COMMENTS RECEIVED JANUARY 27, 2021 to APRIL 1, 2021

Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
1				2/3/2021	Colby Pereira	With regard to land use pie chart, does that align well with the percentages of land use in the funding model for the GSA as a whole?	**Abby Ostovar:** This is the same data from the GSP in Chapter 3 from the Monterey County Assessor's office, but for example vacant land was separated. If it was near a city it would go toward urban growth and if it's far from a city then it was classified as dormant land because it would like go to irrigated ag in the future. **DW:** The data in the GSP matches what is used in the funding structure.	
2				2/3/2021	Chris Bunn	It is clear that whatever happens going forward, ag users will bear the brunt of the changes and cost. I think we need to reach out to the farmers in the Eastside for their opinion. I'm uncomfortable opining on this in the absence of hearing from the larger Eastside farming community.	**Abby Ostovar:** What process should we follow for getting that input?	
3				2/3/2021	Chris Bunn	Reach out to SBAWA, and Norm. It's not a lot of people but it's important to reach out to them.	**Comment received**	
4				2/3/2021	Colby Pereira	Going through SBAWA would be the best approach.	**Abby Ostovar:** Ultimately, this committee gives us direction, but maybe we could reach out to them and then bring that input back to this committee. **Donna:** Colby and Chris, would you consolidate some of those views for us? **Colby:** SBAWA could submit comments directly, or we could listen and bring back feedback we are hearing. **Abby:** Donna and Emily, we can work with Colby and Chris to come up with an adequate approach. We will revisit this topic in the future.	
5				2/3/2021	Robin Lee	*Re: Municipal growth* : The idea of not allocating water to the cities is ridiculous, so I would throw that one out right away. I would go with the historical pumping approach, but the city is growing and that will have to be taken into consideration. It seems that urban uses is a minor portion of the whole pie and they are conserving. We have to talk to farmers and developers to see what their planning horizons are looking like for future development.	**Abby Ostovar:** You're saying that the historical approach should be used as the standard and then look at the future growth rate and add that in as a "set-aside" for municipal growth?	
6				2/3/2021	Robin Lee	Yes, I don't see why they would need more water than what they use currently in areas that are already built out. So current use, would be a good number to have, if anything, that number will go down as efficiencies go up. If current numbers are considered a historical figure, then yes.	**Comment received**	
7				2/3/2021	Marc Bloom	I agree with most of what Robin said. Historical and current use will give you a decent estimate of need for the future growth. I'm confused about the "set aside" term because the new growth area will be replacing irrigated ag. So residential and light commercial development will use less water anyhow. Development now is planned to be efficient, and that needs to be accounted for. My suggestion is to have allocations adjusted as growth occurs. Urban users are conserving, but Ag is doing a good job conserving, too.	**Comment received**	
8				2/3/2021	Robin Lee	Urban development is required to use low-impact development. In the future growth area, they are looking into things like detention basins that will percolate. So low impact development is a big part of that.	**Comment received**	
9				2/3/2021	Robin Lee	It depends on what the builders say about their rate of development. There is a housing shortage and I think development will happen quickly, so I would say a set aside, but that would need to be based on what the developers are saying about growth.	**Abby Ostovar:** I'm hearing everyone say that growth will occur in municipalities and we need to be able to meet [that demand] with future water.	

Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
10				2/3/2021	Chris Bunn	The land use issue aside, if somebody choses to convert their land from non-irrigated to irrigated you can't stop them from doing that. The allocation should be flexible enough to account for that.	**Abby Ostovar:** That's what Valerie said because we don't have land use authority and this is an allocation which should not conflict with anyone's water rights.	
11				2/3/2021	Robin Lee	There was a comment from the questionnaire that dormant land is not wasted land. I think we should call dormant land something else. I think it's the wrong connotation. I think something like non-irrigated is better. Also, how can you bring more irrigated land when we are already overusing water? It seems like the agency has the resources to fallow land to get us to sustainability. I'm not sure how this goes with land use but in my mind I can't separate land use and getting to sustainability. Fallowing land is the best tool we have right now. We should keep dormant land dormant.	**Abby Ostovar:** I think the challenge in creating a fallowing program is that we can't essentially tell a land user what to do with their land. Ideally we want the approach we take to be legal.	
12				2/3/2021	Robin Lee	I'm just saying dangle some carrots in front of the already dormant land to keep it dormant. I'm not saying to take people's land.	**DW:** I want to address the dormant land issue because part of this is how you implement the allocations. If we do a fee structure then we're not actually having an impact on land use. It's pretty much saying that some land is more expensive to irrigate than other lands. I just want to point out that not having an allocation for dormant land is not preventing that land from being irrigated, it will just make irrigating that land more expensive. We don't have land use authority, but we do have water use authority, and how you bring those two together, we will have to be very cautious about.	
13				2/3/2021	Steve McIntyre	I wanted to point out to the non-farmers in the group that a lot of grazing land has been converted to vineyards. Vineyards will use 1/3 of the water that other given crops will use on an acre. If we work hard at projects and management actions, in particular conservation, there could be enough water and avoid allocations. I think fallowing is a last resort. Let's do this through management actions and projects.	**Comment received**	
14				2/3/2021	Marc Bloom	As the largest urban water supplier in the subbasin, we are not supporting pumping allocations at this time. We understand that it may come into play at some point and if so, we would like to see the historical approach. We do support projects that will get us to sustainability.	**Comment received**	
15				2/3/2021	Robin Lee	I think allocations are imminent because of climate change. I would say that allocations might have to be used sooner than later since we have a lot of extended dry periods. I think we can't have projects that are dependent on rainwater alleviate the need for allocations.	**Comment received**	
16				2/3/2021	Chris Bunn	I'm not a fan of allocations, either. However, the necessary metering component is needed because this will help with getting precise data and fees. I think we should be project oriented. Pumping allocations are a last ditch response. Even in dry years, there is water here.	**Comment received**	
17				2/3/2021	Caroline Chapin	I agree with Chris; I'm uncomfortable with allocations. I work with rainwater and we just let a lot of water run into the ocean. I think we should focus on projects that help us capture and recharge water.	**Comment received**	
18				2/3/2021	Colby Pereira	I agree with comments from Marc, Chris, and Caroline.	**Comment received**	
19				2/3/2021	Robin Lee	In order to have developments, you need to prove you have water, on the flip side shouldn't ag have the same requirement? If we're all paying the price for overdraft and seawater intrusion, should ag be required to prove their water will have a sustainable yield? Is that language valid for our GSP?	**DW:** The requirements that Robin refers to are state laws and we don't have that type of authority for those types of requirements.	
20				2/3/2021	Caroline Chapin	I understand the usefulness of allocations for funding. I think I can support this being a low-priority tool in our toolbox.	**Comment received**	

Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Date	Commenter	Comment	Response	Action
21				2/3/2021	Marc Bloom	I agree with Caroline. My comment was that we don't support pumping allocations right now, but we are open to revisit the topic. I do understand that at some point it may become necessary, so maybe we can state that in our GSP.	**Comment received**	
22				2/3/2021	Chris Bunn	I think the allocations should be the ugly brutal tool in the box that we don't want to use. The priority should be given to the supply projects.	**Comment received**	
23				2/3/2021	Ross Clark	I support this approach as well, but cost considerations might bring us back to this discussion at a later date.	**Comment received**	
24				2/3/2021	Horacio Amezquita	I think we should have water allocations in the toolbox because we never know when an extensive drought will come up.	**Comment received**	
25				2/3/2021	Robin Lee	When we had the drought a few years ago the state asked urban pumpers to reduce by 15%. We have to request Ag to do the same. That should be a tool in the toolbox.	**Comment received**	
26				2/3/2021	Colby Pereira	I agree with keeping [pumping allocations] in [the GSP], but only as a last resort scenario.	**Comment received**	
27				2/3/2021	Steve McIntyre	I agree with all members that it needs to be a last resort. In a prolonged drought, one management action we could take is monitoring our groundwater levels. If we have X% of wells below the minimum threshold, we can propose that everyone reduce their pumping by 10% until water levels rose up again and got closer to the measurable objective.	**Comment received**	