

COMMENTS RECEIVED SEPTEMBER 18, 2020 TO DECEMBER 3, 2020

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
1	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Grant Cremers	If we're measuring difference in the land over time, is there earthquake influence on this? If we set the MO or MT at zero, how is this impacted by earthquakes?	Abby Ostovar: The specific text discusses land subsidence as a result of groundwater activities.	
2	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Grant Cremers	How do earthquakes interact with groundwater?	DW: This is a big topic of debate in hydrology. We are focused more on subsidence due to improper management. This is also a question in storage. A large decline in storage during a drought year is not an undesirable result. As long as we show a reasonable management plan and management actions, we should be fine.	
3	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	What is the level of subsidence in the Upper Valley?	DW: It is 0, and is within a measurement error of +/-0.1 ft per year.	
4	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	Is there a standard for significant and unreasonable?	DW: There isn't. We're talking about how much subsidence is happening 20 years from now.	
5	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Tom Merrifield	Just a comment about the relationship between earthquakes and subsidence. Generally speaking, they work opposite to each other, where we see it. Earthquakes are seen with injection of groundwater. Subsidence, as we're talking about it, is due to extraction of groundwater. You wouldn't see earthquakes as a result of GW withdrawal.	Comment received	
6	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting		Subsidence SMC: Motion to accept Option 1: Any subsidence anywhere in the Subbasin is significant and unreasonable using the metric of InSAR data	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	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Grant Cremers	Will the sustainable yield number be determined each year by a model?	DW: Yes, it is estimated by a model. Then, we look at pumping, and climate, and we ask "was our estimate of sustainable yield reasonable or not." We look at whether GW levels are dropping, and we reassess. Abby Ostovar: The GSPs also undergo 5-year updates. DW: Sustainable yield is easier to estimate in overdrafted basins. This basin is not overdrafted. Abby Ostovar: It's also challenging when we don't have enough data. We will be working on expanding our data collection and monitoring networks. It's a challenge here.	
8	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	Perhaps you have a scenario where groundwater levels don't fluctuate very much. But people look in and still want to say "you should still limit your pumping." How do you respond?	DW: We'll probably break water budget into two parts: natural recharge and what the MCWRA releases from the reservoir as conservation releases. As long as MCWRA continues to release that water, effectively for recharge, the UV is a beneficiary of that. If people say you're taking advantage, that is not a technical problem, it's a negotiation problem.	
9	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Grant Cremers	On measuring this, in a regular year, you have sustainable yield. Then you get into a dry year, and you don't know if it's going to be many years. You lose some GW in a dry year, you are going to dip into your savings. Can we do that?	DW: Yes. In DWR BMP, reduction of GW storage during a drought is expected. As long as there is a plan in place to replenish that water and recover the storage.	
10	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	What is considered "long-term"?	DW: The way I view long-term, we are projecting what is going to be a successful plan based on a certain assumed hydrology. Average precip, average reservoir releases, etc. Long-term is what represents those average conditions. We are representing the conditions we assume about future climate.	
11	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	Both of these options talk about measurements. How would we measure extraction versus GW levels?	Abby Ostovar: Option 1 we would use the GEMS, which is why we talk about expanding it. The other one is using GW elevations and a storage coefficient to relate it to storage.	
12	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Jason Smith	I think we should be discussing what the Forebay Subbasin Committee chose for SMC parameters as well.	Comment Received.	
13	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	When there was a boundary modification, there was a reevaluation/reprioritization process as well. We're classified as medium priority based on technicality, but there is a good story to tell about the UV subbasin, which now includes a large portion of the Paso Robles Basin.	Gary Peterson: Bill is right, it came very close to being sustainable. There were some technical matters that were worked through and required the GSP. That data is out there. Of all of the subbasins, UV including the new areas, is likely the most sustainable subbasin we have.	
14	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Grant Cremers	We want to hold making numbers until we understand data of annual pumping from the UV. Whether we get it from GEMS or other people pumping outside of GEMS.	Abby Ostovar: We're going to talk about data gaps at the next meeting. The purposes of developing options is to have direction as we write the draft chapter, even without the specific numbers. DW: We're generally going in the direction of #1, but you want to reassess when we have numbers.	

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
15	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting		Groundwater Storage SMC: Motion to accept Option 1: Pumping in excess of the sustainable yield leads to significant and unreasonable impacts. With further definition of MO and MT with numbers from GEMS and any other data relevant data collection outside of GEMS.	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.
16	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	Re: GEMS: It's not going to include SW diversions from State control board?	Abby Ostovar: We have looked at the double counting issue. Grant Cremers: It's only double counting if you include both. If you only use GEMs, you're not including the other. DW: If it is reported only as a diversion, we are not viewing it as GW. We view it as that diversion, and SW.	
17	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	Re: Groundwater Quality SMC: I think number 1 is the only option we've got. Maintain what we have and make it no worse. Where possible, and if possible, and if there's a will, then try to improve it.	Comment received	
18	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Grant Cremers	I think Option 1 leaves the door open to improve where we can. Is there a list of what is measured for water quality?	Abby Ostovar: The GAMA data, include ILRP data, and drinking water systems through the same GAMA database.	
19	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Grant Cremers	What do you do if a well shows quality going backwards? Is it like canary in the coalmine or an outlier?	Abby Ostovar: First we look at if there are any GSA actions that would have had an impact. If there is a GSA action, we would look specifically at how it could impact and also monitor.	
20	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	What elements in the water are being measured? What components are being looked at and prioritized?	Abby Ostovar: We separate drinking water from Ag wells. We use Regulatory standards. We then assess how many wells are exceeding that. So, if you have 5 wells that are exceeding that, we don't want more than 5 wells exceeding that in the future. For Ag wells, we look at CoCs that would damage crops. We look at reports from the Basin Plan and we look at what will damage the crops. DW: We will only be concerned about constituents that have already been identified in the UV above the level of concern.	
21	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	Is there a difference between how drinking water wells and ag wells are treated?	DW: What we have set up what is sig and unreas; if the GSA does something that causes a well owner to spend money on treatment, abandonment, or other unreasonable financial burdens, that is sig & unreas. Ag and municiple wells are viewed the same in this way. Abby Ostovar: Re water quality data analysis of CoCs in the UV, shows the number of wells monitored and exceedances. The last column is the percentage of wells exceeding. We don't want that to increase.	
22	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	The slide shows 10mg/L of nitrates which is a DW standard and it is listed for an Ag well.	DW: We shouldn't include that and it should be fixed. The ag wells should have ag water quality standards.	
23	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	With the TDS, which may be unsatisfactory, is a secondary standard when you determine water quality. When you pull out certain contaminants, some have to be more strongly considered for water quality. TDS is a secondary contaminant.	Abby Ostovar: This is also our first cut proposal. If you feel like any of these exceedance standards should be different, let us know. Some people may not want to go beyond these standards. We want your feedback.	
24	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Justine Massey	We understand SGMA doesn't require GSAs to improve water quality, and water quality must be maintained and not further degraded. I appreciate some of Bill's comments about where you *can* improve water quality. We'd love to see this subbasin look at multi-benefit projects. We want to emphasize MO and MT be set at certain monitoring wells. This discussion has focused around the effects at DW and ag wells, which can have disastrous impacts on people's lives. It's appropriate to have attention paid to make sure water users aren't left behind. DW is designated as the highest priority use in state law. Monitoring is a big part of that.	Comment received	
25	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Tom Merrifield	I think you're proposing a set of analytes? We have to look at certain monitoring points to make these comparisons. Will we iron out the details later about what justifies an exceedance?	Abby Ostovar: We look for which ones are present above standards in the basin, and those are the ones we analyze on an annual basis. We'll dig into more of the details. The way we're proposing now is CoCs in any of the wells (ILRP, ag, domestic...) Looking at the exceedance.	
26	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Grant Cremers	My understanding was that the GSA would have no impacts on water quality. We have the regional quality control board. It's my thought that we want to hold and not degrade water quality. I think there will be things outside the GSA that will improve water quality.	Comment received	

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
27	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	There are things already underway to improve water quality coming from the Regional Control Board and others, and we want to support those things, and improve where we can within our mandate. But we need to maintain water quality where we're at and make sure we don't make it worse.	Abby Ostovar: You can look at projects and management actions to look at improvements in water quality. This doesn't prohibit that.	
28	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Jason Smith	None of us want to have bad water quality for domestics or farming. What we've learned is we can't turn things around overnight. It's taken decades, it will take decades.	Comment received	
29	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Justine Massey	I think that this conversation is getting at the heart of the discussions many GSAs have been having. I want to reiterate that these other programs that deal with water quality don't have exclusive jurisdiction. Nothing prevents GSAs from setting a goal to improve water quality. It sounds like there's interest in improving, or setting MOs to improve. I want to voice support for that. I also want to encourage you, as you get more detailed, those monitoring wells are important to establish baseline conditions so you can see where changes are happening. If there are water quality impacts at a domestic well, it will have a very different impact. Extra nitrate on a field is not the same as extra nitrate in DW well.	Comment received	
30	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	I'm glad someone supports the GSA to have some authority. If the GSA could have some control over the water quality throughout the basin, as the sole authority, that'd be great. But getting authorization also means stepping on some toes.	Comment received	
31	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Grant Cremers	With a good GSA and GSP, I would hope to just improve our water resources. If we can improve our volume, it will improve quality.	Comment received	
32	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	Also think about connecting DW users to DW systems. Some areas could really use it. It would improve in our county and our state. It's a human right.	Comment received	
33	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 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.
34	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	RE: Groundwater Levels SMC: I wouldn't be averse to selecting a certain year, 2015. We may have enough data.	DW: That is the direction the Forebay is going, 2015 is the year.	
35	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Justine Massey	From community water center's perspective, GW level MT should be set to domestic wells, which are more shallow than ag wells. We recommend the GSA conduct a domestic well impact analysis for the proposed MO and MT, which should be done before setting SMCs. Drinking water users need to be notified. We recommend those studies be done before making this decision.	Abby Ostovar: We did do an assessment of the domestic wells in the 180/400, and we can do that here, too.	
36	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Grant Cremers	Obviously we know the ag wells were impacted in 2015/2016. Were domestic wells impacted then, too?	DW: There is a DWR map that shows which domestic wells were impacted around the state. Several in the Paso Robles subbasin. There were very few in the Salinas Valley compared to the Paso Robles. Abby Ostovar: We do look at the GW levels and the depths of the domestic wells. We can look at that for whichever year we analyze.	
37	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	This is about whether you have supply to continue forward, right? You reach a point where you can't do more than this.	DW: We are asking about whether we are having an impact to a point where someone cannot pump water or get the water they need.	
38	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	I know for the UV, when you look back 50-60 years, 2015 was one of the worst years on record. Using 2015 as the "we never really want to get below again."	DW: If you look at the graph, yes, 2015 is really one of the lowest points.	
39	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Jason Smith	2015, if the reservoirs were operated the way we felt they should have been, we never would have been at this level. We don't want to be in that situation again. Should we choose another year?	DW: I think this is what Bill referred to earlier, where 2016 was really the lowest, but 2015 was the precursor. Abby Ostovar: This is MTs, MO can always be higher and what you're aiming for.	
40	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting		Groundwater Elevation SMC: Motion to accept Option 1, groundwater elevations in 2015 were significant and unreasonable.	Motion was passed by Committee.	This will be incorporated into GSP development as a strategic comment. See memo for further discussion.

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
41	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	Re: Interconnected Surface Water SMC: Legal requirements could weigh-in pretty heavily. This would have big implications. There are wells along the river. There is fuzzy area whether it is interconnected or not.	DW: In the 180/400, we looked at uses and users. We asked, if we chose Option 3, do we think we have legal impact on some other users? Is there a legal requirement for flows that we think we won't be able to meet. We decided we could meet the legal requirements. We could do the same analysis here.	
42	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	Besides environmental users, what other user classes are there?	DW: There was a question about whether there were any appropriative users that had not been able to take their appropriative right on the river, riparian users (only having a right to natural flows), and recreational users.	
43	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Les Girard	SGMA regulates groundwater not surface water. Certain surface water users have rights which are regulated by the state, those are the appropriators. Riparian users have the right to riparian water for reasonable and beneficial uses. The science is going to be very delicate, as you get into that area between river water and groundwater. We're going to have to be very careful.	DW: What we did was not intended to be a legal analysis, just an acknowledgement of various users and to see if we could balance their interests.	
44	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Grant Cremer	Please explain the MT and MO again, if you say equal to today's shallow GW levels?	Abby Ostovar: We will use the model, and look at where shallow GW levels are. Look at pumping areas. We will set up the monitoring network of shallow wells to monitor. On an annual basis, compare. Our initial cut is that it's mainly along the river. DW: This is similar to the loss of storage one. Look at levels in shallow wells along the river, and look for a long-term downward trend which may indicate a long-term depletion.	
45	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	This would be another long-term view? In my experience, that interconnected level can vary, and sometimes it's connected to releases and drought years. We should be looking at 10-20 years.	DW: That has been my attitude, and not everybody views it that way. Letters from NMFS and others say, "how would you adjust your pumping during dry years to deal with the issues of that year?" Generally, my response is that GW management as a long-term management issue, not as a response to every fluctuation. Just my advice.	
46	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Grant Cremer	For shallow GW levels, are you measuring SW or GW?	DW: What you are measuring is how much "pull" there is on the SW. What is the difference between the river elevation and the GW.	
47	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 Meeting	Bill Lipe	When there was a lot of stress in 2016 from all users, then in 2017 we got huge flows, and it took a few weeks and a couple of surges, and perhaps three weeks until the interconnection was reestablished. I'm glad Les chimed in.	comment received.	
48	Upper Valley					10/05/2020 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). Using the metric of groundwater levels.	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.
49	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Bill Lipe	You mentioned two knobs on pumping. I recall the [basin] prioritization process, ours reevaluated recently. There's an environmental score that had to do with habitat areas. Would that be a third knob? Would you agree? There may be project with respect to fish that would potentially get us to low priority status.	DW: I don't know if you'll ever get to low priority status. You're right, there was a new scoring process. I don't think you have a lot of control over the prioritization process. DWR's choice.	
50	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Bill Lipe	BMPs, the RWQCB already imposes BMPs. Is that another instance of stepping on toes?	DW? The BMPs we're talking about are probably BMPs to be water efficient, to use less water w/o losing your crops or reducing your crops. The Regional Quality Control Board's BMPs are to control nitrate. We're talking about voluntary measures to reduce water usage.	
51	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Bill Lipe	When you report to the RWQCB, they also look at water usage. If you report overpumping, they will call you on it. They do take into account water volume by commodity. Maybe go to Ag Associations or UCCE to see how efficient people are already being. Especially all the medium to large growers, they have implemented very efficient watering systems. I don't know how much more they can do, there's been a lot of innovation in the last 20-30 years.	Comment received	

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
52	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Nancy Isakson	I want to talk about the tool of pumping reductions. I've stated this in other committee meetings. The water coalition has discussed, it's a good tool to have. It's important to know the approval process. Will it be voted in by the land owners? BOD? If BOD, does it require a super majority? And then to implement, we believe there needs to be standards and criteria. Need to be a basis on understanding the implementation.	DW: Thank you. I do agree, the basis of implementation is a good step to have in these GSPs. Then it becomes less mysterious in the future if you implement it in the future. You bring up several legal questions about requirements to implement that I can't answer. Les: Nancy asked how things get implemented. If you look at JPA, a super majority plus vote is required on proposals to submit to the electorate or property owners, decisions to impose on fees or taxes. When you look at projects, you have to talk about how the projects will be financed, if it's funded by an assessment or tax, or a grant. If grant, you only need a simple majority if there is an independent source of funds. If it has to go out to a vote, then you need a super majority plus before it goes to the electorate. A super majority vote is needed if you get a new source of funding, then you need to amend your budget. The vote requirements depend on what is being voted upon.	
53	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Tom Virsik	My comment on the two or three knob analogy is that it would seem to be a good idea to concentrate on the dial that regulates the reservoirs. In subbasins not in overdraft, it is difficult to calculate a sustainable yield. So my suggestion for emphasizing the reservoir releases is that it would help to understand the sustainable yield.	DW: We will talk about reservoir reoperation in this presentation.	
54	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Tom Merrifield	If we had additional releases from reservoirs, is that direct recharge?	DW: Yes, in a way it is. I would view as direct recharge. The conservation releases are direct recharge. The purpose is to provide water for users down the river, and to recharge the aquifers.	
55	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Tom Merrifield	If we had something like a cost-benefit analysis, where you know what your rough investments are, that might help in the decision-making process down the road. It may assist.	DW: We will have costs in the GSPs, to give you an idea of cost per AF. Is a project to bring more water in compared to reducing pumping or other conservation...We will include that information.	
56	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Bill Lipe	It's good to know what the yield and cost per acre-foot will be for projects. It will help us prioritize.	Comment received	
57	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Jason Smith	Many projects are with MCWRA assets. What discussions have we had about that? What roadblocks are there moving forward with those projects?	DW: We are only implementing this program in coordination with a lot of other groups, including MCWRA. There are already discussions going on about reservoir reoperation. What we are offering is a way to reoperate the reservoir where everyone's needs can be met. An investment can be made by installing the ASR wells, then there is a reasonable way to reoperate the reservoir where everyone's needs can be met.	
58	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Jason Smith	With the HCP, in general, winter releases should work in tandem with the environmental piece, right?	DW: That is a good point, and is another benefit we're seeing. Winter releases gets us closer to a natural flow. Winter releases mean more releases during the season when the fish need it to migrate. The idea is to bring us more in line with the necessary environmental flows.	
59	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Bill Lipe	Why isn't the HCP being done first? A lot of people understand that many things are derived from the HCP. I'm trying to pick projects with the limited information on the requirements in the HCP. Will the GSA be involved in the development of the HCP?	DW: I will point out that we can look at it as, not 'we'll be controlled by the HCP,' rather we can do some upfront analysis. Les: The reason it's not going through is based on funding. The agency will be reaching out to many stakeholders. I believe our GSA will have a significant role in shaping the HCP.	
60	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Bill Lipe	You've put out a proposed area, isn't there a Zone 2B for CSIP to cover?	DW: The cost benefit is to expand to various land. How much would it cost to expand and what is the value?	
61	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Bill Lipe	Value engineering. That a term you use, going forward? Some of the optimization that we talking about are the unintended consequences of under-engineering.	DW: I'm not opposed to value-engineering, you get 90% there, that's not good enough. We have to get to sustainability.	
62	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Bill Lipe	You mentioned SRDF to pull water and inject it. What about recycled water to inject in the winter?	DW: There is a plan to do that. The CEQA analysis has already been done. There is a second issue, for a small local plant. You bring up a concern we haven't worked through. If there is water available from Monterey OneWater in the winter, and water from SRDF, how do we manage both streams in a way that meets all reg requirements? We still need to look into that further.	

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
63	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Bill Lipe	We're happy to see you looking at winter releases. Replicating the natural flow makes a lot of sense. I'm hoping the science backs it up. I see you combining with ASR and SRDF, and reoperating existing assets that have already been paid for. I'm sure there will be a study to prove the concept. Is there an expectation that other people in the valley will contribute to infrastructure that will be built on the coast?	DW: I don't think we're talking about paying for specific infrastructure, rather talking about paying for benefits. The Upper Valley see some benefits from reoperation. Key benefit is that reoperation without ASR wells becomes more difficult reoperation. The one we propose is easier reoperation and part of the entire program that the UV sees some benefit from.	
64	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Bill Lipe	I also see you have Chualar there for 11043 takeout. What is the official takeout point for 11043. I hear it's above the confluence just south of Soledad.	DW: My understanding is there are two permitted diversion points. Les: Yes, I believe there are two points. One is above the confluence and another somewhere else. 11043, MCWRA is reapplying for utilizing that water. The ultimate takeout points could change.	
65	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Bill Lipe	If you can clarify about Chualar and 11043, maybe we can get update on where county is at. You said yesterday, this water right has been eroded over time because they have never done anything with the permit. I think the state is getting restless but folks are going to need to ask.	Les: The state has made noises about revoking the whole thing. The Agency has approached them about keeping permit alive. The state has said that there may be less water than original permit. Les: Shared screen with a map with the original two diversion points. One diversion point above the confluence and one north of Chualar.	
66	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Grant Cremers	As far as taking water at rubber dam for injection, would it be easier or cheaper to treat water to DW standards to send to Salinas? To stop continuous city pumping?	DW: Been brought up by Roger Moitoso. I will look at it as an option for direct delivery, and take pumpers offline. I think we'll stitch in to concepts.	
67	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Grant Cremers	We've obviously had some large fires, there may be some year of increased runoff. If the river channel is already more wet, will it increase the potential to capture more water? If we do winter releases, but there's enhanced runoff, do we have potential to catch more water?	DW: There are temporary permits for very high flows. You have that option. Can't do it without permit. This is different than releases from reservoirs. When you divert that, it's a second diversion. You don't have to jump through as many hoops to change redirection.	
68	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Grant Cremers	If everything is fine, do we have to wait for an optimum rainfall season to do the transition? How does the transition work?	DW: Excellent question, and we don't know the answer yet. I have not thought about transition period.	
69	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Tom Merrifield	Sounds like ASR wells will be positioned close to SWI. My limited experience with ASR wells is they are prone to biofouling which increases O&M costs. If you have two water sources being mixed, there could be more corrosion and encrustation. Those costs need to be considered in evaluation.	DW: You are right on all those points and we will have to consider that.	
70	Upper Valley					10/14/2020 Special Meeting	Justine Massey	With community water center, we want to weigh in with suggestions on projects and management actions. Sounds really exciting that there is a broader design idea to ramp up recharge in your basin. We want to encourage you to look at multi-benefit remediation projects, which can increase water quantity and quality for drinking water users. Opens up grants. Look at DW aspects holistically. I think we can offer you a DW mitigation framework that we have created. I can supply a copy of our write-up for that. We are prepping a presentation we can share with your Advisory Committee for the overall SVBGSA. Generally want to suggest this group take a look since it aligns with P&M actions for backups if first steps don't go well. Correct any problems that are going on. Especially if there are problems impact DW uses, since that has an immediate effect on people. One of my suggestions is to use adaptive management strategies, using monitoring wells representative of DW users. You'll want to know if recharge going on from injection wells are pushing contaminant plumes toward DW wells. You would have a trigger system set up, decide acceptable levels where you would take reactive measures. That's just a broad overview. I want to follow up and give you more of that information, I believe it would be a benefit to this subbasin.	Emily Gardner: Please feel free to reach out to me, Justine.	