



(760) 878-0001
FAX: (760) 878-2552

EMAIL: mail@inyowater.org
WEB: <http://www.inyowater.org>

P.O. Box 337
135 South Jackson Street
Independence, CA 93526

**COUNTY OF INYO
WATER DEPARTMENT**

August 4, 2015

California Department of Water Resources
Attn: Sustainable Groundwater Management Section
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236

Dear Sustainable Groundwater Management Section:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Basin Boundary Regulations (Draft Regulations).

340.4 - This section states that the Draft Regulations apply to “revision of any basin boundaries or creation of new subbasins,” implying that designation of new basins or deletion of existing basins will not be considered in the upcoming boundary modification process. DWR should consider definition of new basins as part of this process.

344.14(a)(1) - Can the surficial geologic map be included by reference (e.g. to the State 1:250,000 series of maps) or must a map be included in the submittal?

344.14(a)(2) - The vertical thickness of basin fill in large deep basins may be difficult to assess and not be relevant to groundwater management where groundwater development is limited to relatively shallow zones.

344.14(b)(2)(A) - Where data are too sparse to develop potentiometric maps, records of groundwater levels wells may be useful for evaluating the presence or absence of subsurface barriers to groundwater flow. For example, although two wells would be insufficient to develop a potentiometric map, a flow barrier could be inferred from a large decline in head between two wells. Suggested modification: “Historical and current potentiometric surface maps, groundwater levels in wells, groundwater recharge and discharge rates...”

344.14(b)(3) - When in the process would a requesting agency be informed by DWR as to what other information DWR requires? These regulations should include a process for consultation between requesting agencies and DWR so that expectations for the process are understood by all parties.

344.18 - What information does DWR require to satisfy its responsible agency requirements? How has CEQA been addressed by DWR for prior basin boundary changes?

345.2(b) - The history of sustainable management (or lack thereof) in a basin is not relevant to the desirability of a proposed boundary modification. Basins may have been managed unsustainably in the past, but the proposed boundary revision will facilitate sustainable management in the future. It makes no sense to deny a basin boundary change in such circumstances.

345.2(d) - How will requesting agencies know what information DWR deems necessary?

345.4(a)(1) - Where this section refers to "hydrogeologic models," is this a reference to specifically numerical groundwater flow models, or is this term more generally including conceptual models, statistical models, etc.?

345.4(a)(3) - This section should recognize that even where potentiometric maps cannot be developed due to insufficient data, hydrographs of groundwater levels in wells may be sufficient to infer a groundwater flow boundary.

345.4(d)(1)(E) - This is not a relevant factor. If a basin is in long-term decline and the proposed jurisdictional boundary change would facilitate better groundwater management, why would the historical decline be a basis for denying the boundary change?

345.4(d)(3) and (4) - Similar to the above comment, why would a prior history subsidence or adverse effects on surface water be a basis for denying a boundary change? Such a boundary revision may be part of a plan to remedy or reverse prior negative effects.

346.2 - This section implies that after reviewing a request for a boundary change, DWR may make changes to the proposed boundary change, resulting in a boundary change that differs from that proposed by the requesting agency. It is not clear what criteria or guidance DWR would use to alter a proposed boundary change. This process would benefit from a step where, if DWR believes that a proposed boundary change needs to be modified, the requesting agency and DWR confer to try to reach agreement on a mutually acceptable change prior to presentation of the matter to the Commission.

Thank you for consideration of these comments. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns about any of the above.

Sincerely,


Robert Harrington, Water Director, Inyo County

Cc: Inyo County Board of Supervisors
Inyo County Water Commission
Kevin Carunchio, Inyo County CAO

Marge Kemp-Williams, Inyo County Counsel
Stacey Simon, Mono Co. Deputy County Counsel
Brent Calloway, Mono Co. Community Devel.