ID	Basin Number	Basin Name	Comment Description	DWR Action Taken	Priority Status
1a	3-49	Montecito	Annual reports, the Montecito Water District lists the following amount of groundwater production: 2010-11 (300AF), 2011-12 (200 AF), 2012-13 (180 AF) and expected for 2013-14 (300 AF). Total delivery to customers is generally about 5800 AFY to 6200 AFY.	Updated GW Reliance Volume to 300 Ac-Ft (.0477 Af-Ft/Ac).	Changed from Medium to Very Low
1b	3-49	Montecito	They state that groundwater is below 5% of water supply. The remaining supply is almost entirely imported water from the Cachuma Project and the State Water Project.	GW reliance changed to reflect 5% for GW and 95% for surface water (300 Af-Ft of GW / 6,200 Ac-ft total water use)	Will have no impact since they are already Very Low - See 1a
2a	4-13	San Gabriel Valley	Inconsistency in "Impact" scoring. They both have essentially the same description for the additional ranking value, but Raymond receives 4 points and Main San Gabriel receives 1 point, which makes the difference for medium to high. - If 1 is appropriate, then Raymond drops to Medium. - If 3 or 4 is appropriate, then San Gabriel goes up to High. - Opinion is that both should be high.	Changed "Documented Impact" from 1 to 3 to be consistent	Changed from Medium to High
2b	4-23	Raymond	Inconsistency in "Impact" scoring. See 2b	Changed "Documented Impact" from 4 to 3 to be consistent	Changed from High to Medium
3	6-12	Owens Valley	1) Consider assigning additional population to Owens Valley to account for the fact that Owens Valley gw pumping supports LA urban users, and 2) Check estimated gw use for Owens. LADWP has 100 wells producing between 90-100,000 af/yr.	Adjusted "Other Information" to account for water transfers and added 100K AF to total GW Volume. Other Information was adjusted again for the non-basin population that is dependent on the Owens Valley GW	Changed from Low to Medium
4	7-24	Borrego Valley	It is requested that DWR double check 1) Irrigated Acres and 2) GW Use. He said that they have those numbers and we could contact him for the information.	Need to change GW % to 100 and Surface water to 0	No change from Medium
5	8-1	Coastal Plain of Orange County	Requests that DWR double check 1)Total Wells and 2) PSWs. Contact agency for details	Changed PSW from 324 down to 200.	Changed from High to Medium
6	General Comment	Process Write-up	Suggested that we provide some additional information on how the final basin prioritization ranges were determined. He mentioned that he would submit his comments in an email.	Additional text added where needed to clarify	NA
7	9-9	Escondido Valley	Why is Econdido a 0 score?	GW use less than 2000 ac-ft/yr automatically records zero for overall ranking score. However, individual component rankings are maintained and can be used for future analysis.	No Change
8	NC Map	NC Map	Table in North Coast figure has incorrect information for population %	For the final report, DWR only produced maps covering statewide and the four region office areas. . North Coast map is no longer needed.	NA

ID	Basin Number	Basin Name	Comment Description	DWR Action Taken	Priority Status
9	2-35 (south portion)	Westside	Why does Westside Basin have a zero score in the CASGEM Basin Prioritization? Was informed of the 2000 AFY cutoff. The Westside Basin uses more GW than that cutoff. The following table is from p 3-1 of the South Westside Basin GWMP (LGA funded), which covers the southern portion of the basin (San Mateo County portion). As you can see, the production is approx. 8600 AFY. The northern portion would add a small quantity of landscape irrigation to this amount. [This may be] sufficient to get the scores added and the basin included in the Prioritization. A table is provided as westside.jpg in the comments directory.	Changed GW Volume to 8,564 and GW % to 30	No change from very low because the GW Volume is still below the 9500 Ac-ft of GW pumping breakpoint. Basin has no documented impacts
10	1-52	Ukiah Valley	Mendocino County Resources Conservation District asked how many wells they have in Ukiah Valley. I looked at the Draft Basin Summary Sheet and noticed that the total wells count is >20 wells/sq. mi. This value seems very high for this basin. Dan McManus asked to provide all sections that Ukiah Valley touches. Below is the list, however the 118 boundary is just a small portion of many of these sections: 17N12W07-08, 17-20, 28-34. 17N13W36. 16N13W01, 12-13, 24. 16N12W03-11, 14-22, 27-35. 15N12W02-11, 14-23, 26-29, 32-36. 14N12W01-05, 07-16, 23-28, 33, 35-36.	Not enough data to determine, not able to take action on basin data at this time	No change from Medium
11a	1-48	Gravelly Valley	Gravelly Valley has a small community, many of which are vacation homes. With an irrigated acreage of 0 ac/sq. mi., groundwater use of 0.001 ac ft/ac, and 100% of the total supply coming from groundwater, the overall ranking increases from 7.5 to 9.5.	Change Volume to 2.98 Ac-ft, (.001 ac-ft/ac) and 100% GW reliance	No change from Very Low
11b	5-13	Upper Lake Valley	With an irrigated acreage of 254 ac/sq. mi., groundwater use of 0.74 ac-ft/ac, and 68% of the total supply coming from groundwater, the overall ranking increases from 14 to 19.75. The total estimated groundwater demand is 7,514 ac-ft/yr. The Overall Basin Ranking Score was not calculated for this Basin, although it qualifies in the Medium Ranking Range. This changes the overall ranking from a Medium to a High Ranking Range.	Changed irrigated acreage to 254 ac/sq. mi groundwater use of 0.74 ac-ft/ac Calculated Volume is 5372 Af-ft (different from estimated from LC) 68% of the total supply coming from GW	No change from Very Low
11c	5-14	Scotts Valley	With an irrigated acreage of 133 ac/sq. mi., groundwater use of 0.70 ac-ft/ac, and 80% of the total supply coming from groundwater, the overall ranking increases from 15.25 to 16.75.	Changed irrigated acreage to 133 ac/sq. mi groundwater use of 0.70 ac-ft/ac Calculated Volume is 5124 Af-ft 80% of the total supply coming from GW	No change from Medium
11d	5-15	Big Valley	With an irrigated acreage of 180 ac/sq. mi., groundwater use of 0.53 acft/ac, and 70% of the total supply coming from groundwater, the overall ranking increases from 15 to 15.75.	Changed irrigated acreage to 180 ac/sq. mi groundwater use of 0.53 ac-ft/ac Calculated Volume is 12,832 Af-ft 70% of the total supply coming from GW	No change from Medium
11e	5-16	High Valley	With an irrigated acreage of 40 ac/sq. mi, groundwater use of 0.04 acft/ac, and 100% of the total supply coming from groundwater, the overall ranking increases from 9.5 to 10.25.	Changed irrigated acreage to 133 ac/sq. mi groundwater use of 0.04 ac-ft/ac Calculated Volume is 94 Af-ft 80% of the total supply coming from GW	No change from Very Low
11f	5-17	Burns Valley	With an irrigated acreage of 18.5 ac/sq. mi., groundwater use of 0.07 ac-ft/ac, and 30% of the total supply coming from groundwater, the overall ranking decreases from 13 to 11.25. The Overall Basin Ranking Score was not calculated for this Basin, although it would have qualified in the Medium Ranking Range, however, as groundwater use is only 160 ac-ft/yr., it may not be subject to ranking. This changes the overall ranking from a Medium to a Low Ranking Range.	Changed irrigated acreage to 18.5 ac/sq. mi groundwater use of 0.557 ac-ft/ac Volume is 160 Af-ft 30% of the total supply coming from GW	No change from Very Low
11g	5-18	Coyote Valley	With an irrigated acreage of 67 ac/sq. mi., groundwater use of 0.48 ac-ft/ac, and 71% of the total supply coming from groundwater, the overall ranking increases from 15.375 to 16. The total estimated groundwater demand is 2,464 ac-ft/yr. The Overall Basin Ranking Score was not calculated for this Basin, although it qualifies in the Medium Ranking Range.	Changed irrigated acreage to 67 ac/sq. mi groundwater use of 0.38 ac-ft/ac Volume is 2464 Af-ft 71% of the total supply coming from GW	No change from Very Low

ID	Basin Number	Basin Name	Comment Description	DWR Action Taken	Priority Status
11h	5-19	Collayomi Valley	With an irrigated acreage of 23 ac/sq. mi., groundwater use of 0.06 ac-ft/ac, and 67% of the total supply coming from groundwater, the overall ranking increases from 12.9 to 13.5. The Overall Basin Ranking Score was not calculated for this Basin, although it would have qualified in the Medium Ranking Range, however, with annual groundwater use of 649 ac-ft/yr., it may not be subject to ranking.	Changed irrigated acreage to 23 ac/sq. mi groundwater use of 0.1 ac-ft/ac Volume is 649 Af-ft 67% of the total supply coming from GW	No change from Very Low
11i	5-30	Lower Lake Valley	With an irrigated acreage of 18 ac/sq. mi., groundwater use of 0.24 ac-ft/ac, and 97% of the total supply coming from groundwater, the overall ranking increases from 12.5 to 13.75.	Changed irrigated acreage to 18 ac/sq. mi GW use of 0.24 ac-ft/ac calculated volume is 577 Af-ft 97% of the total supply coming from GW	No change from Very Low
11j	5-31	Long Valley	With an irrigated acreage of 103 ac/sq. mi., groundwater use of 0.19 ac-ft/ac, and 100% of the total supply coming from groundwater, the overall ranking increases from 7.25 to 8.25.	Changed irrigated acreage to 103 ac/sq. mi GW use of 0.19 ac-ft/ac calculated volume is 532 Af-ft 100% of the total supply coming from GW	No change from Very Low
11k	5-66	Clear Lake Cache Formation	A majority of the population is served by public water supplies which draw from Clear Lake. With an irrigated acreage of 3.8 ac/sq. mi., groundwater use of 0.01 ac-ft/ac, and 18% of the total supply coming from groundwater, the overall ranking decreases from 11.75 to 10.	Changed irrigated acreage to 3.8 ac/sq. mi GW use of 0.01 ac-ft/ac Calculated volume is 297 Af-ft 18% of the total supply coming from GW	Changed from Low to Very Low
11l	5-93	North Fork of Cache Creek	This groundwater basin was flooded in 1977-78 with the construction of Indian Valley Reservoir. The entire basin is owned by Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (Yolo) as a water supply reservoir. It is our understanding the only water supply is for the park operated by Yolo at the south end of the reservoir, and it draws surface water from the reservoir (the campground is currently shut down due to lack of water at this time). With no reliance on groundwater, the overall ranking would decrease from 2.25 to 0.75.	groundwater use of 0.00 ac-ft/ac Calculated volume is 0 Af-ft 0% of the total supply coming from GW NO CHANGES WERE MADE	No change from Very Low
11m	5-94	Middle Creek	With an irrigated acreage of 87 ac/sq. mi., groundwater use of 0.57 ac-ft/ac, and 92% of the total supply coming from groundwater, the overall ranking increases from 7.25 to 10.	Changed irrigated acreage to 87 ac/sq. mi GW use of 0.57 ac-ft/ac calculated volume is 402 Af-ft 92% of the total supply coming from GW	No change from Very Low
12	5-21.61	South Yuba Subbasin	Comment is regarding completion of the Yuba Wheatland Canal, which, starting in 2009, brought surface water to Wheatland Water District in the southeastern portion of the South Yuba Subbasin. There are approximately 9,200 acres that were converted from groundwater to surface water. As this was not reflected in the 2005 DWR land use data, there might be an impact to the scoring for Item 6 – GW Reliance in the prioritization sheet.	Based on conversations, the new land Use numbers are more reflective of the GW use in the basin. (6TAF for AG and 11TAF for Urban). The 2005 numbers (58TAF) were too high for the AG GW portion	No change from Medium

ID	Basin Number	Basin Name	Comment Description	DWR Action Taken	Priority Status
13	1-8.xx	Mad River	While reviewing the Basin Prioritization data sheets, I came across what I believe to be an issue with the Mad River Valley Basin, subbasins Mad River Lowland (1-8.01) and Dows Prairie School Area (1-8.02). I noticed that the Subbasin ID and name matched up on these sheets, but the values for the basin areas appeared transposed. I referred to Bulletin 118, and noticed that Figure 25 (Bulletin 118, update 2003), has the Subbasin IDs transposed as compared to the description of the Subbasins in the Basin data sheets contained in Bulletin 118. Based on my knowledge of the local area, the Bulletin 118 data sheets correctly identify the Basin Boundaries and Hydrology for the respective subbasin names, but Figure 25 has the labels transposed.	Data between the two basins is transposed. Adjusted the data for Basin Prioritization and notified data steward about adjusting the basin details in future B-118 release.	NA
14a	General Comment	Butte County	We encourage the Department of Water Resources (DWR) to emphasize that this ranking is primarily not a reflection of whether these basins are managed, monitored, in overdraft etc. but rather an indication of the importance of groundwater use in these areas for urban and agricultural demands. This explanation should accompany any use of the resulting Basin Prioritization Map to dispel preconceived notions of what this process does or does not do.	See technical paper for inserted comments	NA
14b	General Comment	Butte County	The technical paper and project materials indicate that, "these findings and the limited resources for the CASGEM program, DWR will focus efforts on evaluating the status of groundwater level monitoring in High or Medium Priority groundwater basins where monitoring will have the greatest benefit" (page 7). However, under the subsection, "Additional Potential Applications of CASGEM Basin Prioritization" in the technical paper (page 7), it broadens the potential use of this effort's findings. Our concern is that prioritization ranking could be used more broadly as a category for giving additional weight to a project in a future grant proposal process, and not just to identify and limit funding to unmonitored High/Medium priority basins. This could put potential projects of local importance in basins highly dependent on groundwater but not 'important' on a statewide level at a disadvantage in a competitive grant process. We encourage the DWR to emphasize that these "findings are not intended to diminish the local importance of the smaller size or lower use groundwater basins" (page 3).	See technical paper for inserted comments	NA
14c	General Comment	Butte County	The draft technical paper states that "groundwater level monitoring and management in Low and Very Low priority basins is still encouraged" (page 7), but also that this process serves to focus the limited resources of the CASGEM program toward high and medium priority basins. We encourage the DWR to support efforts by locals in low priority basins who take the initiative to establish a monitoring entity and network in their basin.	See technical paper for inserted comments	NA
14d	5-21.58	West Butte	For the West Butte basin, we were surprised by the assigned ranking range of >80% for the % of Total Supply under the GW Reliance category. This seems high given the high proportion of the basin served by surface water for irrigation even though a smaller portion of the basin is likely close to 100% groundwater dependent. Otherwise, the results for this basin also appear reasonable and appropriate.	Butte County Inventory report showed the GW use to be 150K AF @ 38% of the total water supply. The new LWU numbers report the GW use is only 23,206 AF @ 4%. Local knowledge of GW superseded DWR calculation.	No change from High
14e	Technical paper Comments	Butte County	Suggest adding a final sentence to the introduction section (pg. 2) stating on what basis this prioritization process has been done. Ex. The CASGEM prioritization process develops a statewide ranking of groundwater basin importance based on current and projected urban and agricultural use of the resource.	Additional text added where needed to clarify	NA

ID	Basin Number	Basin Name	Comment Description	DWR Action Taken	Priority Status
14f	Technical paper Comments	Butte County	Suggest adding a sentence to the paragraph beginning, "Figure 1 is a map of California's ten Hydrologic regions…" (pg. 5) stating that this priority ranking is not a reflection of whether these basins are managed, monitored, in overdraft, etc. but instead an indication of the importance of groundwater use in these areas for urban and agricultural demands. This statement should accompany the description of the map to make clear what it does/does not portray.	Additional text added where needed to clarify	NA
14g	Technical paper Comments	Butte County	"The remaining 319 very low-use groundwater basins…not included in any further evaluation or analysis" (pg. 9) does not seem to be the case as results reported in the "Data Component Sources and Processing" section seem to rank and assess all 515 basins. Please clarify.	Additional text added where needed to clarify	NA
14h	Technical paper Comments	Butte County	Stated on page 10, "While the remaining basin data ranked from Low to High, in most cases, was assigned a value from 1 to 5 based on proportionally grouping the data equally across the data distribution range…" Based on Table 3, this does not seem to accurately describe how these ranking ranges were broken out. More explanation of the reasoning for these breaking points, perhaps under each section, seems appropriate.	Additional text added where needed to clarify	NA
14i	Technical paper Comments	Butte County	Suggest adding a sentence or two to last paragraph on pg. 10 stating which data components received and were adjusted by a weighting factor.	Covered where applicable, I.e. Well Density	NA
14j	Technical paper Comments	Butte County	The last column in all Tables under the 'Data Component Sources and Processing' section is not intuitive and warrants a brief explanation either at the beginning of the section or with a sentence under each subsection describing how it relates to the specific dataset.	Additional text added where needed to clarify	NA
14k	Technical paper Comments	Butte County	Suggest adding a sentence at the end of the last paragraph (pg. 23) referencing the results of the last column in Table 10 to clarify what it indicates.	Additional text added where needed to clarify	NA
14l	Technical paper Comments	Butte County	Suggest adding a final brief paragraph at the end of the document describing how these 6 dataset rankings are combined (summed together) with data components seven and eight and how the weighting factors play into the final ranking score. How is the final ranking score then assigned to High, Medium, Low and Very Low rankings presented in Table 2?	Additional text added where needed to clarify	NA
14m	Technical paper Comments	Butte County	How was it decided what the breaking points for the cumulative ranking would be (Table 2)? Is the total possible points 40? Please clarify.	Additional text added where needed to clarify	NA
	Technical paper Comments	Butte County	Other minor corrections:	Technical paper updated	NA
15	8-2.06	Bunker Hill	The Bunker Hill sub-basin is impacted with PCE and TCE from the Newmark Superfund site and with perchlorate from the Crafton-Redlands plume. Pump and treat methods are being used to mitigate the plumes. While the basin is adjudicated and managed accordingly by its management agency, it should be noted that water levels in the pressure zone of the basin have declined to the same historical low levels observed in 1965. Water levels outside of the pressure zone do not show this trend.	Add 1 point to Other information for Adjudication Add 3 points in Documented impacts for WQ, OD, and SF	Changed from Medium to High

ID	Basin Number	Basin Name	Comment Description	DWR Action Taken	Priority Status
16	4-13	San Gabriel Valley	1) The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) established numerous superfund sites for the San Gabriel Valley Basin, including the Area 3 Operable Unit (OU) (Alhambra area), Baldwin Park OU, El Monte OU, Puente Valley OU, South El Monte OU, and Whittier Narrows OU. Watermaster has coordinated with the USEPA on the groundwater cleanup of the San Gabriel Valley Basin to ensure the water supply and water quality needs of the region are met. Consequently, Watermaster encourages DWR to change the draft ranking for CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization data component seven from "one" to "five". 2) Watermaster produces numerous reports (annual reports, five-year plan reports) addressing water availability, water supply, and water quality in the San Gabriel Valley Basin. Watermaster encourages DWR to change the draft ranking for CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization data component eight from "zero" to "three" based on Watermaster's review of DWR's criteria for CASGEM Groundwater Basin Prioritization data component eight. Documentation from Watermaster can be provided at a later time upon DWR request.	Add 1 point to Other information for Adjudication Add 3 points in Documented impacts for WQ and Super Fund	No change from High
17	8-2.06	Bunker Hill	I would like to ask why no points were given for the “Impacts” and “Other Information” categories? The Bunker Hill Basin has several groundwater impacts/impairments not were not identified in the summary results. Those include liquefaction potential, contamination plumes, extraction exceeds recharge and the basin is adjudicated. The adjacent basins received ranking values for these types of impacts. Maybe this is why Bunker Hill received a “medium” and not a “high” ranking.	See comment #15 for changes	Changed from Medium to High
18a	7-21.02	Mission Creek	Is credit given in Item 6, Groundwater Reliance, for the 145,817 acre-feet of groundwater replenishment in the Mission Creek Subbasin since 2002	Basin assessment is not using artificial recharge as a factor in the assessment at this time.	NA
18b	7-21.01	Indio	Is credit given in Item 6, Groundwater Reliance for the 3,082,107 acre-feet of groundwater replenishment in the Indio Subbasin since 1973?	Basin assessment is not using artificial recharge as a factor in the assessment at this time.	NA
18c	7-21.03	Desert Hot Springs	Desert Hot Springs Subbasin cannot have a greater Groundwater Reliance that Mission Creek Subbasin as calculated on the ranking data sheets. Desert Hot Springs Subbasin has very little pumping. Water levels have been steady in this subbasin for years (see attached hydrographs). What data set was used to calculate Item 6? Desert Hot Springs Subbasin should have an overall ranking of “Low”.	Population might be correct, but all urban water comes from Mission Springs subbasin	Changed from Medium to Low
18d	7-21.01	Indio	I’m concerned that a ranking value of 5 for Item 7, Impacts, for the Indio Subbasin is too high. Mission Creek and Desert Hot Springs are ranked 3 and 2.	Called to discuss data - DWR data is accurate	NA
18e	7-21.02	Mission Creek	When calculating the rank for Item 7, “Impacts”, credit should be given for positive impacts. In the Mission Creek , Desert Water Agency and Coachella Valley Water District have imported water for groundwater replenishment for the specific purpose of reducing groundwater overdraft for many years. Since 2002, 145,817 acre-feet of groundwater has been replenished in the Mission Creek Subbasin; This is positive benefit for the subbasins and should be accounted for in the ranking process.	Basin assessment is not using artificial recharge as a factor in the assessment at this time.	NA
18f	7-21.01	Indio	When calculating the rank for Item 7, “Impacts”, credit should be given for positive impacts. In the Indio Subbasin, Desert Water Agency and Coachella Valley Water District have imported water for groundwater replenishment for the specific purpose of reducing groundwater overdraft for many years. Since 1973, 3,082,107 acre-feet of groundwater has been replenished in the Indio Subbasin. This is positive benefit for the subbasins and should be accounted for in the ranking process.	Adjusted Documented Impacts down from 5 to 2 to be more realistic per public comments, reduction of overdraft conditions, kept WQ as an issue within basin	High to Medium

ID	Basin Number	Basin Name	Comment Description	DWR Action Taken	Priority Status
18g	7-21.03	Desert Hot Springs	An overall ranking of Medium for the Desert Hot Springs Subbasin is suspect. I believe there is an error in the Item 6, "Groundwater Reliance" calculation. What data set was used to calculate Item 6 for Desert Hot Springs Subbasin? Desert Hot Springs Subbasin does not have a greater Groundwater Reliance than Mission Creek Subbasin, as has been calculated on the Summary Data Sheets. Desert Hot Springs Subbasin has had very little pumping historically, the water is mostly non-potable. Water levels have been steady in this subbasin for years (see attached hydrographs).	See 18c	NA
18h	7-21.03	Desert Hot Springs	In the Indio Subbasin, a ranking value of 5 for Item 7, "Impacts", should be re-examined (see comment 1 above). Mission Creek Subbasin has a ranking value of 2 for Item 7, and Desert Hot Springs Subbasin has a ranking value of 3 for Item 7. Of these three subbasins, the Desert Hot Springs Subbasin should have the greatest value of negative impacts due to this subbasins highly mineralized and non-potable groundwater. The Desert Hot Springs Subbasin is named for the number of mineral hot springs found in the subbasin. The Indio Subbasin contains the Coachella Valley's drinking water source.	See 18f	NA
19a	General Comment	Santa Cruz County	Purpose – the draft Basin Prioritization Process document states that, the process is "is being used to focus and align limited resources towards the implementation of the CASGEM legislation that requires all groundwater basins to be monitored for seasonal and long-term groundwater elevation trends." The document goes on to say that, "However, based on the comprehensive set of data included in the CASGEM basin prioritization effort, the prioritization ranking could also help focus and align limited resources and assistance to local agencies trying to implement best practices and procedures for groundwater basin management and planning. High and Medium Priority basins would also likely have a greater need and responsibility to implement effective and sustainable groundwater management practices." Despite these explanations of purpose, we still are unclear as to the intent of this prioritization. DWR has stated that this is a statewide prioritization, and that a lower priority statewide priority basin might have a very high priority locally. Such is the case for Santa Cruz County, which relies heavily upon our local groundwater supplies. Our evaluation of the prioritization process might be different if the purpose of the program is to ensure monitoring (which is being done locally) versus if the purpose is to allocate limited state resources. As such, we recommend that the purpose of this effort be clearly stated in the final draft of this document.	No change is needed. The purpose of the CASGEM BP program is provided in the document. Local evaluation of the adequacy of local gw level monitoring is likely based on local goals and objectives, which may be more focused and detailed than statewide goals and objectives.	NA
19b	General Comment	Santa Cruz County	Data Components – In our opinion, the data component of groundwater use per acre is not a useful metric. This value will be much lower in urban / suburban land use as compared to agriculture. Further, this value will be lower in areas with low-per capita water use, such as Santa Cruz, thus distorting the ranking value. As such, we recommend removing this metric and simply using the percent of total supply as a component of groundwater reliance.	Comment considered but not incorporated. Prioritization of use based solely on the percent that GW meets total supply would skew importance towards low use basins having gw comprise a high % of their overall supply, and diminishing the importance of very high gw use, having gw comprise a moderate % of the overall supply.	NA
19c	3-1	Soquel Valley	Impacts – the County designated Soquel / Aptos basin includes the Purisima Formation, which extends to the coast. However, Bulletin 118 identifies the Purisima Formation as an inland basin, and as such, not subject to seawater intrusion. The reality is that the Purisima Formation is experiencing seawater intrusion similar to the Pajaro Valley, yet the Purisima scored a 0 for impacts whereas Pajaro scored a 4. We recommend that the Purisima basin score be changed to reflect conditions of overdraft and seawater intrusion in-line with Pajaro's score.	Documented Impacts already includes some saline intrusion and WQ issues with a point value of 1	No change from High

ID	Basin Number	Basin Name	Comment Description	DWR Action Taken	Priority Status
20a	2-9.01	Niles Cone	Item 2. Population Growth: The Niles Cone sub basin is adjacent to the Santa Clara Sub Basin. Historically, population growth associated with the Santa Clara Sub Basin has been mirrored by the Niles Cone Sub Basin due to their proximity. It appears population growth values from the Department of Finance for the Niles Cone Sub Basin are based on Alameda County population growth calculations (as a whole and not the ACWD tri-city area) as opposed to the Santa Clara County population growth calculations. Using the more reasonable Santa Clara County population growth calculations would be more realistic and accurate.	At this time, DWR estimates on population and growth potential are not editable	NA
20b	2-9.01	Niles Cone	Item 4. Total Wells: The number of municipal and private pumping wells in the Niles Cone Sub Basin are well documented. ACWD, under its Replenishment Assessment Act, tracks the users and pump rates of those who pump groundwater. The Ranking Value for this item is reasonable and no Confidence Adjustment should be applied .	No Action	NA
20c	2-9.01	Niles Cone	Item 5. Irrigated Acreage: As part of ACWD's Annual Survey Report, irrigation is a component in the evaluation on water use. This value is well documented and based on the CASGEM Basin Process, has the appropriate Ranking. No Confidence Adjustment should be applied.	No Action	NA
20d	2-9.01	Niles Cone	Item 6. GW Reliance: As mentioned previously, ACWD depends on groundwater for up to 60 percent of its total domestic water supply. That percentage will increase as the present drought situation continues to persist. The ranking value for this item should be at Medium if not Moderately High due to the present conditions. ACWD's dependence on groundwater is well documented and no Confidence Adjustment should be applied.	No Action	NA
20e	2-9.01	Niles Cone	Item 7. Impacts: Historical overdraft of the Niles Cone Sub Basin resulted in the intrusion of saline water into the upper aquifer zone. As the upper aquifer became impacted, deeper aquifer wells were installed which eventually drew the saline water to the deeper aquifers. As the deeper aquifers became saline, those wells were abandoned. As presented above, saline water intrusion in both the upper and deeper aquifers now exist in the western areas and central portion of the Niles Cone Sub Basin. The impacts to both the upper and deeper aquifers are long term issues due to the presence of abandoned agricultural and former water supply wells. Further, the Niles Cone Sub Basin uniquely contains a forebay area that allows direct recharge from surface impoundments and creeks. This direct connection between surface water and groundwater leaves the basin susceptible to water quality issues in the Alameda Creek watershed area that is outside of ACWD's jurisdiction.	Increased the Document Impacts for Saline Intrusion from 1 to 3	Basin remained Medium
21a	4-8	Las Posas Valley	4 - Total number of wells – we feel that the figure for total number of wells used by DWR is low. Our database shows a total known number of wells of approximately 600 with approximately 295 wells still in service.	Changed well count to 600	Changed from Medium to High
21b	4-8	Las Posas Valley	7 - Impacts on the groundwater; including overdraft, subsidence, saline intrusion, and other water quality degradation – The southern portion of the basin is affected by the adjacent Simi Valley area. Discharge of poor quality groundwater from dewatering wells and effluent discharge from the wastewater treatment facility into the Arroyo Simi have led to rising water levels in the southern portion of the basin along with higher TDS and Chloride levels. These waters have been pushing west and northward into the basin causing degradation of the higher quality Lower Aquifer System waters. Also the effects of this water can be seen in rising well levels and poorer quality water in the Pleasant Valley basin (4-6). A basin specific management plan for the Las Posas basin is currently in development and addresses water quantity and quality issues.	Documented impacts updated, WQ issues are already taken into consideration	Changed from Medium to High

ID	Basin Number	Basin Name	Comment Description	DWR Action Taken	Priority Status
21c	4-8	Las Posas Valley	8 - Any other information deemed to be relevant – The Las Posas basin is an important part of the water supply infrastructure for the Calleguas Municipal Water District (CMWD). CWMD provides water to approximately 75% of the population of Ventura County. CMWD operates an Aquifer Storage and Recovery well field in the Las Posas basin. Regional desalters are in the planning stages to help alleviate both the declining water quality issues as well as offsetting some of the pumping that has led to declining groundwater levels in the basin.	When basins as assessed in the coming years, consideration will be needed to accommodate	NA
21d	4-4.05	Fillmore Basin	We feel that the basin priority ranking should be medium rather than high similar to the other basins that make up the Santa Clara River Valley. Review of data for a regional Salt and Nutrient Management Program have shown groundwater quality impacts to be localized to certain portions of the basin and that the basin has an assimilative ability to handle these impacts. A review of the impacts in Category 7 that led to the ranking value may lower the adjusted ranking value enough to lower the priority level to medium.	WQ issues are localized and being managed Changed Documented Impacts from 5 to 2 for consistency	Changed from High to Medium
22	6-5.01	Tahoe Valley South	• Public Water System (PWS)Supply Wells = 22 wells (Table A3 shows 5) STPUD = 16 LBWC = 3 TKWC = 3 • Small Community Water Supply (SCWS) Wells = ~56 wells • Private Wells = ~625 wells • Well Density (Table A3 shows >20 wells/sq. mi) PWS Wells = 0.95 wells/sq. mi; Add SCWS Wells = 3.33 wells /sq. mi.; Add Private Wells = >30 wells/sq. mi. • Groundwater Production STPUD = ~7050 AF/year; LBWC = ~ 390 AF/year; TKWC = ~ 845 AF/year. Total from PWS = 8,285 AF/year (of course this does not include SCWS and Private well production) • Groundwater Use = 8,285 AF/14,784 acres = 0.56 AF/acre (Table A3 shows 0.21 – 0.40 AF/acre) • Percent of Total Supply (estimated): > 90% (Table A3 shows >80%)	Updated the GW volume number to 8,285 AF. Adjusted total Wells changed to 680 Adjusted Public Supply Wells to 79	No change from Medium
23a	8-2.01	Chino	According to Watermaster's well database, the number of active public-supply wells in the Chino Basin is 178. This is 0.74 wells per square mile. This value is within the ranking range of 0.51 to 1.0 wells per square mile that was assigned to the Chino Basin on the Summary Sheet. We suggest no change to the ranking value of 4 for this data component.	Public Supply Wells adjusted to 179	No impact to componet or overall basin ranking
23b	8-2.01	Chino	According to Watermaster's well database, the number of total wells (active, inactive, or abandoned wells of all well types) in the Chino Basin is 2, 162. This is 8.94 wells per square mile. This value is within the ranking range of 5.1 to 10.0 wells per square mile that was assigned to the Chino Basin on the Summary Sheet. We suggest no change to the ranking value of 3 for this data component, and we contend that there is no need for a confidence adjustment.	Adjusted total wells to 2,162	No change from High

ID	Basin Number	Basin Name	Comment Description	DWR Action Taken	Priority Status
23c	8-2.01	Chino	Irrigated Acreage: We used land use data from the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for 2005 to estimate the irrigated acreage in the Chino Basin. This estimate was computed by summation of: (i) the acreage of pervious areas associated with the land use types of irrigated field crops, pastures, fruits and nuts, and citrus and applying a 30% reduction for urbanization that has occurred in the Chino Basin since 2005; (ii) the acreage of pervious areas associated with the land use type of Urban Residential and assuming that 60% of these areas are irrigated; (iii) the acreage of pervious areas associated with the land use type of Low Density Urban Residential and assuming that 60% of these areas are irrigated; and (iv) the acreage of pervious areas associated with the land use type of Commercial and assuming that 20% of these areas are irrigated. This analysis estimated a total of about 25,000 acres of irrigated area in the Chino Basin, which is about 100 acres per square mile. This value is within the ranking range of 61 to 115 acres per square mile that was assigned to the Chino Basin on the Summary Sheet. We suggest no change to the ranking value of 2 for this data component, and we contend that there is no need for a confidence adjustment.	Updated Irrigated acreage to 25,000 acres to capture local information	No change from High
23d	8-2.01	Chino	Groundwater Reliance: Two sub-components were considered by the DWR in determining groundwater reliance: the volume of groundwater used annually (Groundwater Use), and the percent of the total water supply that is groundwater pumped from the basin (Percent of Total Supply). Watermaster maintains a groundwater production database and accounts for all other sources of water supply used within the Chino Basin. Using these data, we calculated the amounts of Groundwater Use and Percent of Total Supply for the prior 13 years (fiscal years 1999/2000 to 2011/2012). Total groundwater production from the Chino Basin ranged from 147,585 to 188,819 acre-feet per year, with an average of 169,488 acre-feet per year. Using the average, this is about 1.1 acre-feet/acre. This value exceeds the ranking range of 0.61 to 0.8 acre-feet/acre that was assigned to the Chino Basin on the Summary Sheet. We suggest a ranking value of 5 for Groundwater Use. Other sources of water supply available to the water-supply agencies within the Chino Basin are groundwater produced from other basins, imported State Water Project water, surface water, and recycled water. The percentage of groundwater used in the Chino Basin for the total water supply ranged from 46% to 59% over the last 13 years, with an average of 53 percent. The range and the average are below the ranking range of 61% to 80% that was assigned to the Chino Basin on the Summary Sheet. We suggest a ranking value of 3 for Percent of Total Supply.	Changed GW volume to 169,488 AF and percent from GW to 53%	No change from High

ID	Basin Number	Basin Name	Comment Description	DWR Action Taken	Priority Status
23e	8-2.01	Chino	Documented Impacts: The DWR considers documented impacts for Basin Prioritization to include overdraft, subsidence, saline intrusion, and other water-quality degradation. The Summary Sheet noted that the impacts documented in the Chino Basin are "locally high nitrates and TDS." This is accurate. Watermaster's comprehensive groundwater-quality monitoring program has documented nitrate and TDS concentrations in groundwater that exceed Federal and State MCLs for drinking water. These areas are typically located in the down-gradient end of the basin, and in areas where the overlying land use is or was agricultural. Documented Impacts that were not listed on the Summary Sheet include land subsidence and ground fissuring which occurred historically in the southwestern portion of the basin. Uncontrolled overdraft was occurring for many years prior to the adjudication in 1978. In 2000, Watermaster began implementation of a comprehensive basin-wide management plan called the Optimum Basin Management Program (OBMP). The OBMP is a long-range management plan to enhance basin water supplies, to protect and enhance water quality, to enhance the management of the Basin, and to equitably finance its implementation. The major elements of the OBMP include expansion of storm-water and supplemental-water recharge facilities, expansion of the direct reuse and artificial recharge of recycled water, construction of 40 mgd of groundwater desalination and treatment facilities, management of groundwater levels to enhance the yield of the Chino Basin, a pioneering salt and nutrient management plan, cooperative programs with regulatory agencies to accelerate groundwater remediation programs, management of land-subsidence and ground-fissuring problems, enhanced management of groundwater storage for broad mutual benefit, and implementation of comprehensive monitoring programs to support all elements of the OBMP. Watermaster constructed, calibrated, and used computer-simulation models of surface-water and groundwater to develop, refine, and evaluate the OBMP. Watermaster continues to upgrade and use the models as necessary. Because of the advanced groundwater basin management that is occurring in Chino Basin to address the Documented Impacts, we suggest a ranking value of 3 for this data component.	Conclusions by the watermaster was accepted. Reduced ranking from 4 to 3	No change from High
23f	8-2.01	Chino	Other: A ranking value of 1 was assigned to the Chino Basin for the data component of Other Information. The DWR considers other information for Basin Prioritization to include "basin is adjudicated." This is accurate. In addition, the basin is highly managed to maximize the beneficial use of all water supplies. The Chino Basin was adjudicated on January 30, 1978 under a Judgment entered in the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of San Bernardino, entitled "Chino Basin Municipal Water District v. City of Chino et al." A fundamental premise of the Judgment is that all Chino Basin producers are allotted to pump water from the Chino Basin to meet their requirements, and if pumping exceeds their share of the Safe Yield, that water is replaced. In this manner, the Judgment halted the uncontrolled overdraft that was occurring. We suggest no change to the ranking value of 1 for this data component.	The current value of 1 is for the basin being adjudicated. No change	No change from High
23g	8-2.01	Chino	Important Note: A recent addition to the OBMP is a program of controlled overdraft of 400,000 acre-feet from the Chino Basin though 2030. The purpose of the controlled overdraft is to control the outflow of poor-quality rising groundwater, which will enhance the yield of the basin and protect downstream beneficial uses. It is likely that the CASGEM monitoring program will show declining groundwater levels in parts of the Chino Basin. Watermaster wants the DWR to be aware that this drawdown is anticipated as part of the program of controlled overdraft.	Put comment in DB, but did not make any values changes	No change from High
24a	3-3.01	Llàgas	Thanks for the opportunity to provide comments on the draft basin prioritization for the Santa Clara and Llàgas Subbasins in Santa Clara County. Based on our review of the draft basin prioritization, we concur that the Santa Clara Subbasin is appropriately ranked as a high (?) priority basin. However, we believe the overall basin priority for the Llàgas Subbasin should be changed from medium to high based on updated local data. Most notably, the reliance on groundwater in the Llàgas Subbasin appears to be significantly underestimated by the draft basin prioritization. Groundwater from the Llàgas Subbasin is the sole source of drinking water for municipalities and thousands of domestic well owners, and provides over 90% of the total water used in the subbasin.	No edits to population related values at this time, see 24b and 24c for other significant changes	Changed from Medium to High

ID	Basin Number	Basin Name	Comment Description	DWR Action Taken	Priority Status
24b	3-3.01	Llàgas	Per the District's 2012 Groundwater Management Plan, the average GW pumping in the Llàgas Subbasin from 2002 to 2011 was 44,000 AF/year. Groundwater provides all drinking water within the Llàgas Subbasin, with small amounts of surface water and recycled water used for nonpotable uses. [GW provides over 90% of the total water used in the subbasin.]	Changed GW Volume to 44,000 AF and GW Percent to 90%	Changed from Medium to High
24c	3-3.01	Llàgas	Nitrate has impacted a significant number of private domestic wells across the Llàgas Subbasin due to historic and ongoing sources including agricultural activities and septic systems. Per the District's 2012 Annual Groundwater Report, approximately 30% of wells monitored in the Llàgas Subbasin and Coyote Valley exceeded the drinking water standard. Perchlorate has also impacted the subbasin due to a contaminant release site in the northern portion of the subbasin.	Added WQ issues to Documented Issues with a ranking of 2	Changed from Medium to High
25	7-5	Chuckwalla	I was curious why the method of prioritization doesn't take into consideration the industrial uses in a basin. We are building large solar power plants in that basin and BLM is licensing other plants that pump groundwater out there. There is also a large prison out there that might throw off population calculations. Our environmental analyses are showing that the basin will be in overdraft from the cumulative impacts from all the project proposed in that basin. We have done our best to require mitigation for groundwater impacts. As I recall the SWRCB made a finding of overriding considerations for groundwater basin impacts to approve the Eagle Mountain pumped storage project. I remember working with BLM on a few of the solar projects and they mentioned they might have the pumpers in the basin put together a groundwater management plan for the basin but I'm not sure they have a mechanism to require that or how far that went. Seems like this basin is worthy of a medium to high priority. Given the current and future development it might be a good place to have a designated monitoring entity anyway.	Other Information: Significant growth in industry (solar), and others. Prison is also a significant user the GW resources. Ranking 2	No change from Low
26b	2-9.03	San Mateo Plain	Link to the 2003 Water Board Study of South Bay groundwater basins: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/water_issues/programs/groundwater/sobayground.shtml This report recommended that DWR adopt slightly revised boundaries for the San Mateo Plain Groundwater Subbasin, as shown in the report's Figure 9 (Reference: Table ES-3. Recommendations Requiring Coordination Among Agencies). Most importantly, Appendix C describes the Geology of the San Francisquito Cone Area. The alluvial fan composing the cone includes the following entities: San Mateo and Santa Clara counties, Stanford University and the Cities of Palo Alto, East Palo Alto, Menlo Park, and Redwood City. The San Francisquito Cone that is hydraulically connected and contains portions of the San Mateo Subbasin and the Santa Clara Subbasins. Based on A DWR pumping test from the 1960's this area is also hydraulically connected to the Niles Cone (John Fio, personal communication January 2014 and BAWSCA 2014).	Basin boundary's is not adjustable at this time. Referred issue to DWR HQ for additional analysis.	NA

ID	Basin Number	Basin Name	Comment Description	DWR Action Taken	Priority Status
26b	2-9.03	San Mateo Plain	As discussed, estimated groundwater pumping is 2,329 AFY (References: Table 7 of Todd Engineers, 2012 http://www.ci.east-palo-alto.ca.us/documentcenter/view/36 and USGS 1997 http://pubs.usgs.gov/wri/1997/4033/report.pdf) I confirmed this number with John Fio, who developed the groundwater model for BAWSCA: http://www.bawsca.org/docs/BAWSCA%20Phase%20IIA%20TM%20GW%20model%20Mar%2012%202013%20FINAL_v3_w_Figures.pdf Current groundwater users includes two small commercial water companies that serve East Palo Alto and Menlo Park: O'Connor Tract Cooperative Water Company and Palo Alto Park Mutual Water Company, institutional wells at USGS, St. Patrick's Seminary, Menlo College, and Veterans Administration, City of East Palo Alto and Stanford University. Future groundwater users based on current planning documents also include the cities of Redwood City, Palo Alto and Menlo Park, as well as expanded use by current users.	Edited GW use to be 1,987 AF per comment references, left GW % as determined by LWU effort, The referenced report overlaps with neighboring basin therefore only a portion of the GW volumes can be used.	No change from very low because the GW Volume is still below the 2000 Ac-ft of GW pumping breakpoint
26c	2-9.03	San Mateo Plain	3. Total annual recharge to this sub-basin is estimated at 8,000 AFY. A 20% reduction in Hetch Hetchy water could increase groundwater use to 4,947 AFY, plus 2,295 AFY Emergency. (reference: Todd Engineers 2012 and BAWSCA 2014). Groundwater extraction 1900s-1960's resulted in subsidence, declining water levels– some areas were previously artesian others had water level declines of up to -140 feet below sea level in Palo Alto, and salt intrusion. Pumping ceased when higher quality imported water became available as part of the State Water Project by 1965. Historical pumping was about 7,500 AFY when these adverse effects were observed. Thus, this sub-basin would not meet DWR's priority threshold based on total AFY, but would have adverse effects from over pumping. (References: Todd Engineers, 2012, Metzer & Fio, 1997, BAWSCA 2014 and http://pubs.usgs.gov/wri/wri024078/)	Added documented impacts = 1 for reported WQ issues within the basin. Historical subsidence and potential reductions in future surface water deliveries can not be considered at this time. GW volume remains below the 2000 AF cutoff to be considered for higher ranking priority	No change from Very Low
26d	2-9.03	San Mateo Plain	In conclusion, DWR plans to limit funding for groundwater management projects that are in very low and low priority basins. In this case, it does not make hydrogeological sense to have a high priority basin adjacent to a very low priority basin, when the basins are directly connected. Moreover, planned used of this basin may exceed a sustainable yield that is still below DRR's classification threshold. This does not even consider groundwater/surface water interactions in San Francisquito Creek, and the effect that unsustainable groundwater pumping could have on ecosystem services. Recommend that DWR will review this information for B118 update and adjust the priority ranking scheme as soon as possible. I am happy to talk to you about this in person, answer questions or get other stakeholders involved. Please feel welcome to contact me if you require further information.	DWR is not limiting funding opportunities to less than Medium basins. Communicated to comment submitter	No change from Very Low
27	5-22.16	Cosumnes	Passing along a comment received via phone conversation from an IRWM representative for Mokelumne-Amador-Calaveras IRWM group. 1) It seemed that the GW Reliance score for Consumes sub-basin (which is a 3), may be higher than it should, as compared to Eastern San Joaquin, which is more developed and likely has more agriculture (ESJ scored a 2.25). I verified that these were the scores for those basins via the basin summary sheets. Requesting data to research this more and need it as soon as possible.	Nothing, no specific data was provided at this time GW use and the percentage of Total water is used in the calculation Updated Land Use numbers increases the GW reliance to a ranking of 4. No additional information provided prior to final release of rankings.	No change from Medium