

81				Meeting	11/4/2020	Norm Groot	As you may know, I'm participating on the Deep Aquifer working group. That groups has been discussing the study and the need to get it done. The problem is we have not identified a funding source. It will probably take a year or more. The county is not willing to fund it, so it will require grants or another funding source. There is a survey out which includes how to fund the study. I urge you all to complete the survey Gary Peterson created. We really need your input on this.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
82				Meeting	11/4/2020	Justine Massey	I want to reiterate what Community Water Center has said in the past. Monitoring networks must include shallow well monitoring to establish baseline conditions in quality and groundwater elevation that effects domestic users. We find this to be critical, and encourage a robust shallow well monitoring program. I would be happy to provide more information how that connects to our DW well mitigation framework.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
83				Meeting	11/4/2020	James Sang	On the monitoring of the water level, how is it done and where is it done?	DW: There is a map in Chapter 7, it's done quite a few wells in the Forebay, which will be reported regularly. There is a map. Monitoring is conducted by MCWRA and private well owners. We receive the data and report to DWR.	Meeting comment - noted.
84				Meeting	11/4/2020	Jerry Lohr	Re: Management are memo: I thought it was quite complete and the process is working well.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
85				Meeting	11/4/2020	Steve McIntyre and Jerry Lohr	Re: SMC Presentation/Discussion/Groundwater Storage/MT and MO: I think this approach is appropriate.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
86				Meeting	11/4/2020	Justine Massey	I want to follow up on the 21% of domestic wells potentially being impacted. If the impact is in that range, is there a plan in the works about how to mitigate those impacts? How does the committee respond if that is the case?	Steve McIntyre: We're going to get better data as we go along. I would expect the domestic wells to have been impacted by the 2015 drought more than the ag wells, since they are so much shallower. I think there is a way to monitor and find a standard that is more appropriate. Abby Ostovar: We're going to talk about projects and management actions a little later. I think the wells that went dry was very low, suspiciously low, close to zero, which is why we expanded our analysis. Steve McIntyre: I would add from 2015, I don't know of any domestic wells that went dry on our ranches or our neighboring ranches. 2015 was an extreme situation for all of us.	Meeting comment - noted.
87				Meeting	11/4/2020	Gus Yates	I want to clarify about ASGSA consultant not liking this. By using pumping as a storage surrogate, it's assuming that storage decline is a result of pumping. In this basin, the storage decline during the last drought was a result of an interruption of surface flow and a decrease in recharge, not from an increase in pumping. Both decreases in recharge and increases in pumping both effect storage.	Steve McIntyre: That's a really good point. As a management action, if we reoperate the reservoirs, we could have prevented that. DW: I want to disagree with Mr. Yates. I think that he overstates it to say that the lowered water levels were from lack of streamflow. Lack of streamflow was important, but you could also have cut back on pumping to maintain storage. You need both recharge and to control our pumping. In the thresholds we're writing, we agreed the storage threshold based on GW levels is reasonable. We also said that we need to pump within our sustainable yield. It's not one or the other, it's both. It's both recharge and controlled pumping.	Meeting comment - noted.
88				Meeting	11/4/2020	Jerry Lohr	It's important to point out the drought years as well as the operation of the reservoirs.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
89				Meeting	11/4/2020	Justine Massey	Two reports came out, one from the Water Foundation that found similar results that the GSP plans that came for 2020 will result in up to 12,000 wells going dry and thousands of CA residents losing access to their DW. I would be happy to forward that information along. It is a very real possibility that these SMC MT are being prepared in a way that will not protect domestic users. I understand process-wise, you've separated SMCs and projects. You don't want to set yourself up for a giant gap that will cause drastic problems.	Steve McIntyre: I really appreciate that. I appreciate the opportunity to speak with you, and maybe a group of us can chat with you about these studies and how they might relate to this subbasin.	Meeting comment - noted.
90				Meeting	11/4/2020	Jerry Lohr	In ISW data gaps (7.6.2), it says the level of interconnection basin fill aquifer and the Arroyo Seco aquifer is unclear. That is something we need to be cognizant of going forward.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
91				Meeting	11/4/2020	Jerry Lohr	Re: Subsidence SMC. I think it would be good to have 1ft cumulative.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.

92				Meeting	11/4/2020	Allan Panziera	I would agree to 1 ft cumulative.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
93				Meeting	11/4/2020	Steve McIntyre	I would agree to that, too.	DW: If you have a rate for one metric, you need to have a rate for the other, too. You can't have a rate for one metric and cumulative for the other. Trying to make it easy on us for DWR to approve our plan.	Meeting comment - noted.
94				Meeting	11/4/2020	Colby Pereira	Based on what DW said, I would lean toward that recommendation, using a rate.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
95				Meeting	11/4/2020	Steve McIntyre	Re: Water Quality: At the last coordinating committee meeting, we talked a lot about this topic. There are other efforts outside of SGMA looking at water quality, like the irrigated lands program. Our primary goal is to work on salt water intrusion and the quantity of water to achieve sustainability. I think we need to spend more time on water quality and be more proactive. Farmers are concerned about salt build ups. City of Greenfield, we might need to look at water softeners and maybe change them out so we aren't adding to our salt load. I think we need to spend more time on this.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
96				Meeting	11/4/2020	Justine Massey	At Community Water Center, we feel that it's important that the MT and MO to be set at each well. If you just average across the subbasin, you can harm the users within the basin. If someone's well is no longer functioning and they can't rely on it, it doesn't matter to them that on average the		Meeting comment - noted.
97				Meeting	11/4/2020	Steve McIntyre	If we're going to have shallow wells for ISW, maybe we could use those shallow wells for water quality monitoring as well.	Abby Ostovar: One question would be spatial representation. The shallow wells for ISW will be concentrated along the river. DW: Water quality is based on supply wells. So we need to analyze what supply wells we can use in our monitoring system, and the shallow ones would be the domestic ones.	Meeting comment - noted.
98				Meeting	11/4/2020	Jerry Lohr	Re: Projects Discussion: Other projects: 11043, are we not including those?	Abby Ostovar: Those are part of a valley-wide program. I tried to focus on what would benefit this subbasin specifically.	Meeting comment - noted.
99				Meeting	11/4/2020	John Bramers	Re: winter releases, can SRDF operate in winter months?	Abby Ostovar: Technically it can operate, we're working with WRA about permitting. DW: During the 180/400 GSP discussions, our engineer asked MCWRA about this. MCWRA said it could. Usually water levels are high enough to raise the rubber dam. You could also operate the diversion without the rubber dam. We went forward assuming we could operate it in the winter.	Meeting comment - noted.
100				Meeting	11/4/2020	John Bramers	We would have to expand the CSIP and do a lot of things to actually capture the water and use it.	DW: Yes, it is part of a bigger project. Donna Meyer: One qualifier is that they have a flow prescription they have to operate to for winter flows for fish passage. There is a prescription that is tied that physical possibility as well.	Meeting comment - noted.
101				Meeting	11/4/2020	James Sang	I don't like the idea of any kind of project that inhibits a grower. I look at this, in the long term, you have growth of ag product and growth of population. Both mean you have to have increased water. If a grower can't use his land, or you charge him for using the GW, I don't see this as a sustainable strategy for the long term. I think you need to recharge the wells themselves, and recharge the underground aquifers. I don't know if it's possible for each grower to develop ponds on his land, or what the health	Steve McIntyre: I would encourage you to submit your comments in written form so we can include that later. Abby Ostovar: The swales are something that could fall under the ag BMPs. I was also building on a past presentation and a large part of the reservoir reoperation is for recharge, which will get water into the ground. Recharge is a main focus of that project.	Meeting comment - noted.
102				Meeting	11/4/2020	Norm Groot	I just want to mention that we have conflicting objectives between agencies controlling our GW at this point. The ILRP that is currently being proposed is going to discourage the percolation of irrigation water into GW. If we design projects to enhance groundwater recharge, we need to make sure we aren't getting crosswise of the ILRP program. As it stands now, the regional water board does not want irrigation water below the root zone and we should be aware of that as we move forward with projects.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
103				Meeting	11/4/2020	Gus Yates	Does the inclusion of various mechanisms for reducing pumping mean we assume pumping needs to be reduced? Or is it a back stop?	Abby Ostovar: It's a back stop. We want to think about the approach if we need it.	Meeting comment - noted.

104				Meeting	11/4/2020	Tom Virsik	I had comments on draft chapter 8. I assume it will be in a future meeting. Since there is so much red in it, I'm not sure if staff are ready to receive comments. There are some issues with water rights, I can submit my comments in writing. I'm not sure if staff are ready for substantive comments.	Emily Gardner: I would encourage you to submit comments. The draft chapter was included in the agenda packet, but it is a work in progress. We want to get as much feedback as possible. We have not been issuing multiple versions, but this is an exception for more feedback. Another draft chapter 8 will be coming in January or February. DW: If we have language concerns, especially with water rights. We want those comments now.	Meeting comment - noted.
105				Meeting	1/6/2021	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 following, 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.	Meeting comment - noted.
106				Meeting	1/6/2021	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.	Meeting comment - noted.
107				Meeting	1/6/2021	Allan Panziera	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.	Meeting comment - noted.
108				Meeting	1/6/2021	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.	Meeting comment - noted.
109				Meeting	1/6/2021	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.	Meeting comment - noted.
110				Meeting	1/6/2021	Jason Smith	What's the difference of being in the management area versus not being in the management area, for any landowner?	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.	Meeting comment - noted.

									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.	
									Steve McIntyre: The fees will be the same.	
111				Meeting	1/6/2021	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.		Meeting comment - noted.
112				Meeting	1/6/2021	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.		Meeting comment - noted.
113				Meeting	1/6/2021	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.	Meeting comment - noted.
114				Meeting	1/6/2021	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.		Meeting comment - noted.
115				Meeting	1/6/2021	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	Comment received.		Meeting comment - noted.
116				Meeting	1/6/2021	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.		Meeting comment - noted.
117				Meeting	1/6/2021	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.		Meeting comment - noted.

118				Meeting	1/6/2021	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.	Meeting comment - noted.
119				Meeting	1/6/2021	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.	Meeting comment - noted.
120				Meeting	1/6/2021	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.	Meeting comment - noted.
121				Meeting	1/6/2021	Allan Panziera	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.	Meeting comment - noted.
122				Meeting	1/6/2021	Allan Panziera	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.	Meeting comment - noted.
123				Meeting	1/6/2021	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.	Meeting comment - noted.
124				Meeting	1/6/2021	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.	Meeting comment - noted.
125				Meeting	1/6/2021	Allan Panziera	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.	Meeting comment - noted.

126				Meeting	1/6/2021	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.	Meeting comment - noted.
127				Meeting	1/6/2021	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.	Meeting comment - noted.
128				Meeting	1/6/2021	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.	Meeting comment - noted.
129				Meeting	1/6/2021	Justine Massey	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.	Meeting comment - noted.
130				Email	1/28/2021	James Sang	https://sjvwater.org/delanos-big-dig/	Comment received.	Noted.
131				Meeting	3/3/2021	John Bramers	Were we going to do a template or 1-pager about what it would look like in or out of the management area?	Donna Meyers: We are still working through the documentation on the management area. There was a database created, it's not fully updated. Curtis and I will give an update and can answer your question then.	Meeting comment - noted.
132				Meeting	3/3/2021	Gus Yates	I'm curious about the calculation of 267,000 AF. Was that calculated from subtracting the differences between two contoured surfaces and applying a constant storativity value? What was that value?	DW: I think the storativity value was applied to the difference between the MT and MO, I don't know the storativity value off hand.	Meeting comment - noted.
133				Meeting	3/3/2021	Justine Massey	Does this committee have any data on how many wells will be impacted at that MT?	Abby Ostovar: The storage calculation is essentially the same as the water levels, and how we do that calculation. That was presented in November, and I sent it to Heather. The challenge with domestic wells, and the 150 DDW wells, many don't show accurate locations. We can really only use those with accurate locations.	Meeting comment - noted.
134				Meeting	3/3/2021	Justine Massey	There were only 8 wells with accurate location data, right? Is there a way to track down more accurate information on those wells?	Abby Ostovar: Yes. No, way with existing data.	Meeting comment - noted.
135				Meeting	3/3/2021	John Bramers	On the winter releases and ASR wells: Where will those go and what aquifer will store that water?	DW: The idea is that the winter release water goes to the 180/400. And we store water in those aquifers in the winter. It has additional benefits to the Upper Valley and Forebay subbasins. The idea of the project is to store the water in the 180/400. And then there are supplementary benefits that accrue to the Upper Valley and Forebay Subbasins.	Meeting comment - noted.
136				Meeting	3/3/2021	John Bramers	Is this a different project than pumping water from the Hwy 1?	DW: This [Winter release ASR project] is trying to get more fresh water in the ground, whereas the Hwy 1 project is trying to extract seawater from the ground. Abby Ostovar: That other project is not off the table, it just doesn't primarily benefit the Forebay.	Meeting comment - noted.

137				Meeting	3/3/2021	Allan Panziera	What are the benefits to the Forebay?	DW: This will take a reoperation of the reservoirs. I want to be clear, it isn't the GSA's purview, and will take a lot of coordination with MCWRA. The idea is to store more water in the reservoirs in the summer, and then release more water in the winter. This was the largest concern we heard from Upper Valley and Forebay, about droughts where you don't get regular releases to recharge the aquifer.	Meeting comment - noted.
138				Meeting	3/3/2021	Gus Yates	Can someone explain the difference between the D-TAC and what MCWRA does all along which is wait until a drought comes along to decide what to do?	<p>Curtis Weeks: So the TAC is a group of technical folks and resource agency folks put into place to establish release schedule for the coming year and drought sequence. The principals are to guide a revised process for a release schedule and prevent multiple years of no releases.</p> <p>Steve McIntyre: It's a multi-stakeholder group, but each group must designate a qualified technical person to sit on the committee. It's a broader view and advice on how to run the reservoirs during a drought. Trying to be a little more proactive as we go.</p> <p>Emily Gardner: The guiding principles of the D-TAC are in place. It's a unique management action. Each year there is a drought, the D-TAC will come up with a narrative about how operations could look into the fall. That's where the management action happens because no one knows how that will look due to the variability each year.</p> <p>Jason Smith: A good example is that we would have implemented those principles already if we hadn't gotten the rain we got. It has come out of the lawsuit and this is part of the mitigation.</p>	Meeting comment - noted.
139				Meeting	3/3/2021	Nancy Isakson	<p>The Standards and Guidance Principles was adopted by the Board of Directors, this was a result of the litigation with SVWC and the MCWRA. I think this is really a good thing for everybody. NOAA, NMFS is a part of it.</p> <p>Also I want to mention, we've sent letters to this committee, one about the winter release schedule. Water released during winter would not only help recharge the aquifers, but also provide for additional fish passage. We see it as win-win. It is simply a reoperation of the reservoirs without the capital costs described here [with ASR]. We are moving forward with the WRA on that. We should have the final tech memo this month. Our prelim analysis shows that through this process, the average annual is 10,000 AFY available additional water per year, with little to no impact on SRDF, and benefits the entire Salinas Valley Basin. The SVWC thinks what we are working on with WRA for the winter release program shows almost as much potential as what this presentation shows, but without the capital cost. It should be included as an alternative in the GSP.</p>	<p>Steve McIntyre: The analysis Nancy is speaking of is actual modeling. The WRA is doing modeling, and the SVWC is doing modeling, and we've spent a lot to get these models going. We're seeing the same kinds of benefits.</p> <p>Abby Ostovar: We did look into this. It isn't included here because the details haven't been released yet. The language drafted for the GSP has these 3 projects, as well as any other winter release projects will also be considered.</p>	Meeting comment - noted.
140				Meeting	3/3/2021	Tom Virsik	On the river management program [Invasive Species Eradication], a cost of \$160/AF. Is this for the 20,000 AF?	Abby Ostovar: Yes. These aren't finalized numbers and we are hoping to update the project yield numbers. We anticipate that the project yield will be less.	Meeting comment - noted.
141				Meeting	3/3/2021	Tom Virsik	My understanding is that the interlake tunnel releases water April-October, which is not winter. There are contrasting projects that are winter releases. It sounds incompatible for them all to exist at once. It appears when this process goes further, there may have to be some clarity from technical people and policy-making whether the interlake tunnel is preferred. It seems like it would not work well to do both the interlake tunnel project and winter releases.	Abby Ostovar: These aren't necessarily compatible projects. These are potential projects that deal with reservoir reoperations. What evaluations are needed to move forward. We are doing the winter release model runs. We thought it was better to acknowledge all of the potential projects and then lay out the approach and a process through which they will be evaluated.	Meeting comment - noted.
142				Meeting	3/3/2021	Tom Virsik	I'm suggesting that perhaps the next point to be explicit that there is a project that goes in this direction, and these other projects go another and that they are not compatible. There needs to be a technical reality before it goes to a policy decision.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
143				Meeting	3/3/2021	Roger Moitoso	This is the same discussion we had in the Upper Valley, we have a GSA looking for a job and we are crossing into jobs that aren't ours. This agency's attorney made the argument that the GSA is only to manage the native natural waters. Managing Arundo, and the river, okay, fine. But the reservoirs, that is someone else's job and stakeholders already paying for that. That would be like me calling Steve and telling him I'll manage his vineyard. It's not my job.	Steve McIntyre: We are looking at these projects, keeping in mind that they don't belong to us, but if they are implemented then we would need to have considered them.	Meeting comment - noted.

144				Meeting	3/3/2021	Justine Massey	Just to clarify, how pumping in the Forebay is close to sustainable yield. That's really encouraging. I want a better idea of what that means. Is that based on conditions this year? What is the baseline?	Abby Ostovar: That is the topic of DW's presentation later. But we will address that today, after the next sections, Allocations and Implementation.	Meeting comment - noted.
145				Meeting	3/3/2021	Jerry Lohr	I've spoken to this before. We all realize some crops take more than others. We also have to consider annual crops, too. Wine grapes take 20-24 inches of rain and irrigation water a year. We're all using our water as efficiently as possible. So, if we have 5 inches of rainfall, we need 15 inches of irrigation water. If we have 15 inches of rainfall, we need 5 inches of irrigation water. That is a large variable. We have to take into account the difference in needs between annual crops and perennial crops. As for water for dormant land, are you talking about fallow land, or land that hasn't been developed. There's a movement here to reduce pumping to then bring new lands into production that has never been irrigated before. Can you define what you mean by dormant land? Fallowing is a good thing, but if we are bringing new lands in, that goes against our water use.	Abby Ostovar: Dormant land that has previously never been irrigated now coming in to be irrigated.	Meeting comment - noted.
146				Meeting	3/3/2021	Jerry Lohr	Crops can change. Someone is putting in a lemon orchard. Someone could grow on hillsides, are we setting aside water for that future unknown use?	Abby Ostovar: You can adjust the allocations as dormant land comes into use, or you could set a dormant set aside. The GSA does not have land use authority. You could have distinct set of rules for non irrigated dormant land.	Meeting comment - noted.
147				Meeting	3/3/2021	Jerry Lohr	I came through here in Spring of 1959. There's a lot of land irrigated now that wasn't irrigated then. And it's very productive. The reservoirs were put in. How do we quantify? Will there be an additional 50,000 acres or 100,000 by 2040? Meanwhile we're all trying to conserve water.	Abby Ostovar: We don't need to decide the details now. We can include things like the distinction between perennial and annual crops, as important factor to this subbasin.	Meeting comment - noted.
148				Meeting	3/3/2021	Jason Smith	This gets into a lot of the conversation we had in the Upper Valley.1. We understand we're trying to create a plan to send to DWR, and what we're going to send isn't the rules we have to abide by, but that this is our best guess as to what we might be able to do. What we did in the Upper Valley, and it's similar to the Forebay, both being somewhat sustainable with water, is no one wants to pigeonhole themselves into anything. We're trying to address a what-if. Creating a problem we don't have. For us as a committee, we need to give you something. I don't think anyone is going to be comfortable saying "option 2, we'll put some dormant set-aside". We're not talking about a canal system where you can allocate water evenly. This all gets into the water budget conversations. We're still talking about it in the Upper Valley. It's really difficult to come up with something that is committing to something we may never have to do. Jerry brings up a good point about what land was before and what it might be, permanent crops and dormant land. We have our baselines that are in there. Once we get into one of those danger zones, then we're already meeting as a committee and deciding how we want to handle that. I also understand, we can't harm other basins. If we're in sustainable yield, and we're deemed as we're not hurting anyone else...then...?	Abby Ostovar: I would encourage you to think about the Forebay distinct than the Upper Valley. We're still trying to understand the numbers. We can have this as an alternative, as an "if needed". We're managing to sustainability for the next 50 years. We can also have this triggered only during a drought. Even as a backstop, this will still take several years to develop. Going into the GSP shows DWR we've thought about it.	Meeting comment - noted.
149				Meeting	3/3/2021	Brad Rice	Maybe what we ought to do what they're doing in the Upper Valley, and that is just monitor.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
150				Meeting	3/3/2021	Steve McIntyre	For drought conditions only seems to be a recurring theme in the Forebay and Upper Valley. When you were calculating the dormant land, did you use Zone 2C as your outer boundary? If you take the water out of 2C, you have to pay back taxes.	Abby Ostovar: We used the DWR boundary. We'd have to go through further analysis and refinement. There are questions that would need to be addressed.	Meeting comment - noted.
151				Meeting	3/3/2021	Brad Rice	I'm hearing allocations and allocations are not acceptable to us.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
152				Meeting	3/3/2021	Jason Smith	I think what we are most concerned about with agreeing to things along the way, even if they're just conceptual, there's not a lot of trust in the valley that once we put something on paper that it isn't something we'll be held to. What you're saying is that we're just putting it in as a possible option. We're reluctant to put anything down. How do we address this so you can successfully submit a plan, and we won't feel like we won't have our feet put to the fire for something we put in our plan.	Abby Ostovar: Would you be more comfortable with this as an alternative management action and the committee decided on a trigger?	Meeting comment - noted.

153				Meeting	3/3/2021	Jason Smith	Yeah, this goes to monitoring. For example, we've had 3 years of no rain. Now we get together as a committee once we reach those triggers and go through X, Y, Z steps. We're like everybody else, we can't live without water. We just don't want to put it out there that we have an allocation with a trigger. Perhaps something like what triggers the next talks would help.	Abby Ostovar: That's helpful, drought is a big concern for this subbasin. It's most important to have this during drought. There's going to need to be a few years to develop a structure.	Meeting comment - noted.
154				Meeting	3/3/2021	Jason Smith	Let's use the D-TAC as an example. If X happens, we're trying to prevent ourselves from getting into trouble. If we have 1 year of drought under our belt, what is that trigger to address year 2, year 3. I think that would be better to address this, because it's staged. As we have droughts, there will be wells that run out of water.	Emily Gardner: I just want to add, to clarify. Jason, you're talking about the concept of triggers. If a trigger was hit, maybe people would want to have a conversation. But it would take years to develop that with enough stakeholder input. I just want to point out the time that it would take.	Meeting comment - noted.
155				Meeting	3/3/2021	Steve McIntyre	I would add, it's really going to come down to language to state, in a drought condition, a committee will be convened and allocations will be considered based on the following triggers.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
156				Meeting	3/3/2021	Allan Panziera	It is going to be obvious. Some people already use more water than others and there is water law that goes along with it. It needs to look like an adjudication because everyone isn't going to get equal amounts. If it doesn't look like adjudication, then it will be open to litigation.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
157				Meeting	3/3/2021	Brad Rice	Let's look back at history. In the last 60 years, we've only hit trigger points 2 times. What are we trying to fix here?	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
158				Meeting	3/3/2021	Nancy Isakson	I appreciate the discussion. I want to make a distinction on restrictions and allocations. SVWC survey responses say they do not support allocations. We wrote a letter and suggested pumping limitations as a tool in your toolbox when you get to that point where you've exceeded your MTs. You get together and say, what are you going to do? Reduce 5%/10%? How can you address the issue at hand? Seems simpler than needing years to develop pumping allocations. Specific standards and criteria should be developed similar to the D-TAC. Another tool in your toolbox when you get to that point.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
159				Meeting	3/3/2021	Tom Virsik	In response to these discussions, it might be best not to use the word "allocation" a lot, it rubs people the wrong way. I think of it like math. Call it what you want, but the calculation will be there about acres and water. You're going to start with what looks like an allocation. I agree with Ms. Isakson, that pumping limitations would be a useful tool. The GSP might pigeonhole stakeholders. The land use authorities look at GSPs during planning, and they'll look at your plan and permits to see a path forward. Dormant land simply means lands not currently being irrigated, but they overlie groundwater and have correlative rights to pump that water. If another 100 acres comes into use, everybody's right gets reduced. The default needs to be explicitly recognized in the GSP. It's less of an issue for my clients in the Forebay. I would almost say "option 1" is almost the default. You have water that is distributed, and with new land that comes into production, the distribution is recalculated.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
160				Meeting	3/3/2021	Curtis Weeks	This is a challenging issue. I think Jason hit on some key points. I'll summarize this from the ASGSA. We need to have some controls when we get into droughts. The Forebay is a unique subbasin because of the groundwater flow, recharged by two different river systems and is pretty	Abby Ostovar: The voluntary reduction in pumping, if not enough people volunteer, what do you do then? Curtis Weeks: We can create an allocation system after those voluntary systems would occur.	Meeting comment - noted.
161				Meeting	3/3/2021	Marieke Desmond	Under the 3rd allocation approach, can you tell us the formula for that and is it the same across the whole basin? And, what is the consequence if DWR feels that each subbasin has not sufficiently planned for drought conditions? What are the next steps?	Abby Ostovar: Drought conditions are not at the top of DWR's concerns. That is more of a local concern for this subbasin. The state can step in if they feel the plan is inadequate and doesn't provide enough options to reach sustainability. Every five years, we do an update, and every year we have an annual report. To your point, this is an example, if you used less historically, you would receive a smaller allocation. It is even across the subbasin. We used a land use map. The crop multipliers were from Monterey County. It's in the data packet.	Meeting comment - noted.

162				Meeting	3/3/2021	Steve McIntyre	I have a question to pose to the committee. We need to give Abby and Derrick some direction. I'm going to suggest, instead of calling it allocations, we call it pumping restrictions because it would be faster to implement based on Emily's comments. Whether it is active or passive restrictions, if we drop below the MT by 10% for two years, or 75% of the wells, then we restrict our pumping by 10% or some percentage. And this would give us time to develop allocations if it's a prolonged drought.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
163				Meeting	3/3/2021	Brad Rice	I'm sitting on over 9,000 acres, and this whole allocation thing makes me nervous. I make a motion that we continue to monitor and give that direction.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
164				Special Meeting	3/30/2021	James Sang	If there are 15 inches of rain on 1 acre of land, that's 400,000 gallons of water. The advantage of trenches or swales is that the majority of water in them can be protected from evaporation. If we can calculate how many swales or trenches would be needed to offset the water farmers are using, then we can pass those savings onto farms so that they wouldn't have to pay for the water they're using.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
165				Special Meeting	3/30/2021	Jerry Lohr	I'm very appreciative of how Abby worked with us. I think the huge issue that we hopefully clarify here is de-linking fundraising. After Derrick's presentation today, we might want to revisit this because we didn't hear the water budget last time. I'm willing to go forward now, but I would prefer to wait.	Steve McIntyre: Thank you, Jerry. Other committee member thoughts?	Meeting comment - noted.
166				Special Meeting	3/30/2021	John Bramers	We didn't go too much into how monitoring and enforcing was going to go. We might want to get this TAC together sooner rather than later just to see how that's going to look so you can't enforce something.	Steve McIntyre: Yes, you raise a good point. Emily Gardner: One of the first issues we hope the TAC can address is looking at what data we can collect.	Meeting comment - noted.
167				Special Meeting	3/30/2021	Nancy Isakson	Thank you for putting this together. The water resource agency has adopted a drought TAC process. I know you're a part of that. Emily is a participant. Reservoir operations will be an important part of how these triggers are met. You need to consider the reservoir operations. Therefore, I think you need to have a linkage with what the water resources agency is doing there. What they did with their TAC was to take the politics out of it and base it on science and the facts. I recommend something similar here. I noticed in the one-page handout there is still mention of "control" pumping. This is kind of a red flag for some of us. I think it would also be helpful if you had a monthly timeline. I would concur it would be important to add what the TAC will be defining. Thank you.	Steve McIntyre: Thank you, Nancy. The nomenclature is important. We struggled with that ourselves.	Meeting comment - noted.
168				Special Meeting	3/30/2021	Tom Virsik	It's unclear as presently phrased whether the TAC could create management actions for all of the Forebay - and only all of Forebay - or for the Arroyo Seco Management, or for subareas within Forebay where water levels may be dropping. The emphasis with TAC should be technical, so the experts should be leading the committee more than the stakeholders. If the TAC decided that pumping should be curtailed by X percent in geographic area B, would that require an update to the GSP or the annual updates or the 5-year updates? What would be the procedural result of the TAC reaching a conclusion?	Abby Ostovar: It doesn't actually change anything. We'll mention it in the annual report as a management action.	Meeting comment - noted.
169				Special Meeting	3/30/2021	Justine Massey	I really appreciate the adaptive management approach. I have a question about the timing. When are the measurements taken? When does the TAC meet? When is a decision reached? Water levels are seasonal. The way the timing is currently set up, we might consistently have dry wells in the summer, then the TAC would meet later, and any actions it takes would be too far delayed. Could we include criteria based on the number of dry wells or partially dry wells in the area?	Steve McIntyre: Those are details that we need to work out. We have some previous examples to guide us. We want to be careful not to act too quickly, because you're right, rainfall can change suddenly and unpredictably. We don't want to rush into action because that would be disruptive, and it might be unnecessary if it happens to rain a lot the next month.	Meeting comment - noted.
170				Special Meeting	3/30/2021	Marieke Desmond	What if we don't pass 218 and the dams don't get fixed? Will the GSP take that possibility into account?	Steve McIntyre: It's something all of us have thought about. This is a question for the broader board, something advisory committees should be considering. It's too early to say without modeling, but good to think about.	Meeting comment - noted.
171				Special Meeting	3/30/2021	James Sang	What if you withhold pumping controls until you start projects that raise the groundwater levels?	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.

172				Special Meeting	3/30/2021	Jason Smith	Re: Water budget: If we're using 20% more water than necessary then we're just bad farmers and PG&E is benefitting from our inefficiency. We're all better when we're using more information. Are we agreed on the Arroyo Seco Management Area?	Steve McIntyre: That's not an agenda item today, but I can say, with Donna's approval, that we are close to an agreement and we expect to be able to share good news soon.	Meeting comment - noted.
173				Special Meeting	3/30/2021	Jason Smith	Whether it's sustainable or not necessarily sustainable, it's not a swimming pool. Not all is equal. I have land on the east side of Forebay. I know what happens along the river when there's a drought. Reducing pumping far away in one corner of the subbasin doesn't necessarily help the opposite corner of the subbasin. The TAC makes sense.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
174				Special Meeting	3/30/2021	Jerry Lohr	I think it would be simpler if we could work in concert with other committees so that we can share data. Earlier, I had a draft of Chapter 9, but I saw inconsistencies when I got the actual draft of the 180/400 Chapter 9.	DM: After working through SWIG membership, the committee is recommending that using a water market framework is best put aside. Instead, we should focus on getting our GSPs finished. Subbasin plans are taking different tacks on how to reach sustainability criteria. We feel at this point the water charges framework is good to think about for the future, but not as important as finishing the GSPs.	Meeting comment - noted.
175				Special Meeting	3/30/2021	Jerry Lohr	It would be simpler to work in concert with the Water Resources Agency TAC. After hearing about the water budget and that we are mostly in balance except for drought, I think we should get the committees put together sooner rather than later so we can get the data coming in.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
176				Special Meeting	3/30/2021	Jason Smith	Building on Jerry's TAC comments and what Steve was saying when he said, "We'll meet in October..." and then we had rain and we didn't need to implement any restrictions. Rather than recreating the wheel, then maybe we could use the Water Resource Agency framework/TAC because it is really about how the dams are operated.	Steve McIntyre: I think we'll want to consider how they'll use the dams differently during a drought. Any Forebay TAC or smaller TAC will have to be coordinated. Especially for Forebay, we need more than just technical expertise, because a drought could have a big impact on everyone. Emily Gardner: I just wanted to point out that the TAC we're talking about for the Forebay Subbasin has a slightly broader scope than just responding to droughts. In the future, hopefully this concept could help us to monitor for land use, different crop types, and other factors that could affect the amount of water in storage.	Meeting comment - noted.
177				Special Meeting	3/30/2021	Jerry Lohr	I'm glad the model accounts for climate change. I've noticed climate change here in Paso Robles even more than in Salinas. When Derrick said climate is expected to be not just hotter, but also wetter, I was pleasantly surprised. I think going back to row crops could be another issue.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
178				Special Meeting	3/30/2021	Nancy Isakson	Starting with the TAC, while they are different, you might want to develop a process in the way the water resources agency did. First, identify the standards and guiding principles. Then develop an action plan. Do this sooner rather than later. Another question: on your Arroyo Seco slides, historical water budget you have a net flow from/to Forebay at 1,600 AF in the future it says net subsurface flow? Is that the same?	DW: Yes, sorry for the wording change. Descriptive wording is the modeler's dilemma.	Meeting comment - noted.
179				Special Meeting	3/30/2021	Nancy Isakson	Each subbasin must pump within their sustainable yield. When do they need to meet that? Today? Tomorrow? Next year?	DW: The sustainability goal must be reached in 20 years. Pumping within sustainable yield is a bit of a circular problem. Sustainable yield isn't just a number. It's the undesirable results that matter.	Meeting comment - noted.
180				Special Meeting	3/30/2021	Justine Massey	I have questions about the climate change modeling. From what I understand, most climate change models are split. There isn't agreement on whether it will be wetter or drier. How certain are these results? Also, thank you for acknowledging that there could be trouble spots within an otherwise sustainable basin that could require more localized management actions.	DW: The climate model we selected is what DWR considered the most likely climate. There were three models and this is the one DWR thought was most likely. If you're asking me if I have a lot of confidence in the climate change model, I do not. But the climate scientists say it is the most likely.	Meeting comment - noted.
181				Special Meeting	3/30/2021	Justine Massey	I wonder if maybe it would be useful for the committee members to see what the other possibilities were modeled to see the range of possibilities. That way we could prepare for a worse scenario. Hope for the best, prepare for the worst.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
182				Special Meeting	3/30/2021	Tom Virsik	One comment and one question. Comment: Underflow has a particular legal meaning. I know you're not using that word with the legal meaning, but some people might think that. We should add a footnote to clarify. Question: Do you know if we'll see winter release model results in the projects and management actions chapter? It might be useful to look at modeling results and then the modeling and what will happen with the	Steve McIntyre: Is that something we could do? Abby Ostovar: We are looking at that. It is a possibility. They probably won't be presented in parallel to the point you could make a decision based on them, but we hope to provide some information and a process for how they will be compared in the future.	Meeting comment - noted.

183					Special Meeting	3/30/2021	Curtis Weeks	Thanks, everyone. Steve is right, we're very very close to having an agreement with Arroyo Seco. I agree with how Mr. Williams looks at sustainable yield. One cautionary note: The period you chose includes a change in reservoir management. Since 2011, reservoir management has been different. Be careful. Make sure you have the right operational model that is consistent with where we are headed as a Valley.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
184					Special Meeting	3/30/2021	James Sang	I think we shouldn't have something in place to address climate change just for the sake of having something in place.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
185					Email	4/12/2021	James Sang	<p>I wanted to present some potential agenda items.</p> <p>1. Can rainfall harvesting through swales refill wells and increase groundwater and water aquifers? Reference a: You Tube video (Harvesting Water Naturally with Swales by Urban Farmer Curtis Stone)</p> <p>Reference b: You Tube video (Recharging A Well Part II -John Kaisner The Natural Farmer)</p> <p>Reference c: You Tube video (Swales on Contour can Drought -proof Gardens, Farms and Pastures with Water Harvested Passively by Edible Forest Gardens)</p> <p>Reference d: You Tube Video (Deep Soil Ripping for Water Conservation by Megan Clayton)</p> <p>Reference e: "Deep Soil Ripping as an Effective and Affordable Water Capture Tool written by Amanda C. Krause, Megan K. Clayton, ...et al" Please google search article.</p> <p>2. Can you make a presentation on what UC Santa Cruz is doing to recharge their wells? This is what Robin Lee wanted. Reference a. You Tube video (Enhancing Groundwater Recharge in the Pajaro Valley by California Department of Food and Agriculture)</p> <p>I believe that swales and subsoil plowing can recharge a farmers well, groundwater and aquifers. This is a cheap and easy way to help every farmer and landowner have a plentiful supply of water. This idea will solve California's goals of recharging water aquifers and holding back salt water intrusion into our coastal lands. Can you show this to all interested parties?</p>	Comment received.	<p>Point #1 was considered throughout the Salinas Valley and it is incorporated in projects for other Subbasins.</p> <p>Point #2 has been incorporated into the overland flow MAR project which was modeled on the Pajaro Valley project noted.</p>
186	6				Email	4/23/2021	MCWRA	<p>Operations of the San Antonio and Nacimiento Reservoirs applies to the Salinas Valley Operational Model, unless the intent is to describe that historical hydrologic data in the SVIHM would reflect MCWRA reservoir operations.</p> <p>Water Year 2016 was preceded by multiple dry or dry normal years. Has the impact of that on the chosen "current WY" budget been explored? Or should that at least be mentioned here for context?</p>	Comment received.	<p>The SVIHM uses historical hydrologic data which reflects how MCWRA operated the Reservoirs in the past.</p> <p>Noted. 2016 is preceded by multiple dry years, however, current water budgets are merely reported and are not used for managing the GSP.</p>

							Are conservation releases defined somewhere in the GSP? This is terminology used by MCWRA for a categorization of releases that may not be widely understood, or could be left open for interpretation. If intended in the same manner as MCWRA uses it, the conservation release period is April through October.		Noted. The MCWRA period is from April to October, however, it seems that flows in April and May can be a combination of natural flows, conservation releases, and other releases such as for steelhead. Teasing out the different releases and flows from model results is very difficult, so we are using a simplified approach. The June to September period is assumed to be the approximate period when the majority of flows are from conservation releases.	
187	7				Email	4/23/2021	MCWRA	Well owner information is typically redacted when sharing well data in order to comply with information privacy concerns. Suggest removing it unless explicit consent has been obtained from the well owner.	Comment received.	Comment was noted and
188	3				Email	4/23/2021	MCWRA	For Section 3.8.3 (Well Permitting), consider mentioning the 2020 POWER v Stanislaus County case will also affect well permitting.	Comment received.	Comment was noted and text was revised to
189	9				JotForm	5/3/2021	Tom Virsik	The cost of the tunnel project seem inconsistent in Chapter 9: 118M v 173 M and thus the basis of the \$393 AF cost is not clear. Note that per MCWRA in March 2021, the cost is projected at \$180 M and the water gained is 20K (but it may not all be apples to apples figures). Two MCWRA filings are attached that recite the cost and projected water gained: 1. Monterey County Water Resources Agency Petition for Extension of Time under Permit 21089 (Application 30532) 2. Monterey County Water Resources Agency Petition for Change under License 7543 (Application 16124)	Comment received.	The original number in the table only included the project developemnt and capital cost but the costs were revised to also include operations and maintenance. The number in the text now matches what was in the table.
190	10				JotForm	6/8/2021	Tom Virsik	A bullet point suggests evaluation of recharge benefit to the UPPER VALLEY is required. The parallel section of the Upper Valley chapter also reflects the upper valley. Perhaps the Forebay was intended in this Forebay specific chapter?	Comment received.	Noted. Text for Forebay chapter has been fixed.
191					Meeting	5/5/2021	John Bramers	Estimates on crop type valley-wide, just want to clarify. Growing lettuce in Salinas will have the same estimate as in King City?	DW: They will have different climates, but the same demand. In King City, the climate may drive more irrigation.	Meeting comment - noted.
192					Meeting	5/5/2021	Kay Mercer	I wanted to follow up on John's question on estimating water use by crop. So, in the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, once growers have to submit an irrigation and nutrient plan summary report, they will estimate total water applied by ranch, evapotranspiration, and water applied by crop. That will happen for the part of the Forebay and Upper Valley, the first report will be made in early 2024. I know you're doing the model now. As you get that type of information, will the model be updated with new types of information?	DW: This model has not yet been publicly released. Once it is publicly released, it is a model that can be updated regularly. There's always a question as to how often you update it and what the value those updates have. This group would have to ask, is it worth our while to update the model this year? Would it change our management decisions? We don't want to spend money if we don't have to.	Meeting comment - noted.
193					Meeting	5/5/2021	Kay Mercer	The whole Valley will be reporting by 2028. For the first phase, not whole Forebay or Upper Valley will be reporting by 2024. Dates to keep in mind. Thank you.	Comment received	Meeting comment - noted.

194				Meeting	5/5/2021	Nancy Isakson	Thank you for your presentation. It helps us understand how you develop your numbers, and how they can/cannot be reconciled with the annual extraction reports. You said the model doesn't exit. But it does, it's just not publicly available right now. You're working with it. There seems to be a disconnect. You all are writing this plan, and we're relying on you for it. Because we thought you had access to it, but it seems the finger keeps getting pointed to the USGS. When you say the SVIHM underestimates the pumping, to what extent? What is the margin of error within the model?	DW: I want to thank you and your colleagues for pointing out the differences in extraction data. We had to go back and ask a lot of questions. As far as the statement about the model existing, it does not exist in a way where we can calibrate it or change the model. We only have access to input/output files. It just does not exist in a way where we can change it. My language was a bit too flippant on that. We're looking at the model underestimating pumping to a degree. We are not a part of the calibration process. We don't want to get ahead of ourselves. How closely does it have to estimate the pumping? These are all questions that are out there. I can't really address that until we get there. We're bringing you up to speed on where we are, as of today. This is the part we're in the midst of.	Meeting comment - noted.
195				Meeting	5/5/2021	Curtis Weeks	I heard you acknowledge the boundary differences between the subareas. I'm curious as to why there hasn't been an acknowledgement or an effort to correct them.	DW: The subbasin boundaries are defined by DWR. The GSP has to be written for that boundary. There could be an effort to adjust the subbasin boundaries to match the subarea boundaries. We accepted the boundaries when we started this.	Meeting comment - noted.
196				Meeting	5/5/2021	Curtis Weeks	If you look at basin boundaries provided by DWR, MCWRA has worked to refine the understanding of the basin through various hydrogeologic studies, and I believe it is more accurate. It's an artifact of how we started, especially with respect to the Arroyo Seco area. It would help to get a better handle on the hydrogeology. It's something for consideration. Second question, Derrik you said you wanted to use the best available information. I don't know what that is. GEMS or model data? Which data will we use to develop and finalize the GSPs?	DW: We are going to say, the water budget that comes from the model. If the numbers are not that far off from the GEMS data, we would probably say the amount of reported pumping in the subbasin is X. In the Forebay, the Forebay has historically pumped within its sustainable yield, and the model says it has pumped this much on average. Then we will also say, this much pumping is reported through the GEMS program, still within the sustainable yield. So the sustainable yield is at least within the GEMS pumping.	Meeting comment - noted.
197				Meeting	5/5/2021	Curtis Weeks	When I look at the Arroyo Seco Cone, it just doesn't make sense. It's too low. I raise that issue to recognize that they Forebay as a whole is sustainable. The larger question is how is Agency is going to use this tool going forward to evaluate different projects or programs that provides reliable, calibrated information you can rely upon. For the Arroyo Seco Management Area, we have concerns. I understand the process you're undertaking, I ask you to consider this.	DW: The amount of pumping in the Arroyo Seco Cone triggered us looking more closely at that. I appreciate your view that how we use this model should have buy in from stakeholders, that we're using it in a way that provides good direction.	Meeting comment - noted.
198				Meeting	5/5/2021	Curtis Weeks	It's a tool like any other. We need to have confidence in it, we're not there yet.	Donna Meyers: We are working at breakneck speed. We have received the model late, Derrik and his team have been working nonstop on it. We are working with a tool that we have received. I want to remind everybody as we bring things out, this is why we have created these committees. If something doesn't look right, you let us know. Derrik and his team take that seriously and work on it. As far as the boundaries, with the work ahead and meeting the State's timelines, revising the boundaries was not something that could be done efficiently. We moved forward with planning instead.	Meeting comment - noted.
199				Meeting	5/5/2021	Jerry Lohr	Do you mind going back to the Winter Release with ASR? I realize it's premature to get into valley-wide costs. The \$1,450 per acre-foot will probably elicit some comments. It's probably premature to estimate the costs.	Abby Ostovar: This reflects the ASR cost. The unit cost is not yet taking into account any recharge, or frequency of recharge which would benefit the Foreaby. We're trying to figure out what those figures are, and how to relay what those benefits are. This is just the unit cost of the ASR component of the project.	Meeting comment - noted.
200				Meeting	5/5/2021	Curtis Weeks	General manager Meyers, we talked about some of the projects and implementation issues that are a part of the Arroyo Seco's previous GSP. I'm concerned about recognition of no dams on the Arroyo Seco. I'm wondering if this is the proper place to bring this up.	Donna Meyers: Yes, I believe today is a good time to have that conversation. I believed we resolved the other three.	Meeting comment - noted.
201				Meeting	5/5/2021	Curtis Weeks	You do have a management action that speaks to developing a drought technical advisory committee. We wanted to develop a multi-agency group on reservoir reoperations, to prevent multi-year droughts with no releases. As long as we're able to capture that in the D-TAC, I'm okay there. The other management action, to prevent any dams from being constructed on the Arroyo Seco, that's a key piece. It's consistent with our need to allow flow to recharge into the ground, and the environmental benefit. It's a matter of commitment on the part of our organizations. I would like to see that added as a management action.	Donna Meyers: How would we fit this in, Derrik, Abby?	Meeting comment - noted.

202				Meeting	5/5/2021	Kay Mercer	On the arundo removal, you say you're not going to estimate the benefit of removing it? component #1, you won't quantify the benefit of the recharge projects benefits? Are you saying that you haven't done it or you don't plan to?	Abby Ostovar: Arundo removal is component #2. There can be arundo removal under the Stream Maintenance Program. It's the Stream Maintenance Program we don't have the benefits quantified. We have qualitative benefits, but not the actual acre-feet per year, the benefits aren't exactly saving water except the arundo part. We have to think more about that. The two programs are complementary, and I need to make sure we're not double counting.	Meeting comment - noted.
203				Meeting	5/5/2021	Kay Mercer	I still think it's important, it's a very important project, The Stream Maintenance Program. From the water quality perspective, what are the benefits? It would be great to understand the impacts of the Stream Maintenance Program to groundwater supply, in the future if you could do that. In terms of your cost, that might be a benefit, actual savings or benefit rolled into the cost, to show a cost-benefit to the program. It could be added tourism, fire control, there are a lot of different ways.	Abby Ostovar: We do want to reflect all the benefits in a consistent way.	Meeting comment - noted.
204				Meeting	5/5/2021	Kay Mercer	What you're going to do is balance out the costs eventually. You're going to have positive financial benefits and those could offset the cost of the program. It's Ecosystem services. I'm talking about costs now.	Abby Ostovar: It came from looking at unit cost, if a basin is in overdraft, the amount of groundwater recharge there.	Meeting comment - noted.
205				Meeting	5/5/2021	Kay Mercer	In terms of agricultural pumping. In the future I would expect to see people dialing in their water use, based on the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, that number may get adjusted downward. It might take 10 years. Particularly for vegetables. You could qualify your number (3.3 AF) with a footnote. In the ILRP, we criticized their CEQA analysis for following because they didn't consider particulates for air quality. Are you considering other environmental impacts?	Abby Ostovar: That's an excellent comment. There's no analysis required. It doesn't mean that impacts like that shouldn't be taken into consideration.	Meeting comment - noted.
206				Meeting	5/5/2021	Curtis Weeks	I wanted to circle back, I didn't get an answer to my question about projects and management actions. We have one issue in the Arroyo Seco Cone area, to prevent dams on the Arroyo Seco. How will that be addressed?	Donna Meyers: That will be addressed in the next agenda item.	Meeting comment - noted.
207				Meeting	5/5/2021	Nancy Isakson	I want to go back to valley-wide benefits, and your draft Chapter 9, says "part of a larger set of projects and benefits for the valley." There are going to be differing benefits and not all projects are applicable to all subbasins. As I read Chapter 9, I think that's lost. It appears the projects are being developed in a way to be integrated in a valley-wide manner. On the winter release program, it does say in your Chapter 9, "eliminating most summer reservoir releases," further you say it will provide more water to SRDF. Most of the water that's released benefits the entire basin through recharge. Reading through your description, it does highlight that there have been some things eliminated or not considered. The reservoirs are managed in a way to provide the water envisioned for the Salinas Valley Water Project. You're project says its going to eliminate most of the releases during the summer. That could be an impact to growers in the Forebay and Upper Valley. When you're evaluating the benefits, you have to look at what you're taking away. It's going to be really important to reach out to those Forebay and Upper Valley growers to see how they feel about it. We have submitted an extensive letter, including comments about the winter release program that we are currently discussing with MCWRA. Our model with the United States Geological Survey is very close to our model. We are looking at "real time" for this last year, pilot program. How has it worked, what changes could be made? We will meet in a couple of weeks. We will share with you because we think it is important for all to be collaborating. Personally, I want to caution how you word and present these things. Everybody is looking to you, and we are looking to build confidence in what you're putting together.	Comment received	Meeting comment - noted.
208				Meeting	5/5/2021	Gus Yates	The presentation documented the costs/benefits of following reductions. Given the historic sustainability of the Forebay, are they included only as contingent in case things get worse? How can you describe the triggers that would cause implementation?	Abby Ostovar: The next presentation will get into that a little, but this describes the suite of projects and management actions. They don't all have to be implemented. The next presentation talks about how to prioritize.	Meeting comment - noted.

209				Meeting	5/5/2021	Justine Massey	Feedback on some of the projects and management actions. This is accompanying some written comments we submitted on Chapter 9. We are interested in the further development of the local GW elevation trigger management action. We think it's appropriate for more real time tracking. We support that project. We recommend it include monitoring for water quality, not as a separate problem, but a problem that goes hand in hand. For example, we know as water levels drop, nitrates often increase because it cannot be diluted. Other constituents can leach as well. As you develop this program, include this intrinsic component of water quality that could have an impact on wells and beneficial users, particularly drinking water users. We have recommendations for how to model that, for example setting a trigger at 75% of the MCL. It's easy to manage and monitor when you see those problems developing. The D-TAC proposal, we see this as very problematic because it creates an extra layer of delayed planning. Not including that initial planning in the GSP itself seems contrary to the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act. The point is to have a plan now. That's why the plan is made before the undesirable results happen. We would like to see clear guidelines for when pumping would need to be restricted if there was a drought. It doesn't seem that stakeholders can evaluate if it's an effective plan if there is no plan to evaluate in the GSP, and similarly the Department of Water Resources couldn't evaluate it. Final comment, the delayed timeline that has been proposed for when the D-TAC would be put into practice, assuming it could come up with a plan in a couple months is troubling. That means waiting until wells have gone dry, or potentially waiting to see wells going dry for multiple years before you show there's a problem. People can't afford to lose their drinking water before actions are done to protect it.	Comment received	Meeting comment - noted.
210				Meeting	5/5/2021	Jerry Lohr	There's quite extensive work being done here in the Agency, I think it's pretty well called out. I commend whoever wrote this draft. It seems quite progressive compared to when it was first presented a couple of months ago. I was quite pleased to see the progress here.	Comment received	Meeting comment - noted.
211				Meeting	5/5/2021	Jason Smith	I respect Justine's opinion. The idea of putting together a technical committee is to actually address things before they get somewhere. Putting together plans for when the nuclear bomb goes off, we're all sensitive to how we need to manage our water. Putting together a committee of technical people, not stakeholders, we can proactively address in real time, instead of submitting several what-ifs. I respect your thoughts, but I've been really pleased, and dealing with this in a way that is technical. The idea is to create a committee to address it and take it to the actual stakeholders and make a plan. We can't not have water for drinking or agriculture. I think it's been a good process with the input of everybody.	Comment received	Meeting comment - noted.
212				Meeting	5/5/2021	James Sang	Everybody seems to like the Salinas River project. I've been confused by this project. The origin of this water starts in central California and goes to the Monterey Bay. It's not a unit where the water is held in any one place. We're losing 2,000 gallons per second. I don't understand winter or summer releases, where this water will go out the other side. The point is to try to refill the aquifers. Are there aquifers next to the river that aren't filling? I read reports where the aquifers are going into the river. I like that you presented the floodplains. I think that will be a very good source for infiltrating basins. Thank you.	Comment received	Meeting comment - noted.
213				Meeting	5/5/2021	Nancy Isakson	When is the deadline for submitting comments on these chapters? I want to comment on the drought. I would ask Justine if she has looked at Appendix 10, that provides the details about the standards and principals that were developed from litigation from the Salinas Valley Water Commission, and included several people here. It was strictly experts. They put together these standards and principals, and looked at them. The Salinas Valley Water Commission has asked for the last 20 to 30 years for a drought contingency plan, and we're pleased it is being included in the GSP.	<p>Emily Gardner: Obviously there's a lot of opportunity to comments. For these chapters, mid-June is when we're requesting comments relative to Version 2 of the GSPs.</p> <p>Abby Ostovar: We want to get out Version 2 by early July. The sooner, the better.</p> <p>Emily Gardner: We'll send a reminder out. We're trying to get these chapters out quickly.</p>	Meeting comment - noted.

214				Meeting	5/5/2021	Tom Virsik	If someone if doing something useful, then we the GSP can take credit for it. The GSA doesn't necessarily have to run, manage, or create the project, it can be a part of the plan if it exists. My other comment I wrote simply points out the Interlake project, MCWRA has filed some things with the State Water Resources Control Board for how much could be saved. I forwarded that material to whomever gets it so you can get whatever information exists.	Comment received	Meeting comment - noted.
215				Meeting	5/5/2021	Justine Massey	I'm not saying that a lot of work hasn't gone into this plan as a whole, but I'm saying specifically this Drought TAC is leaving some open holes. You are saying that people have the chance to look at plans, doing the plan now means stakeholders are a part of what goes into the GSP. Leaving it open and saying decisions will be made later leave holes in the process. I think there should be a list of optional choices based on different circumstances. Whether it's worth it to plan in the face of uncertainty, that's this whole process. That the benefit of planning.	Comment received	Meeting comment - noted.
216				Meeting	5/5/2021	Curtis Weeks	Projects and management actions, our overall approach to reservoir reoperation project was a multi-agency project to eliminate multi-year no-release scenarios. I think it's important to the Forebay since the Forebay relies upon releases. We want to eliminate multi-year operations that don't provide releases. How do we integrate that? We want a recognition that the Arroyo Seco not have any impediments, and that the GSAs support that approach to continue to provide natural recharge. Those are the two key things we want to see get integrated into the plan.	DW: Regarding the first one, we maybe haven't stated clearly enough, there are a series of projects and actions that are benefits of reservoir reoperations. The major benefit to the Forebay and Upper Valley is that reoperation should result in regular releases, shooting for every year. We can highlight that a little more, that is one of our objectives. We had a conversation with MCWRA's consultant this morning so we all understand what the benefits of each of the projects are. There are benefits of SRDF diversions and benefits of dry year releases. We want the modelers to understand the slew of benefits. We can state it more clearly in the GSP. Regarding the Arroyo Seco, my advice is that the series of projects and management actions are actions that we can take, should the Forebay appear to be not meeting its sustainability goal. They are proactive actions to meet the sustainability goal. All the projects and management actions are not to prevent something. I don't see taking a stand against a reservoir on the Arroyo Seco as on the same level as the projects and management actions. I don't want to say the GSA is in favor of a reservoir, we have never proposed it and it has never come up. All of our actions are focused on something that benefits GW. I am nervous to commit the GSAs to a position without understanding the impacts to GW.	Meeting comment - noted.
217				Meeting	5/5/2021	Curtis Weeks	You've taken a narrow view of sustainability. Having a commitment to allow the Arroyo Seco River to flow unimpeded to support steelhead and other riparian life, makes sense to support those groundwater dependent ecosystems and surface water dependent ecosystems. Sustainability has a broader context.	DW: I appreciate that. That's just my view of why I was hesitant to include it.	Meeting comment - noted.
218				Meeting	5/5/2021	Curtis Weeks	We have very active stakeholders, one in particular that represents Trought Unlimited. This is one of his key elements. For folks looking for sustainability actions. A native run of a river that supports native steelhead. This is something I'll have to take up with the General Manager.	Donna Meyers: I'm happy to talk more with you. Hearing Derrik's thought was helpful, let's get together and talk language to see what this would look like. I have implementation questions, I don't know how we would do that. Let's work on the language. Emily Gardner: I just want to suggest to get the subbasin committee input, too. Maybe this is a good time to have a broader conversation.	Meeting comment - noted.
219				Meeting	5/5/2021	Jerry Lohr	If you start seriously talking about damming the Arroyo Seco, as a serious consideration, it is going to be a huge problem.	Donna Meyers: Our GSA is not proposing any kind of dam on the Arroyo Seco. We have never discussed this. I don't know where this has come from. Curtis, I want to make sure we understand your stance. Maybe there is a misunderstanding.	Meeting comment - noted.
220				Meeting	5/5/2021	Curtis Weeks	Relative to the position an agency can take, it can be committed to supporting/not supporting actions on the river. An affirmation of what you can support and what you could stand against.	Comment received	Meeting comment - noted.
221				Meeting	5/5/2021	Jason Smith	It's not that anyone is proposing a dam. It's a can of worms. For the environmental piece, it is very helpful. It's advantageous for things we all need. You have put this together as protection for the Arroyo Seco, and for the rest of the basin. This is where staff and the agency have an issue. What can of worms does this open up for the rest of the basin, that they would suggest that would never happen. Put something in that no one is discussing. It was shot down 20 years ago.	Comment received	Meeting comment - noted.

222				Meeting	5/5/2021	Curtis Weeks	This will be updated every five years. People's perspectives change. There may be a future scenario where people propose it again. It helps inform and frame the issue in a way we think is positive.	Comment received	Meeting comment - noted.
223				Meeting	5/5/2021	Tom Virsik	I have no position on any dam on the Arroyo Seco. What Mr. Weeks said about everything being updated every five years, the metric is, what would sustainability look like in 20 or 30 years, AND do we have to change everything every five years? To have a project that says we don't need a project seems odd, maybe we could have language somewhere else. However it turns out, it would be unfortunate to have a list of projects that we would never look at because somebody says so today.	Donna Meyers: I propose Mr. Weeks and I talk tomorrow or Friday and bring something back at the next meeting.	Meeting comment - noted.
224				Meeting	6/9/2021	Allan Panzeira	What is the model using to come up with a number that is so far apart from the GEMS data?	DW: The model estimates pumping based on crop type and climate. It is calibrated to some data the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) had. We alerted the USGS and the WRA that we think the data they are using is underestimating the pumping. I don't know the background. It was pointed out to us by groups such as this one, and that allowed us to go back and ask what we put in the GSP to determine the storage and sustainable yield. We aren't the ones to make changes to address why the model is underestimating.	Meeting comment - noted.
225				Meeting	6/9/2021	Allan Panzeira	Are they using satellite imagery?	DW: They are not using satellite imagery right now. They are estimating pumping based on crop type and then comparing it. They might be missing things like frost control. They're currently looking into that.	Meeting comment - noted.
226				Meeting	6/9/2021	Steve McIntyre	There could be other things like leaching requirements and winter irrigation during droughts. There are other things they might not consider.	Comment received	Meeting comment - noted.
227				Meeting	6/9/2021	John Bramers	How many different crop types are in the model, do we know that?	Abby: I think it's in the 50s. There are two types per each crop.	Meeting comment - noted.
228				Meeting	6/9/2021	John Bramers	How are acres counted in the model for each crop type?	DW: They have estimates for which acres based on historical maps and county reports. They stitched together a number of different data sources to determine the crop changes over time. The most recent might be from 2014. I know the 2018 data are out now, but they have not been stitched into the historical model.	Meeting comment - noted.
229				Meeting	6/9/2021	Steve McIntyre	At other subbasin committee meetings you've reported on this underestimate. Is the difference consistent? Could you apply the same factor to all subbasins?	DW: They are different enough that we want the factor to be subbasin specific.	Meeting comment - noted.
230				Meeting	6/9/2021	Steve McIntyre	Do you think, given the wide discrepancy between GEMS data and what the model is predicting for sustainable yield, that we have a viable model or should we go back and rework the model so the results are more accurate?	DW: The model works for certain things and you can use them for things you are confident in. Generally the model is balanced, is the basin in overdraft or not? We don't want to stake our management on all the model numbers now, or until it's updated. I think the model responds to changes of inflows and outflows relatively accurately. If we're looking at the impact of change or projects, I think it will a relatively accurate change. We don't want to hang our hat on the pumping numbers we're seeing right now.	Meeting comment - noted.
231				Meeting	6/9/2021	John Bramers	Are you advocating that the best way to look at extractions is metering?	DW: The best way to look at pumping is to measure it, any way you can. Many people are trying to use satellite data and back out an estimate, but a direct measurement is the best way way to go.	Meeting comment - noted.
232				Meeting	6/9/2021	Nancy Isakson	I thought the numbers in your initial presentation about the historical sustainable yield, I thought you said those were all the Forebay. Then you broke it out and talked about the Arroyo Seco. Are the first numbers inclusive of the Arroyo Seco Management Area?	DW: The first number was *inclusive* and this will be how it's presented in the GSP. We will report the whole subbasin, then the management areas.	Meeting comment - noted.
233				Meeting	6/9/2021	Nancy Isakson	It looks like you're reporting a separate number for the Arroyo Seco management area. Wouldn't you want a number that reports for the rest of the subbasin excluding the Arroyo Seco?	DW: This goes to the requirements for reporting. You have to report the sustainable yield for the basin and then for the management area. If this group wants more detail, we can include that.	Meeting comment - noted.
234				Meeting	6/9/2021	Nancy Isakson	My suggestion is we do the total, then a number for the Arroyo Seco and for the rest of the subbasin so people can see how they fit together within the sustainable yield.	Comment received	Meeting comment - noted.
235				Meeting	6/9/2021	Amy Woodrow	I want to give a little more information on the land use questions. At the Board of Supervisors, the USGS included a bit of information on their land use approach in the model and those slides are available on the MCWRA website.	Comment received	Meeting comment - noted.

236				Meeting	6/9/2021	Allan Panzeira	There's a \$16.5 million number on the stream channel improvement, and when I look at the yield numbers, it's almost \$800 per acre-foot. And I go to the lower amount to 2,790, then it's like \$6,000 per acre-foot.	Abby Ostovar: Part of the reason there's such a wide estimate of costs and benefits is that there is a really high range of ET estimates for the Arundo vegetation. When you look at that, according to the two projected benefits, that's how you get the unit cost of \$60 or \$740 per acre.	Meeting comment - noted.
237				Meeting	6/9/2021	Allan Panzeira	But if I divide the whole cost by that number, if the cost stays the same, then that's like \$5,900 per acre-foot. It almost looks cost prohibitive.	Abby Ostovar: We incorporate the costs over a 25-year lifespan and incorporate interest rate and annualize it. We incorporate capital costs and also consider retreatment costs which is operations and maintenance. That is the total, or capital, cost for treating the arundo once. I can double check that. It's not an average cost per acre-foot, not an annual cost, but the total treatment cost. We will have the cost spreadsheets as an appendix, and that's what these costs are based on.	Meeting comment - noted.
238				Meeting	6/9/2021	Allan Panzeira	So I see the need for having projects and something to turn in, but the one thing that's missing is the HCP because that's going to drive a lot of these other costs. It might eliminate projects until you see what you can do.	Abby Ostovar: The HCP will affect groundwater management, but is not a straight groundwater management project.	Meeting comment - noted.
239				Meeting	6/9/2021	Steve McIntyre	Depending on the outcome of the HCP, we may not be able to do some of these projects, or the cost could change.	Comment received	Meeting comment - noted.
240				Meeting	6/9/2021	Donna Meyers	The HCP will be a permit that allows you to do certain activities. What you'll do is you'll apply. It's effectively a take permit for a 30-year period. You have to calculate whether you'll lose habitat or make a species go extinct. But it gives you a permit to operate. It's called a habitat conservation plan, but it's basically a permit. With the multi-benefit stream channel project, it's within the structure of protection of the highest quality habitat, with seasonal limitations. Based on my knowledge, I wouldn't see how that program would be negated at the end of an HCP process. We basically got what's called a consistency determination from NMFS. I don't see this project (A1) having an issue.	Abby Ostovar: All of the projects are based on current conditions/current infrastructure, continuing to operate. If and when there's an HCP, it will, and it could potentially affect which projects we can do, or what the benefits and costs will be. We'll adjust accordingly, but we didn't want to project what might occur in the future, so I hope we added that language in there efficiently in Chapter 9. If it's not in there, please feel free to highlight it because we do want to make sure that's clear.	Meeting comment - noted.
241				Meeting	6/9/2021	Allan Panzeira	I have a question on why the Interlake tunnel project is in there. If the MCWRA is already talking about going to a 218.	Abby Ostovar: It is a project that could potentially affect groundwater. It's not necessarily a GSA project, but it is a project that would affect groundwater conditions and our ability to meet the sustainable management criteria, whether the GSA implement them, a partner agency, or somebody else. These are all just potential projects and management actions that could help reach and maintain sustainability.	Meeting comment - noted.
242				Meeting	6/9/2021	Jerry Lohr	On the various projects here, I'm very supportive of the arundo, but I'm really surprised that we're talking about the project and not clearly pointing out which projects will lead to salt water intrusion mitigation. I think I know which one it is. What is the project that is in here, and I think it should be explicit.	Abby Ostovar: There is no seawater intrusion in the Forebay and it doesn't look like it will get there. The way we scoped the project are the projects that will directly affect the Forebay and help them reach sustainability goals. Maybe what we could do is we say "here are the benefits for the Forebay and here are the benefits to the other subbasins." I believe winter ASR tries to differentiate. We can go through and try to show where there may be benefits that might be outside the Forebay, would that be helpful?	Meeting comment - noted.
243				Meeting	6/9/2021	Allan Panzeira	I have a comment on the technical advisory committee for pumping restrictions. I think Upper Valley went a different way, I think they went to doing the analysis and identifying projects that might help. I think that would be better than going straight to pumping restrictions.	Steve McIntyre: I think that was the intention of our technical advisory committee. Abby Ostovar: This technical advisory committee was focused on demand management side. The Upper Valley took the approach to include all the sustainable management criteria, which really isn't seawater intrusion or subsidence, but more so groundwater levels, storage and quality. There are a few other differences to note, it is meant to be a more scientific technical advisory committee, so it is meant to have a group of scientific experts who then provide advice to the subbasin committee. The Upper Valley is a longer timespan, so they wouldn't make decisions for this irrigation year. They have it set up to look at the AR after April, and essentially wait a year. The Forebay technical advisory committee is set up to look at Fall groundwater levels in January and decide whether we need to adjust pumping in the coming summer, but not enact them if they GW elevations rebound.	Meeting comment - noted.

244				Meeting	6/9/2021	Jerry Lohr	When we set that up, I thought it was a good idea. But I would like to see if the Forebay can be more similar to the agency one and the Upper Valley one. It wouldn't be the same people, but the same professionals. Just make it simpler. If some farm managers have properties in the Forebay and Upper Valley, if they're similar in the data we received, and similar in the concepts that we used. It might be easier to adopt them. That's my hope.	Comment received	Meeting comment - noted.
245				Meeting	6/9/2021	Allan Panzeira	That's what I'd like to see, too.	Abby Ostovar: If that is the consensus of the group, maybe the small group that got together before should get back together to incorporate these changes. Steve McIntyre: Why don't we consider these changes and bring them back to the committee.	Meeting comment - noted.
246				Meeting	6/9/2021	Jason Smith	We tried to have the technical advisory committee be more scientific in the Upper Valley. Let's get real data and they're going to bring recommendations to landowners and then discuss how we would address that.	Comment received	Meeting comment - noted.
247				Meeting	6/9/2021	Allan Panzeira	It talks about the TAC considering the whole subbasin, including the management area. Does that mean that the AS Management Area doesn't have regulatory power?	Abby: We established it so that they would be a part of the decision making process and part of the TAC. It will be based on what conditions are being seen. Donna Meyers: Certainly the Arroyo Seco, the intent of the implementation agreement is the focus on the management area. As Abby mentioned, you'd be envisioned as a member of the technical advisory committee. It envisions doing the work together. Curtis and I are looking to finalize some things, we're not quite done with that work yet. There is an understanding that the intention is co-management. All committees moving forward will have a seat for ASGSA on them.	Meeting comment - noted.
248				Meeting	6/9/2021	Steve McIntyre	There are ongoing conversations to come up with the language to satisfy all the GSAs needs.	Donna Meyers: We'll get caught up to these chapters.	Meeting comment - noted.
249				Meeting	6/9/2021	Jerry Lohr	I hear you're making good progress, and we should acknowledge that.	Emily Gardner: We will meet with that smaller group and come up with a new version of the TAC concept in Version 2.	Meeting comment - noted.
250				Meeting	6/9/2021	Nancy Isakson	Looking at the costs table, you have a valley-wide cost and you say the benefit to the subbasin will be determined later. You should just call it a capital cost. I like what you've done with the technical advisory committee, and looking at what the Upper Valley has done there. We appreciate the work. I don't see a separation that all these projects will be folded into the management area as well. It is distinct from the rest of the subbasin, and our discussion highlights the need to have it separate. Wouldn't you also	Abby Ostovar: First, on your last point, this is a point we're taking with all the 2022 GSPs, we're planning on doing a two-year update with the 180/400 GSP. There has been a strategic planning effort. There's a plan to have an integrated planning committee and that's where these conversations will be taking place. Emily Gardner: Maybe we can figure out a different word to use instead of "valley-wide".	Meeting comment - noted.
251				Meeting	6/9/2021	Tom Virsik	First, I agree with Ms. Isakson and Emily, that "valley wide" term is a bit fraught at this point. I am compiling a more detailed comment for Chapter 9 of the Upper Valley/Forebay GSPs. One, I do think there are more recent numbers for the tunnel project, and I noted that in some emails from the State Resource board. About the ASR and what the capital should reflect, some of the more granular language in Chapter 9 is reasonably clear about what the project is and the benefits are, but the table can be a bit misleading. The word "maintain" or the word "attain" and the text hasn't been consistent. For the Forebay, Arroyo Seco, and Upper Valley, my hope is that the GSP will "maintain" sustainability. And projects say they "must occur" to reach sustainability. This will be applicable to both the Upper Valley and Forebay.	Abby Ostovar: Thank you for sending those previous numbers. I think part of the discrepancy in the cost section, they break out various costs, the table numbers may not properly summarize them. Just a note on "maintain" vs "attain": the plan is meant to cover both where we might fall out of sustainability, or may just need to maintain it.	Meeting comment - noted.

252				Meeting	6/9/2021	James Sang	For the arundo, they use a kind of chemical that is poisonous for the whole valley. The cost seems kind of high. Seems like if they just got an excavator, they could dig it out by the roots. I don't see how this project could cost \$35 million. For the floodplain, I don't see how you can just find the land that's just kind of permeable and the water will just kind of go into the water aquifers. The Salinas River runs directly in the center of the Forebay. If you could put floodplain in the areas where it shows that the level of the water goes up and down the most, it could replenish the aquifers. The floodplains are based on where it's most permeable, to get past this obstacle, in order for the water to get into the ground, if we could direct the Salinas River water to these dry areas, it would be very helpful.	Comment received	Meeting comment - noted.
253				Meeting	6/9/2021	Curtis Weeks	I want to further some comments from GM Meyers, we are developing language on how the AS management area will be managed in the GSP. It will address the comments raised today about maintaining sustainability. I would ask the committee to hold on and continue the good work we're doing for Version 2.	Comment received	Meeting comment - noted.
254				Meeting	6/9/2021	Allan Panzeira	I think we should include the dam repairs in the projects. I think it affects the Salinas Valley Water Project (SVWP) and I think that is important.	Comment received	Meeting comment - noted.
255				Meeting	6/9/2021	Nancy Isakson	I wanted to look at 10.1.4, identified data gaps. You talk about the deep aquifers study, and how it's possible the deep aquifers might be in the Forebay Subbasin. Seems like the study is going to go forward. If there is a connection, then what is the impact from the wells and pumping in the Pressure to the Forebay? A lot of people in the Pressure area have said they think pumping in the Forebay is impacting the Pressure area. We need to look at it both ways. Under projects and management actions, you say the SVBGSA will begin these steps immediately following submittal of the GSP. Is that something the SVBGSA needs to undertake immediately before these projects are approved? As these projects are in the process of being approved, since you're not in charge or the lead agency on these projects, I just wonder the staff time and cost, and to what extent you would need to take those steps "immediately following submittal of the GSP." I want to give you kudos on the approval of the 180/400 GSP, however it seems they relied heavily on the water charges framework. We have had discussions at the subbasin level that the water charges framework isn't the applicable approach. It's important that the fees moving forward are acknowledged that it's just for the Forebay or the management area.	<p>Donna Meyers: The water charges framework has not surfaced as a priority. The 180/400 is a different plan. The plans that are adopted are the ones we'll implement.</p> <p>Abby Ostovar: DWR was just looking at the 180/400 plan, so they were reacting to what we had for that subbasin. We are looking at other reviews that come out to understand what DWR views on other approaches. We lay out various funding mechanisms, but it's different for each project and to be decided in the implementation period [for each subbasin].</p> <p>Donna Meyers: On the two-year update, we'd like to have all the plans on the same timeline. Each of the subbasin plans have taken their own shape, regardless of the 180/400. I would anticipate after we get through these chapters, we're going to bring an integration presentation to our board. We have to think about the partnership aspect, the funding aspects and some of these projects are just not our projects. Some of that will be addressed in the Strategic Planning work. That Plan will come to our board in July. Into September, you'll see how we get to the bigger picture. We have a foot in each world, and we're trying to forecast these regional and subbasin specific questions.</p> <p>Gary Peterson: What DWR specifically says, we're not required to make any updates. But they expect updates every five years or when appropriate. The time for the revision to water markets, this is learning as we go, and we will update when we make plan updates in two years which is appropriate. They accepted it as is, knowing it will change. And they will accept changes at the next update.</p>	Meeting comment - noted.
256				Meeting	6/9/2021	Tom Virsik	There is text "To evaluate the benefits to the Upper Valley" on page 10 (chapter 10). I wanted to flag that.	Abby Ostovar: It should be Forebay	Meeting comment - noted.
257				Meeting	6/9/2021	Jerry Lohr	One of the most difficult things to get are best management practices (BMPs). In Paso Robles it's entirely different. How do you see what you might be doing with best management practices?	Abby Ostovar: We left it vague in the GSP. We did call out the evapotranspiration work, and there probably needs to be more systemic analysis than we've done regarding which ones are more useful, and that will be a conversation with all of you. It would be helpful to bring in experts from elsewhere.	Meeting comment - noted.
258				Meeting	6/9/2021	Jerry Lohr	I think it's very important. We're trying to do it in the Paso Robles area. I don't know if another agricultural economy is trying to do that. If we have changes in climate or crop changes, best management practices adoption by growers, many in the Salinas Valley, that's an area that can make a lot of change.	Abby Ostovar: One has come up that is not in there currently. It's looking at the soil conservation program. Going forward, this is going to be an evolving conversation and what would help all the growers in the region.	Meeting comment - noted.

259					Meeting	6/9/2021	James Sang	When I look at the overall view of the projects, the ones that really bother me are the ones that limit pumping and fallow land. I don't understand where you get numbers to fallow land. Is the agency paying landowners a certain amount? Anything that affects the economy in this area in that way, I would not like that. I would like to focus on projects that really recharge the water.	Comment received	Meeting comment - noted.
-----	--	--	--	--	---------	----------	------------	--	------------------	--------------------------