

Commenter	Comment or link to comment
1. Jill Slocum	Slocum GSP Comments April 2022 PDF.pdf (23kB)
2. Michael Hogan	Sierra Valley Groundwater Sustainability Plan comments mph.docx (1.2MB)
3. Lucy Blake	Comment letter from Lucy Blake 4-23-22.pdf (2.3MB)
4. Brett Hall from Sierra Valley and Tahoe Chapter, California Native Plant Society	CNPS on Sierra Valley Grnd Water.pdf (187.2kB)
5. Pablo Ortiz for the Nature Conservancy, Union of Concerned Scientists, Clean Water Action/Clean Water Fund, CivicWell, Audubon California	FinalGSP SierraValley PublicCommentLetter (1).pdf (3.8MB)
6. Janice Eggers	This draft plan lacks many items, and should be revised, and more meetings held. All stakeholders need to be heard, and all needs of everyone that lives here should be addressed. I am also concerned in regards to the use of water for wildland fires, or using our domestic wells, (as we have been told by Cal Fire) to fight fires on the large acreages in the Sierra Valley. With California being in a "Mega" drought, we need to work together to keep our water here, and sustainable. Water is what makes this valley such an ideal place for the ranchers, the wildlife, and everyone else who lives here. I would also like to see more advertising for the future, so that more people can be involved in the decisions. What happened in Owens Valley is very real, and we do not want that to happen here.
7. Donna Lindquist, Watershed Consultant	Response letter to SVGW Plan 2022.pdf (223.9kB)
8. Shelton Douthit, Feather River Land Trust	Sierra Valley GSP Comment Letter - FRLT - April 2020.pdf (1.2MB)
9. John Pang	Like others, I just heard today that comments are due for the Sierra Valley Groundwater plan tomorrow. I attended one of the zoom meetings a few months ago, and was told that the outreach would be improved. I feel that the consultants writing the plan forgot to include some of the public during the "engagement" process. I attended Statewide ACWA conferences when SGMA hit a number of years ago-the intent was to get input from everyone-not just a specific industry or special interest group. While the Sierra Valley Ground Management District is supposed to represent all water users, I have a hard time believing they do. In any case, the plan does not seem to really recognize the domestic water users interests. While I have adjudicated water rights to draw from a creek, most homeowners do not. The plan, as drafted, seems biased towards the commercial water pumpers. While I can certainly see their need, I do not feel they should be granted

	<p>any more consideration than the domestic users.</p> <p>In our ever-changing climate world, and in as much as California is one of the least consistent states in terms of annual precipitation, I feel the plan should address contingencies during drought years. Additionally, I do not see any plans to monitor domestic wells-something that should be included to ensure equity, and to prevent catastrophic drawdowns during drought years. Additionally, where is the accountability if we do indeed hit serious triggers that warrant everyone cutting back on their pumping? Who will enforce the rationing if domestic water wells dry up? Allowing ten domestic wells to go dry would not be ideal if one of the wells provided water to your house.</p> <p>The intent of this act was to get everyone at the table to arrive at a sustainable plan for a few decades. While the requirement for the plan was broadcast many years ago, it was not until recently that the Sierra Valley group started working on it. The consultants seemed rushed, and were intent on using a “cookie cutter” recipe to get the plan in on time with the promise of being able to “adjust things later”. I do not doubt their expertise nor intentions, but in reality, the plan does not represent everyone’s water interests.</p> <p>One of the intents of SGMA was to get everyone working together to arrive at a mutually agreeable plan. While I am sure that some of stakeholders feel this is just another governmental “mandate” that could change their “business as normal” strategies, I feel it is important that the plan meets the intent, and holds everyone responsible for ensuring that our groundwater is available for everyone far into the future.</p> <p>Please send the plan back and ask that it be re-done to include everyone’s water interests, and meet the intent of the act. In the re-do please ensure that there are seats at the table for domestic water users, as well as for those representing wildlife, plant life, and forest health-all of whom depend upon water.</p>
10. Cindy Noble	CBN DRAFT SGMA Comments 4- 2022.pdf (80.2kB)
11. Cindy Noble, Feather River Trout Unlimited	FRTU SVGSMF Comments 4- 23-2022.pdf (90.5kB)
12. Kim McKinney	FRTU SVGSMF Comments 4- 23-2022.pdf (90.5kB)
13. Shannon Hoyt	<p>Our groundwater must be managed for the benefit of the ecosystem as a whole and the residents who rely on groundwater for domestic use. Any agricultural or business use of groundwater must be sustainable. This plan does nothing to ensure a sustainable groundwater basin in Sierra Valley.</p> <p>This plan was developed without much input from the homeowners who rely on groundwater for domestic use and to preserve the values of their homes. The plan does not protect homeowners and does not protect the wildlife and ecosystem from the effects of lowering groundwater levels. We need a plan that will monitor groundwater levels and immediately limit use to a sustainable level. This plan allows domestic wells to go dry before there is discussion over what to do to prevent draw down of groundwater. This is unacceptable.</p>
14. Rhyne Hollitz	<p>My concerns and comments about the draft plan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I have a domestic well and as stakeholder in the largest group of users the plan writers failed to reach out to me and my neighbors. One of the triggers is for 6-10 wells to go dry before the Ground water Management District considers any action. As a property owner for the past 25 years I know that the water table has been dropping. Regular monitoring of shallow domestic wells is as important as deep wells.

	<p>2. As a former Director of the Sierraville Public Utility District which serviced about 120 water users, I never saw the draft plan or ever had any contact with the writers of the plan. There are several public water boards in the Sierra Valley and they represent significant stakeholder group that uses groundwater to serve their customers.</p> <p>3. As we enter a new era of climate change and drought there is no plan to deal with this change just a simple mention in the plan.</p> <p>4. There is no requirement to stop over pumping in the draft plan. All stakeholder groups need a voice and representation on the board of Directors(Sierra Valley Groundwater District) as I pay an annual fee to the District on my tax bill annually. Governance was not addressed in the plan. How can all the stakeholder be fairly represented now that the State of California has mandated groundwater basin organizations statewide.</p>
15. Mike Blide	Letter Goundwater Plan.docx (15.1kB)
16. Lynn McKechnie	<p>I was made aware that a plan for Sierra Valley ground water management was formulated as as required by the state of California Department of Water Resourses. I was informed after the fact and had no meaningful opportunity to add my input in the formulation of the plan. I have lived in the valley for over two decades and felt that all water stakeholders would without a doubt be represented in creating a workable plan for our groundwater sustainability. I was so wrong! After being made aware of the huge problems in the plan, I realized that as a domestic well owner, I could be left high and dry, literally, as a result of the lack of sustainability this plan provides. The stake holders at the table seemed to have one thing in mind: agricultural profits, mainly short term, since the plan as created would allow the water in the valley to be pumped out without regard to recharge rates. In other words, grab what you can while the water is still there.</p> <p>We need a plan that respects the needs of all stakeholders, including fish, birds, animals, plants that sustain our environment. We need to realize that our climate crisis will require a strong response, a well planned response that cannot be achieved without all stakeholders involved. We need a new plan.</p>
17. Dolly Chapman	<p>This plan was developed without much input from the homeowners who rely on groundwater for domestic use and to preserve the values of their homes. The plan does not protect homeowners and does not protect the wildlife and ecosystem from the effects of lowering groundwater levels. We need a plan that will monitor groundwater levels and immediately limit use to a sustainable level. This plan allows domestic wells to go dry before there is discussion over what to do to prevent draw down of groundwater. This is unacceptable. Our groundwater must be managed for the benefit of the ecosystem as a whole and the residents who rely on groundwater for domestic use. Any agricultural or business use of groundwater must be sustainable. This plan does nothing to ensure a sustainable groundwater basin in Sierra Valley.</p>
18. Daphne Nandino, CDFW	CDFW Comments Sierra Valley FinalGSP.pdf (791.7kB)