<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Comment Citation</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Local Government Response and Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inventory, Characterization, and Analysis Report, Top of p.14:</td>
<td>Tom Jensen</td>
<td>Suggest explanation, i.e. “...forming an aquitard (an impervious layer, typically clay)...”</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inventory, Characterization, and Analysis Report, Bottom of p. 14:</td>
<td>Tom Jensen</td>
<td>Bottom of p. 14: Exactly what are DoE’s pH levels, does the White fail high or low, and is that failure the only reason to list it as an “impaired” water body?</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inventory, Characterization, and Analysis Report, p. 28 and elsewhere:</td>
<td>Tom Jensen</td>
<td>Explain “hyporheic”, especially what the report means by “hyporheic function.” That word isn’t in my Collegiate Webster's or F&amp;W Encyclopedic dictionaries. I think it means “downflow of water from a stream to an aquifer” with inferred filtration. I even wonder if the statement “HIGH: Soils are conducive to both hyporheic flow and support of vegetation.” isn’t an oxymoron. Maybe that’s just a favorite buzzword of the Watershed Company, or maybe it’s used to please insiders who have to approve the report.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inventory, Characterization, and Analysis Report, Section 6.1</td>
<td>Tom Jensen</td>
<td>Sect. 6.1 reads nice, the document sure isn’t very recreation-friendly. “Fishing” is not mentioned and Exhibit 6 and the little orange line (Fish Distribution) make my mouth water.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>