

Comment Source	Date	Commentor	Subject	Section, Page Number, Figure, Table	Comment or Issue	Addressed By	Response	Status/Notes
SAC Member	9/24/2020	Donna Senauer	General	NA	How long will the length of public comment period be for Chapter 2?	GSA	There are two different types of public comment timeframes. First there is a comment period for the public to comment on any element of the GSP. This is open as long as any GSP chapter is in draft. The second is a public review period for entire GSP, which will be 90 days once all the chapters of the GSP had been drafted, reviewed and compiled into a final administrative draft.	Completed
SAC Member	9/24/2020	Stan Roden	General	NA	What is the deadline for committee comments to current draft of GSP Chapter 2?	GSA	The GSA is requesting SAC comments on the Chapter 2 draft by the first week of October 2020.	Completed
SAC Member	9/24/2020	Donna Senauer	General	NA	Are comments preferred as verbal or in written form?	GSA	Comments are preferred to be received in written format via email, dropbox, or hard copy. An Excel spreadsheet will be created and used to track all meeting comments as well as comments on the draft of Chapter 2 of the GSP.	Completed
SAC Member	9/24/2020	Donna Senauer	Monitoring Wells	NA	What regulatory agencies handle permitting for these monitoring wells which only are meant to acquire "monitoring data"?	GSA	All monitoring wells that the GSA intends to drill will be permitted through County of Santa Barbara Department of Environmental Health Services, which is the regulatory agency for monitoring and producing groundwater wells. If the wells are located within the coastal zone, they may also require Coastal Commission approval.	Completed
SAC Member	9/24/2020	Donna Senauer	Monitoring Wells	NA	Clarification on the difference between monitoring wells and producing wells and how it relates to the wells the GSA plans to drill.	GSA	Monitoring wells will not be permitted as extraction wells, and the GSA believes that monitoring wells will not be able to be converted to extraction wells for the life of the wells. GSA will confirm with Legal on this issue.	Completed
SAC Member	9/24/2020	Donna Senauer	Streamflow Monitoring	NA	Could the GSA use the one operational gage in the Basin	GSA, MN	Data from the existing stream gage on Montecito Creek monitored and maintained by the County of Santa Barbara will be used to the extent that the data are made available and are determined to be of use (e.g., of sufficient temporal resolution). Data being used for calibration of BNM.	Completed
SAC Member	9/24/2020	Donna Senauer	General	NA	Is the Groundwater Sustainability Parcel Fee proportional to acreage and, if so, recommends that this be more-widely publicized	GSA	Yes, the fee is proportional to the parcel acreage that overlies the groundwater basin. More information will be added to the GSA website on this subject.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Land Subsidence	2.2.4.5	In some basins there are survey data of monuments collected by the County in some areas, so I am wondering if that type of data might exist for the MWD area?	DP	The location of existing survey monuments and continuous global positioning system (CPGS) stations operated by the County of Santa Barbara, UNAVCO, USGS, DWR, and NOAA were reviewed. There are no CPGS stations within or near the basin that can be used for monitoring land subsidence. Yes, the County has survey monuments, at least one of which is in the basin; however, there is currently no plan to regularly survey the monument as the risk for inelastic subsidence in the basin has been determined to be low.	Completed
TAC Member	9/16/2020	Tim Thompson	Land Subsidence	2.2.4.5	In some basins there are survey data of monuments collected by the County in some areas, so I am wondering if that type of data might exist for the MWD area?	DP	The location of existing survey monuments and continuous global positioning system (CPGS) stations operated by the County of Santa Barbara, UNAVCO, USGS, DWR, and NOAA were reviewed. There are no CPGS stations within or near the basin that can be used for monitoring land subsidence. Yes, the County has survey monuments, at least one of which is in the basin; however, there is currently no plan to regularly survey the monument as the risk for inelastic subsidence in the basin has been determined to be low. (Note that this is a duplicate comment - identical response).	Completed
TAC Member	9/16/2020	Tim Thompson	Groundwater Modeling	2.3.3.2	A better characterization or quantification of groundwater interchange to the west of the basin (towards Santa Barbara) and to the east (towards Carpinteria) will be valuable for long term basin management. I was anticipating that this could be done as part of the groundwater modeling which I understand is currently in process. Will this be the case?	TJ	Yes, this is the case. The Basin Numerical Model will treat the jurisdictional boundaries between the Montecito Groundwater Basin and the Santa Barbara and Carpinteria Basins using a general head boundary condition - this approach allows the model to directly compute rates and volumes of groundwater interchange between Basins throughout time.	Completed
TAC Member	9/16/2020	Tim Thompson	Groundwater Modeling	2.3.3.2	Return flow evaluation would benefit from assessing the quantification of groundwater interchange at most if not all of the parcels in the District, rather than only at the larger parcels.	TJ	The Basin Numerical Model will incorporate return flows for both large and small parcels. Return flow estimates and locations will be based on MWD water delivery rasters that characterize historical deliveries across the basin. These rasters do not directly relate deliveries to individual parcels, but provide delivery volumes at a 500 x 500-ft spatial resolution. Dudek will use these rasters to help characterize initial estimates of return flows, which will be adjusted, as needed, during model calibration.	Completed
TAC Member	9/16/2020	Tim Thompson	Monitoring Wells	NA	Interested in where new monitoring wells will be recommended to fill some of the data gaps	DP, MN	The location for new monitoring wells will be addressed later in the GSP process in Chapter 3 - Sustainable Management Criteria and Monitoring Network. Based on data gaps and location of existing wells, potential locations for new monitoring wells include areas of the Toro Canyon Storage Unit and Storage Unit 2 where groundwater level and quality data are currently sparse. Note that the TAC will be consulted as locations are considered.	Completed

Comment Source	Date	Commentor	Subject	Section, Page Number, Figure, Table	Comment or Issue	Addressed By	Response	Status/Notes
TAC Member	9/16/2020	Tim Thompson	Groundwater Modeling	2.3.3.2	It will be important in the characterization and modeling of Storage Units 1 through 3 to consider the evidence that the aquifer materials are highly heterogeneous. Our thoughts during previous work for MWD were that historical debris flows are a likely mechanism for the formation of these aquifers. We've surely seen that areas such as where many of the MWD wells exist have pretty good yield, whereas not far away yields from other wells area considerably less. This aspect will also likely tie into the discussion that occurred during the meeting regarding the difference in groundwater-in-storage versus recoverable groundwater, i.e. Slade's 1991 estimate. How is this variability being addressed in the model?	TJ	<p>Aquifer heterogeneity will be incorporated into the model to the extent that is required to match historical water level trends in the basin. Development of the model will begin using average values of aquifer properties within a given storage unit. Following the ASTM groundwater model development guidelines, Dudek will initialize aquifer properties using simplified, homogeneous property representations, and introduce zonal heterogeneity as is needed and evidenced by the model's ability to reproduce water levels. Dudek will incorporate, to the best of their ability, depositional setting and understanding when introducing higher levels of heterogeneity into the model.</p> <p>This approach is supported by data on aquifer properties that are largely collected by pumping a test well during development and measuring drawdown at that given well. These tests help characterize transmissivity and specific capacity at the test well, but do not provide information on the length-scales over which these properties are correlated.</p>	Completed
TAC Member	9/16/2020	Steve Bachman	Geology	Figures 2-12 to 2-14	Cross Sections have different scales. Consider making same scale for consistency.	DP	Recommendation noted. Adjustment of the scales will be discussed and considered. The horizontal scale on Figure 2-14 can easily be adjusted to match Figures 2-12 and 2-13. Adjusting the vertical scale on all of the figures would require either eliminating some valuable information from the figures with the larger scales (e.g., Figure 2-12), or adding information that is currently unavailable to extend the scale on the figures with smaller scales (e.g., Figure 2-13).	Completed
TAC Member	9/16/2020	Steve Bachman	Groundwater Modeling	2.3.3.2	How will groundwater-in-storage versus recoverable groundwater be defined/calculated? Will sea-level be used as a reference point?	TJ	Groundwater in storage will be directly computed from the model using calibrated estimates of storage properties, water levels, and basin geometry. The groundwater in storage calculations will provide an estimate of total groundwater stored within the principal aquifer, from land surface to bedrock. Recoverable groundwater will be defined based on the definitions of undesirable results for the basin, which will be addressed in Chapter 3 of the GSP. Sea-level as a reference point will be considered when defining minimum thresholds and measurable objectives for the basin.	Completed
TAC Member	9/16/2020	Rick Hoffman	Monitoring Wells	NA	Suggest targeting higher productive areas for monitoring wells.	DP, MN	Recommendation noted. The installation of new monitoring wells in the more productive areas of the basin will be considered during the well siting and design process. Note that the TAC will be consulted regarding the placement and design of the proposed monitoring wells.	Completed
TAC Member	9/16/2020	Rick Hoffman	Monitoring Wells	NA	Will provide recommendations on regional drilling companies that can construct multi-zone completion monitoring wells.	DP	Great, thank you.	Completed
TAC Member	9/16/2020	Rick Hoffman	Seawater Intrusion	NA	Age of wells to be considered. Suggest using wells with PVC casing vs steal for monitoring network, consider running video logs on wells in network to determine casing condition.	DP	Recommendation noted. The use of PVC for new seawater intrusion monitoring wells and completion of video logs in existing wells will be considered during development of the monitoring network.	Completed
Public	9/16/2020	Steve Slack	Streamflow Monitoring	NA	Requested being informed of locations and gage types when they are installed.	DP, MN	Mr. Slack and the general public will be informed of the locations and gage types installed when the work is completed. A description of the streamflow monitoring network and gage locations will likely be provided in report format. In addition, the project development will be presented at TAC and other public meetings prior to its implementation.	Completed
TAC Member	9/16/2020	Steve Bachman	Seawater Intrusion	2.2.4.3	Seawater Intrusion reference is confusing and should be reworded- refer to Loaciaga section. As written in the draft the topic of seawater intrusion is referenced as currently occurring which has yet to be determined.	DP	As currently written, the Section 2.2.4.3 does not draw any conclusions, rather it presents the observations and hypotheses presented in previous published works which are speculative but inconclusive. As stated in Section 2.2.4.3, "additional monitoring at regular intervals and with adequate spatial coverage is necessary to establish whether seawater intrusion has occurred and to evaluate and adapt sustainability criteria related to seawater intrusion."	Completed
TAC Member	9/16/2020	Steve Bachman	Seawater Intrusion	2.2.4.3	Noted the advisability of using the northern-most well as an "ambient well" for comparison and it might be good to add another. (Staying within Storage Unit 3).	DP	Recommendation noted. The spatial coverage of monitoring wells will be considered during development of the seawater intrusion groundwater monitoring network.	Completed
TAC Member	9/16/2020	Rick Hoffman	Streamflow Monitoring	NA	Will the program be gaging surface flow only, or shallow sub-surface flow as well?	GSA	Currently, the plan is to design the streamflow monitoring program for monitoring surface flow only; however, monitoring of hyporheic zone flow will be discussed and considered prior to finalizing the streamflow monitoring program.	Completed
TAC Member	9/16/2020	Steve Bachman	Monitoring Wells	NA	Requested that the preliminary design of wells to be reviewed by the TAC.	GSA	Draft monitoring well design and construction details will be presented to the TAC for review and comment when available.	Completed
SAC Member	10/6/2020	Donna Senauer	Metering	NA	MWD had a water meter moratorium in place for xxxxx amount of years which contributed to the increase in water well drilling and development during those drought years.	MN	Information on the water meter moratoriums of 1973 and 2014 has been added to Section 2.1.3.3.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	General	NA	Needs consistency with identifying acronyms with their associated description (am certain there will be an intro with equivalencies).	DP	An abbreviations and acronyms list will be included with the GSP.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	General	NA	Always reference the origin date of any Act etc. (i.e. Porter Cologne etc.).	DP	The origin dates of all Acts referenced in the GSP have been added.	Completed

Comment Source	Date	Commentor	Subject	Section, Page Number, Figure, Table	Comment or Issue	Addressed By	Response	Status/Notes
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Jurisdictions	2.1	Need clarity on a descriptive where 'a 210 acre portion of the eastern edge of the City of Santa Barbara' lies.	DP, MN	Figure 2-2, Water Purveyors within and adjacent to the Groundwater Sustainability Agency Boundary shows where the City of Santa Barbara overlaps the basin. The complexity of the boundary does not lend itself to a narrative.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Jurisdictions	2.1	'Coincident with' needs more clarity when described... coincident term should be actually 'one and the same basin' or 'interconnected'... i.e. the parameters of the boundaries are on 'paper only' for purposes of jurisdiction, particularly with the MGB coastal groundwater basin.	DP	Coincident in this context means 'occupying the same place or position,' meaning the basins share a mutual boundary.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Regulatory	2.1.1.1	Santa Barbara County: no mention of EHS (division of County Public Health)as the permitting agency for the County for groundwater well development EXCEPT for well applications within the Coastal Zone... a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) is required FROM THE COUNTY and is a ministerial review from P&D.... NOT THE COASTAL COMMISSION. ONLY IF P&D denies or approves the groundwater CDP and there is an appeal, the appeal FIRST goes to the MPC for review, and if MPC action approves the appeal or denies, THEN the MPC decision, if appealed, goes on to the Coastal Commission for Substantial Issue determination review and de novo action etc. The Coastal Commission is NOT the originating approval/permitting authority for groundwater well development in the MGB Coastal Zone.	DP	Additional information on groundwater well permitting in the Coastal Zone has been added to Section 2.1.4.2, Groundwater Well Permitting.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Private Water Companies	2.1.1.2	No mention that these private municipal water companies have been required to report extraction data and quality metrics to the State, County and MWD since their inception. Believe it is quarterly but could be monthly.	DP	See Section 2.1.4.3 for additional information on the requirements of water companies defined as public water systems. Information on private water companies in the MGB have been incorporated into the GSP where available. Single-Parcel and Multiple-Parcel/State Small Water Systems are regulated by the County.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Monitoring Wells	2.1.2.1	Need clarity on if MWD is collecting data for 'all' MWD active/some inactive wells only or 'all' wells etc.. as it reads.	DP	Revised sentence so it reads: "Under its groundwater monitoring program, MWD has been collecting semi-annual, static groundwater levels for all active and some inactive MWD groundwater production wells since 1983, occurring each spring and fall for high and low season groundwater levels." Additionally, the sentence after provides clarification in the case it is unclear to the reader.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Water Use	2.1.3.3	When referencing 'per capita' use, must always state each time mentioned it is per capita PER DAY for consistency . Would be good to see if indoor (public health and safety) usage could be cited out from the total GPPPD).	DP, MN	Text has been revised to ensure "per capita per day" is used throughout GSP. Public health and safety usage is not directly relevant to the GSP and would be difficult to determine.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Water Use	2.1.3.3	In Table 2-4, is the citation of Ag Deliveries referencing MWD non potable groundwater supply or other... is that in addition to MWD GW extraction metrics.	DP	Agriculture deliveries include water conveyed through the MWD system for agricultural use. Agriculture deliveries have been removed from Table 2-4 as they are not part of the MWD municipal supply portfolio.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Water Sources	2.1.3.3	Should state why Jameson's production supply is diminished to 10% of MWD total production silting due to fires, debris flow etc., (and not economic to de-silt).	DP	Added following text to GSP: "due to naturally occurring reservoir siltation." Although wildfire has likely exacerbated natural siltation, conclusions cannot be made without including a reference or data.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Water Sources	2.1.3.3	Again 'per capita' should include per day (GPD). Reference to GSI 2020 should be specified as the GSI(spelled out,). MWD Groundwater Augmentation Feasibility Study; also cite the MSD/MWD argumentation study 2017?). "7: 'With groundwater being an important LOCAL source(LOCAL should be added).	DP	Text has been revised to ensure "per capita per day" is used throughout GSP. Acronyms within citations are not defined in body text of GSP, but instead defined in References section. The appropriate references are currently cited in the GSP. Added the word "local" to the sentence to clarify that groundwater is an important local source of supply.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Regulatory	2.1.4.2	This section should be integrated with the information in 2.1.1.1 (or at least provide a reference to this section). COSB EHS now in fact does bi monthly well application and status reports which includes location, depth and proposed use on its website... but not pumping capacity. 'MGB is not designated as critically overdrafted'... would add 'at this time' (there truly are no data/metrics that supports that it is not in an overdraft state...in fact the Loaiciga Report to the Coastal Commission 2015 does cite overdraft conditions.).	DP	Section 2.1.1.1 references Section 2.1.4. Added "at this time" to the sentence regarding MGB's status.	Completed

Comment Source	Date	Commentor	Subject	Section, Page Number, Figure, Table	Comment or Issue	Addressed By	Response	Status/Notes
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Regulatory	2.1.5.1	Paragraph 4: first sentence: The MONTECITO Community Plan.. cite MGMO, MLUDC also which is found later in. Would include additional CDP/CDH permit requirements within the CZ .. Inland and CZ have different codes/regs. Groundwater Resource Section: last sentence should add 'gross groundwater supply.....rather than just water supply.	DP	The abbreviation "Community Plan" is presented earlier in the text and used throughout GSP instead of the full name of plan. Additional language describing well permitting requirements in the Coastal Zone has been added to GSP. Unable to locate referenced sentence that describes groundwater supply. Page number needs to be provided in order to review sentence.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Management Plans	Table 2-7	Goal 1: ..and to eliminate prolonged overdraft (delete prolonged). Goal 2: delete 'where feasible'. Goal 3: although MGB is not determined to be 'critically in overdraft', term 'seriously or prolonged overdraft' could be applied. Policy 2-3: "To be determined"?.	DP	All of the text in Table 2-7 that describes a "Goal" or "Policy" is verbatim from the referenced general and community plans. Therefore, it is not appropriate to modify the text.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	General	2.2.1.2	Temperatures 'within'.. should rather be in the vicinity of.'	DP	The sentence has been revised to read "in the vicinity of."	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Groundwater Levels	2.2.2	Date & citation needed for 'More recent groundwater elevation contour maps'.	DP	The sentence has been revised to include a reference to Section 2.2.4.1, Groundwater Elevation Data, where the data and maps are described in greater detail. The groundwater elevation contour maps referenced were created as part of the data analysis associated with the GSP.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	General	NA	Paragraph 2: 'amsl' needs to be spelled out: Above Mean Sea Level) then going forward can be cited as AMSL.	DP	All references have been changed to msl, mean sea level. It is included in the acronyms list.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Groundwater Levels	2.2.4.1	Paragraph 2: There should be a mention of the relationship of the increased amount of groundwater water well developments during the drought to the increased groundwater extractions... which is quantified by EHS data from 2007-2019.	DP	A description of groundwater extractions and the increase in the number of production wells in the MGB during the last drought is provided in Section 2.3.3, Outflow from Groundwater System. Section 2.2.4.1, Groundwater Elevation Data, is based on empirical data and focused on groundwater flow direction and changes in groundwater elevation over time.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Seawater Intrusion	2.2.4.3	Paragraph 1: add and cite 'hydraulic head' descriptive. Last sentence: add many coastal aquifers globally as well as in the United States, west coast (cite examples: Salinas etc. etc.).	DP	Replaced "groundwater levels" with "hydraulic head" and added descriptive footnote with citation. Modified last sentence of paragraph to read "Seawater intrusion associated with groundwater overdraft has occurred to some degree in many coastal aquifers around the world, as well as the West Coast of the United States." Since this is an introductory paragraph to seawater intrusion in the MGB and not a review of seawater intrusion in all coastal groundwater basins, it is not appropriate to make assertions as to conditions in other basins.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Seawater Intrusion	2.2.4.3	Para 2: cite the 'several studies'; cite a 'few studies'. Be specific as to the referenced studies. STRIKE/ELIMINATE: ' THE RESULTS OF THE STUDIES THAT HAVE BEEN COMPLETED THUS FAR HAVE GENERALLY BEEN INCONCLUSIVE AS TO THE AREAL AN VERTICAL EXTENT OF SEAWATER INTRUSION, OR ITS OCCURRENCE AT ALL.' This statement is not supported by historical data, is not accurate and should not be included.	DP	Added in text citations for referenced studies. Because the studies on seawater intrusion that have been completed thus far have relied on limited empirical data, the general statement is accurate. The sentence states that at this time it is not known if seawater intrusion has occurred.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Seawater Intrusion	2.2.4.3	Para 9: starting in sentence two: if these wells are MWD production wells, this citation and description needs to be added for clarity.	DP	Added text to GSP indicating that wells Ennisbrook 2 and 5 are MWD production wells.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Groundwater Quality	2.2.4.4	Again, for well citations, indicate clearly if these wells are MWD production wells.	DP	Added text to clarify that the wells monitored by MWD are MWD production wells.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Groundwater Quality	2.2.4.4	Summary of Groundwater Quality Standards Para 2: MCL reference: spell out at first citation with a footnote 19	DP	MCL is spelled out earlier in the GSP in Section 2.1.4.1 on pg. 2-19. A descriptive footnote is provided in Section 2.2.4.4 on pg. 2-68.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems	2.2.4.7	Best for clarification in the following Ecosystems: clearly reference MWD production wells vis-a-vis private THROUGHOUT.	DP	Section 2.2.4.7 is planned to be revised to include a more robust analysis of potential GDEs. When the section is revised, clarification on well ownership will be included.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems	2.2.4.7	Para 2: last sentence: identify which are the three units that are identified as potential GDE' that have NO WELLS in the vicinity.. again, is this MWD production wells or ANY wells.	DP	Section 2.2.4.7 is planned to be revised to include a more robust analysis of potential GDEs. When the section is revised, clarification on well ownership will be included.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems	2.2.4.7	Sycamore Creek Tributaries -wells within 500ft How proximal exactly.	DP	Section 2.2.4.7 is planned to be revised to include a more robust analysis of potential GDEs. When the section is revised, clarification on exact distance to stream channel will be included.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems	2.2.4.7	Para 2: 'bgs'. Define: Below Ground Surface.....equivalent to 'Depth to Water' use one term or the other for consistency.... but not interchangeably.. if the equivalency is the same.... Also 'groundwater level measurements?? Too many descriptives used.	DP	Section 2.2.4.7 is planned to be revised to include a more robust analysis of potential GDEs. When the section is revised, use of a single descriptive for referencing groundwater levels will be considered.	Completed

Comment Source	Date	Commentor	Subject	Section, Page Number, Figure, Table	Comment or Issue	Addressed By	Response	Status/Notes
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems	2.2.4.7	Oak Creek -again, which wells are the citations referencing: MWD or private	DP	Section 2.2.4.7 is planned to be revised to include a more robust analysis of potential GDEs. When the section is revised, clarification on well ownership will be included.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems	2.2.4.7	San Ysidro 2nd para: three wells are private... not MWD...say so	DP	Section 2.2.4.7 is planned to be revised to include a more robust analysis of potential GDEs. When the section is revised, clarification on well ownership will be included.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems	2.2.4.7	3rd para: there are 5 private groundwater wells on ONE property between Santa Rosa and the creek... newest added about 3 yrs. ago...would have to affect the health of the creek and groundwater The reference since '2012 is interesting MWD Amapola there too (which is in a resting state). -last sentence: vegetation health reference should include more than just the debris flow.	DP	Section 2.2.4.7 is planned to be revised to include a more robust analysis of potential GDEs. When the section is revised, an evaluation of the potential impacts of production from the wells located at the referenced property on GDEs will be included. Also, reference to measured NDVI and NDMI trends will be included in addition to impacts of debris flow.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems	2.2.4.7	THERE IS A NEXUS of stream/creek to groundwater depletion from adjacent wells extraction.	DP	If empirical data are available that indicate there is a nexus between groundwater pumping and streamflow depletion, it will be included in the GSP. Currently, field data are limited so it is not appropriate to draw any conclusions as to the degree of stream-aquifer connectivity.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Groundwater Extraction	2.3.2	Number of Groundwater Wells (add Estimated)	DP	The estimated current number of wells in the MGB is provided in Table 2-18.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Groundwater Extraction	2.3.2	Table 2-18: 496 Private groundwater well count is not predicated nor supported on all available data.	DP	The estimated number of wells presented in Table 2-18 is based on all data and information available at this time, as described in Section 2.3.2. Well data and information is being updated with recently available data.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Groundwater Extraction	2.3.2	Table 2-19: should cite Loaiciga 2015 report data (skipped from Slade to Dudek, leaving out Loaiciga).	DP	Loaicigia (2015) simply presents a summary of groundwater extraction estimates provided in previous studies. The extraction estimates presented in Loaicigia (2015) are included in Table 2-19.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Seawater Intrusion	2.3.2.1	Delete second sentence: it creates bias that the Rincon Fault precludes significant seawater intrusion....	DP	The word "postulated" is included in the sentence to communicate to the reader that previous studies have hypothesized that the Rincon Fault is a barrier to seawater intrusion, but the studies have been inconclusive.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Figures	NA	Overall, consistency with legend identifiers would be most helpful... i.e. all MWD production wells same icon, same with monitoring wells.... Throughout....etc. etc.	DP	Use of consistent symbols on GSP figures will be considered.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Figures	Figure 2-5	Indicate MWD wells (rather than just production wells)	DP	Section 2.1.2.2 and Table 2-2 provide information on wells monitored for groundwater production.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Figures	Figure 2-20	Not sure what this is: Mosby and Neal identified... what are the other two... also indicate sub basins where they are located	DP	Figure 2-20 shows hydrographs for four key groundwater wells, one located in each storage unit. The T. Mosby and Neal well names are included in addition to their numerical identifiers. The other two wells (wells 2-2 and 4-4) are private wells monitored by MWD. The MGB subbasins are labeled and symbolized by the black line. See Section 2.2.4.1 for additional information.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Figures	Figure 2-22	Identify AGF ABD ASF Distribution Station in the Coastal Zone Sub Basin #3.... understand this is from GEOTRACKER but does need a bit of further clarification if possible.	DP	See Section 2.2.4.4 and Table 2-15 for a description of the sites shown on the map.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Figures	Figure 2-24	Legend at bottom needs more clarity in reference to: 64'. Groundwater Level (feet bgs) 1977 Year of last measurement....	DP	Each well on the figure is labeled with a groundwater level in feet below ground surface and date of measurement, which is what the legend is attempting to communicate. Edits to the figure legend so that it is more clear to the reader will be considered.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Figures	Figure 2-26	What are the metrics for 'irrigated areas' what does that mean.	DP	See Section 2.3.1.5 for additional information. In summary, the map shows areas of substantial irrigation based on review of aerial imagery.	Completed
SAC Member	10/5/2020	Donna Senauer	Figures	Figure 2-29	Note if these are 'verified permitted wells'. Should be stated that this is an estimate rather than an exact count of all existing wells.	DP	As stated in Section 2.3.2, the total number of wells in the MGB reported in Table 2-18 and Figure 2-29 is an estimate.	Completed

Comment Source	Date	Commentor	Subject	Section, Page Number, Figure, Table	Comment or Issue	Addressed By	Response	Status/Notes
SAC Member	2/9/2023	Cheryl Trosky	Chapter 2	2.1	Chapter 2.1 raises more questions than it answers. The Draft accurately noted the California Department of Water Resources established Montecito Groundwater Basin as a very low priority basin. It mentions the MGB priority was changed but does not give a reason for the DWR change from very low to a medium priority basin. The subsequent MGB status change to a medium priority basin was by request of the Montecito Water District Board. In response to this request DWR reprioritized MGB to a medium priority basin thereby necessitating the formation of a Ground Water Sustainability Agency funded by taxpayer dollars costing \$2.4M annually. Currently the document mentions there was a change in priority but needs to detail what precipitated the change. The Draft, in many locations, documents the projected 50-year GSP model along with historical data determines the MGB is stable with no indication of over drafting or undesirable results. It is assuring to note that after years of in-depth analysis, studies, monitoring and considerable expenditure the MGSA confirms DWR's evaluation from the outset. Armed with this information the MGSA decided mandated metering of wells be a possible future project, if warranted, but not a baseline project. Yet mandated well metering is referenced in 3.5.2.1.4, 3.5.7.2 and in chapter 44-2, 4.2.2. The January 30, 2023 GSA Finance Committee Meeting noted to date there is a 99% rejection of	GSA, MN	Comments noted.	Completed
SAC Member	2/9/2023	Cheryl Trosky	Figures		Chapter 3, figure 3-2 should be accompanied by a graph from an earlier presentation detailing three management action thresholds. This informative graph is important and should be included in this document for its historical perspective reflecting the MGSA decision process.	GSA, MN	Several draft scenarios were examined toward selecting appropriate SMCs. It is not appropriate nor possible to include information on all potential scenarios. Not included.	Completed
SAC Member	2/9/2023	Cheryl Trosky	General		Why are the MWD wells exempt from the rules imposed on private wells?	GSA, MN	As producers of potable water for a public water system, the MWD wells are subject to more stringent requirements than those for private wells. In addition, they are subject to the same requirements through the GSP.	Completed
SAC Member	2/9/2023	Cheryl Trosky	General		It would be helpful to have a definition of the acronyms.	GSA, MN	An acronym table will be included in the Admin Draft.	Completed
SAC Member	2/9/2023	Cheryl Trosky	Chapter 2		There is a typo in chapter 2 on 2-77 third paragraph, second sentence reads 'sweater' and I think it might mean seawater?	GSA, MN	Corrected.	Completed
TAC Member	2/21/2023	Steve Bachman	Chapter 4	4.1.5	Groundwater modeling: It is not clear exactly what will be performed and when during a model update. From the budgeting, it looks like a single update in the first 5 years. Is that "update" a recalibration of the model using the new data (a larger task, but worth the effort), or is it simply to run the model using the new data and see how well it matches reality (more of a verification, lesser effort), The section on Circumstances for Implementation says that the model will be "updated" as new data become available; because new monitoring data become available all the time, this doesn't make any sense. I think you want to say once during first 5-year period.	TJ	Revised language in Section 4.1.5	Completed
TAC Member	2/21/2023	Steve Bachman	Chapter 4	4.1.6	Well Database: Confidentiality is always a concern when private wells are involved. It is possible to keep parts of the database confidential (this has been done for years in Ventura County where the well databases are extensive — thousands of wells). It is not helpful to basin management to just exclude confidential information from the database as stated in the Legal Authority section, It can just be excluded from public documents.	GSA, MN	Section updated to clarify that confidentiality will be maintained including in publicly available databases.	Completed

Comment Source	Date	Commentor	Subject	Section, Page Number, Figure, Table	Comment or Issue	Addressed By	Response	Status/Notes
Public	3/27/2023	Glyn Davies	Metering	4.2.2	Comment letter linked here.To be added to table prior to GSP adoption		Comments received	In Progress
Public	3/31/2023	Gregg Zachritz	Funding	Chapter 5	It seems to me a parcel tax does not capture the outsized impact parcels with private wells have on ground water sustainability. Consequently, the owners of such parcels should shoulder an outsized share of the costs. I understand that larger parcels pay a larger parcel tax, but that tax remains the same whether they have a private well or not. I'm looking for something along the lines of a "private well tax". The costs should be shared equitably, not equally.	GSA	The Montecito GSA Groundwater Sustainability Fees adopted in 2020 are for the purposes of funding the costs during the first 5 years of GSA operations, including development of the regulatorily required Groundwater Sustainability Plan. Future changes in fees would be established by a subsequent cost of service study and public notice process, likely to be conducted during 2024 if new fees were to be implemented in 2025. That may be when your comment would have most relevance, as the current fee schedule is set. Please feel free to comment again in the future, particularly if/when a new fee schedule is being considered.	Completed
Public	4/5/2023	John Watson	General		Comment letter linked here.To be added to table prior to GSP adoption	GSA, MN	Comments received	In Progress