

>> On Jun 20, 2019, at 6:26 PM, mallory Boyd <mallory.boyd@gmail.com> wrote:

>>

>> Adam -

>>

>> My comments below.

>>

>> 1) Not sure where to put this within section 3.3 (page 8 or 9) - but given that a small but vocal component of the IWV still believe Dr Austins' ascertainment that some Eastern Sierra watersheds might be contributing to the IWVGW through fractured granitic (bedrock) materials, I think we need to somehow address this. My concern is no discussion of this will lead certain elements of the public to scream fowl. This chapter even potentially opens this topic on top of page 10, where highly fractured bedrock is presented as permeable.

>> It seems to me that we either need to put this to rest by providing evidence that this doesn't exist; give it honorable mention but with a low probability; cite studies that have disputed the claim; something.

>>

>> 2) page 6, second to last line - families living on navy property from 1940's to the 1970's.

>>

>> 3) page 9, 2nd para, second line. suggest dropping the words 'that are currently isolated'. We know for a fact that some GW is coming in from Rose Valley, and we state elsewhere in the document that some GW flows

>> into Salt Wells. Hard to do if the valleys were isolated.

>>

>> 4) page 10 center section. for consistency, i'd recommend adding xxx years ago for both Pleistocene and Holocene references

>>

>> 5) page 11, fourth para - how is precipitation rates and ET connected? how about instead 'With high temperatures and high winds the IWVGB has high ET rates'

>>

>> 6) page 13 table 33 should be 3.3

>>

>> 7) top of page 18 - greasewood ET of 2.4 ft/yr seems high given relatively shallow root system and annual rainfall around 6 inches. was this supposed to be 2.4 inches?

>>

>> all for now, not sure when your due date is, I'm guessing tomorrow. if so, can i use the day early and apply it to future events that i might fall behind?

>>

>> r/ mal