Response to Comments Received on December 20, 2013 version

Commenter No.	Comment No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
1	1	Atascadero	Atascadero Creek - Mid Salinas River - Water Management Entities Santa Margarita does not overlie the Paso Robles basin or the Atascadero sub-basin. I believe the wells tap into the alluvium of Yerba Buena creek. I don't believe there is any Paso Robles Formation in Santa Margarita	Parts of Santa Margarita (Garden Farms, for example) are reported to overlie the Atascadero Sub Basin of the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin and "are extremely dependant on that water source". Useful maps can be found in the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Management Plan and through the Blue Ribbon Committee's website at: http://prwaterbasin.wordpress.com/about-the-basin/
	2		Atascadero Creek - Mid Salinas River - Recycled Water Change to Atascadero sub-basin	Corrected
2	3	San Simeon - Renee Samaniego	We were completely left out of the study. Cambria and Hearst Ranch were mentioned but there was no connection to our watershed and to the Big Creek Watershed. Is Pico Creek not connected?	This was a data compilation project. Any data published about this watershed by the San Simeon CSD, San Luis Obispo County or otherwise was included in the compilation effort. To remain consistent with the CalWater HUC 10 watershed scale, Pico Creek was included in the San Simeon - Arroyo De La Cruz watershed grouping. Big Creek is in a separate grouping, again remaining consistent with CalWater and the HUC 10 scale.

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

3	4	Carrie Burton	Excerpt fromemail dated 12-30-13,"The County of San Luis Obispo is discussing the watershed of Chorro Creek which includes the subterranean stream, aquifer and Chorro Creek". "....the County is not acknowledging the Coastal Commission's enforcement on the Roandoak building, its illegal wells (ie the new one and the abandoned 9A).	The Watershed Snap Shots are a collection of basic existing information for land/water management to be used by the community. They do not capture policy and regulation or how these decisions impact natural resources. The RCDs understand that policy and regulation are important. We hope that the Snap Shots will raise awareness around water issues and spur future conversations on how our knowledge can improve water management, among other issues. The Resource Conservation Districts are organizations independent of the County that strive to improve natural resource management through voluntary stewardship. We have no enforcement power.
			Excerpt from letter dated 12-30-13, "The County of San Luis Obispo Planning stating that they will not enforce the violations, and the County Health department not enforcing the illegal wells, is very serious."	See Response #3.
	5			
4	6	Linda Chipping	Correct all watershed planning areas.	These were corrected throughout the snapshots based on the Master Water Report.
	7		Climate Change section of entire document It is time and page consuming to redundantly give same general climate change information for each watershed. Climate Change information should only be provided if there is specific information relevant to the watershed. Otherwise, the notation to refer to the IRWM Plan 2014, Section X is adequate.	All Watershed Snapshots already following this format. Because snapshots are intended to be untilzed as a combned or segmented resource, we felt it was important to provide complete information for each snapshot.

8	TABLE OF CONTENTS Add: Arroyo Grande Creek Watershed Alamo Creek Watershed Page 1, Water Planning Area Cuyama WPA 7, correct to Huasna Valley WPA 8 Groundwater Basin : I'll bet there is none, but the county Master Water Report labels it Huasna Valley basin	This comment only applied to the public comment version. The watershed is included in the final report. All South County WPA were corrected. All South County Groundwater Basins were corrected to reflect the Master Water Report. The original information was pulled from County GIS shapefile which were incorrectly labeled.
9	Alamo Creek Watershed page 1, Description edits: Kettle Creek spelling should be corrected to KENNEL Creek Add Los Machos Creek (blue line), which drains into Kennel Creek, as a major tributary Add Branch Creek (blue line), which drains directly into Alamo Creek. (Branch Creek is identified/named later in the document at pages 5 & 7) Little Jolo spelling should be corrected to JOLLO	The spelling corrections were made. Branch Creek was already listed and Los Machos Creek was added.
10 11	Page 2, Physical Setting Add Los Machos Creek to Geology Description and correct spelling for Little Jollo Creek	Additional geology information was added for the Alamos Creek watershed that encompasses Los Machos Creek. More information on the geology landscape unit categories is included in the full report.

	Page 3, Land Use Jurisdictions & Local Communities: Add Los Padres National Forest, since it easily comprises 70% of the watershed. They are responsible for the roads and other enforcement activities in the Nat'l Forest, as examples of their jurisdiction.	The U.S. Forest Service is included on pg 1 under jurisdictions. This cell on pg 4 is meant to call out cities and communities not every jurisdiction.
12	There are 2 open campgrounds (Baja and Buck Spring in that watershed, and the forest service web site notes that recreational uses are hunting, mountain biking and OHV use in those areas. Therefore, need to take into account impacts from those uses- vegetation destruction, increased sediment/erosion vulnerability from legitimate and illegitimate off road travel.	These land uses were added to the description on pg. 1
13	Page 5, Watershed Codes Little Jolo spelling should be corrected to JOLLO	This spelling was corrected.
14	Page 7, Watershed Codes Little Jolo spelling should be corrected to JOLLO	This spelling was corrected.
15		

	Page 8, Critical Issues Upland Erosion and Habitat degradation: Potential causes recreational/OHV use. I'm not familiar with the Twitchell Management Authority document, but believe that the Forest Service would be a better source of discussion of upland critical issues. It's easy to see that sediment/erosion in some of those upper drainages would not impact the reservoir, but would impact forest health.	This primary issues list only includes published issues ideally vetted by the community. It was not part of our scope of work to evaluating all the potential issues in a watershed.
16	Arroyo Grande Creek Watershed Page 1 Water Planning Area – Five Cities WPA 5, correct to WPA 7 South Coast Groundwater Basin(s) – Remove San Luis Obispo Valley as a groundwater basin. The Edna Valley subbasin, although in WPA 7 by virtue of a political line, is not in the Arroyo Grande Creek Watershed. The Edna Valley subbasin drains to Pismo Creek Watershed.	All South County WPA were corrected. All South County Groundwater Basins were corrected to reflect the Master Water Report. The original information was pulled from County GIS shapefile which were incorrectly labeled. Based on these sources, it looks like the Edna Valley basin extends to the Terminal Reservoir in Arroyo Grande Creek Watershed. This area is on the border of the Pismo and Arroyo Grande Creek watersheds. If you are aware of a more detailed study of the Edna Valley basin that clearly describes the extent of the basin, please let the RCD know.
17	Show Arroyo Grande Creek as a subbasin of the Santa Maria River Valley basin.	All South County Groundwater Basins were corrected to reflect the Master Water Report.
18		

	Jurisdictions: Add California Department of Parks and Recreation. (Pismo State Beach is a beach on the Pacific coast of California. It is approximately 17 miles long and fronts the towns of Pismo Beach, Grover Beach, and Oceano. This includes the campgrounds and golf course. This does NOT include the SVRA area, most of it is in a different watershed.)	Keeping in line with the intent, Pismo State Beach was added.
19		
	Description: ADD to the last sentence, …a regional airport in Oceano.	This suggestion was added.
20		
	Page 7, Land Use: Add Ca Dept Parks and Recreation to Jurisdictions and Local Communities. Facilities Present: Add - Oceano Airport. Commercial Uses: modify the sentence, by adding the blue wording. “Recreation and tourism at Lake Lopez, City of Arroyo Grande, State Park Beaches and Oceano Dunes SVRA entrance.”	The Pismo State Park was added to og 1 under jurisdictions. This cell on pg 4 is meant to call out cities and communities not every jurisdiction. Airport was added to the facilities. Commercial wording was altered.
21		
	Page 8, Disadvantaged Communities: EDIT to Yes, Oceano.	This suggestion was added.
22		

	Page 8, Water Supply Water Management Entities: ADD Northern Cities Management Area to the list. Someplace the composition of the NCMA should be identified, with an * and listed below the table. Basin groundwater users in the Northern Cities Management Area include City of Pismo Beach, City of Arroyo Grande, City of Grover Beach, Oceano Community Services District, small public water systems (including Halcyon Water Unified School District), and residential and agricultural overlying users.	This suggestion was added.
23	Page 13, Critical Issues Erosion and Sedimentation Flood Management Lack of capacity of the flood control channel	Under Flood Management, we added the following "sedimentation in the flood control channel results in reduced capacity"
24	Bibliography: Edit the 2009 date to the correct March 2005 date for the CCSE AG Watershed Mgmt Plan.	The date was corrected.
25	Coastal Irish Hills Watershed Suggest that this be retitled to: Irish Hills Coastal Watersheds. Use the plural to clearly identify several watersheds. Using “Irish Hills Coastal” would be consistent with terminology used by the Coastal Conservancy Conservation Plan.	This suggestion will be added after the IRWMP public comment period due to the need to update all maps accordingly.
26		

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

	Page 1 Water Planning Area Page 1, Description Suggest edit to 1st sentence: The Irish Hills Coastal Watersheds are located in the San Luis Range, along the remote San Luis Obispo County coastline between the communities of Los Osos in the north and Avila Beach in the south.	The suggestion was added.
27		
	Jurisdictions: ADD California Department of Parks and Recreation. (Montana de Oro State Park, at 8,000+ acres, and about 85% of that in the Irish Hills, has a hunk of the	The suggestion was added.
28	landscape responsibility)	
	Page 6, Land Use, Jurisdictions: ADD California Department of Parks and Recreation	The State Park was added to pg 1 under jurisdictions. This cell on is meant to call out cities and communities not every jurisdiction.
29		
	Page 9 Watershed Health by Major Groundwater Basin This shows the Los Osos Basin, but the LO basin is not in the Irish Hills watershed. On page 1, it is stated that there is no groundwater basin in this watershed. Therefore, delete this.	This was corrected based on the Master Water Report.
30		

	WATERSHED SNAPSHOTS – NORTH COAST A watershed is the whole region from which a river receives its supply of water. There are several instances throughout the document where the term "watershed" is used incorrectly, resulting in needless confusion. In most cases several proper watersheds of individual creeks are lumped as a mythical and incorrect "watershed" in which the waters of the proper watersheds are not connected in any way. As the entire document is meant to address watersheds in the proper and correct sense, this is a major error.	This grouping of creeks was used to remain consistent with the nationally recognized CalWater Hydrologic Unit Classification scale (HUC 10). This was the scale selected at the onset of this project by the Technical Advisory Committee. We have altered the names of some of these watershed groupings (e.g. Big Creek Watershed was altered to "Big Creek - San Carpoforo" watershed) to reflect the inclusion of specific local creeks whose boundaries are shared between San Luis Obispo and Monterey County(s).
31	Starting at page 1, San Carpoforo Creek is lumped into Big Creek Watershed. At page 13, Villa Creek is lumped with Santa Rosa Creek, even though each has a distinct entrance to the ocean. Right after that the Cayucos Creek "Watershed" involves discussion of the completely independent Morro Creek, Toro Creek and Old Creek.	This grouping of creeks was used to remain consistent with the nationally recognized CalWater Hydrologic Unit Classification scale (HUC 10). This was the scale selected at the onset of this project by the Technical Advisory Committee. Some snapshot names were changed to reflect creek groupings (e.g. Cayucos Creek was changed to "Cayucos Creek - Whale Rock Area Watershed).
32	It does a disservice to watershed planning when real, actual watersheds are lumped into inaccurate "watershed" descriptions. If the goal is to be useful in the development of management plans for specific areas sharing a common water source, by definition it should be by watershed. At the very least it should follow the watershed definitions of DWR Bulletin #118. True watersheds are the basis of planning for steelhead recovery and a legal limitation to the export of water.	This grouping of creeks (i.e. watershed) was used to remain consistent with the nationally recognized CalWater Hydrologic Unit Classification scale (HUC 10). This was the scale selected at the onset of this project by the Technical Advisory Committee.
33		

	Watersheds that are identified DWR Region Basin and sub basins should have their own descriptions. For example, San Carpoforo Creek, Arroyo de la Cruz, San Simeon, Santa Rosa Creek, Villa Creek, Cayucos, Old Creek, Toro Creek and Morro Creek.	This grouping of creeks (i.e. watershed) was used to remain consistent with the nationally recognized CalWater Hydrologic Unit Classification scale (HUC 10). This was the scale selected at the onset of this project by the Technical Advisory Committee. Expanded data on these individual creeks could be a goal of phase 2 of this project.
34	There is an inconsistency in the treatment of the watersheds in the North Coast Region compared to those of the North County Region. The North County region has had its major watershed basins diced up. On the North Coast, most water is in small shallow aquifers surrounded by large areas of impermeable and dry bedrock. Many drainages, such as Little Pico Creek are 'islands unto themselves' and require specific management planning. North Coast watersheds deserve better representation.	This grouping of creeks (i.e. watershed) was used to remain consistent with the nationally recognized CalWater Hydrologic Unit Classification scale (HUC 10). This was the scale selected at the onset of this project by the Technical Advisory Committee.
35	The Hydrologic Unit Name and Water Planning Area information boxes at the beginning of each watershed page provide 'broad brush', regional information. The SLO County IRWM Watershed document should scale down to and focus on the county's watersheds.	The purpose of the first page of the snapshot is to give an overview of the watershed and how it fits into the world both within the County and beyond it. The specific characteristics of each watershed grouping that only focus on occurances within SLO County are highlighted in each snapshot.
36		

	Big Creek Watershed This is a large scale HUC 10 Frontal Pacific Ocean regional grouping. It is composed of 7 distinct watersheds, 6 of which are along the Big Sur coast in Monterey County. Those 6 drain steep, coastal slopes. San Carpoforo is the 7th, where the lower portion of the weatershed is relatively flat, cutting through a marine terrace. San Carpoforo Creek is a SLO watershed that is recognized by federal and state agencies and governmental departments.	This grouping of creeks (i.e. watershed) was used to remain consistent with the nationally recognized CalWater Hydrologic Unit Classification scale (HUC 10). This was the scale selected at the onset of this project by the Technical Advisory Committee.
37		
	DELETE: Big Creek Watershed and change to San Carpoforo Creek Watershed.	This grouping of creeks (i.e. watershed) was used to remain consistent with the nationally recognized CalWater Hydrologic Unit Classification scale (HUC 10). This was the scale selected at the onset of this project by the Technical Advisory Committee. We have altered the names of some of these watershed groupings (e.g. Big Creek Watershed was altered to "Big Creek - San Carpoforo" watershed) to reflect the inclusion of specific local creeks whose HUC 10
38		
	The acreage of the entire San Carpoforo Creek watershed is 29,316 acres in area (see South-Central Ca Coast Steelhdead Recovery Plan, Dec 2013), with approx half of it in San Luis Obispo County.	The Big Creek - San Carporforo Area Watershed described in this project only includes data relevent to San Luis Obispo County. The HUC 10 scale includes Chris Flood Creek and Mount Mars Creek in addition to Upper and Lower San Carpoforo Creek.
39		
	It should be noted that that Polar Star Mine (mercury) and its status, is located in the upper watershed.	Aside from a quick mention in an opinion-piece document from the Cambria Historic Society, our research team has not identified published documents about this mine. This could be further explored in phase 2 of this project.
40		

41	DELETE all Special Status Wildlife and Plant information that is keyed to locations in Monterey County.	This has been corrected in the special status species table submitted to Kelly on 1/21. Big Creek table was limited to USGS quads that overlap this HUC 10 for SLO County Only.
42	Cayucos Creek Watershed This is not correct. Old Creek, Toro Creek and Morro Creek (spelling incorrect in description) are separate, distinct watersheds. DELETE these.	This grouping of creeks (i.e. watershed) was used to remain consistent with the nationally recognized CalWater Hydrologic Unit Classification scale (HUC 10). This was the scale selected at the onset of this project by the Technical Advisory Committee. Some snapshot names were changed to reflect specific creek groupings (e.g. Cayucos Creek - Whale Rock Area Watershed).
43	ADD: Morro Creek Watershed It should have a separate watershed section. It is geomorphologically, historically, culturally, economically and politically aligned with the City of Morro Bay. The terminus of Morro Creek watershed is within the city limits. The city has wells in the basin. Before the realignment of the Morro Bay harbor entrance, Morro Creek flowed into the mouth of the bay.	This grouping of creeks (i.e. watershed) was used to remain consistent with the nationally recognized CalWater Hydrologic Unit Classification scale (HUC 10). This was the scale selected at the onset of this project by the Technical Advisory Committee. Based on advise from the Techical Advisory Committee, the Morro Creek Watershed was grouped with the Cayucos Area Watersheds in part because of similarities in the physical landscape units.

	ADD: Old Creek Watershed, Whale Rock reservoir is an important county water resource with significant water planning and management considerations. It should not be lumped. Even SLO Public Works uses a different descriptive – they call Old Creek watershed the 'Whale Rock Reservoir Watershed'. (See their reservoir report)	This grouping of creeks (i.e. watershed) was used to remain consistent with the nationally recognized CalWater Hydrologic Unit Classification scale (HUC 10). This was the scale selected at the onset of this project by the Technical Advisory Committee. Some snapshot names were changed to reflect specific creek groupings (e.g. Cayucos Creek - Whale Rock Area Watershed).
44		
	Morro Bay Watershed Page 1, Water Planning Area WPA 7, correct to WPA 8 South Coast Groundwater Basin	This comment does not seem to relate to this watershed.
45		
	Page 1 Water Planning Area – WPA 3, correct to WPA 4 Chorro Valley Basin AND WPA 5 Los Osos Valley Basin	WPA were corrected.
46		
	Flows to: It should be noted that it flows to Pacific Ocean via Morro Bay estuary.	This suggestion was added.
47		
	Jurisdictions: ADD California Department of Parks and Recreation. They are listed as a basin water user (Ref A, pg 19) and its size, 2,700 acres with legal authority over it, warrants their listing. Also, Los Padres National Forest. It is the uppermost part of the Chorro watershed.	This suggestion was added.
48		

	Description: The Morro Bay Watershed is a coastal basin located in northern San Luis Obispo County. Recommended edit: The Morro Bay Watershed is located in the central area of coastal San Luis Obispo County.	This suggestion was added.
49	ADD Camp San Luis Obispo as a developed facility. Also, Morro Bay State Park and El Chorro Regional Park (700 acres) should be listed as examples of large recreational park areas.	We added Camp San Luis Obispo to the description. It is already listed under Facilities. We added El Chorro Regional Park to commericial uses and added Morro Bay State Park to Other Unique Characteristics
50	Watershed Plans: The user of this document should know the earliest plans for this watershed were performed. Therefore, the following should be listed. They have been the basis/foundation for activity in the watershed.	We do not list every study completed in a watershed. We added "Due to the uniqueness of Morro Bay, the watershed has been studied since the late 1980's with watershed plans from that era being completed and forming the foundation for current activities." to the description to address your comment.
51	Morro Bay Watershed Enhancement Plan, San Luis Obispo County, California (USDA SCS 1989) Erosion and Sediment Study Morro Bay Watershed (USDA SCS 1989)	
52		

	Page 3, Special Status Wildlife and Plants Why is only steelhead trout spelled out at the top of this section? Red Legged Frog is on Chorro Flats and other places in the watersheds, documented during CF restoration. It should be listed under the steelhead trout. Perhaps every listing that occurs below which is shown in BOLD should be listed at the top of this section?	Steelhead trout is listed in the CNDDB chart and was removed from the top of the cell. Meg's comment: Initially in the tables, we bolded all species that had FESA and CESA rankings. It appears that the bold scheme was kept in the south county snapshots but not in north county and was not spelled out in the key. We had done this because species listed under either endangered species act have a higher level of protection that species listed as special animals, special concern, or rare plant rank alone. It appears the bold may have created some confusion. Replace bolded species in North County and North Coast. Include description in key
53	Page 8, Other Environmental Resources ADD: Chorro Flats (At its size and functions, and public ownership, is certainly as unique and comparable to the Sweet Springs Preserve or Elfin Forest in importance. Perhaps the Nine Sisters of SLO is more appropriately noted on p. 10 at Other Unique Characteristics.	Chorro Flats was added. The Nine Sisters was not moved.
54	Page 8, Jurisdictions and Local Communities ADD all those listed on page 1 jurisdictions, and include State Parks.	This cell on is meant to call out cities and communities not every jurisdiction.
55		

	Page 9, Surface Water EDIT: It should be noted that Chorro Reservoir is owned by Camp San Luis Obispo. Cal Poly has some small reservoirs on its ranchlands in the watershed. Do you want the report that Cal Poly prepared in 2005 for RWQCB on water quality mgmt?	Section was reworded as "Chorro Reservoir owned by Camp San Luis Obispo and operated by California Men's Colony;. Small reservoirs on agricultural lands."
56		
	Page 10, Other Unique Characteristics, Other The Nine Sisters, a line of volcanic plugs, dominate the landscape from Morro Rock through the City of San Luis Obispo. Morro Rock (576 ft.) is the Pacific terminus, with Black Hill (665 ft.), Cabrillo Peak (911 ft.), Hollister Peak (1,404 ft.) in the Morro Bay watershed.	This suggestion was added.
57		
	Additional Comment Time constraints permitted only a cursory review of the North County Region section of the watershed document. However, I did note the following:	
58		
	Indian Valley Watershed This is a sub watershed of the Salinas Watershed. Indian Valley Creek terminates on the east side of the Salinas River in Monterey County. Therefore, DELETE this watershed.	Special status species tables for the SLO County portion of the HUC 10 Indian Valley watershed were updated to just the quadrangles that overlap the watershed in SLO County.
59		
	Description: The statement that the majority of the town of San Miguel is in Indian Creek Valley Watershed is incorrect. It is in the Salinas Valley.	This is a function of the naming system used with the CalWater HUC10 scale, and can be clarified by using a different name for this reach of the Salinas.
60		

5	61	David Chippin	As a member of WRAC, and the author of a geology field guide used in portions of the watershed document, my intent was to review and verify that information was used accurately.	
	62		This commentary is a result of a quick look-through of the North County region watersheds. It does not represent, in any way, a thorough edit of the document. In many cases, where my comments concern the readability pertaining to a certain data field in a particular watershed, it could probably extend to the same data field in other watersheds. The error level appears to be high.	
	63		In general each watershed should have a sketch map that shows the labeled locations of each sub watershed mentioned in the subsequent text.	Interactive map on the website (www.slowatershedproject.org) will help clarify these locations.

64	p.1 Black Sulphur Springs Watershed. This does not exist as described. A drainage divide occurs on the floor of the SE extension of the Carrizo Plain, so that all drainage goes to Soda lake north of the divide, and to a closed drainage near the Elkhorn/Soda Lake junction to the southeast. Statements in this section about use of Soda Lake for recreation and fishing are wrong, as it has never served this purpose. Some drainages on the east side of the southernmost part of Elkhorn Road flow towards Maricopa but have steep headwaters in SLO County. The southern portion of the Elkhorn Plain is essentially a closed basin. The following sentence makes no sense: "The watershed, like the adjacent Soda Lake watershed is an alkali endoheic (closed) basin with no outflow beyond Soda Lake." as it first establishes separation from Soda Lake (correct) and then includes Soda Lake in discussion of basin outflow. The term 'endoheic' is incorrect and is correctly 'endorheic', but use of the term is overly jargonistic when a simple 'closed saline basin' is sufficient. The picture is from the Soda Lake watershed.	We provided some corrections to the description of uses of Soda Lake and recommended that the repeated material regarding the lake be moved out of the Black Sulphur Spring snapshot. Saline basin language was clarified. The picture was incorrectly labeled by Althouse and Meade, and it was correctly replaced with a correctly labeled photo from Elkhorn Plain in Black Sulphur Spring. Removed all other Soda Lake references from the Snapshot.

	p.2-3 shows significant confusion with the Soda lake watershed, such as the statement about Vaqueros rock monoliths. Statements like "Beam Flat, Abbot Canyon, Goat Spring, and Cottonwood Spring are composed of moderate steep moderately infiltrative early to mid-Tertiary headwaters and flat highly infiltrative Quaternary inland" defy logical parsing. The hydrology model reference (North Coast Engineering 2008) is for areas north of Soda Lake in a different watershed.	Hydrology models for solar projects were in the Soda Lake watershed, and generally only the northern part, and were removed from the Black Sulphur snapshot.
65		
	Many of the subsequent pages up to page 21 appear to be a copy and paste from the Soda Lake Watershed.	Removed references to Soda Lake from Black Sulphur Springs
66		
	p.13 Soda Lake Watershed encompasses essentially the central and northern portions of Carrizo Plain Nat'l Mon. (CPNM) Water from the Padrone Springs Road and Corrals area, plus the Padrone Springs Valley behind Traver Ranch, and the Elkhorn Plain from White Rocks northward - all contribute to Soda Lake. The same errors on uses of Soda Lake are repeated.	We provided some corrections to the description of uses of Soda Lake. Saline basin language was clarified.
67		
	The dominant land use is not agriculture (it was dry land grain years ago, but is now either CPNM, rural residential or solar plant, with dry land grain only existing at the extreme north end. Parts of the area are used as range.	Until very recently, much of the Soda Lake watershed was range and dry agriculture. Rangeland uses are agricultural uses. Dominant land uses were changed to reflect grazing and solar farm activities.
68		
	Air temperature is wrong if 88F is considered a high, which is routinely above 100F for about +/- 4 months of the year.	These values were calculated by averaging the high temperature from summer months
69		

	p.14 The sentence "Painted Rock, Goodwin Ranch and San Diego Creek are moderate steep moderately infiltrative early to mid-Tertiary headwaters and are flat and highly infiltrative Quaternary inland – Category #7 (Bell, pers. comm., 2013). " is opaque and meaningless.	References to Stillwater category numbers were deleted from each snapshot. References to descriptions may need clarification such as providing an appendix item that contains the geologic map used to classify the groupings. Another suggestion could be to remove these descriptions entirely and only use meaningful geologic narratives of the watersheds
70		
71	In regard to vegetation, the recent CDFW - CNPS Vegetation Map should replace the outdated 1990 shape file.	We provided additional clarification of vegetation using a summary of the CNPS vegetation map, which is available online.
72	p.27 Technically the area around Shandon is either in the San Juan or Estrella watersheds, rather than the Cholame. The watershed headwaters also include drainages along Davis Rd. into the northernmost Temblor Range. There are significant stands of blue oak within the Palo Prieto drainage.	Shandon is at the boundaries of Cholame, Estrella, and San Juan watersheds using boundaries consistent with CalWater HUC10-scale. Portions of the unincorporated town are in each of these.
73	p.28 The mention of the Rinconada fault is not appropriate, as it lies along the trend of the Salinas River and has nothing to do with the Cholame Creek Watershed. Similarly, the quotes from Chipping (1987) pertain to the Paso Robles Groundwater basin rather than the geology of the Cholame Valley. Vegetation cover has blue oak, not black oak.	Vegetation cover summary has been clarified. Remove reference to Rinconada Fault if edits allow.
74	p.32 It is questionable if it is appropriate to discuss CSA16 under this watershed rather than Estrella or San Juan.	See **comment #72,** Shandon is composed of parts of the San Juan, Estrella and Cholame watersheds
75	p.33 The beneficial uses of water include recreation and ground water recharge. Where are facilities that serve these purposes?	Beneficial uses are from the RWQCB basin plan. The RWQCB determines which beneficial uses apply in each watershed.

	p.36-37 Discussions of groundwater quality should be confined to the Cholame Creek Watershed. There are no concentrations of "rural "ranchette" users" in the Cholame Creek Watershed. Discussions of groundwater changes should also be confined to the watershed, with a notation that they might be affected by drawdowns in the adjacent Estrella valley.	These suggestions require deeper evaluations of the data than were used for our Snapshots. The phrases "rural ranchette users" were pulled from the Master Water Plan and describe the situation for the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin in general. We made no attempt to make the descriptions watershed specific or remove and/or add information to make them specific
76		
	p. 43 In general, I have no idea where Shimmin Canyon is, and so a sketch of the watershed showing the locations of all sub-watersheds would be useful for each watershed in this document	The interactive maps that will be available on the website will clarify watershed and subwatershed locations and names greatly.
77		
	p.45 The list of species include areas such as Wilson's Corner and Parkfield, which are not anywhere near the Estrella River Watershed.	The species lists are by USGS 7.5' quadrangle. These were rechecked, and the Parkfield and Wilson's Corner 7.5' USGS quadrangles touch into the Estrella watershed as drawn for these snapshots. A clarification has been added to all species tables specifying that these names refer to quadrangle names, not towns or other locations. Quadrangle name is used by CNPS and CDFW as part of their rare species tracking databases.
78		
	p.48 Kit fox is not a riparian species, preferring open grasslands. However, connectivity of open grassland areas between the Carrizo Plain and Camp Roberts have been one of the thrusts of the North County HCP.	SJKF language has been corrected - it was meant to refer to upland habitats in the same valley.
79		
	p.57 While agriculture is important, much of the watershed is chamise dominated scrubland.	Dominant land use characterization was based off land use data from County GIS shapefiles
80		

81	p.58 The geology description of the watershed is highly biased toward valley floor alluvium. Much of the upper West Huer Huero is on granite or granite-derived rocks and the middle fork is on dissected Paso Robles, Santa Margarita, and Monterey Formations. I would suggest doing an overlay from existing geologic maps where appropriate.	Revise Huer Huero geologic description to reflect Dr. Chippings suggestions.
82	p.60 Shedd Canyon is not part of the Huer Huero watershed, as it flows to the Estrella.	See comment 78 above regarding place names.
83	p.72 No part of the Nacimiento River watershed is in the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin.	The Bradley Subarea of the PR Groundwater Basin includes a portion of the Nacimiento River
84	p.73 Sentences like "Franklin Creek and Town Creek are steep Franciscan non-infiltrative headwaters with flat pre-Quaternary moderate infiltrative valleys – Category #1. " do not make things very clear. This sort of language shows up all the way through the document and should be converted to something that resembles a sentence with meaning.	See **Comment #70**. Narrative descriptions may be more valuable to the reader than the geologic language used in the Stillwater groupings.
85	p. 74 Peak flow "near San Miguel" cannot be on the Nacimiento River. It might be worth pointing out that Bryson is in Monterey County and reflects part of the inflow to the reservoir, while Bradley data reflects peak dam release.	This issue was corrected

	p.92 The concept of watershed works for the Paso Robles Creek drainage, but not for a random section of the Salinas River watershed. Watersheds should be delineated by divides, not arbitrary political lines. This complaint can be carried throughout this document. In this case San Marcos Creek is included in the document with the Paso Robles Creek drainage, except that the two creeks drain to the Salinas on opposite sides of Paso Robles.	This comment addressed by deleting Indian Valley snapshot
86	p.111 None of the Indian Valley Watershed is in San Luis Obispo County. It is certainly not in the Atascadero/Templeton Planning Area. This is a significant error. This section should be removed from the document.	The lower portion of the Indian Valley HUC10 watershed in the CalWater system is the portion of the Salinas River at San Miguel, creating a misleading name. Indian Valley was folded into Lower Salinas-Paso Robles Creek Area Watershed
87	p.125 The confluence of San Juan Creek and the Estrella river occurs where the Estrella and Cholame creeks merge and become the Estrella (at Shandon), nowhere near Creston (as noted further down the page in regard to Kit Fox)	Reference was corrected to refer to Shandon.
88	p.126 Water is produced from the Santa Margarita Formation in some upper parts of the Shell Creek watershed	Is there a place for this information in the Lower San Juan Watershed Snapshot?
89	p.130 Palo Prieto is at Bitterwater Road in the Cholame watershed, not the Lower San Juan.	Remove references to Palo Prieto from from "Other Unique Characteristics" in Lower San Juan Snapshot
90	p.143 How is the Cuyama Valley a groundwater resource for the Upper San Juan watershed? Also, this upper section of the San Juan is too far away to be considered any part of the Paso Robles groundwater basin. Nearly all water is derived from shallow alluvium along streams, with some wells into bedrock.	Check groundwater basin maps with watershed boundaries to verify Paso Robles GW Basin and Cuyama Valley (ptn) in Upper San Juan and that San Juan Subarea of PRGW basin includes Upper San Juan
91		

	92		p.152 typo. National Forest! Also I like being governed by the Count of San Luis Obispo. Gives us a little class, don't you say.	Typos corrected.
	93		p. 153 The hard sandstone around Santa Margarita is not moderately infiltrative. It is well cemented and has low permeability.	The geological variability of this region is addressed in the snapshot.
	94		p.166 The lumping of Tassajara, Santa Margarita and Trout Creeks with Atascadero Creek is a mistake, and if they were to be lumped, it would be better with the Upper Salinas. The three creeks reach the Salinas well above Atascadero Creek, and the watershed of Santa Margarita Creek has been subject to flooding and water supply issues.	This grouping of creeks was used to remain consistent with the CalWater HUC 10 scale. Part of the Salinas River is included in this grouping. For better clarity, however, we have altered the name of this grouping to Mid Salinas - Atascadero Area Watershed.
	95		Arroyo Grande Snap shot p. 12 Estimated safe yield for the Northern Cities Area citing DWR is incorrect. The Master Water Report has an estimate of 9,500 AFY.	This was corrected.
6	95	NCMA TG		
	96		Arroyo Grande Snap shot p7. Facilities Present - Replace Oceano with South San Luis Obispo County Wastewater Treatment Plant.	This was corrected.
	97		Pismo Creek Snap shot p.8 Imported water says 1,100 AFY of State Water. The Master Water Report has 1240 AFY Table A Allocation and 1240 AFY of Drought Buffer of State Water	This was corrected.
	98		Arroyo Grande - The Ceccheti Road crossing was completed and should be removed from the list of fish passage barriers.	The County made improvement to the Ceccheti crossing in 2013 that were limited to repairing a hole in the top deck. Nothing that interacts with water flow or fish passage was changed so the status as a partial barrier is unchanged.
	99		Arroyo Grande - Add Meadow Creek to Other Environmental Resources.	This was added.
	100		Add the County of San Luis Obispo to the Jurisdictions listed under Land Use	This was added.

	101		Add Halcyon to Potential growth Areas.	This was added.
	102		Add City of Pismo Beach to Water Management Entities.	The Northern Cities Management Area and a list of its participants was added.
	103		Add the potential for recycled water at the South County Sanitation District.	This was added.
	104		Review the Northern Cities Management Area Technical Group Annual report in reference to water budgets.	A references to the NCMA water budget was added. The RCD will follow up with the NCMA to more fully understand the assumptions of the existing water budget.
7	105	**Atascadero Mutual Water Company**	**Comments related to the Draft Instream Flow Assessment (Below).**	See below listed responses.
	106		General (AND VERY IMPORTANT) - page iv. Nicole Smith had advised that due to the extreme coarse nature of this very preliminary effort, there would be a disclaimer that identifies to the reder to NOT use this effort for any regulatory or mandatory requirements when establishing permit limits; however, no such disclaimer is located anywhere within this document. THIS DISCLAIMER MUST BE PROVIDED RIGHT UP FRONT, AND PERHAPS IN SEVERAL LOCATIONS. It must be very clear what the limitation are, who the expected users are, and who the users should not be	

Page iv, Acknowledgement: The statement that the Water Resources Advisory Committee had an involvement in the study is incorrect. The WRAC simply heard two verbal report on this effort, and at no time was the WRAC ever given direction that its listening to these reports was going to be the only involvement in the study. The second report was given so late in the meeting that over half of the Membership had to leave. In no way was the WRAC engaged in this study, and this reference must be changed to simply say that two presentations were given at WRAC meetings, and nothing more

107

Page iv, Acknowledgement: Everyone receives acknowledgement of where they work or who they are except for Stephanie (is her name misspelled in the report) Wald - who is she? Why is she listed here?

108

Page iv, Acknowledgement: Second to last line, behind the word "grant", please identify just how much this grant was for, and if appropriate, identify the distribution of the funds to the consultant and the administrating agency. Also , at the end of the sentence, identify what the Proposition Number was for the grant.

109

Page iv, A Note on Units of Measurement: Fourth line - USGS never measures discharges in "feet per second", they always measre discharge in "cubic feet per second". The units of "feet per second" is a unit of measuring

110 velocity, not discharge

Page iv, A Note on Units of Measurement: Fifth line - the units "grams per millileter" is not the common usage in water quality…that would be "milligrams per liter."

111

112	Page iv, A Note on Units of Measurement: In the table, under the column for English units, for the row "1 hectare-meter (hm)", the value of 0.12 acre-feet (ac-ft) is incorrect, and should read 8.10 ac-ft.
113	General - the Master Water Report (MWR) in the main text does identify Environmental Water Demand (EWD) as one of the four categories of water demands discussed within the MWR. The one pointed recommendation within the MWR regarding EWD is as follows: "Site and project-specific in-stream flow requirements need to be completed to be able to determine a water balance that accounted for environmental water demand on a water planning area basis in future Master Water Reports" (MWR, Section 5.2.1). It continues by further stating "This would allow the environmental water demand to be quantified and represented on a sub-watershed and creek basis. The first steps in this effort are establishing appropriate data collection sites, identifying opportunities for coordination with appropriate entities on the effort and prioritizing locations to study first. The DRAFT San Luis Obispo County Regional In-Stream Flow Assessment (Study) (page v, under Introduction) indicates that the MWR is the driver behind the development of the Study; therefore, the focus of this study needs to be limited to those recommendations pointed out in the MWR. As such, the objectives of the Study should be as presented below. 1. a County-wide assessment of in-stream flow estimates for steelhead based on an in-stream flow assessment of stream gages and field observations of a limited number of streams. 2. an assessment of data needs to support EWD estimates. 3. initial EWD estimates for a select few of the

	Page v, in Introduction: The definition for EWD is not written the way it is written in the MWR. It should not be paraphrased in that form because it is misleading (it reads as if the EWD is for steelhead, whereas the MWR says it is for a target species, and that the target species selected is steelhead - a much different meaning). Suggest it be written to match the MWR
114	
	Page v, first sentence in the Approach: …Was defined in
115	relations "to" steelhead
	Page v, Third line in the Approach: Available hydrologic and physical terrain data and available in-stream flow assessments were reviewed…Further on, it states that All available hydrologic and physical terrain data were evaluated….This Study needs to list each and every bit of data that was reviewed, evaluated and used. Detailed descriptions of it need to b e made, inclueding periods of records, locations, who provided it, etc. This data must then be placed in an appendix. This Study will be long lasting on a shelf somewhere, and as it ages, the reader of the future need to understand just how old the data that was being used to write this Study is
116	

	Page vi, first paragraph: The reference to the interactive map should be deleted from the Study. The work contained herein is so preliminary, is based on such limited information, is not site-specific enough to warrant a full-scale distribution of such a web-based system, that so doing would be misleading the general public, and in particular, regulators, as to the level of sophistication of the results and giving a false sense of accuracy. Furthermore, the interactive map has absolutely no disclaimer information upon it (see earlier comment). The only people who should utilize information from this Study are those that actually read and have the Study in hand so that they know and understand its limitations
117	
	Page vi, second paragraph, The end of the paragraph ends without giving any reason as to what this is the case, which is the cause of misleading by omission. Suggest the following sentence be added: "This is because no rain occurs in the summer; therefore, there is no runoff to support summertime discharges".
118	
	Page vi, Discussion and Recommendations: First paragraph, second line - the words "This suggests" begs the question "what suggests?" - please provide clarity as to
119	what "this suggests" means.
	Page vi, Discussion and Recommendatios: First paragraph, fifth line, after the word "County" suggest adding - "however, the natural conditions of most streams in the County is they dry up in the summer."
120	

	Page vi, Discussions and Recommendations: Delete in the first paragraph the sentence: "However, estimates of EWD are minimum…"If there are limitations in this study (which I know there are) then they are best organized into a section dedicated to listing them. Furthermore, was there a baseline analysis to answer the basic question of "was there ever enough water to support these aquatic systems?" The author should provide a baseline analysis and all the supporting historical data to support the presumption that there was sufficient water in the past; otherwise, it sounds like there is intent to create these aquatic systems.
121	
	Page vi, Discussions and Recommendations: The bulleted recommendations are suggested to read as follows: 1. Delete the first bullet entirely. The contents of the statement are outside of the scope of the Study, and the effort provided within the study is qualitative in nature, not quantitative, and thus is judged insufficient to be part of this Study. 2. Anaylze current streamflow...<leave as is, except change "gauging" to "gaging" 3. Monitoring streamflows in all 25...<leave as is except delet the last sentence that reads "Results could be used..." because the District, through stakeholder input, should provide policy, not the Consultant
122	

Page 1, first paragraph: Delete the last sentence as it is not a stated purpose within the MWR, but instead is a sentence offered in combination with another sentence in the executive summary of the MWR that has been left out, and when left out, completely changes the meaning of things. Neither one of those sentences are identified in the MWR as the "purpose" either! No, the "purpose" of the MWR is given in Section 1.2, and it is that purpose that should be presented in this Study.

123

Page 1, Second paragraph, at the end of the sentence that is the definition of EWD, the following words need to be added such that the definition is exactly as stated in the MWR: "and ecosystem processes." Furthermore, the reference in the MWR should be shown so the reader knows where to go find it (MWR, Sec 4.6.5.1)

124

Page 1, Second paragraph, delete the last sentence in that paragraph. It does not fit what is being discussed. It is talking about a water management issue and the purpose of this Study is not at all related to water management. The topic of that sentence is out to the scope of this Study. It is a big threat and there is no justification for this statement

125

Page 1, third paragraph, the concept in the last sentence that reads "For example, a creek could be dry all summer, effectively extirpating steelhead, and then achieve its annual flow requirement during winter floods" is exactly the behaivior of the streams along the central coast given the hydrology of this region. This fact is naturally ocurring and should be acknowledged at other places within this report.

126

	Page 1, fourth paragraph, the sentence: "These estimates are intended to inform water supply planning efforts by the SLO IRWM participants to understand, anticipate, and incorporate, to the extent appropriate, environmental in-stream flow requirements into SLO County water supply planning" has wording that is challenging and suggested changes are as follows: "These estimates are intended to inform water supply planning efforts by the SLO IRWM participants to understand in-stream flow estimates within their areas of interest." The way it is worded is too policy oriented, and that should come from the District, not a consultant. Secondly, it mentions "in-stream flow requirements" and throughout this Study the auther mentions that the method is providing an "estimate", so the use of the word "requirement" is too restrictive and filled with authority, indicating that a much greater effort was made in developing the Study, whereas that is not the case. And lastly, this study is so preliminary in nature, that it would be way too early for such a statement constructed as originally worded to be accurate for this Study
127	
	Page 1, fouth paragraph, the last sentence: An oral presentation was made to the WRAC twice, and no action or support was taken or provided. This sentence needs to be reflective of this, and this only. To state it in the way written is inaccurate and false. The commenter is a WRAC member and did not vote to "support" the outcome of this
128	Study.
	Page 1 and 2, the numbered specific objectives - see the comment above (#8) for a complete list of comments on
129	these

	Page 2, Sec 2.1, second paragraph, second sentence - delete as that effort is out of scope of this Study, and the work done was not scientific, but was qualitative, and there is high risk of its misuse by future users
130	
	Page 3, fifth line, the words "stream gradient" are used
131	twice
	Page 5, delete the paragraph atop the page for the reasons
132	stated in comments #130
	Page 6, Sec 2.2.1, first line "All available in-stream flow analyses" - where is this listed and cataloged? Needs to be listed and placed in this study for future users
	Page 6, Sec 2.2.2, third line, end of line, delete the words "and lagoon function" for the reasons given in Comment #130.
	Page 10, Section 2.3.3, first paragraph, the period of 2013 just happens to be the driest period of record at most gages (precipitation and streamflow) recorded in the State, and now this Study is utilizing much information from 2013. This is seriously skewing many statements and tables in this document, and the analyses are not likely representative. AMWC has 100 years of precipitation records, and the 2013 year is the single driest year on record
	Page 11, last paragraph, last line - the author must advance this discussion and tell the reader why the summer visit was dry … It was because (1) it is a common and natural occurring condition of streams along the central coast, and (2) the Summer 2013 is associated with the single driest precipitation year on record at many recording gages in the area and the State.

Page 13, Figure 6, never is it described how the Measured Flow is determined. Measuring flow in a natural stream is challenging, difficult, and susceptible to error; thus, it needs to be clearly described how the author did this.

Page 13, Figure 6, in the right table, how is the velocity measured?

Page 16, first paragraph, delete the last sentence because the work described is outside the scope of work performed for this Study

Page 16, third paragraph, the model described is a "simple regression analysis" … Is this the only statistical modeling that applies? Or is there other statistical distributions that could have been utilized but were not used, but their utilization might have resulted in more accurate predictions? Perhaps a footnote could be used to provide additional insights. Stating that a "simple regression analysis" makes the reader that the consultant took a simplified approach to make a point of what is actually a very complicated and complex analysis, and thus, makes one wonder if the effort is accurate.

Furthermore in this same paragraph, the phrase "we developed a linear multiple regression model" seems hard to believe that the complexities of hydrology can be simply defined as a straight linear relationship.

Page 16, Section 3.1 - see comment #32 on year 2013 usage

Page 17, it is amazing that the dialogue on San Luis Creek does not discuss two things - that this creek has had in-stream flow studies done upon it, and that the flows in the creek are effluent-dominated by the City's Water Reclamation Facility. Both are very important and the reader should be made aware of this.

Page 18, Figure 9 - See comment #145. The caption should note that the creek flows are dominated by City's Water Reclamation Facility

Page 19, the area of the paragraph that starts "In contrast, river channels such …" is a repeat of words from prior in the report (p. 17) and should be deleted.

Page 20, Figure 12 - note in the figure that 2013 is the driest year on record

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

Page 20, Section 3.2 - Multi-comments

The statement that channel size and channel gradient are a function of drainage area is a curious one. As the drainage area Is larger, the amount of tributary runoff increases, and with this increase generally comes an increase in discharges from precipitation events; therefore, the channel size is likely to be larger as you go downstream (thus as you increase the drainage area). But does an increase in drainage area naturally mean a relationship change in gradient? This commenter does not believe so. Take the Mississippi River for example. If you go from Ohio to Missouri, the change in gradient is likely small, wheras the change in flow is obvously lagre. Suggest taht this relationship statement be re-thought out and decide whether it even needs to be in this Study

The statement of "thus the direct proportionality between EWD and drainage area" is not a correlations with water velocity at all, but instead, is a correlations with discharge to discharge area. The only connection between discharge and velocity is the flow area (Q=V*A). But the geometry of a flowing channel is not linear; thus, it is highly unlikely that a linear relationship exists between drainage area and velocity

The statment "locations with larger drainage areas had lower gradient and wider channels, and thus required higher flows..." begs the question - on a cfs/mi^2 basis, is it really "greater"? Again, as you travel downstream, the

Page 21, Several comments
1. fix the decimal points on the y-axis
2. make the y-axis scale on both graphs the same
3. show the linear equation on both graphs
4. show the R^2 value on both graphs
5. somewhere in this report, list the 12 gages that were used to make these graphs. List their gaging number, their gaging names, their drainage area, their period of record, and their average spring and summer flows that are plotted on this graph.
6. Somewhere in this report identify the limitations of the equations, for example if a watershed hass 1000 mi^2, is the equation still applicable? Or does it have limitations (confidence limits) that run out at say a smaller area, and if so, what is that limiting factor
7. THis analysis has one fatal flaw - at zero area, the in-stream flow should also be zero, but per this model, it is not. There is a y-intercept for both of these situations, and it is obvious that you cannot get runoff from a watershed that has zero drainage area. This mathematical phenomenon should be discussed, and furthermore, it should be discussed as to what the limitations might be for the minimum drainage area. Said another way, is there a minimal area by which the model breaks down, and the only way to determine the results is to do a physical in-stream flow study? If so, state this fact.

Page 23, top two paragraphs on page - see comment #45

Page 23, Sec. 3.3, delete reference to interactive map per comment #12

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

Page 23, Table 3, multiple comments -
Add the Analysis Watershed reference to each point
Under EWD delete the word "requirements" and replace with "Estimate" because all throughout this Study it talked about how this effort creates an Estimate, and even the graphs say "Estimate"

Page 26, Sec. 3.4 - recommend that all qualitative work be deleted. If a Brief discussion of this information is listed as "out of scope of this Study and can be taken up by the District in the future", then perhaps something can be shown, but there is too much non-scientific and analytical information provided herein that will be misused and should not be here

Page 32, Sec. 3.5, end of paragraph, change ot read "… and agricultural needs may have changed."
Page 32, Table 5, multiple comments
<Delete reference to interactive map (see Comment #12)
<add column showing Drainage Area (mi^2)
<fourth row, Arroyo Grande Creek

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

Page 33, Sec. 4, multiple comments

1. first paragraph, fourth line, behind the word "County", add "however, the natural conditions of most streams in the County is they dry up in the summer."

2. First paragraph, delete from the words "However, estimates of Environmental ..."through to the end of the paragraph

3. Second paragraph, fifth line from the bottom, beginning from the words "For example, in this study ..." delete from there to the end - the language is out of scope for this Study

4. Third paragraph, from the words "For those that are not, there may be ..." delete from there through to page 37, just above the second paragraph that starts out with "If more intensive..." The reason for such a large deletion is because all of that discussion is either out of scope of the Study, or in the case of Table 6, the data presented therein is based on the worst hydrological year on record, and thus the results are completely skewed and misleading. Much of the discussion within this reach is completely without any stakeholder meetings and involvements and that is so out of character for a document of this magnitude for this County. The author must remind themselves what the purpose of this study was, and that purpose is stated in the MWR - whereas the dialogue presented within this band is completely out of that scope, and thus, must be deleted.

Page 37, the paragraph that begins "if more intensive…"
the comments are:
<Delete the words "if more intensive evaluations are conducted, and capitalize the word "there"
<Keep the remainder of the paragraph. It is appropriate to suggest for site-specific efforts the tools that are available for such site-specific work to develop an in-stream flow assessement
Page 37, see Comment No. 17 for changes to the list of recommendations

Concluding remarks
<on page 35, middle of the page, the paragraph that starts off "Based on available data, EWD is not achieved …", even though an earlier comment suggest deleting this entire section, it is important to point out a theme of this paragraph that has much inaccuracy about it. The auther should be ab le to describe what they had in mind by this statements. There shoudl be some mention of what good programs have already been done by water managers within the County (e.g., Lopez HCP, live stream agreement on the Salinas River, Arroyo Grande Oilfield Pismo Creek Discharge permit, SLO City Reclaimed Water Facility studies, etc.) Furthermore, the normal hydrology of the County is that the precipitation is low, and the streams just don't have runoff - period! Especially summertime when there is no precipitation. To state that "the water management is reducing surface flow" is inflammatory, inaccurate, and without justification, and certainly far beyond the scope of work for this Study. Hence, all reasons to delete this from this Study
2. It is clear why this Study was done for a single species, but what would a more detailed study cost if more species were considered (and using quantitative efforts, not qualitative
3. The Study seems to say that the only thing steelhead need is water, whereas other things such as quiescent pools, shade, and other things are also needed.

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

Responses to the Draft Watershed Snapshot Project (IRWM data collection)
Comments Received 12/20/13

-

-