AGENDA ITEM #6 - SRCD Comments on SoAm DRAFT GSP

Commenting		Date of	Section/	PDF Page	PDF Line	
Organization	Comment By	Comment	Appendix #	Number	Number or	Comment
Sloughhouse RCD	Austin Miller	8/4/21	Section 1	13	Figure 1-1	Incorrect boundary line between SCGA and SRCD. Needs updated.
Sloughhouse RCD	Austin Miller	8/4/21	Section 1	16	155	Should a sentence or two be added to SCGA's section to highlight the future transition to RWA/SGA?
Sloughhouse RCD	Austin Miller	8/4/21	Section 1	19	241	It was my understanding that Reclamation District 551 GSA had joined the North Delta GSA.
Sloughhouse RCD	Austin Miller	8/4/21	Section 1	19	269	Update Phone Number: 916-526-5447
Sloughhouse RCD	Austin Miller	8/4/21	Section 2	25	Figure 2.13	Incorrect boundary line between SCGA and SRCD. Needs updated.
Sloughhouse RCD	Austin Miller	8/4/21	Section 2	210	110	Specify land use type of tribal land (future casino).
Sloughhouse RCD	Austin Miller	8/4/21	Section 3	358	Figure 3-21	Are areas that are not currently covered by the 24.25 square mile buffers around monitoring points be included as data gaps? Include it in the GSP may help get future funding. Specifically SRCD GSA area near Rancho Murieta.
Sloughhouse RCD	Austin Miller	8/4/21	Section 5	51	2	Include Cosumnes Subbasin or change to "Sacramento County" or "throughout the region"
Sloughhouse RCD	Austin Miller		Section 4	438	755	The GSAs have not agreed to funding or development for a basin wide well protection program. Consider changing tone to reflect Section 5, line 248: "The management actions that will be undertaken by the GSAs, either jointly OR singly.