

Mid-Kaweah GSA Comment and Response Matrix

Version Date: 20191107

Bill Huott	GE	BH-001		1	Surface Water Supply Management		We need to create a reservoir that was the natural way thus valley was constructed and discovered. A Tulare lake size reservoir, all this water should never flush to the ocean! Never did, it filled Tulare Lake! Come on. We has a good year but now we could have seven years drought! No cushion, no backup, no reservoir!	Comment self-explanatory	New storage is contemplated in several projects described in Sec. 7.3.	N/A
Ca Department of Fish and Wildlife	GL	DF-003		3	Minimum Thresholds- Groundwater Levels		Sustainable management criteria allow for decades of continued groundwater decline in this subbasin designated as 'Critically Overdrafted.' A. Issue: These sustainability criteria suggest that groundwater elevations at all representative wells in the subbasin can continue to decrease for the next 20 years, dropping further from historically low groundwater elevations during drought years, without witnessing undesirable results. The subbasin is characterized by DWR as 'Critically Overdrafted,' meaning "continuation of present water management practices [in the basin] would probably result in significant adverse overdraft-related environmental, social, or economic impacts" (CDWR 2019). However, according to statements in the GSP, the basin has not experienced undesirable results, nor will it under projected 2040 groundwater levels "barring significant and unreasonable impacts on existing wells and freshwater storage" as stated on page 5-3; therefore, minimum thresholds allow for continued groundwater depletions. Specifically, "minimum thresholds were set at the water level projections for 2040 using the same trend in groundwater levels from 2006 to 2016" as stated on page 5-3, effectively allowing for 20 years of groundwater table declining trends and mirroring trends that contributed to the subbasin's Critically Overdrafted status. Conceptually, there is a disconnect between the subbasin's 'Critically Overdrafted' designation and the GSP's claim that the basin has not experienced undesirable results, nor will continue to have undesirable results if groundwater levels continue to decrease. b. Recommendation: The Department recommends the MKGSA reconsider minimum thresholds and measurable objectives, accounting for undesirable results for fish and wildlife beneficial uses and users of groundwater and interconnected surface water, to design sustainable management criteria that reflect a 'Critically Overdrafted' subbasin designation by seeking to improve current groundwater conditions rather than allowing for continued aquifer depletions over the next two decades.	Comment 3 Sustainable Management Criteria (Sustainable Management Criteria, 5.3 Minimum Thresholds, starting on page 5-2): Reset MTs and MOs to account for impacts related to interconnected surface waters	Include difference map showing ground surface elev. and water table; reference TNC 50' threshold for justification to not consider interconnected surface waters	5.3.5
Ca Department of Fish and Wildlife	IS	DF-001	MCR-7	3	Beneficial Users- Environmental		Environmental beneficial uses and ecosystem users of water are not adequately considered throughout the plan. A. Issue: Though the GSP identifies 'environmental and ecosystem interests' on the list of interest-based categories to be considered per Water Code 10723.2, these interests are not specified nor considered in a meaningful way. For example, on the bottom of page 1-23, the narrative paragraph lists beneficial users of groundwater in the basin but excludes any mention of environmental users. In Section 1.5.2.10, page 1-25, the GSP lists 'Environmental and Ecosystem Interests,' but unlike the other beneficial users, these interests are identified only as representative environmental organizations, not as the specific groundwater end user (e.g., groundwater dependent ecosystems). The lack of specificity around and consideration of environmental beneficial users perpetuates throughout the plan. For example: i. On page 3-2, first paragraph, the sustainability goal is entirely 'enterprise' focused and does not mention any environmental beneficial users of groundwater. ii. Similarly, undesirable results largely do not reflect potential impacts. to environmental beneficial uses and users of water. These users are excluded from the analysis and effects of undesirable results or their inclusion is cursory and dismissive. For example, on page 3-9, the discussion around Interconnected Surface Waters undesirable results acknowledges and accepts the potential for the temporary loss of riparian vegetation, which does not align with General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element objectives that seek to maintain or enhance riparian habitat as presented on page 1-14. iii. On page 3-8, the GSP notes that any "undesirable results caused by habitat loss within stream channels will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and independent of other undesirable results". This statement effectively separates instream habitat undesirable results from the GSP undesirable result analysis for all other beneficial users without specifics as to how these 'cases' may be managed. Also, habitat 'loss' suggests permanence, which may mean once a 'case' is identified, it could be too late to mitigate significant impacts to environmental beneficial uses and users of groundwater. b. Recommendation: The Department recommends the GSP identify specific habitats and species that depend on groundwater in the subbasin and define for these beneficial users undesirable results and related causes. The Department recommends reviewing and evaluating the Critical Species Lookbook (TNC 2019) for threatened and endangered species within the basin, as well as for narrative on species and habitat groundwater dependence that can be a model for describing environmental beneficial uses and users of groundwater in the GSP.	Comment #1 Environmental Beneficial Users: (Introduction, 1.5.2 Beneficial Uses and Users, starting on page 1-23):	Same as comment #8	Same as comment #8
Ca Department of Fish and Wildlife	IS	DF-002	MCR-3	3	Undesirable Results- Interconnected Surface Waters		The GSP offers an inconsistent and incomplete analysis of interconnected surface waters and related sustainable management criteria (SMC). A. Issue: On page 5-1, the GSP establishes 'non-applicability' of Interconnected Surface Waters sustainable management criteria, but poorly justifies and inconsistently applies this conclusion. Below are a series of GSP excerpts and CDFW comments. i. On page 3-4, the undesirable result analysis for Interconnected Surface Waters states, "Depletions of interconnected surface waters are minimal and, to the extent they occur, impact only vegetation along the banks of unlined channels within the forebay regions of the aquifer system where natural channels exhibit gaining reaches from time to time. Undesirable results may occur should any such groundwater-dependent vegetation disappear from locations of known historic existence." ii. On page 3-5 states "Groundwater elevations shall serve as the sustainability indicator and metric for chronic lowering of groundwater levels and, by proxy, for and interconnected surface waters. Justification for use of groundwater elevations as a proxy in this instance is provided in Section 5." iii. On page 3-7 states, "The water level sustainability indicator is to serve, by proxy, for establishing interconnected surface waters. Periodic comparisons of surface water elevations and flowrate depletions in applicable stream channels and adjacent groundwater will be pertinent to this establishment." iv. On page 3-9 states, "Water bodies, primarily stream channels, which become temporally disconnected throughout the year from the underlying water table may experience the disappearance of adjacent vegetative habitat which may be considered as a beneficial use of groundwater. Such occurrences are generally restricted to the upper reaches of applicable channels in the fore bay region of the aquifer system near the Sierra foothills. The consensus among Subbasin GSAs and stakeholders is that the intermittent nature of this vegetative habitat is such that its temporary loss does not rise to the level of an undesirable result." Each of the above statements suggest that the basin has some surface water groundwater interconnectivity, and that groundwater elevation will serve as a proxy metric for Interconnected Surface Waters monitoring. The last sentence for page 3-9 above, suggests the consensus is more the expressed opinion of the stakeholders and not based on scientific or engineering verification. v. On page 4-14, states, "As stated previously, the interconnection of surface water and groundwater was disrupted many decades ago in the MKGSA. Therefore, a monitoring network and monitoring is not required for this GSA." vi. On page 5-18 states "Insufficient information and flow data exist with which to gauge seasonal connections and relative importance of any vegetative habitat known to intermittently exist along stream channel banks." The above two statements suggest that the GSP is dismissing all groundwater surface water connectivity as non-existent, despite an absence of data and previous suggestion that there is some degree of interconnectivity. Notably, the data gaps identified in the plan do not include Interconnected Surface Waters (see pages 2-2 and 4-14); and though the GSP proposes use of groundwater elevation as a proxy for Interconnected Surface Waters depletions on page 3-7, no further justification or application of that proxy metric is included. b. Recommendations: To reconcile the inconsistent and inadequate consideration of Interconnected Surface Waters depletions in the GSP, the Department recommends the MKGSA consider: i. Installing shallow groundwater monitoring wells near potential GDEs and Interconnected Surface Waters, potentially pairing multiple-completion wells with streamflow gauges for improved understanding of surface water-groundwater interconnectivity. ii. Identifying the estimated quantity, timing, and location of streamflow depletions in the subbasin per 23 CCR 354.28 (c)(6)(A). If this information is unavailable, identify and define a timely and clear approach to estimating these values. iii. Re-evaluating sustainable management criteria based on an improved understanding of Interconnected Surface Waters and based on undesirable results for environmental beneficial users of groundwater and Interconnected Surface Waters. 1. Even though potential undesirable results are defined for Interconnected Surface Waters depletions, the causes for these depletions are not identified in Section 3.2.1.5 Causes Leading to Undesirable Results: Interconnected Surface Water. Causes leading to undesirable results for all other applicable SMC are identified.	Comment #2 Interconnected Surface Waters (Multiple Sections/Pages):	Same as comment #8	Same as comment #8
Ca Department of Fish and Wildlife	IS	DF-004	MCR-3	3	Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems		Starting on page 146, the GOE identification section, pursuant to 23 CCR § 354.16 (g), is based on very limited information to demonstrate exclusion of ecosystems that may depend on groundwater. A. Issue: Methods applied to the Natural Communities Commonly Associated with Groundwater (NCCAG) dataset to eliminate potential GDE's are not robust. i. Depth to Groundwater: The removal of areas with a depth to groundwater greater than 50 feet in Spring 2015 relies on a single-point-in-time baseline hydrology, specifically a point in time that is several years into a historic drought when groundwater levels were trending significantly lower due to reduced surface water availability. Exclusion of potential GDEs based on this singular groundwater elevation measurement is questionable because it does not consider representative climate conditions (i.e., seasons and a range of water type years) and it does not account for GDEs that can survive a finite period of time without groundwater access (Naumburg et al. 2005), but that rely on groundwater table recovery periods for long term survival. ii. Adjacent to Surface Water: The GSP did not fully evaluate potential GDEs that depend on adjacent losing surface water bodies and a GDE's adaptability and opportunistic nature in accessing water supply. The GSP assumption that these potential GDEs are accessing and primarily dependent on surface water is based on proximity to a surface water source, but this assumption is poorly justified and there is no acknowledgement of the potential for shifting reliance between surface and ground water. Additionally, GDEs that are near interconnected surface water bodies may depend on sustained groundwater elevations that stabilize the gradient or rate of loss of surface water, meaning that ecosystems near interconnected surface waters may depend on sustainable groundwater elevations. Therefore, it is possible that any of these potential GDEs rely on groundwater during specific seasons or water year types. B. Recommendations: The Department recommends the MKGSA consider the following for information gathering related to GDEs: i. Depth to Groundwater: Develop a hydrologically robust baseline which includes areas with a depth to groundwater greater than 50 feet that relies on multiple, climatically representative years of groundwater elevation and that accounts for the inter-seasonal and inter-annual variability of GOE water demand. ii. Adjacent to Surface Water: Re-evaluate potential GDEs that are in proximity to a losing surface water body. The Department recommends the GSP be more conservative and all-inclusive until there is evidence that the overlying ecosystem has no significant dependence on groundwater across seasons and water year types. The Department advises that these riparian GOE beneficial users of groundwater and surface water are carefully considered in the analysis of undesirable results and minimum thresholds for depletions of interconnected surface waters. iii. Include additional references for evaluation: The Department recognizes that NCCAG (Klausmeyer et al. 2018) provided by California Department of Water Resources (CDWR) is a good starting reference for GDE's; however, the Department recommends the GSP include additional resources for evaluating GOE locations. The Department recommends consulting other references, including but not limited to the following tools and other resources: the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Vegetation Classification and Mapping Program (VegCAMP) (CDFW 2019A); the CDFW California Natural Diversity Database (CNDD8) (2019B); the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Manual of California Vegetation (CNPS 2019A); the CNPS California Protected Areas Database (CNPS 2019B); the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) National Wetlands Inventory (2018); the USFWS online mapping tool for listed species critical habitat (2019); the U.S. Forest Service CALVEG ecological grouping classification and assessment system (2019); and other publications by Klausmeyer et al. (2019), Rohde et al. (2018), The Nature Conservancy (TNC) (2014), and Witham et al. (2014).	Comment #4 Section 5.3.5 Minimum Thresholds - Interconnected Surface Waters on pages 5-7 to 5-8 and Appendix 2A Section 2.10 Kaweah Subbasin Basin Setting Components. Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems.	Same as comment #8	Same as comment #8

Mid-Kaweah GSA Comment and Response Matrix

Version Date: 20191107

California Water Service Company	GE	CW-001		1	General		As noted in the draft GSP, there are a number of significant management actions to be undertaken by the affected parties in the coming years to implement the plan. In particular, the development of the pumping allocation program, refinement of the Water Accounting Framework, and the cost allocation process for basin-wide management and project implementation activities will require significant coordination among and input from the impacted parties. Cal Water looks forward to being a direct participant in the management of the GSA as we ensure the sustainable management of the Kaweah Subbasin.	Request for involvement and input during GSP implementation	Cal Water will continue to be represented on the Tech. Sub-Committee and the Adv. Committee and thus remain involved during GSP implementation.	N/A
Edward Henry	LS	EH-012		2	Land Subsidence- Correlation with Groundwater Levels		It states, "... Over-pumping during drought periods, which may result in new lows in terms of groundwater elevations, is of particular concern based on current scientific understanding of subsidence trends in this region. Regional correlations of water levels v. subsidence trends remain difficult to ascertain ..." and yet on Page 4-6, Section 4.2.3 Representative Monitoring, in the second sentence of the second paragraph it states, "... The USGS and DWR have utilized changes in groundwater elevations to estimate changes in storage and have demonstrated a correlation between groundwater elevation and subsidence ... ". This appears to infer a stronger correlation of groundwater elevations and subsidence than what was stated in Section 3.2.1.3 where it states, "... Regional correlations of water levels v. subsidence trends remain difficult to ascertain ... ". So for the Kaweah Subbasin, in general, and the MKGSA, in particular, how strong is the correlation? Because of differential subsidence and regional effects on critical infrastructure, groundwater elevations may or may not have a good or strong correlation with land subsidence-it that correct? It's my understanding that within the KSB there are some regions of strong correlations for groundwater elevations and land subsidence, and for other regions the correlations are quite weak? Is the language in those two sections in conflict with each other? Also see where it states, "... Additionally, there was not sufficient data to find a good correlation between pumping and land surface subsidence ... ". With this text there is some conflicting information to the casual reader on the relationship between groundwater elevations [due to pumping] and land subsidence. (NOTE: Perhaps I'm "beating a dead horse" here with semantics and parsing words in those three above referenced sections on the correlation between groundwater elevations and land subsidence. What will DWR accept here? As noted there are data gaps and perhaps by 2025 with better monitoring sites and technology there will be a better understanding of that relationship between groundwater elevations and subsidence whether for better or worse-meaning a more positive correlation or a less positive one, or good in one region and not good in another.)	Correlations of local and regional land subsidence and water levels and water storage not adequately explained.	Beef up subsidence bullet point, make a second bullet * while the basin setting and other reference information in the plan relates subsidence to water levels, in our basin it remains a data gap that will be filled over time through collection of data from our LSS monitoring network.	Sec 2.2
Edward Henry	WB	EH-009	MCR-19	2	Water Budget Accounting		Can further explanation be given as to how the "water [supply] accounting framework" (WSAF), Table 6-2 in Section 6, will define the "water budget", Table 2-1 in Section 2? How are they related? I thought each one was independent of the other-the WSAF being based on a legal construct concept/definition whereas the water budget is the physical movement of water? It is curious that by combing those two figures for the MKGSA there is essentially a 50,000 AF range (swing) from a +38,000 AF surplus in the WSAF (Table 6-2) to a -13,000 AF deficit in water budget (Table 2-1). So is/are WSAF data/inputs considered the independent variable (driver), and then the water budget would then be considered the dependent variable of the WSAF? With the approximate -13,000 AF deficit in the water budget is this the more realistic figure/calculation that should be used by the three management areas (Tulare, Visalia, & TID) when establishing Minimum Thresholds and Measurable Objectives?	Reconciliation of water budget and water accounting framework (WAF) not adequately disclosed.	Add a table in showing how you go from the WB to WAF. Clean up section 6 to be sure we are consistent with our terms in referring to either water budget vs water accounting framework.	Section 6
Edward Henry	AL	EH-031		2	De Minimis Extractors		In the second sentence of the first paragraph it states, "... this initial phase of an allocation program shall exclude those well owners who extract less than two AF per year (i.e., de minimis extractors) ... ". Again, I will challenge how a de minimis extractor will be identified? So if one lives in the county (not within the jurisdictional boundaries of a city-i.e. Tulare or Visalia) on a 2-3 acre parcel with a half-dozen head of beef cattle, a couple of horses, irrigated pasture(s), some fruit and nut trees, a vegetable garden, a 1/2 acre green lawn, etc. that will be declared a de minimis extractor-there's no way that parcel/residence is a de minimis extractor? I live in Tulare on just under 1/3 of an acre, and I am definitely a de minimis user of groundwater. But because I'm within the jurisdictional boundary of Tulare, I won't have the same rights (to use that groundwater) as a de minimis extractor. Granted I don't have the risks of a well going dry or potentially degraded water quality or other well associated operation and maintenance concerns as one who has a domestic well in the county but something is wrong with this picture. Make de minimis extractors prove they are truly de minimis-keep the playing field level and equitable. Meter the de minimis extractor.	De minimis pumping should be metered.	Reference potential sampling of domestic wells in Sec. 7.4.8 in Sec. 4, Paul will add that should in the future it be determined that the diminimus pumping be managed or otherwise regulated, we will bring this to the attention of the GSA Board. Also note that these extractions along with small domestic well pumping has been quantified and included in our water budget and GW model. Per SGMA Sec. 10725.8(e), de minimis extractors' wells shall not be metered or otherwise measured.	4.9, 4.10
Edward Henry	GL	EH-011		2	Minimum Thresholds- Drought Impacts		BMP document, November 2017, page 4, under the heading Sustainability Indicators, the first indicator, "Chronic lowering of groundwater levels ... " I would like to add a direct quote from there to the end of the sentence at the top of Page 3.4 from this section of the BMP which states, "Overdraft during a period of drought is not sufficient to establish a chronic lowering of groundwater levels if extractions and groundwater recharge are managed as necessary to ensure that reductions in groundwater levels or storage during a period of drought are offset by increases in groundwater levels or storage during other periods." A lot of people on these GSA boards, committees, etc. are not aware of the above "wobble room" statement allowed by the State--this is a very important point. To me, the State recognizes that agriculture may have to overdraft during a declared drought period in order to be economically sustainable but then it must make-up for that overdraft in normal and wet years. After all, the primary purpose of SGMA is to stop the chronic lowering of our groundwater, and we have until 2040 to bring our groundwater into sustainability. In Section 3.2.1.1 Groundwater Levels should now read, "Undesirable results associated with groundwater level declines are caused by over-pumping or nominal groundwater recharge operations during drought periods such that groundwater levels fall and remain below minimum thresholds. Over-pumping and lack of recharge is area specific, and some GSA Management Areas experience greater adverse impacts than others. [However], Overdraft during a period of drought is not sufficient to establish a chronic lowering of groundwater levels if extractions and groundwater recharge are managed as necessary to ensure that reductions in groundwater levels or storage during a period of drought are offset by increases in groundwater levels or storage during other periods." (Note: The bold, italic insert above is from the Sustainable Management Criteria- BMP document, November 2017, page 4) Also note that Undesirable Results has the complete text for the definition of undesirable results for groundwater elevations (including the "... Overdraft during a period of drought..." caveat sentence for additional clarification): "Chronic lowering of groundwater levels indicating a significant and unreasonable depletion of supply if continued over the planning and implementation horizon. Overdraft during a period of drought is not sufficient to establish a chronic lowering of groundwater levels if extractions and groundwater recharge are managed as necessary to ensure that reductions in groundwater levels or storage during a period of drought are offset by increases in groundwater levels or storage during other periods. "	Explain why over-pumping during droughts need not be considered as an undesirable result if offset by recharge in wet years, in accordance with SGMA.	Add SGMA quote as referenced.	3.2.1.1
Edward Henry	WB	EH-030		2	Water Budget/Water Accounting Framework		In the third sentence of the first paragraph there is an additional correction which was missed in my original comments' submission on September 3, 2019, and it states, "...Despite the water budget surplus, as evidenced in Section 2 (Basin Setting Appendix 2A), groundwater levels and storage have been in decline within the Mid-Kaweah area...". In fact, there is not a water budget surplus as stated above (go to the MKGSA website and see Section 2 Appendices 2A, Page 109, Table 32, which shows a -77.6 TAF deficit for the entire Kaweah Subbasin), but rather it's the water accounting framework which shows a surplus within the MKGSA of around 38 TAF in Section 6 – Water Supply Accounting (on Page 6-3, Table 6-3 of this GSP). Later in that same sentence it states, "...and hydrogeologic evaluations will continue to determine the reason for the differences between the water budget surplus and the conditions of decline...". Again, it's the water accounting framework which shows a surplus (~38 TAF) and not the water budget (" -13 TAF—see Page 2-3, Table 2-1 of this GSP). With those corrections that sentence should now read as follows, "...Despite the water accounting framework surplus, as evidenced in Section 6 – Water Supply Accounting (on Page 6-3, Table 6-3) of this GSP, groundwater levels and storage have been in decline within the Mid-Kaweah area and hydrogeologic evaluations will continue to determine the reason for the differences between the water accounting framework surplus and the conditions of decline...". I'm concerned that there is incorrect interchangeable usage of the terms water budget and water accounting framework and will confuse the casual reader. On Page 2-2, 2.3 GSA Water Budget, there's a good definition and the current estimate of the MKGSA water budget: "...This localized water budget represents the estimated physical movement of water in and out of the MKGSA area on an annual basis and provides an average for the 21-year period. During that period, average groundwater storage depletions were 12.6 thousand acre-feet (TAF) per year due to a combination of water management activities within the GSA as well as influences from neighboring GSAs both in the Kaweah Subbasin and in neighboring subbasins...". Also on Page 2-2 there is a good definition of the water accounting framework [which is specifically addressed on Page 6-3, Table 6-2 and Table 6-3 of this GSP] and shows an Imputed Balance (Table 6-3) surplus within the Mid-Kaweah area of approximately 37.8 thousand acre-feet (TAF) per year: "...To apportion responsibilities for the development of projects and management actions (extraction reductions), Section 6 of this GSP segregates groundwater inflows based on a legal construct of native, foreign, and salvaged components. These components are proportionately assigned to each of the three Subbasin GSAs. This construct and apportionment were considered and accepted by each GSA and represent a preliminary water accounting framework to be further discussed and refined during the first five-year assessment of this GSP...". These two components/entities are calculated quite differently, and should not be loosely interchanged particularly when one is negative and the other is positive.	Reconcile difference between water budget and water accounting framework values as they relate to the MKGSA.	Better distinguish between the terms "water budget" and "water accounting framework."	6.2, 7.4.2.2
Edward Henry	WQ	EH-021	MCR-6	2	Measurable Objectives- Water Quality		In the second sentence of first paragraph under the heading, 5.4.3 Water Quality Measurable Objectives it states, "... All future projects and management actions implemented by the MKGSA are designed to avoid causing further groundwater quality degradation ... ". It's my firm understanding that the primary charge of SGMA is to stop the chronic lowering of groundwater which will be accomplished through projects and management actions. Projects and management actions most likely will always benefit groundwater quality but there's also a small risk that somehow it (water quality) may be negatively impacted such as unintentional plume migration. I'm very concerned that stating "... all future projects and management action ... are designed to avoid causing further groundwater water degradation ... " could be a potential segue into litigation through misinterpretation, and that sentence should be stricken from this GSP in the final document version for submission to DWR. Again, the design of future projects and management actions should be heavily geared towards the sustainability indicators of chronic lowering of groundwater levels, loss of groundwater storage, and land subsidence through preventing or eliminating those undesirable results-hopefully groundwater quality will be a [secondary] beneficiary of those projects and management actions, and not the primary focus as currently stated above. Again, it should be noted that there is a very poor correlation between groundwater levels and water quality (for Arsenic and Nitrates) as shown in the graphical data presented at the meeting of the GKSGA's Combine Meeting of the Rural Communities Committee and Stakeholder Committee on June 14, 2019 (see reference to Page 5-13 above.)	Do not indicate that projects and mgt actions are designed to avoid further groundwater contamination.	SGMA requires some degree of water quality protection, i.e., further degradation.	N/A
Edward Henry	AL	EH-033		1	De Minimis Extractors		The last bullet point at the bottom of the page states, "... A determination by the GSA to not regulate any de minimis extractor, i.e., any well owner pumping two acre-feet or less annually ... ". Again, I'll voice my concern that in fact a "... de minimis extractor..." should have to prove the de minimis extractor designation or classification- metering will be the only way to validate such a claim.	Comment self-explanatory	Di miiimis extractions included in water budget; regulation thereof may be reconsidered at a later time, to exclude measurement per SGMA.	N/A

Mid-Kaweah GSA Comment and Response Matrix

Version Date: 20191107

Edward Henry	GE	EH-007		1	MKGSA Characteristics	Municipal and Industrial Well Operators: "The City of Tulare and the City of Visalia account for about 20 and 30 percent of the land area within the MKGSA, respectively." More accurately, Tulare's land area within the MKGSA is 12.7% (13,631 acres divided by 107,000 acres in MKGSA) and Visalia's land area is 21.7% (23,197 acres divided by 107,000 acres in MKGSA) for a total urban acreage of approximately 37,000 acres or 35% (~37,000 acres divided by 107,000 acres) of the MK GSA acreage.	[Page 1-24]: 1.5.2.6	Cited percentages to be revised to 12% and 22% respectively for Tulare and Visalia.	Appendix 2A?
Edward Henry	GL	EH-013		1	Minimum Thresholds- Groundwater Levels Measurement	In the third sentence of the first paragraph should be inserted "minimum threshold (MT)" before "... groundwater ..." so as to read, "... If any of the representative monitoring wells fall below the minimum threshold (MT) groundwater elevation in its respective zone, undesirable results could occur ...".	[Page 5-2, 5.3 Minimum Thresholds, 5.3.1 Minimum Thresholds - Lowered Groundwater Levels, 5.3.1.1 Overview]:	Edit noted	5?
Edward Henry	GL	EH-014		1	Measurable Objectives- Groundwater Levels	In the first row under the heading of Well ID, KSB-0922, and under the Measurable Objective heading, <i>the fmsl figure/number is listed as a minus 19 (-19) which is incorrect as it should be positive 19 fmsl</i> . In Appendix SB Groundwater Level Sustainable Management Criteria Hydrographs the first hydrograph is for well KSB-0922 which definitely shows a Measurable Objective of +19 fmsl and not a negative figure. Of the 42 listed Well IDs in Table 5-3, well KSB-0922 is the only well I compared or cross-checked the numbers to the hydrographs shown in Appendix 5-B. (Due to the tediousness of going completely through each well in that table and comparing/cross-checking them to the hydrographs, and the time constraints of thoroughly going through this GSP.)	[Page 5-5, Table 5-3]: Summary of Groundwater Level Sustainability Management Criteria for MKGSA:	Corrections noted for Sec. 5 and related appendices	5
Edward Henry	GS	EH-015		1	Interim Milestones- Graphing	[Section 5 Appendices]: Although the following comments may be out of contextual order but while in Section 5 Appendices (from above), I also looked at Appendix 5D: Water Storage Additions - An Alternative Approach. <i>In Figure 1: Hypothetical Representation of Measurable and Optimal Objectives (on the last page), the four interim Milestone numbers in parenthesis are shown as positive numbers. Shouldn't they be listed as negative numbers as all are below zero (0) with regards to storage depletion on the y-axis?</i> They should be -21, -33, -40, & -42 TAF. Also the Storage Depletion label/units in parenthesis should be (TAF) rather than the (AF) as currently shown.	Comment self-explanatory	Corrections to App. 5D to be made if warranted.	Appendix 5D
Edward Henry	GS	EH-020		1	Optimal Objective- Groundwater Storage	In the second sentence of the paragraph following the bullet points it states, "... Figure 5-3 shows the results of this analysis indicating that the measurable objective has 641,000 AF in storage at 2040, and the optimal objective has 1,356,000 AF in storage at 2040 ...". When going back to Figure 5-3 on Page 5-10, that figure shows the Optimal Objective at 1,340,000 AF rather than the number of 1,356,000 AF cited above-that's a difference of 16,000 AF (which is almost the amount of groundwater pumped annually by the City of Tulare at roughly 18,000 AF). Which number is correct?	Comment self-explanatory [Page 5-21, 5.4.2 Groundwater Storage Measurable Objectives]:	Correction to Fig. 5-3 and/or associated text to be undertaken.	5.3.2.3
Edward Henry	MA	EH-019		1	Water Budget/Management Areas	In the third to the last sentence in the last paragraph on Page 5-20, it states, "... MKGSA anticipates that coordination will focus on the Management Areas where water budgets remain in deficit, depending on degree ...". Obviously there is a water budget for the MKGSA but are there also individual waters budgets for the 3 Management Areas-City of Tulare, City of Visalia, and TID? <i>If there are separate water budgets for each Management Area, when will they be published?</i> This is the first I've heard of additional water budgets [within the MKGSA], and I may be totally mis-reading that sentence.	Question re existence of water budgets for Mgt Areas [Page 5-20, 5.4.1 Groundwater Level Measurable Objectives]	Mgt. Area water budgets to be determined and considered by GSA board when establishing fees and charges during GSP implementation.	N/A
Edward Henry	MU	EH-005		1	Municipal Water Use- Landscaping	<i>Simple calculation: 700 sq miles x 640 acre/sq mile = 448,000 acres within the KSB. Current accepted KSB acreage is 441,000 acres. So which figure is the most accurate? If the 441,000 acres is correct, then the "occupying some 700 sq miles" needs to be ch</i>	Comment self-explanatory	Acreage citations to be made consistent	1, App. 2A
Edward Henry	MU	EH-032		1	Urban Water Management Plans	In the third line of that paragraph it states, "... mandates of a 20 percent reduction in urban per capita water usage by 2020 ...". <i>What is the base year for the reduction?</i> During the drought years 2012-2016, cities were mandated by the governor to cut the water usage by 28-32% from the base year of 2013: <i>Will 2013 be used again as the base year?</i>	Comment self-explanatory [Page 7-41, 7.4.6 Urban Water Conservation, 7.4.6.3 Permitting and Regulatory Compliance]	Base year set per 20X2020 legislation.	N/A
Edward Henry	OR	EH-006		1	Public Outreach/GSP Organization	At the bottom of the page, "... Communication & Engagement (C&E) Plan, developed by Stantec for MKGSA and adopted on August 14, 2018 and included as Appendix 1C." <i>The posted document in Appendix 1C has a date of August 7, 2018, Draft: Version 4, rather than the August 14th date cited in the above quoted text. There should or must be a later version to reflect the noted date of August 14, 2018, as the database of the August 7, 2018 document is definitely not up-to-date. The last entry in that database of August 7, 2018, is the Waksache Tribe.</i> Also it's probably too late for this version of the MKGSA GSP draft, but in the future it would be very helpful when a Figure, Table, Appendix, etc. is referenced that one could move the cursor to that item and click on it and it would take you directly to that item. <i>Right now, one has to get out of a document and search in the Table of Contents in order to go to the referenced item(s)</i> -- Also the last sentence of the last paragraph. "All outreach efforts and engagement activities were tracked in a Community Engagement and Activities Database (CE & AD) that was continuously monitored and updated, consistent with DWR Emergency Regulations §354.10 (b) and §354.10 (d)." <i>As noted above, the Communications and Engagement Activities Database is not up-to-date.</i>	Include final version of cited appendix.	Final version of App. 1C to be included.	1
Edward Henry	OR	EH-008		1	Internal referencing/GSP Organization	In the first sentence of the second paragraph starting with "... Section 6 of this GSP ..." - after "Section 6" should insert reference to Table 6.2 so as to read "... Section 6 in Table 6.2 of this GSP ...". By adding in Table 6.2 makes for better clarity. Also see (Section 6 Water Supply Accounting) in the last sentence, "... Yet, as acknowledged in Section 2 of this Plan, ...", reference to Table 2-1 should be inserted after "Section 2" so as to read "... Yet, as acknowledged in Section 2 in Table 2-1 of this Plan, ...". By adding in Table 2-1 makes for better clarity.	Editorial improvements suggested [Page 2-2, 2.3 GSA Water Budget]: [...] Page 6-3	Comment noted.	N/A
Edward Henry	OR	EH-010		1	Undesirable Results/GSP Organization	At the end of the first sentence should add after "... interconnected surface waters ..." the 6th Undesirable Result which is "seawater intrusion". All 6 Undesirable Results (UR) should be listed in this opening sentence as seawater intrusion is the last listed UR in section 3.2.1.6 Seawater Intrusion at the bottom of the page.	Editorial comment self-explanatory [Page 3-3, 3.2.1 Causes leading to Undesirable Results]:	Will strike the reference to ISW in Sec. 3.2.1, since none are assumed.	3.2.1
Edward Henry	OR	EH-016		1	Internal referencing/GSP Organization	In the paragraph beginning with the sentence, "... The results of this well impact analysis ...", there is reference to "... Figure 5-2 is an example plot showing 144 domestic wells in Hydro geologic Zone 2 ...". <i>None of the plots and statistical well summaries categorized by zone (1-10) have listings by Figures which makes it difficult to locate what is listed as Figure 5-2. Can this be corrected to add a Figure x.x, accordingly, to each of the plot and statistical well summaries?</i> Also not seeing the well impact evaluation summaries referred to in the following sentence, "... The well impact evaluation summaries for all zones (Appendix SC) indicate that 18 percent of agricultural wells, 9 percent of public wells, and 21 percent of rural residential wells including domestic wells ...". <i>There is no summary for all zones-only plots by each zone without Figure x.x assignments.</i>	Suggested improvements to well hydrographs as cited [Page 5-7]	Additional explanatory material to be added.	5.3.1.3
Edward Henry	OR	EH-022		1	Measurable Objectives- Table Formatting	In Table 5-3 in the Measurable Objective column there are no units, i.e. "inches", nor is that a timeframe. Can those additions be made to the Measurable Objective column? Also it's not clear as to how the Measurable Objective numbers were determined.	Comment self-explanatory [Page 5-23, Table 5-3]	All values in Table 5-3 are in feet relative to mean sea level (fmsl) as noted therein. MOs were determined as explained in Sec. 5.4.	N/A
Edward Henry	OR	EH-023		1	Hydrogeologic Zones- Table Formatting/Internal Referencing	[Appendix 5A] The term "hydrogeologic zone(s)" (AKA HZs) is used 14 times in the MKGSA GSP, and yet there is not an actual map/figure of the KSB showing those nine (9) HZs of which there are four (4) HZs in the MKGSA—1, 2, 4, and 7. An excellent map/figure is found (at the MKGSA website) under Documents, Section 5 Appendices, Appendix 5A Overview of Application of Hydrogeologic Zones for Development of Groundwater Level Minimum Thresholds, Figure 5.1 on Page A5-1. For easy reference by the reader of this GSP, I would suggest imbedding Figure 5.1 into Section 2. Basin Setting at the bottom of Page 2-5 and above the Section 2 – Basin Setting explanation box. In the first sentence of the third paragraph from the bottom on Page 2-5 , it reads in part, "... Each MA's minimum thresholds have been determined using the hydrogeologic zone mapping...", and yet there is no HZs map in this GSP. Since the word "...mapping..." is used here, this would be an excellent place to include/insert this map/figure. After the word "...mapping..." should be added (Figure 5.1), so as to read, "...Each MA's minimum thresholds have been determined using the hydrogeologic zone mapping (Figure 5.1) ...".	Clarity sought re application of hydrogeologic zones (HZ) in setting MTs	Clarity to be added to Sec. 5.3.1.3 to better explain role of HZs.	5.3.1.3
Edward Henry	OR	EH-024		1	Hydrogeologic Zones- Internal Referencing	In [Appendix 5B] Groundwater Level Sustainable Management Criteria Hydrographs there are approximately 34 hydrographs. In the heading at the top of each hydrograph there is a well designation (plus other information), i.e. Well KSB-0922 , but it does not identify the HZ where that particular well is located. After some prolonged looking, Well KSB-0922 can be found in HZ1. It would be more convenient if the HZ for each hydrograph were to be labeled with the HZ in the heading as shown in the example below: Well KSB-0922 – HZ1 Mid Kaweah GSA Well ID: CID_038 Aquifer System: Unknown – Model Layer 3 Also, none of the 34 hydrographs listed in Appendix 5B have a Figure designation, i.e. Figure x.xx , in their lower left-hand corner as do other Figures and Tables in this GSP and the accompanying Appendices at the MKGSA website. Having all Tables and Figures labeled as such would be more convenient for referencing and cross-checking when needed.	Suggestion of HZ identification for monitoring wells	Labeling of hydrographs to be considered for editing.	Appendix 5B

Mid-Kaweah GSA Comment and Response Matrix

Version Date: 20191107

Edward Henry	OR	EH-025		1	Hydrogeologic Zones- Internal Referencing	<p>In the last sentence of the second complete paragraph down from the top of Page 5-19 of this GSP it states, "...This approach is summarized in the bullet list that follows and is illustrated on Figure 5.1 of Appendix 5A..." There is a definite inaccuracy here related to "...Figure 5.1 of Appendix 5A..." as Figure 5.1 is a map/figure (not a hydrograph) of the Hydrogeologic Zones in the KSB (see map/figure below). Could you be referring instead to Figure 5.2 through Figure 5.5 in Appendix 5A, OR RATHER is it in Appendix 5B where the first hydrograph (unlabeled—no Figure designation) is shown as Well KSB-0922? In looking further at the "...bullet list..." and in the discussions that follow about the minimum thresholds, measurable objectives, and interim milestones, it seems logical that Well KSB-0922 is the well being referred to here as the example illustration. But since Well KSB-0922 does not have a Figure designation attached to it, it was confusing initially. (See hydrograph of Well KSB-0922 on Page 2 of 2 below.)</p> <p>In the second sentence of the next to the last paragraph on Page 5-19 it states, "...Figure 5-1 shows these criteria at a single well in the southwest area of MKGSA and Appendix 5B includes these criteria for each well..." That "...single well..." is Well KSB-0922 which is in HZ1 (the southwest area of the MKGSA) but it does not have a Figure 5-1 designation (confusing). All 34 hydrographs in Appendix 5B need to be updated with a Figure designation, i.e. Figure x.xx, in the lower left-hand corner (below the hydrograph) of the each hydrograph for a more concise and easier referencing process. As mentioned earlier on Page 2 of 2, Addendum #4 (of these GSP comments) where the example for Well KSB-0922 – HZ1 is shown (to include the HZ number), it is first of all suggested here that the "well title headings" include the HZ for all 34 hydrographs. Secondly, it also would be very convenient to have all hydrographs grouped by Hydrogeologic Zones for easier referencing in this GSP. Although on Page 5-2 it states, "...one-third of the Subbasin's representative monitoring sites exceeding minimum thresholds for water levels would constitute an undesirable result...", it would be very helpful to know if those exceedances are random within the KSB or even the MKGSA or if one HZ is statistically more heavily impacted than another HZ. If those exceedances were isolated to a particular HZ, then possibly Projects and Management Actions could be specifically tailored to that HZ or a region of that HZ, and/or the Management Area occupying that HZ. There is the possibility the exceedances could occur in only one Management Area of a particular HZ (which potentially traverses one or more Management Areas—i.e. HZA which traverses all three Management Areas of the MKGSA) and not throughout an entire HZ. As an example, what if the "...one-third..." exceedances occurred only in the northeast section of the City of Tulare which is in part of HZA? The whole KSB and the MKGSA should not be penalized in that scenario. In summary, there are several main points here: First, is to identify the HZ in which each well resides and add to each well's "well title headings" which HZ it's located in, and secondly, would be to group the 34 wells by HZ.</p> <p>In the MKGSA GSP in Table 4-5: Groundwater Level monitoring network Well Summary on Page 4-8 there are 43 Well IDs listed, and yet in Appendix 5B there are hydrographs for only 34 wells. That's a difference of nine monitoring wells without hydrographs. All nine wells are in the Tulare Irrigation District and have the following Well ID: KSB-1320s; KSB-1320d; KSB-1408s; KSB-1408d; KSB-1536s; KSB-1536d; KSB-1545s; KSB-1545d; & KSB-1879. With the exception of KSB-1879 the other eight wells appear to have good and complete Well Construction Information as listed in those three columns of Table 4-5. Why are those nine wells which are listed in Table 4-5 not showing hydrographs in Appendix 5B?</p>	Inconsistencies between Figures 5-1 and 5-2; improve application of HZs as they relate to monitoring wells	Reference to appropriate figure to be made.	5.4.1
Edward Henry	OR	EH-026		1	Sustainable Yield/Internal Referencing	<p>A general comment on the term "sustainable yield" as it is used in the MKGSA GSP. The term "sustainable yield" is used a total of 10 times in this GSP but it does not indicate or state an actual numerical value for the "sustainable yield" in any of the text. At many of the KSB's GSA meetings over the past 6 months it's been stated by the 3 GSA managers and others, and shown in tabular form that the "sustainable yield" is 659,999 AF (660,000 AF rounded up) for the KSB. This is depicted on Page 6-3, Table 6-2: GSA Apportionment, of this GSP. (NOTE: This table is also known as the Water [Supply] Accounting Framework, and also referred to as the "Three Buckets" accounting method) In that table in the lower right-hand corner is the figure of 659,999 which is often referred to as the "sustainable yield" but not specifically labeled as such. I would suggest putting a double asterisks(**) after the 659,999 number. Then below the table add this additional footnote (to the ones already there) with a double asterisks (**). The footnote would then read, "... **Sustainable Yield for KSB ...". Although "sustainable yield" is used 10 times, there is no concise definition of the term "sustainable yield" found anywhere in this GSP. At the MKGSA website under Documents in Section 3 Appendices, 3B Sustainable Management Criteria Best Management Practices, 5. KEY DEFINITIONS, Page 34, it gives the definition of "sustainable yield" as follows: (w) "Sustainable yield" means the maximum quantity of water, calculated over a base period representative of long-term conditions in the basin and including any temporary surplus, that can be withdrawn annually from a groundwater supply without causing an undesirable result. Perhaps this definition should be inserted in parenthesis the first time the term "sustainable yield" (last bullet point) is used in the 1. Introduction, General Information, 1.1.1 Purpose of GSP on Page 1-1. That last bullet point would now read in part, "... the sustainability goal and ensure that the Subbasin is ultimately operated within the sustainable yield. ("Sustainable yield" means the maximum quantity of water, calculated over a base period representative of long-term conditions in the basin and including any temporary surplus, that can be withdrawn annually from a groundwater supply without causing an undesirable result.)..."</p>	Need to define "sustainable yield" within the GSP.	Sustainable Yield to be defined consistent with Appendix 3 of the Coordination Agmt.	1.1.2 (Ex. Summary)
Edward Henry	OR	EH-035		1	Internal Referencing	<p>In the first paragraph below Table 7-1, the third sentence states, "... This range of recharge accomplishments is depicted in the "Cumulative Added Storage" bandwidth on Figure 7-5..." It should read Figure 7.6, not Figure 7-5.</p>	Reference to correct figure noted.	Correction noted.	7.5.2
Edward Henry	OR	EH-036		1	Water Resources- Typo	<p>At the bottom 1/3 of Table 7.2 under the heading, Combined, it has "SVP Surplus"- shouldn't read "CVP Surplus"?</p>	Correction to reference table as noted.	Correction noted.	7.6.1
Edward Henry	OR	EH-037		1	Internal Referencing	<p>In the paragraph below Table 7-3 in the second sentence of that paragraph it states, "... Technical Memorandum (TM) "Estimate of Future Friant Division Supplies For Use in Groundwater Sustainability Plans," Friant Water Authority, December 2018, included as an appendix to the Basin Setting report ... ". To facilitate easier location of this Technical Memorandum (TM), it should be noted or referenced that this document is in Appendix D. Friant Water Authority Future Water Supply Study, of Section 2 Appendices- 2A Kaweah Subbasin Basin Setting Components. At the MKGSA website the Basin Setting Components document, due to its MB size, is split-Pages 1- 200 (23.2MB) and Pages 200-373 (20.4MB). The Friant document, referenced, above is in the second half, Pages 200-373, and is the very last document listed.</p>	Comment self-explanatory [Page 7-51]	Basin Setting report to be referenced as Appendix 2A.	7.6.1
Edward Henry	OR	EH-038		1	Annual Reporting- Typo	<p>In the first paragraph note that September only has 30 days. "... which will be WY 2019 (October 1, 2018 to September 31, 2019) ..."</p>	Comment self-explanatory [Page 8-1, 8. DWR Reporting, 8.1 Annual Reporting Summary]	Correction noted.	8.1
Edward Henry	PM	EH-028		1	Management Actions	<p>In the first sentence (4th line) of the second paragraph on Page 7.1 it states, "... future urban and agricultural conservation, ..." and yet on Page 7.2, in the Table/Chart under the column heading, Management Actions, for the bullet point, Agricultural Water Conservation and Management Program, none of the four boxes are checked for the 4 Sustainability Indicators and states, Not Applicable, whereas the bullet point, Urban Water Conservation Program, 2 of the Sustainability Indicators, GW Levels and Reduction in Storage, are checked. Why does the Agricultural Water Conservation and Management Program get a pass on conservation? I would have thought that all 4 Sustainability Indicator boxes for the Agricultural Water Conservation and Management Program would have been checked—after all agriculture is by far and away the largest extractor of groundwater. This is not to pit ag versus urban but putting an unrealistic burden on urban areas (cities) is counter productive. I'll refer you back to my comments on Pages 2 through 4 regarding the "urban forest" and the actual urban water usage. Also under the heading of Extraction Measurement Program it states Not Applicable. Although SGMA doesn't require "metering", the regulatory agencies will never fully have an accounting of groundwater extraction until there is metering. All the "players" who have "straws in the punch bowl" need to be metered at some point—realistically by 2025. Meters will be part of the costs of doing business. Those "players" who are designated or self-designated as "de minimis" (less than 2 AF annually) need to prove they are truly de minimis, and the only accurate and reliable way to demonstrate that is by being metered. Yes, one could argue that the de minimis user's groundwater extraction is probably less than 5% of the total groundwater pumped but again if the regulatory agencies want to know ALL extractors and to have equality, then metering is the only answer. Right now the small 3-5 acre "ranchettes" will get a pass on SGMA whereas a city resident (and I'm a definite de minimis user) may have draconian reductions impose on outdoor landscape usage for my "urban forest".</p>	Inquiry as to treatment of Ag water conservation in terms of pgm benefits [Page 7-1, 7. Projects and Management Actions, 7.1 Summary]	As TID ag lands use less water under a conservation effort, the same surface water deliveries will still be made to the District, presumably to other ag parcels or for GW recharge. This is contrary to urban conservation, whereunder less water will be pumped.	N/A
Edward Henry	SB	EH-001	MCR-5	1	Kaweah Subbasin Characteristics	<p>Simple calculation: 700 sq miles x 640 acre/sq mile = 448,000 acres within the KSB. Current accepted KSB acreage is 441,000 acres. So which figure is the most accurate? If the 441,000 acres is correct, then the "occupying some 700 sq miles" needs to be changed to "689 sq miles" to be more accurate (441,000 acres divided by 640 acre per sq mile = 689 sq miles).</p>	Comment self-explanatory [Page 1-1, 1.1.2 Executive Summary]: 1.1.2-"occupying some 700 sq miles"	References to KSB acreage to be made consistent within reason.	1.1.2; Appendix 2A
Edward Henry	SB	EH-003	MCR-5	1	Kaweah Subbasin Characteristics	<p>Kaweah Subbasin (696 sq miles). By calculation: 696 sq miles x 640 acres/sq mile = 445,000 which is different than section 1.1.2 at "700 sq miles" which calculates/equates to 448,000 acres in the KSB. There needs to be agreement and accuracy on the total acreage within the KSB.</p>	Comment self-explanatory [Page 1-4]: 1.4.1	References to KSB acreage to be made consistent within reason.	1.1.2; Appendix 2A
Edward Henry	WB	EH-027	MCR-20	1	GSA Water Budget, GSA Water Budget Table Formatting	<p>In the third sentence of the first paragraph it states, "... Whereas the average water accounting framework water balance is positive, the comparable hydrogeologic water budget is negative by about 13,000 AF ... ". After the word "positive" should insert "at around 38,000 AF", in order to be consistent with the negative "13,000 AF". With the insert "at around 38,000 AF" that sentence would now read, "... Whereas the average water accounting framework water balance is positive at around 38,000 AF, the comparable hydro geologic water budget is negative by about 13,000 AF ... ". This would help the reader to see both the positive and negative number for better clarity. With regard to Figure 6.1, several additions would make this figure more understandable. First the label on the y-axis needs to be Groundwater Storage, and the "Change in Acre-Feet" needs to be in parenthesis, "(Change in Acre-Feet)". Lastly, to the right of the two horizontal lines, in the upper line, Shared/Owner Ave, put in the 38,000 AF figure to reflect what is in the text above, and for the lower line, Hydrogeologic Ave, put in the negative/minus -13, 000 AF, again to be consistent with the text description above on Page 6.4 and give the reader better clarity of that figure.</p>	Suggested edits to water accounting framework descriptions and related figures [Page 6-4, 6. Water Supply Accounting, 6.3 Water Accounting Framework Allocation]:	Comment noted.	N/A

Mid-Kaweah GSA Comment and Response Matrix

Version Date: 20191107

Edward Henry	WB	EH-029	MCR-20	1	Water Budget/Water Accounting Framework	In the first sentence of the first paragraph it states, "... As identified in GSP Section 6.1, the MK GSA's water budget shortfall is estimated to be fairly negligible...". After "fairly negligible" consider inserting "by about -13,000 AF..." so as to read, "... As identified in GSP Section 6.1, the MKGSA's water budget shortfall is estimated to be fairly negligible by about -13,000 AF...". Then in the second sentence of the same paragraph after the word "... surplus..." consider inserting "at around 38,000 AF" so as to read, "... a surplus at around 38,000 AF is in fact inferred based on preliminary water accounting framework..." By inserting those figures/numbers in those two sentences would give the reader more clarity regarding the actual numbers, and would spare [the reader] the need and time to refer back to Section 6.1 in order to verify those numbers-just makes for an easier read. In the third sentence of that same paragraph there is a major typo reference/category-water budget versus water accounting framework. It states in part, "... hydrogeologic evaluations will continue to determine the reason for the differences between the water budget surplus and the conditions of decline...". That's incorrect as it's not the "...water budget surplus..." which in fact has a deficit by about -13,000 AF but rather it's the "... water accounting framework..." that has a 38,000 AF surplus. With the correction that portion of the sentence should now read, hydrogeologic evaluations will continue to determine the reason for the differences between the water accounting framework surplus and the conditions of decline..".	Suggested edits to water accounting framework descriptions and related figures [Page 6-4, 6. Water Supply Accounting, 6.3 Water Accounting Framework Allocation];	Clarity to be added to better distinguish between hydrogeologic water budget and water accounting framework budget.	6.2
Edward Henry	WB	EH-034	MCR-20	1	Water Budget/Accounting Framework	In the first sentence of the first paragraph on Page 7-46 (below Figure 7-5) it states, "... coupled with this GSA's assigned share of the Subbasin water budget as articulated in Section 6 of this Plan...". Isn't it the water accounting framework which present in Section 6? Instead of referring to the "water budget" shouldn't replacing the term water budget with the term water accounting framework be more correct/accurate as it is articulated on Page 6-3 in Section 6 of this Plan, in Table 6-2 and Table 6-3.	Suggested edits to water accounting framework descriptions and related figures [Page 6-4, 6. Water Supply Accounting, 6.3 Water Accounting Framework Allocation];	Clarity to be added to better distinguish between hydrogeologic water budget and water accounting framework budget.	6.2
Edward Henry	WI	EH-004		1	Well Density	Figures 1-6 (Domestic)and 1-7 (Production). Both of these figures show these two types of wells within the jurisdictional boundaries of Tulare and Visalia. With specific regard to Figure 1-7 (Production), it is surprising that there are agriculture production wells within the jurisdictional boundaries of both of these cities. Is this data accurate?	Comment self-explanatory [Page 1-9]	Fig. 1-7 to be revised if necessary. May be due to older ag wells which have since been abandoned due to city annexations.	1.4.2
Edward Henry	WQ	EH-002		1	Water Quality- Impact of septic systems	Top of the page-should add in "possible degraded individual septic systems as the result of age, poor maintenance, and/or lack of routine service." See attachment from Washington State Department of Health, How Nitrogen from Septic Systems Can Harm Water Quality. https://www.doh.wa.gov/Portals/1/Documents/4450/337-142-Nitrogen-Removal-from-OSS-FactSheet.pdf (See Attachment A). Would add in "minimum" threshold (MT) and "measurable" objective (MO).	Comment self-explanatory Page 1-2	Need to find referenced section of GSP	?
Edward Henry	WQ	EH-017	MCR-6	1	Mimumum Thresholds- Water Quality	While in the process of doing an extensive word search on "projects" and "management actions", a second identical sentence to the one on Page 5-21, section 5.4.3 Water Quality Measurable Objectives was found (obviously an oversight on my part when I first read this GSP) which states, "...All future projects and management actions implemented by the MKGSA will be designed to avoid causing further groundwater quality degradation...". As stated then in my initial GSP comments (submitted on September 3, 2016), this sentence should be stricken from this GSP in the final document version for submission to DWR. I'll refer the reader of these GSP comments back to my original comments on Page 5-21 which will apply here also.	Reques that commitment to avoidance of water quality degradation by projects be stricken [Page 5-11, 5.3.3 Minimum Threshold-Degraded Water Quality, 5.3.3.1 Overview]	Comment noted; however, referenced stmt is an obligation per SGMA.	N/A
Edward Henry	WQ	EH-018		1	Minimum Thresholds- Water Quality	In the next to the last sentence of the last paragraph of this section on degraded water quality (Page 5-13) it states, "... The relationship between groundwater levels and degradation trends, if any, is site-specific. ". At the June 14, 2019, meeting of the GKGSA's Combine Meeting of the Rural Communities Committee and Stakeholder Committee, Agenda Item 4 (handout), there were a total of 13 data graphs presented from various HZs in the KSB: 3 for Arsenic and 10 for Nitrates. All 13 graphs showed either a very poor correlation and/or no correlation between groundwater levels and water quality for those 2 constituents/substances. It is paramount that all GSAs in the KSB are not in some way or another held "hostage" to [degraded] water quality issues. This lack of correlation may perhaps be unique to the KSB (but doubtful), and water quality issues should not be the driver of projects and management actions that would have a positive outcome on preventing the undesirable results of other sustainability indicators, particularly groundwater levels, groundwater storage, and land subsidence.	Comment re lack of correlations between water quality and water levels [Page 5-13, 5.3.3 Minimum Threshold-Degraded Water Quality, 5.3.3.3 Minimum Thresholds]	Commntent noted.	N/A
Kevin Layne	GE	KL-001		1	Summary of GSP	I just reviewed your recently released GPS. Has anyone put together an abridged version with the highlights that I could easily share with my customers and coworkers? I'd love to see something that explained how many acres of recharge basins were going to be added and how many acre feet they would drink, how much pumping is going to have to decrease and how fast, and how many acres are expected to come out of production and the timeline for that.	Request for summary information re the GSP	We are in receipt of your email comment submitted on August 13, 2019. In response to your inquiry I have attached a GSP Takeaway flyer that has been	
Kings County Water District	WQ	KC-017		2	Data Gaps- Water Quality	The District would view the following as additional data gaps: 1) regionally, there is very little data on water quality at specific depths because of current well construction (screens across hundreds of feet), 2) The groundwater quality of many rural residential home owners is not understood by local GSAs. Please consider revising.	Comment self-explanatory	Add bullet for DAC data gaps in Sec. 2 and possible monitoring in Sec. 4.10	2.2, 4.10
Kings County Water District	AL	KC-004		2	Extraction across Subbasin Boundary	The District did not find any information or estimate of groundwater pumping in the MK GSA that is being used outside of the MK GSA area by landowners that have ranches that cross GSA or Subbasin boundaries.	Lack of data re groundwater exports out of Subbasin.	Chris to add a bullet in data gap list explaining that this needs to be further studied and quantified during the implementation period.	Section 2.2 - data gaps
Kings County Water District	GL	KC-012		2	Undesirable Results- Groundwater Levels	includes this statement, "With respect to water-level declines, undesirable results occur when one-third of the representative monitoring sites in all three GSA jurisdictions combined exceed their respective minimum threshold water level elevations. Should this occur, a determination shall be made of the then-current GSA water budgets and resulting indications of net reduction in storage. Similar determinations shall be made of adjacent GSA water budgets in neighboring subbasins to ascertain the causes for the occurrence of the undesirable result. " This approach,	Supplement explanation of annual water budget determinations on this and neighboring GSAs	Acknowledge comment and that further application of water budgets will be addressed during adaptive management and intra and inter-basin	3.2.1.1
Kings County Water District	GS	KC-007	MCR-15	2	Undesirable Results- Groundwater Storage	Sec. 3.2.1.2 includes this statement "Given assumed hydrogeologic parameters of the Subbasin, direct correlations exist between changes in water levels and estimated changes in groundwater storage. " The District views that this statement is misleading. In order to relate groundwater levels to change in storage, many significant regional assumptions must be made to develop the estimates. The District views that a reliable correlation can only be developed with significantly more information about local aquifer properties than is currently available. Also, this statement ignores the reality that some groundwater amounts may be somewhat bound in formations while other amounts may be more available for extraction. Please consider revising.	Insufficient discussion of local and regional correlations between water levels and changes in groundwater storage.	Our understanding of Basin Conditions including the correlation between changes in groundwater levels and changes in storage will be improved through the collection and analysis of empirical data from our planned representative monitoring networks. Updates the the GSP on 5-year increments during	N/A
Kings County Water District	GS	KC-013	MCR-15	2	Undesirable Results- Groundwater Storage	Sec. 3.2.2.2 contains a statement about there being a direct relationship between change in storage and groundwater levels. Please see the District's previous comment on Section 3.2.1.2. Please consider revising.	Insufficient discussion of local and regional correlations between water levels and changes in groundwater storage.	Our understanding of Basin Conditions including the correlation between changes in groundwater levels and changes in storage will be improved through	N/A
Kings County Water District	GS	KC-014		2	Undesirable Results- Groundwater Storage	The District would view that reduced groundwater storage also impacts beneficial users by reducing the amount of supply potentially available during a drought (when very little surface water is available for existing uses). This section does not seem to address this potential effect. Please consider revising.	Sec. 3.2.3.2 does not sufficiently discuss detrimental impacts of reductions in groundwater storage.	Add to last sentence..."such as a reduction in supply for areas not served by a surface water system."	3.2.3.2
Kings County Water District	HM	KC-002		2	Groundwater Inflows/Outflows	There did not appear to be a discussion of historic groundwater flow directions and whether recent groundwater flow directions are a departure from historic norms. This would seem critical to any evaluation of groundwater flows across GSA or Subbasin boundaries.	Insufficient discussion of groundwater fluxes and changes thereof over time.	Further GWE modeling simulations, as well as annual reports re GW contours, will provide new information in this regard.	N/A
Kings County Water District	HM	KC-006		2	Hydrogeologic Modeling	There is a listing of how the Sustainability Goal will be achieved, which includes this statement " Application of the Kaweah Subbasin Hydrologic Model (KSHM) - incorporating the- initial selection of projects and management actions by the Subbasin GSAs - and its simulation output is summarized in the Subbasin Coordination Agreement to help explain how the sustainability goal is to be achieved within 20 years of GSP implementation." The District views that the referenced simulation is only an indication of what may result if certain actions are taken. Please consider revising.	Empahsize that groundwater model simulation results are constrained to only depict assumed projects & mgt actions.	GW model and monitoring network data will both be used to ascertain achievement of the SG.	3.1
Kings County Water District	IS	KC-011	MCR-16	2	Interconnected Surface Waters	includes this statement, "Depletions of interconnected surface waters are minimal and, to the extent they occur, impact only vegetation along the banks of unlined channels within the forebay regions of the aquifer system where natural channels exhibit gaining reaches from time to time. " The District views that depletions of interconnected surface water would also negatively impact deliveries of surface water to right holders due to the increased losses to groundwater. Please consider revising.	Discuss occurance of interconnected surface waters and impacts of associated seepage losses on downstream water right holders.	Further justification to be provided re lack of GDEs in Sec. 2.2 and inapplicability of ISWs in Sec. 5.3.5.	2.2, 5.3.5
Kings County Water District	LS	KC-008		2	Undesirable Results- Land Subsidence	[3.2.1.3 - Land Subsidence, page 3-4] The section does not mention the connection between subsidence and dewatering saturated clay formations. This could lead to the misunderstanding that subsidence can occur everywhere that groundwater levels fall below minimum thresholds. Please consider revising.	Provide more detail re the relationship of lowered groundwater levels and land subsidence.	Refer to applicable sections of Basin Setting report (Appendix 2A)	N/A
Kings County Water District	WQ	KC-009		2	Undesirable Results- Degraded Water Quality	includes this statement, " Undesirable results associated with water quality degradation can result from pumping localities and rates, as well as other induced effects by implementation of a GSP, such that known migration plumes and contaminant concentrations are threatening production well viability are causes of Undesirable results. " This statement is very confusing. Please revise to clarify.	Comment self-explanatory.	Statement to be revised with input from other Subbasin GSAs.	3.2.1.4
Kings County Water District	WQ	KC-010		2	Undesirable Results- Degraded Water Quality	includes this statement, " Well production depths too may draw out contaminated groundwater, both from naturally occurring and man-made constituents which, if MCLs are exceeded, may engender Undesirable results. " Many local geologic formations contain aquifers with naturally occurring substances like Arsenic and Uranium. The District views that groundwater quality issues relating to local geologic properties, regardless of State MCLs, cannot be viewed as contamination or indicators of Undesirable Results. Please consider revising.	[3.2.1.4] Naturally-occurring contaminants not the responsibility of a GSA to correct for.	Current language is deemed consistent with SGMA and Regs.	3.2.1.4
Kings County Water District	WR	KC-003		2	CVP Deliveries- Drought	There did not appear to be any discussion or evaluation of the lack of Friant Division CVP surface water deliveries in Water Yeats 2014 or 2015 and how that unique changed condition impacted local groundwater levels, groundwater storage or subsidence.	Comment self-explanatory	Historic water budget and related narrative addresses drought years, including both local and imported surface water supplies.	N/A
Kings County Water District	LS	KC-018		1	Data Gaps- Land Subsidence	The District would view the following as additional data gaps: 1) there is almost no information on what geologic zone is subsiding in this area, 2) the number of well compression failures, 3) the impact of subsidence to local flood zones, and 4) if land subsidence has any correlation to groundwater quality. Please consider revising.	Comment self-explanatory	Part of five-year assessment	N/A

Mid-Kaweah GSA Comment and Response Matrix

Version Date: 20191107

Kings County Water District	HM	KC-016		1	Data Gaps- Groundwater Levels/Groundwater Storage		The District would view the following as additional data gaps: 1) aquifer characteristics to inform the assumptions currently being made, 2) well construction information for many existing wells and related information on how much water is being pumped in the confined aquifer versus the unconfined aquifer, 3) direct measurements of the amount of groundwater being pumped in agricultural areas, 4) information on bound versus more recoverable groundwater, 5) more accurate information on the base of fresh groundwater across the subbasin, 6) information to validate or criticize the HCM and aquifer descriptions from recent SkyTEM efforts. Please consider revising.	Certain HCM information that is lacking should be further disclosed as data gaps.	Part of five-year assessment; add to data gap discussion in Sec. 2	2.2
Kings County Water District	GE	KC-005		1	Executive Summary		The Executive Summary appears to be a placeholder and does not seem to be developed enough or meet DWR requirements about helping laymen.	Comment self-explanatory	See Sec. 1 for expanded Ex. Summary	1.1.2
Kings County Water District	GL	KC-001		1	Groundwater Levels		There did not appear to be much information or discussion on declining groundwater levels. As this is one of the primary issues the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) was developed to address, it seems that this historic information should be central and flow to what will be undertaken by the MK GSA to address the declines.	More discussion of declining groundwater levels needed.	GW level declines as noted in Sections 2, 5 and 6 are considered adequate.	N/A
Kings County Water District	LS	KC-015		1	Undesirable Results- Land Subsidence		The District would view that continued land subsidence would also increase the flood risks to residents and critical facilities (hospitals, prisons, domestic and municipal wells, etc.) in and around flood zones. Please consider revising.	Comment self-explanatory [3.2.3.3 - Potential Effects from continued Land Subsidence, page 3-8]	URs as a result of lost canal conveyance capacity to be added.	5.3.4.2
Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability	DC	LC-001		3	Disadvantaged Communities		The Draft GSP omits critical data, and does not give DWR or the public sufficient information to evaluate compliance with state law or the impact of the plan on beneficial users. Specifically, the Draft GSP has not clearly evaluated the impact of the plan on domestic well users and disadvantaged communities, which are likely to cause a disparate impact on protected groups pursuant to state civil rights law. Further, the GSP has not committed to a clear program to address those impacts. The GSP also does not contain sufficient information on groundwater contamination in the GSA area, and does not clearly show how the actions of the other GSAs in the subbasin will achieve sustainability throughout the subbasin. The GSA also does not provide adequate information about the plan for continued public engagement during GSP implementation. More information about each of these gaps in data and information is included below. The GSP cannot be adopted until this key information is made available to the public. The GSA must incorporate this information into the Draft GSP before the Draft GSP can be effectively reviewed by the public or by DWR.	GSP doesn't discuss impacts on small-system or domestic users; no discussion of contamination of groundwater as it relates to these users. Plan should disclose any data gaps in this regard.	Amplify impact discussion re domestic wells and small systems/DACs	5.3.1.3
Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability	DC	LC-002	MCR-21	3	Disadvantaged Communities	§ 10723.2	Mid Kaweah GSA must prioritize drinking water as an essential pillar of the proposed groundwater sustainability plan. The Draft GSP will cause significant, unreasonable and disparate impacts on protected groups as a result of the sustainability goals that it has set, and has not committed to a concrete plan to prevent or mitigate those impacts. Under SGMA, the GSA is tasked with managing groundwater in a way that does not cause "significant and unreasonable impacts" to the beneficial uses and users of groundwater in the subbasin. The GSA's activities cannot avoid impacts only on certain types of beneficial users; under SGMA it must "consider the interests of" an enumerated list of all types of beneficial users, including domestic well users and disadvantaged communities on domestic wells and community water systems.1 1 Water Code § 10723.2. Furthermore, state law provides that no person shall, on the basis of race, national origin, ethnic group identification, and other protected classes, be unlawfully denied full and equal access to the benefits of, or be unlawfully subjected to discrimination under, any program or activity that is conducted, operated, or administered by the state.2 2 Gov. Code § 11135 ("No person in the State of California shall, on the basis of sex, race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, ethnic group identification, age, mental disability, physical disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, or sexual orientation, be unlawfully denied full and equal access to the benefits of, or be unlawfully subjected to discrimination under, any program or activity that is conducted, operated, or administered by the state or by any state agency, is funded directly by the state, or receives any financial assistance from the state."); Gov. Code § 65008 [Any discriminatory action taken "pursuant to this title by any city, county, city and county, or other local governmental agency in this state is null and void if it denies to any individual or group of individuals the enjoyment of residence, land ownership, tenancy, or any other land use in this state..."]; Government Code §§ 12955, subd. (l) [unlawful to discriminate through public or private land use practices, decisions or authorizations]. In addition, the state's Fair Employment and Housing Act guarantees all Californians the right to hold and enjoy housing without discrimination based on race, color, or national origin.3 3 Gov. Code § 12900 et seq. Lastly, the Department of Water Resources is required to consider the Human Right to Water in its evaluation of the GSA's proposed Groundwater Sustainability Plan, so the drinking water impacts of the GSP are of utmost importance in its approval.4 4 Water Code § 106.3. Small disadvantaged communities of color within the San Joaquin Valley are disproportionately impacted by unsustainable groundwater use, falling groundwater tables, dry drinking water wells, subsidence, and water quality degradation.5 5 Feinstein et al., "Drought and Equity in California" (January 2019); Balazs et al., "Social Disparities in Nitrate Contaminated Drinking Water in California's San Joaquin Valley," Environmental Health Perspectives, 19:9 (September 2011); Balazs et al., "Environmental Justice Implications of Arsenic Contamination in California's San Joaquin Valley," Environmental Health Perspectives, 11:84 (November 2012); Flegel et al., "California Unincorporated: Mapping Disadvantaged Communities in the San Joaquin Valley" (2013). As described in more detail below, and analyzed in the attached Focused Technical Review, domestic well users are de minimis pumpers in the GSA area, but the policies proposed in the Draft GSP for managing groundwater levels and groundwater quality will likely fully or partially dewater approximately 86% of domestic wells,6 6 Focused Technical Review, p. 4. creating a disproportionate impact on domestic well users. Water quality will not be monitored in proximity to private domestic wells, since drinking water contaminants will only be tested for compliance where more than 50% of the pumping around a representative monitoring well is for drinking water purposes. Furthermore, the GSA has proposed a potential program to assist domestic well users and small systems with addressing these impacts, but the program is not concrete or detailed and the GSA board has not committed to implementing the program. The negative impacts discussed in this letter, which will be allowed by the Draft GSP and may not be addressed through an effective drinking water protection program, will likely be disproportionately felt by low income communities of color, and are thus discriminatory on the basis of race, color, ancestry, and national origin. In order to prevent disparate impacts, the Mid Kaweah GSA must reassess the GSP's potential disparate impacts and include robust and proactive policies, projects, and management actions to protect vulnerable disadvantaged communities and the projected 85% of domestic wells from disparate impacts.7 7 Focused Technical Review, p. 2. The sections below provide recommendations on some ways that the GSA could do so.	The GSP does not address disparate impacts on DACs, and proposed assistance pgm is insufficient and indicates no commitment for implementation.	Amplify impact discussion re domestic wells and small systems/DACs; stress that DAC needs are not paramount above others. Not GSA responsibility to solve all WQ problems, ref. Sec. 5.3.3.1	5.3.1.3
Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability	DC	LC-006	MCR-21	3	Sustainability Goal- Disadvantaged Communities/Domestic		GSAs must establish a sustainability goal that "culminates in the absence of undesirable results within 20 years."14 Undesirable results are the point at which there are "significant and unreasonable impacts" from the six sustainability indicators set out in SGMA: chronic lowering of groundwater levels, reduction of groundwater storage, seawater intrusion, degraded water quality, land subsidence, depletions of interconnected surface water.15 Also fundamental to SGMA is the obligation that GSAs must "consider the interests of" an enumerated list of beneficial users, including "holders of overlying groundwater rights, including...domestic well owners" and "disadvantaged communities, including, but not limited to, those served by private domestic wells or small community water systems."16 Therefore, the sustainability goal must be based on impacts from the six sustainability indicators, particular with respect to the impacts that they will have on beneficial users. However, instead of basing on impacts from any of the six sustainability indicators on beneficial users, the Kaweah subbasin sustainability goal focuses primarily on "the viability of existing enterprises of the region," the "water needs of existing enterprises," and local plans that create "economic and population growth." This sustainability goal focuses on water for industry, is counter to the intent of SGMA, and frustrates the goals of the law because it does not take into account the needs of or "significant and unreasonable" impacts on all types of beneficial users in the GSA area. This sustainability goal should not focus on economic growth, but rather must consider the interests of all beneficial user groups in the GSA area. The sustainability goal therefore must have co-equal goals of preserving water resources for many uses, including drinking water, environmental, urban, and agricultural. Their discussion of the Sustainability Goal also focuses on augmenting supply, and only implementing Management Actions "where necessary." Even if all projects are implemented and sustainable management criteria are complied with in the plan, many vulnerable drinking water users will still be impacted, and the GSA has not committed to implementing its domestic well and small systems management action. Instead, the GSA should focus simultaneously on projects and management actions to ensure sustainability and protect drinking water resources. Furthermore, the means by which the GSA states it will achieve this sustainability goal, through a "glidepath" approach, is geared towards protecting agricultural interests, and is likely to have severe impacts on the drinking water resources of domestic well users. The sustainability goal states that it will be reached by the combined efforts of all three GSAs. However, the coordination agreement does not clearly show how the sustainability goal will be achieved, or how actions by other GSAs in the subbasin could impact the Mid Kaweah GSA area. However, given that 86% of domestic wells are already at risk of full or partial dewatering from the GSA's proposed minimum thresholds, we know that groundwater users in the Mid 14 23 CCR § 354.24 15 Water Code § 10721(w). 16 Water Code § 10723.2. Kaweah GSA cannot afford to be further impacted by overpumping in neighboring GSAs. Therefore, we recommend that the We further recommend that the Mid Kaweah GSA set a clear sustainability goal for its own local GSA area, and ensure that the coordination agreement with the other Kaweah subbasin GSAs does	SG should explicitly address protection for DACs and domestic users	Amplify considerations for DACs as part of Goal stmt.	3.1
Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability	GL	LC-010		3	Measurable Objectives- Groundwater Levels		The SGMA regulations require the GSA to set measurable objectives and interim milestones that "achieve the sustainability goal for the basin within 20 years of Plan implementation and to continue to sustainably manage the groundwater basin over the planning and implementation horizon." Measurable objectives must be more ambitious than the minimum thresholds, and must be the point at which the GSA has determined that it will not exceed its sustainable yield, and therefore avoid "significant and unreasonable" impacts on beneficial users. The GSA has taken the 2006-2016 trend line and set the measurable objective for 2040 at the groundwater elevation reached by the trend line in 2030. The GSA has not evaluated how this groundwater elevation will affect domestic well users and disadvantaged communities, whose critical drinking water resources will be impacted by a decline in groundwater levels. In fact, the attached Focused Technical Report shows that approximately 64% of domestic wells in the GSA area will be dewatered if groundwater levels reach the measurable objectives, and an additional 9% of domestic wells will be partially dewatered. The GSA cannot therefore have considered the interests of this beneficial user group in determining its measurable objectives, and is likely to have a disparate impact on a protected group if it pursues this course of action. In order to show that it has considered impacts on domestic well users and disadvantaged communities, and ensure that it is not causing a disparate impact on groups protected from such impact by state civil law, the GSA must conduct a complete analysis of how many wells will be impacted by this measurable objective, in particular domestic wells and small community system wells in disadvantaged communities. It should measure whether the impacts to wells are "significant and unreasonable" by consulting with domestic well owners and disadvantaged communities. If its current measurable objective will cause a disparate impact or cause significant and unreasonable impacts to these beneficial user groups, it must modify its measurable objective to comply with its legal obligations. It is also unclear how the measurable objectives will achieve the sustainable yield. The GSA must clarify how achieving the measurable objectives at all representative monitoring wells will cumulatively result in attaining the sustainable yield for the GSA area. The GSA must include the following in its Draft GSP to bring its measurable objectives into compliance with law: The GSA must clarify how its measurable objectives will achieve the sustainable yield. The GSA must analyze how many wells will be fully or partially dewatered at the groundwater elevation of the proposed measurable objective. The GSA must show how it has considered the needs of all beneficial users, including drinking water users, in setting its measurable objectives, by publishing the above analysis in the GSP and showing how it consulted with domestic well users and disadvantaged communities to set a measurable objective that avoids significant and unreasonable impacts to their beneficial user groups.	Need to reset MOs such that unreasonable impacts to DACs and domestic users are avoided. The 2030 trend-line selection is not justified in this regard.	Confirm validity of NGO focused tech. report	5.3.1.3

Mid-Kaweah GSA Comment and Response Matrix

Version Date: 20191107

Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability	WQ	LC-003	MCR-17	3	Groundwater Quality/Disadvantaged Communities		The SGMA regulations require GSPs to include “[g]roundwater quality issues that may affect the supply and beneficial uses of groundwater, including a description and map of the location of known groundwater contamination sites and plumes.” ⁸ The Draft GSP does not contain information about groundwater quality issues, or a map of known groundwater contamination sites and plumes. This information is critical to ensuring that beneficial users are not harmed by increased groundwater contamination resulting from the GSA’s groundwater management activities. This information is particularly important for domestic well owners and small disadvantaged communities on small community water systems, whose drinking water supply is most vulnerable to groundwater contamination. Without such information, the GSA cannot measure the impact of groundwater contamination, and therefore cannot protect the drinking water needs of these vulnerable groups. To effectively consider the interests of these types of beneficial users, and avoid a disparate impact on protected groups pursuant to state civil rights law, Mid Kaweah GSA must: Include information on groundwater quality issues that may affect the supply and beneficial uses of groundwater, including a description and a map of the location of known groundwater contamination sites and plumes. Include adequate information regarding past, current and potential drinking water issues affecting small disadvantaged communities and domestic well users in the GSA area, including drinking water contamination, dry wells, and other drinking water supply and quality issues.	Inadequate assessment of groundwater contaminant conditions and related impacts re drinking water supplies.	Confirm coverage of known plumes	Appendix 2A of 2.2
Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability	WQ	LC-004	MCR-18	3	Monitoring Network- Groundwater Quality	23 CCR § 354.34	Pursuant to 23 CCR § 354.34, GSAs must monitor impacts to groundwater for drinking water beneficial users, particularly domestic well users and disadvantaged communities. ⁹ Water Code § 10723.2. and must avoid disparate impacts on protected groups pursuant to state law. ¹⁰ Gov. Code § 11135; Gov. Code § 65008; Government Code §§ 12955, subd. (l). The monitoring network as described in the Draft GSP fails to capture drinking water impacts on domestic wells. Representative monitoring wells are the only wells that the GSA will use to measure its compliance with its sustainable management criteria. The Draft GSP establishes two types of representative monitoring wells in the groundwater quality monitoring network: wells that will monitor for only three contaminants of concern that are harmful for agricultural production, and wells that will monitor for ten additional drinking water contaminants. The Draft GSP states that representative monitoring wells will only monitor for agricultural contaminants when over 50% of “pumping” nearby is for agriculture. This means that none of the representative monitoring wells will capture groundwater quality or supply impacts to domestic wells outside of public water systems. It is also unclear whether the water quality monitoring wells will capture impacts to domestic wells across the GSA areas because <i>the GSP does not include well construction information for a majority of the water quality representative monitoring wells</i> , so the public and DWR cannot evaluate whether the wells are sampling at the depths of the zones used for drinking water purposes by domestic well users and community water systems in the GSA area. ¹¹ Focused Technical Report, p. 6. The GSA mentions that it may conduct domestic well sampling, which could be added into the groundwater quality monitoring network data. This program, if implemented effectively and if enough wells are tested with adequate frequency, could ensure that domestic wells are also being monitored for compliance with minimum thresholds. <i>In order to avoid drinking water contamination from groundwater management activities, the GSA should include this program in its Management Actions, and provide a clear timeline and strategy for developing and implementing this program.</i> As the attached Focused Technical Report shows, the water quality monitoring network does not cover a large portion in the west of the GSA area, which includes at least 200 domestic wells and several public water systems for DACs and schools. ¹² 12 Focused Technical Report, p. 5. <i>The GSP must demonstrate how the monitoring network will be able to monitor for impacts to beneficial users in this area.</i> In developing this monitoring network, <i>the GSA has not considered the interests of this beneficial user group and is likely to cause a disparate impact on the protected groups dependent on domestic wells.</i> The insufficiency of the monitoring network poses a significant threat to the validity of the Plan at large, and therefore must be addressed immediately. The GSA must do the following: Improve groundwater quality monitoring network to include monitoring wells in the western portion of the GSA area, ensuring that impacts to domestic wells and water systems in this area are monitored for compliance with groundwater quality goals. Monitor for compliance with drinking water contaminants across all representative monitoring wells. All representative monitoring wells for groundwater quality must test for all Title 22 contaminants. The GSA must invest in constructing more dedicated monitoring wells and needs to explain how they plan to transition current wells in the monitoring network into dedicated monitoring wells. Include a domestic well sampling program in the GSP’s Management Actions, and provide a clear timeline and strategy for developing and implementing this program.	Inadequate description of monitoring pgm to track groundwater quality issues related to drinking water uses.	Add bullet for DAC data gaps in Sec. 2 and potential monitoring for potable water conditions in Sec. 4	2.2, 4.10
Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability	GL	LC-007	MCR-21	2	Sustainable Management Criteria- Groundwater Levels	17 Water Code § 10723.2. 18 Gov. Code § 11135; Gov. Code § 65008; Government Code §§ 12955, subd. (l).	The sustainable management criteria for groundwater levels must be made after considering the interests of all beneficial user groups, including domestic well users and disadvantaged communities. ¹⁷ These policy decisions must also avoid disparate impacts on protected groups pursuant to state and federal law. ¹⁸ The GSA has not shown how they have considered the interests of beneficial users including domestic well owners and disadvantaged communities. The resulting impact from the proposed sustainable management criteria will likely lead to disparate impacts on protected groups pursuant to state and federal law. 17 Water Code § 10723.2. 18 Gov. Code § 11135; Gov. Code § 65008; Government Code §§ 12955, subd. (l). Furthermore, the Draft GSP does not show how the sustainable management criteria for groundwater levels will comply with the sustainability goal to “preserve the quality of life or support population growth.”	SMC selections result in disparate impacts on DACs and domestic well users.	The issues raised in this comments will be addressed through our handling of the three key issues raised on the SHE/LCIA technical report: resolving disparate impacts, locally defined URs and enhanced mitigation measures	N/A
Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability	GL	LC-008	MCR-13	2	Undesirable Results- Groundwater Levels	19 23 CCR § 354.26. 20 23 CCR § 354.26.	Undesirable results are the point at which “significant and unreasonable” impacts on beneficial users caused by declining groundwater levels. The SGMA regulations require GSAs to justify their undesirable results by including the “[p]otential effects on the beneficial uses and users of groundwater.” ¹⁹ GSAs must also describe the “processes and criteria relied upon to define undesirable results.” ²⁰ The Draft GSP’s undesirable results for groundwater levels are inadequate because significant and unreasonable impacts will occur without triggering an undesirable result. The Draft GSP states that “one-third of the representative monitoring sites in all three GSA jurisdictions combined exceed their respective minimum threshold water level elevations.” ²¹ Violating one-third of the minimum thresholds of the entire subbasin’s representative monitoring wells would have unreasonably severe impacts on domestic well users, particularly given that reaching the minimum thresholds in the Mid Kaweah GSA alone would dewater 71% of domestic wells in the Mid Kaweah GSA area and partially dewater an additional 15% of domestic wells. ²² The Draft GSP acknowledges the serious financial impact of having to drill deeper wells, well failures, and the increased energy costs of pumping water from lower depths, but the undesirable result for groundwater levels does not prevent either of these impacts. ²³ Furthermore, the vast majority of wells the GSA would allow to go dry before triggering plan failure would be overwhelmingly upon domestic well users and disadvantaged communities, causing a disparate impact in violation of state law. In order to avoid these disparate impacts, the GSA must change the undesirable result or define its own local undesirable result to prevent widespread drinking water impacts to protected groups in the GSA area. In order to avoid a violation of state civil rights law and avoid causing significant and unreasonable impacts as required by the SGMA, the GSA must: Include a local undesirable results definition that makes it clear that the GSA will locally define and address an undesirable result within its service area and protect beneficial users of groundwater. 19 23 CCR § 354.26. 20 23 CCR § 354.26. 21 Mid Kaweah GSA Draft GSP p. 3-5, dated July 2019. 22 Focused Technical Report, p. 4. Our analysis shows a much larger impact on domestic wells than the evaluation of well impacts in the Draft GSP. 23 Mid Kaweah GSA Draft GSP p. 3-8, dated July 2019.	Criteria used to apply a one-third threshold trigger for undesirable results are insufficient, and result in significant dewatering of domestic wells.	Staff plan to meet wih SHE on 10/21 or 10/22 to address the these three themes highlighted in this comment and agree on how to modify the GSP: Impact discrepancies, locally applied UR, improved mitigation. Following this meeting, we will provide and updated response.	various
Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability	GL	LC-009	MCR-13	2	Minimum Thresholds- Groundwater Levels	25 23 CCR § 354.26. 26 23 CCR § 354.28. 27 23 CCR § 354.28.28 Water Code § 106. 29	The groundwater levels sustainable management criteria set by the GSAs must be the point that, “if exceeded, may cause undesirable results.” ²⁴ Therefore it must have the purpose of avoiding thresholds for each monitoring site at the level “that may lead to undesirable results.” ²⁶ Under the SGMA regulations, the GSA should provide a description of “the information and criteria relied upon to establish minimum thresholds,” an explanation of how the proposed minimum thresholds will “avoid undesirable results,” and “how minimum thresholds may affect the interests of beneficial uses and users of groundwater.” ²⁷ The GSA must also consider that drinking water use has been recognized as the “highest use of water” by the California legislature, and should consult with stakeholders to ensure that the minimum threshold is set in such a way as to guarantee the human right to drinking water to all individuals in the subbasin. ²⁸ The Mid Kaweah GSA’s approach to setting minimum thresholds does not “consider the interests of” drinking water beneficial users. The GSA’s proposed minimum thresholds would allow the current rate of pumping (established by the trend from 2006 to 2016) to continue at least until 2040, and possibly after 2040. The GSA contains an evaluation of well impacts that shows that 21% of wells will go dry, but our analysis shows a much larger impact: taking into account well screen intervals on domestic wells in the GSA, the attached Focused Technical Report shows that 71% of the domestic wells in the GSA will be fully dewatered at the minimum threshold, and an additional 15% will be partially dewatered. ²⁹ The GSA has therefore chosen to allow large amounts of pumping to occur at the potential expense of up to 86% of the domestic wells in the GSA area. Since domestic well users are de minimis pumpers and are not part of this aquifer-depleting pumping, this will be a disproportionately negative impact on domestic users, the majority of whom belong to a group protected by state civil rights law. This therefore will cause a disparate impact in violation of state civil rights law. In order to show that it has considered impacts on domestic well users and disadvantaged communities, and ensure that it is not causing a disparate impact on groups protected from such impact by state civil law, the GSA must conduct an analysis of how many wells will be impacted by reaching this minimum threshold, in particular domestic wells and small community system wells in disadvantaged communities. It should also quantify the increased pumping costs associated with the increased lift at the projected water levels. Then, it must measure whether the impacts to wells and household finances are “significant and unreasonable” by consulting with domestic well owners and disadvantaged communities. If its current choice of minimum threshold will cause a disparate impact or cause significant and unreasonable impacts to these beneficial user groups, it must modify its minimum threshold to comply with its legal obligations. The Mid Kaweah GSA must set minimum thresholds that consider the interests of drinking water beneficial users and do not create a disparate impact on protected groups by doing the following: 25 23 CCR § 354.26. 26 23 CCR § 354.28. 27 23 CCR § 354.28.28 Water Code § 106. 29 Focus Technical Report, p. 4 Accurately evaluate the number of wells that will be impacted should water levels reach the proposed minimum thresholds, taking into account their well screen depth, and the increased pumping costs associated with the increased lift at the projected water levels. Consider drinking water impacts in shaping minimum thresholds, and ensuring that protected groups are protected from disparate and disproportionately negative impact. The GSA must show how it has considered the needs of all beneficial users, including drinking water users, in setting its minimum thresholds, by publishing the above analysis in the GSP and showing how it consulted with domestic well users and disadvantaged communities to set a minimum threshold that avoids significant and unreasonable impacts to their beneficial user groups. In order to protect drinking water users, the GSAs should place the minimum threshold at a level above where the shallowest domestic well is screened in each Threshold Area. Provide a robust drinking water protection program to prevent impacts to drinking water users and mitigate drinking water impacts that occur.	Criteria used to set minimum thresholds (MTs) are insufficient, and result in significant dewatering of domestic wells. Detailed analyses of MT impacts on DACs and domestic wells should be included in the GSP.	Staff plan to meet wih SHE on 10/21 or 10/22 to address the these three themes highlighted in this comment and agree on how to modify the GSP: Impact discrepancies, locally applied UR, improved mitigation. Following this meeting, we will provide and updated response.	various

Mid-Kaweah GSA Comment and Response Matrix

Version Date: 20191107

Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability	MA	LC-005	MCR-12	2	Management Areas- Disadvantaged Communities	13 13 23 CCR § 351	The SGMA regulations allow GSAs to establish Management Areas “based on differences in water use sector, water source type, geology, aquifer characteristics, or other factors,” for the purpose of identifying “different minimum thresholds, measurable objectives, monitoring, or projects and management actions.”13 13 23 CCR § 351 However, it may not do so in a way that causes disparate impacts on a group protected by state civil rights law, or has not adequately “considered the interests of” all types of beneficial users. The Management Areas that the GSA proposes to establish will likely have disproportionately negative impacts on domestic well users and disadvantaged communities. The Draft GSP states that the GSA will establish Management Areas along to the borders of local water and irrigation districts within the GSA, so that each district can manage groundwater its own jurisdiction. However, some districts are only accountable to the needs of agricultural pumping, and do not have representation of drinking water users on their boards. For example, Tulare Irrigation District will be managing a wide area that includes small communities and domestic well owners; however, the irrigation district’s board and clientele only reflect agricultural pumping needs. Additionally, East Tulare Villa, a disadvantaged community that depends on drinking water from the City of Tulare, is not included in the same management area as the City of Tulare, which does not allow effective protection of the community’s water resources. Therefore this division of Management Areas means that all beneficial users’ interests will not be considered in the management of areas where drinking water and agricultural pumping interests are present, and will likely lead to disparate impacts on protected groups. Instead, a tool for protecting drinking water for disadvantaged communities and domestic wells is creating Management Areas around clusters of domestic wells and around disadvantaged communities, with a buffer around the area where the vulnerable drinking water users are located, and setting more protective groundwater quality and groundwater levels minimum thresholds in those areas. This ensures that there are no localized impacts to drinking water resources from groundwater levels dropping or from contaminant plumes being drawn towards large quantities of groundwater pumping. Therefore, we recommend that the GSA: Form Management Areas around clusters of domestic wells and around disadvantaged communities in the GSA area, with a buffer around the area where the vulnerable drinking water users are located, and set groundwater quality and groundwater levels minimum thresholds that will protect drinking water resources in those areas.	Establishment of Mgt Areas should include those areas encompassing DACs or domestic well clusters.	DACs and domestic well owners to be considered within the Tulare ID Mgt Area	2.4
Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability	PM	LC-014	MCR-11	2	Projects and Management Actions- Disadvantaged Communities/Domestic	Water Code § 10723.2. 47 Gov. Code § 11135; Gov. Code § 65008; Government Code §§ 12955, subd. (l). 48 Gov. Code § 11135; Gov. Code § 65008; Government Code §§ 12955, subd. (l)	The GSA must consider the interests of beneficial users including domestic well owners and disadvantaged communities46 and avoid disparate impacts on protected groups.47 In light of the impacts on domestic well users and disadvantaged communities from the policy decisions discussed above, the GSP must therefore include Projects and Management Actions that protect domestic well users and disadvantaged communities from the drinking water impacts that will occur from the GSA’s policy decisions. As noted above and on the attached Focused Technical Report, the minimum thresholds for groundwater levels put more than 86% of domestic wells in the GSA area at risk of full or partial dewatering, and the groundwater quality sustainability goals leave domestic wells unprotected from increased contamination. Furthermore, the GSP cannot create a disparate impact on protected groups pursuant to state law. Without proactive policies and projects to mitigate forthcoming disparate impacts, communities and homes belonging to protected groups based on race, national origin and ethnicity will experience a disproportionately negative impact in violation of state civil rights law. Because the GSP as written will cause a disparate impact on protected groups, and does not consider the interests of domestic well users or disadvantaged communities, the GSP must include projects to prevent and mitigate those impacts.48 The Draft GSP’s chapter on Projects and Management Actions contains two projects that may help protect against disparate impacts, but those projects as written are not sufficient to prevent disparate impacts. The recharge basin next to Okieville is a positive step in the right direction towards protecting Okieville’s drinking water supply and quantity. The Small Systems/Domestic Well Owner Assistance program could help prevent disparate impacts and show that the GSA has considered the interests of domestic well owners and small systems, but the GSA’s Board of Directors has not committed to doing this program, and does not define how the assistance measures will be implemented or funded. Before adoption, the Mid Kaweah GSA must clearly commit to projects and management actions to prevent disparate impacts on vulnerable water users, and have defined timelines for those projects. The Draft GSP’s potential groundwater extraction allocation program also raises 46 Water Code § 10723.2. 47 Gov. Code § 11135; Gov. Code § 65008; Government Code §§ 12955, subd. (l). 48 Gov. Code § 11135; Gov. Code § 65008; Government Code §§ 12955, subd. (l). concerns from the perspective of domestic well users and disadvantaged communities. Such a scheme could negatively impact critical drinking water resources if the GSA does not ensure that small systems, in addition to domestic wells, are exempt from pumping restrictions. In order to prevent disparate impacts on protected groups, and show that it has considered the interests of all beneficial users including domestic well users and disadvantaged communities, the GSA should consider the following projects and management actions: Clearly Commit to a Drinking Water Protection Program for the Mid Kaweah GSA Service Area: The GSP contains a potential program to assist domestic well owners and small water systems obtain solutions to drinking water issues in the GSA area. This is a step in the right direction, but needs a more solid commitment and a defined scope and proposed activities. We recommend some parameters for a potential program below, and are glad to work with the GSA on shaping an effective program for preventing drinking water impacts from declining groundwater levels, increased groundwater contamination, and subsidence. We recommend that the GSA consider the following factors in approving such a program: -Eligible activities in the program should include: drilling of new wells or deepening wells if homes’ wells go dry due to declining groundwater levels, increased energy costs from pumping from deeper depths,49 assistance in connecting to larger water systems. -Any project funded by the program must be guided by the residents or communities that are recipients of program benefits. Community input into a project will ensure project success, by learning from resident experience and knowledge to shape a project that will best suit their drinking water needs. -The GSA must ensure that the program is accessible for all residents who may need its assistance. The program should work with local agencies and organizations to spread information about the program, should not require residents to opt in to the program, and the GSA must provide translated materials regarding the program.50 Such a program must be proactive, rather than reactive. We recommend that Mid Kaweah GSA implement a Drinking Water Observation Plan (DWOP) that will serve as a warning system so that the GSA is aware of when wells are going dry, or when wells are going to become 49 Recent research has concluded that “in the Tulare Lake area, with an average well depth of 120 feet, pumping would require 175 kWh per acre-foot of water. In the San Joaquin River and Central Coast areas, with average well depths of 200 feet, pumping would require 292 kWh per acre-foot of water.” 50 Gov. Code, §§ 7293, 7295 contaminated from groundwater management	Provide stronger assurance and commitment to a small-system and domestic well assistance program; determine pro-active measures as part of the program.	Staff plan to meet with SHE on 10/21 or 10/22 to address these three themes highlighted in this comment and agree on how to modify the GSP: Impact discrepancies, locally applied UR, improved mitigation. Following this meeting, we will provide and updated response.	various
Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability	WQ	LC-011	MCR-18	2	Groundwater Quality- Disadvantaged Communities/Domestic	33 30 Water Code § 10721(w)(4); 23 CCR § 354.28(c)(4). 31 Water Code §§ 10727.2(d)(2); 10721(x)(4) 32 Water Code § 10723.2. 33 Gov. Code § 11135; Gov. Code § 65008; Government Code §§ 12955, subd. (l).	SGMA charged GSAs with the responsibility to protect water quality through groundwater management,30 and requires that the GSA consider the interests of all beneficial users including domestic well users and disadvantaged communities.31 This Draft GSP fails to incorporate performance measures and management criteria with respect to contaminants that impact human health including those contaminants with established primary drinking water standards, and in doing so, fails to conform with the requirements of SGMA. The Draft GSP leaves drinking water users in the subbasin vulnerable to increased drinking water contamination from the GSA’s groundwater management activities or from the lack of adequate groundwater management in the subbasin. The GSA has not shown how it has considered the interests of beneficial users including domestic well owners and disadvantaged communities in shaping groundwater quality sustainable management criteria.32 Furthermore, as described in more detail below, the monitoring network for groundwater quality does not monitor or manage groundwater impacts for any domestic wells. The resulting impact from the proposed sustainable management criteria, will likely lead to disparate impacts on protected groups, in conflict with state and federal law.33 30 Water Code § 10721(w)(4); 23 CCR § 354.28(c)(4). 31 Water Code §§ 10727.2(d)(2); 10721(x)(4) 32 Water Code § 10723.2. 33 Gov. Code § 11135; Gov. Code § 65008; Government Code §§ 12955, subd. (l).	Performance measures not identified to adequately protect drinking water; monitoring network inadequate for domestic wells within MKGSA.	Position stmt re GSA not being a water quality regulatory agency charged with remediation.	N/A
Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability	WQ	LC-012	MCR-18	2	Minimum Thresholds- Groundwater Quality	GSAs must place groundwater quality minimum thresholds for each monitoring site at the level “that may lead to undesirable results.”34 Under the SGMA regulations, the GSA should provide a 34 23 CCR § 354.28. description of “the information and criteria relied upon to establish minimum thresholds,” an explanation of how the proposed minimum thresholds will “avoid undesirable results,” and “how minimum thresholds may affect the interests of beneficial uses and users of groundwater.”35 The GSA must also consider that drinking water use has been recognized as the “highest use of water” by the California legislature,36 and should consult with stakeholders to ensure that the minimum threshold is set in such a way as to guarantee the human right to drinking water to all individuals in the subbasin. The Draft GSP does not protect domestic wells from drinking water contamination resulting from groundwater management activities. The Draft GSP states that the number of contaminants of concern (COC) monitored at each representative monitoring well will vary by the “dominant use” of groundwater around each representative monitoring well, and that the “dominant use” is measured as “more than 50% of the pumping” around the well. Since agricultural pumping will always dominate domestic well pumping, this means that no representative monitoring wells outside of cities and community water systems will monitor for drinking water contaminants. This leaves the vast majority of domestic wells in the GSA area unmonitored and unprotected from groundwater quality impacts. This policy decision has not considered the interests of this beneficial user type, and will cause a disparate impact on protected groups pursuant to state civil rights law. The GSA should instead monitor for drinking water contaminants at all representative monitoring wells. Another concern is that there are only 4 representative monitoring wells detecting contamination from groundwater management activities outside of the cities of Tulare and Visalia.37 This will allow for contamination to occur undetected in these areas, where domestic well users and disadvantaged communities depend on groundwater for their vital drinking water resources. The GSA must immediately increase the number of representative wells in these areas of the GSA in order to avoid a disparate impact on protected groups. Also, the proposed minimum threshold is not sufficient to protect against significant and unreasonable impacts to drinking water, because it does not protect against all primary drinking water contaminants. The GSA only proposes to monitor for compliance with MCLs for six drinking water contaminants of concern “where applicable”: arsenic, nitrate, chrome-6, DBCP, 123-TCP, and PCE.38 The GSA does not present a rationale to justify why these six drinking water contaminants were chosen, and why it chose not to monitor for other drinking water contaminants. This Draft GSP allows the GSA to conduct groundwater management in a way that contaminates domestic wells, and allows the GSA to cause increased contamination from other drinking water contaminants. It also allows the GSP to cause increased contamination in other drinking water contaminants known to increase from groundwater management activities, such as uranium.39 As written, the groundwater quality minimum threshold puts all drinking 35 23 CCR § 354.28. 36 Water Code § 106. 37 Draft GSP, p. 4-14. 38 Draft GSP, p. 3-6 39 Smith et al., “Overpumping Leads to California Arsenic Threat,” Nature Communications (June 2018) [arsenic discharge from clay correlated with overpumping]; Jurgens et al., “Effects of Groundwater Development on Uranium” (November 2010) [strong correlation between high bicarbonate irrigation and recharge water and leaching of uranium from shallow sediments to groundwater]. water at risk of contamination from drinking water contaminants that are not included in the six contaminants of concern. The impacts of this contamination will be particularly felt by domestic wells, which are most vulnerable to drinking water contamination, and are not going to be monitored for compliance with any drinking water contamination that may result from the GSA’s groundwater management activities. The GSA must therefore monitor for compliance with drinking water contaminants in all areas where drinking water wells are present, including domestic wells. The GSA must monitor for compliance with MCLs for all primary drinking water contaminants, hexavalent chromium and PFOSs/PFOAs (both of which are known to cause serious health impacts but do not have MCLs currently), as well as for contaminants that are known to increase due to groundwater pumping and groundwater management activities such as uranium.40 It is unclear when groundwater quality minimum thresholds will be triggered. We know that another GSA in the subbasin requires ten years of data before a minimum threshold for groundwater quality will be triggered. The Mid Kaweah GSP seems to communicate that a minimum threshold at a representative monitoring well will be triggered when a contaminant violates the MCL, and the GSA finds that its groundwater management activities were the cause of the increased contamination, and that the GSA will “coordinate [its] activities such that they do not result in an exceedance of any MCL.”41 The GSP	Clarity needed as to whether a drinking water MCL or AG WQO governs at monitoring wells. Need specificity as to what triggers an undesirable result for water quality.	Position stmt re GSA not being a water quality regulatory agency charged with remediation. GEI will also explore the possibility of expanding the WQ RMN near the small rural community water systems.	N/A	

Mid-Kaweah GSA Comment and Response Matrix

Version Date: 20191107

Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability	WQ	LC-013	MCR-18	2	Undesirable Results- Groundwater Quality		Undesirable results are the point at which "significant and unreasonable" impacts on beneficial users caused by degraded groundwater quality. The SGMA regulations require GSAs to justify their undesirable results by including the "[p]otential effects on the beneficial uses and users of groundwater." ⁴³ GSAs must also describe the "processes and criteria relied upon to define undesirable results." ⁴⁴ The undesirable result cannot have a disparate impact on protected groups pursuant to state civil rights law. The Mid Kaweah GSA has defined a groundwater quality undesirable result as "one-third of all Subbasin designated water quality monitoring sites exhibit a minimum threshold exceedance, and those exceedances are all associated with GSA actions." ⁴⁵ Like the groundwater levels minimum threshold, this definition of undesirable result is inadequate because significant and unreasonable impacts will occur without triggering an undesirable result. Violating water quality standards in one-third of the minimum thresholds of the entire subbasin's representative monitoring wells would have unreasonably severe impacts on drinking water users. Furthermore, the vast majority of wells the GSA would allow to become contaminated before triggering plan failure would be overwhelmingly upon domestic well users and disadvantaged communities, causing a disparate impact in violation of state law. The GSP states that the GSA discussed these impacts with Advisory Committee members, but it cannot have held an informed discussion because it did not have data on the actual potential impact to beneficial users. In order to avoid these disparate impacts, the GSA must change the undesirable result or define its own local undesirable result to prevent widespread drinking water impacts to protected groups in the GSA area. 43 23 CCR § 354.26. 44 23 CCR § 354.26. 45 Draft GSP, p. 3-6 In order to comply with SGMA and state civil rights law, the GSA must: Define its own local interpretation of the subbasin's undesirable result. Consider the impact of its undesirable impact on all types of beneficial users in the GSA area by evaluating the potential groundwater quality impact to beneficial users. Publish this analysis in the GSP, and show how it was used to define the undesirable results. Ensure that this undesirable result does not cause a disparate impact on protected groups under state civil rights law.	Lack of justification in selecting Subbasin undesirable result for water quality; specificity needed for individual monitoring wells used for drinking water protections.	Position stmt re GSA not being a water quality regulatory agency charged with remediation.	N/A
Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability	DC	LC-017		1	Beneficial Uses- Disadvantaged Communities/Domestic	Water Code § 10720.5(b).	The "reasonable and beneficial use" doctrine, to which SGMA expressly must comply, ⁵⁵ is codified in the California Constitution. It requires that "the water resources of the State be put to beneficial use to the fullest extent of which they are capable, and that the waste or unreasonable use or unreasonable method of use of water be prevented, and that the conservation of such waters is to be exercised with a view to the reasonable and beneficial use thereof in the interest of the people and for the public welfare." (Cal Const, Art. X § 2; see also United States v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1986) 182 Cal.App.3d 82, 105 ["...superimposed on those basic principles defining water rights is the overriding constitutional limitation that the water be used as reasonably required for the beneficial use to be served."].) The reasonable and beneficial use doctrine applies here given the negative impacts of the Draft GSP on groundwater supply and quality, which are likely to unreasonably interfere with the use of groundwater for drinking water and other domestic uses. As the Draft GSP authorizes waste and unreasonable use, it conflicts with the reasonable and beneficial use doctrine and the California Constitution. 55 Water Code § 10720.1(a).	GSP conflicts with the state's reasonable and beneficial use doctrine.	GSP and its Mts and MOs are considered to be compliant with SGMA and state law.	N/A
Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability	PO	LC-015	MCR-23	1	Public Outreach		Public outreach has been a critical part of the SGMA implementation process and will continue to be critical in implementing the GSP. The first chapter of the Draft GSP contains a brief description of community engagement during GSP implementation, stating that the GSA will continue notifying the public through email, postings, and social media about GSA board and committee meetings, and the GSA will do additional presentations as resources allow. does not contain adequate information regarding the plan implementation schedule and public process, annual reporting, or the potential to make amendments to the GSP. In the annual report outline proposed by the GSA, public outreach is not included in any of the key sections. Additionally, in the initial GSP implementation budget, there is no budget set aside for public outreach. This engagement is not enough to ensure that all beneficial user groups are considered, or that a wide diversity of stakeholders are included in GSP implementation decisions. The GSP must establish processes by which it will seek and incorporate feedback from the public on an ongoing basis through direct outreach to disadvantaged communities and public workshops that are held at convenient locations and times and accessible in multiple languages. Additionally, proposed reconsiderations must be publicly noticed and circulated for public review and comment prior to final adoption. To ensure that the GSP is implemented properly, the GSA must do the following: The GSA must include a plan for public outreach for the GSP implementation process. This plan should include translation services in order to meaningfully consult with and consider the interest of all beneficial users. Workshops and meetings must be at an accessible time and locations for all stakeholders. The GSA must include public outreach as part of the annual reporting. The GSA must budget for public outreach. The budget should include translation services in order to meaningfully consult with and consider the interest of all beneficial users. Clarify in the GSP that the plan may be modified as data becomes available, and that the GSA will seek and accept feedback from the public on an ongoing basis throughout plan implementation. Clarify that any modification to the GSP must be in writing, noticed and provide sufficient time for public review and feedback.	Provide more supporting information re stakeholder involvement during GSP implementation, prep. of annual reports and any changes to the GSP.	Comment noted. Further outreach will take place during GSP implementation phase, including to small communities and school districts.	N/A
Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability	WR	LC-016		1	Water Rights/Groundwater Levels	Water Code § 10720.5(b).	In enacting SGMA, the legislature found and declared that "[f]ailure to manage groundwater to prevent long-term overdraft infringes on groundwater rights." ⁵³ The test of SGMA further notes 53 AB 1739 (2014), that "[n]othing in this part, or in any groundwater management plan adopted pursuant to this part, determines or alters surface water rights or groundwater rights under common law or any provision of law that determines or grants surface water rights." ⁵⁴ As discussed in detail above, the Draft GSP allows continued overdraft above the safe yield of the basin, such that drinking water wells (especially domestic wells) will continue to go dry, infringing on the rights of overlying users of groundwater. The GSP must be revised to protect the rights of residents of disadvantaged communities and/or low-income households who hold water rights to groundwater. 54 Water Code § 10720.5(b).	Further declines in groundwater levels infringe on groundwater rights	Comment noted. The selection of MOs, MTs and domestic/small-system assistance pgm is deemed sufficient to protect all beneficial users.	N/A
Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability	WR	LC-018		1	Water Resources/Public Trust		The "public trust" doctrine applies to the waters of the State, and establishes that "the state, as trustee, has a duty to preserve this trust property from harmful diversions by water rights holders" and that thus "no one has a vested right to use water in a manner harmful to the state's waters." ⁵⁶ The "public trust" doctrine has recently been applied to groundwater where there is a hydrological connection between the groundwater and a navigable surface water body. ⁵⁷ In Environmental Law Foundation, the court held that the public trust doctrine applies to "the extraction of groundwater that adversely impacts a navigable waterway" and that the government has an affirmative duty to take the public trust into account in the planning and allocation of 56 United States v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1986) 182 Cal.App.3d 82, 106; see also Nat'l Audubon Soc'y v. Superior Court (1983) 33 Cal.3d 419, 426 ["before state courts and agencies approve water diversions they should consider the effect of such diversions upon interests protected by the public trust, and attempt, so far as feasible, to avoid or minimize any harm to those interests."]. 57 Environmental Law Foundation v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (2018) 26 Cal.App.5th 844, 844. water resources.58 The court also specifically held that SGMA does not supplant the requirements of the common law public trust doctrine. ⁵⁹ In contrast to these requirements, the Draft GSP does not consider impacts on public trust resources, or attempt to avoid insofar as feasible harm to the public's interest in those resources.	GSP does not reflect public trust resource protections nor impacts thereon.	ISWs do not exist within MKGSA	N/A
Richard Garcia	GL	RG-003		1	Groundwater Level Modeling		I would like to see better computerized graphics. Use the well log data from cities, public water agencies and public schools to create the dynamic 3D models that will show the public how bad reality is.	Comment self-explanatory	Enhanced graphical information to be considered in annual reports and five-year assessments.	N/A
Richard Garcia	HM	RG-002		1	Hydrogeologic Modeling/Stakeholder Involvement- KDWCD & USACE		Using new technologies the Agency's consultants have collected an impressive amount of new geological and hydrological data. Water audits and "Water Budget" discussions are interesting exercises, and the airborne geophysical data collection efforts are intriguing. This new data will build upon the existing work of the Kaweah Delta Water Conservation District, an entity that should perhaps play a bigger role in formulating the basin's plans. They have been working on the problem for a long time and they are the connection to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Ideally, the Corps should be part of this discussion. Flood control and recharge efforts are not exclusive.	Colaboration encouraged with KDWCD and USCE	Comment noted, and new data when available will be incorporated as part of Subbasin HCM.	N/A
Richard Garcia	IS	RG-001	MCR-16	1	Interconnected Surface Waters/Waterways		In my opinion the current M-KGSA Groundwater Sustainability Plan is an incomplete document that fails to monitor and protect the basin's natural streams and waterways. Throughout the plan statements are made minimizing the importance of protecting interconnected waterways that support and feed the underground aquifers we are tasked to sustain. The Kaweah River, Saint Johns River and Visalia's many beautiful creeks are all interconnected parts a working delta that deserver's protection and better management. Below is an example of the dismissive language used repeatedly throughout the plan: "Water bodies, primarily stream channels, which become temporally disconnected throughout the year from the underlying water table may experience the disappearance of adjacent vegetative habitat which may be considered as a beneficial use of groundwater. Such occurrences are generally restricted to the upper reaches of applicable channels in the forebay region of the aquifer system near the Sierra foothills. The consensus among Subbasin GSAs and stakeholders is that the intermittent nature of this vegetative habitat is such that its temporary loss does not rise to the level of an undesirable result. As stated previously, the interconnection of surface water and groundwater was disrupted many decades ago in the MKGSA. Therefore, a monitoring network and monitoring is not required for this GSA" Neighboring Kaweah River Sub-Basin GSA's such as the Eastern Kaweah, Greater Kaweah and several Kings County GSAs are also serviced by flows from the Tule and Kings Rivers. If a solution is to be found, neighboring intra-basin GSAs must cooperate and coordinate with each other to monitor and protect these shared waterways if sustainability plans are to succeed. A comprehensive Groundwater Sustainability Plan must consider its impact on our rivers, creeks, canals and ditches. If they are not valued and protected, what is to keep avaricious agencies from proposing upstream pipeline projects to curtail seepage and "save" water for downstream surface water customers at the expense of the entire basin's water table?	GSP fails to give due consideration to importance of surface water resources and flow system as they relate to groundwater [3.2.1.5 Causes leading to Undesirable Results Pg. 3-4], [3.2.2.5 Criteria to Define Undesirable Results Pg. 3-7], [3.2.3.5 Potential Effects on Beneficial Uses and Users Pg. 3-9], [4.8 Existing Monitoring Networks and Programs Pg. 4-14], [5.3.5 Minimum Thresholds Pg. 5-17], [5.4.5 Interconnected Surface Water Measurable Objectives Pg. 5-23]	Sustainability Goal to be enhanced to reflect importance of river, creeks and unlined channels for GW recharge; applicable recharge projects to make mention of environmental benefits.	3.1, various 7.3 sub-sections

Mid-Kaweah GSA Comment and Response Matrix

Version Date: 20191107

Self-Help Enterprises	DC	SH-010		3	Water Budget- Domestic/Public/Municipal	<p>The GSP water budget requirements are intended to quantify the water budget in sufficient detail in order to build local understanding of how historical changes have affected the six sustainability indicators in the basin. Ultimately, this information is intended to be used to predict how these same variables may affect or guide future management actions. Another important reason for providing adequate water budget information is to demonstrate that the GSP adheres to all SGMA and GSP regulation requirements and can demonstrate the ability to achieve the sustainability goal within 20 years, and maintain sustainability over the 50 year planning and implementation horizon. 10 Galloway, D., Jones, D., and Ingebritsen, S.E. Land Subsidence in the United States. U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1182. 11 DWR, 2016. Best Management Practices for the Sustainable Management of Groundwater, Modeling (BMP #5), December 2016.</p> <p>The water budget made available to the public is incomplete, and a full evaluation of the model and assumptions cannot be made at this time. Without a complete GSP draft that thoroughly explains the assumptions and methods used for the development of the water budget, the public is unable to provide meaningful comments and recommendations. The GSP is missing key information that includes all information on data and assumptions used in the development of the water budget. We recommend the following changes:</p> <p>Summarize and highlight important information for the MKGSA from Appendix 2A.</p> <p>Include a single tabulation of all the sources used. The sources of data used for the water budget components are identified throughout the text of the Appendix 2-A. However, the discussion and tabulation of all data sources in a single section would improve the ability of the public to assess the data sources and evaluate the water budget assumptions for reasonableness and completeness.</p> <p>Provide additional information detailing how the water budget presented in Table 2-1 was estimated. Little information is provided in the draft GSP on the methods and assumptions used to estimate groundwater inflow and outflow data presented in Table 2-1. Without a complete GSP draft that thoroughly explains the assumptions and methods used for the development of the water budget, the public is unable to provide meaningful comments and recommendations. Please clarify how data was compiled, including the methods and assumptions used to estimate the small water system and rural domestic water demand.</p> <p>Provide additional information detailing how small water system demand was estimated in Appendix 2A. No information was provided regarding Small water system demand was reported to be estimated from data in previously published reports. Very little specific information is provided in the draft GSP on the methods and assumptions used to estimate the small water system demand. The annual demand from small water systems is shown to increase throughout the water budget period but it is not possible to determine if the values are reasonable from the information and assumptions provided in the draft GSP.</p> <p>Provide additional information detailing how rural domestic water demand was estimated in Appendix 2A. Appendix 2A states that rural domestic water demand and consumptive use was estimated using an assumed demand rate of 2 AFY per dwelling and the density of rural domestic dwellings. The draft GSP reports that the density of these dwellings has not changed significantly over time and, therefore, rural domestic pumping has not changed over time. The method and data used to determine the density of these dwellings is not reported and cannot be evaluated and no maps are provided in the Appendix 2A showing the locations of these rural domestic users. Revise percentage of return flow from rural domestic water to address inconsistencies: Page 99 of Appendix 2-1 states that "Similar to the rural small water system analysis above, a 70 percent portion of the pumped rural domestic water is assumed to return to groundwater via septic system percolation and irrigation return flows (Dziegielewski and Kiefer, 2010). Throughout the Subbasin, an annual total pumpage for rural users was 2,272 AF/WY on average, 30 percent of which returned to groundwater." The assumed fraction of total rural domestic pumping that returns to groundwater and the calculation of net rural domestic pumping reported in Appendix 2-A is inconsistent. It is unclear if the assumed fraction of pumping that returns to groundwater is 30% or 70%.</p> <p>Provide additional information regarding the assumptions used to define changes in land use and how that was incorporated into the projected water demand presented in Table 2-1 and Appendix 2A. Based on the draft GSP, current land use was determined using the 2014 DWR land use survey data. Historical changes in land use area are not reported and, at this time, it cannot be determined if land use changes, including changes in urban areas, were incorporated into the water budget as is required by GSP Regulation Section §354.18.</p> <p>Provide water budget annual component results broken down for each subarea in order to allow for the assessment of the spatial variability of the water budget components. Section 2.3</p>	MKGSA water budget needs more detail re climate change and assumptions for small system pumping and return flows.	Include water budget components' definitions for MKGSA	2.3
Self-Help Enterprises	DC	SH-001	MCR-17	2	Well Inventory- Domestic/Public	<p>In order to develop a GSP that addresses the needs of all beneficial users, it is critical that the location and groundwater needs of these communities are explicitly addressed early on in the GSP. In order to improve this section, we recommend the following:</p> <p>Include a map indicating the location of public water systems serving SDACs and/or DACs as well as domestic well communities. In order to contextualize the subsequent sections of the GSP, it is critical that the geographic locations of these communities be included. Maps overlaying the location of these communities should also be included in subsequent sections of the GSP, including but not limited to when describing management areas, threshold regions, or potential recharge locations.</p> <p>Include a description of the amount of groundwater that each public water system serving SDACs and DACs is dependent on. In addition to better quantify groundwater usage by each community, include a description of the amount of domestic wells located within the MKGSA and the estimated amount of total groundwater used by domestic well users.</p>	GSP should include maps and general descriptions of DACs and domestic users within the GSA.	Chris to ensure that more explanation for small system pumping and demand requirements is provided with the descriptive information being brought in from the Appendix 2a.	
Self-Help Enterprises	DC	SH-006		2	Water Quality/Disadvantaged Communities	<p>SHE strongly encourages that the Groundwater Conditions section be improved in order to better achieve the objectives described in the GSP regulations and be more aligned with the guidance provided in DWR's GSP Emergency Regulations Guide. In particular, it is of utmost importance that information specific to the MKGSA area from Appendix 2A is discussed in this section, and that data regarding the water issues affecting groundwater sources of S/DACs and households relying on domestic wells is improved.</p> <p>As part of GSP Regulations Section §355.4, DWR is required to evaluate whether the interests of the beneficial uses and users of groundwater in the basin, as well as the land uses and property interests potentially affected by the use of groundwater in the basin, have been considered DWR. January 2018. Guidance Document for Groundwater Sustainability Plan Stakeholder Communication and Engagement. S/DACs and rural families relying on shallow domestic wells are extremely vulnerable to changes in groundwater conditions. As such, impacts to their drinking water sources caused by changes in groundwater levels, plume migration, increased degradation of groundwater quality, and subsidence should not be overlooked and these impacts deserve a more in-depth evaluation. A description of the current issues affecting these vulnerable users is key to demonstrating that the MKGSA is taking proactive actions to protect their human right to water. Without adequate characterization of current and historic challenges that communities dependent on groundwater face, MKGSA will not be able to effectively plan to quantify or avoid potential impacts related to groundwater management. Specific recommendations on how this section can be improved are provided in the forthcoming sections.</p>	GSP should include maps and general descriptions of DACs and domestic users within the GSA.	Add detail re MKGSA water budget in Sec. 2; discuss in more detail GW conditions as they relate to DACs and domestic users. Specifically, include key well hydrograph figure in Section 2 that also shows the locations of DACs and small system wells including domestics, Land surface subsidence Figure showing DAC and locations of small system wells including domestics Selected WQ constituents and DAC locations.	2.2
Self-Help Enterprises	DC	SH-007	MCR-13	2	Groundwater Levels/Disadvantaged Communities	<p>Changes in groundwater elevation can result in significant impacts to vulnerable communities, including: increased energy costs associated with additional lift pump costs; costs associated with cleaning of the well screen; cost of lowering well pumps; costs of drilling deeper wells; complete dewatering of wells; movement of contaminant plumes; and the financial, emotional, and physical costs associated with having to rely on bottled water. This section can be improved by including a description of the groundwater level conditions in and around S/DACs and by showing whether changing groundwater levels in these communities have led to dry wells or a decrease in water production. SHE recommends the following changes:</p> <p>Include information of the groundwater conditions and trends that are specific to the MKGSA area from Appendix 2A. Identify communities burdened by or susceptible to changes in groundwater levels. S/DACs and domestic well owners are extremely vulnerable to changes in groundwater levels. Therefore, it is imperative that the GSP properly identify vulnerable communities that have a higher risk of being affected by changes in groundwater levels to understand: (1) where drinking water wells that are more vulnerable to groundwater level changes are located, and (2) whether changes in groundwater levels may be exacerbated in specific areas by pumping volume or location, conjunctive management or other forms of active management as part of GSP implementation. Based on the Focused Technical Analysis and extensive work with S/DACs, we believe that the following communities are susceptible to changes in groundwater levels with the risk of having their water access impaired:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Okieville-Highland Acres: The community of Okieville-Highland Acres consists of approximately 100 homes located in Tulare County, five miles west of the City of Tulare. An unknown number of private wells which serve the remaining 20 homes not connected to the recently constructed water system (based on 3.76 people per household, the population is assumed to be 76) are susceptible to changes in groundwater levels and at risk of having their water access impacted. The depth of these wells are unknown, but typical domestic wells in the area are drilled to a depth of 130 to 225 feet. More recent domestic wells have been drilled to a depth of 360 feet in a preventive effort to declining groundwater levels. -Waukena: A severely disadvantaged private well community with a population of 175 residents. Private well communities face unique challenges and are more susceptible than most community water systems to changes in groundwater conditions, drought impacts, and water quality concerns. This is primarily due to the shallow nature of most private wells. -High density of domestic wells northwest of the City of Tulare: Similar to other private well communities, families relying on domestic wells face unique challenges and are more susceptible than most community water systems to changes in groundwater conditions, drought impacts, and water quality concerns. This is primarily due to the shallow nature of most private wells. -Water systems serving Waukena Elementary School, Buena Vista School, Palo Verde School, Liberty School, Sycamore Valley Academy, and Oak Valley School. Include a description of the impacts experienced during the 2012-2016 drought. Include a description of the successes and challenges experienced by local agencies and stakeholders when addressing impacts of the last drought, including: number of wells that were dewatered; number of households utilizing the interim household water tank program; local cost of emergency drinking water services; amount of grants/loan programs developed and utilized for replacement wells; and an estimated number of homes currently without a sustainable water source. A good understanding of what happened, including what programs and strategies worked well in effectively addressing impacts to drinking water and what strategies could be improved, can aid the MKGSA with the development of management actions that adequately prepares the GSA to prevent and mitigate potential impacts of future droughts. This planning is important for wells that supply drinking water to vulnerable populations that have limited capacity and resources to respond to extreme weather conditions. Based on SHE extensive work with S/DACs in providing water supply emergency assistance, we recommend adding the following information: -Drought conditions between Spring 2012 and Spring 2016 lowered the groundwater table, significantly impacting water access for domestic well users. Households reported water supply shortages northwest of the City of Tulare and in Okieville/ Highland Acres, a severely disadvantaged community located 5 miles west of the City of Tulare. During the drought, water levels in Okieville declined from 102 feet below ground surface to 171 feet, a drop of almost 70 feet. A survey of dry wells indicated that 17 wells serving 27 homes went dry. Interim water tanks were installed on 13 properties as a short-term solution while a permanent solution was pursued. Households that met income requirements received bottled water deliveries paired with the water tank program. In 2016, through a cooperative multi-agency effort involving the California State Water 	Elaborate more on the impacts of declining water levels on DACs and domestic well communities.	Same comment as above, we will also include a well statistics table as suggested above. SHE has provided a lot of suggested GSP language and will use much of the language suggested. We will provide SHE with highlighted version of their letter showing exacted what language we copied into the GSP.	

Mid-Kaweah GSA Comment and Response Matrix

Version Date: 20191107

Self-Help Enterprises	GL	SH-013	MCR-2	2	Groundwater Levels- Minimum Thresholds/Measurable Objectives	354.16	<p>The Focused Technical Review of the July 2019 Draft MKGSA GSP identified several data gaps and potential significant impacts to public water systems and domestic wells. As expressed by our organizations during MKGSA meetings, the current GSP does not adequately consider the groundwater impacts that may affect the supply and beneficial uses of groundwater as required by GSP Regulations Section 354.16.</p> <p>Additionally, during the previously mentioned community GSP review workshops, participants were asked to share their opinions and provide recommendations for what should be included in the Subbasin's sustainable management criteria. Participants were concerned with the proposed MT/MOs and what it could mean to their access to water. Feedback provided at the workshop included ensuring preserving drinking water supplies and addressing groundwater quality.</p> <p>Though we are pleased that MKGSA is considering providing assistance to small-system and domestic well owners without the financial wherewithal to service or replace their pump and well facilities, particularly those that provide potable water, we would like to highlight the following concerns and recommendations:</p> <p>Conflicting information: The draft GSP presents water level MTs by: (1) hydrogeologic zones that reportedly share similar groundwater conditions and hydrogeologic behavior (Table 5-2); and (2) by Representative Monitoring Wells (RMWs) (Table 5-3). According to the draft GSP, the hydrogeologic zone MTs are based on the average of the RMW MTs for a particular area. As stated in Section 5.3.1.3, "Consistent with this requirement, the minimum elevation thresholds in this Plan are set at specific levels based on four different hydrogeologic zones as defined herein." However, well impact analyses are performed based on the MTs developed for each individual RMW, and the MOs are only established at the RMWs (i.e., not by hydrogeologic zones). Based on the conflicting information presented in the draft GSP, it is not clear which set of MT values will be used for compliance purposes through the GSP implementation phase. Please ensure that the Sustainable Management Criteria, including MTs and MOs, be clearly identified and applied consistently in the GSP.</p> <p>Minimum thresholds are established without regard to well depths or other potential impacts: With a collective population of over 63,000 people, communities within the MKGSA area are entirely dependent on groundwater for drinking water purposes. The MKGSA includes 13 community water systems, 11 of which have less than 300 service connections but collectively serve over 5,300 people. Despite the broad and diverse dependence on groundwater for drinking water use, the approach to setting water level MTs/MOs and URs does not explicitly take these drinking water beneficial users into account. The MTs for each threshold region are set based on an assumed trajectory of decreasing water levels over the next 20 years, without regard to well depths or other potential impacts.</p> <p>The draft GSP includes a limited evaluation of well impacts (Section 5.3.1.3 and Appendix 5c) that compares the known screened intervals of agricultural, public, and domestic wells with the projected 2040 groundwater elevation at each well to estimate the number of wells that would be dewatered. The results of the well impact analyses are categorized by zone and well type. However, this analysis does not appear to actually evaluate the potential well impacts based on either the hydrogeologic zones MTs (Table 5-2) or the RMWs MTs/MOs (Table 5-3). In addition, which wells are within the MKGSA and the locations of these wells that are expected to be impacted are not clearly stated or mapped in the draft GSP. Therefore, the well impact analyses performed in the draft GSP does not appear to actually evaluate the potential impacts to subbasin wells associated with the MTs/MOs developed by the MKGSA.</p> <p>Moreover, based on the well impact evaluation in Section 5.3.1.3 and Appendix 5C, "18 percent of agricultural wells, 9 percent of public wells, and 21 percent of rural residential wells including domestic wells, would be subject to groundwater levels that would be below their constructed depth" if water levels reach the MTs, as identified at the hydrogeologic zone level. This assessment appears to have been done relative to the bottom of the total well construction depth. However, water supply wells become unusable or subject to decreased performance and longevity as water levels fall within the screened interval, which will occur before water levels reach the bottom of the well. Therefore, the actual number of domestic wells that would be significantly impacted at the proposed water level MTs would be expected to be higher than represented in the draft GSP.</p> <p>Lastly, our assessment of the water levels (Focused Technical Review, Figure 2) compared the well screens of the domestic wells located within a one-mile radius of RMWs to the proposed MOs and MTs. Approximately 30% of domestic wells in the MKGSA are located within the one-mile buffer of RMWs with both MT/MO and GSE data. Based on our assessment of the water levels, approximately 71% of these domestic wells would be expected to be fully dewatered and an additional 15% of these wells would be expected to be</p>	<p>Establishment of MOs and MTs not adequately explained; associated impacts on potable groundwater users not sufficiently detailed.</p>	<p>Staff plan to meet with SHE on 10/21 or 10/22 to address these three themes highlighted in this comment and agree on how to modify the GSP: Impact discrepancies, locally applied UR, improved mitigation. Following this meeting, we will provide an updated response.</p>	various
Self-Help Enterprises	GL	SH-016	MCR-17	2	Groundwater Levels-Monitoring/Drinking Water		<p>Robust monitoring networks are critical to ensuring that the GSP is on track to meet sustainability goals. As currently developed, the monitoring network can be improved to adequately monitor how groundwater management actions related to groundwater levels could impact vulnerable communities. We recommend the following changes:</p> <p>Identify which monitoring wells will be used to assess impacts to drinking water wells caused by changes on groundwater levels and describe how that assessment will be conducted. As required by 23 CCR § 354.28, DWR will evaluate the ability of the proposed monitoring program to properly assess impacts to beneficial users of groundwater and to protect beneficial users within the subbasin. In particular, it is important to clarify how MKGSA plans to monitor and assess drinking water wells at risk of dewatering.</p> <p>Include the location of S/DACs, areas with high density of domestic wells, and GDEs in Figure 4-3 and 4-4. Maps overlaying the location of these communities will allow stakeholders to evaluate the adequacy of the network to monitor conditions near these beneficial users.</p>	<p>Provide detail on monitoring network as it relates to water quality assessments and impacts on DACs and GDEs.</p>	<p>The groundwater level representative monitoring network and associated sustainable management criteria are designed to protect all beneficial users of groundwater. Data collected from these wells will be reported to DWR in the annual reports. If impacts to small system wells occur, the GSA will work with small system owners to further evaluate options.</p>	N/A
Self-Help Enterprises	MA	SH-011	MCR-12	2	Management Areas/Disadvantaged Communities		<p>The proposed three management areas consist of the respective jurisdictional areas of MKGSA's three Members, i.e., the City of Visalia, City of Tulare, and the Tulare Irrigation District. Our main concern is that the current proposal for management areas and threshold regions has limited consideration for vulnerable communities dependent on groundwater and does not adequately describe how the area will operate under different minimum thresholds. We recommend the following changes:</p> <p>Revise the description of the management areas to describe the S/DACs and number of domestic well users within each boundary. As described in the draft GSP, management areas are responsible for implementing projects and management actions within their area. Without a clear understanding of the S/DACs and domestic well users within the management area boundaries, the current draft GSP does not adequately describe conditions in these areas as required by Reg 354.20.</p> <p>Consider developing management areas or threshold regions around vulnerable communities. Vulnerable communities within the MKGSA do not have access to surface water and are dependent on groundwater. In order to develop more protective thresholds for vulnerable communities, it would be important to consider developing a protective buffer, management area, or threshold region around them. This recommendation can also be considered under projects and management actions. Key communities that could benefit of such protection include Okieville and Waukena and the water systems serving Waukena Elementary, Buena Vista, Oak Valley and Liberty School.</p> <p>Revise the description of the Monitoring and Analysis to better describe how the management areas will operate to avoid undesirable results. As currently drafted, the description of management areas could be improved by better clarifying how the different management areas can operate under different minimum thresholds and measurable objectives without causing undesirable results. The chart indicates which threshold regions are within each management area, but there is no description of how each management area will address the different water surface elevation conditions. Since S/DACs and domestic well users are the most vulnerable beneficial users within the MKGSA, it is important to clearly indicate how undesirable results will be avoided.</p>	<p>Comment text in bold sufficiently highlights primary concern.</p>	<p>DACs and domestic well owners to be considered within the Tulare ID Mgt Area</p>	2.4
Self-Help Enterprises	WQ	SH-012	MCR-7	2	Sustainability Goal/Water Quality		<p>The Kaweah Subbasin sustainability goal draft included in the draft GSP focuses on protecting groundwater for industry uses, which does not satisfy SGMA's intention, and does not reflect the collaborative stakeholder-driven process that took place over the course of several MKGSA Advisory Committee and Kaweah Subbasin Management Team meetings. Beginning in November 2018 and continuing over the course of several meetings, the MK Advisory Committee spent a great deal of time discussing what should and should not be included in the Sustainability Goal statement. While perspectives were varied, there was general support among committee members to set a Sustainability Goal that includes a protective stance toward groundwater quality. SHE would like to see more proactive steps taken to improve groundwater quality and tools necessary. This needs to be clearly stated in the language in the MKGSA final draft. Including human consumption in the language will make the statement stronger and demonstrate to residents that their water needs are a priority. Water quality is another important component to strengthening the Sustainability Goal. This will help the GSP meet SGMA standards. SGMA further requires a transparent and inclusive process; therefore it is critical that all GSAs within the subbasin respect guidance and recommendations previously provided by various stakeholders. Revising the sustainability goal without proper explanation or discussion with the public is not appropriate nor is it in accordance with SGMA. Additionally, upon reviewing the draft GSP, community participants at a SHE workshop in Okieville brought attention to the lack of mentioning the need for drinking water in the proposed GSP's Sustainability Goal. At the workshop, participants were provided information about SGMA, their local GSA and presented general information about the draft GSP. Participants were asked to share their vision for sustainability and provide recommendations for what should be included in the Subbasin's sustainability goal. Participants primary question if agricultural enterprises should be prioritized over human consumption. Other feedback provided at the workshop included the importance of ensuring preserving drinking water supplies and addressing groundwater quality. Based on participants' feedback and SHE involvement at several MKGSA Advisory Committee meetings and Kaweah Subbasin Management Team meetings where sustainability goal for Kaweah were discussed, SHE recommends considering the revision of the current Sustainability Goal in order to fully integrate stakeholders' vision for groundwater management. We recommend the following:</p> <p>Adopt the sustainability goal that was previously and extensively discussed during public meetings. The sustainability goal should include language that demonstrates MKGSA's intent to support the protection of the human right to water by "preserv[ing] the viability of cities and existing agricultural enterprises as well as the viability of school districts, smaller communities, and households relying on shallow domestic wells ". As stated by our organizations during several meetings and in written comments, Kaweah Subbasin GSAs should strive for the viability of unincorporated communities and schools, both now as well into the future.</p> <p>Add a clear statement of the efforts the Agency plans to take to address groundwater quality. From our understanding and based on SGMA's inclusion of UR No. 4, it is clear that water quality degradation must be addressed in a GSP. As DWR will consider the "human right to water" policy when implementing these regulations, we recommend for a clearer statement of how the GSA plans to include and address groundwater quality issues in the area. 12 Quote from draft Kaweah Subbasin sustainability goal previously developed.</p>	<p>Replace sustainability goal with original version promulgated by MKGSA's Adv. Committee.</p>	<p>Original SG to be revisited with input from other Subbasin GSAs.</p>	3.1

Mid-Kaweah GSA Comment and Response Matrix

Version Date: 20191107

Self-Help Enterprises	WQ	SH-014	MCR-19	2	Groundwater Quality-Monitoring/Minimum Thresholds/Maximum Contaminant Levels	<p>We are pleased that the draft GSP establishes MTs/MOs based on maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) for contaminants of concern for municipal use. However, the water quality monitoring network and analysis presented does not clearly illustrate how the MOs/MTs will adequately ensure that the water quality UR of impacting the long-term viability of the groundwater resource will be avoided, particularly for domestic water users and S/DACs. The proposed MT to allow contaminants to further degrade appears to be inconsistent with state water quality laws and policies. We recommend the following changes:</p> <p>Include an assessment of the concentrations of COCs at all monitoring wells to establish MT baseline conditions. The draft GSP indicates COC concentrations will be evaluated for compliance with water quality MTs in the future and where MCLs are already exceeded prior to GSP implementation, this will be considered a baseline condition that MKGSA is not responsible for remediating. It is critical that the GSP draft includes an assessment of the current concentrations in order to present the baseline conditions relative to the proposed MOs/MTs.</p> <p>For transparency and completeness, clearly identify on maps and in tables which set of MTs/MOs will be applied to which RMWs. These maps should clearly identify the location of DACs, small water systems, and other sensitive users so that the public is able to review and evaluate the proposed sustainability approach. The draft GSP identifies a methodology used to distinguish between the applicability of either MCLs or agricultural WQOs as the MTs for a given RMW. As stated in Section 5.3.3.3, "If the majority of the beneficial use (greater than 50% of the pumping within a determined area) was agriculture and there were no public water systems (including schools) the minimum threshold would be a host of agricultural water quality constituents" and "If a monitoring well is located within an urban area, or near a public water system (e.g., within a mile), which includes schools, then the minimum threshold would be set at the MCL for drinking water." However, the draft GSP does not clearly identify on a map or otherwise which RMWs will use MCLs and which will use agricultural WQOs. The document also does not identify which monitoring wells are located within an urban area or near a public water system. Per 23 CCR §354.28, the draft GSP should provide a detailed explanation as to how the proposed water quality MTs may affect the interests of beneficial uses and users of groundwater or land uses and property interests.</p> <p>Expand groundwater quality monitoring network near Okieville. Figure 3 from the Focused Technical Review shows that there are no Representative Monitoring Wells (RMWs) with established water quality minimum thresholds set at the MCL for drinking water near the community of Okieville. We recommend expanding current RMW network to include additional representative monitoring wells both in the confined and unconfined aquifers when applicable, particularly near vulnerable communities and groundwater stakeholders.</p> <p>Provide a detailed explanation of how the proposed water quality MT approach and monitoring network will result in protection of groundwater for DACs and other drinking water beneficial users in the subbasin. Specifically, the draft GSP indicates that "an exceedance of any of the MCL or agricultural metrics as defined herein at any representative monitoring sites will trigger a management action within the applicable Management Area or GSA, subject to determination that the exceedance was caused by the actions of the GSA" (Section 5.3.3.3). SHE greatly appreciates MKGSA and stakeholder intention to address an exceedance of any of the MCLs or agricultural metrics if the exceedance was caused by the actions of the GSA. However, the draft GSP does not identify which management action(s) will be implemented and provide very limited description on how MKGSA will evaluate and determine if the exceedance was caused by the actions of the GSA or not. Additional information is necessary in order to evaluate whether the proposed plan is protective of beneficial users in the subbasin.</p> <p>Revise MT to prevent further degradation of contaminants. The draft GSP indicates that where MCLs are already exceeded prior to GSP implementation, this will be considered a baseline condition that MKGSA is not responsible for remediating. SGMA requires the prevention of undesirable impacts to water quality, including degradation of water quality. An undesirable impact is one that is "significant and unreasonable". Public water systems are required by state law to be in compliance with water quality objectives. Increased contamination levels necessitate water systems to utilize more expensive treatment methods and/or the need to purchase additional alternative supplies as blending may become more difficult or impossible. Further, communities reliant on domestic wells, who are aware of contamination in their water (while also acknowledging that many reliant upon private wells are unaware of the water quality), and use a POU/POE may no longer be able to use their devices if contaminant levels rise beyond levels where water cannot be treated. Increased contamination levels result in unreasonable impacts to safe and affordable water access and is thus inconsistent</p>	Identify contaminants of concern. Measurable objectives and min. thresholds not shown to protect water quality. Which of the MCLs or Ag WQOs apply at which representative monitoring wells.	Staff plan to meet with SHE on 10/21 or 10/22 to address these three themes highlighted in this comment and agree on how to modify the GSP: Impact discrepancies, locally applied UR, improved mitigation. Following this meeting, we will provide and updated response. GEI will also explore the possibility of expanding the WQ RMN near the small rural community water systems.	various
Self-Help Enterprises	WQ	SH-017	MCR-18	2	Groundwater Quality-Monitoring/Minimum Thresholds/Maximum Contaminant Levels	<p>For the reasons identified below, the water quality representative monitoring wells (RMW) are inadequate for determining if the actions of the MKGSA degrade the beneficial use of water and for ensuring that the stated water quality UR of impacting the long-term viability of the groundwater resource will be avoided—particularly for domestic water users and S/DACs.</p> <p>GSAs undertaking recharge, significant changes in pumping volume or location, conjunctive management or other forms of active management as part of GSP implementation, must consider the interests of beneficial users, including domestic well owners and S/DACs. For these vulnerable groups, GSAs should avoid disproportionate impacts. The draft GSP lacks representative monitoring wells in areas where drinking water users may be particularly vulnerable to groundwater supply and quality issues, leaving MKGSA with no ability to adequately measure and avoid significant and unreasonable impacts to those users. It is critical that MKGSA develop sufficient monitoring networks, capable of detecting changes in groundwater quality conditions related to groundwater management. We recommend the following changes:</p> <p>Identify which monitoring wells will be used to assess impacts to drinking water wells caused by groundwater quality degradation and describe how that assessment will be conducted. As required by 23 CCR § 354.28, DWR will evaluate the ability of the proposed monitoring program to properly assess impacts to beneficial users of groundwater and to protect beneficial users within the subbasin. In particular, it is important to clarify how MKGSA plans to monitor and assess drinking water wells at risk of further contamination. In specific:</p> <p>-For transparency and completeness, the GSP should clearly identify on maps and in tables which set of MTs/MOs will be applied to which RMWs. These maps should clearly identify the location of DACs, small water systems, and other sensitive users so that the public is able to review and evaluate the proposed sustainability approach.</p> <p>-Provide a focused and detailed explanation of how the proposed water quality MT approach and monitoring network will result in the protection of groundwater for S/DACs and other drinking water beneficial users in the subbasin, as required by 23 CCR § 354.28.</p> <p>Expand groundwater quality monitoring network near Okieville. Based on the spatial distribution of the wells dedicated to monitoring water quality presented in Figure 4-6 and 4-7 of the draft GSP, the network is not spaced evenly across the area. The water quality RMWs are located in the northern and eastern portions of the MKGSA area and the monitoring well density varies by two orders of magnitude across the MKGSA. Although the western portion of the MKGSA, including the communities of Okieville and Waukena, are more sparsely populated than the eastern portion, there are at least 200 domestic wells and several public water systems, including the Okieville/Highland Acres Mutual Water Company, Waukena Elementary School, and Buena Vista School water systems, located in this area. Figure 3 from the Focused Technical Review shows that there are no RMWs with established water quality minimum thresholds set at the MCL for drinking water near the community of Okieville. SHE recommends expanding the current RMW network to include additional representative monitoring wells, particularly near vulnerable communities and groundwater stakeholders. Specifically, consider incorporating the new well serving Okieville/Highland Acres Mutual Water Company as a RMW with established water quality minimum thresholds and quantifiable measurements of sustainability.</p> <p>Clarify how the GSA plans to align groundwater monitoring efforts with any emerging contaminants of concern and new MCLs. Perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) and perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOAs) have been identified as emerging contaminants in the basin. Due to their emergence, it is important that MKGSA include these contaminants as COCs to be monitored and evaluated. In addition to these two contaminants, the draft GSP would benefit from an explanation of how the plan will be updated to align groundwater monitoring efforts with any emerging contaminants in the basin and any future new MCLs.</p> <p>Include well construction information for all RMWs included in the GSP. The draft GSP identifies 43 RMWs for water levels, but does not include well construction information for these wells as is required for all monitoring wells by 23 CCR § 352.4. This type of information is critical to allow the public and DWR evaluate if the RMWs are adequate in evaluating water levels relative to the MOs and MTs over the long term.</p>	Which of the MCLs or Ag WQOs apply at which representative monitoring wells. Demonstrate how planned projects do not worsen water quality for DACs or domestic users.	Staff plan to meet with SHE on 10/21 or 10/22 to address these three themes highlighted in this comment and agree on how to modify the GSP: Impact discrepancies, locally applied UR, improved mitigation. Following this meeting, we will provide and updated response. GEI will also explore the possibility of expanding the WQ RMN near the small rural community water systems.	various
Self-Help Enterprises	AL	SH-019		1	Groundwater Allocations	<p>SHE appreciates MKGSA's intent to conduct a full stakeholder outreach program during the development of the Mid-Kaweah Groundwater Extraction Allocation Framework such that well owners will be afforded the opportunity to provide input on the proposed implementation of the program. We are also pleased that MKGSA also plans to exclude those well owners who extract less than two AF per year (i.e., de minimis extractors) at least for this initial phase of an allocation program. Nonetheless, we recommend the GSP provide stronger clarification regarding provisions that the GSA plans to implement and consider to ensure that drinking water users will continue to have access to drinking water. When developing a groundwater allocation framework, consider the following measurements to ensure that the framework is protective of the Human Right to Water (AB 685):</p> <p>Sustainable yield allocation: In order to best protect drinking water needs we recommend that GSAs establish an allocation amount of groundwater as part of the calculation for the sustainable yield to adequately meet drinking water needs for public health and safety, both now as well into the future. Small water systems serving disadvantaged communities, domestic well owners, and water systems serving schools should be excluded from an allocation program. In order to determine this baseline for drinking water, GSAs will need to work with small community water systems, cities, and/or the county to determine current and future daily drinking water needs.</p> <p>Fees: The draft GSP indicates that it will not impose pumping restrictions on well owners that extract less than two AF per year. However, it does not address small water systems that may extract over two AF per year and serve critical drinking water needs, such as the Okieville/Highland Acres Mutual Water Company, and the Waukena Elementary School system. When developing a groundwater user fee structure, please consider that small communities have fewer economic resources. Additional fees increase families' water bills that are frequently already above the California water affordability threshold of 1.5% of MHI. Moreover, it is important to recognize and value other ways DACs and low-income residents contribute to the implementation of SGMA. For example, the Kaweah Subbasin, like many others around the State, was granted a DAC waiver and qualified for \$1.5 million in grant funds to offset the costs of developing the GSP. The DAC waiver was granted by demonstrating the number of DACs that are located within the subbasin. Additional grants were obtained to construct monitoring wells and a recharge basin. For these reasons, we recommend exempting small drinking water systems managed by DACs and De Minimis Extractors from any GSAs fees (use permits and penalty fees) to support their efforts to provide affordable safe water.</p> <p>Financial penalties: Penalties for DAC water providers with limited technical, managerial, and financial capacity have often been found by the SWRCB to be counter-productive. If MKGSA consider implementing a sort of penalty for over-use, at a minimum consider 1) creating a more flexible warning and appeal process with these users, 2) proactively assisting SDWS that may be at risk of over-extraction, and 3) conditional forgiveness and reduction of penalties should be considered. This would encourage transparency and working collaboratively with MKGSA to take corrective actions addressing the underlying causes of overuse. Ideally, we recommend that MKGSA consider exempting SDWS serving DACs be from financial penalties for over-use.</p> <p>Allocation decisions time-frame: In the context of extreme weather events and given the unique set of factors that play a role in the recharge of the aquifers within the GSAs area, we recommend that allocations decisions are not tied to a time frame but to an adaptive management methodology that can respond timely to undesirable results and adjust allocations accordingly. The adaptive management methodology could guide allocation decisions and be used as a corrective tool to avoid localized drawdown impacts on communities and ecosystems, such as dewatering of shallower wells and streams. Particular attention should be placed on protecting groundwater levels for drinking water beneficial uses in the vicinity of community water systems of all kinds (municipal and unincorporated) and domestic well communities.</p> <p>Banking allocation of groundwater: Susceptibility to experiencing undesirable results from a given amount of pumping depends on hydrogeologic, climatic, biological, and other factors that can vary significantly within short and long periods. We recommend a short period for banking allocation to avoid significant negative externalities. We also recommend that any allocation period be strictly tied to an adaptive management methodology that can respond timely to undesirable results and adjust allocations accordingly. This is particularly important in the context of changing climate and data uncertainties.</p> <p>Transitional allocations and period: The following protective measures can be considered if excessive pumping is allowed during the transition period or if transitional buffer allocations are made available to eligible groundwater users:</p> <p>-Develop an adaptive management methodology</p>	GSP needs more substantive discussion as to protections for drinking water users during implementation.	Pumping restrictions/allocations to be developed by GSA during first five years, including any for DACs.	N/A

Mid-Kaweah GSA Comment and Response Matrix

Version Date: 20191107

Self-Help Enterprises	AL	SH-020		1	Water Marketing	There are a number of important foundational steps agencies need to take before considering a groundwater market as a possible tool for groundwater management. Changing where and when groundwater is pumped or the place, method, timing, or purpose of its use, can significantly change the impacts experienced by people and ecosystems. Whether a groundwater market leads to harmful or beneficial impacts all depends on how the market is designed, governed, implemented, and what feedback mechanisms are included and utilized throughout the life of the market. Groundwater markets are not a viable option where the potential impacts of trading are not well understood – which is the case in areas that have significant data gaps and data uncertainties – where trading rules cannot sufficiently address negative externalities, or where the expected benefits of a market do not outweigh the burdens and uncertainties associated with designing and implementing a market. The foundation of a well-designed trading program requires a fair and adequate allocation of groundwater for drinking water uses, an additional margin for future growth prior to allocating water for trading purposes, and trading rules that avoid undesirable results as well as avoid or mitigate potential impacts to communities dependent on groundwater supplies. If these components are missing, the market can have significant negative impacts upon a community's drinking water supply. Some impacts include, but are not limited to: localized drying of community and domestic wells, increased contamination levels, or unaffordable water rates. Before considering a groundwater market framework, consider the following: Establish a non-tradeable allocation for drinking water: A non-tradeable allocation amount of groundwater should be included as part of the calculation for the sustainable yield to adequately meet current and future drinking water needs for public health and safety. Ensure that monitoring networks are in place to detect the status and trends of groundwater conditions, and to ensure that the market is running well and is not resulting in adverse impacts to groundwater quality and/or groundwater levels. Implement an early warning system utilizing data collected through the monitoring network that helps identify at-risk groundwater users and anticipate potential negative impacts, such as groundwater level declines or worsening groundwater quality. Provide security considerations to ensure that transfers do not individually or cumulatively cause or contribute to violations of water quality standards. Implement interim and long-term solutions to mitigate for negative impacts to drinking water users caused by the groundwater trading. Outreach and engagement: Devise ways to help engage, communicate and translate technical information to stakeholders, particularly to rural communities, private well owners, and small farmers. 17 Green Nysten, Nell, Michael Kiparsky, Kelly Archer, Kurt Schnier, and Holly Doremus. 2017. Trading Sustainably: Critical Considerations for Local Groundwater Markets Under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act. Center for Law, Energy & the Environment, UC Berkeley School of Law, Berkeley, CA. 90 pp1	Any groundwater trading/marketing program should give due consideration to drinking water user needs.	GW marketing/trading pgm to be considered and developed during first five years; small-system and domestic pumpers to be taken into consideration.	N/A
Self-Help Enterprises	DC	SH-005	MCR-17	1	Hydrogeologic Modeling/Disadvantaged Communities	In order to better depict the hydrogeologic considerations for vulnerable groundwater users, we recommend the following changes: Summarize and highlight important information for the MKGSA from Appendix 2A. Include a description of how groundwater quality considerations also impact the potential of recharge suitability under the description of Potential Recharge Areas. Include the location of SDACs and DACs and domestic wells in Figure 16 and 18 of Appendix 2A. By adding the spatial distribution of communities, stakeholders will be better able to assess which of these communities could benefit from future recharge projects.	Highlight information pertinent to MKGSA from Appendix 2A with respect to prime recharge areas; better identify locations of DACs.	Addressed as part of Priority 3 comments.	1.4.2, 2.2
Self-Help Enterprises	DC	SH-021	MCR-14	1	Groundwater Levels-Domestic/Public	SHE appreciates MKGSA and stakeholder interest in providing assistance to small water systems and domestic well owners without the financial impacts to service or replace their pump and well facilities. As the assistance measures described in the draft GSP have not yet been approved to be carried out, we would like to further express the importance in providing such an assistance program to prevent and mitigate for impacts to drinking water users. The draft GSP identifies an impact to 21% of rural/domestic wells and, based on our Focused Technical Review, the actual impacts could be much higher. Moreover, rural domestic and small water system demand does not contribute substantially to the overdraft conditions, yet the risks imposed on these drinking water users are overlooked, creating a disproportionate impact on already vulnerable communities. With the decision of postponing the implementation of a groundwater allocation program or addressing reductions in groundwater pumping, drinking water users could face significant impacts, particularly if the region faces another drought. If MKGSA defines its sustainability criteria in a way that allows for the dewatering of drinking water wells, it is critical that MKGSA develops a robust drinking water assistance program to prevent impacts to drinking water users and mitigate the drinking water impacts that occur. The draft GSP presents a couple of mitigation measures that are being considered by the GSA's Advisory Committee and Governing Board. We would like to provide a set of additional considerations for establishing such an Assistance Program. Mainly, we recommend that mitigation measurements are tied back to a monitoring network and an adaptive management framework (trigger system) to evaluate groundwater conditions and predict potential groundwater impacts to drinking water wells. The framework should forecast how groundwater levels and quality could change based on potential project impacts, identify at-risk domestic wells, identify areas for additional monitoring, and determine if monitoring triggers have been met. Please consider the following for the development of an Assistance Program: Drinking Water Wells Monitoring Network: Expand and improve the monitoring network described by the GSP draft to assess impacts to drinking water wells caused by changes on groundwater levels and quality, in particular for groundwater conditions near the Okieville and Waukena communities, areas with high density of private domestic wells, and water systems serving schools. This will allow MKGSA to better comply with GSP regulations section 354.34, which requires GSAs to describe how potential impacts to groundwater users and uses will be monitored, ensure the success of the Assistance Program, and take a proactive approach to protect S/DACs and domestic well owners access to safe and affordable drinking water. Adaptive Management/Trigger System: Develop a protective warning system, also referred to as an adaptive management approach, which can alert groundwater managers when groundwater levels are dropping to a level that negatively affects drinking water users. Such triggers are essential for groundwater management but can be adjusted to fit the needs of different management actions as well as the basin as a whole. The table below provides an example of what a warning system might look like, using green, yellow, and red light indicators or "triggers", and some potential corrective actions groundwater managers can take to remedy the problem. Ultimately, this approach allows for evaluating what is happening and responding accordingly to prevent or mitigate negative impacts. "Green-light" Groundwater levels are stable. No action required. "Yellow-light" Groundwater levels are approaching concerning levels and impacts may occur or are occurring at a low rate. Some corrective actions are needed. - Undertake an analysis to pinpoint the cause - Undertake targeted water quality testing for selected domestic wells as mentioned in the draft GSP as one of the measures being considered by the GSA's Advisory Committee and Governing Board - Provide support to groundwater users experiencing impacts -Reassess pumping allocation and pumping patterns and consider restricting or limiting groundwater extraction near the triggered area. "Red-light" Time to stop and mitigate as significant impacts are imminent or are occurring. - Reassess pumping allocation and pumping patterns and consider further restricting or limiting groundwater extraction near the triggered area. -Provide interim emergency solution while pursuing a permanent solution to impacted groundwater users. Drinking Water Well Impact Tool/Model: Develop a tool/model tied to the monitoring network and the adaptive management framework (trigger system) to evaluate groundwater levels and predict potential groundwater impacts to drinking water wells. Update model regularly and develop a prediction of the potential groundwater impacts to drinking water wells. The tool/model could be used to: monitor and forecast changes in groundwater levels, monitor and forecast any localized areas for special attention and/or monitoring, attempt to identify domestic wells at risk of impacts, and determine if triggers have been met based on the adaptive management framework. Results of this assessment could be	Add to small-system and domestic assistance pgm as recommended.	Assistance pgm set forth in Sec. 7.4 not all-inclusive and may be expanded pending further information during implementation.	N/A
Self-Help Enterprises	GA	SH-022		1	Interagency Collaboration	SHE appreciates MKGSA and stakeholder proposal to further collaborate and partner with other regulatory agencies during GSP implementation to ensure that its minimum thresholds and measurable objectives are maintained and that the water quality objectives of these other entities are achieved. As expressed previously, SHE believes that the strategic governance structure of GSAs can uniquely leverage resources, provide local empowerment, centralize information, and help define a regional approach to groundwater quality management unlike any other regional organization. When implemented effectively, GSAs have the potential to be instrumental in reducing levels of contaminants in their regions, thus reducing the cost of providing safe drinking water to residents. GSAs are the regional agency that can best comprehensively monitor and minimize negative impacts of declining groundwater levels and degraded groundwater quality that would directly impact rural domestic well users and S/DAC within their jurisdictions. When potential projects are proposed, MKGSA should consider taking leadership in coordinating regional solutions.	GSAs should take leadership role in coordinating projects to provide drinking water benefits.	MKGSA strives to collaborate with other Kaweah Subbasin GSAs on future projects. One such project is described in Sec. 7.3.6.	N/A
Self-Help Enterprises	LS	SH-009		1	Land Subsidence/Disadvantaged Communities	The GSP's current evaluation of land subsidence states general impacts, such as impacts to infrastructure, in particular to the Friant Kern Canal, but fails to describe previous and potential impacts to vulnerable communities. Land subsidence could result in many direct and indirect impacts to vulnerable communities. Direct impacts can include damages to community infrastructure including bridges, pipe crossings, roads; collapsing of well casings, that result in well rehabilitation or replacement; and the mobilization and release of arsenic from clay layers into the groundwater aquifer. Indirect impacts can include flooding and long-term environmental effects. Since S/DACs, public water systems, and domestic well communities often lack the resources to address these damages, it is important to document and describe previous and potential impacts in order to prevent them from occurring or mitigate impacts if they occur. Please consider the following recommendations: Summarize and highlight important information for the MKGSA from Appendix 2A and include local knowledge of the groundwater conditions affecting groundwater use and users in MKGSA area. Include a description of possible impacts of land subsidence for S/DACs, public water systems, and domestic well communities. Include documentation of any historical impacts of land subsidence for S/DACs, public water systems, and domestic well communities in Past Land Subsidence.	Provide assessment of land subsidence on DACs and domestic well communities	Current information re subsidence is insufficient to gauge impacts on rural DACs and associated infrastructure. Will acknowledge same as a data gap.	2.2
Self-Help Enterprises	LS	SH-015		1	Land Subsidence/Disadvantaged Communities	As mentioned previously, land subsidence could have significant impacts on vulnerable community infrastructure. In communities that do not have the financial capacity to address costly infrastructure damages, impacts of land subsidence should be evaluated more closely. We recommend the following changes: Expand the description of potential impacts for S/DAC communities and rural domestic well users under the description of the Potential Impacts on Beneficial Uses and Users. Clarify the relationship between groundwater quality and land subsidence. Researchers have found that there is a relationship between land subsidence caused by overpumping and increases in contaminants like arsenic15. The section on the Relationship for each Sustainability Indicator needs to be revised to clarify that this is not applicable to the MKGSA. 15 Smith, R., Knight, R., & Fendorf, S. (2018). Overpumping leads to California groundwater arsenic threat. Nature communications, 9(1), 2089. doi:10.1038/s41467-018-04475-3	Provide assessment of land subsidence on water quality for drinking water uses	Current information re subsidence is insufficient to gauge impacts on rural DACs and associated infrastructure. Will acknowledge same as a data gap.	2.2

Mid-Kaweah GSA Comment and Response Matrix

Version Date: 20191107

Self-Help Enterprises	PM	SH-018	MCR-11	1	Projects and Management Actions- Multiple Benefit/Disadvantaged Communities/Water Quality	<p>We are pleased with the inclusion of Okieville Recharge Basin Project. A partnership has been established between Okieville and TID in order to construct the recharge basin upstream from the community that can bring mutual benefits. Indeed, groundwater recharge projects can have multiple benefits such as increasing groundwater storage and levels, as well as diluting contaminant plumes and improving groundwater quality. Carefully designed and implemented recharge projects, dry wells, on-farm recharge and storage projects type can simultaneously provide benefits to communities, farmers, and ecosystems. Moreover, these types of partnerships can enhance community engagement in projects, increase community awareness of the issues being addressed and establish a framework to support communities in their efforts to secure safe and reliable water.</p> <p>However, if not properly designed, recharge projects may mobilize nitrates, pesticides, and fertilizers, as well as naturally occurring contaminants, and can lead to the further degradation of groundwater quality, impacting drinking water wells. Currently, it is unclear if recharge, injection wells, and on-farm recharge proposed projects include precautions of groundwater quality degradation or if groundwater quality is included in the monitoring plan of these projects. In order to develop recharge projects that move the subbasin towards sustainability, avoid the further degradation of groundwater, and improve drinking water conditions, we recommend the following considerations and changes:</p> <p>Strengthen partnerships between Okieville and other DACs such as Waukena. MKGSA and TID should continue to partner with communities for the development of projects with multiple benefits that addresses overdraft while ensuring the protection and viability of important drinking water sources. When feasible, MKGSA should continue to prioritize and provide additional recognition for recharge projects near or up gradient to drinking water systems that have shared benefits: increase groundwater baseflow while at the same time addressing drinking supply needs, including improving GW quantity and quality.</p> <p>Include a map that overlays all of the potential recharge projects onto one map and include the location of S/DAC, domestic wells, and public water systems. As currently described, stakeholders are unable to effectively evaluate the collective potential benefits or impacts of recharge projects for drinking water users in the MKGSA.</p> <p>Develop criteria for recharge projects that prevent unintended impacts to drinking water. We recommend providing security considerations to ensure that all recharge and storage projects do not cause nor increase groundwater contamination. Attention should be placed on monitoring water quality, avoiding the use of contaminated soils through which water will percolate or use of surface water that is contaminated, and proposing strategies that can avoid/prevent/mitigate for any potential short and/or long term impact to drinking water wells, including domestic wells. For more information please refer to back to the guide Protecting Drinking Water Quality Under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act 16. 16 Community Water Center. Guide to Protecting Drinking Water Quality Under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act.</p> <p>https://d3n8a8pro7vnm.cloudfront.net/communitywatercenter/pages/293/attachments/original/1559328858/Guide_to_Protecting_Drinking_Water_Quality_Under_the_Sustainable_Groundwater_Management_Act.pdf?1559328858</p>	Provide clarity re proposed on-farm programs and effects on water quality.	Consistent with the objectives of MKGSA as stated in Sec. 3.1, analyses of proposed projects on water quality will be made during GSP implementation. Each such project will include a monitoring component.	N/A
Self-Help Enterprises	PO	SH-002	MCR-22	1	Public Outreach- Disadvantaged Communities	<p>Public Engagement, when done well, goes far beyond the usual participants to include those members of the community whose voices have traditionally been left out of political and policy debates. (DWR. (2018) Stakeholder Communication and Engagement). It invites citizens to get involved in deliberation, dialogue, and action on public issues that are important to them. More importantly, it helps leaders and decision-makers have a better understanding of the perspectives, opinions, and concerns of citizens and stakeholders, especially the underrepresented ones. This section of the GSP is generally in accordance with SGMA regulations and adequately captures beneficial uses and users of groundwater. Please consider the following recommendations to ensure more effective public engagement:</p> <p>Within the GSP include a high level summary of strategies included in the plan. The draft GSP currently only mentioned plan goals and requirements and would benefit from a more expanded description.</p> <p>Revise Section 1.5.2 to include water supply for Souls Tract, Lone Oak Tract, and the water systems of Waukena Elementary, Buena Vista, Oak Valley and Liberty School.</p> <p>Provide more information about stakeholder input and responses from the GSA to address the stakeholder input.</p> <p>Account for S/DAC outreach, engagement and translation services when applying for state funding, establishing and approving operating budgets and enacting groundwater fees: In order to ensure proper engagement of underrepresented groundwater users or the next 20 years of GSP implementation, (disadvantaged communities, residents relying on domestic wells and other Spanish speaking users), MKGSA should account for S/DAC outreach, engagement and translation services when applying for state funding, establishing and approving operating budgets and enacting groundwater fees. The GSA should hire qualified consultants who have a record of proven demonstrated success and clear qualifications for working with these stakeholders. Effective community outreach and engagement includes, but is not limited to, conducting direct community outreach, hosting local community meetings, providing bilingual information, and making interpreting services available at meetings and workshops.</p>	Provide more information re DACs and involvement in establishing fees/charges during GSP implementation.	Executive Summary to be expanded per comment. References to DACs and schools to be added.	1.1.2; 1.5.2.2
Self-Help Enterprises	PO	SH-003	MCR-23	1	Public Outreach	<p>The current draft GSP provides limited information regarding how communication and updates related Plan implementation will take place and how this will be accomplished. Please consider the following suggestions:</p> <p>Utilize existing community venues for community meetings, workshops and events to provide information. For example, consider conducting short presentations during water board and school district board meetings. Venues should be carefully selected in order to meet the needs of the targeted audience.</p> <p>Identify community social media (Facebook, Instagram, etc.) groups, pages and websites and post information. Continue to develop media advisories, press releases and work with local media outlets, such as local radio stations, television stations, and local newspapers to captivate a broader audience that are not being reached via the electronic-based outreach currently used.</p> <p>Identify, and work with key community leaders /trusted messengers to distribute broader information and encourage community participation.</p> <p>Provide bilingual (English and Spanish) information and materials on the website, via email and consider inserting short notices (notices can include key messages, visuals and information that is relevant to the average water user) in water bills and/or community newsletters. At a minimum, this information should be provided during plan updates, and prior to critical decisions. In particular, the draft GSP released during the formal comment period should include materials highlighting key summaries of the GSP. Critical decision points can also include the adoption of groundwater fees, development and adoption of the potential Assistance Program as well as the Groundwater Allocation Framework, and the Pumping Restriction Program.</p> <p>Partner with other educational programs to leverage resources and explore opportunities to educate different generational groups.</p>	Provide more supporting information re stakeholder involvement during GSP implementation.	Comment noted. Further outreach will take place during GSP implementation phase, including to small communities and school districts.	N/A
Self-Help Enterprises	SB	SH-004		1	Kaweah Subbasin Characteristics	<p>The GSP basin setting requirements are intended to describe the hydrological and groundwater historical changes that have affected the six sustainability indicators. Ultimately, this information is intended to document conditions and quantify the water budget in sufficient detail in order to build local understanding of how it will be used to predict how these same variables may affect or guide future management actions. (DWR, 2016. Best Management Practices for the Sustainable Management of Groundwater, Modeling (BMP #5), December 2016.) The current GSP draft does not include information about local groundwater conditions for MKGSA, yet it encourages the reader to review Appendix 2A to understand the hydrogeologic and groundwater conditions within the context of the entire Subbasin. However, Appendix 2A is not specific to the MKGSA area and it is difficult to readily understand what parts of this assessment are specifically applicable to the MKGSA. Moreover, the lack of a summary highlighting the main conditions affecting groundwater use and users within MKGSA boundaries creates a challenge in understanding how the data will be further utilized in other sections of the GSP. It is therefore recommended to:</p> <p>Include specific information of the Basin Setting and trends within the MKGSA area, in particular as it pertains to the groundwater conditions in section 2 of the GSP. Providing context of local challenges in a single section within the Mid-Kaweah GSP draft GSP would improve the ability of the public to evaluate the basin setting assumptions for reasonableness and completeness to prevent and mitigate for undesirable results.</p>	Provide data specific to MKGSA from Basin Setting report (App. 2A)	Excerpts from App. 2A pertaining to MKGSA to be added.	2.2
Self-Help Enterprises		SH-008		1	Groundwater Quality/Disadvantaged Communities	<p>The current characterization of groundwater quality conditions in Appendix 2A fails to recognize that several public water systems within the GSA have experienced challenges remaining in compliance for safe drinking water standards. Further, because of these data gaps in measuring groundwater quality, the extent of groundwater quality contamination for domestic wells or state small water systems is not fully quantified or accounted for in the draft GSP. This section can be improved by including a better description of groundwater quality conditions near or within S/DAC communities as well as an improvement in understanding how potential groundwater management actions could potentially impact the extent of groundwater contamination. We recommend the following changes:</p> <p>Summarize and highlight important information for the MKGSA from Appendix 2A and include local knowledge of the groundwater conditions affecting groundwater use and users in MKGSA area. This is particularly important considering that Appendix 2A, page 125, states that a "groundwater quality discussion" in the Basin Setting for the context of the entire Subbasin "is largely generalized, although constituents of concern are identified geographically." As such, the current characterization of groundwater quality conditions fails to adequately provide a narrative of issues affecting the supply and beneficial uses of groundwater as required by GSP Regulations Section §354.16.</p> <p>Include a description of historical groundwater quality conditions for each public water system. Cities, communities and schools within the MKGSA have historically had challenges meeting safe drinking water requirements. In order to prevent further degradation of groundwater quality conditions, it is important to adequately capture current challenges. At a minimum, consider including in the Mid-Kaweah GSP, section 2, information regarding cities and communities that have fluctuated in and out of compliance. According to the Human Right to Water portal, the water system of Buena Vista School has fluctuated in and out of compliance for Nitrates. The water system of Waukena Elementary School has been in and out of compliance for Uranium and Nitrates. The water system for Oak Valley School has also been in and out of compliance for Arsenic. Moreover, the water well recently drilled for Okieville only found water that meets primary water quality standards at the depth range between 894 ft to 1005 ft. Water depth less than 894 ft exceeds MCLs for Arsenic and Aluminum. Furthermore, SHE recommends providing a summary of the information regarding water quality for the City of Visalia and Tulare, including the city-wide PCE plume in Visalia.</p> <p>Include an assessment of current 10-year average concentrations of contaminants of concern. The maps depicting current groundwater quality conditions in Appendix 2-E only include individual contaminant concentrations over several different time periods. In order to develop the proposed minimum thresholds and measurable objectives, it is important that the current baseline conditions are established.</p> <p>Include a map of current 10-year average groundwater quality conditions that includes locations of vulnerable communities. Once current baseline conditions are established, it would be helpful to include the 10-year average conditions overlaid with location of S/DACs, domestic wells, public water systems, and any other sensitive beneficial users. This is important in order to adequately evaluate how groundwater quality issues correlate with drinking water supply areas.</p> <p>Include an analysis of how groundwater quality concentrations have fluctuated relative to changes in groundwater levels, particularly during drought periods. The level of concentration of a few contaminants of concern included in the GSP are directly influenced by changes in groundwater levels, both by pumping and recharge. Appendix 2-E does not include a statistical analysis of the change in contaminant concentrations relative to groundwater levels and groundwater storage. It is important to evaluate the relationship between changes in contaminant concentrations and groundwater management activities, in particular for arsenic. Revise the description of arsenic to include the causes of arsenic mobilization due to over-pumping and compression of clay layers. The GSP's description of the chemical properties of arsenic currently attributes the mobility of arsenic to absorption/desorption. The GSP should be revised to include the following ways in which groundwater management can cause arsenic to be mobilized into the aquifer: pumping in areas of the aquifer with low-oxygen conditions and/or with a pH of over 8.5 as well as over-pumping (compression of clay layers). Accurately describing the conditions that result in the mobilization of arsenic is important in order to properly evaluate how potential groundwater management actions could further facilitate its release.</p> <p>Revise the description of the sources and spatial distribution of nitrate to include dairies and other concentrated animal feeding operations as a source of contamination and revise the description of septic systems as a source of contamination. Dairies are a major contributor to nitrate contamination of groundwater, and thus must be included in the description of the sources of nitrates and how nitrate contamination</p>	More information needed on public water supply systems and associated data gaps; insert excerpts from Appendix 2A in this regard.	Comment addressed under Priority 3.	2

Mid-Kaweah GSA Comment and Response Matrix

Version Date: 20191107

Self-Help Enterprises/ Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability	GL	SL-001	MCR-2	2	Groundwater Levels- Minimum Thresholds/Measurable Objectives	The draft Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) developed by the Mid-Kaweah Groundwater Sustainability Agency (MKGSA) sets the minimum thresholds (MTs) for groundwater levels as the groundwater levels projected through 2040 based on the average groundwater level decline observed over the 2006-2016 time period. Similarly, the MKGSA sets the measurable objectives (MOs) for groundwater levels as the groundwater levels projected through 2030 using the same declining water level trend. This approach is intended to represent continued long-term drought conditions. The draft GSP defines the undesirable result (UR) for chronic lowering of water levels as being when one-third of the representative monitoring sites in the Kaweah Subbasin (subbasin), across all three GSAs, exceed their respective MTs. This approach is consistent with the approach used in the East and Greater Kaweah GSAs and leaves key beneficial users in the subbasin, specifically domestic well users and members of disadvantaged communities (DACs), potentially vulnerable to impacts. While an assistance program is identified in the draft GSP, that program currently lacks key details that would make it a robust mitigation measure for these beneficial users. The draft GSP presents water level MTs by: (1) hydrogeologic zones that reportedly share similar groundwater conditions and hydrogeologic behavior (Table 5-2); and (2) by Representative Monitoring Wells (RMWs) (Table 5-3). According to the draft GSP, the hydrogeologic zone MTs are based on the average of the RMW MTs for a particular area. As stated in Section 5.3.1.3, "Consistent with this requirement, the minimum elevation thresholds in this plan are set at specific levels based on four different hydrogeologic zones as defined herein." However, well impact analyses are performed based on the MTs developed for each individual	Subbasin selection of undesirable result thresholds unduly exposes DAC water supply systems and domestic well owners. Establishment of MOs and MTs not adequately explained; associated impacts on potable groundwater users not sufficiently detailed.	Staff plan to meet with SHE on 10/21 or 10/22 to address these three themes highlighted in this comment and agree on how to modify the GSP: Impact discrepancies, locally applied UR, improved mitigation. Following this meeting, we will provide an updated response.	various
Self-Help Enterprises/ Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability	WQ	SL-002	MCR-18	2	Groundwater Quality-Monitoring/Minimum Thresholds/Maximum Contaminant Levels	The draft GSP sets the MTs for water quality at Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) or the Agricultural Water Quality Objectives (WQOs) at each RMW based on the dominant beneficial use for that monitoring well. The MOs for water quality were set at 75% of the MCLs or WQOs. The draft GSP further defines the UR for degraded water quality as being when one-third of the RMWs in the subbasin exceed an MT. Section 2.2 of the draft GSP identifies arsenic, nitrate, certain volatile organics, and 1,2,3-trichloropropane (TCP) as Constituents of Concern (COCs) for the MKGSA due to concentrations near MCLs or due to increasing trends. The draft GSP further identifies the following constituents to be measured where applicable (Section 3.2.2.4): arsenic, nitrate, chromium-6, dibromochloropropane (DBCP), TCP, tetrachloroethylene (PCE), sodium, chloride, perchlorate, total dissolved solids (TDS). For the reasons identified below, the water quality monitoring network and analysis presented in the draft GSP does not clearly illustrate how the MOs/MTs will be sufficient to ensure that the stated water quality UR of impacting the long-term viability of the groundwater resource, particularly for domestic water users and DACs, will be avoided. The draft GSP identifies a methodology used to distinguish between the applicability of either MCLs or agricultural WQOs as the MTs for a given RMW. As stated in Section 5.3.3.3, "If the majority of the beneficial use (greater than 50% of the pumping within a determined area) was agriculture and there were no public water systems (including schools) the minimum threshold would be a host of agricultural water quality constituents" and "if a monitoring well is located within an urban area, or near a public water system (e.g., within a mile), which includes schools, then the minimum threshold would be set at the MCL for drinking water." However, the draft GSP does not clearly identify on a map or otherwise which RMWs will use MCLs and which will use agricultural WQOs. The document also does not identify which monitoring wells are located within an urban area or near a public water system. For transparency and completeness, the GSP should clearly identify on maps and in tables which set of MTs/MOs will be applied to which RMWs. These maps should clearly identify the location of DACs, small water systems, and other sensitive users so that the public is able to review and evaluate the proposed sustainability approach. Per 23 CCR §354.28, the draft GSP should provide a detailed explanation as to how the proposed water quality MTs may affect the interests of beneficial uses and users of groundwater or land uses and property interests. Figure 3 shows the water quality monitoring network identified in Figures 4-6 and 4-7 of the draft GSP, including the new proposed multi-level monitoring wells. The water quality RMWs are focused in the northern and eastern portions of the MKGSA area and the monitoring well density varies by two orders of magnitude across the MKGSA. Specifically, the density of water quality RMWs in the northern portion of the MKGSA area (Visalia area) is approximately two RMWs per square mile, the eastern portion (Tulare and surrounding area) has density of about 0.6 RMWs per square mile, and even with the new proposed wells, the western portion will have a density of about 0.06 RMWs per square mile. Although the western portion of the MKGSA, including the communities of Okieville and Waukena are more sparsely populated than the eastern portion, there are at least 200 domestic wells and several public water systems (including the Okieville/Highland Acres Mutual Water Company, Waukena Elementary School, and Buena Vista School systems) located in this area. The GSP should clearly demonstrate how the proposed water quality monitoring network in the western portion of the MKGSA area is sufficient to monitor for impacts to beneficial users in this area, given the significant density discrepancy compared to the other portions of the MKGSA area. The draft GSP stated that "An exceedance of any of the MCL or agricultural metrics as defined herein at any representative monitoring sites will trigger a management action within the applicable Management Area or GSA, subject to determination that the exceedance was caused by actions of the GSA" (Section 5.3.3.3). However, the draft GSP does not identify which management action(s) will be implemented. Additional information is necessary in order to evaluate whether the proposed plan is protective of beneficial users in the subbasin. The draft GSP states that "MKGSA will evaluate groundwater quality degradation by either directly performing groundwater sampling at representative monitoring sites and [sic] coordinating with other agencies responsible for the collection and reporting of groundwater quality through other regulatory programs" (Section 5.3.3.3). Appendix 2A of the draft GSP includes a discussion of groundwater quality conditions for the subbasin; however, it is not specific to the MKGSA area and it is difficult to readily understand what parts of this assessment are specifically applicable to the MKGSA area. It is therefore recommended that the GSP include specific discussions of the water quality conditions and trends for applicable constituents and uses within the MKGSA area. It is further recommended that this analysis clearly include an evaluation of the	Which of the MCLs or Ag WQOs apply at which representative monitoring wells; use improved mapping for this purpose. Need more discussion of specific constituents and water quality conditions within MKGSA.	Staff plan to meet with SHE on 10/21 or 10/22 to address these three themes highlighted in this comment and agree on how to modify the GSP: Impact discrepancies, locally applied UR, improved mitigation. Following this meeting, we will provide an updated response. GEI will also explore the possibility of expanding the WQ RMN near the small rural community water systems.	various
Self-Help Enterprises/ Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability	AL	SL-003	MCR-18	1	Projects and Management Actions-Domestic/De Minimis Extractors	The draft GSP describes a plan to develop a groundwater extraction allocation program between 2020 and 2025 (Section 7.4.2) and states that "this initial phase of an allocation program shall exclude those well owners who extract less than two AF per year (i.e., de minimis extractors)." Under Section 7.4.8.1, it is acknowledged that the early stages of planning for the assistance program will include "A determination by the GSA to not regulate any de minimis extractor, i.e., any well owner pumping two acre-feet or less annually." This provision is critical to ensure that drinking water users, including DACs and other domestic well users, will continue to have access to drinking water and therefore, the GSP should provide stronger clarification that this provision will be included in any allocation program through and beyond the 2025 timeframe. As described above, the draft GSP indicates that it will not impose pumping restrictions on well owners that extract less than two AF per year, but does not address small water systems that may extract over two AF per year, but serve critical drinking water needs, such as the Souls Mutual Water Company, Okieville/ Highland Acres Mutual Water Company, and the Waukena Elementary School system. The GSP should therefore clearly identify how a groundwater allocation program would be designed to protect small water systems and the beneficial users that depend on them. As discussed above, the draft GSP identifies an impact to 21% of rural/domestic wells, and based on our "quick and dirty" evaluation herein, the actual impacts could be much higher. Given these impacts to well owners, the draft GSP identifies assistance measures that are being considered for small water systems and domestic wells (Section 7.4.8.1). If assistance measures are planned to mitigate impacts to drinking water wells, then the draft GSP should provide clear funding mechanisms and implementation plans for these assistance measures. The GSP should also consider the following in its implementation plan: -A secure and reliable funding source and mechanism for implementation of any assistance measures needs to be identified. While grant or emergency funding could potentially be available for such a program when needed, the availability of these funds is not certain. A more secure funding mechanism could be the establishment of a reserve fund that is paid into on an annual basis and accrues funds that would then be available as water levels drop in the future. -The implementation of an assistance measure program should be triggered before wells begin to become unusable, so that funding will be available, and the necessary planning and contracting will be completed such that the necessary construction will be implemented without unnecessarily leaving community members without access to drinking water. Thus, the measure should be designed to be proactive, rather than reactive. -An assistance measure should not be established only in case of emergency, such as the emergency measures implemented in portions of the state during the last drought. Droughts are said to be becoming more and more frequent and severe, and as such should be included as part of the long-term sustainability planning for the subbasin. 3 Stanford, 2019. A Guide to Water Quality Requirements Under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, Spring 2019.	Non-regulation of de minimis extractors should extend beyond 2025; any allocation program should provide protections therefor. Proposed assistance program should provide funding mechanisms.	GW allocation program to be developed during first five years. DACs and domestic pumpers to be taken into consideration, including a continuance to not regulate de minimis extractors.	N/A
The Nature Conservancy	IS	NC-004		2	Interconnected Surface Waters/Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems	This section describes the programs of USACOE, Kaweah and St. Johns Rivers Association (KSJRA), and the ditch companies. Surface water sources are listed along with the group monitoring them. Small surface streams which pass through TID's service area are noted as used, but the names are not listed. There is no mention of ISWs or GDEs and how they are monitored. Please explain how existing stream flow monitoring is protective of ISWs and GDEs.	Comment self-explanatory	Further justification to be provided re lack of GDEs in Sec. 2.2 and inapplicability of ISWs in Sec. 5.3.5.	2.2, 5.3.5
The Nature Conservancy	IS	NC-008	MCR-8	2	Interconnected Surface Waters	Please identify interconnected surface waters in the Basin by relying on groundwater elevation and stream gauge data, specifying any data gaps that exist so that they can be resolved in the monitoring network. ISWs are best estimated by first determining which reaches are completely disconnected from groundwater. This approach would involve comparing groundwater elevations with a land surface Digital Elevation Model that could identify which surface waters have groundwater consistently below surface water features, such that an unsaturated zone would separate surface water from groundwater. Groundwater elevations that are always deeper than 50 feet below the land surface can be used to identify the aboveground reaches as disconnected surface waters. Please reconcile data gaps (shallow monitoring wells, stream gauges, and nested/clustered wells) along surface water features in the Monitoring Network section of the GSP to improve	Key comment text shown in bold.	Further justification to be provided re lack of GDEs in Sec. 2.2 and inapplicability of ISWs in Sec. 5.3.5.	2.2, 5.3.5
The Nature Conservancy	IS	NC-009	MCR-3	2	Interconnected Surface Waters	"Depletions of interconnected surface waters are minimal and, to the extent they occur, impact only vegetation along the banks of unlined channels within the forebay regions of the aquifer system where natural channels exhibit gaining reaches from time to time. Undesirable results may occur should any such groundwater-dependent vegetation disappear from locations of known historic existence." This discussion is inadequate and is not supported by data. Please expand the discussion of ISWs to include the above referenced recommendations on identifying and mapping ISWs and provide discussion of the depletions on specific rivers or creeks.	Key comment text shown in bold.	Further justification to be provided re lack of GDEs in Sec. 2.2 and inapplicability of ISWs in Sec. 5.3.5.	2.2, 5.3.5
The Nature Conservancy	IS	NC-010	MCR-8	2	Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems	All three of the above referenced sections refer to or include discussion of the identification of groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs). Please consolidate and expand these sections of the document in GSP Appendix 2A Section 2.4 (Groundwater Elevation and Flow Conditions §354.16), since the identification of groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs) is a required element of Current and Historical Groundwater Conditions (23 CCR §354.16). This is a more appropriate place for the identification of GDEs, since groundwater conditions (e.g., depth to groundwater, interconnected surface water maps, groundwater quality) are necessary local information and data from the GSP in assessing whether polygons in the NC dataset are connected to groundwater in a principal aquifer. For detailed guidance on how to address GDEs, please see our publication, GDEs under SGMA: Guidance for Preparing GSPs 5. In particular, note the following: Please provide a	Provide more information re GDEs. [Section 5.3.5 Minimum Thresholds – Interconnected Surface Waters (p. 5-17)], [Appendix 2A Section 2.2.7.3 Delineation of recharge areas, potential recharge areas, and discharge areas including springs, seeps, and	Further justification to be provided re lack of GDEs in Sec. 2.2 and inapplicability of ISWs in Sec. 5.3.5.	2.2, 5.3.5
The Nature Conservancy	IS	NC-011	MCR-9	2	Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems	Once potential GDEs are identified, please provide information on the historical or current groundwater conditions in the GDEs or the ecological conditions present. Refer to GDE Pulse (https://gde.codefornature.org; See Attachment E of this letter for more details) or any other locally available data to describe depth to groundwater trends in and around GDE areas, as well as trends in plant growth (e.g., NDVI) and plant moisture (e.g., NDMI). Below is a screenshot example of data available in GDE Pulse for NC dataset polygons found in the Mid-Kaweah Subbasin: Once potential GDEs are identified, provide an inventory of the vegetation types or habitat types and rank the vegetation species as having a high, moderate or low value. Please identify whether any endangered or threatened freshwater species of animals and plants or areas with critical habitat were found in any of the GDEs. The list of freshwater species located in the Kaweah Subbasin can be found in Attachment C of this letter.	Provide more detail re the past and current existence of GDEs within the GSA.	Further justification to be provided re lack of GDEs in Sec. 2.2 and inapplicability of ISWs in Sec. 5.3.5.	2.2, 5.3.5
The Nature Conservancy	IS	NC-013	MCR-7	2	Sustainability Goal- Interconnected Surface Waters/Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems	"The broadly stated sustainability goal for the Kaweah Subbasin as agreed to by the three GSAs therein is, for each GSA to manage groundwater resources to preserve the quality of life through maintaining the viability of existing enterprises of the region, both agricultural and urban." There is no mention of protection of ISWs or GDEs, and no indication that environmental stakeholders were consulted. Please expand the goal to include protection of GDEs, ISWs, and critical habitats.	Subbasin Sustainability Goal makes no mention of GDEs nor ISWs	ISW language in concert with other subbasin GSAs	3.1
The Nature Conservancy	IS	NC-014	MCR-3	2	Interconnected Surface Waters	The statement "Depletion of interconnected surface waters are minimal and, to the extent they occur, impact only vegetation along the banks of unlined channels within the forebay regions of the aquifer system..." is not backed up by evidence presented in the GSP. Once ISWs are analyzed per our comments on Checklist Items 8, 9, and 10 above, please revise this section, noting any data gaps to be filled.	Insufficient data to support conclusion of little or no interconnected surface waters with groundwater.	Further justification to be provided re lack of GDEs in Sec. 2.2 and inapplicability of ISWs in Sec. 5.3.5.	2.2, 5.3.5

Mid-Kaweah GSA Comment and Response Matrix

Version Date: 20191107

The Nature Conservancy	IS	NC-015	MCR-10	2	Measurable Objectives- Groundwater Levels- Interconnected Surface Waters/Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems	The measurable objective was set equal to the water level at 2030 using the 2006-2016 water level trend for each of the wells selected as representative monitoring sites. The specific measurable objectives for all of the selected wells are listed in Table 5-3. Please explain how the measurable objectives will help achieve the sustainability goal as it pertains to the environment. After GDEs and ISWs are identified, please discuss if any impacts to GDEs or ISWs are expected. Data gaps should be noted and addressed in the Monitoring section.	Impacts of selected measurable objectives on GDEs or ISWs not discussed.	Further justification to be provided re lack of GDEs in Sec. 2.2 and inapplicability of ISWs in Sec. 5.3.5.	2.2, 5.3.5
The Nature Conservancy	IS	NC-016	MCR-10	2	Measurable Objectives- Groundwater Levels- Interconnected Surface Waters/Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems	The trend of the 2006-2016 water levels over time was used to set the minimum threshold at 2040 for each of the wells, used as representative monitoring sites, in each of four hydrogeologic zones within the Subbasin (shown on Figure 5.1, p. A5-1). The minimum thresholds and other sustainable criteria for each well are listed in Table 5-3 (p. 5-5). The minimum threshold derived in this manner means that it is based on a pre-SGMA level. After GDEs are identified, please add discussion of the possible impacts to the environment. Data gaps should be noted and addressed in the Monitoring section.	Impacts of selected measurable objectives on GDEs or ISWs not discussed; disclose and discuss related data gaps.	Further justification to be provided re lack of GDEs in Sec. 2.2 and inapplicability of ISWs in Sec. 5.3.5.	2.2, 5.3.5
The Nature Conservancy	IS	NC-019	MCR-4	2	Undesirable Results- Interconnected Surface Waters/Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems, Recreation	After the identification and evaluation of potential GDEs is completed, this section should discuss impacts to those GDEs. Specifically, For chronic lowering of water level, the GSP Committee considered that one-third of the representative monitoring sites (wells) exceeding minimum thresholds for water levels would constitute an undesirable result. There appears to be no additional guidance to protect potential GDEs or ISWs. Please discuss how this undesirable result can be used to avoid impacts to GDEs or ISWs. There appears to be no consideration of undesirable results on land uses that include and consider recreational uses (e.g. fishing/hunting, hiking, boating) and property interests that include and consider privately and publicly protected conservation lands and open spaces, including wildlife refuges, parks and natural preserves. Please describe how impacts to these types of properties will be avoided. Please provide more specifics on what biological responses (e.g., extent of habitat, growth, recruitment rates) would best characterize a significant and unreasonable impact to GDEs. The definition of 'significant and unreasonable' is a qualitative statement that is used to describe when undesirable results would occur in the basin, such that a minimum threshold can be quantified. Potential effects on all beneficial users of groundwater in the basin need to be taken into consideration. According to the California Constitution Article X, §2, water resources in California must be "out to beneficial use to the fullest extent of which they are capable." Please identify appropriate	Provide more detail re the past and current existence of GDEs within the GSA. Discuss undesirable results in this context as well.	Further justification to be provided re lack of GDEs in Sec. 2.2 and inapplicability of ISWs in Sec. 5.3.5.	2.2, 5.3.5
The Nature Conservancy	SB	NC-006		2	Kaweah Subbasin Characteristics	The base of the Subbasin corresponds with the base of freshwater. "This is generally defined as the elevation below which total dissolved solids are greater than 2,000 milligrams per liter (mg/l) (Bertoldi et al., 1991)" (p. 22 of Appendix 2A). As noted on page 9 of DWR's Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model BMP (https://water.ca.gov/LegacyFiles/groundwater/sgm/pdfs/BMP_HCM_Final_2016-12-23.pdf) "the definable bottom of the basin should be at least as deep as the deepest groundwater extractions". Thus, groundwater extraction well depth data should also be included in the determination of the basin bottom. Properly defining the bottom of the basin will prevent the possibility of extractors with wells deeper than the basin boundary from claiming exemption from SGMA due to their well residing	[Appendix 2A Section 2.2.4 Bottom of the Subbasin (p. 22)] Better define base of fresh water and base of Subbasin.	The base of freshwater in Appendix 2A was defined using best available information. We acknowledge that there is still a high degree of uncertainty due to the lack of information available to pin it down (using well logs and geophysical logs extending to	N/A
The Nature Conservancy	WB	NC-012	MCR-1	2	Water Budget- Phreatophyte Extraction	Please clarify what the term "phreatophyte extraction" means. The text states "Phreatophyte extraction consists of removing vegetation in riparian areas to prevent consumptive water use." If phreatophytes were indeed removed from within the Subbasin, please provide further details. If phreatophyte extraction refers to the uptake of groundwater by phreatophytes, then correct this text. It should be clearly stated if the phreatophytes are referring to GDE vegetation (riparian vegetation). Also the reference is from 2007 and the acreage and ET estimation methodology may be outdated. Please clarify what assumptions and data were used to calculate the outflow term from groundwater by phreatophytes.	[Appendix 2A Section 2.5.1.3 Summary of Water Budget Components (p. 102)] Improve text discussing phreatophyte extractions.	Phreatophyte extraction means removal of GW by the plants, applicable to eastern portion of the Subbasin only, not MKGSA.	Basin Setting
The Nature Conservancy	GP	NC-005		1	Well Permitting	This section should include a discussion of the following: Future well permitting must be coordinated with the GSP to assure achievement of the Plan's sustainability goals. The County of Tulare is currently revising their well permitting program. The City of Visalia also has a well permitting program for wells within their jurisdiction. The State Third Appellate District recently found that Counties have a responsibility to consider the potential impacts of groundwater withdrawals on public trust resources when permitting new wells near streams with public trust uses (ELF v. SWRCB and Siskiyou County, No. C083239). The need for well permitting programs to comply with this requirement should be stated in the text.	County self-permit system should acknowledge public trust resources [Section 1.4.4 Well Permitting Process (p. 1-17)]	Subbasin GSAs have been collaborating with Tulare County on well permits and exchange of related information as described in Sec. 1.4.4.	N/A
The Nature Conservancy	IS	NC-001		1	Beneficial Users- Environmental	Surface water users and the following groups were listed as Beneficial Users: "Environmental and ecosystem interests in MKGSA include representatives of the Tulare Basin Wildlife Partners, Sierra Club Mineral King Group, and Sequoia Riverlands Trust (p. 1-25)." Please identify whether or not the following beneficial uses and users of groundwater in the subbasin are present: Protected Lands, including preserves, refuges, conservation areas, recreational areas; and other protected lands; and Public Trust Uses, including wildlife, aquatic habitat, fisheries, and recreation. The types and locations of environmental uses, species and habitats supported, and the designated beneficial environmental uses of surface waters that may be affected by groundwater extraction in the Subbasin should be specified. To identify environmental users, please refer to the following: Natural Communities Commonly Associated with Groundwater dataset (NC Dataset) - https://gis.water.ca.gov/app/NCDatasetViewer/ The list of freshwater species located in the Kaweah Subbasin in Attachment C of this letter. Please take	Confirm existence of environmental and other land uses and users within MKGSA [Section 1.5.2 Beneficial Uses and Users (p. 1-23 to 1-25)]	Confirm lack of preserves, refuges, conservation areas etc. to be undertaken.	1.5.2.10
The Nature Conservancy	IS	NC-002		1	General Plans- Interconnected Surface Waters/Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems	This section should include a discussion of General Plan goals and policies related to the protection and management of GDEs and aquatic resources that could be affected by groundwater withdrawals, rather than being limited to goals and policies directly related to groundwater resources as the Tulare General Plan does. Please include a discussion of how implementation of the GSP may affect and be coordinated with General Plan policies and procedures regarding the protection of wetlands, aquatic resources and other GDEs and ISWs. This section should identify Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) or Natural Community Conservation Plans (NCCPs) within the Subbasin and if they are associated with critical, GDE or ISW habitats. Please identify all relevant HCPs and NCCPs within the Subbasin, and address how GSP implementation will coordinate with the goals of these HCPs or NCCPs. The Open Space and Conservation Element of the City of Visalia's General Plan includes (p. 1-14 to 1-15): "1. Protect, restore and enhance a continuous corridor of native riparian vegetation along Planning Area waterways, including the St. Johns River; Mill, Packwood, and Cameron Creeks; and segments of other creeks and ditches where feasible, in conformance with the Parks and Open Space diagram of this General Plan. 2. Establish design and development standards for new projects in waterway corridors to preserve and enhance irrigation capabilities, if provided, and the natural riparian environment along these corridors. In certain locations or where conditions require it, alternative designs may be appropriate (e.g., terraced seating or a planted wall system) 3. Place special emphasis on the protection and enhancement of the St. Johns River Corridor by establishing extensive open space land along both sides. 4. Where no urban development exists, maintain a minimum riparian habitat development setback from the discernible top of the bank: 50 feet for both sides of the Mill, Packwood, and Cameron Creek corridors and 25 feet for both sides of Modoc, Persian, and Mill Creek ditches. Where riparian trees are located within 100 feet of the discernible top of the banks of the creek corridors and 50 feet from the banks for the ditches, the setback shall be wide enough to include five feet outside the drip line of such trees. Restore and enhance the area within the setback with native vegetation as follows: a. Where existing development or land committed to development prohibits the 50-foot setback on Mill, Packwood, and Cameron Creek corridors, provide the maximum amount of land available for a development setback. b. Where existing development or land committed to development prohibits the 25-foot setback along Modoc, Persian, and Mill Creek ditches, provide the maximum amount of land available for a development setback." Please specify if any of these areas are potential GDEs and describe how they are managed. Please refer to The Critical Species	Provide detail as to how the GSP could affect general plans and their recognition of GDEs and ISWs [Section 1.4.3 General Plans in Plan Area (p. 1-12 to 1-16)]	Coverage of county/city general plans considered adequate as modified by County comments.	N/A
The Nature Conservancy	IS	NC-003		1	Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems	The monitoring programs are described, but there is no mention of how GDEs are monitored and protected. Once GDEs are identified, please describe how existing groundwater monitoring programs are protective of GDEs, or propose additional monitoring that specifically targets GDEs.	Comment self-explanatory [Appendix 2A Section 2.3.1 Existing Groundwater Level Monitoring (p. 37-38)]	GDEs not present within MKGSA	N/A
The Nature Conservancy	IS	NC-017	MCR-3	1	Interconnected Surface Waters	Please specifically cite "periodic comparisons of surface water elevations and flowrate depletion in applicable stream channels and adjacent groundwater" as a data gap and further address in the monitoring section.	Comment self-explanatory [Section 3.2.2.5 Interconnected Surface Waters (p. 3-7)]	Interconnected surface waters non-existent within MKGSA.	N/A
The Nature Conservancy	IS	NC-018	MCR-9	1	Interconnected Surface Waters/Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems	As noted above, an inventory of the vegetation types or habitat types and ranking of the vegetation species as having a high, moderate or low value will provide rational for the statement that "the intermittent nature of this vegetative habitat is such that its temporary loss does not rise to the level of an undesirable result."	Comment self-explanatory [Section 3.2.3.5 Interconnected Surface Waters (p. 3-9)]	GDEs not present within MKGSA	N/A
The Nature Conservancy	IS	NC-020	MCR-3	1	Groundwater Level Monitoring Network- Interconnected Surface Waters/Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems	The GSP proposes to use groundwater level monitoring for chronic groundwater level. Some of the monitoring wells are missing well construction information (only 22 of 37 wells are complete). Only 14 of the 37 wells are screened in the Upper Aquifer. The missing well information is a known data gap and was acknowledged on p. 4-15. Two multi-level wells are proposed to help fill this data gap, shown on Figure 4-7 (p. 4-22). The missing information should be obtained or a different well selected for monitoring. "As stated previously, the interconnection of surface water and groundwater was disrupted many decades ago in the MKGSA. Therefore, a monitoring network and monitoring is not required for this GSA (p. 4-14)." Data has not been presented to substantiate this statement. Please provide additional analysis to back-up this conclusion. Per the GSP Regulations (23 CCR §354.34 (a) and (b)), monitoring must address trends in groundwater <i>and related surface conditions</i> (emphasis added). Groundwater level monitoring alone may be insufficient to establish a linkage between groundwater extraction and potentially resulting impacts to environmental resources associated with GDEs and ISWs. The cause-effect relationship between groundwater levels and the biological responses that could result in significant and unreasonable impacts to ISWs and GDEs depends on a number of complicated factors, and this relationship is not characterized or discussed. As such, it is not possible to determine whether the proposed monitoring, minimum thresholds and measurable objectives are sufficiently	Omit monitoring wells having insufficient construction details; further substantiate omission of monitoring network for ISWs; expand monitoring network for potential GDEs [Section 4.4 Groundwater Level Monitoring Network (p.4-6 to 4-11)]	GDEs and ISWs not present within MKGSA; additional justification for this conclusion is provided in Sec. 2 and 5.3.5.	N/A
The Nature Conservancy	SB	NC-007	MCR-8	1	Kaweah Subbasin Characteristics- Interconnected Surface Waters/Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems	Basin-wide cross sections provided in Figures 4 through 13 are regional, and do not include a graphical representation of the manner in which shallow groundwater may interact with ISWs or GDEs that would allow the reader to understand this topic. Please consider including an example near-surface cross section that depicts the conceptual understanding of shallow groundwater and stream interactions at different locations, including the Upper Aquifer, as well as any potential GDEs.	Include x-sections as part of HCM to depict any ISWs [Appendix 2A Section 2.2.1.3 Kaweah Subbasin Geology (p. 17-21)]	GDEs and ISWs not present within MKGSA.	N/A
The Nature Conservancy	SB	NC-021		1	Groundwater Contour Maps- Interconnected Surface Waters/Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems	A groundwater elevation map should be prepared for the Upper Aquifer above the Corcoran Clay , as that is the only way one can determine the appropriate depth relationships between the surface water and the groundwater, which are needed to designate a GDE. Mixing shallow and deep wells, particularly when confined conditions may be present, can be misleading.	Annual report to include mapping/contour data re unconfined aquifer layers.	GDEs not present within MKGSA; aquifer layer mapping will be undertaken as more data becomes available.	N/A
Tulare County Resource Management Agency	AL	RM-018		1	Groundwater Allocations	"...a GSA has the authority to regulate groundwater extractions and impose an allocation mechanism." "...and an arrangement to apportion responsibilities..." Could we say this is achieved through the Coordination Agreement?	Comment self-explanatory [Page 7-33]	Individual GSAs to determine allocation mechanism within their jurisdiction; Coordination Agmt to set forth water budget allocations as among the three GSAs.	N/A
Tulare County Resource Management Agency	AL	RM-020		1	Extraction Data	"Table 8-1: Sample Groundwater Extraction Summary" May want to add 'small community water systems' as a separate line from M&I and Domestic?	Comment self-explanatory [Page 8-3]	Will consider delineating this data set in annual reports to DWR	N/A

Mid-Kaweah GSA Comment and Response Matrix

Version Date: 20191107

Tulare County Resource Management Agency	GA	RM-005		1	GSP Adoption	"...the MKGSA will address these issues with the adoption..." Might want to reference the GSA's authority to address these issues here and specifically detail how adoption of the GSP will address these issues.	Comment self-explanatory [Page 1-13]	Reference SGMA Sec. 10726.9	1.4.3.1
Tulare County Resource Management Agency	GA	RM-008		1	GSA Roles	This section notes the role for the GSA's in the process that you may want noted above.	Comment re County well-drilling permit as proposed	Reference SGMA Sec. 10726.9	1.4.3.1
Tulare County Resource Management Agency	GL	RM-011	MCR-2	1	Groundwater Levels- Minimum Thresholds/Measurable Objectives	"...one-third of the representative monitoring sites in all three GSA jurisdictions combined exceed their respective minimum threshold water level elevations." Over what time period?	Comment self-explanatory [Page 3-5]	This is to be further addressed by the Subbasin GSAs during implementation.	N/A
Tulare County Resource Management Agency	GL	RM-012		1	Undesirable Results- Groundwater Levels	"...a determination has been made that the percentage of wells completely dewatered by 2040 should the minimum thresholds not be exceeded would not constitute an undesirable result." For clarification should that actual percentage be stated here?	Comment self-explanatory [Page 3-5]	Comment noted	Sec. 3 or 5?
Tulare County Resource Management Agency	GL	RM-013		1	Groundwater Levels-Economic Impacts	"During this 20-year period, pumping costs will rise due to higher lifts and higher energy pricing, but this condition is considered by the MKGSA as a manageable impact that has been occurring for many years and is comparable to inflationary costs experienced by agricultural businesses, municipalities, and small-system and domestic households." Can you further detail the costs comparisons?	Comment self-explanatory [Page 5-3]	Cost comparisons to be considered during GSP implementation.	N/A
Tulare County Resource Management Agency	GP	RM-002		1	General Plans- Urban	"Urban land use is located within the limits of the cities of Tulare and Visalia and the surrounding unincorporated areas within the sphere of influence for the cities." General Plan Land Use Diagrams should be referenced or included in the GSP. Tulare County General Plan Land Use Diagram Figure 4-1 (page 4-5) at a minimum should be referenced or included here.	Provide more detail re general plan land use projections [Page 1-6]:	Narrative re County General Plan to be expanded accordingly.	1.4.3.1
Tulare County Resource Management Agency	GP	RM-003		1	General Plans	"Each of the two incorporated cities in MKGSA's area have adopted General Plans. For the areas not within the limits of the incorporated cities, the Tulare County General Plan applies. The General Plans for the cities and the General Plan for the county each have land use elements which address water usage. These elements were considered in this GSP." General Plan Land Use Diagrams should be referenced or included in the GSP. Tulare County General Plan Land Use Diagram Figure 4-1 (Page 4-5) at a minimum should be referenced here . This statement should describe the specific general plan elements that were reviewed.	Address in more detail County General Plan elements re water resources [Page 1-12]:	Narrative and figures re County General Plan to be expanded accordingly.	1.4.3.1
Tulare County Resource Management Agency	GP	RM-004		1	General Plans- Water Resources	"However, the Tulare County 2012 General Plan has a Water Resources Element..." Note that the County's GP also has other elements that address water. These should be referenced. The Tulare County General Plan includes both policies and implementation measures that address water supply, wastewater treatment, adequate infrastructure, plans, programs, and funding in the following elements: Planning Framework (Chapter 2), Agriculture (Chapter 3), Land Use (Chapter 4), Economic Development (Chapter 5), Housing (Chapter 6), Environmental Resources Management (Chapter 8), Health and Safety (Chapter 10), Water Resources Chapter 11), Public Facilities and Services Chapter 14), Gen Plan Water Resources Element policies include: Water Supply WR-1.1 Groundwater Withdrawal, WR-1.3 Water Export Outside County, WR-1.4 Conversion of Agricultural Water Resources, WR-1.5 Expand Use of Reclaimed Wastewater, WR-1.6 Expand Use of Reclaimed Water, WR 1.7 Collection of Additional Groundwater Information, WR-1.8 Groundwater Basin Management, WR-1.9 Collection of additional Surface Water Information, WR-1.10 Channel Modification, WR-3.1 Develop Additional Water Sources, WR-3.2 Develop an Integrated Regional Water Master Plan, WR-3.3 Adequate Water Availability, WR-3.4 Water Resource Planning, WR-3.5 Use of Native and Drought Tolerant Landscaping, WR-3.6 Agricultural Irrigation Efficiency, WR 3.7 Emergency Water Conservation Plan, WR-3.8 Educational Programs, WR-3.9 Establish Critical Water Supply Areas WR-3.10 Diversion of Surface Water, WR-3.11 Policy Impacts to Water Resources, WR-3.12 Joint Water Projects with Neighboring Counties, WR-3.13 Coordination of Watershed Management on Public Land PFS-2.1 Water Supply, PFS-2.2 Adequate Systems, PFS-2.3 Well Testing, PFS-2.5 New Systems or Individual Wells, Water Quality, WR-1.2 Groundwater Monitoring, WR 1.7 Collection of Additional Groundwater Information, WR-1.8 Groundwater Basin Management, WR-2.1 Protect Water Quality, WR-2.2 NPDES Enforcement, WR-2.3 Best Management Practices, WR-2.4 Construction site Sediment, WR-2.5 Major Drainage Management, WR-2.6 Degraded Water Resources, WR-2.7 Industrial and Agricultural Sources, WR-2.8 Point Source Control, WR-2.9 Private Wells, PFS-2.1 Water Supply, PFS-2.5 New Systems or Individual Wells, Implementation Measures should also be included.	Cover other elements of County General Plan re water resources	Narrative re County General Plan to be expanded accordingly.	1.4.3.1
Tulare County Resource Management Agency	GP	RM-006		1	General Plans- Agricultural Land	"...work with the county and other organizations to protect prime farmland and farmland of statewide importance outside the city's Urban Development Boundary..." Should policies from the County General Plan be specifically referenced here? This discussion could reference County Adopted City General Plans (Visalia Area Community Plan) as the appropriate mechanism to coordinate land use and policy decisions within the UAB and UDB. See Tulare County General Plan Planning Framework Chapter 2 Section PF-4 and 4-A. In addition, groundwater recharge is not solely determined by FMMP designations (See Tulare County General Plan Health and Safety Element Figure 10-7 areas for groundwater recharge. In addition the following County General Plan policies including but not limited to primarily address farmland protection: AG-1.1 Primary Land Use, AG-1.2 Coordination, AG-1.3 Williamson Act, AG-1.5 Substandard Williamson Act Parcels, AG-1.6 Conservation Easements, AG-1.7 Preservation of Agricultural Lands, AG-1.8 Agriculture Within Urban Boundaries, AG-1.9 Agricultural Preserves Outside Urban Boundaries, AG-1.10 Extension of Infrastructure Into Agricultural Areas, AG-1.11 Agricultural Buffers, AG-1.12 Ranchettes, AG-1.13 Agricultural Related Uses, AG-1.14 Right-to-Farm Noticing, AG-1.15 Soil Productivity, AG-1.16 Agricultural Water Resources, AG-1.18 Farmland Trust and Funding Sources, AG-2.8 Agricultural Education Programs, LU- 1.5 Paper Subdivision Consolidation, LU-2.1 Agricultural Lands, LU 2.2 Agricultural Parcel Splits, LU-2.5 Residential Agriculture Uses, LU- 2.7 Industrial Development, RVL- 1.1 Development Intensity, RVL- 1.2 Existing Parcels and Approvals, RVL- 1.3 Tulare County Agricultural Zones, RVL- 1.4 Determination of Agricultural Land, RVL- 1.5 Non Conforming Uses, RVL- 1.6 Checklist	Suggestion that farmland protection considerations of County General Plan could be summarized	County General Plan summary as modified per other RMA comments considered sufficient.	N/A
Tulare County Resource Management Agency	GP	RM-007		1	Well Permitting	"The county is revising their well permit application based on GSA input. The proposed revised application is provided on the following pages." For clarification purposes, this section could clearly delineate what revisions to the well permitting application are being proposed.	Comment self-explanatory [Page 1-17]:	Text to be added re County/GSA collaboration re revised well permits and changes pertaining to GSA needs.	1.4.4
Tulare County Resource Management Agency	GP	RM-010		1	Public Property Permitting	"Placement of recharge projects and management of pumping regimes in each GSA/Management Area such that acceleration of contaminant plume migration that impairs domestic and municipal supply well production as induced by GSP projects and management actions is avoided." this is important for any new community, as well as for existing communities that fall under the County's purview. Acquisition of property for public purposes may require a General Plan Referral.	Comment self-explanatory [Page 3-3]	Comment noted.	N/A
Tulare County Resource Management Agency	MU	RM-019		1	Municipal Water Use	"...capped at 55 gallons per capita per day (gpcd) in 2019 and ramped down to 50 gpcd by 2030..." It might be better to say, "May be adjusted back up from 50, based on science."	Comment self-explanatory [Page 7-41]	Comment noted.	N/A
Tulare County Resource Management Agency	OR	RM-001		1	Internal Referencing	"It is one of the prime agricultural regions in the Central Valley and home to numerous small towns and communities, as well as the larger cities of Tulare and Visalia." Should reference a specific map or diagram.	[Page 1-1]:	Reference to existing figure in GSP to be made.	1.1.2
Tulare County Resource Management Agency	OR	RM-009		1	GSP Organization	"As shown in Figure 1-2, the MKGSA region includes three areas identified as a Census Designated Place by the 2016 U.S. Census Bureau as disadvantaged or severely disadvantaged. The City of Tulare has been identified as a Disadvantaged Community, while the community of Matheny Tract and Waukena have both been determined as a Severely Disadvantaged Community. The community of Okieville/Highland Acres is located within a 2016 U.S. Census Bureau Disadvantaged Community Tract. Stakeholders in these communities have the opportunity to consult on the plan during the agency's Board of Directors and Advisory Committee meetings and during review of this Plan." Seems to be a repeat of Section 1.5.2.3	Repetative text called out [Page 1-25]	This paragraph to be struck.	1.5.2.11
Tulare County Resource Management Agency	PM	RM-016		1	Projects and Management Actions- Coordination Agreement	"It is the intent of the Subbasin GSAs, as stipulated in the Coordination Agreement, to continue to discuss water balances and groundwater conditions during GSP implementation and, in so doing, manage the location, extent, and financial contributions to projects and management actions of each." This would be a good place to discuss the Coordination Agreement? Specific language or chapter/section citations in the coordination agreement should be referenced here.	Comment self-explanatory [Page 6-4]	Coordination Agmt will only referenced in the GSP and not outlined in detail.	N/A
Tulare County Resource Management Agency	WB	RM-014	MCR-19	1	Water Budget	"Comparing these resulting groundwater inflow assignments to MKGSA to annual groundwater pumping for the same current period (1997-2017), as identified in Table 6-3, results in an imputed water balance surplus for MKGSA of about 38,000 AF on an average basis. Yet, as acknowledged in Section 2 of this Plan, MKGSA, like the balance of the Subbasin, experiences a historical decline in groundwater levels and attendant depletion of groundwater in storage within its jurisdictional region." This might be a good place to describe the imputed water balance in greater detail to describe the difference from the previous budget.	Provide clarity re water accounting framework budget [Page 6-3]	Clarity to be added to better distinguish between hydrogeologic water budget and water accounting framework budget.	6.2
Tulare County Resource Management Agency	WB	RM-015	MCR-20	1	Water Budget/Water Accounting Framework	"Whereas the average water accounting framework water balance is positive, the comparable hydrogeologic water budget is negative by about 13,000 AF. This reduction in storage is to be expected, as water levels decline in the range of 3 feet per year over much of the GSA region. The relative contributions of multiple causes of these declines is the subject of further study and hydrogeologic analyses." Please provide greater of the detail in regards to the cooperative agreement to help understand why groundwater levels are trending down in the overall Kaweah, even if there is 'surplus' according to the budget in the Mid-Kaweah.	Explain water accounting framework surplus re declining GW levels in more detail [Page 6-4]	Further hydrogeologic analyses during GSP implementation will shed light as to reasons for GW level declines in MKGSA.	N/A

Mid-Kaweah GSA Comment and Response Matrix

Version Date: 20191107

Tulare County Resource Management Agency	WR	RM-017		1	Surface Water Rights/Recharge Operations		"As an irrigation district under Division 11 of the California Water Code, TID has authority to manage, regulate, and engage in groundwater recharge operations for the benefit of its landowners." Can you state here that the water rights under the existing contracts?	Request for further elaboration re surface water rights [Page 7-4]	Comment noted. The selection of MOs, MTs and domestic/small-system assistance pgm is deemed sufficient to protect all beneficial users.	N/A
Various Non-Profits	DC	NP-031	MCR-17	3	Disadvantaged Communities		DACs are not explicitly identified for purposes of developing URs, MOs and MTs, but domestic well users are discussed in terms of URs and MTs. "The potential effects of degraded water quality from migrating plumes or other induced effects of GSA actions include those upon municipal, small community and domestic well sites rendered unfit for potable supplies and associated uses, and/or the costs to treat groundwater supplies at the well head or point of use so that they are compliant with state and federal regulations."	Identify DACs and considerations in establishing URs, MTs and MOs	Include map depicting GSPs with associated narrative	5.3.3.2, 5.3.3.3
Various Non-Profits	DC	NP-034		3	Undesirable Results- Disadvantaged Communities		Based on the presented information, domestic well uses are considered under URs and for the development of water level MOS and MTs, such as the statistical summary of well impact analysis for domestic wells, but DAC members are not explicitly considered. More detail and specifics regarding DAC members, including those that rely on smaller community drinking water systems, not only domestic wells, is necessary to demonstrate that these beneficial users were adequately considered.	Specifically address small-system well impacts in MT analyses	Include map depicting GSPs with associated narrative	5.3.3.2, 5.3.3.3
Various Non-Profits	IS	NP-026	MCR-3	3	Interconnected Surface Waters/Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems		"As stated previously, the interconnection of surface water and groundwater was disrupted many decades ago in the MKGSA. Therefore, a monitoring network and monitoring is not required for this GSA (p. 4-14)." Data has not been presented to substantiate this statement. Per the GSP Regulations (23 CCR §354.34 (a) and (b)), monitoring must address trends in groundwater and related surface conditions (emphasis added). Groundwater level monitoring alone may be insufficient to establish a linkage between groundwater extraction and potentially resulting impacts to environmental resources associated with GDEs and ISWs. The cause-effect relationship between groundwater levels and the biological responses that could result in significant and unreasonable impacts to ISWs and GDEs depends on a number of complicated factors, and this relationship is not characterized or discussed. As such, it is not possible to determine whether the proposed monitoring, minimum thresholds and measurable objectives are sufficiently protective to ensure significant and unreasonable impacts to GDEs and ISWs will be prevented.	Inadequate data presented to justify disconnect between groundwater and surface waters.	Same as comment #8; state why monitoring for GDEs not warranted.	Same as comment #8
Various Non-Profits	IS	NP-028	MCR-12	3	Figures- Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems/Disadvantaged		The GSP should include maps or information of what GDEs and DACs are in each Management Area.	Comment self-explanatory	Reference map(s) depicting DACs minimal GDEs	5.3.3.3, 5.3.5
Various Non-Profits	IS	NP-029	MCR-8	3	Monitoring Network- Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems/Disadvantaged Communities		If any gaps exist in the monitoring networks for GDEs and DACs, they should be clearly identified in the GSP.	Comment self-explanatory	Add bullet for DAC data gaps in Sec. 2 and possible monitoring in Sec. 4	2.2, 4.10
Various Non-Profits	IS	NP-030	MCR-3	3	Interconnected Surface Waters/Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems		The GSP should provide additional analysis to back-up the conclusion that states "the interconnection of surface water and groundwater was disrupted many decades ago in the MKGSA", and add monitoring of potential GDEs and at any locations where ISWs have been or were previously present.	Comment self-explanatory	Current GSP justification is sufficient	N/A
Various Non-Profits	IS	NP-032	MCR-4	3	Undesirable Results- Interconnected Surface Waters/Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems		For chronic lowering of water level, the GSP Committee considered that one-third of the representative monitoring sites (wells) exceeding minimum thresholds for water levels would constitute an undesirable result. There appears to be no additional guidance to protect potential GDEs or ISWs.	Comment self-explanatory	Current GSP justification is sufficient	N/A
Various Non-Profits	IS	NP-033	MCR-9	3	Undesirable Results- Interconnected Surface Waters/Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems/Recreation		As noted above, an inventory of the vegetation types or habitat types and ranking of the vegetation species as having a high, moderate or low value will provide rationale for the statement that "the intermittent nature of this vegetative habitat is such that its temporary loss does not rise to the level of an undesirable result." There appears to be no consideration of undesirable results on land uses that include and consider recreational uses (e.g. fishing/hunting, hiking, boating) and property interests that include and consider privately and publicly protected conservation lands and open spaces, including wildlife refuges, parks and natural preserves. The definition of 'significant and unreasonable' is a qualitative statement that is used to describe when undesirable results would occur in the basin, such that a minimum threshold can be quantified. Potential effects on all beneficial users of groundwater in the basin need to be taken into consideration. According to the California Constitution Article X, §2, water resources in California must be "put to beneficial use to the fullest extent of which they are capable".	Potential effects of undesirable results on habitat-related uses not sufficiently detailed.	GSA's to consider in Sus. Goal statement	3.1
Various Non-Profits	WB	NP-022		2	Water Budget- Climate Change		Based on the data presented, it is not clear how climate change is expected to affect some specific elements of the water budget (i.e., subsurface flows, surface water and groundwater outflows, including exports).	Lack of detail on climate change assumptions applied for projected water budget.	We will include as an action in for the 5 year update - Chris to discuss with Kwabena to see if we can easily provide more specific info. in the 2020 GSP	N/A
Various Non-Profits	MA	NP-027	MCR-12	2	Management Areas- Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems		The GSP does not identify that any of the Management Areas are specifically defined to manage GDEs or DACs.	Management Areas not established with groundwater-dependent ecosystems or DACs in mind.	Add bullet point explaining that the 2 cities don't have DACs, The TID management area does have	Section 2.4
Various Non-Profits	WB	NP-018		2	Water Budget- Other Demands		The demands by these sectors are stated to be included in the projected water budget, however, the demand by each of these sectors is not specifically identified , since they are all included in the "Other demand" by the GSP.	Municipal, small-system and domestic water demand estimates not sufficiently detailed.	Work to GSI to see if we can further subdivide the demands.	Section 2 and Appendix 2a
Various Non-Profits	WB	NP-020		2	Water Budget- Environmental		The GSP includes the projected agricultural demand but does not include a demand associated with native vegetation and/or wetlands.	Non-ag vegetative water demand assumptions not adequately explained.	Based on limited data and science available, we assumed it would stay the same. Chris to double check.	Section 2 and Appendix 2a
Various Non-Profits	WB	NP-023		2	Water Budget- Domestic/Public/Municipal		The GSP also does not provide specifics on drinking water demands included for large urban water systems, domestic well users, or community water systems in the historical, current or future water budgets. This information should be provided for full transparency of the assumptions, data, and results of the water budgets.	Urban and potable water demand estimates of all magnitudes not fully explained.	We will be bringing in more water budget description information from Appendix 2A.	Sec 2.2
Various Non-Profits	WB	NP-024		2	Phreatophyte Extraction		The GSP should clarify what assumptions and data were used in the water budget to calculate the outflow term from groundwater by phreatophytes.	Phreatophyte groundwater usage not fully explained.	Confirm existing plume discussion in Basin Setting report	Refer to App. 2A
Various Non-Profits	DC	NP-013		2	Monitoring Network- Disadvantaged Communities		The GSP does not include the identified DACs in the proposed monitoring network maps.	Comment self-explanatory	Chris to add DACs to the monitoring network maps- see Figure 1-9 as starting point.	Section 4
Various Non-Profits	DC	NP-043	MCR-14	2	Domestic Wells/Small Water Systems Assistance Program		An assistance program for small water systems and domestic wells is described, but does not include an assessment of costs or a funding mechanism or clear plan of implementation. This program is described because the acknowledged impacts the proposed water level MTs will have on these beneficial users. Such a program needs to be robust and proactive, rather than reactive, so that clean and safe drinking water is available to these users without interruption as water levels decline. It is critical that a funding mechanism be identified and implemented to ensure that this program is successful.	Comment self-explanatory	Crig will explain that we acknowledge the importance of a clear plan and associated costs and this activity will be completed during early during the implementation period as approved by	
Various Non-Profits	GL	NP-035	MCR-2	2	Minimum Thresholds- Water Levels		The draft GSP identifies MTs for both hydrogeologic zones and for individual well points, but does not clearly explain which set of MTs will be applied through the implementation phase of SGMA.	Comment self-explanatory	Move entire discussion of Hydrogeologic Zones to appendices to avoid confusion. Text remaining in Section 5 will only address specific wells in the	5.3.1.3
Various Non-Profits	GL	NP-036	MCR-13	2	Minimum Thresholds- Water Levels		The approach of setting MOs and MTs based on a continued projected declining water level trend results in MOs and MTs that are significantly lower than current water levels, and those experienced during the drought. The MTs in some areas are nearly 200 feet below current water levels. For example, the MT for well KSB-1071, located near the community of Okieville, is over 170 feet below current groundwater levels and the MT at well KSB-1628, located in north Tulare, is over 190 feet below current groundwater levels. The GSP should provide maps and information clearly identifying the expected water level declines to both the MOs and MTs, and assess the effects it will have on specific areas and communities.	Elaborate on declining water levels as a result of chosen MOs and MTs on specific areas within GSA.		
Various Non-Profits	IS	NP-010	MCR-8	2	Interconnected Surface Waters		ISWs are best estimated by first determining which reaches are completely disconnected from groundwater. This approach would involve comparing groundwater elevations with a land surface Digital Elevation Model that could identify which surface waters have groundwater consistently below surface water features, such that an unsaturated zone would separate surface water from groundwater. Groundwater elevations that are always deeper than 50 feet below the land surface can be used to identify the aboveground reaches as disconnected surface waters.	Identify which surface channel reaches are 50 ft or more above underlying water table.	Further justification to be provided re lack of GDEs in Sec. 2.2 and inapplicability of ISWs in Sec. 5.3.5.	2.2, 5.3.5
Various Non-Profits	IS	NP-011	MCR-3	2	Interconnected Surface Waters/Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems		"Depletions of interconnected surface waters are minimal and, to the extent they occur, impact only vegetation along the banks of unlined channels within the forebay regions of the aquifer system where natural channels exhibit gaining reaches from time to time. Undesirable results may occur should any such groundwater-dependent vegetation disappear from locations of known historic existence." This discussion is inadequate and is not supported by data.	Insufficient data to support conclusion of little or no interconnected surface waters with groundwater.	Further justification to be provided re lack of GDEs in Sec. 2.2 and inapplicability of ISWs in Sec. 5.3.5.	2.2, 5.3.5
Various Non-Profits	IS	NP-014		2	Monitoring Network- Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems		The GSP does not include the identified GDEs in the proposed monitoring network maps.	Discuss monitoring network as it relates to tracking GDEs	Further justification to be provided re lack of GDEs in Sec. 2.2 and inapplicability of ISWs in Sec. 5.3.5.	2.2, 5.3.5
Various Non-Profits	IS	NP-016	MCR-8	2	Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems		The original NC dataset should be mapped and the GSP should document which polygons were added (and what local sources were used to identify them), removed (and the removal reason), and kept (from the original NC dataset). TNC guidance on best practices should be used for the method to use local groundwater data to verify whether polygons in the NC dataset are supported by groundwater in an aquifer, in particular BMP #3, which emphasizes that GDEs should not be excluded due to partial reliance on surface water. If insufficient data are available to describe groundwater conditions within or near polygons from the NC dataset, include those polygons in the GSP until data gaps are reconciled in the monitoring network. Once GDEs are identified, the GSP should describe how existing groundwater monitoring programs are protective of GDEs, or propose additional monitoring that specifically targets GDEs.	Provide detail on use of NC data sets in identifying GDEs. Discuss monitoring network as it relates to tracking GDEs.	Further justification to be provided re lack of GDEs in Sec. 2.2 and inapplicability of ISWs in Sec. 5.3.5.	2.2, 5.3.5
Various Non-Profits	IS	NP-017		2	Interconnected Surface Waters		The GSP should identify interconnected surface waters in the Basin by relying on groundwater elevation and stream gauge data, specifying any data gaps that exist so that they can be resolved in the monitoring network, and reconcile data gaps (shallow monitoring wells, stream gauges, and nested/clustered wells) along surface water features in the Monitoring Network section of the GSP to improve ISW mapping.	Presence of any GDEs or ISWs not fully discussed in context of water-level data; disclose and discuss related data gaps.	Further justification to be provided re lack of GDEs in Sec. 2.2 and inapplicability of ISWs in Sec. 5.3.5.	2.2, 5.3.5
Various Non-Profits	IS	NP-039	MCR-7	2	Measurable Objectives- Interconnected Surface Waters/Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems		The GSP should explain how the measurable objectives will help achieve the sustainability goal as it pertains to the environment. After GDEs and ISWs are identified, please discuss if any impacts to GDEs or ISWs are expected. Data gaps should be noted and addressed in the Monitoring section.	Discuss impacts of measurable objectives and achievement of sustainability goal on GDEs and ISWs; make note of related data gaps.	Further justification to be provided re lack of GDEs in Sec. 2.2 and inapplicability of ISWs in Sec. 5.3.5.	2.2, 5.3.5
Various Non-Profits	IS	NP-040	MCR-3	2	Interconnected Surface Waters		The GSP should specifically cite "periodic comparisons of surface water elevations and flow rate depletion in applicable stream channels and adjacent groundwater" as a data gap and further address in the monitoring section.	Discuss data gap of channel flows and groundwater elevation correlations.	Further justification to be provided re lack of GDEs in Sec. 2.2 and inapplicability of ISWs in Sec. 5.3.5.	2.2, 5.3.5

Mid-Kaweah GSA Comment and Response Matrix

Version Date: 20191107

Various Non-Profits	IS	NP-041		2	Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems		After the identification and evaluation of potential GDEs is completed, this section should discuss impacts to those GDEs. Specifically, the GSP should: (1) discuss how this undesirable result can be used to avoid impacts to GDEs or ISWs; (2) describe how impacts to these types of properties will be avoided; (3) provide more specifics on what biological responses (e.g., extent of habitat, growth, recruitment rates) would best characterize a significant and unreasonable impact to GDEs; and (4) identify appropriate biological indicators that can be used to monitor potential impacts to environmental beneficial users due to groundwater conditions.	Discuss impacts of any undesirable results on GDEs.	Further justification to be provided re lack of GDEs in Sec. 2.2 and inapplicability of ISWs in Sec. 5.3.5.	2.2, 5.3.5
Various Non-Profits	IS	NP-044	MCR-7	2	Interconnected Surface Waters/Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems		The GSP should state how ISWs and GDEs will benefit or be protected, or what other environmental benefits will accrue.	Discuss protections afforded to GDEs and ISWs of chosen measurable objectives.	Further justification to be provided re lack of GDEs in Sec. 2.2 and inapplicability of ISWs in Sec. 5.3.5.	2.2, 5.3.5
Various Non-Profits	MA	NP-025		2	Management Areas- Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems		"MKGSA reviewed the "Natural Community Dataset Viewer" maps for the Kaweah Subbasin to evaluate the possibility of whether groundwater dependent ecosystems could exist in the MKGSA management area. The mapping system identifies stream reaches supporting habitat that may rely on groundwater." But no management areas are specifically defined to manage GDEs.	Consider setting up Mgt Areas for protection of GDEs.	Further justification to be provided re lack of GDEs in Sec. 2.2 and inapplicability of ISWs in Sec. 5.3.5.	2.2, 5.3.5
Various Non-Profits	PM	NP-042	MCR-11	2	Projects and Management Actions-Disadvantaged Communities		A brief description of a project benefit to one DAC is provided in the GSP, but not discussed in detail. A discussion should be added for each project or management action to clearly identify the benefits to DAC drinking water users and potential impacts to the water supply. For all potential impacts, the project/management action should include a clear plan to monitor for, prevent, and/or mitigate against such impacts. The GSP should identify additional actions and funding mechanisms for potential failures of achieving the MOs by the identified actions.	Projects & mgt actions should include an assessment on drinking water users and any needed mitigation measures.	Staff plan to meet with SHE on 10/21 or 10/22 to address these three themes highlighted in this comment and agree on how to modify the GSP: Impact discrepancies, locally applied UR, improved mitigation. Following this meeting, we will provide	various
Various Non-Profits	PM	NP-045	MCR-11	2	Projects and Management Actions-Multiple Benefit/Environmental		The GSP should also identify if there will be habitat value incorporated into the design of projects and how the recharge ponds will be managed to benefit environmental users.	Discuss any environmental benefits of groundwater recharge projects.	GW recharge projects may provide habitat improvements.	Various 7.3 projects
Various Non-Profits	WB	NP-019	MCR-1	2	Phreatophyte Extraction		Please clarify what the term "phreatophyte extraction" means. The text states "Phreatophyte extraction consists of removing vegetation in riparian areas to prevent consumptive water use." If phreatophytes were indeed removed from within the Subbasin, please provide further details. If phreatophyte extraction refers to the uptake of groundwater by phreatophytes, then correct this text. It should be clearly stated if the phreatophytes are referring to GDE vegetation (riparian vegetation). Also the reference is from 2007 and the acreage and ET estimation methodology may be outdated.	[Appendix 2A Section 2.5.1.3 Summary of Water Budget Components (p. 102)] Improve text discussing phreatophyte extractions.	Phreatophyte extraction means removal of GW by the plants, applicable to eastern portion of the Subbasin only, not MKGSA.	Basin Setting
Various Non-Profits	WQ	NP-002		2	MCLs		The draft GSP used the DWR Mapping Tool to identify DACs. The GSP only clearly identified CA MCLs as a source for developing MTs, while PHGs or Regional Water Quality Control Plan WQOs were not considered in the assessment of drinking water users.	Consideration of only MCLs in establishing min. thresholds is insufficient.	GEI to investigate and provide Advisory Committee with recommended action by end of October 2019.	5.3.3.3
Various Non-Profits	DC	NP-001		1	Beneficial Users- Public Water Systems		"Beneficial users of groundwater in MKGSA include agricultural users, domestic well owners, municipal well operators, public water systems, local land use planning agencies, California Native American Tribes, disadvantaged communities, and entities engaged in monitoring and reporting groundwater elevations." DACs include "those served by private domestic wells or small community water systems (Water Code §10723.2(i))" The number and sizes of the public water systems within the MKGSA are not clearly described.	Details needed re DACs within MKGSA [1.5.2.1, Page 34]	Details to be provided in Sec. 1	1.4.2
Various Non-Profits	DC	NP-015		1	Well inventory- Domestic		The GSP should include detailed information about the location and depths of domestic wells. Providing maps of the monitoring network overlaid with location of DACs, domestic wells, community water systems, GDEs, and any other sensitive beneficial users will allow the reader to evaluate the adequacy of the network to monitor conditions near these beneficial users.	More information needed re domestic wells and adequacy of monitoring network to track impacts thereon.	Additional information re domestic wells to be part of five-year assessment.	N/A
Various Non-Profits	GA	NP-007		1	MKGSA Organization- Advisory Committee		The SCEP identifies an intent to have up to 3 members representing DACs and/or environmental users, but the GSP does not identify who the actual members of the Advisory Committee were through the GSP development process and what organizations/interests were represented.	Comment self-explanatory	Adv. Committee members selected per GSA board policy; all have specific terms and are subject to reappointments to continue to serve during	N/A
Various Non-Profits	IS	NP-003	MCR-7	1	Beneficial Users- Environmental/Recreation		The GSP should identify whether or not the following beneficial uses and users of groundwater in the subbasin are present: Protected Lands, including preserves, refuges, conservation areas, recreational areas; and other protected lands; and Public Trust Uses, including wildlife, aquatic habitat, fisheries, and recreation.	Comment self-explanatory	Confirm lack of preserves, refuges, conservation areas etc. to be undertaken.	1.5.2.10
Various Non-Profits	IS	NP-004	MCR-7	1	Beneficial Users- Environmental		The types and locations of environmental uses, species and habitats supported, and the designated beneficial environmental uses of surface waters that may be affected by groundwater extraction in the Subbasin should be specified.	Comment self-explanatory	GDEs and ISWs not present within MKGSA; additional justification for this conclusion is provided in Sec. 2 and 5.3.5.	N/A
Various Non-Profits	IS	NP-009	MCR-8	1	Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems		Figure 19 of Appendix 2A is titled "Potential Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems", however the figure does not actually present this. The NC dataset is a starting point for GSAs to identify GDEs in their basin. The NC dataset comprises 3,488 acres of potential GDEs for the entire Kaweah basin, representing a significant amount of GDEs to be considered.	Clarification re cited figure sought [Figure 19 (Appendix 2A page 172)]	Referenced figure to be evaluated and modified if necessary.	Appendix 2A
Various Non-Profits	OR	NP-021		1	Internal Referencing		Most water budget information is included in the appendices. The main GSP text could provide reference or direction to the appendices where specific topics are discussed to assist readers navigate the documents.	Comment self-explanatory	Additional information re MKGSA water budget to be added per other comments.	2.2
Various Non-Profits	PO	NP-006		1	Public Outreach		The GSP listed venues for stakeholders to provide input and also stated that the MKGSA responded to stakeholders' comments during the development of the GSP. However, detailed information about stakeholder input and responses from the GSA to address the stakeholder input are not presented.	Request for more information re stakeholder input/involvement during GSP development.	More detail re public comments are forthcoming in final GSP. Minutes of Adv Committee meetings (which document stakeholder input) are part of the public record and available on the GSA website.	N/A
Various Non-Profits	PO	NP-038	MCR-22	1	Public Outreach- Disadvantaged Communities		The GSP should also discuss whether and how input from DAC members was considered and incorporated into the development of URs, MOs, and MTs.	Request for additional information re DAC involvement in setting SMCs	More detail re public comments are forthcoming in final GSP. Minutes of Adv Committee meetings (which document stakeholder input) are part of the public record and available on the GSA website.	N/A
Various Non-Profits	WI	NP-008		1	Well inventory- Domestic/Public		(Domestic and Public Supply Well Locations and Depths) The well locations and depths are not specifically identified in the GSP.	Comment self-explanatory	Future annual reports will specify these details to the extent available.	N/A
Various Non-Profits	WQ	NP-005		1	Water Quality		The GSP should clarify what criteria it uses to characterize groundwater quality as "generally good" and should ensure that, at minimum, groundwater quality conditions should include the most recent SDWIS data.	Inadequate data re good water quality characterization	Comment noted.	N/A
Various Non-Profits	WQ	NP-012		1	Monitoring Network- Water Quality		"Figure 4-2 (at the end of this Section) provides the current distribution of wells throughout the entire Subbasin with available data through CASGEM, local and regional agencies, and Management Areas. Figure 4-3 (at the end of this Section) shows the current groundwater level monitoring wells in the MKGSA only, with aquifer designations if known." The map of existing monitoring wells for groundwater levels is included in the Appendix 2A. No map of existing water quality monitoring networks is found in this GSP.	Request for another map of water quality networks within MKGSA [4.4.2 Page 76]	Confirm identification of network wells used for WQ sampling.	4
Various Non-Profits	DC	NP-037		1	Undesirable Results- Disadvantaged Communities		The trigger for undesirable results (% of wells in all the management zones impacted) creates the potential for disproportionate impacts to disadvantaged communities; those impacts should be assessed.	Impacts of undesirable results impacts on DACs needs to be assessed.	Comment noted; addressed sufficiently in Sec. 3.2.2.1	N/A
Westchester Group Investment Management	AL	WG-001		2	On-Farm Recharge- Groundwater Allocations		I do have some clarifying comments regarding the Project and Management Actions in Section 7 of the Plan. Specifically, the concept of on-farm recharge covered in Section 7.3.4. My comments are as follows: 1. It would be helpful to understand how on-farm recharge water quantities will be credited and accounted for. Will there be any losses applied, or "leave-behind?" 2. Will individual water user accounts be created to manage the credits? 3. In addition to on-farm recharge, I would like to see some further discussion on private water user/landowner recharge projects such as recharge basins and subsurface recharge system projects. With these projects, the same questions outlined above regarding how recharge will be credited and accounted for would be applicable. It would be beneficial to see these items further defined in the Plan , but if specifics on such Projects and Management Actions cannot be quantified at this time, I would at least like to see the Plan outline a process of how such projects and actions could be developed post Plan, and prior to implementation.	Inquiry as to rules to govern implementation of on-farm recharge program.	Those specific credits related to on farm GW recharge programs have yet to be determined by the GSP board.	
	PM	NC-022	MCR-11	1	Projects and Management Actions-Multiple Benefit/Interconnected Surface Waters/Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems		Please state how ISWs and GDEs will benefit or be protected, or what other environmental benefits will accrue. Recharge ponds, reservoirs and facilities for managed stormwater recharge can be designed to include elements that act functionally as wetlands and provide a benefit for wildlife and aquatic species. In some cases, such facilities have been incorporated into local HCPs, more fully recognizing the value of the habitat that they provide and the species they support. For projects that will be constructing recharge ponds, please identify if there will be habitat value incorporated into the design and how the recharge ponds will be managed to benefit environmental users.	Identify environmental benefits of recharge projects	GDEs and ISWs do not exist in MKGSA. Narrative will be added to relevant projects to emphasize wetland improvements for water fowl.	7.3 (various)