

<u>Row #</u>	<u>Commenter</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>
1	Lynn Nolan, STPUD	4	Section 4---Climate Change....I know that we didn't get into this too deeply while setting our goals and objectives, but do you feel like this brief discussion about gathering up plans will actually meet the state's criteria for addressing climate change? Maybe we need a bit more verbage about it in here...can we talk about it with the subcommittee?	Section meets requirements for addressing climate change adaptation. Addressing emission reductions is not listed in the Plan Review Checklist
2	Lynn Nolan, STPUD	8	Page 8-1 ....while listing the guidelines governance structure, some have * after them but no explanation that I can find for why they are starred	No changes made. Paragraph after the list provides explanation for asterisks.
3	Sarah Green, Alpine County	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>section 8.2 - I don't think I saw anything about the Leadership Team. Did that idea get dropped? I see it under 9.1.1 but thought it was originally described under governance.</li> </ul>	Add subsection describing LT & function?
4	Isaac Silverman, Sierra Watch	6	Opposes the inclusion of project #60.	No changes made. Project list was vetted by Partnership.
5	Curtis Ailing, Ascent	ES	{At Plan Goal #1} It would be important to include Lake Tahoe clarity as a key water quality objective, because it drives many planning and environmental decisions in the region. (I know this plan is not Tahoe-focused, but lake clarity is still one of the important goals.)	No changes made. Project goals and objectives were vetted by Partnership.
6	Brent Wolfe, NHC	2	{at 2.9.2.3} Echo Lake and Fallen Leaf Lake both have small dams. Like Tahoe, those dams just raise the water level above the natural rim of the lake.	Language added. Searching for sources of information about owner/operators of dams.
7	Kristen Stoner, Ascent	5	{at 5.2.3.1} Could include discussion to consider incorporating energy recapture (in-conduit hydro, co-generation) and distributed energy storage systems. Encourage local utilities to apply for eligibility for the CPUC's Self-Generation Incentive Program (SGIP) so that projects may be eligible for rebates. (TSAC p. 4-14)	No changes made. Consider adding to future updates of the Plan.

<u>Row #</u>	<u>Commenter</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>
8	JoAnn Anders, Town of Truckee	Ack	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On the Acknowledgements page – The Regional Water management Group of the Tahoe Sierra IRWM. Shouldn't this acknowledgement be to the Partnership of the TS IRWM?</li> </ul>	Change made.
9	JoAnn Anders, Town of Truckee	ES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On page ES-12, last paragraph – states the Partnership (TS IRWM) may provide in-kind services to the RWMG. I think this is backwards, shouldn't it say the RWMG ma provide in-kind support to the Partnership?</li> </ul>	<p>text is “Members of the Partnership may provide in-kind services to fulfill the roles of the RWMG and administrative support.”</p> <p>Changed “RWMG” to LT; with parallel change in §8.</p>
10	JoAnn Anders, Town of Truckee	ES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page ES-12, last line – RWMG should be Praternship.</li> </ul>	Changed (no parallel sentence in §8)
11	Lynn Nolan, STPUD	ES	Page ES9....Table ES-2 project Summary...Project Type has a little (a) after the title, but I can't seem to find the reference for the (a) so if we could put that in somewhere explaining what the R, SW and W stand for...and maybe put it WW for wastewater?	Footnote added from §6 tables
12	Lynn Nolan, STPUD	5	Section 5, page 5-5, 5.2.4.3.....recycled water use...talk about the restrictions on its use in the basin?	Added language: “use of recycled water within the Lake Tahoe Basin is prohibited with few exceptions by the Porter-Cologne Act”
13	Lynn Nolan, STPUD	6	Page 6-9, STPUD's project Iroquois Pond, is listed at 7.5M and is actually only \$266,250 (p.s. love the new tables, much easier to read)	Corrections to tables made.
14	Sarah Green, Alpine County	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>page 2-11 - I believe the 2010 census data for Alpine is <u>incorrect</u>. I just did a check on the census website and it's 1,175.</li> </ul>	No changes made; 1,175 is the 2010 population for the entire county; 726 is the estimated 2010 population for the portion of the county that is in the Region.

<u>Row #</u>	<u>Commenter</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>
15	Sarah Green, Alpine County	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix 3-A - I believe Alpine County has a Groundwater Management Plan. Shall I confirm that and get back to you?</li> </ul>	
16	Sarah Green, Alpine County	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix 3-A - Under "other documents", I'd like to see the Upper Carson River Watershed Stream Corridor Condition Assessment .Here is a link to the doc -<a href="http://ndep.nv.gov/bwqp/file/upper_carson_covertoc_1004.pdf">http://ndep.nv.gov/bwqp/file/upper_carson_covertoc_1004.pdf</a></li> </ul>	Added to appendix & references.
17	Sarah Green, Alpine County	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>table 6-4 - Alpine County's Markleeville Creek Restoration Project should be on the that list. It should be on Lynn's scoring sheet. It should also be included then in the Appendix Tables 6B</li> </ul>	Project #22 is in Table 6-2 and 6B-2 as a Restoration project
18	Brent Wolfe, NHC	ES	{at Table ES-1} Table doesn't summarize the complete analyses in Section 5 related to the applicability of these RMS to the Region. The ones deemed not applicable are in italics here. But you qualitatively ranked all these RMS in Section 5 as: not applicable; limited applicability; applicable, and highly applicable. Seems that a table that presented the RMS within those categories would be more meaningful and better summarize the work done to evaluate relative to the Region. (Same comment for table in Section 5 of main report).	No change made, Partnership didn't want to prioritize the objectives so assuming they don't want to highlight the qualitative assessment of applicability in the narrative.
19	Brent Wolfe, NHC	ES	{at ¶13 of §6 summary) Unclear statement. Are you implying that the reader should be aware that the list will change over time? Looks like Section 6 says the list gets updated every 2 years.	Yes. Text added: "as the list is expected to change over time as projects are completed and new project concepts added"  No change made in §6 as there is discussion in that section about biennial updates.
20	Brent Wolfe, NHC	ES	{at table ES-2} Does this imply an overall ranking based on the scoring system referenced above?	No, identification #, not ranking. No change made.

<u>Row #</u>	<u>Commenter</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>
21	Brent Wolfe, NHC	ES	{at table ES-2} I can infer from the text above what these abbreviations mean, but there is no legend or key that describes what these abbreviations mean for Project Type.	Footnote added from §6 tables
22	Brent Wolfe, NHC	ES	{at Project #2} Think this should be “SW” if its BMP implementation.	No change made; project is “R” per information form.
23	Brent Wolfe, NHC	ES	Abbreviation not previously defined. Think this is the Regional Water Management Group?	Yes. Changed to spell out abbreviation.
24	Curtis Ailing, Ascent	ES	{at ¶5 of§2 summary) this is an important point. Water quality is protected by non-degradation standards as a result of this designation. ADDED: “Notwithstanding the decline in clarity, Lake Tahoe is designated an Outstanding National Resource Water by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.”	Accept added text
25	Curtis Ailing, Ascent	ES	ADDED: “from 102.4 feet of visible depth to 75.3 feet” to Lake Tahoe clarity sentence	Accept added text
26	Brent Wolfe, NHC	1	I’m not aware of quagga muscles occurring in the Region. There is a major ongoing effort to keep them out with the boat inspection program, especially out of Lake Tahoe.	Text revised to remove quagga muscles and add curly pondweed (change to list of aquatic invasive species that are present and are the focus of control programs.
27	Curtis Ailing, Ascent	2	{at §2.7 climate change subsection mention of Cal-Adapt.org} Good	no change made
28	Brent Wolfe, NHC	2	{at §2.7 “Cal-adapt} Global change please, as a proper name.	Changed all occurrences to “Cal-Adapt”
29	Brent Wolfe, NHC	2	{at §2.8.3 Truckee River, gw basins} Is one of these numbers a typo? 20 times difference in capacity relative to estimated storage?	No changes made. Confirmed that the #'s match what’s in DWRs Bulletin 118.

<u>Row #</u>	<u>Commenter</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>
30	Brent Wolfe, NHC; Curtis Ailing, Ascent	2	{at §2.9.1.2 paragraph 2} (both commenters offered a revision of the same sentence)	Accepting change made by Brent Wolfe
31	Curtis Ailing, Ascent	2	{at §2.13.1 Climate Change mention of Sustainability Action Plan} good	no change made
32	Kristen Stoner, Ascent	2	{at §2.13.1 Climate Change mention of Sustainability Action Plan} Community health vulnerabilities have been added from Ch. 5 of the TSAP that were left out of this list.	Accepting additions to the list of vulnerabilities per the TSAP
33	Kristen Stoner, Ascent	2	ADDED: More frequent warm storm events will increase <del>excessive amounts of</del> runoff, which can threaten water quality of Lake Tahoe	Accepting change made by Kristen Stoner with modification of wording.
34	Curtis Ailing, Ascent	2-D	{at 8.6 in prioritization list} Please clarify how this is a vulnerability. I made a suggestion. Is this correct?	The checklist item is "Does your region include one or more of the habitats described in the Endangered Species Coalition's Top 10 habitats vulnerable to climate change" Not accepting suggested change, but revising text in list.
35	Curtis Ailing, Ascent	2-D	ADDED: The U.S. Forest Service and other land management agencies are actively pursuing fire fuel management actions; however, much of the forest in the Region still needs treatment.	Accepting change
36	Curtis Ailing, Ascent	2-D	Good. Also, please add a comment on the status of TMDL adoption here.	No change made
37	Curtis Ailing, Ascent	2-D	ADDED: TRPA, state agencies, and local agencies have implemented and are planning several river and wetland restoration projects to help reduce fine and suspended sediment volumes reaching Lake Tahoe.	Accepting change
38	Curtis Ailing, Kristen Stoner, Ascent	3	(no comments, minor changes)	Accepting changes

<u>Row #</u>	<u>Commenter</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>
39	Kristen Stoner, Ascent	4	<p>{at MPT WQ5.1} The TSAP provides incentives to prohibit development in SEZs and 100-yr floodplain.(p. 5-23 of TSAP):</p> <p>Prohibit development within the 100-year flood plain and evaluate on an ongoing basis, as data is available, how the 100-year flood plain may change over time under new precipitation patterns and warmer storms.</p> <p>Provide transfer incentives to remove public and private development from Stream Environment Zones (SEZs) and 100-year flood plains to reduce drainage problems and damage to public and private property.</p> <p>Require property owners and developers to dedicate land within 100- year floodplains, conservation easements, and SEZs to the jurisdiction or other designated entity when a development project is approved.</p>	No changes made. Objectives were vetted by Partnership.
40	Kristen Stoner, Ascent	4	<p>{at WQ6} What about consideration of alternative energy generation and distribution approaches for wastewater (see actions discussed on p. 4-14 of TSAC)? Granted, these may not result in water-related benefits.</p>	No changes made. Objectives were vetted by Partnership. Consider adding to future updates of the Plan.
41	Kristen Stoner, Ascent	4	<p>{at WS3} What about enforcement of requirements for new construction to implement CalGreen Water Efficiency measures (in California) or equivalent (in Nevada) within building codes. Incorporate water efficiency measures into the Green Building Ordinance. (p.4-24 of the TSAP for details).</p>	No changes made. Objectives were vetted by Partnership. Enforcement practices would fall under MPT WS3.1.
42	Kristen Stoner, Ascent	4	<p>{at GMW1} The TSAC (p. 5-19) recommends research of groundwater vulnerabilities associated with altered hydrologic conditions and investigating methods to maximize groundwater recharge.</p>	No changes made. Objectives were vetted by Partnership. Research falls under IRWM1 and there are several projects in the Plan involving research into improving groundwater recharge.

<u>Row #</u>	<u>Commenter</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>
43	Kristen Stoner, Ascent	4	{at ER3} This may be a good place to add that the combined effects of climate change and increased wildfire are expected to impair forest health and encourage invasive species (examples provided on p. 5-14 of TSAC)	Adding language to first sentence of the paragraph “especially considering the potential increases in fire risk in the future related to climate change”
44	Curtis Ailing, Ascent	4	{at IWM5} ADDED: , wildfire hazard	Rejecting change. Objectives were vetted by Partnership. Consider adding to future updates of the Plan.
45	Kristen Stoner, Ascent	5	{at 5.2.1.2} Recommend mentioning the need to prepare for increased water supply variability as a result of climate change (discussed in TSAP)	Adding language: “Due to the climate change vulnerabilities in the Region, this strategy can help all water suppliers to adapt to the potential effects of climate change, especially increased water supply variability.”
46	Kristen Stoner, Ascent	5	{at 5.2.6.5} TSAP recommendation: “Research groundwater vulnerabilities associated with altered hydrologic conditions and investigate methods to maximize groundwater recharge.” (p. 5-19)	No changes made.
47	Kristen Stoner, Ascent	7	(no comments, minor changes)	Accepting changes

Note: This table summarizes comments and significant changes made by commenters. Minor changes to punctuation, wording, etc. made in the text are not listed here.