COMMENTS RECEIVED NOVEMBER 25, 2020 to JANUARY 27, 2021

Number	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
1					12/2/2020	Steve McIntyre	Re: Water Quality and Water Levels Relationship Update: Is the yellow circle the old cattle yard? Which is pretty much a nitrate farm. We have been working on nitrates for a while. We try to get clean water to people who want it. Ag practices have advanced and what we are currently doing should be able to help nitrate concentrations in the future. I think water levels are related to nitrate concentrations. For example, at the Wild Horse truck stop, there are shallow wells and in the past, during the drought, they had high N concentrations. When the groundwater was recharged, the concentrations decreased.	**DW**: We are not addressing N sources here. Just a simple image of GWL and Nitrate.	
2					12/2/2020	Kay Mercer	I'm surprised by the charts. Are these monitoring wells, or does it include shallow drinking water wells? Also, confirming that where we have alluvial influences, the nitrogen concentrations fluctuate relative to groundwater elevations.	**DW**: This is using all ILRP wells, so it is combination of well types. I will double check.	
3					12/2/2020	James Sang	If the nitrate loading is caused by ag, what would be the solutions for that? I heard of studies in Santa Cruz where they used wood bark to absorb nitrate.	**DW**: The studies you are referring to are run by Andy Fisher. We're not looking at remediation of nitrate which the ILRP is in charge of. We are looking at the question of whether we need to set groundwater elevations at a certain level that won't degrade water quality further. We don't have land use authority to tell people how to manage their land.	
4					12/2/2020	Robin Lee	There has been conversion of dry land ag and grazing to irrigated lands. The more irrigated lands, then the more nitrate applied and more nitrate in the GW. There was probably a lot of wells that were drilled and wells are a pathway for pollutants to travel. I don't see how we can stay away from land use in this GSP. So there is such a cause and effect in everything that is done, I don't see how we can eliminate land use as a probable cause. There's a link there.	**Abby Ostovar**: We're going to get into projects in a bit so you'll see how land use is a big constraint. Although, we don't have land use authority we can partner with the County or other agencies. Or we could think of incentives for fallowing.	
5					12/2/2020	Chris Bunn	In the Eastside, we definitely have not increased irrigated ag land acreage, and not in the recent past.	Comment received	
6					12/2/2020	Robin Lee	The Santa Rita area has had an immense increase in irrigated land, from what I have seen the north of the eastside has had an increase.	Comment received	
7					12/2/2020	Steve McIntyre	I want to confirm what Chris Bunn said. The Eastside has not had significant ag land developed.	Comment received	
8					12/2/2020	Kay Mercer	I think you should look at drinking water separately. The ILRP assumes that the shallow groundwaters have more nitrate.	**DW**: We average all the data for a given year, GWL for all wells. So at no point are we comparing shallow to deep groundwater, we are looking at relatively high and low years.	
9					12/2/2020	Kay Mercer	I don't think we see that much variability in the Eastside, so I'm not sure why this is happening. How meaningful is this data, does this really relate the depth of nitrate concentrations and GWL if you aren't looking at the depth of the well?	**DW**: What this data relates to is the SMC, would setting the SMC for GWL at a certain level significantly change the concentration in these wells? And what we conclude is that we don't have conclusive evidence to confirm that.	
10					12/2/2020	Eric Tynan	Is this legacy nitrate use?	**DW**: We don't know because we didn't try to assess that.	
11					12/2/2020	Norm Groot	It sounds to me that what we are talking about is that pollution dilution is occurring when GWL are higher?	**DW**: I think that's what the question was. I don't think this data is definitive to put a quantitative number on that GWL.	

Number	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
12					12/2/2020	Robin Lee	Over time if remediation included fallowing of land and then we had less nitrate applied over time. Then the fallowing would cause GWL to go up and nitrates would go down. It looks like they are linked.	Comment received	
13					12/2/2020	Norm Groot	I don't think there is a direct correlation between fallowing land and decreasing nitrate levels in the GW. I don't think you can make that correlation because of legacy loading issues.	Comment received	
14					12/2/2020	Robin Lee	I think I would feel better about making this decision when we see projects and modeling results. It's all about money and how much we want to pay to get to our objective.	Comment received	
15					12/2/2020	Ross Clark	We are setting an objective and minimum bar and the difference between them is our "cushion" . We want a big enough cushion to allow for drought, variability and ag and urban practices and lag time between action and response. I appreciate Robin Lee's comments about setting these MT and MO would direct our focus on certain projects over others. Some projects have less certainty and may require longer time periods to confirm effectiveness.	**Comment received**	
16					12/2/2020	Steve McIntyre	I think it's important to recognize that these aren't carved in stone. We can come back to change them as we establish projects. I think establishing MT to 2015 and MO to 2010 so that we have something to start comparing projects and management actions. Then ask the question, do you want a larger or smaller buffer?	**DW:** The advantage of a large buffer is there's less risk if you manage toward your objective. For a small buffer you don't have to take as much action to get to the MO. Let's say we set the MT and we don't want to get below the MT after a three-year dought, we could look at historically how much water levels have dropped in three year drought and then add that to the MT and then that would be our MO. That's one way to think about it.	
17					12/2/2020	Chris Bunn	I was relieved to hear Derrik's response to flexibility. I find myself reluctant to commit to anything on this until we look at projects and management actions and how much they are going to cost.	**Abby Ostovar:** We can circle back to this.	
18					12/2/2020	Chris Bunn	I like Steve McIntyre's proposal with the idea of the three-year drought mentioned before.	**Abby Ostovar:** So basically at the end of the three-year drought you don't want to go below 2015.	
19					12/2/2020	Steve McIntyre	You set 2015 as the MT, add three years of the decline with the drought. Use the 2015 as your bottom and then go up for the MO.	**Comment received**	
20					12/2/2020	Chris Bunn	Is there any possibility of a secondary MT that would be triggered by X years of drought?	**DW:** I haven't heard of this but if the future turns out different than our assumptions, we can change the MT and MO. Changing MT and MO requires public input, but it is completely doable. **Abby Ostovar:** We can set the MT and MO as you suggested, and we can also look at how drought will affect.	
21					12/2/2020	Horacio Amezquita	Can we get the volume of water that is represented between different GWL because we are going to need it to see what projects we have to implement?	**DW:** That is true, and to be able to size the projects. **Abby Ostovar:** We will have a water budget and the projects are trying to get to sustainability across the 6 indicators.	
22					12/2/2020	Horacio Amezquita	I understand but we need to have an idea of the amount of water we have been over-pumping over the years. Hopefully, we can get it in the water budget.	**Abby Ostovar:** In a perfect world, we would get everything in a linear fashion. But we're still waiting on that. And we won't finalize projects until we have the water budget.	

Number	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
23					12/2/2020	Kay Mercer	I like the concept of looking at a three-year drought. I think it would be helpful for the committee to see that visually. Your goal is to say the GW is sustainable if the drinking water wells don't go dry. Is that correct? You're setting the MT for GWL to protect drinking water water wells?	**Abby Ostovar:** Six sustainability indicators. The SMC for GWLs to protect shallow domestic wells is correct.	
24					12/2/2020	Kay Mercer	I think it would be helpful to know how many domestic wells went dry below 2015 WLs.	**Abby Ostovar:** We would love to have that but there's no one who collects that information.	
25					12/2/2020	Robin Lee	The Eastside subbasin is in overdraft now. So to get to sustainability, we can't continue to do what we are doing now, as far as pumping water. Is that a good assumption?	**Abby Ostovar:** Kind of, yes, if pumping is all you are looking at. The other thing you could do is increase recharge or bring more water into the subbasin.	
26					12/2/2020	Robin Lee	But we are looking at right now. We aren't doing projects now and it isn't raining. We are in overdraft. If we continue, it will get worse. How does that apply to the MT. I would put MT where we are now. We can't get any worse.	**Abby Ostovar:** You can set the MT lower. Overdraft is basin wide. GWL vary spatially across the subbasin. We don't have 2020 on the graph, but I think they would be higher than 2015.	
27					12/2/2020	Robin Lee	Why would you want to make the MT lower than where we currently are? If you extrapolate the pattern we are going to get worse. In order to hold the line, we would have to have projects.	**Abby Ostovar:** 2015 addresses that there will be droughts in the future but the committee decides where to set the SMC.	
28					12/2/2020	Steve McIntyre	I think it would be interesting to see the 2019 data. 2015 was in the middle of a drought. I could bet that the 2019 WLs have rebounded. We don't want to go back to 2015 levels.	**Comment received**	
29					12/2/2020	Colby Pereira	I wanted to echo Steve's comments. I think we need to give ourselves wiggle room for climate change and weather related conditions. I would like to set some conservative benchmarks and let our projects and management actions develop to keep us above the MT.	**Comment received**	
30					12/2/2020	Chris Bunn	Groundwater Level SMC: Measurable Objective set at 1999, and the Minimum Threshold set at 2015.	Motion was passed by Committee and will be incorporated into GSP.	**The MO and MT will be incorporated into Groundwater Level SMC.**
31					12/2/2020	Robin Lee	Re: Projects and Management Action Discussion: A lot of the projects are rain dependent. The scalping plant would give water every day. It is the most dependable. And it's less money than Gabilan Creek and Salinas River diversion projects. Water doesn't have to be transported anywhere, we are using local water to recharge our aquifers. I'm also supportive of the projects that follow the natural cycles. If we imitate the natural processes, we'll have more success at less cost.	**Comment received**	
32					12/2/2020	Ross Clark	We want to get to sustainability in a way that is sustainable for farmers, landowners and the community, so cost is a factor. There are certain levels of certainty that we get from engineering projects, but usually at a higher cost. There are other projects like recharge that are more uncertain, but lower cost and there are partners that can bring resources to the table. Is there a way to look at a temporal priority? Pursue lower cost projects for the short term and invest more money and achieve more certainty if we need to. It's a question for everyone. Do we need to pick the most certain project now? Or could we invest more money as we see if the project is working?	**Abby Ostovar:** DWR wants to see that we have the tools to reach sustainability and they are benchmarking that 20 years out. We will do our best to estimate project yields, but it will be up to group to assess your level of comfort with project certainty.	

Number	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
33					12/2/2020	Chris Bunn	It's difficult to speak about these comprehensively without more details about the specific projects, costs and yields. Re: Extraction from 180/400 Project: You actually wouldn't have to cross the river but you would have to go under the 101. It could be a dual subbasin project because it could also serve the 180/400 ft aquifer. I expect the project will be expensive to move water to various places within the subbasin. Another point, we need to look at comprehensive river management. If we could clean the river of overgrowth, we could get better percolation, especially at Somavia Road. Re: the scalping plant idea, I like the concept, but it will take water away from the CSIP farmers and that isn't a good idea.	**Abby Ostovar:** I look forward to comments on the data packet	
34					12/2/2020	Colby Pereira	When we talk increased recharge, I want to echo Chris' idea of river maintenance. That will have a benefit for the whole valley. Ag has been very proactive with BMPs pre-SGMA; we don't want to set unreasonable standards for future BMPs, there needs to be collaboration. I think the CSIP expansion would benefit both 180/400, Eastside subbasin and subbasins futher to the south. I think the 11043 diversion would help, too, but it has a significant price tag. We definitely don't want to keep leaving it on the table because our allotment could be cut again. We can do something with it, we should investigate other solutions with that water.	**Comment received**	
35					12/2/2020	Caroline Chapin	I'm not a fan of the scalping plant idea because we'd have to fight Monterey One Water because there is limited recycled water. Also very expensive. I think we should recharge overland flow. Continuing to investigate recharge projects would be high on my list.	**Comment received**	
36					12/2/2020	Brenda Granillo	I wanted to state the importance for us to have a variety of projects. I would advocate for the Salinas scalping plant. There will be new growth areas and I think there's potential to have this water offset the pumping as Salinas grows. Also look at pumping controls and reduction to benefit the Eastside subbasin.	**Comment received**	
37					12/2/2020	Brenda Granillo	I can let you know that Cal Water was pumping 19,000 AFY of water in 2013. With restrictions in place we went to 14,000 AFY and now we average 16-17,000 AF of water per year. And we did have to extend two of our wells during drought due to GWL dropping.	**Comment received**	
38					12/2/2020	Horacio Amezquita	I was wondering if studies have been done to see if the Gabilan mountains could be used to hold water and release it when we need it?	**Abby Ostovar:** I haven't seen anything like this. But we could dig around some more.	
39					12/2/2020	James Sang	I wanted to explain my idea about the swails. But instead, I want to present the idea of who to make this area rain more. There's a relationship between soil moisture and precipitation. If we can hold the moisture in the soils long enough to get the humidity higher from moisture from plants and the ground, as the winds go up the hillslope we could get precipitation at the right time.	**Comment received**	
40					12/2/2020	Robin Lee	I know in Hawaii there was less rainfall when they deforested. We are on the wet side of the Gabilan, so I think the vegetation does have an effect on the amount of precipitation. There's definitely a correlation.	**Comment received**	