Butte Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan - Basin Setting and Monitoring Network Chapters Public Review Draft- Summer 2020 Comment Tracking Table

| _ | Comment Hacking Lable | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------|------------------------|---|--|
| # | Commenter Name | Commenter Organization | Chapter* (BaS or MoN) | Section | Line #s or Figure # | Comment | Proposed Action |
| | | | | | | The word "Refuge" should be changed to "Area." Refuges are federal lands, and Areas are state run | |
| 1 | Dave Van Baren | CDFW | BaS | 1.1.7.1 | 635 | facilities. | Revise document based on comment |
| 2 | Bridget Gibbons | CDFW | BaS | 1.1.8.1 | 706 | Groundwater Sustainability Agencies must consider all beneficial users of groundwater, including environmental users of groundwater [Water Code 10723.2(e)]. CDFW recommends including GDE beneficial users of groundwater and interconnected surface waters as primary water uses. Groundwater Sustainability Plans must identify and consider potential effects on all beneficial uses and users of groundwater [22 CCR 354.10(a), 354.26(b)(3), 2354.28(b)(4), 354.34(b)(2), and 354.34(f)(3)]. | Document to be revised. GDEs are in the process of being identified in the subbasin and will be included in the Basin Setting Chapter when the effort is complete. GDEs will also be considered along with all beneficial uses/users during development of SMCs. |
| 3 | Bridget Gibbons | CDFW | BaS | 1.1.9.1 | 753 | CDFW recommends the installation of shallow groundwater monitoring wells near GDEs and interconnected surface waters to monitor impacts to environmental beneficial uses and users. | Recommendation noted and will be considered for inclusion in the description of data gaps and possible PMAs for additional monitoring |
| 4 | Bridget Gibbons | CDFW | BaS | 1.1.9.2 | 759 | CDFW recommends pairing shallow groundwater monitoring wells near interconnected surface waters with streamflow gauges to further inform the BBGM and improve understanding of interconnectivity. | Recommendation noted and will be considered for inclusion in the description of data gaps and possible PMAs for additional monitoring |
| | | 005111 | | | 000 | Additional context clarifying that Spring 2015 was the height of the drought should be included. Though the section mentions curtailed supply of surface delivery from the settlement contractors, including clear references to the drought adds important context and clarity when discussing | |
| | Dave Van Baren | CDFW | BaS | 1.2.2.1 | 882 901-904 | conditions from these years. | Revise document based on comment Revise document based on comment |
| - | Dave Van Baren Dave Van Baren | CDFW CDFW | BaS BaS | 1.2.2.1 | 901-904 | Again, context that high pumping in 2015 was related to the drought would add clarity. Specificying specific drought years, rather than "recent" would add clarity. | Revise document based on comment Revise document based on comment |
| l – | Dave van Baren | ODI W | Dao | 1.2.2.0 | 010 | Should the benefit of wildlife area's having summer water and permanent water be mentioned as | Trevior abounding based on common |
| | Dave Van Baren | CDFW | BaS | 1.2.2.4 | 992-1011 | potential sources of percolation into the aquifer? | Revise document based on comment |
| 9 | Dave Van Baren | CDFW | BaS | 1.2.4.1 | 1074 | "In" should be changed to "is". | Revise document based on comment |
| 10 | Bridget Gibbons | CDFW | BaS | 1.2.6.1 | 1323 | Additional monitoring of shallow groundwater will help to refine the BBGM simulated groundwater elevations and allow for more accurate groundwater elevation contours throughout the basin. The Groundwater Conditions section does not include "identification of groundwater dependent | Staff agrees. Recommendation noted and will be considered for inclusion in the description of data gaps and possible PMAs for additional monitoring |
| 11 | Bridget Gibbons | CDFW | BaS | 1.2 | N/A | ecosystems within the basin" as required by 22 CCR 354.16(g). A map identifying groundwater dependent ecosystems throughout the basin should be included, drawing from best available information, along with a description of the GDEs' ecological condition and an identification of GDE ecological importance. CDFW recommends that GDE identification err on the side of inclusivity until evidence exists that an ecosystem has no significant dependence on groundwater across seasons and water year types. | Document to be revised. GDEs are in the process of being identified in the subbasin and will be included in the Basin Setting Chapter when the effort is complete. GDEs will also be considered along with all beneficial uses/users during development of SMCs. |
| | | | | | | Though the categories of evapotranspiration considered are identified in Table 1-6 (agricultural, urban and industrial, managed wetlands, native vegetation, and canal evaporation), it would add | |
| 12 | Bridget Gibbons | CDFW | BaS | 1.3.4 | 1651 | clarity to identify those categories in the explanatory text as well. | Revise document based on comment |
| | Bridget Gibbons | CDFW | BaS | 1.3.4 | 1670/ Table 1-7 | The groundwater system water budget does not include evapotranspiration as an identified outflow. Water used by groundwater dependent ecosystems should be included in the groundwater system water budget to prevent an underestimation of system outflows. If water use by groundwater dependent ecosystems is captured by a different groundwater system water budget category, please add clarification. | Revise document based on comment to clarify. The BBGM does not estimate evapotranspiration of groundwater. Water in the rootzone is available to riparian and native land uses in the model |
| 14 | Dave Van Baren | CDFW | BaS | 1.3.8.1 | 2147-2148 | Please add clarity to this paragraph regarding the reference to managed wetlands in this section and the statement regarding additional data being needed. Managed wetlands are systems that existed naturally, and in the case of State and Federal areas, have significant documentation associated with water sources relative to surrounding farms. Why are they referenced specifically? | Revise document based on comment |
| 15 | Bridget Gibbons | CDFW | MoN | 1.1.6.1 | Figure 1-4 | Additional multi-completion groundwater monitoring well reference locations proximate to streams and paired with streamglow gauges are needed to further refine the characterization of groundwater and surface water interconnectedness. | Recommendation noted and will be considered for inclusion in the description of data gaps and possible PMAs for additional monitoring |
| | Ben King | Stakeholder | BaS | | 122+ | The foundational support for the hydrogeology of the southern portion of the Butte Basin needs to include reports that analyze the dominant geological features of this area which is the volcanic structure of the Sutter Buttes and the presence of the Willows fault that runs between the geologic formation of the Sutter Buttes and the Sacramento River and City of Colusa near the south western boundary of the Basin. | Revise document based on comment by adding references to applicable reports |
| | Ben King | Stakeholder | BaS | 1.1 | 122+ | Regarding the Sutter Buttes - suggested foundational reports are: Hull, Laurence (1984)" Geochemistry of Ground Water in the Sacramento Valley, California USGS Geological Survey Professional Paper 1401-B which frames the importance of the Sutter Buttes as being one of the unique geormophic units of the Sacramento Valley - see Page B4. See also Hausback, Muffler and Clynne (2011) "US Geological Survey - Reducing The Risk From Volcano Hazards - Sutter Buttes - The Lone Volcano in California's Great Valley" which discusses the predominant presence of the shallow sea on the floor of the Sacramento Valley over the last 75 million years and the eruption of the volcano 1.6 million years ago. Particular reference to localized faults in the volcano structure, the Colusa Dome formation and the interplay between the geologic historical setting of an ancient sea bed with a more recent volcanic episode. | Information noted and will be incorporated as appropriate |

| # | Commenter Name | Commenter Organization | Chapter* (BaS or MoN) | Section | Line #s or Figure # | Comment | Proposed Action |
|----|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------|------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | The most comprehensive ground water quality data which empirically supports the geochemical heritage of the volcanic structure admidst an ancient sea bed is Schmitt, Fram, Dawson and Belitz (2008) " Ground-Water Quality Data in the Middle Sacramento Valley Study Unit, 2006 - Results from The California GAMA Program - USGS in cooperation of the SWRCB - see in particular the 2006 results for GAMA well ESAC-21 - See Table 9 Major and Minor Ions - Cloride 626 mg/L, TDS 1290, Table 10 Trace Elements - Arsenic 80.6 ug/L, Boron 1010 ug/L, Table 4 Water Quality Indicators Specific Conductance 2370 uS/cm, Table 13 Nitrogen and Oygen Isotopes O of Dissolved Carbonates + 5.57 per. mil and Carbon - 14 - 11 % modern. The GAMA Site ESAC-21 is the nearest measurement site north of the Sutter Buttes on the south western portion of the Basin which | Information noted and will be incorporated as |
| 18 | Ben King | Stakeholder | BaS | | 122+ | appear as extreme empirical support for the ancient sea bed and volcanic geochemistry. The potential adverse impact of another earth quake such as the 1975 Oroville earthquake on | appropriate |
| | | | | | | future water quality and water flows due to the presence of the Willows fault, the Colusa Dome and localized faults within the volcanic structure of the Sutter Buttes is foundationally addressed in Harwood and Helley (1987) "Late Cenozoic Tectonism of the Sacramento Valley, California" USGS Professional Paper 1359. The foundational research for the HCM should also include the work of Springhorn, Steven T. (2008) "Stratigraphic Analysis and Hydrogeologic Characterization of Cenozoic Strata in the Sacramento Valley near the Sutter Buttes" Springhorn's work is particullary important because much is not known about lateral depths or ground water quality of the fresh water aquifer at the southern boundary of the Basin. Springhorn suggests that the Sutter Buttes rampart extends in a 15 mile circumferential apron around the Buttes which would facilitate the lateral | |
| 19 | Ben King | Stakeholder | BaS | | 122+ | movement of connate seawater and trace elements 10 to 15 miles into the southern boundary of the Basin. | appropriate |
| 20 | Ben King | Stakeholder | BaS | 1.1.1.1 | 143+ | boundary. Butte Sink should be noted as a Groundwater Dependent Ecosystem. | Revise document based on comment to include reference to Butte Sink around line 144 |
| | | | | | | Springhom's thesis quoted in the Sutter County GMP should be included in this section. On Page 23 of the GMP "The Sutter Buttes Rampart consists largely of gravel, sand.silt and clay sediments which were deposited circumferentailly around the Buttes as a geologic apron. These sediments may extend up to 15 miles north and west beyond the Sacramento River". The depth of the southern portion of the Basin depends on the depth and stratigraphy of the geologic apron as it is | Information noted and will be incorporated as |
| 21 | Ben King | Stakeholder | BaS | 1.1.1.2 | 163+ | extends north from the Buttes. The topography of the elevational depression of the Butte Sink should be highlighted because it not | appropriate |
| 22 | Ben King | Stakeholder | BaS | 1.1.2 | 182+ | only manifests itself as a high water table but also as an area of highly flood flows. There should also be some reference to the presence of the housing on the east side of the Sacramento River and the confluence of Butte Creek and the Sacramento River overflow via the Colusa Weir on the southwestern portion of the Basin. Seasonal flooding commonly occurs on the south western | Information noted and will be incorporated as appropriate |
| | | o canonicos. | | | | It should be noted that surface water is being diverted from the Sacramento River by RD 1004 and also by other Settlement Countractors on the western boundary of the Basin. This will be an | No change proposed. The text includes RD 1004 as a |
| 23 | Ben King | Stakeholder | BaS | 1.1.2.3 | 238+ | subsitution, potential on-farm recharge opportunities and potential adverse lateral groundwater flows caused by pumping depressions. | surface water diverter from both Butte Creek and the Sacramento River. |
| | Ben King | Stakeholder | BaS | 1.1.2.4 | 254+ | The seasonal flooding from the common overflow via the Colusa Weir, Butte Creek and sometimes the Moulton Weir needs to be noted as it portains to the southwestern portion of the Basin. It should also be noted that these flows are interconnected with the operation and flows of the the Sutter Bypass. | |
| Г | Ŭ | | | | | It should be noted that the interplay between the northern façade of the Sutter Buttes Rampart and | Revise document based on comment to include |
| | Ben King Ben King | Stakeholder Stakeholder | BaS BaS | 1.1.3 | 329+ 346+ | of the Sutter Buttes Volcano from Hausback et al. | reference to Sutter Buttes in section 1.1.3 Information noted and will be incorporated as appropriate. |
| | | | | | | , , , , , | Revise document to add additional description of cross- |
| | Ben King Ben King | Stakeholder Stakeholder | BaS BaS | 1.1.6 | 546+ 621+ | interface of the Rampart Reference the Sutter Buttes Volcano Figure in Hausback et. al. | sections Revise document to incorporate comment |
| | | | | | | There is empirical evidence that connate seawater is moving laterally across the stratigraphic apron of the Sutter Buttes Rampart and contaminating the fresh water aquifer and has been for approximately 100 years. See "Sutter - Yuba Counties Investigation", SWRCB Bulliten No. 6. September 1952 Page 38, See Figure 19 of the Sutter County GMP regarding EC and arsenic levels, See reported arsenic levels for Grimes municipal water distict and Arsenic levels in the Yuba City groundwater supply for its sewage system as analyzed by the EPA. This lateral movement on the north facade of the Sutter Buttes is empirically supported by high arsenic levels in ESAC-21, ESAC-11, ESAC-5, ESAC-28 and ESAC-31 as reported in the USGS GAMA report by Schmitt et. al. | |
| 29 | Ben King | Stakeholder | BaS | 1.1.7.1 | 631+ | as cited above. See the Figures referenced for the USGS GAMA report by Schmitt et. al. for ESAC-21 regarding | appropriate. Information noted and will be incorporated as |
| 30 | Ben King | Stakeholder | BaS | 1.1.8.4 | 725+ | many extreme and concerning water quality observations. As mentioned above - the extent and depth of the Sutter Buttes Rampart, the movement of connate | appropriate. Recommendation noted and will be considered for |
| | Don Ki | Chalcel - Lil | DoC. | 110 | 751 | sea water along the stratigraphy of the Rampart and the contamination of the fresh water aquifer by | inclusion in the description of HCM data gaps and |
| | Ben King | Stakeholder | BaS | 1.1.9 | 751+ | the connate sea water and related contaminants are all HCM Data Gaps. Concern for the vertical gradient between the connate seawater and topographical depression of the Butte Sink. Concern that the lateral movement of the seawater and other contaminants will be agrivated by pumping depression relating to increased groundwater substitution by Settlement Contractors on the east side of the Sacramento River within the scope of the circumferential apron of | |
| 32 | Ben King | Stakeholder | BaS | 1.2.2.2 | 906+ | the Sutter Buttes Rampart. | through development of SMCs |

| # | Commenter Name | Commenter Organization | Chapter* (BaS or MoN) | Section | Line #s or Figure # | Comment | Proposed Action |
|----|-------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------|------------------------|--|--|
| 33 | Ben King | Stakeholder | BaS | 1.2.3 | 1042+ | For most of the 75 million years that comprises the geologic formation of the Butte Basin, the Basin was the location of a shallow salt water sea. The issues and mitigation needed to address seawater from the Sutter Buttes and seawater from a coastal site follow the same laws of chemistry and and uniquely different from a natural occuring contaminant that comes into solution. In fact to the extent that the connate sea water is anoxic the chemisty and biochemistry of seawaters interaction with fresh water is the same as the interaction of seawater and freshwater on a coastal site. It is interesting to think that the spread of arsenic from the Sutter Buttes may have the same biochemical genisus as the spread of arsenate in Chesapeake Bay which anoxic seawater intermixes with oxidized fresh water. The laws of physics and chemistry are the same on the coast or in the valley. NA and CL ions act the same in all sea water. The question is whether or not we should start from the perspective from a couple of geologic minutes or analyze from the perspective of geologic hours. The complexity of the geology of the Sutter Buttes demands the perspective gained from continium of time and not just the arrogance of trying to short circuit the proper analytical framework. | Concern noted and can be taken into consideration through development of SMCs |
| 34 | Ben King | Stakeholder | BaS | 1.2.4 | 1049+ | There is a long history of groundwater contamination from the lateral movement of seawater brines and arsenic to the south of the Sutter Buttes as documented in the Yuba -Sutter Investigations Bulletin No. 6 and the Sutter County GMP. ESAC-21 contaminant levels are extreme. GAMA arsenic level observations for ESAC-21, 11,5,28, and 31 give the impression that the geological apron of the Sutter Buttes Rampart is contaminating fresh water in the southern portion of the Basin. | Information noted and will be incorporated as appropriate. |
| | | | | | | | |
| 35 | Ben King | Stakeholder | BaS | 1.3.3.3 | 1543+ | Potential increases in groundwater pumping caused by groundwater substitution by Settlement Contractors water transfer sales should be considered in the analysis. | Concern noted and can be taken into consideration through development of SMC or through PMAs These issues are covered by the more general bullet, |
| 36 | Ben King | Stakeholder | MoN | 1.1.1 | 35 - 42 | Possibly one bullet point highlighting the need to protect the water availability and water quality for the Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems in the Basin. Highlight the importance of Gray Lodge and the Butte Sink in general. Other is to protect water quality and quantity for the domestic well users specifically highlighting the neighboring SDAC residents | "Monitor impacts to the beneficial uses and users of groundwater." since beneficial uses/users include GDEs and domestic well users. No proposed change to the text. |
| 37 | Ben King | Stakeholder | MoN | | 82+ | Please refer to my comments in the Chapter section. The question is the right foundational approach to mitigate potential problems. Connate seawater is seawater not salts that have come into solution. Gravity pushes seawater along stratigraphic layers the same irrespective if it is on the Coast or in the valley. Pumping pulls seawater the same irrespective if it is on the coast or in the valley. Please look closely at the GAMA observations for ESAC-21 near the intersection of Butte Creek and Laux Road since this is the heart of the Butte Sink GDE. The Carbon Dating observations seem to validate that this water is connate and the water quality related observations are extreme and very concerning. The comparison to other GAMA sites is alarming - something is going on at this site and the monitoring network needs to be set up to mitigate the spread of contaminants. See the USGS report by Schmitt et. al. cited in the Chapter and referenced below: As cited in Basin Setting Chapter Comments, Springer has identified the Sutter Buttes Rampart as a | Approach regarding SMCs for Seawater intrusion vs. Water Quality will be raised for discussion by the BAB/GSAs. Information noted and will be incorporated as appropriate. |
| 38 | Ben King | Stakeholder | MoN | 1.1.4.1 | 217+ | geologic apron with a circumference of 15 miles north and west of the Sutter Buttes. This apron extends below the southern portion of the Basin and there is evidence of sea water and arsenic contamination near or within the Basin. This problem has been identified in the 1930's as existing south of the Sutter Buttes in State Water Board Bulletin No. 6 (see cite in Chapter Comments) and recently identified in the Sutter County GMP. The arsenic contamination identified by the EPA in the Yuba City sewage system groundwater supply and the elevated arsenic levels in the Grimes water system also seem to be coming from the lateral movement of seawater from the Buttes. 2006 GAMA observations in ESAC- 21, ESAC-11,ESAC-5, ESAC-28, and ESAC31 indicate the northerly movement of arsenic | |
| 39 | Ben King | Stakeholder | MoN | | | Specific attention should be focused on all of the quality observation in the USGS report of Schmitt, Fram, Dawson and Belitz (2008) "Ground-Water Quality Data in the Middle Sacramento Valley Study Unit, 2006 - Results from The California GAMA Program - USGS in cooperation of the SWRCB - see in particular the 2006 results for GAMA well ESAC- 21 - See Table 9 Major and Minor Ions - Cloride 626 mg/L, TDS 1290, Table 10 Trace Elements - Arsenic 80.6 ug/L, Boron 1010 ug/L, Table 4 Water Quality Indicators Specific Conductance 2370 uS/cm, Table 13 Nitrogen and Oygen Isotopes O of Dissolved Carbonates + 5.57 per. mil and Carbon - 14 - 11 % modern. The GAMA Site ESAC-21 is the nearest measurement site north of the Sutter Buttes near the intersection of Butte Creek and Laux Road. | Information noted and will be considered for incorporation into monitoring network and support of SMC development |
| | | | | | | Monitoring sites should be placed in a circumferential pattern away from the Sutter Buttes consistent with the expected span of the Sutter Buttes Rampart Formation. Particular attention should be on the potential for contamination of the water suppy for the Butte Sink and Gray Lodge since it is | Recommendation noted and will be considered for |
| | Ben King Ben King | Stakeholder Stakeholder | MoN | | | closest to the Sutter Buttes. As pumping increases for groundwater substitution by Settlement Contractors on the east side of the Sacramento River these monitoring sites should be assess whether the pumping depressions agrivate any potential spread of these contaminants across the GDE areas and potentially into domestic wells of residents in the SDAC area of the east side of the Sacramento River in Colusa County. | inclusion of PMAs for additional monitoring Information noted and will be considered for incorporation into monitoring network and support of SMC development |
| | Ben King | Stakeholder | MoN | | | Some provision should be made in the area of the Colusa Dome since there is a potential interaction | · |

| # | - 1 | | | Chapter* (BaS or MoN) | ISection | Line #s or Figure # | Comment | Proposed Action |
|---|-----------|----------|-------------|--------------------------|----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|
| | 43 E | Ben King | Stakeholder | MoN | | | the highest in the Sacramento Valley. Monitoring should be made to protect the domestic wells on | |
| t | \dagger | | | | | | | |

*Abbreviate BaS for Basin Setting Chapter and MoN for Monitoring Network Chapter

BBGM- Butte Basin Groundwater Model; *GDE-* Groundwater Dependent Ecosystem; *HCM*- Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model; *PMA- Project and Management Action; *SMC-* Sustainable Management Criteria

*Document version 10/15/2020