

Comments Letters on the Fillmore Basin Draft GSP

The Fillmore and Piru Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (FPBGSA) received the following comment letters and comments via its website. Each of the comments is included in and responded to on the following Response to Comments table. The full comment letters are available at the FPBGSA website at <https://www.fpbgsa.org/comments-received-for-fillmore-basin/>.

Letters:

1. Bondy Groundwater Consulting, Inc., September 29, 2021
2. Brokaw, Katie, October 2, 2021
3. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, October 8, 2021
4. California Trout, Inc., October 8, 2021
5. National Marine Fisheries Service, September 22, 2021
6. State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry, University of California Santa Barbara, and Cardiff University, October 9, 2021
7. The Nature Conservancy, Audubon California, Local Government Commission, Union of Concerned Scientists, Clean Water Action/Clean Water Fund, October 9, 2021
8. United Water Conservation District, October 8, 2021
9. Ventura County Public Works Agency, Watershed Protection, October 8, 2021

Comments Submitted Via Website:

- A. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, October 8, 2021

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS - FILLMORE GSP

GSP	Letter No.	Comment No.	Commenter(s)	Comment	Response
Fillmore	1	1-1	Bondy Groundwater Consulting, Inc.	Two principal aquifers are proposed in the GSPs. The proposed "Main Aquifer" consists of "Aquifer Systems" A & B. The proposed "Deep Aquifer" consists of "Aquifer System" C. The terminology used in the GSP may not be appropriate and may create confusion for some readers. Specifically, how can an "aquifer" consist of one or more "aquifer systems"? It is recommended that the A, B, and C "Aquifer Systems" be referred to as zones or horizons instead to avoid confusion.	We concur that the usage of Aquifer, Aquifer System, and Aquifer Zone was potentially confusing. Upon consultation with the commenter, UWCD, and DWR, we have adjusted the language in the GSP to a single Principal Aquifer composed of Aquifer Zones A and B. Zone C is designated as a non-Principal Aquifer. References to Aquifer System(s) have been removed.
Fillmore	1	1-2	Bondy Groundwater Consulting, Inc.	The identification of multiple principal aquifers appears to be based exclusively on technical criteria without consideration of the management and cost implication. The technical reasons provided include: (1) "the distribution and extent of hydraulic properties (i.e., hydraulic conductivity) in the United (2021a) VRGWFM", (2) unconfined vs. semi-confined conditions, and (3) an aquitard between the B and C "Aquifer Systems". Given that there is only one "Aquifer System" C groundwater elevation monitoring well in each basin, it does not appear that sufficient data are available to evaluate the degree of confinement of "Aquifer System" C. Similarly, there are insufficient borehole data to conclude that the aquitard between "Aquifer Systems" B and C is continuous across the Basins. This is indicated by the GSP cross-sections, which do not depict geologic strata beneath "Aquifer System" B over large portions of the Basins due to a lack of data at depth.	See response to previous comment.
Fillmore	1	1-3	Bondy Groundwater Consulting, Inc.	It is unclear whether identification of the "Deep Aquifer" is consistent with the definition of the term "principal aquifer". (GSP Emergency Regulations § 351 (aa) defines "Principal aquifers" as aquifers or aquifer systems that store, transmit, and yield significant or economic quantities of groundwater to wells, springs, or surface water systems.) Specifically, it is unclear whether the "Deep Aquifer" transmits significant or economic quantities of groundwater to wells. The GSPs indicate that only 1 to 4% of verifiable pumping in the basins occurs from this zone. Furthermore, the GSPs refer to "Deep Aquifer" pumping as "minor" when discounting "Deep Aquifer" data gaps. At a minimum, the designation of the "Deep Aquifer" as a Principal Aquifer contradicts the statements about the "minor" pumping from the "Deep Aquifer".	Aquifer Zone C is no longer referred to as a Principal Aquifer. Although there are a few wells extracting from this zone, the quantity of water being pumped is not a predominant source in the basin.

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS - FILLMORE GSP

GSP	Letter No.	Comment No.	Commenter(s)	Comment	Response
Fillmore	1	1-4	Bondy Groundwater Consulting, Inc.	<p>The most significant concern is the apparent lack of consideration of the management and cost implications of the decision to identify the “Deep Aquifer” as a separate principal aquifer. The GSP does not communicate what management objective(s) would be met by identifying the “Deep Aquifer” as a principal aquifer. Rather, the GSP argues the opposite - that there is little concern about the “Deep Aquifer” because there is only a minor amount of pumping sourced from it. It is unclear why this small amount of pumping requires special consideration in the GSPs and how identifying separate principal aquifers furthers management of the basins. Moreover, the GSP does not consider the costs for complying with the additional self-imposed requirements that come with this decision. Specifically, the GSP Emergency Regulations require the following for each Principal Aquifer:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model GSP Section: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. General water quality b. Vertical and lateral extent 2. Groundwater Conditions GSP Section: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Groundwater elevation contour maps b. Groundwater elevation hydrographs c. Hydraulic gradients between the Principal Aquifers 3. Monitoring Network: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Sufficient density of monitoring wells to collect representative measurements in each Principal Aquifer to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Demonstrate groundwater flow directions ii. Demonstrate water quality iii. Calculate hydraulic gradients between Principal Aquifers 4. Annual Reports: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Change in storage for each Principal Aquifer 	See responses to comments 1-1, 1-2, and 1-3.
Fillmore	1	1-5	Bondy Groundwater Consulting, Inc.	<p>The sustainable yields presented in the GSPs are based on the “pumping minus change in storage” approach applied to the water budget data. This approach underestimates the sustainable yield because it ignores the fact that the basins refill completely periodically and reject potential recharge during such periods. Simply stated, the basins could recover with higher pumping rates than used in the water budgets. Modeling results presented during various meetings have demonstrated this fact very clearly. Moreover, the basins experienced deeper groundwater levels prior to the historical water budget period without reported undesirable results, further suggesting that the sustainable yield is greater than that which results from a strict application of the “pumping minus change in storage” mathematics. Ideally, the sustainable yield would be estimated using numerical model simulations designed to estimate the true potential and resiliency of the basins. If this is not feasible in the time remaining for GSP completion, then it is recommended that the GSPs be updated to caveat the sustainable yield values as noted above.</p>	- The “pumping minus change in storage” calculation is considered a minimum sustainable yield estimate (based on 50 year historical record adjusted for 2070CT climate change and associated increased pumping demand. The change in storage SMC will be updated to reflect using GW levels as a proxy.
Fillmore	1	1-6	Bondy Groundwater Consulting, Inc.	<p>GSP Emergency Regulations § 351(l) defines “data gaps” as a “lack of information that significantly affects the understanding of the basin setting or evaluation of the efficacy of Plan implementation and could limit the ability to assess whether a basin is being sustainably managed.” A potential interpretation of this definition is that anything identified as a “data gap” would need to be addressed during GSP implementation. The GSP Emergency Regulations make this clear for the monitoring network - “data gaps” must be addressed within five years following GSP adoption (GSP Emergency Regulations § 354.38(d)). A concern is that the term “data gap” is used in the GSP to describe data limitations that are not necessary to address to sustainably manage the Basins and for which the GSA has no plan to address. It is recommended that each use of the term “data gap” be carefully reconsidered to determine if the item in question is really a data gap as defined by the GSP Emergency Regulations. It is recommended that any items that are not truly data gaps (as defined by the GSP Emergency Regulations) and/or that the GSA is not committed to addressing be characterized using a different term, such as “data limitation” or “potential data gap.”</p>	"Data gaps" usage will be revised to only reflect HCM and SMC items that limit implementation of the GSP and assessment of sustainability. References to "data gaps" altered to "potential data gaps", where appropriate.

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS - FILLMORE GSP

GSP	Letter No.	Comment No.	Commenter(s)	Comment	Response
Fillmore	1	1-7	Bondy Groundwater Consulting, Inc.	Calculations of interconnected surface water depletion are presented in Section 2.2.2.7 and referred to in Section 3.2.5. These calculations were developed by running the VRGWFEM with historical pumping rates and comparing to a second simulation which employed a hypothetical 50% reduction in basin wide pumping. Appendix J discussed changes in streamflow using a similar analysis that eliminated pumping within 1 mile of the Santa Clara River. Both approaches do not calculate the full amount of depletion, as seems to be required by the GSP Emergency Regulations. In particular, indirect depletion ² is being underestimated. It is recommended that the analysis be revised to include removal of all pumping to fully estimate depletions. Doing so will ensure compliance with the GSP Emergency Regulations and provide a more robust technical basis and transparency for the decision to screen out the depletions of interconnected surface water sustainability indicator.	Our interpretation of the Emergency Regulations are a bit more pragmatic. The goal is to quantify the amount of surface water depletion due to groundwater extractions, which for this basin is possible at the East Grove and Fish Hatchery areas. The relationship between surface water flow (i.e., rising groundwater) is approximated by the empirical relationships between water levels in key wells and manual surface water flow measurements. The manual measurements are constrained to some upper limit that incorporates consideration of personnel safety while gathering the flow data. Hence the data in Figures 2-4 and 3-16 in Appendix J have upper flow rates at or near 50 cfs. The empirical relationship does not extend beyond this value, so if the water levels in the key wells rise to an elevation that falls outside the range of the field measurement (due to the hypothetical elimination of all groundwater extractions in the groundwater flow model), we do not currently have a mechanism to quantify that flow rate. The best available information for this topic is the empirical relationship.
Fillmore	1	1-8	Bondy Groundwater Consulting, Inc.	The justification for not developing SMC for the depletions of interconnected surface water sustainability indicator can be better described. Only a few sentences are devoted to this critical decision. The concern is that the basis for not developing SMC will be unclear to those who did not directly participate in the planning process, including certain stakeholders and DWR reviewers. It is suggested that Section 3.2.5 be expanded to more fully present the rationale for not developing depletions of interconnected surface water SMC. For example, Point No. 2 in Section 3.2.5 should be supported with appropriate references. Pertinent information from the Stillwater memo appendix could be summarized here together with a more detailed description of why the decision to not develop depletions of interconnected surface water SMC is not inconsistent with designation of the Santa Clara River as critical habitat for steelhead. Lastly, consider more fully describing the process for reaching the decision. More description of the number of meetings this matter was discussed, outreach, feedback received, etc. could be included to support the decision.	See the updated language in Appendix J, Section 3.6.5 and GSP Section 3.2.1.
Fillmore	1	1-9	Bondy Groundwater Consulting, Inc.	Appendix J, Section 3.6.5 makes the argument no significant and unreasonable effects will occur because estimated past and future depletion rates are similar. This logic is questionable. For example, could GSAs in the Central Valley continue with subsidence so long as the subsidence rates are less than or equal to historical rates? Probably not. A potentially stronger argument may be that there have not been reported undesirable results historically and depletion rates are not projected to increase; therefore, undesirable results are not expected in the future. The lack of reported undesirable results should be emphasized and supported in the GSP and appendix to provide a more solid basis for not developing depletions of interconnected surface water SMC.	The rate of subsidence is not similar to rate of ISW depletions (the rate of ISW depletion at East Grove and Fish Hatchery areas fluctuates within a range of values through time), while a constant rate of subsidence will result in cumulatively worse conditions over time. Section 3.6.5 in Appendix J has been revised to expand on the rationale for not developing a MT.

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS - FILLMORE GSP

GSP	Letter No.	Comment No.	Commenter(s)	Comment	Response
Fillmore	1	1-10	Bondy Groundwater Consulting, Inc.	The GSP establishes minimum thresholds and measurable objectives for degraded water quality but then says the GSA is not responsible for meeting them. This approach does not appear to be consistent with the GSP Emergency Regulations because it does not address any degradation that could be caused by pumping or plan implementation. DWR has been very clear that GSPs must address any potential degradation that may be caused by pumping or plan implementation. The GSPs do not provide information concerning whether pumping or plan implementation can potentially cause water quality degradation. If there is no nexus between water quality degradation and groundwater pumping or plan implementation, then the GSPs should present the technical evidence, clearly state there is no nexus, and use this information to further justify the approach for this sustainability indicator. If there is potential for groundwater pumping or plan implementation to degrade water quality, then the GSPs should describe that potential and caveat the SMC by saying the criteria only apply if GSA determines that the degradation in question is being caused by pumping or plan implementation. This is the approach taken by several other GSAs.	Section 3.3.4 of the GSP states that the GSA will continue the water quality monitoring program during GSP implementation to assess if any observed material water quality changes are caused by the implementation actions. Neither historical or current extraction rates or water levels have resulted in undesirable GW quality results. The GSP does not propose any projects or management actions that would change the groundwater extraction regime in the basin.
Fillmore	1	1-11	Bondy Groundwater Consulting, Inc.	Section 3.2.3.1 of the GSPs states that an undesirable result for chronic lowering of groundwater levels occurs when groundwater elevations drop below the bottom of well perforations (i.e., screen) in 25% of the representative monitoring sites. Section 3.3.1 goes on to say that “the Agency acknowledges wells going dry is an undesirable result, yet, a certain number of shallow water wells (i.e., less than 100 ft deep) going dry is acceptable (see DBS&A, 2021c [Appendix J]). A concern is that justification for the 25% criterion and “a certain number of shallow water wells going dry” is not supported by an analysis of impacts on beneficial uses. There is a concern that the DWR reviewers may conclude that there is insufficient justification for this criterion. It is suggested that the GSP be expanded to include a description of the effects on beneficial uses that would be expected if groundwater levels reached the minimum threshold levels and to provide justification for why those effects are not considered to be significant and unreasonable.	See Appendix J Section 3.3.1.1 for adjusted language that has been brought forward into the GSP.
Fillmore	1	1-12	Bondy Groundwater Consulting, Inc.	The GSP text and SMC Appendix (Appendix J) are in conflict. The GSP text (Section 3.3.2) uses the sustainable yield for the minimum threshold. In contrast, Appendix J uses groundwater levels as a proxy and adopts the minimum thresholds for the chronic lowering of groundwater levels sustainability indicator. The GSP text (Section 3.4) does not establish a measurable objective. In contrast, Appendix J uses groundwater levels as a proxy and adopts the measurable objective for the chronic lowering of groundwater levels sustainability indicator. The approach proposed in Appendix J is preferred because of the sustainable yield values presented in the GSPs understate the true pumping potential of the basins, as discussed in an earlier comment.	We have adjusted the text to remove the conflict.
Fillmore	1	1-13	Bondy Groundwater Consulting, Inc.	Implementation costs were not included in the draft GSP. These should be made available as soon as possible for stakeholder review.	Full implementation costs can be developed once the Mitigation Plan for supplying supplemental groundwater supplies to the Cienega Springs Restoration project has been prepared and the Board of Directors has the opportunity to consider the other projects identified in Section 4 of the GSP.
Fillmore	1	1-14	Bondy Groundwater Consulting, Inc.	GSP Sections 3.2.2 state that “water quality degradation beyond historical conditions” is an undesirable result. GSP Sections 3.2.3 state that “groundwater levels changes (i.e., declines) can extend to any of the applicable undesirable results. When considering these statements together, there is an implication that a causal relationship between groundwater levels and groundwater quality exists. The GSPs do not provide technical information to justify or refute a causal relationship between groundwater levels and groundwater quality. More information should be provided in the GSPs to clarify whether declining groundwater levels cause groundwater quality degradation. The statement in Section 3.2.3 should be revised if it is concluded that declining groundwater levels do not cause groundwater quality degradation.	Pumping does not have an evident impact on GW quality, based on analysis of GW level and quality trends (Appendix K, Section 2.2.2.5.2). The documented historical fluctuations in water levels have not resulted in undesirable results.

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS - FILLMORE GSP

GSP	Letter No.	Comment No.	Commenter(s)	Comment	Response
Fillmore	2	2-1	Katie Brokaw	The GSP seems too succinct in describing the process the GSA and stakeholders went through to develop the Plan. Because the Plan doesn't adequately reflect the great effort behind the Plan, it may result in an avoidable DWR review. DWR should be informed of how much we struggled with key issues for countless hours and how much the GSA engaged with stakeholders to resolve those issues. Otherwise they may conclude that the Plan is simply a "box-checking" exercise and initiate an unnecessary review.	See sections 2.1.5 and 3.2. Further description of stakeholder involvement in GSP development has been added to Section 2.1.5.3.
Fillmore	2	2-2	Katie Brokaw	The approach that the consultants took significantly underestimates the true resiliency and potential of the Fillmore Basin. As indicated by early model runs, this basin can refill with more pumping. I would therefore encourage the consultants to use those model runs where there was a lot more pumping and the Basin still recovered as the basis for our Sustainable Yield. The point should be clearly articulated that our Sustainable Yield is actually much higher than the one the consultants used, which is based on historical water budget.	We have adjusted that language in Section 2.2.3.7 to clarify that the sustainable yield estimate is a minimum value.
Fillmore	2	2-3	Katie Brokaw	It seems unnecessary to break out the deep aquifer C from the other combined category of Aquifers A & B. We are not using the deep aquifer C significantly (only between 1% and 4% of our supply) but breaking it out as a separate principal aquifer will add costs and monitoring effort for an insignificant source. I would suggest combining it with the A & B aquifer category.	See responses to comments 1-1, 1-2, and 1-3.
Fillmore	2	2-4	Katie Brokaw	As I understand it the regulatory definition of "data gap" is a lack of data that significantly impairs our ability to manage the aquifer sustainably. It appears that the consultants in a number of places in the GSP used the term data gap inappropriately when they lacked information or had limited data about something that does not impact our ability to sustainably manage the basin. For example in Section 2-41 lines 2-6, the text reads: "Data gaps exist for the hydraulic gradients between the Main and Deep principal aquifers throughout the Basin that would help refine the HCM; however, these data gaps are not considered significant enough to prevent this Plan from demonstrating that the Basin can be managed sustainably, especially because relatively little groundwater is used from the Deep Aquifer." If the lack of information on the hydraulic gradients is not considered significant enough to prevent the Basin from being managed sustainably, then that lack of information is not, by definition, a "data gap" and therefore, should not be referred as such. It seems to me other instances of the improper use of "data gap" occurred as follows: Section 2-59 starting at Line 20, Section 2-38 starting at Line 3, Section 3-16 starting at Line 7, Section 2-37 starting at Line 24, Section 3-15 starting at Line 9, Section 2-56 starting at Line 16, Section 3-29 starting at Line 17. I would ask the consultants to carefully review their use of "data gap" at these places in the GSP to be sure they are referring to true "data gaps" and not simply to areas where they lack information that is not critical to sustainable management (i.e. "nice to know" but not essential to sustainability).	See the response to comment 1-6. Section 2 and 3 of the GSP have been updated accordingly.

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS - FILLMORE GSP

GSP	Letter No.	Comment No.	Commenter(s)	Comment	Response
Fillmore	3, A	3,A-1	California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)	<p>There is insufficient information in the Draft GSP about the hydrologic interconnection between the shallow aquifer and the Main aquifer. Page 2-37 of the Draft GSP states, “Data gaps (Figure 2.2-15) in the HCM comprise a lack of groundwater level data in the shallow groundwater of the Main Aquifer along the streams (e.g., Santa Clara River and Sespe Creek), and a lack of groundwater level data in the Deep Aquifer. The shallow groundwater data gaps in the stream areas will be addressed with the installation of monitoring wells by the Agency (per DWR Grant Funding) and installation of shallow monitoring wells by UCSB (Stillwater, 2021b)”. CDFW appreciates the efforts the GSA undertook to analyze the Basin in terms of geologic and hydrogeologic characterization. CDFW also appreciates FBGSA’s proposed plans to utilize the updated HCM to fill in the data gaps and deficiencies identified in the Draft GSP. However, there is a need for a better understanding of the interactions between interconnected surface water and groundwater particularly in the GDE areas (Cienega Riparian Complex Area, East Grove, Fillmore Basin Santa Clara River Riparian Shrubland, Sespe Creek, Fillmore Basin Tributary Riparian). Additional clarification is needed in the final GSP along with a description of future assessments on how this data gap will be addressed.</p> <p><u>Recommendation #1(a)</u>: Accurate hydrogeologic modeling requires an accurate and complete data set. CDFW recommends the installation of shallow groundwater monitoring wells near potential GDEs and interconnected surface waters.</p> <p><u>Recommendation #1(b)</u>: CDFW also recommends pairing multiple-completion wells with additional streamflow gages to facilitate an improved understanding of surface water- groundwater interconnectivity and subsurface recharge channels. CDFW agrees with the FBGA proposal to install more multiple-well monitoring facilities across the basin. The Draft GSP states that “Construction of twenty of these facilities equally spaced across the Basins would greatly decrease GSP analysis uncertainty and would be consistent with the DWR’s data quality recommendations but would likely be cost prohibitive for FPBGSA rate payers in the Fillmore and Piru Basins.” (Page 3-33, Lines 22-25, Draft Text). CDFW recommends the FBGA commit to a more modest number of strategically placed well monitoring facilities in the Project and Management Actions.</p>	<p>- Surface water occurs at limited areas during various time periods. The only perennial surface water areas are the East Grove, followed by Cienega Riparian Complex (which goes dry during drought periods). The other GDE areas depend on groundwater and occasionally have surface water present nearby.</p> <p>- RE: Recommendation #1(a) - the GSA plans to install shallow GW monitoring wells near the GDEs</p> <p>- RE: Recommendation #1(b) - streamflow gages have been considered infeasible in the SCR and lower Sespe Creek channels by USGS, Ventura County and United. Multi-completion wells are not necessary (only clustered, single-completion wells are necessary) for understanding shallow GW levels near/beneath GDEs. The difficulty of maintaining streamflow gages within the basin prevents characterization of potential interconnected SW, with the limited exception of identifying surface water with aerial imagery and/or field mapping.</p>

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS - FILLMORE GSP

GSP	Letter No.	Comment No.	Commenter(s)	Comment	Response
Fillmore		3,A-2 (cont'd)		<p>Recommendation 2(a): CDFW recommends the five areas within the Basin that were mapped as containing potential GDEs be included in the Final GSP as GDEs because these areas rely on the shallow perched groundwater, bedrock groundwater and/or surface water within the Basin. The FBGA has not provided enough data to make the assertion that the groundwater interaction with these GDEs should remain omitted. Water in the shallow alluvial aquifer can also percolate to the main aquifer below. As groundwater pumping occurs from the principal aquifer, water from the shallow alluvial aquifer can become depleted as it recharges the principal aquifer. These are important contributions to sustaining these habitats and Areas 3, 4, and 5 should be reinstated in the Final GSP as GDEs. This shallow alluvial “aquifer” needs to be protected under SGMA. If these GDEs are adversely impacted, groundwater plans should be in place to facilitate appropriate and timely monitoring and management response actions.</p> <p>Recommendation 2(b): CDFW recommends that the best scientific data on depth to groundwater be included in the analysis of interconnected surface waters before any data is excluded. USGS mapped springs/seeps and comparisons of recent groundwater level contours to vegetation root zones should also be included in the analysis. Mapping GDEs and other beneficial uses is an essential component in the consideration, development, and implementation of GSPs (Water Code §10723.2) and in assessing the potential effects on groundwater beneficial uses. GSAs must also include sustainable management criteria and monitoring to detect adverse impacts on all groundwater beneficial users.</p> <p>Recommendation 2(c): CDFW recommends using Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) and Normalized Difference Moisture Index (NDMI) to assess habitat health for all five areas on an annual basis and should inform the revision of both the planning and minimum thresholds for the representative wells to within or near the historic baseline. CDFW does not recommend relying solely on soils information. For example, the presence of sandy, dry, and friable soils, does not mean that existing plant species do not rely on groundwater for some portion of their life cycle. Capillary fringe associated with root networks from native plants could be accessing groundwater from deeper depths.</p>	<p>A) There isn't any evidence that potential GDEs rely on perched groundwater or groundwater from the bedrock. The Riparian Shrubland GDEs are mostly comprised of mulefat and other plants that combine shallow roots (< 2 ft) with low water requirements. These plants are generally located where groundwater is 5-10 ft at its shallowest, and generally deeper, based on the new depth to water map in Fall 2011 (ie., the roots are located above the groundwater elevation and the capillary fringe). They are outside the area of mapped rising groundwater and typically do not support surface flow. The plants that make up this GDE may use groundwater during wet years given some uncertainty in the elevation of groundwater, but if groundwater were typically within the rooting zone, the dominant vegetation likely be cottonwoods and willows.</p> <p>B) The depth to groundwater map has been updated using Fall 2011 groundwater contours provided by United Water, based on the assumption that this wet year represents the highest summer groundwater levels in the basin. A discussion of the depth relative to rooting zones has been added to the GSP.</p> <p>C) NDVI and NDMI monitoring of the potential GDE sites has been included in the monitoring program.</p>
Fillmore	3, A	3,A-4	California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)	<p>CDFW is concerned that the Fillmore Fish Hatchery pumping is overquantified. The FBGA states on page 136 that “...there is potential that Fish Hatchery groundwater pumping which constitutes the largest pumping by a single entity in the basins for some years may complicate interpretation of water level data gathered from a new monitor well facility (i.e., measured water levels may not be representative static water levels if they are significantly influenced by the nearby pumping).” Although the Draft GSP identifies the Fish Hatchery as the largest pumping entity (pg. 136), impacts to groundwater levels are substantially minimized by returning pumped water to the main aquifer for recharge. Most of the water pumped from CDFW groundwater wells enter the fish hatchery raceway to sustain young fish. Although some water is lost from evaporation after entering the raceway, the majority of pumped well water is returned to the groundwater system via soil saturation and percolation.</p> <p>CDFW agrees with the FBGA’s concern (pg. 136) that the Fish Hatchery production well has the potential to interfere with the accuracy of data collected from the shallow monitoring wells. The Fish Hatchery well is screened at the 300-foot-level whereas the shallow monitoring wells have been proposed at the 100-foot-level. The cone of depression from the Fish Hatchery production well has the potential to skew data as the surrounding areas of the production well in aquifer are slowly replenished.</p> <p>Recommendation #3(a): CDFW recommends the final GSP accurately quantify pumping activities at the Fillmore Fish Hatchery using both pumping and return flow quantities that recharge the aquifer when evaluating impacts to the groundwater. The rising groundwater area around the Fish Hatchery should retain sufficient water levels to protect both the pumping of water and key GDEs as suggested on page ES-1 of the Draft GSP.</p> <p>Recommendation #3(b): CDFW recommends the FBGA investigate adding additional shallow aquifer monitoring wells away from the vicinity of the Fish Hatchery production well to generate additional monitoring data that will accurately identify groundwater pumping trends, interactions, or interferences.</p>	<p>The Fish Hatchery pumping is self reported and quantified in a consistent manner as other wells in the Basin.</p> <p>- RE: Recommendation #3(a) - pumping is accurately measured; return flows are not measured by CDFW, UWCD, or VCWPD, however return flows were included in the groundwater flow model. measured and commonly quantified/estimated based on GW model calibration</p> <p>- RE: Recommendation #3(b) - The GSA can consider additional monitoring wells at locations that assist in the management of the groundwater resources and are included in Section 4 of the GSP.</p>

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS - FILLMORE GSP

GSP	Letter No.	Comment No.	Commenter(s)	Comment	Response
Fillmore	3, A	3,A-5	California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)	<p>CDFW has not engaged in meaningful discussions of Basin overdraft mitigation with FBGA regarding SGMA project and management actions at the Cienega Springs Ecological Reserve. Page 4-2 of the Draft GSP states, "The FPBGSA desires to dampen the impacts of groundwater extraction by supporting the restoration efforts at the Cienega Restoration Project. The primary action being considered by the FPBGSA is to provide supplemental groundwater to the restoration program during multiyear droughts when the shallow groundwater levels decline to below the Critical Water Level" (Draft Text, Page 4-2). Page 4-2 of the Draft GSP also states, "FPBGSA staff have engaged with CDFW representatives about this project and the conversations are continuing. A detailed Mitigation Plan will be developed after the GSP has been adopted by the FPBGSA and the GSP submitted to DWR for their review (Jan 2022)" (Draft Text, Page 4-2). CDFW had a meeting on July 12, 2021 to talk about the Cienega Riparian Complex Area with members of TNC and FBGA. Beyond any initial discussions, CDFW has not received detailed information on FBGA's mitigation proposal. CDFW is open to discussing FBGA's potential mitigation projects or management actions that may include the construction of a production well on CDFW property. CDFW believes the Cienega Riparian Complex is situated in an area of rising groundwater. This Cienega Riparian Complex should retain sufficient water levels to protect key GDEs as suggested on page ES-1 of the Draft GSP except during "below normal years of precipitation". During instances of "below normal years of precipitation," the Cienega Riparian Complex has the potential to remain resilient through project and adaptive management actions.</p> <p><u>Recommendation #4(a)</u>: CDFW recommends the installation of additional shallow monitoring wells to inform specific trigger levels and thresholds requiring adaptive management actions.</p> <p><u>Recommendation #4(b)</u>: CDFW recommends the FBGA consider alternate project and management actions as opposed to a production well on CDFW property such as: i) reduced groundwater pumping; ii) implement groundwater pumping allocations; iii) implement Arundo donax removal; and iv) increase the quantity of imported water. CDFW looks forward to discussing these project and management actions to achieve groundwater sustainability within the Basin.</p> <p><u>Recommendation #4(c)</u>: CDFW proposes the final GSP incorporate Recommendation #3(b).</p>	<p>The Basin is not in overdraft. CDFW representative(s) are aware of and have attended FPBGSA Board meetings, where discussion among Board members and stakeholders has occurred regarding potential mitigative actions at the Cienega Springs Restoration Project area. The Board, in consultation with stakeholders, determined that a mitigation project of supplemental water for GDE support during droughts is the best solution for all beneficial users and uses of groundwater. GSA staff have met with CDFW representatives on at least two occasions to outline the proposed mitigative program. The current high-level mitigation plan is to provide supplemental water (from an existing deep well) to restoration experts (i.e., CDFW, TNC) who already have invested time and money in formal plans to make GDEs more resilient and have jurisdiction over and expert knowledge regarding the best use of water for GDEs.</p> <p>- Recommendation #4(a) - shallow MWs are proposed and planned to be installed at the CSRP area.</p> <p>- Recommendation #4(b) - (i) pumping reductions have been shown to be ineffective at providing total mitigation of declining water levels in prolonged droughts and functionally shift the total impact of drought-induced water level declines to groundwater pumper (including the Fish Hatchery operations). Pumpers have no control over drought-induced groundwater declines, (ii) pumping allocations are not considered reasonable by the Board and merely shift the undesirable impacts from one beneficial user group to others. An allocation program could mean that the Fish Hatchery operations would be subject to a reduction in its groundwater extractions, also. Allocations would also impact the DACs in the basin. Allocations are not favored given the ability to use supplemental water to mitigate GDE dieoff and reduce undesirable results on GW pumpers (i.e., the economy); (iii) and (iv) are being considered by the Board following GSP adoption.</p> <p>- Recommendation #4(c) - see response to comment 3,A-4</p>

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS - FILLMORE GSP

GSP	Letter No.	Comment No.	Commenter(s)	Comment	Response
Fillmore	3, A	3,A-6	California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)	<p>CDFW is concerned the depletion of interconnected surface waters will have undesirable impacts on the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed southern California steelhead (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i> or steelhead). The FBGA states on page 3-7, lines 3-13 “The Agency deliberated extensively to determine if undesirable results related to the depletion of interconnected surface water, namely loss of Steelhead rearing and spawning habitat along the Santa Clara River as a sustainability indicator, is a significant and unreasonable effect of groundwater conditions. Ultimately, the Agency does not consider this a significant and unreasonable effect related to depletions of interconnected surface water because: (1) there is no designated existing or potential beneficial use for spawning and rearing along the Santa Clara River in the Basin per the LARWQCB Basin Plan (LARWQCB, 1994); (2) there is no evidence of these fish using the surface water (except during major flood events when the Santa Clara River is fully connected with runoff); and (3) even severe (i.e., 50%) pumping reductions would not prevent the surface water at Cienega Riparian Complex from going dry during severe droughts”. The Santa Clara River is designated as critical habitat for the survival of steelhead and contains important steelhead spawning and rearing habitat in Southern California (NMFS 2021). The Southern California Steelhead Recovery Plan published in January 2012 by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) identified the Santa Clara River as one of the highest priority sites for recovery actions, as one of the most likely to sustain independently viable populations, and as critical for ensuring viability of the species as a whole (NMFS, 2012). Threats to steelhead, such as excessively high-water temperatures in the spring, summer, and early fall, reduce available juvenile rearing habitat. Low flows in the fall and winter can delay adult passage to critical spawning areas. CDFW is concerned that groundwater overdraft will lead to losing streams, temperature increases, diminishing refugia pools, and a lack of connectivity flows needed for steelhead migration.</p> <p>Recommendation #5: CDFW believes the Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) needs to be revised to implement measures that will protect against significant and unreasonable effects related to depletions of interconnected surface water that have been identified in the Basin. Minimum thresholds and measurable objectives for the SCR are important tools that SGMA has provided to quantify groundwater conditions and ensure groundwater sustainability. Monitoring the temperature of the Santa Clara River, which is critical to steelhead survival, is a much-needed component in the Final GSP.</p>	<p>- Depletion of ISW is considered not unreasonable per SWRCB designations of beneficial uses/users (which are specifically referred to in SGMA) and the lack of evidence of spawning/rearing of Steelhead to support the significance of NMFS defined critical habitat. Beneficial use related to fish is limited to migration activities, which are conceptualized to occur when large surface water flows occur along the SCR and tributaries during storm events and wet periods, rather than during dry periods when surface water flow is limited to areas of rising groundwater (i.e., the basin boundaries). The GSA hosted multiple discussions with stakeholders on the merit of including surface water temperature monitoring in the ISW MT. It is not evident how the GSA would alter the GSP if the temperature data were available. Groundwater extraction reductions during prolonged droughts have been shown to not mitigate groundwater declines and shift undesirable impacts to other beneficial uses/users (e.g., DACs, agricultural operations, municipal water supplies).</p>
Fillmore	3, A	3,A-7	California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)	<p>This Draft GSP, the supporting documents and appendices are not user-friendly for public review. There are several instances where a corresponding Appendix is missing in the document labelled “FPBGSA Fillmore Basin GSP Public Review Draft Text With Figures No Appendices”. For example, this sentence is missing the appendix letter at the end: “More information for the VCWPD water16 resources monitoring program can be found in the Monitoring Program and Data Gaps TM (Appendix #)” (Section 2.1.2.1 Watershed Protection District of Ventura County, Page 2-4, Lines 15-17).</p> <p><u>Recommendation #6(a)</u>: CDFW recommends streamlining the Final GSP Package to ensure there are no missing documents.</p> <p><u>Recommendation #6(b)</u>: CDFW recommends the FBGA provide a red-lined version of the Final GSP to understand the changes made between the Draft GSP and Final GSP.</p>	<p>We have updated the list of appendices to assist the reader.</p>

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS - FILLMORE GSP

GSP	Letter No.	Comment No.	Commenter(s)	Comment	Response
Fillmore	3, A	3,A-8	California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)	<p>Three of the five GDEs identified in the draft GSP as wetland, and riverine features, excluded by the FPBGSA are utilized by ESA-listed Steelhead; the FESA-and California Endangered Species Act (CESA)-listed least Bell's vireo (<i>Vireo bellii pusillus</i>), and the FESA-CESA-listed southwestern willow flycatcher (<i>Empidonax traillii extimus</i>). Southwestern pond turtle (<i>Actinemys pallida</i>) was designated as a California Species of Special Concern (SSC) in 1994 and is known to occur throughout the Santa Clara River watershed in four of the five GDEs specified in the Draft GSP. Southwestern pond turtle preferred habitat is permanent ponds, lakes, streams, or permanent pools along intermittent streams associated with standing and slow-moving water. A potentially important limiting factor for the southwestern pond turtle is the relationship between water level and flow in off-channel water bodies (groundwater dependent), which can both be affected by groundwater pumping.</p> <p>Other wildlife resources that could be substantially adversely affected based on declining water levels designated as SSC include coast horned lizard (<i>Phrynosoma blainvillii</i>); coast patch-nosed snake (<i>Salvadora hexalepis virgulata</i>); California legless lizard (<i>Anniella spp.</i>); two-striped garter snake (<i>Thamnophis hammondi</i>); and burrowing owl (<i>Athene cunicularia</i>). If groundwater depletion results in reduced streamflow due to interconnected surface waters, the nesting and foraging success of the SSC yellow warbler (<i>Dendroica petechia</i>), the SSC yellow breasted chat (<i>Icteria virens</i>), least Bell's vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher and other bird species may be diminished due to the reduced nesting habitat and food availability.</p> <p>Proper management of both shallow and deep groundwater pumping combined with reduced surface water pumping and diverting such as that from the would ensure that the Basin is not negatively impacted.</p> <p>Unsustainable use of groundwater can impact the shallow aquifers and interconnected surface waters on which these species and GDEs rely on for survival. This may lead to adverse impacts on fish and wildlife and the habitat they need to survive. Determining the effects groundwater levels have on surface water flows in the Basin will inform how the groundwater levels may be associated with the health and abundance of riparian vegetation. Poorly managed groundwater pumping, and surface water flows have the potential to reduce the abundance and quality of riparian vegetation, reducing the amount of shade provided by the vegetation, and ultimately leading to increased water temperatures in the Basin.</p> <p>Additionally, shallow groundwater levels near ISWs should be monitored to ensure that groundwater use is not depleting surface water and adversely affecting fish and wildlife resources in the Basin.</p>	<p>There is no recorded surface water pumping in this basin. The surface water diversions in this basin average less than 100 AF/year. The GSP provides a rationale for managing groundwater extractions in the basin within sustainable parameters. The GSP increases groundwater monitoring in the areas of rising groundwater in the Fillmore Basin, particularly near the Cienega and East Grove, where rising groundwater connects to interconnected surface water (discharges to the surface, generating surface water).</p>
Fillmore	3, A	3,A-9	California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)	<p>CDFW has significant concerns about data gaps in the Hydrologic Conceptual Model (HCM), Riparian Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems being eliminated, the description of the CDFW Fillmore Fish Hatchery and listing the proposed Mitigation Plan Project as a SGMA project. CDFW urges the GSA to plan for and engage in responsible groundwater management that minimizes or avoids these impacts to the maximum extent feasible as required under applicable provisions of SGMA and the Public Trust Doctrine.</p> <p>In conclusion, the Draft GSP does not comply with all aspects of SGMA statute and regulations, and CDFW deems the Draft GSP inadequate to protect fish and wildlife beneficial users of groundwater for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The assumptions, criteria, findings, and objectives, including the sustainability goal, undesirable results, minimum thresholds, measurable objectives, and interim milestones are not reasonable and/or not supported by the best available information and best available science. [CCR § 355.4(b)(1)] (See Comments 3,A-1, 3,A-2, and 3,A-5); 2. The Draft GSP does not identify reasonable measures and schedules to eliminate data gaps. [CCR § 355.4(b)(2)] (See Comments 3,A-1, 3,A-2, 3,A-3, 3,A-4 and 3,A-5); 3. The sustainable management criteria and projects and management actions are not commensurate with the level of understanding of the basin setting, based on the level of uncertainty, as reflected in the Draft GSP. [CCR § 355.4(b)(3)] (See Comments 3,A-2, 3,A-3, 3,A-4 and 3,A-5); and, 4. The interests of the beneficial uses that are potentially affected by the use of groundwater in the basin, have not been considered. [CCR § 355.4(b)(4)] (See Comments 3,A-1, 3,A-2, 3,A-3, 3,A-4, 3,A-5 and 3,A-9). 	<p>See responses to comments 3, A-1, -2, -3, -4, and -5.</p>

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS - FILLMORE GSP

GSP	Letter No.	Comment No.	Commenter(s)	Comment	Response
Fillmore	4	4-1	California Trout Inc.	<p>Within the FPBGSA jurisdictional area, there is federally designated critical habitat for the endangered Southern California Steelhead (Southern steelhead) in the mainstem Santa Clara River (SCR), Sespe Creek, and other smaller tributaries. Southern steelhead serve as an indicator of total watershed health and integrity. To maintain the landscape level ecosystem function and service on which we all depend, is imperative that we conserve and restore these habitats and the processes that are needed to maintain them. Sustainable groundwater use is directly related and inseparable from the status of Southern steelhead.</p> <p>The Santa Clara River, while maintaining more natural character in comparison to other river systems in Southern California, has seen significant loss of habitat for Southern steelhead and other native species. This has been through extensive modification, simplification and degradation of aquatic habitats including GDEs and depletion of instream flows due to over utilization through groundwater extractions and surface diversions. Depletion of groundwater has been shown to shrink or degrade available habitat for all development stages of southern steelhead by reducing baseflows, increasing surface water types, reducing habitat complexity, and impacting native riparian vegetation and wetland habitats (Barlow and Leake 2012, Glasser et al. 2007, Hayes et al. 2008). The value of habitat remaining in this basin was central to NMFS's Southern Steelhead Recovery Plan (NMFS 2012) assessment that the SCR should be prioritized for recovery actions. FPGSA's management area contains multiple listed riparian and aquatic species, and is central to the long- term success of Ventura and Oxnard communities. The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) clearly specifies the requirement to identify and consider significant and unreasonable adverse impacts to GDEs and for all recognized beneficial uses and users of groundwater including aquatic ecosystems and species dependent on interconnected waters.</p> <p>Unfortunately, this plan does not accomplish that task. It is California Trout Inc.'s (CalTrout) judgement that this plan does not sufficiently characterize the relationship between groundwater and GDEs or interconnected surface waters within their jurisdictional area. It has been repeated shown that groundwater management decisions in the SCR basin within the FPGSA management area have impacts on surface flow conditions and GDEs (Stillwater Sciences 2007a, 2007b).</p>	<p>Stillwater Sciences 2007b does not address groundwater pumping. Stillwater Sciences 2007a largely infers an effect of groundwater pumping but does not show that it has impacted surface flow and GDEs in the Santa Clara Basin. As Stillwater Sciences (2007a) states, there have been numerous pressures on vegetation including water diversions, groundwater pumping, land clearing, urbanization, and invasive species. Pumping reduces groundwater elevation, but the effect of pumping (versus inflows to the basin) on GDEs is not clear. Model results presented in the GSP show that there is an impact of groundwater management on surface flow. Reducing pumping by 50% in the model caused surface flows to decrease by an average of 4 cfs near Cienega and about 5 cfs near Willard Road in the East Grove. The effect of groundwater pumping on surface flows in Sespe Creek area is unknown. The relative influence of pumping versus water inflows to the basin on groundwater levels supporting GDEs is not well constrained. NDVI is relatively consistent during wetter periods, but it declines during droughts at the Cienega and East Grove. The widespread mortality during the most recent drought at Cienega reflects a deepening of groundwater conditions and the degree to which these are due to drought versus pumping is discussed in Appendix J Section 3.6.2.1. It is clear that pumping is not the only factor contributing to the decline in water levels during prolonged droughts (i.e., lack of precipitation). This basin displays a strong cyclic pattern of water levels declining during prolonged droughts and recover during wetter periods (even with a 50% hypothetical reduction in pumping). Additional groundwater monitoring near the GDEs will help to better constrain changes to groundwater levels and infer the influence of pumping on GDEs.</p>

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS - FILLMORE GSP

GSP	Letter No.	Comment No.	Commenter(s)	Comment	Response
Fillmore	4	4-2	California Trout Inc.	<p>The draft GSP shows near complete disregard for core SGMA requirements to ensure no adverse impacts to beneficial uses or users of groundwater in the GSA when they determined that the SCR Riparian Shrubland GDE has “low vulnerability to groundwater reduction” and simply serves as an upstream migration corridor during high flows. This assessment takes the narrowest vantage point possible in determining how Southern steelhead utilize different habitat types to make long-term groundwater management decisions. It also appears to be justified by incomplete or little no to data at all, a fact acknowledged by the GSP. Without robust data to support this decision, the FPGSP cannot ensure that there are not adverse impacts as a result of their future pumping allocations to this GDE.</p>	<p>The best available science supports our assessment of the streams in the Fillmore Basin as primarily a migration corridor for steelhead (Kelley 2004, Stoecker and Kelley 2005). Rearing is unlikely due to poor habitat and temperature conditions (Stoecker and Kelley 2005). We have added a discussion of outmigration for smolts to the technical appendix. Modeling suggests that reducing the pumping by 50% reduces instream flows by an average of 4 cfs. As outlined in the GDE Appendix, this is unlikely to affect spawning or rearing, particularly given the lack of evidence of rearing in the system. The lack of historical connection to groundwater in the Riparian Shrubland reach is supported by the absence of historical riparian forests outside of the East Grove, Cienga, and Del Valle as documented in the historical ecology assessment (Beller et al. 2011). We have revised the groundwater depth map to use 2011 groundwater levels, which shows that groundwater is generally 10 ft below the ground surface and unlikely to be connected even during wet years. Moreover, the Riparian Shrubland GDE in the Fillmore basin is comprised of plants (mostly mulefat) that are typical of higher relative elevation in the East Grove and Cienga GDEs. In these GDEs that are otherwise connected, the shallow-rooted mulefat (~ 2 ft rooting depth) typically occurs in areas where the groundwater is too deep for willow and cottonwood roots to connect with. Taken together, the historical lack of a riparian forest, groundwater data, vegetation along the channel, and observed dry conditions suggests that the riparian shrubland is not connected to groundwater.</p>
Fillmore	4	4-3	California Trout Inc.	<p>The plan is particularly deficient when it comes to the relationship between groundwater quantity and the seasonality of instream flow conditions and interconnected surface waters. These habitats and biotic conditions play and critical role in southern steelhead migration to and from major tributaries that have confluences within the GSA. Sespe Creek is vital to the long-term survival of several listed species. This plan, while acknowledging that immediately upstream is perennial, then decides that connection to groundwater in the GDE is “unknown but unlikely.” The plan offers not data to support this decision or any monitoring plans to determine if it is an accurate assumption.</p>	<p>A map of interconnected reaches has been included in the revised GSP. The lower reach of Sespe Creek is mapped as uncertain. Figure 2-2 in the revised GDE appendix shows that groundwater is relatively deep (>30 ft) upstream of Highway 126 along Sespe Creek. This is based on limited well data, but planned monitoring wells within the Sespe Creek reach will help to re-evaluate the connection to surface water for subsequent updates to the GSP. The transition from the upstream perennial section occurs where the alluvial sediment below the creek thickens toward the Santa Clara River. Limited measurements of Sespe flow near Highway 126 shown on Figure 4-7 suggest that Sespe Creek is a losing reach between the USGS gage (near the basin boundary) and Highway 126 where flows are generally a few cfs lower. Taken together it is likely that at least parts of Sespe Creek are disconnected from groundwater, but the extent of connected groundwater is somewhat uncertain.</p>

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS - FILLMORE GSP

GSP	Letter No.	Comment No.	Commenter(s)	Comment	Response
Fillmore	4	4-4	California Trout Inc.	<p>On page 2-15, the GSP identifies Environmental Stakeholder Director for this GSA as representing the interests of the Santa Clara River Environmental Groundwater Committee. It further elaborates that this committee is under the direction of CalTrout and is comprised of the Santa Clara River Steelhead Coalition (SCRSC). This is a mischaracterization of CalTrout's role in the on-going SMGA process for this basin and of the intended purpose of the SCRSC.</p> <p>The SCRSC is a California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) grant funded program to advance watershed restoration project in that Santa Clara Basin that conserve and protect southern steelhead and their required habitat. There is no named or established Santa Clara River Environmental Groundwater Committee within the SCRSC. We have discussed as a group the importance of groundwater and the relationship it has on mediating fluvial ecosystem processes, but this is not our singular focus. The SCRSC supports processed-based watershed restoration that represent community developed resource management solutions. The appointed Environmental Director of this GSA does not serve at the direction of CalTrout or the SCRSC. Edit this and any other section that implies this to better reflect the representation of environmental interests in this SGMA process.</p>	The referenced text has been corrected.
Fillmore	4	4-5	California Trout Inc.	<p>Ultimately this plan does very little to address the adverse impact groundwater pumping has on the depletion of interconnected surface waters and GDEs. This is evident in how the plan repeatedly dismisses any relationship between groundwater pumping and GDEs or interconnected surfaces waters but routinely acknowledges that limited data was used to draw these conclusions. For the SGMA requirements of sustainability to be meet, the GSA must provide sufficient data describing the relationship between interconnected surface waters and GDEs to current and future groundwater pumping levels. This data should specifically address shallow aquifer conditions for the entire GSA planning area in the same manner and intensity that the principal aquifer is analyzed. It is only with this data collected and analyzed can we determine what sustainability indicators describe these relationships and how anticipated undesirable results will be mitigated or managed to meet the sustainability criteria set out by SGMA.</p>	<p>The analysis of the effects of pumping on GDEs outlined in the technical memorandum relied on trends in groundwater data through time, the groundwater model in Appendix E, our understanding of the patterns of interconnected surface water, vegetation types present along the river, and links between relative elevation of the ground surface and vegetation occurrence in forested wetlands along the Santa Clara. Individual wells show that groundwater typically declines during droughts and recovers during wetter periods. A similar trend was seen for GDEs prior to the recent drought which was long enough and severe enough to cause mortality of willows and cottonwoods in the Cienega GDE Unit. The degree to which the groundwater decline was exacerbated by pumping in this reach is not clear. The model predicted that the lack of surface flow in the Cienega shown in Figure 4-7 of the GDE Technical Appendix was exacerbated by pumping for a few months over the 3 years where surface flow was absent.</p>
Fillmore	5	5-1	National Marine Fisheries Service	<p>The Draft GSP does not adequately address the recognized instream beneficial uses of the Santa Clara River or the principal tributaries within the boundaries of the Fillmore Groundwater Basin, or other GDE, potentially affected by the management of groundwater within the Fillmore Basin. In particular, Draft GSP does not adequately recognize or analyze the groundwater recharge program associated with the Fillmore Basin (and the interrelated upstream surface diversions), and its potential adverse effects on the federally endangered southern California steelhead (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>).</p>	<p>The GSP describes the groundwater recharge quantities and frequencies in Section 2.2.3.3 and Table 2.2-8 that are associated with water releases from Santa Felicia Dam and Castaic Lake. The GSP does not propose SMC for surface water flows in the SCR or its primary tributaries because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) it flows intermittently, (2) the SWRCB only designates beneficial uses related to migration (i.e., when the river flows substantially more due to storm events than groundwater contributions) and does not designate beneficial uses related to spawning or rearing, and (3) there is no evidence or documentation of O mykiss using the SCR or its tributaries within the basin (where they occur within the Basin) for spawning or rearing to support the NMFS critical habitat as a significant beneficial use. See Section 3.2.1 for updates.

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS - FILLMORE GSP

GSP	Letter No.	Comment No.	Commenter(s)	Comment	Response
Fillmore	5	5-2	National Marine Fisheries Service	The Draft GSP does not adequately address the depletion of interconnected shallow groundwater basins and the pattern of groundwater extraction and surface water diversions that have occurred historically, currently, and are likely to occur in the future. Of particular concern is the potential adverse effects on designated critical habitat for southern California steelhead within the Santa Clara River, and tributaries that are essential for the recovery of endangered steelhead, including Sespe Creek within the boundaries of the Fillmore Basin. The surface flows at the confluence of Sespe Creek, for example, are important for maintaining surface hydrologic connectivity for steelhead (and other native aquatic-dependent species) attempting to migrate between these major tributaries and the middle reaches of the Santa Clara River.	The GDE Appendix has an extensive discussion of steelhead in the basin focusing on fish passage and the likely lack or rearing habitat within the Fillmore and Piru basins. We have added information about outmigrating smolts to the GDE technical memorandum. The effect of groundwater pumping on flows in Sespe Creek is unknown. As shown in Figure 2-2, the groundwater is quite deep even during wet years. Additional groundwater monitoring data from Sespe Creek as described in the monitoring section will help to better understand interconnected surface water in this reach.
Fillmore	5	5-3	National Marine Fisheries Service	National Marine Fisheries Service has previously provided extensive comments related to southern California steelhead (letter of April 01, 2021 regarding the "Draft Technical Memorandum-Assessment of Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems for the Fillmore and Piru Basins Groundwater's Sustainability Plan"), which remain largely unaddressed in the Draft GSP.	The Draft GSP provided responses to each comment in the April 01, 2021 NMFS letter on the Draft GDE Technical Memorandum. See Draft GSP Appendix C3, responses to comments numbered GDE_041 through GDE_096. As indicated in these responses, a number of changes were made to the Technical Memorandum in response to NMFS' comments. In particular, text describing the role of specific tributaries for steelhead rearing and their connection to groundwater and the principal aquifer was added to the GDE memorandum. In addition, the connection of surface water flows to groundwater in intermittent reaches was discussed in the response to comments and in the memorandum.
Fillmore	6	6-1	State University of New York College of Environmental Science, University of California Santa Barbara, and Cardiff University	Commentors shared research findings to help improve the identification and consideration of GDEs in the Fillmore Basin. These include: 1. Riparian vegetation die-off during the 2012-2016 drought is linked to groundwater decline. 2. The groundwater decline causes more water stress to riparian vegetation than climatic variables. 3. Native cottonwood and willow trees are groundwater-dependent species that rely on constant root access to groundwater for survival and growth, especially during dry summer months and in drought years. 4. The rate of groundwater level decline is as important to riparian vegetation as the absolute depth below which their roots completely lose access to the water table ("critical water depth"). 5. The installation of more shallow monitoring wells is needed to support ongoing efforts to understand the ecohydrological links between groundwater and riparian forests along the SCR. See comment letter for further discussion of these findings.	Additional monitoring wells are planned following the adoption of the GSP. We have added text about the importance of the rate of groundwater decline to the text of the GDE memo and added a reference to Kibler 2021.
Fillmore	7	7-1	The Nature Conservancy, Audubon California, Local Government Commission, Union of Concerned Scientists, Clean Water Action/Clean Water Fund	The identification of Disadvantaged Communities (DACs) and drinking water users is insufficient. The GSP provides a map of DACs by block group (Figure 2-1.4). However, the plan does not document the population for each DAC. The GSP also failed to include the population dependent on groundwater as their source of drinking water in the basin. The GSP provides a density map of domestic wells in the basin. However, the plan fails to provide depth of these wells (such as minimum well depth, average well depth, or depth range) within the basin. These missing elements are required for the GSA to fully understand the specific interests and water demands of these beneficial users, and to support the consideration of beneficial users in the development of sustainable management criteria and selection of projects and management actions. <u>Recommendations:</u> 1. Include a map showing domestic well locations and average well depth across the basin. 2. Provide the population of each identified DAC. 3. Identify the sources of drinking water for DAC members, including an estimate of how many people rely on groundwater (e.g., domestic wells, state small water systems, and public water systems).	Figure 2.1.4 provides information on domestic well locations (with bottom of screen depths), DAC populations (with bottom of screen depth) and water systems.

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS - FILLMORE GSP

GSP	Letter No.	Comment No.	Commenter(s)	Comment	Response
Fillmore	7	7-3	The Nature Conservancy, Audubon California, Local Government Commission, Union of Concerned Scientists, Clean Water Action/Clean Water Fund	<p>The identification of GDEs is incomplete. We commend the GSA for their comprehensive evaluation of GDEs in the basin, as presented in the GDE Technical Memorandum (Appendix D). The GSP mapped GDEs and potential GDEs using multiple sources, including the NC Dataset (also referred to in the GSP as the iGDE database), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) VegCAMP, US Department of Agriculture (USDA) CalVeg, and National Wetlands Inventory data. Table 2.2-5 describes the type of GDEs in the basin with dominant flora species and acreage within the basin. Table 2.2-7 presents the critical habitat and special status species in the basin. The Appendix states (p. 21): "In light of the limitations of the monitoring well data, the groundwater elevation data presented in this section are intended to illustrate general trends within GDE units. The spring 2019 depth to water surface (Section 2.1.2), as opposed to monitoring well data, is used to establish GDE connectivity with shallow groundwater." The Appendix describes the challenges with using groundwater monitoring well data for some of the GDE units and explains that 2019 groundwater levels are conservative for GDE mapping. However, we would like to see additional discussion and use of groundwater data from the pre-SGMA benchmark date of 2015 where available (e.g., pre-drought 2011 water levels) to determine which GDE units are connected to groundwater.</p> <p>Furthermore, we found that some mapped features in the NC dataset were improperly disregarded (i.e., coastal live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) on slopes). NC dataset polygons were incorrectly excluded for mapped vegetation growing on a clear slope, based on landscape position and improbable connection to groundwater. However, without groundwater data, there is no way to confirm that these NC dataset polygons are not GDEs. If no data are available, then these polygons should be retained as potential GDEs.</p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For GDE units where groundwater elevation data are available, we recommend the pre-SGMA period of 2005-2015 be used to verify a connection to groundwater. If complete data from this period are not available, consider the use of data from 2011 (a wet year) since it is before the SGMA benchmark date of 2015. 2. Re-evaluate the NC dataset polygons that were removed based on their location on a slope. If groundwater elevation data are not available to verify connection to groundwater, retain these polygons as potential GDEs in the GSP. 	<p>The 30 ft depth to water was altered based on Fall 2011 water surface data. This increased the extent of GDEs in the Piru Basin, but had little influence on GDEs in the Fillmore Basin. The justification of removal of coast live oak was expanded in the text of the Section 2.1.3 GDE Appendix "These stands typically occur on the fringes of the basin, where the non-water bearing Pico Formation bedrock outcrops (Figure 2.2-3) and average slopes exceed 20%. It is therefore extremely unlikely that oaks in these areas are connected to groundwater-bearing alluvial or fluvial sedimentary formations."</p>
Fillmore	7	7-4	The Nature Conservancy, Audubon California, Local Government Commission, Union of Concerned Scientists, Clean Water Action/Clean Water Fund	<p>Native vegetation and managed wetlands are water use sectors that are required to be included in the water budget. The integration of native vegetation into the water budget is sufficient. We commend the GSA for including the groundwater demands of this ecosystem in the historical, current and projected water budgets. Managed wetlands are not mentioned in the GSP, so it is not known whether or not they are present in the basin.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. State whether or not there are managed wetlands in the basin. If there are, ensure that their groundwater demands are included as separate line items in the historical, current, and projected water budgets. 	<p>There are no managed wetlands in the Basin and the water budget includes evapotranspiration values for the various land use or vegetative categories.</p>

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS - FILLMORE GSP

GSP	Letter No.	Comment No.	Commenter(s)	Comment	Response
Fillmore	7	7-5	The Nature Conservancy, Audubon California, Local Government Commission, Union of Concerned Scientists, Clean Water Action/Clean Water Fund	<p>Stakeholder engagement during GSP development is insufficient. SGMA’s requirement for public notice and engagement of stakeholders is not fully met by the description in the Communication and Engagement Plan (Appendix B). We note the following deficiencies with the overall stakeholder engagement process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The opportunities for public involvement and engagement are described in very general terms. They include attendance at public meetings, a stakeholder email list, updates to the GSP website and social media, and information shared at meetings held by other local agencies and organizations. There is no specific outreach during the GSP development process described for environmental stakeholders and domestic well owners. 2. The Communication and Engagement Plan does not include a detailed plan for continual opportunities for engagement through the implementation phase of the GSP that is specifically directed to environmental stakeholders. <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include a more detailed and robust Communication and Engagement Plan that describes active and targeted outreach to engage DAC members, domestic well owners, and environmental stakeholders during the remainder of the GSP development process and throughout the GSP implementation phase. Refer to Attachment B of the comment letter for specific recommendations on how to actively engage stakeholders during all phases of the GSP process. 	<p>The FPBGSA conducts extensive outreach to actively engage all stakeholder interests within the basin. Additional text has been added to GSP Section 2.1.5 Notice and Communication that further describes stakeholder outreach and engagement that occurred during GSP preparation, including targeted outreach to domestic well owners, including those within DACs. DACs and well owners within those communities are represented on the Board by the Ventura County, City of Fillmore, and Pumpers Association Directors. In addition, among the organizations represented by the Environmental Stakeholder Director is Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy (CAUSE), which protects environmental and DAC interest. Outreach to DACs includes numerous mailings and communications to well owners by the Pumpers Associations and FBGSA participation at targeted stakeholder outreach and education meetings (“WaterTalks”) sponsored by the Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM).</p> <p>Environmental interests are represented on the FPBGSA Board by the Environmental Stakeholder Director. A number of local environmental organizations nominate the Environmental Director and she regularly reaches out and coordinates with numerous local environmental organizations as described in Section 2.1.5. The Ventura County Director provides information and updates to IRWM and Santa Clara River Watershed Committee.</p> <p>The FPBGSA will use the Communications and Engagement Plan and continue GSP development outreach methods to engage a diversity of stakeholders through GSP implementation.</p>
Fillmore	7	7-6	The Nature Conservancy, Audubon California, Local Government Commission, Union of Concerned Scientists, Clean Water Action/Clean Water Fund	<p>For chronic lowering of groundwater levels, the GSP mentions impacts to DACs and domestic drinking water wells when defining undesirable results. The GSP states (p. 3-3): “Groundwater levels below the base of well perforations (or screen intervals) prevents beneficial uses (i.e., domestic) and users (i.e., DACs) from benefiting from the California Human Right to Water due to dry well conditions.” However, the GSP does not sufficiently describe how the existing minimum threshold groundwater levels are consistent with avoiding undesirable results in the basin. The measurable objectives set for groundwater elevations do not consider DACs and drinking water users.</p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Describe further the direct and indirect impacts on DACs and drinking water users when defining undesirable results for chronic lowering of groundwater levels. 2. Consider and evaluate the impacts of selected minimum thresholds and measurable objectives on DACs and drinking water users within the basin. Further describe the impact of passing the minimum threshold for drinking water users. For example, provide the number of domestic wells that would be de-watered at the minimum threshold. 	<p>The reviewers comments suggest that DACs in the Fillmore basin are a separate group of stakeholders that are not included within other stakeholder categories. The DACs in the Fillmore basin are served by a combination of the City of Fillmore’s water system, various mutual water companies, or by their own domestic wells. The GSP addresses impacts to DACs when discussing how projected future groundwater conditions will effect municipal and industrial, domestic well owners, and agricultural users. It is not correct in this basin to equate all DACs to domestic well users nor are all domestic well operators DACs. The MT for the Declining Water Level sustainability indicator was set by the FPBGSA Board of Directors at when the water levels in 25% of the representative wells (there are 11 in the Fillmore basin) decline to depths below the bottom of the well perforations (functionally a dry well). The representative wells are spatially distributed throughout the basin and complete at a variety of depths. So, the number of domestic wells that would be impacted by a MT violation would depend on which suite of the representative wells had water levels fall below the bottom of the well screen. There are several possible permutations. Qualitatively, if the deepest 25% of the representative wells exceed the MT, then several shallow domestic wells would be impacted, however if the shallowest 25% of the representative wells exceeded the MT, the number of shallow domestic wells that would be impacted will be less.</p>

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS - FILLMORE GSP

GSP	Letter No.	Comment No.	Commenter(s)	Comment	Response
Fillmore	7	7-7	The Nature Conservancy, Audubon California, Local Government Commission, Union of Concerned Scientists, Clean Water Action/Clean Water Fund	<p>The GSP states (2-43): "Historically water quality chemicals (analytes or constituents) of concern (COCs) in the Fillmore and Piru basins have generally included, but are not necessarily limited to, the following analytes: Total Dissolved Solids (TDS), Sulfate, Chloride, Nitrate, and Boron." The GSP further states (2-52): "Additional potential COCs in the Fillmore Basin were identified [as] Radiochemistry (gross alpha and uranium), Selenium, Lead, Iron, and Manganese." The GSP states that the minimum thresholds for degraded water quality correspond with water quality objectives (WQOs) and maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) established by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) Basin Plan and California Division of Drinking Water (DDW), respectively. However, they are not specifically provided in Section 3 (Sustainable Management Criteria) of the GSP.</p> <p>For degraded water quality, the GSP does not discuss direct and indirect impacts on DACs or drinking water users when defining undesirable results for degraded water quality, nor does it evaluate the cumulative or indirect impacts of proposed minimum thresholds on these stakeholders. The GSP does not set any measurable objectives for the degraded water quality sustainability indicator.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Describe direct and indirect impacts on DACs and drinking water users when defining undesirable results for degraded water quality. For specific guidance on how to consider these users, refer to "Guide to Protecting Water Quality Under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act." 2. Evaluate the cumulative or indirect impacts of proposed minimum thresholds for degraded water quality on DACs and drinking water users. 3. Include the minimum thresholds established for the identified COCs in Section 3 (Sustainable Management Criteria) of the GSP, instead of just stating that they align with drinking water standards. 3. Set measurable objectives for the degraded water quality sustainability indicator. 	<p>Evaluations of impacts to DACs are included in the evaluations for municipal, domestic, and agricultural water uses. DACs are not a separate beneficial user that is not already considered (See response to comment 7-6)</p> <p>The water quality MTs are the currently existing water quality objectives (WQOs) or maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) contained in a variety of regulations. All beneficial water uses are already subject to these values.</p> <p>The GSP is not proposing any new water quality objectives and the GSA does not have regulatory authority over water quality. The GSA is responsible for analyzing water quality changes associated with implementation of the GSP, however, the GSP does not contain any changes to the pumping regime and therefore no material water quality changes are anticipated.</p>
Fillmore	7	7-8	The Nature Conservancy, Audubon California, Local Government Commission, Union of Concerned Scientists, Clean Water Action/Clean Water Fund	<p>We commend the GSA for their comprehensive analysis of undesirable results for GDEs and ISWs. The GSP analyzes the impacts on GDEs when defining undesirable results for three sustainability indicators (i.e., chronic lowering of groundwater levels, degraded water quality, and depletions of interconnected surface waters). For minimum thresholds, the GSP states (p. 3-9): "The MT for groundwater levels in the Cienega Restoration / Fish Hatchery area is set at the critical water level (Kibler, 2021 and Kibler et al., 2021), 10 ft below 2011 low groundwater levels (i.e., the MO). If/when this MT is exceeded, mitigation (Section 4) will be implemented to offset the undesirable result that would occur without adequate soil moisture." The GSP does not, however, assess the impacts of minimum thresholds on the other GDEs in the basin.</p> <p>The GSP notes that the Cienega Riparian Complex has historically shown the greatest degradation due to groundwater levels (p. 2-80). It also describes this impact as an undesirable result due to groundwater levels declining, resulting in (p. 3-4) "die off of riparian vegetation (e.g., cottonwood or willow species in the Cienega Riparian Complex GDE unit), due to groundwater level declines below the critical water level, that are attributable to groundwater pumping." If the minimum threshold is exceeded, the referenced mitigation action will require months or years to implement. However, there is no discussion of interim pumping reductions or other actions that could have an immediate positive impact on the undesirable result.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide explicit discussion of how the minimum threshold (10 feet below 2011 groundwater levels) will prevent undesirable results specifically for all GDEs in the basin, not just those in the Cienega Restoration / Fish Hatchery area. 2. State directly what the depth to groundwater corresponds to under the GDEs for the proposed minimum threshold (10 feet below 2011 groundwater levels). 3. Consider GDEs when establishing measurable objectives and evaluate the measurable objectives based on GDE water needs. 	<p>We used Kibler 2021 as the source for defining a critical water level. Kibler's analyses indicated that a 10 ft decline in the water level was an important threshold below which vegetation can die off. This relationship was presumed to be applicable to other the other GDEs. Based on Stillwater 2021a, the only GDE area to experience material die off was the Cienega/Fish Hatchery area. The explicit MT is shown at Figure 3.5-4. The MO for GDEs is the 2011 low water level which functionally represents "a full basin condition".</p>

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS - FILLMORE GSP

GSP	Letter No.	Comment No.	Commenter(s)	Comment	Response
Fillmore	7	7-9	The Nature Conservancy, Audubon California, Local Government Commission, Union of Concerned Scientists, Clean Water Action/Clean Water Fund	<p>The SGMA statute identifies climate change as a significant threat to groundwater resources and one that must be examined and incorporated in the GSPs. The GSP Regulations require integration of climate change into the projected water budget to ensure that projects and management actions sufficiently account for the range of potential climate futures.</p> <p>The integration of climate change into the projected water budget is insufficient. The GSP does incorporate climate change into the projected water budget using DWR change factors for 2070. However, the GSP does not consider multiple climate scenarios (e.g., the 2070 extremely wet and extremely dry climate scenarios) in the projected water budget. The GSP should clearly and transparently incorporate the extremely wet and dry scenarios provided by DWR into projected water budgets or select more appropriate extreme scenarios for their basins. While these extreme scenarios may have a lower likelihood of occurring, their consequences could be significant, therefore they should be included in groundwater planning.</p> <p>We acknowledge and commend the inclusion of climate change into key inputs (e.g., precipitation, evaporation, and surface water flow) of the projected water budget. Additionally, the sustainable yield is calculated based on the projected pumping with climate change incorporated. However, if the water budgets are incomplete, including the omission of extremely wet and dry scenarios, then there is increased uncertainty in virtually every subsequent calculation used to plan for projects, derive measurable objectives, and set minimum thresholds. Plans that do not adequately include climate change projections may underestimate future impacts on vulnerable beneficial users of groundwater such as ecosystems, DACs, and domestic well owners.</p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Integrate climate change, including extreme wet and dry scenarios, into all elements of the projected water budget to form the basis for development of sustainable management criteria and projects and management actions. 2. Incorporate climate change scenarios into projects and management actions. 	<p>Use of the 2070CT climate change factors in the forward groundwater modeling effort indicated that the basin was in a functionally sustainable condition. Analysis of the extreme wet future climate scenario, would have resulted in the basin being "more sustainable." The 2070CT extremely dry scenario was not considered likely based on independent analyses provided by Oakley et al 2019. The 2070CT climate change factors are considered sufficient in other approved GSPs. Climate change factors were incorporated into the projected water budgets. When the GSA is prepared to consider their projects and management actions, they will likely conduct further analyses on the cost-benefit relationship under future climate scenarios.</p>
Fillmore	7	7-10	The Nature Conservancy, Audubon California, Local Government Commission, Union of Concerned Scientists, Clean Water Action/Clean Water Fund	<p>The consideration of beneficial users when establishing monitoring networks is insufficient, due to lack of specific plans to increase the Representative Monitoring Points (RMPs) in the monitoring network that represent water quality conditions and shallow groundwater elevations around DACs and domestic wells in the basin. Figure 2.1-8 (Existing Groundwater Elevation Monitoring Programs Map) and Figure 2.1-9 (Existing Groundwater Quality Monitoring Programs Map) show that no monitoring wells are located across portions of the basin near DACs and domestic wells. Beneficial users of groundwater may remain unprotected by the GSP without adequate monitoring and identification of data gaps in the shallow aquifer. The Plan therefore fails to meet SGMA's requirements for the monitoring network.</p> <p>The GSP provides comprehensive discussion of data gaps for GDEs and ISWs. Section 3.5.4.4.2 (Potential New Monitor Wells) discusses plans to include installation of new shallow monitoring wells to provide water level data around GDEs and ISWs, which is further described in Appendix D (Assessment of Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems for the Fillmore and Piru Basins Groundwater Sustainability Agency) and Appendix K (Monitoring Network and Data Gaps). However, this information is scattered across several locations in the GSP without a comprehensive set of maps provided.</p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide maps that overlay monitoring well locations with the locations of DACs and domestic wells to clearly identify potentially impacted areas. Increase the number of representative monitoring points (RMPs) in the shallow aquifer across the basin for the groundwater elevation and water quality groundwater condition indicators. Prioritize proximity to DACs and drinking water users when identifying new RMPs. 2. Provide maps that overlay existing and proposed monitoring well locations with the locations of GDEs and ISWs to clearly identify potentially impacted areas. 3. Describe further the biological monitoring that can be used to assess the potential for significant and unreasonable impacts to GDEs or ISWs due to groundwater conditions in the basin. Appendix D discusses remote sensing of GDEs using NDVI or other data to monitor the health of GDEs through time, but few details are provided. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additional monitoring wells are being installed with DWR Grant Funding; Figure 3.5-1 shows the locations of the proposed new wells to be added to the monitoring network. The GSA can consider adding some of the new monitoring wells to the RMP list if it assists with water resource management strategies. the data gap figure can be updated with domestic wells to demonstrate sufficient data coverage 2. Section 3 contains a figure (3.5-1) showing GDEs, ISW and proposed monitoring points. 3. The biological monitoring will be focused on the use of NDVI analyses from the Fall of each year and will be evaluated and summarized in each 5-year GSP update.

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS - FILLMORE GSP

GSP	Letter No.	Comment No.	Commenter(s)	Comment	Response
Fillmore	8	8-3	United Water Conservation District	<p>United believes the sustainable management criteria described in the GSP and supporting documents, including measurable objectives and minimum thresholds, are defined appropriately and are reasonable. However, we suggest that more content from Appendix J (Technical Memorandum relating to the Sustainable Management Criteria) be included within the relevant portions of the GSP document and be referenced more clearly, especially in Section 3.4 where measurable objectives are addressed. United agrees that the current understanding of present-day and future groundwater uses in Fillmore basin does not suggest that significant and unreasonable impacts should be expected for the six SGMA sustainability indicators. United agrees that undesirable results related to seawater intrusion are not applicable sustainable management criteria in Fillmore basin as described in Section 2.2.2.4 of the draft GSP.</p> <p>Additionally, United agrees that the potential future depletion of interconnected surface water as presented in the Fillmore basin GSP in the context of temporary habitat loss is reasonable and should not be considered a significant and unreasonable effect, as supported by the explanations mentioned in Section 3.2.5 of the draft GSP.</p> <p>Related to the monitoring network background, analysis, and proposed expansion, United agrees with the information provided in Section 3 of Fillmore basin's draft GSP and looks forward to supporting efforts to collect additional data related to the current and proposed expansion of the monitoring network for the sustainable management criteria for which sustainable management criteria have been developed.</p>	See updated Section 3.4
Fillmore	8	8-4	United Water Conservation District	<p>United agrees with the proposed projects and management actions that support the five sustainable management criteria for which sustainable management criteria have been developed. We agree that these projects and management actions have the potential to enhance the water resources of the Fillmore basin and aid in keeping the basin closer to the desired future conditions. United looks forward to supporting efforts related to ongoing project planning and implementation in the near future.</p>	Comment noted
Fillmore	8	8-5	United Water Conservation District	<p>United is committed to supporting efforts related to ongoing project planning and implementation in the future.</p>	Comment noted
Fillmore	9	9-1	Ventura County Public Works Agency	<p>On page ES-1, it is recommended that the sustainability criteria be renamed to match the terminology used in the regulations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chronic Lowering of Groundwater Levels 2. Reduction of Groundwater Storage 3. Seawater Intrusion 4. Degraded Water Quality 5. Land Subsidence 6. Depletions of Interconnected Surface Water 	See updated ES-1.
Fillmore	9	9-2	Ventura County Public Works Agency	<p>On page ES-1, the rationale for exclusion of the sustainable management criteria (SMC) for Interconnected Surface Water because it is "not applicable due to significant effect of droughts that deplete rising groundwater areas" should be explained in more detail. There is interconnected surface water as well as GDEs supported by rising groundwater, all of which are influenced by the hydrology, including groundwater pumping. This comment applies to all portions of the Draft where interconnected surface water and GDEs are discussed and the SMC is excluded, particularly in Section 3 (SMC).</p>	See Sections 2.2.1.5.6, 2.2.2.7 and 3.2.1 in the GSP, as well as additional technical details in Appendix J.
Fillmore	9	9-3	Ventura County Public Works Agency	<p>There are references to the groundwater model in Appendix E throughout the text body. It would be helpful to include a summary discussion on the model in the GSP text rather than requiring the reader to review the detailed modeling appendix.</p>	Comment noted
Fillmore	9	9-4	Ventura County Public Works Agency	<p>On page 2-8, section 2.1.3, lines 11-16, there should be a description of the assumptions/estimate of demand changes or reasons for why demand changes that are not going to occur.</p>	See updated Section 2.1.3 (reference to land use zoning and General Plan CURB zones)

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS - FILLMORE GSP

GSP	Letter No.	Comment No.	Commenter(s)	Comment	Response
Fillmore	9	9-5	Ventura County Public Works Agency	Section 2.2.1.4 lists the two principal aquifers in the Subbasin (unconfined Main Aquifer and the semi-confined Deep Aquifer). There are subsequent references to Aquifer Zones A, B and C per United (2021a). Discussion of the relationship between the principal aquifers and the Aquifer Zones is not introduced until Section 3.5.4.2. It would be helpful to the reader to introduce this relationship in Section 2.2.1.4 and when discussing Aquifer Zones in other parts of the text. Further, it would be helpful to include the relative depths (and thickness) of these aquifers and the aquitard separating them found in Section 2.2.1.4.2 to better support Section 2.2.1.3.	See responses to comments 1-1, 1-2, and 1-3. See updated Section 2.2.1.4.
Fillmore	9	9-6	Ventura County Public Works Agency	Section 2.2.2.5.2 reports that elevated nitrate concentrations in the Fillmore area may be related to agricultural practices. Septic and wastewater treatment systems may also contribute to the higher concentrations of nitrates.	See updated Section 2.2.2.5.2.
Fillmore	9	9-7	Ventura County Public Works Agency	On pages 2-46 and 2-56, a summary table of constituents of concern (COCs) would be helpful by showing the maximum and minimum regulatory COC thresholds.	Comment noted. The GSP is purposely generic on this topic so that all future changes to water quality regulatory threshold are incorporated by reference.
Fillmore	9	9-8	Ventura County Public Works Agency	A legend should be provided on Figure 2.2–19 clarifying what the different color dots represent.	See updated figure
Fillmore	9	9-9	Ventura County Public Works Agency	The water budget graphic is incorrectly identified as Figure 2.2-30 in the text. It should be identified as Figure 2.2-33.	The text has been adjusted.
Fillmore	9	9-10	Ventura County Public Works Agency	It would be informative to list surface water diversions for the tributaries of the Santa Clara River within the Subbasin and estimated annual quantity of diverted water for each (Section 2.2.2.7). Is this represented as the “Unaccounted Flows” value in Table 2.2-11?	See updated Sections 2.2.2.7 and 2.2.3.1.2
Fillmore	9	9-11	Ventura County Public Works Agency	On page 2-72, lines 3-6, the apparent reduction in average pumping demand during the current drought is inferred, as metered pumping data are not available. The lower recent pumping could be an artifact of the water budget calculations and not supported by evidence (pumping data and/or groundwater levels).	This is based on estimates from production data reported to United (i.e., Fish Hatchery reduced pumping significantly).
Fillmore	9	9-12	Ventura County Public Works Agency	On page 3-1, lines 22–25, were disadvantaged communities (DACs) and private well owners actively involved in the stakeholder process? It would be beneficial to add this information to the text.	See response to Comment 7-5, above.
Fillmore	9	9-13	Ventura County Public Works Agency	On page 3-6, lines 22 – 24, it is unclear if the representative monitoring sites are included in the network at this time. Summary tables in the text would be helpful.	The Rep. Monitoring Sites are currently in the monitoring network. Summary table is added
Fillmore	9	9-14	Ventura County Public Works Agency	On page 3-11, section 3.3.5, the text should provide the rationale for establishment of the subsidence MT by the FPBGSA Board of Directors.	The subsidence MT is established based on tech memo from Pumper’s Association / Bryan Bondy.
Fillmore	9	9-15	Ventura County Public Works Agency	It could be beneficial to include a project in Section 4 to survey existing wells within the Subbasin for well status and annual extractions.	UWCD compiles the groundwater extraction data from known active wells in the basin. Should the basin begin to approach the sustainable yield value, then updating the well status might identify previously unknown extractors.
Fillmore	9	9-16	Ventura County Public Works Agency	On page 4-3, the narrative should be revised to indicate the difference between Projects 2 and 3 for shallow monitoring wells. Where are the wells in Project 3 likely to be needed?	Project 2 includes wells in the Cienega Springs Restoration Project area. Project 3 is for locations outside of the CSR. Additional monitoring wells might be appropriate, if they assist the GSA in managing the basin, near the Sespe Creek and Santa Clara River confluence, for example. Other locations could be added as the GSA identifies the need to augment the current monitoring program network.