| Number | Document | Chapter | Table  | Page  | Figure    | Date     | Commenter                          | Comment   | DW response   | Status  |
|--------|----------|---------|--------|-------|-----------|----------|------------------------------------|---|---|---|
|        |          | опарто. | 10.0.0 | 1 484 | 1 18011 0 | 2.00     |                                    |   |   |   |
| 6-1    | 180-400  | 6       |        |       |           | 6/6/2019 | Director Brennan                   | It would be good to note that the Water Budget chapter will be updated when the model becomes available.  |   | Text Added  |
| 6-2    | 180-400  | 6       |        |       |           | 6/6/2019 | Director Granillo                  | Questioned the accurate use of the period that included State mandatory restrictions in the water budget,   | D. Williams stated that the historical water budget covers to 2014 because that is the date the historical model went to; therefore the projected model started in 2015.  | Question Answered   |
| 6-3    | 180-400  | 6       |        |       |           | 6/6/2019 | Director Secondo                   |   | D. Williams stated that at some point, we refer to historical as 1964 forward because we are looking at data not in the water budget. However, he will review this.   | No reference to 1964 found in document. Future water budget is based on 47 year period starting in Octobver 1967  |
| 6-4    | 180-400  | 6       |        |       |           | 6/6/2019 | Director Secondo                   | water budgets, because the numbers do not match well.   | D. Williams will more clearly point out that the method of creating short term water budgets is good for for long-term periods which average climatic cycles, but not for the short-term water budget when there are a couple of extreme years, and estimates of inflows and outflows do not match. | Text added to Section 6.1 to help clarify the difference between the historical and current water budgets   |
| 6-5    | 180-400  | 6       |        |       |           | 6/6/2019 | Director Secondo                   | groundwater budget. He would like to include 2012-2014 for  | 2012 throung 2014 is part of the historical water budget, the current water budget is for years other than those  | Question Answered   |
| 6-6    | 180-400  | 6       | 29-Jun | 33    |           | 6/6/2019 | Director Secondo                   |   | Will correct this typographical error.  | Corrected   |
| 6-7    | 180-400  | 6       |        |       |           | 6/6/2019 | Nancy Isakson                      |   |   |   |
| 6-8    | 180-400  | 6       |        |       |           | 6/6/2019 | Director Brennan                   | Would like to differentiate between the General Plan projects and imminent projects that currently total 23,000 units and that are not all reflected in urban water management plans. She would like a definition of "existing land use." | Check on the presumption on urban growth and if not in the calculations, include a statement about the uncertainties or   | Text added to state that no urban growth is modeled to remain consistent with USGS model. Additional explanation added regarding the impact of this assumption. |
| 6-9    | 180-400  | 6       |        |       |           | 6/6/2019 | Director Secondo                   | Believes we are losing too much on the evapotranspiration (ET) demand.  | Would like more feedback on this from<br>Director Secondo   |   |
| 6-10   | 180-400  | 6       |        |       |           |          | Nancy Isakson;<br>Director Brennan | State the sustainable yield will be revised based on monitoring.  | Will include  | Text added to Sections 6.8.4 and 6.10.6   |

| Number | Document | Chapter | Table     | Page | Figure | Date     | Commenter                            | Comment  | DW response   | Status   |
|--------|----------|---------|-----------|------|--------|----------|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 6-11   | 180-400  | 6       |           |      |        |          | Directors Brennan                    | Chapter 8 should explain that the future water budget is based on  | Will explain that the water budgets will  | Text added to Section 6.1                            |
|        |          |         |           |      |        |          | and Secondo                          | the Salinas Valley Integrated Hydrologic Model (SVIHM) and the   | correlate better when the historical model is   |  |
|        |          |         |           |      |        |          |                                      | historical water budget is based on historical data. Once the  | available   |  |
|        |          |         |           |      |        |          |                                      | SVIHM historical model is received, this will be simpler.  |   |  |
| 6-12   | 180-400  | 6       |           |      |        | 6/6/2019 | Derrik Williams                      | Typo on Future Water Budget slide/table 6-31   | Correct to reflect 2030 and 2070 instead of 2030 and 2030.  | Corrected  |
| 6-13   | 180-400  | 6       | 6-20;6-31 |      |        | 6/6/2019 | Director Secondo;<br>Derrik Williams | Director Secondo like to see the current year also.  | Will move the 96,000 AFY to this table; could compare all 3 sustainable yields in a single chart  | Historical sustainable yield data adde to Table 6-31 |
| 6-14   | 180-400  | 6       |           |      |        | 6/6/2019 | Directors Secondo<br>and Brennan     | Director Secondo would like to see the current and projected water budgets together in the report for easier viewing. Director Brennan stated it should be foot noted so as not to mislead the reader, because they are based on different data.   |   | Done   |
| 6-15   | 180-400  | 6       | 6-4       |      |        | 6/6/2019 | Director Secondo                     | Blanco Drain has a typo in the number (zeros)  | Will correct  | Corrected  |
| 6-16   | 180-400  | 6       | 6-25      |      |        | 6/6/2019 | Director Secondo                     | Should it say outflow instead of inflow  |   | Inflow is correct                                    |
| 6-17   | 180-400  | 6       | 6-20      |      |        | 6/6/2019 | Nancy Isakson                        | Would like a comment on Table 6-20 explaining what is included and to what extent.   |   |  |
| 6-18   | 180-400  | 6       | 6-5       |      |        | 6/6/2019 | Nancy Isakson; Tom<br>Virsik         | Isakson: There is no true river diversion by ag in the pressure area and the results skew accuracy of report.; Virsik: Is there double counting from the WRA and State reports   | Relying on reports to the State   | Question Answered                                    |
| 6-19   | 180-400  | 6       |           |      |        | 6/6/2019 | Tom Virsik                           | Any lower real performance numbers should be used in future instead of projections. On policy issues, the assumptions could come back as management actions. He finds it odd not to use DWR Bulletin 52 appendices. The Plan should be made to work well now and curtailed if beyond what is needed. |   | Comments noted                                       |
| 6-20   | 180-400  | 6       |           |      |        | 6/6/2019 | Nancy Isakson                        | Need reconciliation between USGS model that does not include surface water diversion when presenting comparison.   | In response to Ms. Isakson, Mr. Williams stated that the USGS model includes crops that need to be irrigated. But he cannot answer how much groundwater the USGS model assumes is needed for crops or whether we can figure out if it balances out. | Question Answered                                    |