.                          | DW: Not my position now to say what is GW and what is SW. Needs to be part of process, but after we have Water Budgets more established.  |        |
| 32     | UV       |         |       |      |        | 6/12/20 | Steve McIntyre | How are you going to get away from the possibility that much of this water is reported twice, and subsequently double counted? 30-40 wells I know are reported to both agencies. Are you going to add those? Will it skew water budget?   | DW: It will not skew our water budget because we're going to use GW models and it will not double count. We can have discussion in the future about how much model works.   |        |
| 33     | UV       |         |       |      |        | 6/12/20 | Grant Cremers  | Sounds like we will try to address computation of SW/GW reporting. This is big point we want clarity on. Want something everyone in the basin will agree too.   | Comment received  |        |

| Number | Subbasin | Chapter | Table | Page | Figure | Date                 | Commenter      | Comment   | Response   | Action |
|--------|----------|---------|-------|------|--------|----------------------|----------------|---|--|--------|
| 34     | UV       |         |       | 1    |        | 6/12/20              | Grant Cremers  | On released chapters, wording issues pg 1, 3rd para: wells were impacted or rendered unusable.... Needs rewording because that was due to reservoir management, we know from lawsuit settlement. <b>Don't want to characterize basin as super-susceptible to drought.</b>   | Comment received   |        |
| 35     | UV       |         |       |      |        | 6/12/20              | Grant Cremers  | 4th para: outline of how GSP will outline sustainability. We may already be in sustainability. Maybe we don't need to say that. <b>Maybe we want to show how the subbasin is already sustainable.</b>   | Comment received   |        |
| 36     | UV       |         |       |      |        | 6/12/20              | Grant Cremers  | What is the current sustainability goal for subbasin? I don't see that anywhere.  | Comment received   |        |
| 37     | UV       |         |       |      |        | 6/12/20              | Bill Lipe      | When subbasin boundary was extended to county line, the Upper Valley was very close to being low-priority, already pretty sustainable. No water for 3 years reached Spreckles, was a very unique situation. If reservoirs/respective rivers are impaired repercussions for years. Recharge from rivers is ~85%. Upper Valley is unique, relatively balanced b/t water resources and water use.  | Comment received   |        |
| 38     | UV       |         |       |      |        | 6/12/20              | Emily          | The Upper Valley Subbasin Committee provided the following motion regarding the strategic direction for the draft Chapters 1, 3 and 4: 1) share information and Chapters as soon as possible; 2) the Subbasin should not be categorized as susceptible to drought and it should be shown how the Subbasin is already sustainable."  | Motion was passed by Committee and will be incorporated. |        |
| 39     | UV       | 3       | 3-2   |      |        | 7/16/2020<br>Jotform | 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   |        |
| 40     | UV       | 3       |       |      |        | 7/10/2020<br>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   |        |
| 41     | UV       | 3       |       |      |        | 7/10/20<br>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: <a href="http://www.greatermontereyrwm.org/documents/disadvantaged-community-plan-for-drinking-water-and-wastewater/">http://www.greatermontereyrwm.org/documents/disadvantaged-community-plan-for-drinking-water-and-wastewater/</a>  | Email Received   |        |
| 42     | UV       | 3       |       |      |        | 7/10/2020<br>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   |        |
| 43     | UV       | 3       |       |      |        | 7/10/2020<br>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 SWS 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   |        |