

COMMENTS RECEIVED DECEMBER 3, 2020 TO JANUARY 25, 2021

Number	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
1					12/7/2020	Nancy Isakson	Re: Items not on agenda: (1) I really want to encourage staff to be able to release and distribute information as early as possible prior to meetings. (2) I submitted a letter, have one correction: the map in Figure 1 under projects memo, mentions Zone 2B. I encourage you to revise it to include Zone 2C.	Comment received	
2					12/7/2020	Nancy Isakson	Re: Schedule and workshop updates: Will there be some kind of note on how the letters and comments will be addressed? How will you address the comments submitted via letter?	<p>Emily Gardner: We decided to try to not paraphrase people's letters. Still working on how to connect letters to action.</p> <p>Abby Ostovar: Previously we had a list of letters and a summarized response. We will do that again.</p>	
3					12/7/2020	Bill Lipe	I know in 2016, GW levels were a little lower. I think the idea was we didn't want to get to 2016. I thought we picked 2015 so we never got there again. I'm not sure where the +5 feet came from. I'd be okay setting things at the 2015 level. I'm open to hear what other folks have to say.	Abby Ostovar: You are correct. The committee decided on 2015.	
4					12/7/2020	Roger Moitosa	As we're going through this, 2015 - are these individual wells? Are we talking about a monitoring system? In San Ardo, there were wells that weren't really affected. As we talk about these levels, are we talking about areas? How does this tie back to your individual well?	<p>Abby Ostovar: In Chapter 7, there are representative monitoring wells that we measure at.</p> <p>DW: The UV is a unique subbasin, especially with respect to the added area for the UV. If we pick 2015, we look at the monitoring network wells, and set it there. For the added areas, and we look at 2015 levels, if it doesn't work we can adjust it in the future. However, as we get more data, we may say this doesn't work because it registers a different signature.</p>	
5					12/7/2020	Bill Lipe	It looks like the UV has been historically stable, especially after the reservoirs. Curious what that MO is.	Abby Ostovar: The MO is what you want to strive for. That's sustainability to strive for. We set these based on what seemed attainable. In the ISP they said 2005 or 2012.	
6					12/7/2020	Steve McIntyre	The MO seems appropriate. I'm concerned about the MT, even at +5 feet from 2015. Of the 8 wells we had on one ranch, 6 went dry. They're by the river. For all the other subbasins where we're farming, we didn't see those impacts. We saw drops, but they didn't go dry. I have concerns about 2015.	Abby Ostovar: I made the correction, the choice is between 2015 and 2016, and there was a 5-foot different between the two.	
7					12/7/2020	Bill Lipe	To Mr. McIntyre's comments: 2015 was definitely red alert for some folks, and 2016 was when some impact was realized. I don't know how much discussion is around 2015. I'm certainly willing to hear from other committee members on using 2015 as the MT.	Comment received	
8					12/7/2020	Grant Cremers	My thoughts are even in 1992 there were wells that were suffering. I think the line should be somewhere between 1992 and 2015. I think 2016 was a wipe out where we couldn't operate wells.	Comment received	
9					12/7/2020	Bill Lipe	You don't want to get to 2016 levels and realize there's a problem. I want to understand the impact of increasing the groundwater level SMC. What's the impact? Do we want to set it artificially high or low?	DW: If we set the MT high, and we don't meet it, we will be seen as not meeting sustainability, which opens the door for DWR to step in. Setting it should also accommodate for normal, small droughts. If you set the MT too low, you're not working toward reasonable sustainability. So, with really high MTs, if you don't meet that, you are by definition, managing unsustainably.	
10					12/7/2020	Jason Smith	2015 would be meeting in the middle. 1992 was more of a natural drought. 2015 is what we don't want to go to and could be attainable through management.		

Number	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
11					12/7/2020	Marc Bloom	What I'm hearing is, this level we're discussing now is a compliance level. What's the trigger level? Where are we at with trigger levels so we don't get to the compliance level?	DW: In SGMA there are no required trigger levels. The levels here are compliance levels. We can add those in, but if we add trigger levels in, we should add 'this is a trigger level and we will do something' not just 'now we are worried.'	
12					12/7/2020	Marc Bloom	If we don't have any actions prior to the compliance level, how are we not going to get there? Whether we set it at 2015 or 2016, if we don't have anything before that, it seems like we will get there.	Comment received	
13					12/7/2020	Bill Lipe	Whether you attach it to humans or nature, we know there are ebbs and flows in what comes down the river. We know the UV is highly dependent on flows. 2015 represents a level you don't want to get to again. If we don't want to get there, we're going to be monitoring it, everyone will be monitoring. I don't think it will be a lack of information. I think it will be more like making sure we don't go more than two years without flows. I'm okay with the MO here, and Option 1 (2015). I'm open to hearing from somebody else.	DW: I think Mr. Lipe made some great statements. There is an annual report, and we will know in advance whether we're approaching the MT.	
14					12/7/2020	Grant Cremers	Will we know we're approaching or when we miss the exit?	DW: You need to manage to your MO, and your MT will take a couple of years to get there, so you have a warning.	
15					12/7/2020	Grant Cremers	Advance warning for what? What do we do if it's not a trigger for something?	DW: Under reasonable future conditions, which includes droughts, what will happen in the UV? If we say we're going to violate our MT regularly, then we have a series of projects and actions to implement. Maybe you release more water in the summer or cut back pumping, we'll have those in the plan. There is a part of what DWR has written, should you go into a long extended drought, and your plan is built that in normal years your WLs will come up, you're not responsible for that long drought. This plan is managing to reasonable future conditions to make sure we are managing toward our MO. Abby Ostovar: We're going to talk about projects. We aren't going to talk about pumping controls yet. One option is to have a WL trigger that would implement pumping controls. We'll talk about it at the next meeting.	
16					12/7/2020	Roger Moitoso	Getting back to 2015, that was a manmade drought. You had 70,000 AF that came into the reservoirs that was not released and 120,000 AF in 2016. In the Forebay, the Arroyo Seco ran. 2014 was the low year and 2015 and 2016 there was recharge. Under normal conditions, the UV is in balance. I don't say that lightly. Look at the last 60 years. Until the Salinas Valley Project, our dry year was 1990, you caught it all and you drove it as far as you could. In 2015 and 2016, those GWL, SGMA wants to manage the natural sustainability and salvage the water. Benefit Zone of 2C. When you talk about natural sustainability, and you use 2015 as the benchmark. I would say, I'm really comfortable with that, but that would mean you have to manage true salvage water. Water all the way to the lagoon and to the ocean and then catch and hold water. If I caught it right, we're managing the native sustainability. Reservoir releases and additional recharge are above and beyond.	Comment received	

Number	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
17					12/7/2020	Steve McIntyre	Thinking about what Derrick mentioned, that you should have a buffer of two years, and thinking about how this basin works. I would think 2015 would be the appropriate MT. The other aspect of that, I don't think you need a trigger because when you reach 2015 the problem takes care of itself. I think the MO will be realized with the reoperation of the reservoirs. I think the 2015 level would be a good MT.	Comment received	
18					12/7/2020	Jason Smith	Groundwater Level SMC: Measurable Objective set at 2012, 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.
19					12/7/2020	Bill Lipe	What is the water level in 2005 and 2012? If there are no real discernable differences, I'm okay with the motion as is.	Abby Ostovar: It looks the same because this is the aggregate of all the years. It may be that 2005 and 2012 are slightly different when we look at the specific monitoring wells.	
20					12/7/2020	Tom Virsik	Re: Chapter 8: Similar to Ms. Isakson's comments on the map with the zones 2A, 2B, and 2C, I think the language is awkward and not clear about those zones. Another piece, at 8.6.2.1, on page 31 of packet, page labeled 8-17, language at the top about pumping of intentionally recharged water that is not part of the natural recharge, is not considered when compared with MTs. My confusion is that I'm not aware of any intentionally recharged water that is not part of the natural recharge. My understanding is that all water in the reservoirs is part of the natural recharge. Also, at 8.6.2.4, page 8-18 toward the bottom under Ag land uses and users, it says agricultural lands currently not irrigated may be impacted by... using water and others would use less. The recommendation of the presenter at the workshop was to take into account the lands not yet irrigated. Will need a footnote somewhere if the committee selects allocations, and wants to consider lands which are not using water to which they are legally entitled. 8.9.2 on page 48, 8-34, at the bottom, I understand this part needs a lot of Chapter 6 and other things that have not come yet. I am interested in that section saying no minimum thresholds are established for times when flows in a river is due to conservation releases. It sounds reasonable to me, but it did catch my eye, and if there's additional explanation, I will be watching for that.	Comment received	
21					12/7/2020	Grant Cremers	Table 8-1, in the undesirable result column for chronic lowering of GWL. Is "2 years" just a number that was placed there?	DW: It is based on the idea that we don't want one well that may regularly operate below the MT, which means one grower bears the brunt of all the problems. It could be 3 or 4 years.	
22					12/7/2020	Bill Stevens	Page 8-36, The USACE has not reinitiated consultation. WRA is not managing flows under the BO, it is under their water right. It is not a "safe harbor practice" because that has a legal regulatory definition. The 2007 BO doesn't have legal standing.	Comment received	
23					12/7/2020	Grant Cremers	Re: Injection well project: The 13,000 AF, is that a permitted number?	Abby Ostovar: We're talking about what the permits are with MCWRA. We need to have more discussions with them.	

Number	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
24					12/7/2020	Grant Cremers	Hybrid where water goes to City of Salinas and some goes to injection wells? I think you need less injection wells if you can send half the water to the city.	Abby Ostovar: I'll take a look at that	
25					12/7/2020	Grant Cremers	For the Arundo program, is that really a \$35 million program?	Donna Meyers: I think the original cost estimate was a little large. However, it has cost about \$12 million to date. I think we'll be at \$12-16 million by the time the program is up.	
26					12/7/2020	Bill Lipe	For the summary slide, I think for the UV, the winter releases are very critical and benefit the whole valley. Can be done sooner rather than later. Hopefully something we can participate in. There are good environmental impacts as well. Not just to benefit the landowners. I think winter releases are important. I would like to attach other things with it, like ASR. I think we should get the winter releases done sooner than later. I think on the ET data, the CIMIS data stations are pretty accurate. I think there are federal grant funding opportunities. Having a broad network of CIMIS stations to manage their own growing practices the best they can. I think we have talked about enhancing outflow efficiency. Utilize the spillway you already have. Be able to release 1,200 cfs over the spillway and from the lower level whenever you want. Hopefully you can manage storing more water in the ground. Will help with a natural pass through for adults and smolt migration.	Abby Ostovar: We are starting to coordinate with MCWRA. We're understanding why they operate the way they do, and how to make some changes.	
27					12/7/2020	Jason Smith	The importance of our work with MCWRA. It is integral to everything we do. I see this disconnect and some messaging opportunities. Some people, as you go north, believe they get no benefit. I think there are messaging opportunities to understand how this winter release thing helps everybody. In reality, the water will never get there if our basin isn't full. Listening to some people talking about why it won't work, if that attitude continues, then now it won't work. I think we have an opportunity to educate everybody. As Bill said, everybody is going to benefit from this. And may be cost effective to do it. I encourage everybody to learn and educate. Reiterating what we've said before.	Comment received	
28					12/7/2020	Grant Cremers	Some of these ideas are basin-wide benefits. And relatively simple and cheap compared to others. We have to have the model ready to share.	Donna Meyers: We have set up weekly meetings with MCWRA staff on a variety of different topics. Now that the projects are being vetted, we're engaged with them on a weekly basis now. Will report back on those coordination efforts.	
29					12/7/2020	Roger Moitoso	As far as the marketing and how we label things, when you talk about winter releases, I gather there are two guys up north that can't get out of their own way. Those are winter releases, those are natural flows if the labeling gets in the way. The water that would go to the underground, that's what SGMA has to manage. How we market. We're not looking to create winter flows that naturally wouldn't happen. When you get a rain event, you have to let the natural flow out. We saw that live time 2017. That river had been bone dry for 36 months. We got a big rain, and water reached Bradley, then was out to the ocean. If you were trying to send 500 cfs after 36 months, it would never get there. These are natural flows. If it's how you market it, great. Let's make sure we manage these natural flows. Make sure those natural, native, enviro fish flows can run. In the old days, it was catch and release. We have an HCP to put together.	Comment received	

Number	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
30					12/7/2020	Bill Lipe	Great points by everybody. I speak for myself. A few of us had been advocating these releases in the winter time as a benefit for everyone. To the best we can, reestablish the natural flow patters. It's a great ideal to strive for. Our MO, in my opinion.	Comment received	
31					12/7/2020	Tom Virsik	Re: pumping controls and whatever nature they come to pass. My client has a lot of land not yet developed, and has whatever entitlement it has to use water. That will be a concern moving forward, that lands do not lose the ability to use water. That is going to be a common concern in the Upper Valley.	Comment received	
32					12/7/2020	Ann Myhre	I just want to thank Jason for bringing this issue up. While we are all aware of the benefits of restoring the natural flow, some people say we're being greedy. I think we need to explain to people in the north county how it will benefit them. I think we need to reach the public how this will be a sucess. I'm always wanting for the whole valley to be a success without harming other folks.	Comment received	