

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DRAFT GSP AND RESPONSES

APPENDIX B – COMMENTS RECEIVED

Draft Groundwater Sustainability Plan – Public Comments Received		
ID and Commenter	Document Type and Date	Separate Attachments
1. The Nature Conservancy	Letter dated 9/9/2019	Attachments A, B, C, D & E
2. NOAA - National Marine Fisheries Service	Letter dated 9/10/2019	
3. California Department of Fish and Wildlife	Letter dated 9/12/2019	
4. Audubon California; Clean Water Action and Clean Water Fund; Local Government Commission; The Nature Conservancy; Union of Concerned Scientists	Letter dated 9/19/2019	Appendix A
5. Jerome Paul	Letter dated 9/19/2019 ¹	
6. Soquel Creek Water District	Letter dated 9/19/2019	
7. Becky Steinbruner	Email 8/14/2019	
8. Becky Steinbruner	Email 8/28/2019	
9. Becky Steinbruner	Email 8/29/2019	
10. Ramona Andre	Email 9/14/2019	
11. Richard Andre	Email 9/14/2019	
12. Cliff Bixler	Email 9/16/2019	
13. Larry Freeman	Email 9/16/2019	Attachment
14. Becky Steinbruner	Email 9/17/2019	
15. Scott McGilvray	Email 9/18/2019	2 Attachments
16. Linda Wilshusen	Email 9/18/2019	
17. Debra Wirkman	Email 9/18/2019	
18. Tom Butler	Email 9/19/2019	
19. Douglas Deitch	Email 9/19/2019	13 Attachments
20. Douglas Deitch	Email 9/19/2019	2 Attachments
21. Erica Stanojevic	Email 9/19/2019	Attachment
22. Becky Steinbruner	Email 9/19/2019	
23. Becky Steinbruner	Comment Card dated 1/17/2019 ²	
24. Becky Steinbruner	Comment Card dated 1/17/2019 ²	
25. Becky Steinbruner	Comment Card dated 1/18/2019 ²	
26. Craig	Comment Card dated 7/20/2019	
27. Becky Steinbruner	Comment Card dated 7/22/2019	
28. Becky Steinbruner	Comment Card dated 7/22/2019	
29. Becky Steinbruner	Comment Card dated 7/22/2019	
30. Michael M.	Comment Card undated ²	
31. Becky Steinbruner	Oral Comment 9/19/2019	

¹ Draft GSP comment letter hand delivered at 9/19/2019 MGA Board Meeting during another agenda item.
²Draft GSP comment cards were not produced and available until the July 18, 2019 MGA Board meeting

See Draft Groundwater Sustainability Plan Public Comments [here](#).

Draft Groundwater Sustainability Plan – Public Comments & Responses

Comment Theme	Main point(s)	Comment ID¹	Comments Resulting in GSP changes
Beneficial Users	Concerns regarding adequate representation	1, 4, 27	1, 4, 27
	Disadvantaged Communities	2, 4	2, 4
Committees	Composition of Committees	1, 4, 22, 27	1, 4, 22, 27
	GSP Advisory Committee did not develop its own recommendations for MGA board (rubber stamp)	27	27
Document Presentation	Document organization is confusing, lack of Table of Contents	8, 27	
Fees/Raftelis	Private Pumper Future Fees & Raftelis White Paper	25, 28	25, 28
GW Modeling	Pumping, modeling and groundwater levels	29	29
	Water Budget/climate change	4, 6	4, 6
Mapping	Add elements to maps	1, 3, 4	1, 3, 4
Monitoring	Stream gage monitoring cost critique	13	13
	Stream monitoring text review and proposed technique	1, 2, 3, 4, 13	1, 2, 3, 4, 13
	Monitoring network	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 31	10, 11, 12, 18, 26, 30, 31
Outreach	July & August 2019 GSP oral presentation criticisms	9, 10, 26	
	Communications and Engagement Plan	4	4
Projects & Mgmt. Actions	Support Pure Water Soquel (PWS)	12, 18	
	Oppose PWS	10, 11, 26	
	Questions about projects and management actions	5, 15, 25, 30	5, 15,
	Criticism of project analysis	5, 15	
	Clarify project description	13, 16	13, 16
	Clarify project costs or assumptions for ASR	16	16
Public Comment	Public comments on Draft GSP should be made available to the public verbatim	22, 23, 31	
	Extend public comment period by 60-days (Nov. 8)	21	
Overall	GSP is inadequate	5, 21	21
	State should manage Basin	19, 20	
	Basin boundary concerns	1, 22	1
	Typos/corrections	13	13
References	References not available; lack of citations	1, 2, 4, 8, 14, 16, 21, 27	1, 2, 4, 8, 14, 16, 21, 27

¹ ID from comment table included in *Compiled Comments on the Draft GSP* found [here](http://www.midcountygroundwater.org/sites/default/files/uploads/Draft_GSP_Public_Comments_2019-1004.pdf) or www.midcountygroundwater.org/sites/default/files/uploads/Draft_GSP_Public_Comments_2019-1004.pdf

Comment Theme	Main point(s)	Comment ID¹	Comments Resulting in GSP changes
Surface Water Sustainable Management Criteria	Poor correlation between stream flow and GW levels	1, 2, 3, 4, 6	1, 2, 3, 4, 6
	Limitations in existing GW & SW monitoring network	1, 2, 6	1, 2, 6
	Concerns regarding stream flow estimate and Basin impacts	2, 4, 6	2, 4, 6
	Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems (GDE) definition criteria/resources used and GDE management	1, 4	1, 4
	Effects on Environmental Beneficial Users & GDE	1, 4, 6	1, 4, 6
	Concerns re SW & GW modeling adequacy/calibration	1, 2, 6	1, 2, 6
Water Quality	Water quality comments	7, 8, 10, 11 12, 14, 18, 17, 26 30	7, 8, 10, 11 12, 14, 18, 17, 26, 30

Continued

¹ ID from comment table included in *Compiled Comments on the Draft GSP* found [here](http://www.midcountygroundwater.org/sites/default/files/uploads/Draft_GSP_Public_Comments_2019-1004.pdf) or [www.midcountygroundwater.org/sites/default/files/uploads/Draft GSP Public Comments 2019-1004.pdf](http://www.midcountygroundwater.org/sites/default/files/uploads/Draft_GSP_Public_Comments_2019-1004.pdf)