

| Task | Comment Number | Date Received | Comment Source | Deliverable               | Comment  | Response   |
|------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------------------|--|--|
| 1    | 1              | 4/18/2014     | N Quinn        | Task 1 Tech Memo Appendix | Page 1. There is a statement "other areas are anticipated to be principally narrative". What other areas?  | Actually says standards are anticipated to be narrative. Changed to "objectives", and clarified.   |
| 1    | 2              | 4/18/2014     | N Quinn        | Task 1 Tech Memo Appendix | Page 1. It is not clear what is meant by the statement "In waters that do not flow to these irrigation supplies."  | Clarified.   |
| 1    | 3              | 4/18/2014     | N Quinn        | Task 1 Tech Memo Appendix | Page 1. Please correct the grammar "sensitivity of that these supplies".   | Text not found in either memo or appendix.   |
| 1    | 4              | 4/18/2014     | N Quinn        | Task 1 Tech Memo Appendix | Page 1. Please explain what is being blended for the statement "Where irrigation water is blended before application to the crop."   | Clarified (e.g., in an irrigation supply canal), (e.g., in an irrigation supply canal).  |
| 1    | 5              | 4/18/2014     | N Quinn        | Task 1 Tech Memo Appendix | Page 1. There is a statement "Crop data can be obtained in the form of annual crop reports, normally from County Agricultural Commissioners or from Irrigation Districts, or as geographic information shapefiles (maps)." Please explain where the shapefiles can be obtained.  | Added.   |
| 1    | 6              | 4/18/2014     | N Quinn        | Task 1 Tech Memo Appendix | Page 1. Please correct the statement "Crop reports7 pertain to specific geographic "   | Text not found in either memo or appendix. Thinking this may have been an issue with the tracking of changes display.  |
| 1    | 7              | 4/18/2014     | N Quinn        | Task 1 Tech Memo Appendix | Page 2. discussion about Methods A and B. There is a statement that the LSR Committee determined "Start with Method A and then tabulate crops that are protected, unprotected, and whose protection status is unknown. If <5% of the irrigable acres are unprotected, then the common crops have been identified. If not, consider adding additional, smaller crop classes to meet this goal." I don't recall rejecting Method B. I actually prefer the cumulative index approach for the following reasons:<br>1. It coincides with the idea of protecting 95% of the crop acreage<br>2. It doesn't appear as arbitrary (although more semantic than real) since it avoids making inclusion judgments at the 4%/5% interface in as obvious a way. | If the method is applied as described, the criteria for both methods can be met. Thus, neither method is selected. Rather, they are applied in succession, with an opportunity for judgement to be exercised in the process of applying Method B, which is almost always going to be the more conservative of the two methods. |
| 1    | 8              | 4/18/2014     | N Quinn        | Task 1 Tech Memo Appendix | Page 2. There is a statement "At present, GS crop pattern layers are not developed with the same frequency as tabular data, and therefore may be less timely (older) for a given analysis." Not sure what is being compared here. Most GS layers are produced every 5-7 years. Is tabular data from water districts?   | Yes. This had been clarified in text of the most recent version.   |
| 1    | 9              | 4/18/2014     | N Quinn        | Task 1 Tech Memo Appendix | Page 2. There is a statement "The LSRJ Committee determined to use irrigable acres to initially identify common crops, but to express the resulting extent of protection as percentages employing both crop and irrigable land acreage bases." It's not clear what is meant by "crop and irrigable land acreage bases"?  | Clarifying explanation has been added.   |
| 1    | 10             | 4/18/2014     | N Quinn        | Task 1 Tech Memo Appendix | Page 2. There is a statement "In general, the most sensitive, common irrigation system should be considered." What is a sensitive irrigation system?   | Text not present in current version.   |
| 1    | 11             | 4/18/2014     | N Quinn        | Task 1 Tech Memo Appendix | Page 2. There is a statement "Based on discussions with the Lower San Joaquin River Committee, it is important in such an analysis to recognize crops as economic, rather than purely mathematical entities." I think you are suggesting to consider economics and maybe other social factors in determining limits of protection?   | Clarification added: "That is, the context in which the crop is typically cultivated by growers, and the economic benefit to farming operations relative to other crops in a rotation, should be considered."  |
| 1    | 12             | 4/18/2014     | N Quinn        | Task 1 Tech Memo Appendix | Page 3. There is a statement "In the current work, it was decided to work with ratios to irrigable acres during the analysis." Ratios of what to irrigable acres?  | This had been addressed in the current version. Crop class acreages.   |
| 1    | 13             | 4/18/2014     | N Quinn        | Task 1 Tech Memo Appendix | Page 3. There is a statement "Both ratios are used to report the results in terms of the area proportions furnished protection by the selected threshold-determining-crop." I'm not sure what is being said here.  | Text not in current version.   |
| 1    | 14             | 4/18/2014     | N Quinn        | Task 1 Tech Memo Appendix | Page 3. There is a statement "Methods A and B for determining common crops yielded the same resulting list of common crops for the LSRJ Service/Study area when irrigable acres are used as the basis". Qualify with the provision that this occurred when the threshold of 5% area or 95% cumulative area was applied.  | Added.   |
| 1    | 15             | 4/18/2014     | N Quinn        | Task 1 Tech Memo Appendix | Page 3. There is a statement "The most sensitive, common crops are Almonds and Walnuts. Beans, which are significantly more sensitive than Almonds and Walnuts, are not included." The statement is correct because they didn't meet the 5% threshold.   | Also, they did not come in under Method B (95% cumulative).  |
| 1    | 16             | 4/18/2014     | N Quinn        | Task 1 Tech Memo Appendix | Page 3. There is a statement "An important qualitative consideration is that Beans are grown in this area largely as a reclamation crop in rotation with Tomatoes, which generate more revenue in the rotation." This practice of rotation generates more revenue because of the nitrogen fixing role of beans.  | Comment noted.   |
| 1    | 17             | 4/18/2014     | N Quinn        | Task 1 Tech Memo Appendix | Page 3. There is a statement "profitability of farming Tomatoes (perhaps due to more stringent discharge requirements) by the very growers afforded this high level of protection might be more greatly harmed by the very thresholds that provide them "protection." The sentence needs reworking.  | Done.  |
| 1    | 18             | 4/18/2014     | N Quinn        | Task 1 Tech Memo Appendix | Page 3. There is a statement "Where possible, this type of unintended consequence should be understood and given due consideration." Which consequence?  | Replaced with "economic harm."   |
| 1    | 19             | 4/18/2014     | N Quinn        | Task 1 Tech Memo Appendix | Table 1. Please provide a key. What is the definition of "unknown"?  | Done. U = Protection status unknown due to lack of crop class sensitivity data.  |