

COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM January 4, 2021 - February 24, 2021

Number	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
1					1/6/2010	James Sang	The November meeting, I don't understand the \$35MIL for the Arundo projects. I think that money could be better spent on recharge [projects] in the subbasin. With Arundo, it seems like you're trying to save water in a bathtub that has a drain because it directly goes to the ocean eventually. I don't see the purpose. With \$35MIL, you could put in infiltration basins, everywhere, to fulfill recharge needs for this whole basin area. The kind of recharge I'm thinking of is not just infiltration basins, but like swales or trenches that are 2-3ft deep, which help prevent evaporation by the sun and the wind. If there are any clay areas, it would be difficult. If we just give it time, rainwater can be absorbed. This idea of fallowing, I don't like the idea where we stop the use of any ag land use. The economics will continuously, in a period of economic growth, these are products people need. Other suggestions, bringing in water supply from the dams. Why do all this work when you can get this water from precipitation?	Comment received.	
2					1/6/2010	Brad Rice	Re: Workshop: when you say approval for funding, what are you talking about?	Emily Gardner: Funding mechanisms, we'll have a workshop on all various types of funding mechanisms for projects: grant opportunities, fees for pumping, 218 votes. It's going to be an informational workshop on how we can fund projects in the future. How it looks at an individual subbasin level will be different based on which projects move forward.	
3					1/6/2010	Alan Panzeira	The north boundary, B Line, when ASGSA was starting, and we were petitioning folks to see if they wanted to join the ASGSA, from that line to the north up to Foothill Road, they all expressed they wanted to be included. I propose they should be included in the ASGSA.	Comment received.	
4					1/6/2010	Ron Panzeira	I agree. That [B] line should be extended up to Arroyo Seco Road, continues up Paraiso Springs Road and that area. I think that's all heavily influenced by the Arroyo Seco and not the Salinas.	Comment received.	
5					1/6/2010	Jason Smith	What are the scientific and technical reasons why that [northern area] wasn't included?	DW: When you look at all the data, you didn't see as strong of an influence from the Arroyo Seco. I want to point out, this isn't Arroyo Seco vs Salinas River. It is, is there an area that is more strongly influenced? I think we had some earlier maps that went to the north, but the data get a little less certain as you go further north. There wasn't anything that specifically said you should NOT go further north.	
6					1/6/2010	Jason Smith	What's the difference of being in the management area versus not being in the management area, for any landowner?	<p>Donna Meyer: SGMA does allow us to create a management area within the GSP, and can be based on a unique feature. It's not meant to divide landowners. I think the committee has done a great job at looking at the technical details. What the next step will be is within a management area, you can work towards objectives and SMCs that are unique to that feature, as long as they are not incongruent with the larger subbasin goals. This area would be managed with the ASGSA, we would be able to provide some funds that are collected by fees per parcel to the ASGSA for management purposes. Any projects or work that was done beyond the SMCs would have to be funded by the ASGSA. Management area implementation agreement will be develop between the two areas that will specify. The management area does not result in the SVBGSA giving up its own powers or authority. It recognizes a partnership and a unique feature within the subbasin. Without answering the boundary question first, we can't move forward with other efforts.</p> <p>DW: Other things we've worked on are agreeing to SMCs throughout the entire basin. We've gone pretty far down that line. Several SMCs are going to be the same in and out of the management area. There will be differences when it comes to allocations. I don't see a need for pumping controls in this basin. Should we come to that in the next 50yr, you have to divide up the pie. There is an option to say one of the pies is within the management area and another pie is outside of the management area. Should that come to pass, that is probably the biggest effect of having a management area.</p> <p>Steve McIntyre: The fees will be the same.</p>	
7					1/6/2010	Gus Yates	I want to add about what happens at the boundary at line B. The water quality effects of the Arroyo Seco continue to the north, but the hydrograph signatures that are characteristic of the Arroyo Seco start disappearing. It is a squishy dividing line.	Comment received.	

Number	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
8					1/6/2010	Colby Pereira	It is important to look at this holistically, and not pit stakeholders against each other based on where a line might be drawn. I want to ask about outreach. You pointed out this map doesn't have holes. Stakeholders petitioned to be a part of this [Management Area] or not, can you update how outreach is going?	Steve McIntyre: Outreach really starts today. This was presented at the ASGSA committee. Talking to various property owners who petitioned to be in, or who said they didn't want to be in, especially where there were holes or islands. We've gotten really good feedback. Now we have to seek comments from a much larger group.	
9					1/6/2010	John Bramers	There's a lot of data on here, but there seems like there is insufficient data from the northeast, from Salinas River to Soledad. Don't you need data there to fine-tune the map?	Steve McIntyre: We hope to develop more data over time. DW: Yes, there are places with missing data. The areas closer to the headwaters are more influenced by the Arroyo Seco. That northern area as you get close to the Salinas River, you get more influence from the Salinas River. Right now we have the best estimate, and we need to move forward. As we collect more data in the future, it may be something to consider. Donna Meyers: We had a similar conversation with the ASGSA this morning. I reminded folks that SGMA is an adaptive management approach. The planning work is that adaptive approach, and understanding more about your basin, and refining your plan as you move ahead.	
10					1/6/2010	John Bramers	I guess as we get more data, would that area grow? What would it look like? Seems like you're looking at hydrograph map as where to put that line. You expanded the Clark Colony portion pretty far out, but the hydrographs don't show that.	Steve McIntyre: We wrestled with that.	
11					1/6/2010	Jason Smith	The yellow dots, they are on the border of either way, strongly Salinas or strongly Arroyo Seco. That's why I ask, what does this mean? At the same time, we say this is a management area and it is relatively sustainable because it has that influence. I would agree that we should look at those yellows a little more in the north and the south, looking at that B-zone boundary. We're pretty close in the south area. You guys had to make a decision, based on science and what else is in there too. It isn't as relevant that certain people wanted to be in or out of the ASGSA or not. What is important is the scientific process, but now we are at the tough ones to make decisions on. Can we look a little closer and see if that boundary can be changed? We need a way to explain.	Comment received.	
12					1/6/2010	Jerry Lohr	It's a judgment call, a practical call. It's something where you put many different things, many different graphs, especially in the north area where this boundary could move. One that I thought was comfortable was where the bluff is to the south. There were some red wells at the base of the bluff, but on the bluff there are some yellow dots as well. Judgements on the area are good. Through several months people have been looking at it, we've gotten away from gaps. I think we're headed in the right direction. I think we're wanting to now go out and talk to people. Where are we with getting more data?	DW: I think we're trying to get feedback to the ASGSA and SVBGSA can come to a final agreement, or an agreement to move forward. If there are data that would make a significant difference, that's great but there's also a timing issue. Donna Meyers: We have been working on this pretty much every month, going through the information, technical. And evaluating how the relationship will work in the GSP. We have been told by DWR that this will need to get resolved fairly soon. When new maps are filed with the state, which we want to do in Feb, there is a curing period. What we risk if it's not resolved, that we will not be able to file this GSP and we will be out of compliance with SGMA. Our intent is that we finish this analysis and work through our boards and finalize the implementation agreement, and look to late Feb to submit the map so the GSP can be submitted. Right now, because of the overlap, neither GSA has the ability to submit.	
13						Roger Moitoso	When you look at those 3 yellow dots, plus the blue one just above, the majority of those land owners have asked to be in the ASGSA. Those 3 dots say it's pretty close, I would recommend you move the line. It's not a big deal to pick them up. It's one GSP, one GSA that spreads the funds, not a big difference.	Comment received.	
14					1/6/2010	Pamela Silkwood	Seems like hydrograph and water quality data, especially around the perimeters, is uncertain. But the geomorphic data is certain. The Arroyo Seco cone is established, which means there is influence from the Arroyo Seco river. Is there a reason why you wouldn't use the Arroyo Seco cone, which then would capture NW area?	DW: You could use the cone, but it shows the historical maximum extent of where the Arroyo Seco was. It doesn't show where today it is hydrogeologically unique. There is a good argument to say the western edge of the arroyo seco cone acts more like the rest of the basin. That doesn't mean you couldn't use the extent of the mapped cone. We're just looking for best available data for the hydrologic influences.	

Number	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
15					1/6/2010	Tom Virsik	It would be useful to have the current boundary map as GIS or a list of APNs, so people can be very granular about their interests. The progress has been really good. What people have said, the difference between being inside or outside may be less important than what it first appeared, with the big caveat potentially being allocation issues which under SGMA is not water rights. I don't see the boundary as binary as what it once seemed to be. I don't see it making any substantive difference, in projects that come down the road like reservoir reoperations or the tunnel. If you happen to be 100% on arroyo seco water, or not, that matters. But if you're on one side or the other doesn't matter as much.	Comment received.	
16					1/6/2010	Nancy Isakson	Wanted to share recommendation from ASGSA Advisory Committee. Recommend to move forward and look at issues in the NW corner and the most SW corner, above the green bridge. Look at those issues and the issues outlined today. Support the remaining boundaries as they have been identified. Include all the way to the lower most southern purple line. They also ask that it be brought back to their advisory board, and I think that's the intent before going to board of directors.	Comment received.	
17					1/6/2010	Alan Panzeira	Re: Pumping allocations: I'm not sure how you set up the structure without the science. One guy might be able to pump all he wants and not worry about the outliers. It might work for the 180/400, and the water runs there longer now with CSIP, but hasn't seemed to stop the problem.	DW: Those are two different ways at looking at the allocation systems: controlling pumping and funding projects. We can give everybody an allocation and there is also an option, legality still working through, if you are pumping or groups of pumpers that are causing an undesirable results, and it's clear, can the GSA say everybody's got an allocation but you're causing an undesirable results. When you talk about pumping, we think there's not exactly a 1:1 connection between this is your allocation and this is your right to pump. This isn't a water right, it's simply an allocation to get to sustainability.	
18					1/6/2010	Alan Panzeira	Are you going to charge somebody who doesn't have a problem or isn't causing a problem. I don't think that is fair.	DW: That's up to this group. We can find a different approach.	
19					1/6/2010	Steve McIntyre	Given the relative water wealth the Forebay has, if we need to allocate, it ought to be during a drought. And maybe that allocation could be tied to a minimum threshold. If a group of wells fell below a threshold, then that group might have to cut back 10%, until they got back above the minimum threshold. My view is irrigated acres, and evaluating on a yearly basis in case somebody wants to fallow or new users come in to the basin.	Comment received.	
20					1/6/2010	Jerry Lohr	There are sometimes permanent crops in the area, and their annual needs are based on rainfall. If we need about 20" of rainfall, but if we have 5" of rain, we need 15" of pumping. The idea of water allocations is going to be a real Pandora's box. It will color people where they won't be able to provide support for the salt water intrusion, or our well heights. I think there's an easier answer. There's a question for population expansion, where are we going to get water for that. Residential probably uses less water per acre than irrigated land does. So if you buy and you want to build, you can then have water used for irrigation for that. So you don't have to go into an allocation process. This is a very complicated process and I think we're just going to scare people.	DW: I agree, and that's why I'm trying to keep this high level. We're trying to avoid adjudications, which are essentially allocations but they're just water rights. We are looking for general concepts that we could agree on. You're right, the details of this will take some time to work through, more time than we have to write this GSP.	
21					1/6/2010	Allen Panzeira	It states that you'll only be allocating native water. Where does the SVWP fall?	DW: We are working with WRA to get their opinion on the legal status on their water. I'm not an attorney, so I'll try to be careful. In general, water that has been diverted, that water belongs to the diverter. The fact that WRA diverts it for the good of the people in the valley, complicates it. But it is not part of the natural recharge.	
22					1/6/2010	Brad Rice	If the only thing we change is the date, 1956 instead of 2021, and we have the same discussion, the allocation is of the natural sustainability pre-reservoir, pre CSIP. You come up with what that number is, and it's not enough. So you build reservoir and you enhance. If they're not enough, you come up with a project. And if that's not enough, then, we've already done that. We've already created enhancement zones 2, 2A, 2C, 2B and you have Clark Colony on top of that, which spreads water and enhances its own. If you talk allocations, you've got to talk about native, natural.	DW: I would like people on this committee to think, is there any place where we're going to need allocations for pumping or for financing. We're looking for a fair way to split things up. What is fair? Net or irrigated acreage? We will send something out to get better feedback, maybe with examples. Or are some people saying they don't even want to see this in the GSP? Steve McIntyre: We should table this until we have more time. I do need to take it out to the public.	
23					1/6/2010	Nancy Isakson	I want to add, you mentioned using allocations for funding. I think historically it's been tried and doesn't really work. If you think that in 50 years you might need an allocation system, what about 30 years down the road, we don't have that information. We don't have enough info today to decide what will need to be developed in 30 years if we exceed our min thresholds. We encourage you to consider that.	Comment received.	

Number	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
24					1/6/2010	Tom Virsik	An observation, that when chapter 6, which is the water budget, is out there, there will be numbers and numbers associated with irrigated acreage. By division, everyone will start with a default allocation, not labelled as such, but where everyone will start. Keep that in mind, that not putting numbers on what's happening may not be the best idea long-term.	Comment received.	
25					1/6/2010	Justine Masse	For de minimis users, how are they defined? I've heard just one definition which is using 2AFY or less. Is there a source for that distinction between domestic and other de minimis users? The importance of having allocations for pumping, it's really one of the most critical tools for a GSA to have to ensure you stay within sustainability. A lot of hope hinges on expectations for recharge water. Looking at this year, it's not something we can count on. It's up to the GSA to make the hard calls as shortages arise. Community Water Center finds this a really important point, there should be some allowance and expectation of growth of urban users. Population is expected to grow, but you can't follow humans, so this is an increase in basic needs use.	Comment received.	
26					1/28/2021	Email: James Sang	https://sjvwater.org/delanos-big-dig/	Comment received	