

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
1	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Curtis Weeks	Not having any subsidence, you're still going to have land surface changes.	Comment received	
2						09/02/2020 Meeting		Subsidence SMC: Motion to accept Option 1: Any subsidence anywhere in the Subbasin is significant and unreasonable using the metric of InSAR data (+/-) 0.1 ft.	Motion was passed by Committee and will be incorporated into GSP.	This will be incorporated into GSP development as a strategic comment. See memo for further discussion.
3	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Norm Groot	At the risk of getting into a tug of war with other organizations, I suggest we maintain current water quality impacts. Choosing to improve may have policy conflicts. With so much we have to do to maintain the groundwater, maintaining quality is probably the best way forward.	Comment received	
4	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Curtis Weeks	This is related to salt management. Salts are likely to increase over time. Maintaining the salt balance over time may be difficult to achieve.	Comment received	
5	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Heather Lukacs	We care a lot about water quality. We recognize what SGMA says, that you can't further degrade water quality. We support setting minimum thresholds and measurable objectives at specific wells. Ours is more of a question around <i>where</i> the monitoring occurs around the basin and how the baseline is developed. There's an opportunity for multi-benefit projects that take into account water quality. We are really hopeful that groundwater management can improve the water quality.	Comment received	
6	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting		Water Quality SMC: Motion to accept Option 1: Degraded groundwater quality resulting from direct GSA actions is significant and unreasonable as measured by the number of supply wells.	Motion was passed by Committee and will be incorporated into GSP.	This will be incorporated into GSP development as a strategic comment. See memo for further discussion.
7	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Nancy Isakson	Are these flexible? We haven't done the water budget, so we don't know what the sustainable yield is, so we don't know how feasible it is to pump within the sustainable yield.	Abby Ostovar: We won't write this section until we have the water budget. This is to provide initial guidance. DW: Kind of by definition, we will already be pumping within sustainable yield. This sustainable yield is what you can pump without having undesirable results. We will put a number on it, but it's subject to revision as we get better information or implement projects.	
8	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Steve McIntyre	I understand these are policies?	DW: Yes, here we're asking for policy directions today, and we'll have better numbers later.	
9	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Heather Lukacs	I agree with others that it's important to see sustainable yield numbers. Other agencies start with that sustainable yield, how much can you pump to maintain water levels and prevent undesirable results. Encourage subbasin to look at sustainable yield. It is what is truly sustainable, not just what you can pump.	Abby Ostovar: We plan on generating the sustainable yield when we get the model, which should be in a couple of weeks. This is really to get your initial reaction so we can start fleshing out the direction, and we will come back with the numbers when we have them.	
10	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Allen Panziera	I don't want us to be pumping to our minimum numbers or water levels. I want to understand that process a little better and how we come up with that number.	DW: What we're going to be doing is, when we implement all of the projects that we have planned, how much pumping does that support and still meet our measurable objectives? And remember, this is in 20 years from now. If we say, 15 years out, and we have implemented projects but we see GW levels going down, we can change our sustainable yield based on what we're seeing on the ground. It can be adjusted along the way.	
11	Forebay			1		09/02/2020 Meeting	Nancy Isakson	I appreciate Derrick's comment. That's the important part, what if projects are not implemented or voted on, you're looking at pumping reductions to meet that sustainable yield. This highlights the importance of being able to identify the sustainable yield.	Comment received	
12	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Steve McIntyre	Even if we don't implement any projects, we don't have to necessarily reduce pumping depending on what is determined to be our sustainable yield. Is that correct, Derrick?	DW: Yes.	
13	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting		Groundwater Storage SMC: Motion to accept Option 1: Pumping in excess of the sustainable yield leads to significant and unreasonable impacts.	Motion was passed by Committee and will be incorporated into GSP.	This will be incorporated into GSP development as a strategic comment. See memo for further discussion.
14	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Steve McIntyre	Arroyo Seco GSP chose 2015, thinking along these same lines.	Comment received	
15	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Allen Panziera	When the Arroyo Seco selected 2015, we saw different things. I'm not sure about the Forebay. Certain things did not recover. I need more information to make that decision.	Comment received	
16	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Jason Smith	We had some issues with how the dams were operating. I'm reluctant to use 2015 as that level because, I don't know how to address that.	Comment received	
17	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Steve McIntyre	We'll be discussing the numbers at a later time, like sustainable yield. We don't have to decide which year today because we are focusing on policy.	Comment received	

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
18	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Heather Lukacs	I think I see the water levels discussion here is a little different. Do we have an understanding of the wells in the area, specifically domestic wells or small water systems? We would like to see groundwater levels that protect drinking water users. We would like to see a drinking water analysis like we saw in the 180/400 so all users can be engaged. How are drinking water users considered in this recommendation?	Comment received	
19	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Jerry Lohr	It seems like we're getting ahead of ourselves. I would like more data and information.	Abby Ostovar: Is there specific data you're looking for? DW: We're asking for policy approaches now, so then we can come back with more data.	
20	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Allen Panziera	We are going to have a cross-section of all groundwater data types including domestic, correct?	DW: Yes, for the data that we have. We don't have a lot of data on domestic wells. Abby Ostovar: We can develop groundwater elevation contours, and show what it would look like in a couple different years.	
21	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Nancy Isakson	I'm struggling with 2015, whatever year you choose, you don't want to make it worse. Potentially, what is the lowest you can live with? Once you get the data, and you look at what happens, you can relook at these with the data.	Comment received	
22	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Heather Lukacs	It would be helpful to see the impacts on the domestic wells first. I know some people have drilled deeper wells in this area mostly because of quality. It would be helpful to see that prior to making a decision.	Comment received	
23	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Jerry Lohr	I agree with that. I would like to see more information and analysis before making a decision. I would like to know more about Option 1 and 4. Domestic wells will have difficulty getting data. So more data and hydrographs for Option 1.	Comment received	
24	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting		Groundwater Elevation SMC: Motion to accept option 1, but need to review additional data.	Motion was passed by Committee.	This will be incorporated into GSP development as a strategic comment. See memo for further discussion.
25	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting		Depletion of Interconnected Surface Water SMC: Motion to accept Option 3: The current rate of surface water depletion is not unreasonable (although it may be significant).	Motion was passed by Committee and will be incorporated into GSP.	This will be incorporated into GSP development as a strategic comment. See memo for further discussion.
26	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Steve McIntyre	I think the reservoir reoperation would be minimal from a financial standpoint, and critical for the Forebay. Same with the invasive species removal. Nobody wants to have pumping restrictions, but we may have to in drought. I'm hopeful as a basin we can come up with financial incentives, to incentivize farmers to use less water based on the ET rate, compared to the amount of water they pump. Use satellite data and decrease the delta between the two. Possibly convert to drip irrigation. I think converting to drip irrigation would save us around 30,000 AFY	Comment received	
27	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Jerry Lohr	I agree with Steve on these first two things. What's new to me is the winter release idea. Winter release and recharge has good merit and are good ideas.	Comment received	
28	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Jason Smith	Since we had a strategic BOD meeting with the MCWRA on Friday, and the topic of working with this agency is a big priority. We are talking about assets and projects run by MCWRA. I think we're moving the right direction, working with the MCWRA. Obviously with the need for work in the 180/400 with SWI, and we are relatively sustainable in the Forebay, we need to continue to understand how that all works together with cost.	Comment received	
29	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Nancy Isakson	How are these projects going to be working together? Some slides show a Salinas Valley Program, and some are more specific to the 180/400, others may be beneficial to the whole valley. How will that all be implemented? When you talk about maximizing the SRDF, what does that mean for the Salinas Valley Water Project which has been voted on and is utilizing that water right? People have paid for that benefit for many years. Winter releases, wasn't clear to me there would be additional diversions, releases. If you inject it at the ASR wells, you would provide that water for the irrigation season at the SRDF?	DW: The idea is the winter releases we inject in the ASR wells, we pump that water instead of summer releases to the SRDF.	
30	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Nancy Isakson	That would limit the releases and recharge from the reservoirs during the irrigation season.	DW: There is a question around how late do we have releases, into July? It's a trade-off. No summer releases? Winter releases and solving for future droughts? Your feedback is important for us to know which trade-off is better or not.	

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
31	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Nancy Isakson	It's public knowledge that the SVWC entered into a settlement agreement with the MCWRA. One thing we are looking at is implementation of a winter release schedule and one concern is impacts to SRDF. Your alternative is avoiding impacts at the SRDF.	Comment received	
32	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Heather Lukacs	1) We really encourage the GSA to explore projects with multiple benefits, especially with regard to GW quality remediation. Funding from the state, SVBGSA wouldn't have to be the lead on it. 2) Design recharge projects that would protect drinking water. I think this could be fundable from many different sources. Exciting research from UC Davis/Santa Cruz. Consider this with recharge projects. 3) Include a drinking water well mitigation program. We work with people with wells in the area, and a mitigation program could help them deepen their well or connect to a nearby water system. We would like to see this included to achieve multi-benefits and bring in more outside funding.	Comment received	
33	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Tom Virsik	The issue of the MCWRA interlake tunnel project is more than a slight complication. This will have a large impact on the pocketbook of users. Sooner or later, the SVBGSA will need to take a position on the tunnel project. Could be more from the technical side, saying we understand the tunnel project would "assist" or "hinder" projects one way or the other and will have a fiscal impact. Even though it's not the GSA's project, I think it is something that the GSA will need to deal with directly.	Abby Ostovar: We fully intend on working with MCWRA.	
34	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Curtis Weeks	This committee is really charged with looking at the Forebay and some projects aren't Forebay related. Thinking about the coordination with the MCWRA on the reservoir reoperation and HCP, I think the coordination is a key element. I think it's going to take a different way of looking at GW. In terms of reduction of pumping, in the last drought cycle, there were some individuals that did have to reduce their pumping. The exception is the CSIP area, which has different supplies and very deep wells, and they used the same or more water during the drought. The area where we have the largest problem, we didn't have a comensurate reduction in pumping.	Comment received	
35	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	James Bishop	The CSIP permit is over 20 years old. If expansion occurs, the new permit may not be the same as the old permit and there may be additional requirements. The title 22 report, issued by DDW, will also need to be updated. We are supportive of the use of recycled water.	Comment received	
36	Forebay	5				09/02/2020 Meeting	Curtis Weeks	Chapter 5, I was concerned about the graphic depicting a predicted Deep Aquifer in the Forebay. The Forebay is an unconsolidated mass of sediments. I was surprised on the predicted area without any data. We shouldn't include those types of designations without proper hydrogeologic characterization.	Comment received	
37	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Steve McIntyre	I also had concerns about characterizing it as part of the deep aquifer without a presentation of data and evidence based science. I think we should revisit it at our next meeting.	Comment received	
38	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Curtis Weeks	It wasn't clear to me if you were calling the area a deep aquifer within the Forebay or if you were making the leap to connect it to the deep aquifer in the coastal areas. It's not clear what the recharge mechanism is for that in the coastal area deep aquifers. To make that kind of leap gives me pause and concern.	Comment received	
39	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Steve McIntyre	I agree with that and I worry it's conjecture and we need some data.	Comment received	
40	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting	Nancy Isakson	That addressed my question. I think it's premature without the data. I reached out to our hydrologist and geologist and they were both surprised that the deep aquifer was included. If you don't have the data, it needs to be removed. But if you believe it needs to be there, then the committee and public need to know what it would take to develop the data.	Comment received	
41	Forebay					09/02/2020 Meeting		Motion: Bring back item of chapter 5 & 7 for discussion next time. Specifically, in regard to the deep aquifer.	Comment received	