

COMMENTS RECEIVED JULY 10, 2020 to July 1, 2021

Number	Chapter	Table	Page	Figure	Comment	Date				
1					Meeting	7/10/2020	Caroline Chapin	If we say no subsidence is allowed in the basin, how do we deal with the existing subsidence due to geologic factors and not due to pumping	DW: You are only responsible for undesirable results due to poor GW management.	Meeting comment - noted.
2					Meeting	7/10/2020	Grant Leonard	The subsidence area shown on the map seems to be in the same area as the Crazy Horse Landfill. Is that associated at all, or is that not related?	DW: That subsidence data is based on satellite measurements. Questions come up about releveling a field, or removing the top of a hill due to landfill operations, will definitely move the land surface. That could show up at subsidence when it really isn't. We can definitely look in to that.	Meeting comment - noted.
3					Meeting	7/10/2020	Tom Adcock	Are we only, for this issue around ISW, considering the Santa Rita Creek or Gabilan Creek since they're the named creeks? Or would it be for all creeks throughout the subbasin?	DW: Those are the two that come up in the hydrography data. If there are other SW bodies the committee wants to add to the GSP, we are happy to add those. These two creeks are probably sufficient. But if you have more information, we are happy to add them.	Meeting comment - noted.
4					Meeting	7/10/2020	Heather Lukacs	The difference between the shallow depth to GW in the well to the north, versus the other two CASGEM wells. Do you know why?	DW: I don't. This is the basin that has the least amount of data. We're writing and analyzing that information now. We may have an answer in the future.	Meeting comment - noted.
5					Meeting	7/10/2020	Heather Lukacs	In the 180/400 you did a well impact analysis, given the proposed minimum thresholds. If you could speak to that, when in the process will you do that?	DW: It is one SMC option. No matter which SMC option is chosen, it is important to make sure that our criteria don't impact too many domestic wells.	Meeting comment - noted.
6					Meeting	7/10/2020	Tom Adcock	Do you think there are discrepancies in the storage predictions versus groundwater levels because they are only using data from three wells in the model?	DW: The pumping could be from a lot of small wells that aren't accounted for in the GEMS program or in the model. The ag modeling is based on what crop use. In areas that aren't cropped, we may be underestimating the pumping.	Meeting comment - noted.
7					Meeting	7/10/2020	Tom Adcock	Falling GW levels has been a historical issue in the Langley Subbasin. Private well owners have had wells go dry.	DW: One thing to say about Storage vs GW levels, if the whole subbasin is not in overdraft, some local areas may be. I'm providing these data as a first cut. We'll get better information as we go.	Meeting comment - noted.
8					Meeting	7/10/2020	Brett Melone	Thinking about where I live and what I've seen. Our CWS wells have served us well, but others have not done as well and have gone dry. I'm curious about the hydrogeology, specifically granite rock and isolated areas where there may be overdrafting that isn't being picked up potentially because those wells and areas aren't monitored.	DW: That is something that is particularly unique to this subbasin, and that is good to know. Several people have mentioned the domestic wells have gone dry. When have they gone dry? Is it your requirement that domestic wells be one of the drivers for SMCs in this respect?	Meeting comment - noted.
9					Meeting	7/10/2020	Grant Leonard	I've lived in area, and at one point Pajaro Sunny-Mesa were trucking in water. At what point are you going to work with the water providers in the area? Seems like they would be an important stakeholder.	DW: I think it's important, you bring up a good point. I would like to know their ideas on what stresses them and what would be significant and unreasonable for them. Emily: We reached out	Meeting comment - noted.
10					Meeting	7/10/2020	Tom Adcock	Pajaro Sunny Mesa have some wells at end of Bear canyon, other locations..., I don't know what kind of data they have. Those seem like strategically placed wells if we want to try to get some more information from them.	DW: We'll look in to that.	Meeting comment - noted.
11					Meeting	7/10/2020	Heather Lukacs	Very helpful discussion. I was wondering about outreach to state and local small water systems in the	DW: I'll ask Emily to help with that. We have a pretty extensive mail list.	Meeting comment - noted.

							area. The ones on the map don't even include all the very small, small state and small local water systems. We're happy to help with outreach.	Emily: I went through and tried to reach as many people as possible. If you have any contacts or lists, we'd be really grateful for the information.		
12					Meeting	7/10/2020	Heather Lukacs	I'm happy to connect. We have all the information for public water systems, information with the county. These systems have an operator on file, but you may be able to reach more than half that way. I can help facilitate that. Tom Adcock, I would check the map and see if ALCO has a well. You might want to check that map.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
13					Meeting	7/10/2020	Tom Adcock	We don't have any wells in the area anymore, but Sunny-Mesa does. I'm happy to help contact those entities and help start the conversation.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
14					Meeting	7/10/2020	Heather Lukacs	Figure 3.5 in plan, that's the map to look at Mr. Adcock. I think your help to make it accurate would be helpful. It would be great to reach out to those systems and make sure they're up to date.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
15					Meeting	7/10/2020	Tom Adcock	If we chose to not address SWI at all, would that affect our plan? How it's accepted by DWR?	DW: The safe way would be to include it.	Meeting comment - noted.
16					Meeting	7/10/2020	Heather Lukacs	I think it would be helpful in the next month or so to have a list of all water systems in the subbasin. You had a really good list in the 180/400, with location, depth, screen intervals... A list like that in this subbasin would be really helpful to have at this stage. I was wondering if there's a plan to produce that list for this subbasin.	DW: I don't know if we have that list. We will certainly look into that and bolster it.	Meeting comment - noted.
17					Meeting	7/10/2020	Heather Lukacs	It's important to share baseline water quality data for the small water systems in the subbasin. We have that information and I can share it with this committee. We have that, and we want to see that alongside the water systems before the committee. Happy to help.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
18					Meeting	7/10/2020	Caroline Chapin	I think you touched on this, there are a lot of data gaps. There are probably a lot more rural wells, we need to reach out. There are older wells. I think it will be important to reach out and get that data.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
19	1,3,4				Meeting	7/10/2020		Derrik, discussing preliminary draft chapters 1, 3, 4	DW: GSPs in the legislation are based on best available data. The approach we are likely to take, is that we do the best we can with what we have available. We agree we will fill data gaps in implementation, and then revise what we do. This will not be the perfect plan the first time around, and we need to be clear	Meeting comment - noted.
20					Meeting	7/10/2020	Brett Melone	Thank you for that additional context. What I've had on my mind with those data gaps, is many exist because of the small water systems don't know how much water is being pumped. We will need to reach out. It will probably be controversial, but helpful in the long run.	DW: That's the kind of thing we'll want to know. Yes, the GEMS program focuses on larger wells.	Meeting comment - noted.

21				Meeting	7/10/2020	Donna	In thinking about this subbasin going forward, we as a GSA will have our eye on the resources available for new monitoring wells with technical grants. It will be so important for us to understand the data gaps as we move forward. The data gaps out there make this so important.	Emily: I can only be so effective cold-calling people. If any of you would be willing to help with outreach would be so appreciated.	Meeting comment - noted.
22				Meeting	7/10/2020	Donna	Question on data we did present. Did we work with environmental health?	DW: We did reach out for our work with the 180/400. We admitted we didn't have a lot of data for the small systems That's what we're dealing with right now.	Meeting comment - noted.
23				Meeting	7/10/2020	Heather Lukacs	I notice in the list of workshops, wondering if we could have a drinking water workshop? Is that part of the plan? I didn't see that on the list.	Emily: Not currently on the list. Donna, is that part of the DACs conversation? Donna: We could probably combine it with that. We can talk about that in the Project Team. And how we want to handle that with the water quality program too. We'll discuss that.	Meeting comment - noted.
24				Meeting	7/10/2020	Heather Lukacs	It's my impression in the Langley subbasin there isn't a strong overlap with census data for DACs. May just be different. However you decide to do it, a DW workshop.		Meeting comment - noted.
30	3	Table 3-2 Existing Well Types		JotForm	7/16/2020	Heather Lukacs	We request that this table include all Monterey County regulated drinking water systems and clearly distinguish between type of drinking water system. Local small water systems serve 2-4 connections, state small water systems serve 5-14 connections, private domestic wells serve 1 connection. In addition this table should list agricultural and industrial users as separate well types. This distinction is made in Figure 3-6 but not in this Table. It is important to distinguish between well type here in order to set the stage for good water budget estimates, for the monitoring network, and throughout the plan. This data is all readily available to the public and GSA.	Submission Received	Table 3-2 was made using DWR's OSWCR database, and it does not provide information on the amount of agricultural and industrial wells so these categories have to be combined into the production category. The parcel data used to make Figure 3-6 came from Monterey Country, not from DWR so it is unlikely that these two data sources match up exactly.
31				Meeting	9/2/2020		Groundwater Storage SMC: Motion to accept Option 1: Pumping in excess of the sustainable yield leads to significant and unreasonable impacts.	Motion was passed by Committee and will be incorporated into GSP.	This will be incorporated into GSP development as a strategic comment. See memo for further discussion.
32				Meeting	9/2/2020		Subsidence SMC: Motion to accept Option 1: Any subsidence anywhere in the Subbasin is significant and unreasonable using the metric of InSAR data	Motion was passed by Committee and will be incorporated into GSP.	This will be incorporated into GSP development as a strategic comment. See memo for further discussion.
33				Meeting	9/2/2020	Heather Lukacs	Do we see that water levels and/or pumping in the Langley subbasin influences SWI? I appreciate you're using the isocontours, but impacts occur at individual wells and that's important to consider.	Abby Ostovar: To date, we haven't seen that what is happening in the subbasin is influencing SWI. The aquifers and geology changes in Langley from the other subbasins, and it's questionable as to extent Langley conditions could influence SWI [outside of the subbasin].	Meeting comment - noted.
34				Meeting	9/2/2020		Seawater Intrusion SMC: Motion to accept Option 1: Any seawater intrusion in the Subbasin is significant and unreasonable using the metric of chloride isocontour at the subbasin boundary.	Motion was passed by Committee and will be incorporated into GSP.	This will be incorporated into GSP development as a strategic comment. See memo for further discussion.

35					Meeting	9/2/2020	Caroline Chapin	We know groundwater quality is a big concern for many people in the subbasin. That can be a strong preference as we consider projects.	Abby Ostovar: If you go with option #1, it doesn't mean you can't go with projects and management actions that will also improve water quality.	Meeting comment - noted.
36					Meeting	9/2/2020	Robin Lee	Recharge from septic systems is important, and we need to know what is in the water that is recharging. You need to be aware of the problems. You can't just ignore it. You can "do no harm" but you have to know what the harm is to avoid it. It's important to keep working with other agencies focusing on water quality.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
37					Meeting	9/2/2020	Heather Lukacs	GW quality is a big issue for us, especially with regard to drinking water. We understand how SGMA is written, to maintain current GW quality. It would be helpful to set measurable objectives and minimum thresholds at individual wells. It would be helpful to look at historical issues to make sure we don't further degrade. GW management is certainly driving quality issues, so we would prefer to see this set at individual wells.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
38					Meeting	9/2/2020	Brett Melone	I think we should be prioritizing projects that have multiple benefits as a principle.	Abby Ostovar: I think we'll get into that as we start talking about projects. Emily Gardner: Brett, if we could bring that up when we start talking about projects, we can make that a strategic comment so it can be memorialized.	Meeting comment - noted.
39					Meeting	9/2/2020		Water Quality SMC: Motion to accept Option 1: Degraded groundwater quality resulting from direct GSA actions is significant and unreasonable as measured by the number of supply wells.	Motion was passed by Committee and will be incorporated into GSP.	This will be incorporated into GSP development as a strategic comment. See memo for further discussion.
40					Meeting	9/2/2020	Caroline Chapin	I struggle with [GW levels] because, as you say, this is based on so few wells, I know we're pressed for time, but I feel like we need more information.	Abby Ostovar: We are receptive to all strategic direction, and we're currently expanding the monitoring networks as we've been writing the chapters. DW: If your preference is to set the SMC at a particular year, but you want updated GW elevation maps, we can certainly do that.	Meeting comment - noted.
41					Meeting	9/2/2020	Caroline Chapin	This subbasin certainly seems to have a lot of domestic wells, so that seems like it would be more important to consider the domestic wells in this SMC.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
42					Meeting	9/2/2020	Robin Lee	I'm with you, Caroline, on addressing the shallow wells. It would be good to know the depths and elevations of domestic wells.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
43					Meeting	9/2/2020	Heather Lukacs	I support what's been said previously. We encourage the GSA to set levels to protect the domestic wells. The last time this subbasin committee met, I brought up the idea of a drinking water well impact analysis, similar to but expanded on what was done in the 180/400 . I think it would allow people in the area to be informed. Here you would want to quantify it for each well type, and allow the public to see how they would be impacted. We are more in favor of Option 4. Seeing more information would help this committee and BOD moving forward.	Abby Ostovar: I will say we are still trying to get information on more wells.	Meeting comment - noted.

44					Meeting	9/2/2020	Caroline Chapin	Groundwater Elevation SMC: Motion to table the discussion with a request to provide additional data on options 1 and 4. Committee members preferred a combination of options 1 and 4, but prior to making a formal recommendation need to review additional data.	Comment received / motion passes.	Meeting comment - noted.
45					Meeting	9/2/2020	Robin Lee	The Prunedale area and Langley Subbasin are heavily forested, a lot with eucalypus groves. Taking all of that into consideration, look at what's there and what could be impacted. There's no description of GDEs that will be impacted. You already have wells going dry and quality being impacted. So what is in the area, and what is going to be impacted. You're going blind, there's no data to make this decision. Especially with regard to the two creeks that flow into the Eastside Subbasin. There is a lot of percolation happening. There's no information about root depths or impacts.	Abby Ostovar: We can provide more information, there is TNC satellite data for vegetation. However, GW elevations tend to be deeper than 30 feet, which is the extent of some GDE roots. There is a small area where there is shallower GW. But generally in this subbasin it may be the case that vegetation is dependent on soil water or surface water, not connected to the GW system.	Meeting comment - noted.
46					Meeting	9/2/2020		Depletion of Interconnected Surface Water SMC: Motion to accept Option 3: The current rate of surface water depletion is not unreasonable (although it may be significant).	Motion was passed by Committee and will be incorporated into GSP.	This will be incorporated into GSP development as a strategic comment. See memo for further discussion.
47					Meeting	9/2/2020	Caroline Chapin	I take from your presentation that this subbasin has some unique challenges. I am familiar with the stormwater controls. I think there's value in returning to existing infrastructure and implementing some of those measures. The approach we take to projects for this subbasin will need to be smaller, more finite, but spread throughout the subbasin. Capture of stormwater in our basin to infiltrate in localized areas, that's the way I would like to focus. Pumping reductions can be a backdrop.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
48					Meeting	9/2/2020	Tom Adcock	Has there been any analysis to determine how much ag there is in the Langley Subbasin, and approximately what their water use is? Also, is the CSIP close enough to be used instead?	DW: I have not looked at exactly how much ag is in the subbasin, but it is along the south/west area. We can look into it, and the water use. As for CSIP, the main question is about expansion. There are some groups that would like to be a part of CSIP, none in this subbasin. We can look at what the effort would be. The long distance could be an excessive cost. Remember, this process, we're getting input, we'll get back to you with data.	Meeting comment - noted.
49					Meeting	9/2/2020	Tom Adcock	In this subbasin, if you were to inject water in one particular location, it wouldn't necessarily fill the basin to the other side, right? You wouldn't be able to inject and expect it to have wide impacts.	DW: Yes, that is our current belief.	Meeting comment - noted.
50					Meeting	9/2/2020	Tom Adcock	This may not be the simplest and easiest to deal with, for the drinking water portion of it, you may find three to five locations with drinking water/well water supply, which may be better spots for recharge and they may need to expand their distribution. Having projects all over may be less cost effective than narrowing it down to better locations where water can be recharged and distributed.	DW: Are you possibly suggesting combining small water systems, or hooking up small well owners into water systems?	Meeting comment - noted.

51					Meeting	9/2/2020	Tom Adcock	I don't live out there, so I can't really say. But we're looking out at 50 years, and that seems like that may be the direction to go.	Abby Ostovar: Figure 3-3 also shows existing land use which shows where ag is. It doesn't say how much water they pump, it's a land use map from the county. We are also willing to receive data from well owners in the area to better understand the possibility of projects. Emily Gardner: We're getting ready to send 346 letters to small water system managers in the subbasin for information and invite to participate.	Meeting comment - noted.
52					Meeting	9/2/2020	Tom Adcock	Maybe there could be water from the ES to be imported into the Langley Subbasin. It would have to be a coordinated effort with the ES.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
53					Meeting	9/2/2020	Robin Lee	It would be helpful to show the watershed maps to show where the water is flowing to and then you can find partners. For example, the Elkhorn Slough is doing tremendous effort in retiring ag land and getting funding. The shopping centers in Prunedale, that's a lot of impervious surface and a lot of runoff. Do you know where that water goes or how it's treated?	Caroline: Those are old systems, there are two large drainages that run on either side of 101, one on Blackie Road and the other on Pasante. I suspect that the drainage from both those centers run south towards Salinas along those drainages and out of the subbasin. I don't think they are treated at the source because they are older. During storm events, a lot of water moves through there. Abby: Could be paired with a dry-well.	Meeting comment - noted.
54					Meeting	9/2/2020	Robin Lee	I think this would be a good project to look at. And implement more LId. Encourage home owners to make rain gardens in their homes/apartments. Santa Rita Creek, Rancho San Juan had a project to infiltrate at headwaters where there are sand lenses. This would be a dual benefit project. You could use small flood plain areas and put them back in to use, instead of putting it all in to Bolsa Knolls which would reduce flooding. It doesn't take big areas, just several small areas. Infiltration and flood control, and it wouldn't cost a lot because you're using nature. With row crops, you're channelizing the flow. Maybe use satellite data to really take a look.	Abby Ostovar: We appreciate getting information on specific locations to look at. We have new features on the website map where you can identify where you are as you're driving around, you can identify where you are in the subbasin (map).	Meeting comment - noted.
55			1		Meeting	9/2/2020	Robin Lee	Can you tell me where the geologic boundary is with the ES?	DW: It's not a geologic boundary, it's a break in slope. The Langley boundary was defined as the break in slope where you start getting more into the hills.	Meeting comment - noted.
56					Meeting	9/2/2020	Robin Lee	Those creeks go to Carr Lake or the Rec ditch.	DW: That's a good way to think of this, as an integrated program. We won't throw out projects just because they don't directly benefit individual subbasins. It will change how the project is funded. We have to take a look at all options and see.	Meeting comment - noted.
57					Meeting	9/2/2020	Robin Lee	Zone 8 planning overlay where no development is allowed. Is that in the Langley?	DW: We'll look more into that.	Meeting comment - noted.

58					Meeting	9/2/2020	Heather Lukacs	I want to comment on the many small water users. Community Water Center works primarily with people on these small systems and domestic well. We have seen that when people are worried about their water quality or water supply, they become far more interested in consolidating or joining water systems. We're interested in supporting outreach in that area. 1) We echo what people have said about multi-benefit projects specifically benefiting water quality. 2) All recharge projects need to be designed with drinking water in mind. We don't want unintended consequences. The regional board will be permitting areas in their jurisdiction ensuring there won't be negative water quality impacts. 3) We're really interested in seeing a drinking water well mitigation program as a management action. We're proposing to have more conversations about that. In the next fifty years, things will change a lot. If there are impacts over our planning horizon, we want to make sure people have access to DW over the long term.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
59					Meeting	9/2/2020	Brett Melone	Following up on some comments, potential interest in small water systems and private wells being interested in a long term solution. This seems like a more rational solution, especially when you see wells drying up around you. And then bringing up the water quality problems in the basin, thinking about CSIP at that scale. Where I live, there are three wells that serve about 30 homes, we were required to put in a treatment system called a Hoot system, not a septic system. Are there some economies of scale solutions to connect small users to larger distribution systems to make the wastewater cleaner for recharge? I think the concept is worth exploring.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
60	5 & 7				Meeting	9/2/2020	Caroline Chapin	Given that we have [additional data] for other wells, I think these chapters [5&7] are ripe for updating with additional information.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
61	5				Meeting	9/2/2020	Heather Lukacs	I want to flag the Groundwater conditions in chapter 5. There are significant water quality contaminations and violations, this is a hotspot. I don't think this chapter adequately reflects that. Similarly with the monitoring network, there is a data gap for the small water systems, the ILRP is for private wells. I know these are on your radar, we look forward to seeing these laid out more clearly, especially in chapter 5.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
62					JotForm	8/26/2020	Robin Lee	Please provide watershed maps for Langley (and Eastside) subbasins before September 2. Also provide map with tiger data.	Submission received	Watershed maps were added to Chapter 4 V2.

63					Meeting	11/4/2020	Robin Lee	I was wondering if you have any info on how many people had trouble with their wells between 1995 and 2019. Do you have any data from the health department or WRA about domestic wells with water quality issues, for whatever reason, the wells' elevations were significantly lowered, or went dry, or had nitrate issues.	Abby Ostovar: We reached out to both the health department and WRA, and other stakeholders. We haven't gotten clear answers. There have only been three requests to drill domestic wells since most recent drought. Another potential, some of these wells were drilled a while ago, if people just switched to small systems. We haven't gotten any answers back. We do know there hasn't been a huge uptick in domestic wells drilled.	Meeting comment - noted.
64					Meeting	11/4/2020	Caroline Chapin	I think the supplemental hydrographs were interesting. Some hydrographs are relatively level, and another nearby shows a dramatic drop. It shows the qualities of the aquifer and how it is highly variable. There are also older domestic wells mixed in with newer systems.	Abby Ostovar: Most of the elevations were about the same or declined slightly, and some went up in elevation.	Meeting comment - noted.
65					Meeting	11/4/2020	Robin Lee	With all the variability in the well elevations, the hydrographs are all over the place. Did you do the average of variability? People have suggested using individual wells due to the variability. With such variability, it's hard to pinpoint a line on a graph.	Abby Ostovar: This hydrograph takes into account all the representative monitoring wells.	Meeting comment - noted.
66					Meeting	11/4/2020	Caroline Chapin	I agree, it's difficult with the variability. We have to make a decision and move forward. As we get into discussing projects, we can keep in mind those outliers.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
67					Meeting	11/4/2020	Colby Pereria	I agree. One of the things we're reminded of is that SGMA allows us to go back in and do course correction as we learn more.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
68					Meeting	11/4/2020		Groundwater Elevation SMC: Motion to select 2019 for the minimum threshold and 2010 for the measurable objective.	Motion was passed by Committee and will be incorporated into GSP.	This will be incorporated into GSP development as a strategic comment.
69					Meeting	11/4/2020	Tom Adcock	I am ALCO water service. I know we don't have any facilities in the Langley area at this time. They were sold to the Sunny-Mesa in 2007 or so. Oak Hills seems high and Pajaro Sunny Mesa seems low.	Abby Ostovar: Maybe you can help us pair reports from the state with the boundaries with the water systems. I'll touch base so you can help us clarify.	Meeting comment - noted.
70					Meeting	11/4/2020	Robin Lee	It'd be helpful to overlay the water system map with the wells. I could see what wells are impacted with the type of water system.	Abby Ostovar: We don't have the wells for the water systems, only the service boundaries. We have addresses, which are not the well locations. It would have been misleading. It was better to have the system boundaries. The wells analysis that was done was for domestic wells.	Meeting comment - noted.
71					Meeting	11/4/2020	Robin Lee	There's another shopping center in Prunedale, Prunetree. That's another vast impervious surface that wasn't mentioned.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
72					Meeting	11/4/2020	Colby Pereria	As we look at projects on or near subbasin borders, have we talked about any real or perceived benefit from using the 11043 surface water permit? I wonder if we're looking at it in the ES, if it could be a peripheral project for Langley.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.

73					Meeting	11/4/2020	Caroline Chapin	I have some thoughts. I think the dry wells concept is a good one. In your discussion, you talk about how they should be used with retention basins. There are a lot of retention basins in the subbasin in neighborhoods and on ag lands primarily as a flood control and erosion control project. The use of those in conjunction with a dry well could be a pretty powerful tool. I'd like to look into that more.	Abby Ostovar: Do you know of any data source that notes the location of those retention basins?	Meeting comment - noted.
74					Meeting	11/4/2020	Caroline Chapin	MCRMA would be a good place to start (permits are required, especially for grading). I think it could have a direct impact on recharge. I think this could also work in the ES as well. It's worth following up on.	Abby Ostovar: We're also thinking about what the role of the GSA is as well: pilot well, or recharging, or analyzing the subsurface. Who should we encourage and how should we encourage?	Meeting comment - noted.
75					Meeting	11/4/2020	Caroline Chapin	On the shopping centers, Prunedale is every bit the same size as Prunedale. Because they are privately owned, I wonder how they would feel about the projects because they might disrupt their operations for a while.	Abby Ostovar: It would be challenging to cross CalTrans land.	Meeting comment - noted.
76					Meeting	11/4/2020	Caroline Chapin	The localized GW trigger, even though it doesn't help us with our SMCs, is still needed in this area. Simply drilling another well is so expensive for well owners. Having a resource for people to turn to is important for public outreach and involvement.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
77					Meeting	11/4/2020	Caroline Chapin	Regarding the Hoot system, the county with their updated development standards, push for more shallow leach fields. It's very cost prohibitive for home owners or even a group of home owners to do this. It also takes more maintenance. It's very challenging and the water stays very shallow. I don't know if it helps us reach our objectives. I think there are other, inexpensive ways to reach our goals like rooftop harvesting. We're seeing those advanced systems going in more. But I don't know if that helps us meet our goals.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
78					Meeting	11/4/2020	Brett Melone	On the trigger system, based on the information you were able to find on domestic wells, what could we do to create a trigger system that would come before a well go dry? At that point it's too late, the well is dry. I think we should look at which wells, where elevations are going down. There's a lack of data, or communication, to do that. I would encourage us to think about how we can get ahead.	Abby Ostovar: This is a tough one. Part of why it's challenging is that there is a lot of variability. Some wells may be drilled into the granite, the could be clay lenses, etc. It's challenging to predict when a well will go dry. We're open to ideas.	Meeting comment - noted.
79					Meeting	11/4/2020	Brett Melone	What about having more real time data from the systems. How can the really small systems be more a part of this, or with BMPs to get ahead of it.	Abby Ostovar: Would small systems want to participate in that? It could be an additional burden to supply that data. It might be helpful, but it may also be a burden.	Meeting comment - noted.
80					Meeting	11/4/2020	Brett Melone	It's kind of like the wild west, we wait for the well to go dry and then we think about solutions. We can't take all of that on, but we're trying to address the sustainability of the aquifer. It's hard to help people to understand what we're trying to do and how it relates to them providing water.	Emily Gardner: Part of this too is where we set the SMC. We can set it at the highest level for the max protection, but then we're on the hook. We can do this earlier with how we set the SMC. This approach is trying to set a reasonable task for GW elevations, but also address the variability in the subbasin. We can revisit the SMC discussion for the more protective approach.	Meeting comment - noted.

81					Meeting	11/4/2020	Caroline Chapin	Whether small systems would be interested in participating. It's how you package it. The average small system or domestic well owner are not going to participate if it's mandated. If we package it as a resource, and voluntary, then it could be a win-win. Maybe it would result in targeted data and patterns. I think people will want to participate because this is a resource that wasn't there before. My opinion with projects, we're not going to find big payoff projects for this area. It's going to take a lot of small efforts all over.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
82					Meeting	11/4/2020	Robin Lee	The Prunedale shopping center, they redid their septic system. There might be information there about what they put in and why related to percolation. I would not use the term rain barrels, I'd use cistern. Add collection rainfall from rooftops. You want households to collect enough to be useful. Also graywater, if you irrigate right away, you don't need a permit. I encourage a lot of the little projects. There are a lot of catch basins all around, you could put in a dry well. Prunetree shopping center also has a basin, a small one.	Abby Ostovar: Who does hear about these issues?	Meeting comment - noted.
83					Meeting	11/4/2020	Caroline Chapin	Every septic system that goes in required perc testing, for approximately 20-30 feet. MC Department of health would have that shallower perc data. Another resource.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
84					Meeting	11/4/2020	Brett Melone	The leader of MOCOWS is Marla Anderson. I want to follow up on how to frame the outreach, thinking about the trigger system. I think part of the frustration is that people get asked for data from different agencies and they don't know how it's being used. I think explaining the different agencies and roles, and engaging people is important.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
85					Meeting	11/4/2020	Robin Lee	The reason I bring up the Rancho San Juan project was to find out where the recharge locations were going to be. They had an ag reserve, they found an area where they could percolate water. It's near the school, up in the corner. It may be in the Eastside Subbasin.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
86					Meeting	11/4/2020	Robin Lee	You could tie it in with the IRWP projects with Gabilan creek. It would be a big flood control project. Bolsa Knolls is very susceptible to flooding, because of the strawberries up there. That would be a multi-benefit program. That's why I've been pushing it hard. It's infiltration, habitat restoration, and flood control. We've had heavy rains in the past that have posed problems.	Abby Ostovar: Your local knowledge adds a lot to the conversation.	Meeting comment - noted.
87					Meeting	11/4/2020	Caroline Chapin	I'd like to see more a cost analysis for the Gabilan Creek projects.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.

88					Meeting	11/4/2020	Robin Lee	I'm not in favor of diversion because the ES basin relies so much on the runoff. If you divert, it cuts off recharge for the ES basin. I am in favor of bringing back flood plains and letting nature do its thing. It happens slowly over time. But if you do a diversion, you effectively have a dam. It would take a dam.	Abby Ostovar: It wouldn't be a dam, it would be a diversion structure for over 90% flows.	Meeting comment - noted.
89					Meeting	11/4/2020	Robin Lee	If you opened up that farming area, you have huge percolation potential. I think this is more the Mud Creek area, outside the Langley. I think there are some more areas where you can reestablish the flood plains. The channels are so incised. Look at this, and see how much it would take to restore them.	Abby Ostovar: We'll do some digging. That you all for your feedback. It's very helpful.	Meeting comment - noted.
90					Meeting	1/6/2021	James Sang	Based on your report, it looks like the great majority of Prunedale has enough water. I think there's only part toward the south you should be worried about because it's been losing water and that seems to be related to the agricultural land there. We could suggest to the farmers to put swales or trenches on an acre or two of land to recharge the well. Swales, if dug deep enough (at least a few feet down), prevent evaporation from the sun and wind. Trenches don't offer that same protection. I don't like the idea of dry wells, because it's like a tube that goes straight down to the water table. The dry well, except for the petrochemical sponge that you have, doesn't prevent nitrates, phosphates and oil chemicals, heavy metals from going down into the drinking water. Dry wells are expensive. Instead, just dig some shallow (few feet deep) swales and trenches. Plants will grow back with time, providing bioremediation. Build trenches or swales underneath the eucalyptus trees. It looks like the trees are drying out. The reason I'm trying to save these trees is they're a great source of evapotranspiration. The water they release into the air creates moisture needed for rainfall. Swales or trenches or terraces – anything that – will capture moisture on these hills and with fire prevention too.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
91					Meeting	1/6/2021	James Sang	Last week or the week before, you shared the idea of putting together the dry wells and retention ponds. Even though I think swales are better, I think that grouping dry wells and retention ponds is a good idea, because retention ponds allow for some green growth that would provide some protection against groundwater contamination via the dry wells.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
							Also, regarding Robin Lee's comment about cisterns, I did some calculations. I looked it up on the internet. If you have a 5,000 gallon water tank and you put it next to a house and you run your rain gutter to it. With 15 inches of rain, you can capture 9,000 gallons of water per year, which is probably plenty for most families.			

92				Meeting	1/6/2021	Tom Adcock	Any pumping allocations structure would be limited to farmers who pump more than 1 acre-feet per year. Is that correct?	Abby Ostovar: A de minimis user is defined as using less than 2 AFY. We're not allowed to meter their pumping, but under SGMA we could regulate them and include them in a pumping allocation structure. That is our current understanding.	Meeting comment - noted.
93				Meeting	1/6/2021	Tom Adcock	Okay, because in Langley we have a significant number of houses that use less than that. I'm worried that a lot of people are going to drill their own wells as a way around having to conserve water. You're going to get a lot of that, I suspect.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
94				Meeting	1/6/2021	Grant Leonard	I'm wondering if pumping controls could lead to something similar to Monterey Peninsula, where there is a tightly regulated system. Those extreme water restrictions are limiting growth. For de minimis users, does that term apply to shared well systems as well?	Abby Ostovar: Monterey Peninsula is under cease and desist order due to CalAm's pumping and that is limiting growth. A pumping allocation structure could limit growth, but it doesn't have to. It depends on how you structure it. DW: Re shared well systems: I think we talked about this earlier as a "per well" system. If the well is pumping enough to supply more than 2 acre-feet per year, then it's no longer de minimis. Abby Ostovar: For now, I think for the purposes of this conversation, consider de minimis users as individual well owners and one household.	Meeting comment - noted.
95				Meeting	1/6/2021	Tom Adcock	Even without pumping allocations limiting use, we could use it for funding. What other options are there for funding?	Abby Ostovar: Yes, there are other options. We'll talk about those more during the funding workshop. We don't have to reach a decision now.	Meeting comment - noted.
96				Meeting	1/6/2021	Caroline Chapin	The thing I'm struggling with about pumping allocations is that some parts of the basins are in overdraft while others are not, so a flat pumping allocation doesn't seem right.	Abby Ostovar: We are looking at comparisons between years looking at how storage has changed, trying to get a better sense of where those conditions exist. Derrick Williams: There's not necessarily a 1:1 correlation between, "this is the allocation," and, "everyone has to cut back equally." If it's just one pumper who is preventing sustainability, everyone has an allocation, but there is a potential that a pumper cannot implement their allocation because they are preventing sustainability. Abby Ostovar: To build on what Derrick is saying, if an individual pumper is preventing you from meeting a sustainability goal – be it seawater intrusion, or chronic lowering of groundwater levels, or something else – that could be as much a fault of the pumper's location as it is their water use.	Meeting comment - noted.

97					Meeting	1/6/2021	James Sang	This is one issue that I really hate about this program, because I understand that we have a problem with overdraft, but I don't want to limit growth. I don't think growth can be stopped. If you set limitations on the amount of water that can be used, you're going to stop new ag growth. I don't want to stop that because it helps the economy of this area. Maybe you can [distribute allocations] on a per well basis. You can find out what the level of the water is and whether it goes up or down, then you can charge them or not. In the northern part of the basin, I see that there is no problem right now. For new communities, I think they should consider where the water supply is going to come from and know how they're going to replenish that source of water. You mentioned \$1600 per AF. We could use numbers like that to scare people into action (swales to collect rainwater, for example, or add a water tank), but I think that, at some point, if you really focus on the supply side, that's the way to go. Punishing people for using too much water isn't going to work.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
98					Meeting	1/6/2021	Caroline Chapin	I feel like there has to be some kind of hybrid approach because we have so many different types of users.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
99					Meeting	1/6/2021	Tom Adcock	Let's say agriculture gets 30%, then we divide that by the acreage? And say municipal gets 30%, then divide that by the number of connections? Is that how it would be separated?	Abby Ostovar: You have to look at what is there across categories of users. You can do a per acre fee and then figure out what percentage of the pie that represents.	Meeting comment - noted.
100					Meeting	1/6/2021	Caroline Chapin	We have to consider future municipal growth. Butterfly Village could be huge. I think we have to consider it.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
101					Meeting	1/6/2021	Tom Adcock	Some of the growth of municipal water systems was connecting existing homes that lost their wells. We might need a better way of accounting for de minimis users that are transferred to municipal systems.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
102					Meeting	1/6/2021	Tom Adcock	Due the General Plan, we can assume that homeowners cannot subdivide existing lots, but ADUs could almost double water use on some lots.	Abby Ostovar: Right, and if you build an ADU, does it get its own connection or is it shared? We can account for them in whatever "set aside" there is. While there is a "set aside" before they've taken their portion of the pie, that reduces what they can take. Do we also want a "set aside" for dormant users?	Meeting comment - noted.
103					Meeting	1/6/2021	Tom Adcock	There's a decent amount of land in Langley that will probably be developed eventually, at low density at least.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
104					Meeting	1/6/2021	Tom Adcock	Speaking as a water provider, per household and per water user is impossible. Not everyone can be relied on to accurately self-report and we can't go door to door. It's a lost cause. I'm guessing we have little to no production data for these smaller systems. If we found a few systems with really good data, then you could build a model from the limited data that you have.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
105					Meeting	1/6/2021	Caroline Chapin	If we feel that there are holes in our historical data, then per connection seems fair to me.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.

106					Meeting	1/6/2021	Tom Adcock	There are some areas where they probably have some golf course lawns on large lots and then smaller lots where there's less landscaping irrigation.	Abby Ostovar: Since these are all overlies, we could do net acreage for lots greater than 1 acre, for example, and per connection for smaller lots. Combines per connection with acreage.	Meeting comment - noted.
107					Meeting	1/6/2021	Tom Adcock	I'm trying to wrap my head around the de minimis users because there are a lot of individual wells in Langley Area. For individual wells, you'd still be basing their	Abby Ostovar: We might need legal advice on that. DW: Agreed.	Meeting comment - noted.
108					Meeting	1/6/2021	Grant Leonard	On the ADU questions, I'm a housing professional. Currently, every single family home is allowed to add an ADU. That's probably the main source of growth in this area. Land use makes a big difference to water use on larger 1-acre to 5-acre parcels. I like the use of a hybrid approach. Using historic usage for farms where we have good data, but for individual residential lots, per connection is probably better. Re: ADUs and how the connection is classified, they vary by jurisdiction	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
109					Meeting	1/6/2021	Tom Adcock	If the ADU has fire sprinklers, then it definitely has a separate connection. Here in Salinas, they're all required to have separate connections. In Prunedale, they might just go with least expensive way to connect, but it would depend on what was required.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
110					Meeting	1/6/2021	Tom Adcock	Derrik, do we have to show the state that there will be some pumping allocations?	DW: No, there is no requirement for pumping allocations. Allocations are a fundamental idea, though. There was a study that showed there were many GSPs that did not require demand style management and the study thought that was a mistake because there are only two knobs: increase supply and limit demand. So, pumping allocations are not required, but they are useful. Abby Ostovar: Another thing that has come up is whether all options should be presented as equally likely to be implemented. Some GSPs show tiered options: first choice, second choice..., last resort.	Meeting comment - noted.
111					Meeting	1/6/2021	Tom Adcock	As a water system during the drought, I didn't have the authority to shut people off if I thought they were using too much. Instead, we had to charge people more – essentially a surcharge. It does work. It will cause people to use less water. So probably some type of pumping allocations will be necessary.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
112					Meeting	1/6/2021	Caroline Chapin	I'm not opposed to exploring the idea of a tool that can be used. Should we use this as a tool, I think we want to treat overlying users differently and leave room for future growth.	We cannot treat overlies differently since they are one category. However, since we have both ag and domestic, we can use one method overall with different metrics depending on acreage or connections.	Meeting comment - noted.
113					Meeting	1/6/2021	Tom Adcock	I'm still worried about de minimis users. We have to factor them in.		Meeting comment - noted.
114					Meeting	1/6/2021	Caroline Chapin	I think we should exempt de minimis users completely. Drilling a well is so expensive. I would be shocked if the average single-family home could afford to drill a well.		Meeting comment - noted.

115					Meeting	1/6/2021	Tom Adcock	When we come up with the total water budget, we allocate a certain amount for de minimis users?	Abby Ostovar: We still want to account for all water, so I think we should estimate the total use by all de minimis users and set that much aside in our water budget.	Meeting comment - noted.
116					Meeting	1/6/2021	Caroline Chapin	How many de minimis users are there? Approximately what is their usage?	Abby Ostovar: It's hard to know exactly. One method to estimate the number is just to count the number of houses, but we are exploring some other methods also. Emiy Gardner: Well registrations could help us count de minimis users in the future, if you want to go that direction.	Meeting comment - noted.
117					Meeting	1/6/2021	Grant Leonard	I agree with Derrik that this is a good idea to develop for our "back pocket" and we should establish an allocation system. What is the administrative process? It seems like it would be a headache to hold people to these limitations. Do we plan to grow the GSA to monitoring this? Or will it be recommendation?	Abby Ostovar: Part of this depends on what you use this for and whether we're in overdraft. If you are using it for financing and not reductions, then that's one thing. If you are doing reductions, then that's another thing. Emily Gardner: This is the beginning of the conversation. We're asking some of the fundamental questions today, but it could take a year or more to decide how we would administer this. Gary Peterson: It is not our intention to grow the GSA to a large size to monitor all of the wells. We have been primarily a planning organization. What we are talking about here is implementation and we don't have answers about what that looks like yet. Donna Meyers: Should the subbasin plans include an allocation program, we would have a full public process. We would need to understand the needs, legal requirements and would be developed in full transparency working with our Board and Advisory Committee.	Meeting comment - noted.
118					Email	1/28/2021	James San	https://sjvwater.org/delanos-big-dig/	Comment received.	Noted.
119					Meeting	3/3/2021	Shawn Nelson	If we fail to meet the minimum threshold or have an undesirable result, what happens?	Abby Ostovar: You have 20 years to reach sustainability and you have to maintain for 30 years after that. We have updates every five years. DWR wants to know that we are on track to meet the measurable objectives. There could be repercussions at that point, but we'll have early warnings before then with annual reports.	Meeting comment - noted.
120					Meeting	3/3/2021	Paul Robins	This is all new to me, but I am curious. In interpreting this, how relevant are the reservoir start dates that are called out in the figure?	Abby Ostovar: We included those dates to be consistent with figures in other subbasins, but you're right, Langley doesn't receive water from those reservoirs.	Meeting comment - noted.
121					Meeting	3/3/2021	Caroline Chapin	I'm inclined to pick 2019 as the minimum threshold year.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
122					Meeting	3/3/2021	Grant Leonard	Does it have to be a year or can we pick a value?	Abby Ostovar: We want to pick a specific year because this shows cumulative change in water levels. We will end up setting these MT at specific monitoring wells.	Meeting comment - noted.
123					Meeting	3/3/2021	Grant Leonard	I think 2019 makes sense.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
124					Meeting	3/3/2021	Tom Adcock	I agree with 2019.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.

125					Meeting	3/3/2021	Jenny Balmagia	I agree especially if it makes things cleaner for the model and making things work, since they are all so close.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
126					Meeting	3/3/2021	James Sang	I would like to see MT set at a lowest level, 1980. That would allow for give and take on the amount of water used from underground. In the next 5-10 years, we don't know how many people are going to start using dormant land. We don't want to drop below the minimum threshold, otherwise authorities could say you have to follow your land. By setting it at the lowest threshold, it gives us time to set up the plan, and find ways of recharging groundwater in the next five years before the update. If we set it at 2019 and if we get a couple of dry years and the regulators come in, that's a big headache. At the 1980 level, we have leeway in case people want to start using dormant land.	Abby Ostovar: Your comment still applies, but the committee has already set the groundwater level SMCs and we are talking about the Interconnected Surface Water minimum threshold now, so it is only around areas of Interconnected Surface Waters. We are using the shallow GW elevations as a proxy to make sure that pumping is not depleting the surface water at an unreasonable rate.	Meeting comment - noted.
127					Meeting	3/3/2021	Caroline Chapin	Re: Minimum threshold for Interconnected Surface Water: I think the consensus is 2019.	Comment received.	Will be included in the SMC for interconnected surface water
128					Meeting	3/3/2021	Shawn Nelson	Do we have any possibility of seawater intrusion where Elkhorn Slough comes up?	Abby Ostovar: I don't think it reaches Langley. DW: I don't think so, either.	Meeting comment - noted.
129					Meeting	3/3/2021	Shawn Nelson	Do we need to keep the pressure up to keep the seawater out?	DW: We haven't looked into it enough to know what the groundwater concentrations are at the slough versus the surrounding area, except for what Pajaro Valley has mapped. It is something that we could look into.	Meeting comment - noted.
130					Meeting	3/3/2021	Caroline Chapin	We talked about residential recharge. What about ag? We have berries and plastic in hilly areas. That creates a lot of runoff. Have we talked about recharge projects related to that?	Abby Ostovar: It is included in "decentralized stormwater", but more in the sense that you could immediately irrigate with captured stormwater. In the Eastside we were talking about capturing overland flow and recharging it, we could add that as well.	Meeting comment - noted.
131					Meeting	3/3/2021	Caroline Chapin	About the Gabilan Creek diversion, if we are taking runoff, how does that affect Eastside?	Abby Ostovar: They may not be very happy. You have to work with your neighbors and coordinate.	Meeting comment - noted.
132					Meeting	3/3/2021	Jenny Balmagia	I have a question about the Prunedale shopping center decentralized stormwater project. You said it would cost \$3.3 million. What does that include? Are there cheaper options for a detention basin, maybe one that's vegetated instead of including a lot of construction.	Abby Ostovar: That project would capture runoff from the shopping center, the parking lot and nearby impervious area. It would be an underground facility, under the parking lot where it could infiltrate. There's no space for anything on the surface and permitting on Caltrans land by the highway is difficult. This was the best we could come up with based on conversations with our engineers.	Meeting comment - noted.
133					Meeting	3/3/2021	Jenny Balmagia	You say it's an example project. You looked at several projects and this was the best example?	Abby Ostovar: Yes, it came out of the subbasin committee as an idea, and it is an example for costs. We are changing this approach slightly to look at program that would incentivize folks anywhere across the subbasin to implement stormwater recharge projects.	Meeting comment - noted.
134					Meeting	3/3/2021	Tom Adcock	On the floodplain and stream restoration, aren't there other agencies also wanting to do this work and potentially receiving grants that could lower this cost? Can the models calculate the benefit?	Abby Ostovar: Yes, we would look into grant funding and cost sharing for any project. We are planning to do a model run with the SVIHM that looks at stream recharge and a realistic group of projects. We are working on it.	Meeting comment - noted.

									Jenny Balmagia: I'm the incoming watershed coordinator. I work with IRWM and GSA to coordinate projects like this. I can help identify funding mechanisms, too. My official start date is next week.	
135					Meeting	3/3/2021	Grant Leonard	Does everything automatically flow to the lowest point with no municipal collection of stormwater? So isn't it already flowing to the low point and recharging naturally? Or is there some other project we are talking about?	Abby Ostovar: Yes, it flows to the lowest point and sometimes the lowest point is outside the subbasin. We're trying to keep stormwater runoff inside the subbasin to get it to recharge and we could direct where it goes.	Meeting comment - noted.
136					Meeting	3/3/2021	Caroline Chapin	You said the unshaded "open" cells in the interconnected surface water figure were still going to be analyzed. I and others who live here know that during big storm events, significant amounts of water run through those drainages and runs over the basin and out of the basin. If we can capture that, and do targeted recharge, it would be valuable. Also, there are so many things that are unknown about this basin. Can we do more targeted research on what subbasin consists of and what is the best way to recharge it?	Abby Ostovar: Yes, in the implementation chapter, we will have "collect more data" and we can make sure what you are describing is included.	Meeting comment - noted.
137					Meeting	3/3/2021	Grant Leonard	We should think about project opportunities related to Highway 156. Caltrans plans to expand the highway.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
138					Meeting	3/3/2021	Margie Kay (via chat)	Would a water rights permit be required for a surface water diversion?"	Yes. The Implementation chapter will have more of a roadmap about the next steps. The project chapter will summarize the permits.	Meeting comment - noted.
139					Meeting	3/3/2021	Paul Robins	I have worked with RCD of Santa Cruz County on recharge basins on the north end of Langley going into Pajaro. In a number of those cases, they aren't diversion projects, they are capturing stormwater, and they have had to answer that same question about it being, in effect, a surface water diversion, in the minds of the Water Board. That's something we would have to address.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
140					Meeting	3/3/2021	Robin Lee	I have a question about the cost of rainwater harvesting. \$650,000 for each AF/year. That's not per year, that's a startup cost. Once we build the infrastructure, the water will be much cheaper.	Abby Ostovar: Yes, thank you, I'll fix that, it is an error on the slide.	Meeting comment - noted.

141					Meeting	3/3/2021	Robin Lee	You said in other places that the closer you are to the source, the more efficient recharge is. Residential areas are the source. This project would probably pay for itself over and over again because it's at the source: homes, sidewalks, that sort of thing. As a stormwater method, those centralized basins would be smaller and your land costs would go down if it's a more decentralized and in lieu. The cost for other things would go down if those projects were used more. Also, the Monterey Regional Water Agency had a big push a couple of years ago to use these decentralized processes. There should be data for that and how well their outreach accomplished their goals. I went to a couple of their workshops and they were well attended, but I don't know what the outcomes were. That's a roadmap we could use so that we're not reinventing the wheel. There should be something there. They were giving out small grants. We could follow that cost stream.	Abby Ostovar: One question, since there has already been an effort, does that reduce the number of houses who might still be interested?	Meeting comment - noted.
142					Meeting	3/3/2021	Robin Lee	Water costs keep going up. It's a different incentive now.	Abby Ostovar: Estimating the cost for a big infrastructure project is a different exercise. We could maybe break it out differently and separate out the costs a bit more, including if the GSA simply implemented a program (and didn't pay for the cisterns). At 10% uptake, the annual benefit is 29 AF/year.	Meeting comment - noted.
143					Meeting	3/3/2021	Robin Lee	Caroline said there are a lot of streams on the map that don't usually have flow but sometimes have a lot of flow. Would check dams be useful here? They are small and wouldn't be hindering movement of wildlife.	Abby Ostovar: There is potential here. That's similar to the Salinas River Diversion Facility. That's a rubber dam. I'm not sure how the flow compares to the Corral area, but that was an extremely costly project.	Meeting comment - noted.
144					Meeting	3/3/2021	Robin Lee	They can be small, not made from rubber, just made from rocks or wood. There would be many of them, so the cumulative impact could add up. If you put it up in the foothills where the sediments are coarser it would have more effect, and it wouldn't just help us, it could help Eastside, too. Look at the whole Valley, not just the subbasin. Thank you very much. It was a good presentation.	Abby Ostovar: This idea could potentially be incorporated into the Floodplain restoration project. We can look at that.	Meeting comment - noted.

145					Meeting	3/3/2021	James Sang	I like the idea of harvesting water from the roof. \$4,000-\$10,000 might be a little too much. I was hoping half the cost could be subsidized by the agency. This thing with the Prunedale shopping center is that I prefer when the stormwater actually goes to a vegetated basin. You shouldn't let stormwater go directly into the ground. Pollutants could get into the groundwater. Vegetated areas would filter out some of the chromium and lead and nitrate and phosphate and all kinds of chemical pollutants. When you inject stormwater directly into the ground, even if it passes through filters, I don't feel comfortable with the size of those filters. With the water from the Prunedale shopping center roof, has anyone thought about how to divert that into the ground somehow? I'd like to see swales next to Gabilan Creek. They could absorb water much faster and get it into groundwater. Another way is to use a 3- to 4-foot plow that breaks up hard sand. I disagree with CSIP. I don't think we should do anything there. We have dry land in Langley. We should try to improve our groundwater situation here before trying to expand CSIP.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
146					Meeting	3/3/2021	Shawn Nelson	We used to have some natural settling pond where the 156 interchange went in. They raised the land so now there are no more settling ponds. I wonder if we could ask Caltrans when they expand the highway to divert water so that would be a natural percolation down into the subbasin here instead of losing it to runoff. We could partner with Caltrans so that it's one big project instead of two separate projects side by side.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
147					Meeting	3/3/2021	Grant Leonard	For the floodplain and stream restoration, there is a N Salinas Valley Mosquito abatement district that often drain water to prevent mosquitos. Those old percolation ponds by the highway were drained on purpose. Would we need a partnership to make sure we don't have competing goals?	Paul Robins: Yes, we need to coordinate with them.	Meeting comment - noted.
148					Meeting	3/3/2021	James Sang	I want to put out the idea about the check dam, made of heavy rocks 2 feet tall. I think you could stop all that water leaving. I think it could get the ground to absorb that water.	Abby Ostovar: One challenge here is that there's a lot of sediment load as well. We will look into it.	Meeting comment - noted.
149					Meeting	3/3/2021	Margie Kay (via chat)	Is any of Granite Ridge subbasin, as identified in Fugro report in 1995, within Langley subbasin?	DW: We're going to address Granite Ridge in a talk coming up here.	Meeting comment - noted.
150					Meeting	3/3/2021	Caroline Chapin	I think this is something that we don't want to include but that we have to include to be responsible and have a responsible plan. My opinion is that Option 1 or Option 3 would be best.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
151					Meeting	3/3/2021	Shawn Nelson	You would meter private wells?	Abby Ostovar: We cannot meter <i>de minimis</i> (<2 AFY) wells. We're looking to examples elsewhere for guidance. It is tricky in Langley because <i>de minimis</i> users are a larger water user proportionately than in other subbasins.	Meeting comment - noted.

152					Meeting	3/3/2021	Tom Adcock	This is obviously very difficult. With a thorough review and discussion of a plan that SWRCB will approve, we want to show that we have the ability to manage withdrawals from the subbasin, right?	Abby Ostovar: Right, it could be included as a backup option. Better to establish it and have it if we need it than not to have a plan.	Meeting comment - noted.
153					Meeting	3/3/2021	Tom Adcock	Once a plan is in place, who would be the entity that decided when to enact allocations? It would be the GSA or the board, correct?	Abby Ostovar: Right, it would be the board to make the final decision. You may want to have a subbasin committee to establish the allocations. Emily Gardner: If I may, we're developing some ideas for what the subbasin planning committees could turn into during the implementation phase. Abby is right, any decision ultimately needs to be approved by the board, but committees can be the ones to suggest ideas and provide the needed input.	Meeting comment - noted.
154					Meeting	3/3/2021	Tom Adcock	Your estimation is that 20% of the subbasin are <i>de minimis</i> users. How did you calculate that?	Abby Ostovar: We took out all households/parcels that are connected to water systems, anything two connections or above. We took those out. For the remaining residential parcels, we estimated 0.4 AF/year per household.	Meeting comment - noted.
155					Meeting	3/3/2021	Tom Adcock	I like Option 3 because it considers lot size. Option 1 is simpler, based only on acreage. That seems reasonable, too.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
156					Meeting	3/3/2021	Paul Robins	I'm thinking of parcels, some may have 10 acres of wild land. Their use could be similar to a one-acre plot without open space. The acre size may not correlate to water use or need and may be better for development potential and that may be a concern. The question of drinking water priority in Option 2, it seems to oversimplify it in terms of a choice. How does the human right to water relate to this? Is there a finer way of looking at this that isn't such a broad brush, drinking water vs. commercial production? Isn't there a threshold that we need to maintain for drinking water?	Abby Ostovar: You could. There's some threshold we we don't want to go below for drinking water and drinking water could be maintained at that threshold. This comes out of the fact that, while overlies have the same groundwater rights, some could prescribe against another overlies. That has happened with regard to drinking water. It could be a combination, it's not that drinking water can take a ton and that irrigation has to take all the reduction. It could be nuanced.	Meeting comment - noted.
157					Meeting	3/3/2021	Grant Leonard	Thinking back to our January discussion, I also prefer Option 3 (Option 1 or 3).	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
158					Meeting	3/3/2021	Max Storms	For Paul's questions, suppose you have a house on 10 acres and a house on 1 acre and they're maybe using the same water. If they're in a water system, then it's two houses on 11 acres total of overlying rights. Option 2 would be something that CalWater would like to see, in my opinion. Option 3 makes a lot of sense as well. I don't know if there is any appetite to set a budget if we are going to go on a connection basis, based on what we may anticipate use per connection to be. For example, if the ten-acre lot uses more water, so maybe we look at that connection to determine their individual use and that would take additional analysis.	Abby Ostovar: Thank you, we are keeping track of all these comments. There's a lot to consider and there will be lots of nuances as this is set up.	Meeting comment - noted.
159					Meeting	3/3/2021	Robin Lee	When we had a drought, water companies had to cut back 15% or something. I assuming mutual water companies had to do the same. Did the smaller systems have to cut back as well?	Abby Ostovar: I'll have to look into that. They have different water rights. Municipal water systems have appropriate water rights.	Meeting comment - noted.

160					Meeting	3/3/2021	Robin Lee	Is the only difference in these options who gets regulated first?	Abby Ostovar: To clarify, everyone is regulated because they are included in the allocation structure, but some have to reduce water use before others depending on the Option.	Meeting comment - noted.
161					Meeting	3/3/2021	Caroline Chapin	It seems Option 3 is the one people have talked about most favorably. I like that one because it takes into account the differences.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
162					Meeting	3/3/2021	Shawn Nelson	I agree with Caroline	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
163					Meeting	3/3/2021	Paul Robins	I support the consensus. I'm too new to have my own opinion.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
164					Meeting	3/3/2021	Tom Adcock	I would go with Option 3.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
165					Meeting	3/3/2021	Max Storms	I would need more time. I'm new as well. Our preference is to look at it per acre. Option 3 might be a good alternative, I would just need more time.	Emily Gardner: I heard a motion and then someone seconded it and now there's a more organic vote happening.	Meeting comment - noted.
166					Meeting	3/3/2021	Caroline Chapin	Motion: Recommendation to proceed with Option 3.	Committee voted and motion passed.	Will be incorporated into Projects chapter.
167					Meeting	3/3/2021	Caroline Chapin	Re: Water Budget: There are a lot of unknowns.	DW: Yes, and the uncertainties are with small numbers that can change easily.	Meeting comment - noted.
168					Meeting	3/3/2021	Tom Adcock	I'm going back to the projects and thinking about outflows to other subbasins. There's a small, maybe expensive potential to bring CSIP water to Langley. Would that reduce outflow from Langley to 180/400?	DW: Yes, I believe it would. We are running simulations. It brings up a good question whether it benefits Langley. Once we get the simulation run, we'll have better numbers on the amount that it benefits this Subbasin.	Meeting comment - noted.
169					Meeting	3/3/2021	Shawn Nelson	Is storage loss actual water loss or just ability to store water?	DW: Thank you. Storage means water in storage. Capacity does not change. The amount of water in storage is changing.	Meeting comment - noted.
170					Meeting	3/3/2021	Shawn Nelson	How deep are the wells we are measuring [on the hydrograph]?	DW: I'm sorry, I don't know that. We can find out.	Meeting comment - noted.
171					Meeting	3/3/2021	Shawn Nelson	I monitor three wells. One is 800-ft deep and the other two are shallower wells. The deep well has gone down, while the shallower wells have gone up.	DW: It takes longer for recharge to reach the deep wells. When there is recharge available, the shallow wells top off more quickly.	Meeting comment - noted.
172					Meeting	3/3/2021	Shawn Nelson	Do we have any measurement of the spring water running out of the hills?	DW: Not that I know of, and it's probably not in this model because the model covers the whole valley, so it might not have that level of detail.	Meeting comment - noted.
173					Meeting	3/3/2021	Shawn Nelson	Where would it make most sense to put percolation ponds to recharge deep wells?	DW: Good question. For the deep wells, for percolation ponds, you'd want to look at where the sediments that the deep wells tap into outcrop at the surface. Another option would be injection wells and dry wells. Those are more expensive, but with them you can percolate the water into exactly where you want it.	Meeting comment - noted.
174					Meeting	3/3/2021	Amy Woodrow	I'm a hydrologist with Monterey County Water Resources Agency. With the northern corner of the basin, the basin has historically observed high water levels in that area. We assume there's a fault zone there. We see it during the spring and fall, shallow and deep. I do believe the USGS took that into account when they built the model.	DW: Thank you, Amy, that's good to know. I really appreciate that. We will now consider that accurate.	Meeting comment - noted.

175					Meeting	3/3/2021	Robin Lee	How long would it take for climate change to be reconciled with actual observations versus the modeling? I've been here since the mid-90s and it's a lot drier now than it was then. How long would we have to wait to know if the future model is right?	DW: That's a good question. Climate change can't be observed in any one year. It's a long-term issue. I think you're correct that everyone is observing what you're observing. We haven't had any long stretches of wet years for decades. So there is a disconnect between what we are observing and predicting of future climate change. This is why I'm suggesting that we continue to gather data and that we have in our back pocket project options available to use. We might not know for years. Remember that our proof of sustainability is the groundwater levels we measure. If we start seeing water levels dropping, we have to take action. Getting back to your question, we don't know how long it will take to confirm or deny the model's predictions. We better have projects and management actions ready, whether we have climate change or not, to get us to sustainability.	Meeting comment - noted.
176					Meeting	3/3/2021	Margie Kay (via chat)	What if we have another extended drought?	DW: The likelihood of a moderate drought is accounted for in the model. Extended droughts are not modeled. With climate change, it is possible that we will see something we haven't seen before. The general understanding is that we wouldn't be able to plan for something like that. We won't be penalized for that, but we might have to reassess what our new normal looks like. It wouldn't be an immediate disaster, but it would be a long-term thing we'd have to deal with.	Meeting comment - noted.
177					Email	4/12/2021	James Sang	I wanted to present some potential agenda items. 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) Reference b: You Tube video (Recharging A Well Part II - John Kaisner The Natural Farmer) Reference c: You Tube video (Swales on Contour can Drought -proof Gardens, Farms and Pastures with Water Harvested Passively by Edible Forest Gardens) Reference d: You Tube Video (Deep Soil Ripping for Water Conservation by Megan Clayton) 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.	Comment received.	Point #1 was considered throughout the Salinas Valley and it is incorporated in projects for other Subbasins. Point #2 has been incorporated into the overland flow MAR project which was modeled on the Pajaro Valley project noted.

							<p>2. Can you make a presentation on what UC Santa Cruz is doing to recharge their wells? This is what Robin Lee wanted.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Can you show this to all interested parties?</p>			
178	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> <p>While it is true that the SVIHM does not simulate domestic pumping, it seems unlikely that all of the annual variability is due to domestic pumping. Consider mentioning other sources of uncertainty.</p> <p>The SRDF diversion rate (18 cfs) used for the projected water budget is much lower than the 36 cfs that MCWRA targets for availability at the SRDF, and which can be diverted during maximum demands. Rates lower than 20 cfs present operational issues with getting water to the impoundment.</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> <p>Noted. The text referring to domestic pumping as the cause of annual variability was removed from the GSP.</p> <p>The SRDF diversion rate used in the SVOM (18cfs) is lower than what MCWRA targets (36 cfs), this is something that will be fixed in the future.</p>
179					Meeting	5/5/2021	James Sang	<p>When the implementation committee is picked, I'd like to see members that are currently on each subbasin be on each implementation committee, especially the stakeholders who have to pay the \$4 or \$5 per acre-foot.</p>	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
180					Meeting	5/5/2021	Paul Robins	<p>How do other GSPs and DWR deal with inconsistent data?</p>	Derrick Williams: This happens everywhere and DWR is aware of it. DWR expects good faith efforts when estimating pumping. Salinas Valley is actually better off than most basins.	Meeting comment - noted.

181					Meeting	5/5/2021	Paul Robins	Is this the only subbasin that has not had an overdraft situation? Will this plan prevent overdraft in the future?	Abby Ostovar: Forebay and Upper Valley are also right on the sustainability line like Langley. Langley's GSP will plan for growth and for climate change. We are setting up to be responsive to changing groundwater conditions. The plan will take years to implement and we need to collect missing data. It's not as urgent as in other subbasins but we do want to start soon.	Meeting comment - noted.
182					Meeting	5/5/2021	Paul Robins	I assume the other subbasins in crisis situations in Salinas Valley Basin will have higher priority for funding.	<p>Emily Gardner: It's something we've been talking about recently. Each subbasin has unique goals and each subbasin needs to have resources, both independent of their sustainability status and dependent on their valley-wide prioritization. There needs to be equity across subbasins and then prioritization based on critical situations like seawater intrusion and overdraft.</p> <p>Abby Ostovar: There are also several projects that could benefit multiple subbasins. Grant funding is another opportunity.</p> <p>Caroline Chapin: Historically we may not have been in overdraft, but geologically I think there are some pockets where we've had problems. That's something we should keep in mind.</p>	Meeting comment - noted.
183					Meeting	5/5/2021	Grant Leonard	Abby, two questions about [projects] C1 and C2. Who would implement the Floodplain Enhancement and Stormwater Recharge Project?	Abby Ostovar: Several organizations are involved in these kinds of projects: CCWG, Resource Conservation District, IRWM. The GSA is more concerned with the recharge aspects of these project, and these are multi-benefit projects.	Meeting comment - noted.
184					Meeting	5/5/2021	Grant Leonard	How does that CSIP expansion relate to Monterey One Water?	Abby Ostovar: It isn't tied to the expansion that is going on for the Monterey Peninsula. Monterey One Water has tertiary treatment and reverse osmosis advanced treatment. For CSIP we only need tertiary treatment. We don't know where the additional source water would come from. Further analysis is needed to determine how much CSIP expansion would benefit Langley.	Meeting comment - noted.
185					Meeting	5/5/2021	Jenny Balmagia	The Central Coast Wetlands Group is interested in building a coalition of people to implement the recharge basin project. We might take the lead. There could be grant opportunities for flooding.	Abby Ostovar: The recharge basins costs are separated out because of the GSA focus on the recharge aspect of these projects.	Meeting comment - noted.
186					Meeting	5/5/2021	Mayra Hernandez	Local groundwater elevation trigger is a good first step. We support a system where well owners can notify the Groundwater Sustainability Agency or partner Agency if their wells go dry. There is so much uncertainty regarding potential impacts on domestic wells. This program should include local groundwater elevation triggers and a plan to prevent drinking water users from dewatering, quality changes and more.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.

187					Meeting	5/5/2021	James Sang	At a previous meeting we were told that the southern part of Langley was in overdraft, but I don't see any projects to address that. I'd like to see a plan for berms or swales in that area. It sounds like Ms. Hernandez is concerned about water quality. If you clean rain gutters properly and if you clean the tank, I think rooftop rainwater harvesting would be an easy way to get potable water. I'd like to see funding available to subsidize rooftop rainwater harvesting. Even if it was just \$1,000 or \$2,000 per household, I think you could find a lot of homeowners who would be willing to pay the rest. The only bioswales I've heard discussed were ones at the Monterey subcommittee. They were 4 feet of gravel with weeds and more gravel on top of that. I'm concerned about the quality of water that is infiltrating. It could be contaminated with pollution from runoff from our streets. Bioremediation could help if we had one foot of soil with plant life on top to try to clean up this water before it infiltrates. With managed aquifer recharge, I assume you'll have a plan for the recharge basin. Trenching and swales are good because they're below the surface of the ground. It prevents rainwater from being evaporated. Evaporation from a recharge basin could be substantial.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
188					Meeting	5/5/2021	Caroline Chapin	You asked for prioritization of pumping controls or allocations. I think the way we described them before was, "The tool we need to have in our toolbox but hope we never have to use." I would rather see recharge basins prioritized above pumping allocations. Perhaps the outreach can begin so we can talk about the allocation structure, but hopefully implement recharge projects first. If we do revisit groundwater sustainable management criteria, it would be useful for you to look at a few years that could be minimum thresholds or measurable objectives and give us some suggestions.	Abby Ostovar: I can respond to your second comment. One approach that another subbasin has taken is to look at a range of years. For each well, rather than peg everything to one year, we can pick a low and a high for each well and use those to help us decide. That may be appropriate for Langley where we're seeing a lot of local variation in groundwater levels.	Meeting comment - noted.
189					Meeting	5/5/2021	James Sang	I am against any kind of water being taken away from farmers. I think we should approach this problem by trying to recharge groundwater before restricting water use. I would like to see how well these plans work before taking more drastic steps.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
190					Meeting	5/5/2021	Paul Robins	Given the very localized nature of the pockets, etc. where there are issues for folks, the solutions for people may need to be localized. It may be that recharge works great in some areas where there is the right geology but not in others where they are experiencing shortages. I would assume that for this plan, there may need to be a sub-subbasin solution for areas where recharge projects may not be an option.	Abby Ostovar: I should clarify, when I say there are localized issues, it's still not fully understood. We don't know how connected the aquifer is. The groundwater elevation trigger is in part meant to address that and draw our attention to trouble spots. As for more localized recharge projects, I don't know that we need to necessarily carve it out now, but that is something we can think about going forward.	Meeting comment - noted.

191					Meeting	5/5/2021	Caroline Chapin	Prioritize recharge projects. Concurrently, begin the stakeholder outreach for the development of the allocation structure. Only implement the allocation structure if we have to, not as a priority.	Abby Ostovar: Allocations can take a long time to plan, so even if we think we won't implement them, it's still a good idea to get started on the planning. Since allocations are our only demand-side option, they can be particularly helpful with drought management and for demand increases, like if more land comes into production.	Meeting comment - noted.
192					Meeting	5/5/2021	Caroline Chapin	It is our only demand side option, but we need to make sure that we communicate to stakeholders that it's a last resort.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
193					Meeting	5/5/2021	Tom Adcock	Maybe we could set a trigger and that's something we could discuss with stakeholders.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
194					Meeting	5/5/2021	Caroline Chapin	We can tell stakeholders, here's the trigger, but there are other precautions we're taking too so that hopefully allocations won't be needed.	Abby Ostovar: Yes, thank you. One last thing I'll say is that many of these groundwater issues are interrelated.	Meeting comment - noted.
195					Meeting	5/5/2021	Mayra Hernandez	I had a quick question about the 4 new wells to fill data gaps. Why only 4 new wells for the monitoring network?	Abby Ostovar: Looking at the distribution of the monitoring network, there are 4 clear data gaps we want to fill and we think one well each would be enough for spatial coverage. Those are the top priority. Wells are expensive.	Meeting comment - noted.
196					Meeting	5/5/2021	Mayra Hernandez	What are the criteria for choosing those wells?	DW: There are regulatory requirements. It has to represent the area. We have to have construction information on the well. We have to be able to access the well with a willing landowner to give access to take water level measurements.	Meeting comment - noted.
197					Meeting	5/5/2021	Mayra Hernandez	For the monitoring system, there are only 15 Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program wells. That seems like a low number and it only includes on-farm domestic wells. Is there any plan to include domestic wells in the state and small water system data in the monitoring network?	Abby Ostovar: The local water system data isn't reported to the state to the GAMA website. It's not that they're not important, it's that we have a sufficient amount of wells in the monitoring network.	Meeting comment - noted.
198					Meeting	5/5/2021	Mayra Hernandez	We are Community Water Center would like to see a more representative monitoring network that includes state and local water system wells since those are the wells that serve the most people in the subbasin.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
199					Meeting	5/5/2021	James Sang	For these projects currently planned, what benefits do you see in the model? And how do I get a copy of this presentation?	Abby Ostovar: Emily will post a copy of this presentation. We don't know how water levels will change as a result of these projects. For example, for the managed aquifer recharge project, we haven't chosen sites yet. Once we get further into the planning process, that's when we can quantify benefits in more detail. For now, it's more conceptual.	Meeting comment - noted.
200					Meeting	5/5/2021	James Sang	Will wells far away, like 10 miles away, be affected by these projects?	Abby Ostovar: We don't know how connected the aquifer is. We talk about that in the data gaps section of the GSP.	Meeting comment - noted.
201					Meeting	5/5/2021	James Sang	So you'll be collecting that information before you implement these projects?	Abby Ostovar: That is what we are proposing. That would be ideal.	Meeting comment - noted.
202					Meeting	5/5/2021	Robin Lee	I was wondering who will be doing all this monitoring. Is that subcontracted work or is it the Water Resources Agency that does it?	Abby Ostovar: We haven't gotten to that level of detail yet. We are just identifying what needs to be done.	Meeting comment - noted.

									DW: Generally, we don't want to invent new monitoring systems. We prefer to leverage existing monitoring systems.	
203					Meeting	5/5/2021	Mayra Hernandez	It's great to see there's a process in place to reach out to affected stakeholders, especially underrepresented members of the community. I see there are plans for workshops and additional resources. I don't see what outreach strategy will be used to engage underrepresented communities.	Abby Ostovar: That hasn't been released yet, but it is coming.	Meeting comment - noted.
204					Meeting	6/3/2021	James Sang	I like that you're lowering the minimum threshold, but I think it should be set lower to what water levels were in 1990. Based on climate change theories, air temperatures are increasing and every increase of 1 degree causes atmospheric moisture to rise by 4 percent. I worry that this might be first year of a new drought. That's why I would like to see the minimum threshold lowered even further. I don't want failure to meet a minimum threshold to prevent anyone from doing the work they do.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
205					Meeting	6/3/2021	Robin Lee	Derrick, how accurate is the measure of the volume of an aquifer?	DW: Do you mean how much water is in storage in an aquifer? It is an estimate and there is uncertainty. That's one benefit of the proxy approach where all we have to do is measure groundwater levels. As long as the groundwater levels stay above the minimum thresholds, then we have enough water in storage.	Meeting comment - noted.
206					Meeting	6/3/2021	Robin Lee	And isn't Langley pretty heterogeneous geologically?	DW: Somewhat, but something that makes measuring groundwater storage difficult in Langley is how hilly the subbasin is.	Meeting comment - noted.
207					Meeting	6/3/2021	James Sang	It's really hard to understand the way you explained it today. Yesterday in Eastside you explained it as a certain amount of water that can be used while staying within the sustainable yield. I think the best way to determine whether any action should be taken is you already have the well, you know the minimum threshold. I think the only other number you need is some accurate number saying how much can be pumped out of the well. If the minimum threshold is reached, then you stop using water and the Agency should help the well owner.	DW: Thank you, Mr. Sang. I'm trying to find the right balance between being informative but not giving too many details. I'm happy to give more information to any committee members who want it.	Meeting comment - noted.
208					Meeting	6/3/2021	Colby Pereira	I think we should move toward the proxy approach for now. It makes sense on a lot of levels. It is easy to implement and we can always reevaluate.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
209					Meeting	6/3/2021	Robin Lee	I have a question about the location of the Groundwater Extraction Management System (GEMS) wells. How imperative is it to get a more representative view of the Langley subbasin?	DW: GEMS provides barely any coverage in Langley. If we wanted more information, we would need to expand GEMS to cover more than 10 percent of Langley that's currently covered, and we would also have to expand to cover more types of wells. Domestic wells are important in Langley.	Meeting comment - noted.

210					Meeting	6/3/2021	Caroline Chapin	I like idea to use the groundwater levels as a proxy approach. There are so many unknowns and GW levels are something that we can measure objectively. How comfortable are you with our ability to show the correlation between groundwater levels and storage?	DW: We'll watch reviews of other Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSPs) that have already taken this approach. The feedback I have inferred from Department of Water Resources (DWR) so far is that we need to show some scientific correlation and probably we would also show it in our model results. Even if the model isn't 100 percent trustworthy, if it shows a correlation, that's still helpful. A strict reading of the regulations we will never do because then a correlation is defined as correlating a change in groundwater levels and the total amount of pumping in the subbasin. That can't be proved because there are too many other variables. DWR has said that if the proxy we choose is a reasonable proxy, that is good enough, and I have confidence we can do that.	Meeting comment - noted.
211					Meeting	6/3/2021	Grant Leonard	I concur with Caroline and Colby about using proxies. I think it's the most logical choice for this basin.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
212					Meeting	6/3/2021	Paul Robins	I move to vote to accept the recommendation to use the proxy of groundwater levels for the storage SMC.	Comment received.	Motion passed with consensus
213					Meeting	6/3/2021	Robin Lee	There's a creek on the north end of the Subbasin that flows into the Elkhorn Slough. Would any project on that creek benefit the Subbasin?	Abby Ostovar: If the creek is in the subbasin, it would benefit the subbasin. It might be a local benefit only, but there would be some benefit. Grant Leonard: Carneros Creek	Meeting comment - noted.
214					Meeting	6/3/2021	Paul Robins	Just speaking to your question, as I understand it, the groundwater basin for which the Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency manages extends that far south.	Comment received.	Meeting comment - noted.
215					Meeting	6/3/2021	James Sang	On the recharge basins, I think what you're trying to do is find an area where you can put a lot of water into a pond. Will that ground be checked for whether that water will be absorbed quickly? If not, I'd like to see the water routed to swales instead, which will prevent evaporation. I notice that another project is managed aquifer recharge. Is that where you store water in a certain area but you can also take water out of it in other areas?	Abby Ostovar: Managed aquifer recharge is very similar to the recharge basins. The way it is scoped is one way where we're just recharging the aquifer, not withdrawing, but sometimes managed aquifer recharge also includes water markets or other means to withdraw water. Each project that's chosen will have more refined cost estimates and benefit analyses.	Meeting comment - noted.
216					Meeting	6/3/2021	James Sang	Are there any studies as to how much water will evaporate from those ponds versus how much water would evaporate in a shallow trench instead? For all this work that we're doing, I think we should try to prevent evaporation and get the water into the ground.	Abby Ostovar: There are some studies. For example, in Eastside, we were scoping a floodplain enhancement project where we took that into account. Ideally, we also want a continuous saturated zone when you are recharging the water.	Meeting comment - noted.
217					Meeting	6/3/2021	James Sang	Has any study been done on the ability of stakeholders to pay for these huge bills? Are they going to be affordable to these people or are they going to go out of business?	Caroline Chapin: I'll clarify because a similar question came up recently. The sources of funding for GSP planning versus project planning are two different things and part of the implementation is deciding on funding mechanisms.	Meeting comment - noted.