Task	No.	Date Received	Comment Source	Deliverable	Comment	Response
3	1	12/21/12	Roger Reynolds	Task 3 Draft Report	Skimmed through and don't have any additional comments.	Comment noted. No changes to the report text or geodatabase have been made.
3	2	12/21/12	Rob Parsons (CDM Smith)	Task 3 Draft Report	I did the review of the data for CV-Salts. The data looks good and well organized. A number of data sets are included in the file geodatabase. FGDC metadata exists for all data layers. It looks like some layers have incomplete metadata. Where metadata has incomplete information, especially descriptive information for the layers, further explanation why the metadata cannot be completed should be entered. A matrix breakdown or simple table should be included indicating which data layers have missing metadata and why.	Metadata for GIS layers have been reviewed and completed for all layers. The main scope of Task 3 is to update the previous NHD with the 2012 NHD dataset, as described in the Task 3 Report. The metadata for the NHD dataset were included in the geodatabase. As also described in the Task 3 Report, the other GIS layers were previously compiled during the Phase 1 BUOS GIS in 2010 and no updates were required under Task 3 effort. In response to this comment, metadata for these layers have been prepared and included in the geodatabase. As described in the report, these data layers were carried over from the Phase I work only for the purpose of keeping the previous data layers in a single depository.
3	3	12/21/12	Rob Parsons (CDM Smith)	Task 3 Draft Report	A couple of things that seem to be bit confusing regarding the file geodatabase, page 15 last paragraph of the workplan states "Updated GIS layers in ESRI shape files, geodatabase….". I believe this is a typo and reference was likely being made to a file geodatabase. It would also be ideal to have a breakdown of the domains and subtypes. The listings in the metadata don't provide the details or definitions of the codes used. Within the file geodatabase I did not see any descriptive info.	We agree that the reference made to the shape files in the workplan is a typo. Task 3 deliverable list in the workplan and Task 3 report were correct with references made to the geodatabase. The main scope of the Task is to update the previous NHD with the 2012 NHD dataset. The original metadata for the NHD were included in the geodatabase. No changes to the NHD metadata have been made.
3	4	12/21/12	Rob Parsons (CDM Smith)	Task 3 Draft Report	A topology check of the data indicates all features are topologically correct. Given the small sampling of data I looked at all were within the specs outlined in the standards.	Comment noted. No changes to the report text or geodatabase have been made.
3	5	12/21/12	Rob Parsons (CDM Smith)	Task 3 Draft Report	I looked at the data a bit further and did not see anything with respect to data quality. I have attached a detailed breakdown of the geodatabase in Excel. I did run through this information but did not see anything that would be an issue. I am unable to assess the data contained in the geodatabase since it would take a substantial effort to verify against the NHD or other source data available. From the standpoint of the task 2 and task 3 documents it appears that a comprehensive set of information (textual and spatial) has been provided to the stakeholders.	Comment noted. No changes to the report text or geodatabase have been made.
3	6	12/21/12	Nigel Quinn	Task 3 Draft Report	p. 14, 2nd paragraph - "... for the continued mapping of the natural streams to the main rivers and the application of the tributary rule ... " Needs more explanation. Isn't clear what the ARCGIS procedures were that have been developed. How do we take advantage of these procedures? Have or can they been applied to the K/J GIS system?	Comment noted. As described below, more detailed descriptions on the procedures, how it can be applied to future beneficial use mapping and its benefits were provided in the report later in this section. Thus, no changes to the report text to avoid redundancy in the text. The text in page 14 was introduction with more detailed explanations provided in the report later in this section. The methodology developed was described in detail with workflow steps in pages 14 through 18. The benefits of this methodology (i.e., how to take advantage of these procedures) were also described in page 18. The methodology developed and described in this section is for future consideration of beneficial use mapping, should CV-SALTS choose to continue this effort. Thus, the procedures have not been applied to the current Task 3 GIS database.
3	7	12/21/12	Nigel Quinn	Task 3 Draft Report	p. 15, 3rd paragraph - " ... *the geodatabase tables need to be reviewed and modified to exclude the non-natural streams.* " has this work been done. How are these tables being modified? The automatic flagging identifies them - have these now been removed from the geodatabase?	Comment noted. No changes to the report text or geodatabase have been made. As described in the report and discussed in the November 26 workshop, the work described in this section is future work that may be completed. Since the work has not been completed, these have not been removed from the geodatabase. As described in the report (page 15, 3rd paragraph), the non-natural streams can be excluded automatically since the NHD records identify non-natural streams.
3	8	01/02/13	Randy Hanson	Task 3 Draft Report	p. 3, last bullet regarding "Groundwater Basins" - Revision of extent of groundwater basins may be required. These have been inaccurate in other parts of California or do not include definitions completed by other more recent or detailed studies.	Comment noted. The groundwater basin boundaries are based on the DWR's Bulletin 118. As described further below, revision of groundwater basin boundaries within the Task 3 effort is out of scope. Thus, no changes to the report text has been made. This comment can be considered by CV-SALTs for future updates to groundwater basin boundary updates to reflect changes from more recent and detailed studies. The main scope of Task 3 is to update the previous NHD with the 2012 NHD dataset. The other GIS layers, including the groundwater basin boundaries, were previously compiled during the Phase 1 BUOS GIS in 2010 and no updates were required under the Task 3 scope. As described in the report, these data layers were carried over from the Phase I work only for the purpose of keeping the previous data layers in a single depository.

Task	No.	Date Received	Comment Source	Deliverable	Comment	Response
3	9	01/02/13	Randy Hanson	Task 3 Draft Report	p. 4, Section "National Hydrology Dataset", last bullet regarding "points" - How about points of diversion or returnflows (tailwater or flood bybass/rerouting), or treated effluent discharge points? This list is incomplete without these additional points	Comment noted. No changes to the report text or geodatabase have been made. "Points" are features that are defined in the NHD dataset. Points of diversions, return flows, or treated effluent discharge points are not included in the NHD dataset. The main scope of Task 3 is to update the previous NHD with the 2012 NHD dataset. The Task 3 GIS maintains the integrity of the original NHD dataset as received from the original source (USGS), thus no changes were made to the NHD dataset.
3	10	01/02/13	Randy Hanson	Task 3 Draft Report	p. 4, "Hydrologic Units" Section - Please state the level of delineation of the HUC's. Are these HUC8 12, 14? Probably need at least 12 if not higher to get subwatersheds correctly and with enough detail.	Comment noted. As further described below, the hydrologic units HU2 though HU16 were included in the geodatabase. The list of hydrologic units was provided later in this section of the report and shown in Attachment C as part of the geodatabase description. Thus, no changes to the report text or geodatabase have been made. The hydrologic units HU2 through HU16 delineated in the GIS layers were included in the geodatabase and these units were . The hydrologic units were listed in page 12 of the report as part of the Geodatabase description and further shown in Attachment C - Description of Geodatabase (Exhibit 2).
3	11	01/02/13	Randy Hanson	Task 3 Draft Report	p. 5, "303(d) Impaired Streams and 303(d) Impaired Water Bodies" Section - This should be checked against the database of pesticide and herbicide permits too to see if there would be any incidental runoff that could contribute to impairments of water quality	Comment noted. No changes to the report text or geodatabase have been made. The main scope of Task 3 is to update the previous NHD with the 2012 NHD dataset. The other GIS layers, including the 303(d) impaired streams and water bodies, were previously compiled during the Phase 1 BUOS GIS in 2010 and no updates were required under Task 3 effort. As described in the report, these data layers were carried over from the Phase I work only for the purpose of keeping the previous data layers in a single depository.
3	12	01/02/13	Randy Hanson	Task 3 Draft Report	p. 6, last paragraph, regarding "Attachment A provides the database tables with beneficial use designations followed by water quality objectives and applicable MCLs and SMCLs" - All surface water bodies should also include Groundwater Recharge as a beneficial use or potential for Managed-aquifer recharge storage sites.	Comment noted. The Task 3 work incorporated the existing and potential beneficial uses which apply to surface water bodies that are specifically identified in the water quality control plans (Basin Plans). Modifications to beneficial use designations of surface water bodies and any departure from the Basin Plan definition of beneficial uses are not within the Task 3 scope and would require the Regional Board judgment. This effort is considered future scope; thus, no changes to the report text or geodatabase have been made.
3	13	01/02/13	Randy Hanson	Task 3 Draft Report	p. 8, top 2 bullets - You may want to have an additional category of potential water bodies that could accommodate the possibility of additional Managed Aquifer Recharge facilities or ASR's. Doe this list include ephemeral rivers like Penoche Creek that may not have a beneficial use because of high concentrations of natural contaminants such as selenium?	Comment noted. The Task 3 work incorporated the surface water beneficial use designations as defined by the water quality control plans (Basin Plans). In other words, surface water bodies with beneficial use designations, the definitions of the beneficial uses for each surface water body, and specific categories are based on the Basin Plans. Modifications to beneficial use designations or any departure from the Basin Plan definition of beneficial uses are not within the Task 3 scope and would require the Regional Board judgment. Thus, no changes to the report text or geodatabase have been made. Also, the list of beneficial use designations was provided in Attachment A of the report, based on the beneficial use tables from the Basin Plans. We assumed the comment refers to the "Panoche Creek" (not Penoche as stated). In reviewing of the Basin Plans, Panoche Creek was not listed explicitly in the Table II-1 of the Basin Plans that list surface water bodies with their beneficial uses.
3	14	01/02/13	Randy Hanson	Task 3 Draft Report	p. 8, 1st paragraph in "Focused Areas Data Update" Section, regarding "Originally, Yolo County around Woodland and the South Delta were considered as the potential areas for this focused effort." - Good example of a region that is being considered for temporary storage of water, water reuse, capture of runoff. Are these beneficial uses?	Comment noted. The Task 3 work incorporated the beneficial use designations for surface water bodies as defined by the water quality control plans (Basin Plans). Also, the list of beneficial use designations was provided in Attachment A of the report, based on the beneficial use tables from the Basin Plans. As described in the report, the original intent of the two focused areas was to do more focused data gap filling with the 2012 NHD dataset. As also noted in the report, data gaps were resolved for the entire Central Valley to the extent possible and basinwide data update was provided. No changes to the report text or geodatabase have been made.

Task	No.	Date Received	Comment Source	Deliverable	Comment	Response
3	15	01/02/13	Randy Hanson	Task 3 Draft Report	p. 9, "National Hydrology Dataset" Section, regarding "A given linear feature…" - The rub is that these rivers are more than linear features. They also have changing widths, Mannings Roughness Coefficients, and depths of incised channels. These are used by CVHM and a better inventory of these features would improve our ability to simulate the streamflow.	Comment noted. No changes to the report text or geodatabase have been made. The term "linear feature" was used in the context of the NHD dataset and follows the terminology used by the NHD dataset by the USGS. As described earlier in page 4 as part of the NHD dataset description, the NHD uses lines to represent linear features such as streams and rivers. The combination of lines (segments) is used to create a network of flow lines in the NHD dataset. The linear lines could represent different features such as those listed in Table 1 under NHDFLowline. As the main scope of Task 3 was to update the previous NHD with the 2012 NHD dataset, representation of rivers by CVHM is not within task 3 scope.
3	16	01/02/13	Randy Hanson	Task 3 Draft Report	p. 9, last paragraph under "Water Quality Control Plans" Section - Is there any plan to merge any of these thousands of segments into a simpler but meaningful configuration based on major confluences, diversion and returnflow points, watersheds, beneficial use regions, etc?	Comment noted. No changes to the report text or geodatabase have been made. The main scope of Task 3 is to update the previous NHD with the 2012 NHD dataset. As described in the report, the NHD dataset contains hydraulic connectivity for segments.
3	17	01/02/13	Randy Hanson	Task 3 Draft Report	p. 14, regarding "Methodology - Tributary Rule for Beneficial Uses" Section - Can this method be modified to include points of diversion, points of ag returnflows, and points of discharge of treated effluent back into rivers or streams?	Comment noted. No changes to the report text or geodatabase have been made. The methodology described in page 14 thru 19 is for future work that would use the updated NHD dataset. The other datasets/GIS data layers that were referred to in the comment are not part of the NHD dataset. Please note a GIS data layer for point of diversions and POTWs are part of Task 4, but outside of the Task 3 scope.
3	18	2/22/2013	Jeanne Chilcott	Task 3 Beneficial Use mapping	I just re-read the GIS workplan (I'm assuming the final one from August 2012) and I cannot find any mention of coordinating with the State Board mapping effort—which was a major point that I brought up during the development of the workplan and one that I was going to ask about today.	Comment has been addressed. The GIS workplan was previously revised to include a statement about coordinating with the State Board mapping effort. The revised GIS workplan dated September has been provided. LWA Team had two coordination conference calls with the State Board mapping effort on 3/6/20123 & 3/11/2013. Overall, based on discussions, no potential issues have been identified with respect to compatibility of the two datasets. In addition, discussions reveal that the more detailed beneficial use mapping has been completed in some areas through the GIS project for CV-SALTS and it is anticipated that this more detailed mapping may be beneficial for the State Board mapping effort. It was noted during the conf call that the final geodatabase and Task 3 can be submitted by CV-SALTS to the State Board for use in their mapping effort.
3	19	2/23/2013	Jeanne Chilcott	Task 3 Beneficial Use mapping	the workplan clearly identifies Task 3 as filling in the data gaps for all designated beneficial uses in our Basin Plans, but the product falls short in not mapping the broader beneficial uses (e.g. for the Tulare Lake Basin: east side streams; westside streams; valley floor and for the Sac/SJR Basin Plan it is not clear how broader areas are mapped such as the upstream sources to Englebright Reservoir). The current report says that effort is "different" and needs alternate funding and could be linked to the "tributary" work. The current report indicates Task 3 as only addressing main stem rivers.	Comment has been incorporated. As part of the Tulare Lake Basin mapping, the other east side streams, westside streams, and valley floor waters have been re-mapped and updated as part of Task 3 effort. The final geodatabase reflects the changes. Also, LWA Team had a conf call with Jeanne on 2/25/13 to go over the Task 3 mapping comments and the proposed approach to update the mapping. Based on the conf call discussion, a small section has been included on page 8 of the final report to describe the approach taken for mapping these areas. It was confirmed by Jeanne after the conf call that the mapping of the broader areas, e.g., upstream sources to Englebright Reservoir was identified correctly and no changes were required.
3	20	3/7/2013	Jeanne Chilcott	The web-based interface	I can't remember where we are in the review process, but don't remember the system being released for this type of review yet. What is your current review process and timing?	The formal submittal for the updated beneficial use mapping under the current GIS project is the geodatabase that was released for review. The geodatabase was provided to the Project Committee in draft and final forms in late December/January. The geodatabase has been updated in response to comments received in Feb/March and the final geodatabase has been issued along with the final Task 3 Report. The web based interface was developed as part of the 2010 Phase 1 work. This system is being used as is solely for the purpose of viewing data layers generated as part of the current GIS project to allow viewing in a user-friendly platform. The current Phase 2 GIS project does not include effort for updating the web-based tool or review of the web-based system.

Task	No.	Date Received	Comment Source	Deliverable	Comment	Response
3	21	3/7/2013	Betty Yee	The web-based interface/ Task 3 Beneficial Use mapping	Cache Creek: Missing SPWN (warm) and SPWN (cold)	Comment has been incorporated. We checked and verified that SPWN beneficial uses for Cache Creek (and other water bodies) are in the geodatabase and in the Beneficial Use table that was provided along with the geodatabase. We found a small script error in the web interface. This will be fixed and the updated web tool will show spawning uses that are in the beneficial use table.
3	22	3/13/2013	Betty Yee	The web-based interface/Task 3 Beneficial Use mapping	Cache Creek – I think there is something wrong with the web interface. See attached picture of the beneficial uses. You'll see that the spawning beneficial uses are not listed. I think there is something wrong with the link between the geodatabase and the web interface since you say the geodatabase does list SPWN (warm) and SPWN (cold) as beneficial uses for Cache Creek from Clear Lake to the Yolo Bypass. Actually, in the web interface, I couldn't find any water body with spawning uses.	Comment has been incorporated. Same response as above. We also want to note that the 2010 web-based tool include BUs and WQOs populated for water bodies such as rivers (represented by lines) within NHD. Although you can't view BUs and WQOs associated with the lakes and reservoirs (represented by polygons) within the web-based tool, they are included within the geodatabase.
3	23	3/7/2013	Betty Yee	Task 3 Beneficial Use mapping	Footnote d on page II-6.00 identifies COMM for North Fork Cache Creek and Bear Creek; however, they have not mapped North Fork Cache Creek nor Bear Creek.	Comment has been incorporated. We checked NHD and identified the North Fork Cache Creek and Bear Creek as tributaries to Cache Creek. While these features are tributaries, since they are included in Table II-1 under Footnote (d), they were mapped with their beneficial uses. They were assigned the BU_ID of 104 for North Fork Creek and BU_ID of 105 for Bear Creek, with their beneficial use designations based on Table II-1 Footnote 9. They are included in the geodatabase.
3	24	3/7/2013	Betty Yee	Task 3 Beneficial Use mapping	They do not identify COMM for any of the Delta waterways (footnote 8).	Comment has been incorporated. The Beneficial Use database table and geodatabase has been updated to add COMM to the Sac/SJR Delta (BU_ID of 99).
3	25	3/7/2013	Betty Yee	Task 3 Beneficial Use mapping	...about Yolo Bypass. They have a line that they mapped called the Yolo Bypass and they have a line mapped called Tule Canal which they identify as being the Yolo Bypass. However, they didn't connect Cache Creek nor Putah Creek with the Yolo Bypass so I'm guessing that they plan to map the Conaway Toe Drain and maybe connect Cache Creek and Putah Creek to the Drain? Maybe they're planning to turn the Yolo Bypass into a polygon? Also they missed the SPWN (warm) beneficial use for the Yolo Bypass.	Currently, mapping of Yolo Bypass is recognized as a data gap. Based on discussion and coordination with the State Board mapping effort, our understanding is that they used a polygon approach and they are considering to re-evaluate how to best approach this feature as part of their next phase of mapping effort. To avoid discrepancy between two datasets, we recommend that this data gap be addressed as part of their mapping effort. This approach has been noted within the final Task 3 report on page 11.
3	26	3/7/2013	Betty Yee	Task 3 Beneficial Use mapping	Marsh Creek (identified in Footnote 9) is missing.	Comment has been incorporated. Marsh Creek and Marsh Creek Reservoir have been included in the Beneficial Use database table delivered as part of the final geodatabase. They were assigned the BU_ID of 100 for Marsh Creek and BU_ID of 101 for Marsh Creek Reservoir, with their beneficial use designations based on Table II-1 Footnote 9. For consistency, these features will be added to the web-based interface.
3	27	3/7/2013	Betty Yee	Task 3 Beneficial Use mapping	The basin plan's list of stream have a lot of "dam to Delta" listings so it is important to overlay the Delta correctly. I'm not sure if the mistake is in the ends of the River or the mapping of the Delta. They need to be pretty exact about this because Delta has MUN and some of the named water bodies as they enter the Delta do not have MUN.	Comment has been incorporated. We initially used NHD to identify the end of the river segments to Delta. In the updated geodatabase, we have overlaid the official Delta boundary to identify any river segments within Delta but mapped as "..to Delta". We identified four main reaches to Delta we went thru and made changes as needed: 1) Calaveras River, New Hogan Reservoir to Delta (BU ID =66), 2) Mokelumne River, Camanche Reservoir to Delta (BU_ID = 63), 3) Cosumnes River, Source to Delta (BU_ID = 59), and 4) Yolo Bypass (BU_ID = 52).
3	28	3/12/2013	Betty Yee	Task 3 Beneficial Use mapping	"dam to Delta" reaches – For an example, please look at the Calaveras River. The reach ID 28770 and the remainder of the reaches to the San Joaquin River are all in the Delta but these reaches are identified as the Calaveras River from New Hogan to the Delta. I think that all the water bodies entering the Delta need to be looked at more closely because a number of them look like they are still called "… to Delta" when they are actually in the Delta.	Comment has been incorporated. Same response as above.
3	29	3/7/2013	Betty Yee	Task 3 Beneficial Use mapping	They did get the site specific water quality objective but their map only has "Water Quality Guidance" and "Water Quality Criteria" and they list the site specific water quality objectives as "Water Quality Guidance."	"Water Quality Guidance" was the terminology that was used during the development of the web based interface in 2010. Since the same platform is being used to display the data layers, that was carried over. The terminology used in the web-based interface will be changed to "Water Quality Objectives".

Task	No.	Date Received	Comment Source	Deliverable	Comment	Response
3	30	3/7/2013	Betty Yee	Task 3 Beneficial Use mapping	Then the south Delta is very confused. The have a piece of the San Joaquin River identified as mouth of Merced to Vernalis but it doesn't actually make it to Vernalis (it doesn't even make it to the Stanislaus River). The next time there is a continuous San Joaquin, they're in the Delta. For the water bodies in the discontinuous area between the two reaches of the San Joaquin, they call them the San Joaquin but then they use "Other lakes and reservoirs" to get the basin plan information. So, they apply the south Delta objectives to the San Joaquin from the mouth of Merced to Vernalis but they don't apply the south Delta objectives to the portion of the San Joaquin in the south Delta.	Comment has been incorporated. The discontinuity in the south of Delta near Vernalis has been resolved and the geodatabase updated to reflect that. Our proposed approach include two steps: 1) connecting the Mouth of Merced River (BU_ID= 83 in Table II-1) to Goodwin Dam to San Joaquin River (BU_ID = 90) and changing the beneficial use designation to BU_ID of 83 in Table II-1 of the Sac/SJR Basin Plan; 2) connecting the Sacramento San Joaquin Delta (with BU_ID =99 in Table II-1) to Goodwin Dam to San Joaquin River (BU_ID = 90) and changing the beneficial use designation to BU_ID of 99 in Table II-1 of the Sac/SRR Basin Plan.
3	31	3/7/2013	Betty Yee	The web-based interface/Task 3 Beneficial Use mapping	For the discontinuous part of the San Joaquin which they associated with "Other lakes and reservoirs" they have no beneficial use or water quality objectives link.	We checked to verify that the web-based tool that was developed in 2010 include beneficial use and water quality objectives populated for water bodies such as rivers represented by lines within NHD and did not include a link to water features such as lakes represented by polygons. The geodatabase includes beneficial uses and water quality objectives for all the main water features identified as part this mapping. So, although you can't view the features (BUs and WQOs) associated with the lakes and reservoirs within the 2010 web-based tool, they are in fact included within the geodatabase.
3	32	3/7/2013	Betty Yee	Task 3 Beneficial Use mapping	By the way, here's an interesting problem, they mapped the California Aqueduct. The California Aqueduct is named in the Sacramento/San Joaquin Rivers Basin Plan but not in the Tulare Lake Basin Plan. They used the Sacramento/San Joaquin Rivers Basin Plan to get its beneficial uses and water quality objectives. They need to disconnect it when it enters the Tulare Lake and then disassociate its beneficial uses from the Sacramento/San Joaquin Rivers Basin Plan and figure out what it is to the Tulare Lake. I always say that according to the Tulare Lake, it's a valley floor water and we won't protect it for MUN.	Comment has been incorporated. Our approach includes disconnecting California Aqueduct when it enters the Tulare Lake Basin and disassociating its beneficial use from the Sac/SJR Basin Plan.
3	33	3/7/2013	Betty Yee	Task 3 Beneficial Use mapping	In the Tulare Lake, I don't think they finished mapping the upper Kings, Kaweah and Tule Rivers.	See responses to comments 34 thru 37.
3	34	3/13/2013	Betty Yee	Task 3 Beneficial Use mapping	Upper Kings, Kaweah and Tule – Upon relooking at the map, the Tule is ok.	Comment noted. No changes in Tule River mapping.
3	35	3/7/2013	Betty Yee	Task 3 Beneficial Use mapping	They have little water bodies mapped between the Tule River and Poso Creek which they associated with Valley Floor Waters and I think those three creeks might be eastside streams.	Comment has been incorporated. Also see related comment #19 above. The Valley Floor Waters (with BU_ID of 220) has been updated in response to the previous comment #19 above. The updated final geodatabase show all water features within the hydrologic units of 551, 557, and 558.
3	36	3/7/2013	Betty Yee	Task 3 Beneficial Use mapping	They're missing a bunch of eastside streams which I think are bigger than the three they mapped so I'm not sure how they picked which water bodies to map. Actually, they have no water bodies which they identify as eastside streams	Comment has been incorporated. Also see related comment #19 above. The Other East Side Streams (with BU_ID of 218) has been updated to address the previous comment #19 above. The updated final geodatabase shows only non-constructed features within the hydrologic units of 552, 553, 554, and 555 .
3	37	3/7/2013	Betty Yee	Task 3 Beneficial Use mapping	They have a very nice set of water bodies for the westside streams.	Comment has been incorporated. Also see related comment #19 above. The Westside Streams (with BU_ID of 219) have been updated to address the previous comment #19 above. The updated final geodatabase shows only non-constructed features within the hydrologic units of 556 and 559 .
3	38	3/7/2013	Betty Yee	The web-based interface	For groundwater, it looks like they used DWR overlays. However, they need to be able to accommodate the areas where we have removed MUN. The DWR DAUs are all much larger than our de-designation areas.	The current GIs mapping is limited to updating NHD dataset. The web-based tool is being used to display the update NHD, but the other layers were carried from the work completed in 2010. The current scope does not include updates to other data layers.
3	39	3/13/2013	Betty Yee	Task 3 Beneficial Use mapping	For the Upper Kings, the North Fork is mapped and the South Fork is mapped until the confluence of the Middle with the South Fork. All of the South Fork as well as the Middle Fork of the Kings should be mapped.	Based on the current scope, we mapped the surface water features that have designated beneficial uses as listed in Table II-1 of the Tulare Lake Basin Plan. Surface water features within NHD were identified based on the names of the streams in Table II-1. Also note all other streams that are within the Kings River (Hydrologic unit 52) are being mapped as part of the Other East Side Streams (BU_ID = 218) mapping in response to the previous comments.
3	40	3/13/2013	Betty Yee	Task 3 Beneficial Use mapping	For the Kaweah, it looks like the entire Middle Fork is mapped but the North, South and Marble Forks are not mapped.	We checked NHD and identified the South, North, and Marble Forks as tributaries to Kaweah River. The current scope is limited to the beneficial use mapping of the main water bodies as identified in Table II-1 of the basin plans, including the Above Lake Kaweah (BU ID = 206), Lake Kaweah (BU ID =207), and Below Lake Kaweah (BU_ID= 208), according to Table II-1 of the Basin Plan. This is similar to the mapping of Tule River. Since the South, North, and Marble Forks are not the main streams identified in Table II-1 and may be considered as part of the tributary rule application, they were not mapped.