

COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM August 20, 2020 to October 30, 2020

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
1	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Beverly Bean	Have any of the recommendations from the GeoSyntec been implemented?	DW: The Zone B8 overlay still only covers the area between the boundary between the subbasins to the Ambler Park area. This overlay says "this is an area of limited water supply". It has not been expanded per the recommendation.	
2	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Beverly Bean	Who would be responsible for implementing those recommendations?	DW: The county planning department would be in charge of the zoning.	
3	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Sarah Hardgrave	Who commission the GeoSyntec report?	Beverly Bean: The County Board of Supes asked for it because of problems with people's wells:	
4	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Janet Brennan	Will the cutbacks in the Seaside Basin be met this year?	Bob Jaques: Yes, through conservation and other measures, they've been able to keep pumping below the 3,000AFY. I anticipate we'll be able to meet that.	
5	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Janet Brennan	CalAm is required to replenish the seaside basin over time. Is that related to the cutbacks?	Bob Jaques: It pays back the basin from the 2007 decision time, by in-lieu replenishment of the basin. By further reducing their pumping by 700 AFY additional, they would pay back what they've pumped since the decision was made.	
6	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Janet Brennan	I think it would be important to know what the demand is in the Corral de Tierra area. That will speak to the kind of projects we need to look at.	DW: We will address that in some upcoming discussions today.	
7	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Sarah Hardgrave	I was involved in the early years of implementation, and have worked with Bob and Derrick. Helpful to see all the work done over time. As you've developed your modeling for the watermaster, can you distinguish the natural safe yield as determined by the court versus the true sustainable yield?	Bob Jaques: Natural safe yield is very simplistic, you look at inputs and outputs at all boundaries. If outputs exceed inputs, you're exceeding the natural safe yield. For sustainable yield, you look at the whole basin. One area can experience drawdown while the whole basin can be sustainable. Our board considered a sustainable yield analysis, but it's very costly. We're waiting to see how the GSP is developed, and then do that analysis with additional information.	
8	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Sarah Hardgrave	Thank you, that is helpful to know. Another observation, the boundaries of the adjudicated area were more political than hydrogeological. The issues between the Eastern Laguna Seca area and the Corral area may be reflective of that. Maybe there isn't a physical division between the subbasins.	Georgina King: You're completely correct, there is no physical boundary there. Parts of the boundary were delineated by flow divides, but we all know those divides change. The boundary shown on the map was actually the incorrect boundary. The correct one was more based on the geology. But yes, you're correct the boundary is more political. DW: Yes, that flow divide was more reflective in the marina area. This corner of the basin was an extension of that line. There really is no difference between managing the Laguna Seca area and managing the Toro/Corral area.	
9	Monterey					09/04/2020 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.
10	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Sarah Hardgrave	Re: Groundwater Storage SMC: I would assume that sustainable yield for the Corral Area would include adequate groundwater flow to the Laguna Seca area.	Abby Ostovar: Yes, through SGMA, you cannot impair your neighbor from reaching sustainability.	
11	Monterey					09/04/2020 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.
12	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting		Seawater Intrusion SMC: Motion to accept Option 2. Existing SWI is significant and unreasonable, and SVBGSA chooses to improve SWI. Goal is to push back seawater intrusion.	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.
13	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Eric Tynan	I appreciate what you're doing. What's going on in Castroville is it's within 2000 feet of our wells, and we're losing well 3. We've been taking measures, so unless we start pushing it back now, we're in a bad spot. I know it's not close to you, but I appreciate what you're doing.	comment received	

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
14	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Bob Jaques	Your comment about arsenic being naturally occurring. I have friends on a CWS with arsenic levels worsening over time. They have to put in a remediation system	DW: These are the thresholds we're setting. When we talk about undesirable results, degraded water quality as a result of GSA actions is undesirable. In the case of the arsenic that has already been degrading over time, that wasn't caused by a direct action of the GSA, we would not be responsible for that. Abby Ostovar: Even with Option 1, it doesn't prevent you from taking actions that have the additional benefit of improved quality.	
15	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Janet Brennan	My question is related to Option 3. It would appear that it would not be interfering with other agencies?	Abby Ostovar: . We can come back on who is responsible and for what. My understanding is that this hasn't really played out with SGMA yet. It's still unclear. DW: You're right, it's still not very clear. Many other places in the state are taking the "do no harm" approach. You want to work with partners, but not overstep their bounds with regard to partners.	
16	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Justine Massey	We think about water quality from the perspective from individual, domestic wells. They are the least protected and regulated, but are very important to those who rely on them. I agree with comments on how GSAs engage with water quality is not very clear. However, water quality is one of the six undesirable results. We would like to encourage taking care to explore what the situation is for the domestic wells. That would mean not just using deep supply wells, but measuring what the quality is in shallow wells. We support Option 3 here, we think there is a role for GSAs to address water quality. Even if you go with Option 1, we have more suggestions such as DW mitigation program. To reiterate, we think there are many opportunities for partnerships and multi-benefit projects to mitigate the impacts.	Sarah Hardgrave: Thank you for your comments.	
17	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Bob Jaques	On discussion to move on Option 1. I would vote no. I move for Option 3. My friends on a small water system would want to see someone try to do something. You can start with that, and revise it if you see it's not working.	comment received	
18	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Sarah Hardgrave	That raises the question as to whether we can have split criteria for different parts of the subbasin. Arsenic issues may be more of a concern in the Corral area. Can we consider different criteria for different areas, with part of Option 3 as well?	Abby Ostovar: There is still the conversation about management areas and the whole subbasin. We haven't reached out to DWR. There is a question about different options for different aquifers as well. This may be an area to get your input now, not make a decision, but bring back more information.	
19	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Beverly Bean	Regarding arsenic: Different areas have different issues. I don't believe quality is the job of the GSA, it's the job of other agencies. I believe our job is to make the amount of pumping sustainable. If you get the pumping under control, many quality issues resolve themselves.	Comment received	
20	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Janet Brennan	Actions as within other areas, like pumping, will indirectly benefit quality. I still support Option 1.	Comment received	
21	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Bob Jaques	My experience with regulatory agencies is, they will notify you of the problem but they will not take over and solve it for you.	Comment received	
22	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Sarah Hardgrave	One final comment, whether overpumping is exacerbating quality issues needs to continue to be discussed.	Abby Ostovar: Yes, this gives us direction on how to begin writing the GSP, and how to engage with MCWD. We will certainly continue to have these discussions. Donna Meyer: We have initiated conversations with MoCo Health and we see them as a valuable partner in this. We are learning more about how we can develop the responsibilities and relationship. We're also reaching out to regional board and other agencies to learn more about jurisdictional responsibilities.	
23	Monterey					09/04/2020 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.

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
24	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Janet Brenna	Re: Groundwater Levels SMC: The relationship of this threshold with SWI, comments were made for the 180/400 that setting it at the 2015 level was not consistent with the requirement to address SWI. Maybe it's not as important in this subbasin. Can we have a discussion about that here?	DW: Janet is correct. And here, we are setting SMCs mainly for the Corral area. In the 180/400 we said we will set SMCs for SWI and we would meet them. What we didn't do is incorporate all our SMCs into GW levels. We said we have 6 different things to meet at the same time. What happens is that one of the SMCs will become the dominant driver of how we manage the GW system. They don't have to absolutely integrate. For example if we say we want to stop SWI by injecting water. Our GW levels will rise above the Min Thresh and it meets the requirements. If we say we want to stop SWI by pumping SWI out, our GW levels will drop and we will have to make some adjustments. At this point, we probably don't want to integrate the objectives just yet because we don't know what our projects will be to meet the SMCs.	
25	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Sarah Hardgrave	I did have some thoughts about data needs for the Corral area and GW levels, and what makes the subbasin unique in terms of the proportional share of pumping for domestic purposes versus ag purposes. Looking at what the 180/400 selected, their water demands and purpose are different than in this area. I think our committee primarily selecting an emphasis on shallow domestic wells is reflective of the primary users in this area. I would like more information on the amount of domestic wells and regulated systems compared to the amount of pumping for ag purposes. I see some reason for having different criteria on the GW levels.	Abby Ostovar: Again, this is an iterative process. Other subbasins also came against this where they need more information. We can get initial direction and still come back with more information.	
26	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Janet Brenna	Groundwater Level SMC: Motion to accept Option 4: Impacting shallow, domestic wells is significant and unreasonable.	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.
27	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Beverly Bear	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.
28	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Sarah Hardgrave	Re: Projects and Management Actions: Pumping reductions question: If domestic wells are de minimus users under SGMA, what ability do we have to do pumping restrictions or a water charges framework?	DW: We will include an analysis of that in our data packet. One question we've talked about internally, we don't have reg authority to meter wells, can there be a voluntary system? We'll look into those options as well.	
29	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Janet Brenna	Seems to me the first priority is not to make the problem worse. So, that means no new wells in the area, that's where we begin.	DW: You did point out earlier about Zone B8 overlay. But if it's the suggestion of this committee, we can propose it is expanded and go to the county as the GSA.	
30	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Sarah Hardgrave	I think it would be helpful if you brought back the recommendations of the GeoSyntec report.	Comment received	
31	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Beverly Bear	I agree. We spent \$300,000 on that report and we have those recommendations. We may not have the power to implement those, the county does. We don't need to reinvent the wheel, and I think we have enough to go on. If the Country Club is not recycling their water, we can have the county require that they do. Generally speaking, upper Corral area has better supply and quality than lower Corral area well. Is there a way to purchase, pump and store in those areas?	Comment received	
32	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Margaret Anne Copernall	With respect to the SWI, there has been new information on sea level rise being higher than initially thought and the impacts on GW will be severe.	DW: I am familiar with that recent study. We are planning on developing GW models to address these issues specifically. However, we will be making decisions before the results of those models are available. But we will address it.	
33	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Janet Brenna	Are most of the residents on septic systems or sewer? Requiring community sewage collection systems and recycling water could be an approach if there are enough residences on septic. I raise this as a brainstorm possibility.	Comment received	
34	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Sarah Hardgrave	I want to add on. In the Toro Park subdivisions, they are on a wastewater system. It's not exactly a benefit directly to our subbasin. I recall in the Ferini Ranch there was a discussion to connect to Monterey OneWater to get more flow. For the Country Club, I don't think they have a recycled water source for irrigation, but it may be a good idea for an in lieu recharge situation.	Comment received	

Number	Subbasin	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
35	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Bob Jaques	A couple things, I know Toro Village is sewered to the Toro area treatment plant near the Highway 68 bridge. I think that system was expanded and extended to pick up a little more, not all the way to the Corral area. Looking at the GeoSyntec recommendations, one was more monitoring wells. This would help M&A to calibrate the model so you're not making too many assumptions. Under the GSP, one was to install more monitoring wells. Even though you can't require de minimis wells to report/monitor, but you can ask them and maybe the GSA could get funding for meters. In Seaside we were able to require some wells to provide pumping data.	DW: Yes, for de minimis users we cannot require metering. One question that has come up in other basins is, can we require users to verify they are de minimis users, so they can account for their water use? This is a possible option, but we need a legal opinion if it falls under SGMA abilities or not.	
36	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Sarah Hardgrave	Any sort of recharge project could be expensive. If in the future, the alternative project to desalinate brackish water pumped from the SWI extraction barrier wells was to come to fruition, if aquifer recharge could happen on the southern end of SWI line, if you were trying to mound treated water in the 180/400, if that would have the benefit of mitigating further SWI? And speaking of water gradients, on the other side we may have water leaving this subbasin to the 180/400 aquifer. Would there be benefit to freshwater recharge at those boundary areas?	Comment received	
37	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Janet Brennan	It seems that addressing some of the problems in the Laguna Seca area would also benefit the Corral area. I don't know what kind of projects those would be, but the inter-relationship should be something to consider.	DW: Would you like us to look at what the shortest pipeline runs might be? From CalWater? Or Monterey OneWater? What is the smallest pipe run possible, and how to get water in the pipe?	
38	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Sarah Hardgrave	I think it depends on what projects MCWD would be developing. I think the shortest route is along Reservation Road. Looking at some sort of recharge/injection in the Laguna Seca area, then along a different route. In addition to providing freshwater and recharge, thinking about if it would also have the benefit of halting SWI.	Comment received	
39	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Janet Brennan	Do we have any idea of water consumption at the residential level, such that recommending conservation measures would be a worthwhile approach?	DW: We don't have specific data. The value used in the 180/400 plan was 0.39 AFY per living unit to be used across the basin. It does not include landscaping use, or differentiate large living units and landscaping.	
40	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Janet Brennan	We could extrapolate use from Carmel Valley or Pebble Beach. Those data are available.	Comment received	
41	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Beverly Bean	I think this data could easily be collected. There are several small systems that keep these record, we just need to do the asking.	Comment received	
42	Monterey					09/04/2020 Meeting	Sarah Hardgrave	I would like to see a quantification of the water systems (all sizes) and residential connections.	Comment received	