

Note: This table includes all comments pertaining directly to Chapter 4 of the WAR. Listed first are comments on Draft A of Chapter 4, presented and discussed at the first WAR workshop. Next are comments from the two Watershed Integration Meetings (WIMs) that were either (1) not specifically addressed in Draft A or (2) were not raised again in comments on Draft A. Next are comments on Draft A of the three technical memoranda (Data Gaps, Lessons Learned, and Limiting Factors) that pertain directly to Chapter 4. The numbering of these comments is retained from the comment tables developed for those TMs for easy cross-referencing. These comments are also included in the QA/QC Worksheet for the respective TMs. Last, any additional miscellaneous comments that were received after the final (fourth) WAR workshop are included at the end of the table.

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
1	City of Sunnyvale	Chapter 4 pp. 1-6	<p>The descriptions of the waterbodies in this section do not seem to follow a consistent format or similar construction process for describing them. This makes the text difficult to follow especially when nothing is mentioned for some waterbodies and one is left to wonder if information was just left out or was not available. If information is not available (e.g., on vegetation types present or flood history) then it should be stated in the text.</p> <p>It would make sense to follow a similar format for each waterbody discussed (e.g., 1st paragraph - general information and location/ size 2nd paragraph - what is known about the vegetation/land use; 3rd paragraph - floods/reservoir releases 4th paragraph - specific unique characteristics)</p> <p>Rob said that in the second draft- a lot of repetitive jargon could be substituted with more descriptive terms “of a more accessible sense”.</p> <p>He also said that an effort could be made to make the format of all the waterbody description sections more alike.</p>	<p>The watershed descriptions have been streamlined with an eye toward a more consistent format. All waterbodies are now discussed rather than simply the major ones. Because consistent information (such as details on floods, vegetation, etc.) was not always available for every waterbody, the amount of information presented will vary. Where information is lacking, it is identified as such.</p>
1.5	Terry Neudorf, SCVWD Guadalupe River Watershed Captain	Chapter 4, section 4-1-1, Waterbodies in the Watershed, p. 1	<p>This list of species occurring in the various waterbodies seems to have no rhyme or reason. For example: <i>“Riparian areas along the Guadalupe River on the valley floor include the following native species: arroyo willow, Fremont cottonwood, box elder (Acer negundo), western sycamore, red willow and sandbar willow (Salix exigua). Nonnative plant species also exist along the lower Guadalupe River riparian corridor, including arundo/giant reed (Arundo donax), fennel, black locust, tree-of-heaven, Himalayan blackberry, prickly wild lettuce, white sweet clover, and bristly oxtongue (Picris echioides) (WCR 2001).”</i></p> <p>This list of natives and non-natives is very odd and omits many common species</p>	<p>The lists of species have been scaled back substantially with only a few representative species mentioned. A comprehensive species list for each waterbody is beyond the scope of this effort.</p>

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
			<p>(oaks and other willows for example). The danger of this is that the information is not very valuable, and the report leads itself to misinterpretation. This same comment also applies to the lists of wildlife and fish.</p> <p>These lists either need to be comprehensive or else, include species that are representative of the stream or reaches being discussed.</p>	
2	Terry Neudorf, SCVWD Guadalupe River Watershed Captain	Chapter 4, section 4-1-1, p. 4	<p>Sentence beginning; <i>“The reservoir was completed in 1935 and has an average surface area of 79 acres and a capacity of 3,740 acre-feet.”</i> (Correct ‘3,740 acre ft’ to ‘3,228 acre ft’).</p> <p>Trish suggests to ‘find the source of these erroneous numbers’ and address all necessary corrections in Characteristics Report, if it’s necessary.</p> <p>Alice says that re-opening the old document for reference checks would delay the review process.</p> <p>These concerns apply for comments 2-7 here. The motion was not to re-open old document for all reference checks- but change the new references to Terry Neudorf instead of WCR.</p>	Information taken from the WCR has been corrected in this new draft.
2.5	Terry Neudorf, SCVWD Guadalupe River Watershed Captain	Chapter 4, section 4-1-1, under Guadalupe Reservoir on p. 4	<p>The following text, <i>“Within the Guadalupe Creek subwatershed is the Guadalupe Reservoir, which is located on the southern boundary of Almaden Quicksilver County Park on Hicks Road. The reservoir was completed in 1935 and has an average surface area of 79 acres and a capacity of 3,228 acre-feet. Its principal purpose is to provide staged releases of impounded water to the Alamos Percolation Pond system downstream on Guadalupe Creek. The SCVWD operates this reservoir for water conservation purposes.”</i></p> <p>This text should be corrected to state, <u>“...Its principal purpose is to provide staged releases of impounded water for groundwater recharge purposes in Guadalupe Creek and River channels, in Los Cap ponds, Alamos Pond, and the Guadalupe recharge ponds.”</u></p>	Revision adopted.
3	Terry Neudorf, SCVWD Guadalupe River Watershed Captain	Chap. 4, section 4.1, p. 4	Sentence beginning; <i>“It has an average surface area of 59 acres and a capacity of 1,780 acre-feet.”</i> (Correct ‘1,780 acre feet’ to ‘1, 586 acre feet’).	Revision adopted.

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
4	Terry Neudorf, SCVWD Guadalupe River Watershed Captain	Chap. 4, section 4.1, p. 5	Sentence beginning; <i>“Calero Reservoir impounds Arroyo Calero and was completed in 1935. It has a surface area of 752 acres and a capacity of 10,050 acre-feet (WCR 2001).”</i> (correct ‘752 acres’ to ‘347 acres’)	Revision adopted.
5	Terry Neudorf, SCVWD Guadalupe River Watershed Captain	Chap. 4, section 4-1-1, p. 5 Lexington Reservoir	Sentence beginning; <i>“Lexington Reservoir was completed in 1952. It has an average surface area of 404 acres and a capacity of 19,044 acre-feet (WCR 2001).”</i> (correct ‘404 acres’ to ‘475 acres’)	Revision adopted.
6	Terry Neudorf, SCVWD Guadalupe River Watershed Captain	Chap. 4, section 4-1-1, p. 6 Lexington Reservoir, continued	Sentence beginning; <i>“The drainage area upstream of Lexington Reservoir is 375 square miles.”</i> (correct ‘375 square miles’ to ‘369 square miles’)	Revision adopted. We assume the comment meant 36.9 square miles.
7	Terry Neudorf, SCVWD Guadalupe River Watershed Captain	Chap. 4, section 4-1-1, p. 6- Vasona Reservoir	The sentence beginning, <i>“The upper part of the drainage area above Vasona Reservoir (excluding the Lexington Reservoir drainage area) is located on the eastern slopes of El Soreno and the northern slopes of St. Joseph’s Hill.”</i> (correct ‘Soreno’ to ‘Serenó’)	Revision adopted.
7.25	Terry Neudorf, SCVWD Guadalupe River Watershed Captain	Chap. 4- related?? No clear reference provided	Some of the prior or existing reservoir designations as COLD that seem to be a disconnect: Calero: Most of it is quite warm. There is no opportunity for trout to move "upstream" to avoid the heat of the summer and all of the bass. The deeper hole in front of the dam is often depauperate in oxygen where the cooler temperatures reside.	This comment has been added to the local knowledge section of the reach summary table in Appendix 4-B and is referenced in the text.
7.5	Terry Neudorf, SCVWD Guadalupe River Watershed Captain	Chapter 4 related?? No clear reference provided	Did we have access to our (FAHCE) reservoir profile data in this process for the district reservoirs? Would these older designations be up for revision from this effort? Or are these designations just an extension of upstream/downstream assignments with little in the way of actual performance expectations?	Only limited FAHCE data was available for use during the pilot assessments – generally fish habitat mapping, temperature, and flow information. Reservoir profile data was not included. Since the time of the pilot assessments, a significant amount of additional FAHCE data has become available. A complete review of this data would have to be performed in order to potentially revise some of the pilot assessment conclusions. This could be done as part of the next phase of work. Some of the general conclusions reached by the FAHCE process are

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
				outlined in the text of the chapter, but no pilot assessment results have been changed in light of this data.
7.75	Terry Neudorf, SCVWD Guadalupe River Watershed Captain	Chapter 4 related?? No clear reference provided	<p>Chinook are not native to these systems (feral hatchery strays naturalized or possibly naturalizing, at best, from an initial colonization period in the '80s, recruitment continuously subsidized by feral hatchery strays thereafter). The statement as it sits needs to be qualified as "native to California" or some other, broader geographic designation than these specific systems. Relying on data, Snyder (the earliest (1905) reference used in this process) did not identify Chinook coming from the south bay streams. We have been down this road before.</p> <p>A larger implication: if this species is used as a "primary" or "preferred" indicator and it is not native, (i.e. naturally occurring and naturally sustained population viability over the historic record and for the long future) was any thought given to how that might play into forecasts and evaluations? it may quickly run into the conundrum of absence of evidence is evidence of absence...</p>	<p>The text reference in question has been removed from the chapter. The issue of whether chinook and steelhead are native to the Guadalupe watershed was hashed out at length in the WCR. This chapter will not go into any detail on this subject.</p> <p>Species presence is used as a surrogate for habitat suitability under the WMI Assessment Framework for COLD. Whether or not the species in question is native to the stream, its current or recent presence in the system indicates at least a minimally acceptable level of habitat quality for COLD.</p>
7.85	Terry Neudorf, SCVWD Guadalupe River Watershed Captain	Chapter 4 related?? No clear reference provided	Was Alamitos Creek actually widened all the way up to Bertram Rd. (at New Almaden) in the 1970's? It is obviously affected by the flood-control project where it was over-widened (in the 1980's?) from Lake Almaden upstream and from the confluence with Calero Creek/Camden Ave xing, just up to McKean. Upstream of McKean it looks much more natural. The creek rerouted itself a bit in the New-Almaden area per some storm flow action (in the 1990's?) which resulted in some stream meander.	This information has been added to the local knowledge section of the reach summary table in Appendix 4-B and is referenced in the text.
8	City of Sunnyvale	Chapter 4, p. 8 Section 4-1-3 (cont.), top of the page	<p>Why is GR/AC-4 not listed here as a reach for the Arroyo Calero subwatershed? It's in the Guadalupe waterbody tables. (p.63)</p> <p>Rob said that it will now be included in the Report- as well as the table.</p>	This reach is now referenced in the text.
9	City of Sunnyvale	Chapter 4, section 4-2, Los Gatos Creek, second paragraph , page 8 and Guadalupe Creek, entire paragraph ,	<p>Both of these sections are very confusing and difficult to read. What is the point about the MUN and RARE data for Los Gatos creek that is being made? It is lost with the parenthetical statements being made here.</p> <p>In order to make the whole Los Gatos Creek section more clear, we suggest breaking it down into separate paragraphs for statements about each beneficial use.</p>	The text has been revised to address these concerns.

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
		p. 9	The statements on P. 9 about the Guadalupe Reservoir are also very difficult to understand. What is the point being made about PFF and COLD? Perhaps breaking some of the very long and convoluted sentences into two separate thoughts would help. The paragraphs and sentences are so run-on in these two sections, trying to tease out the points that are being made about each beneficial use is extremely difficult.	
10	City of Sunnyvale	Chapter 4, section 4-3-1 P. 11- Paragraph before bulleted items	<p>This paragraph states that at the WIM meetings, many detailed comments from stakeholders were received and suggested revisions were not included in the final assessment of support. A selection of the comments received is listed as bulleted items here.</p> <p>How are these comments being dealt with? If they are discussed in another section of the report, then there should be some reference to that section. As it is now, it appears that the WAR response to comments collected from the WIM is "comment noted" and then nothing has been done with them. If stakeholder comments collected during the WIM are going to be listed here, then we should also indicate what the WMI is going to do with them.</p> <p>(This comment also applies to statements about the WIM and stakeholder comments being made in Sections 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, and 4.3.5)</p> <p>Comments were folded in to the assessment results, but it didn't fit in to the overall approach of the process to address comments. Rob's intent was to include them in a bulleted fashion- so that they were not lost- but he feels it is left in the air- as to where they should all be addressed officially (i.e. Lessons Learned memo- new section?)</p> <p>Lori P. suggests that in future assessments someone tracks the comments submitted from WIM meetings- Lesson learned: comments and responses to them should be documented better.</p> <p>Kristy suggested "if we are going to include them in the document- let's follow up with a follow-up paragraph explaining when and how in the future comments will be treated". Perhaps using something similar to Trish's example format for support statement WAR tech appendix. Rob responds by saying that type of format is appropriate for reach comments- but not process-related comments.</p> <p>Let's address these comments in a Response to Comments section in an appendix</p>	<p>The comments generated during the two WIM meetings were largely addressed in the first draft of this chapter (as well as chapters 5 and 6) and the associated tables. Comments that raised larger issues were not addressed in the first drafts and were raised again during the four WAR workshops. Responses to these comments are outlined in these QA/QC worksheets for Chs. 2, 4-6, and the technical memos.</p> <p>The text of this chapter (and Chs. 5 and 6) has been revised to present this information differently. Local knowledge comments have been included in Appendix B to each of the watershed chapters. Larger process oriented comments are addressed in the Lessons Learned TM as appropriate.</p>

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
			<p>and refer to it in a separate section in the Lessons Learned memo, instead of bulleted points in the current section. (Let's use the comment table format appending these items, also include in these tables a field describing whether or not the comment was addressed or incorporated into the final draft. This appendix will be for the WIM comments and comments from these review workshops)</p> <p>Rob/WAC will remove the bulleted points of this p. 11 paragraph and will provide greater context to how these comments are being dealt with.</p>	
11	City of Sunnyvale	Chapter 4, section 4-3-3, p. 13- first paragraph	<p>The use of the term “low level of uncertainty” used here and in other places throughout the document to show that the data set is good and supportive of the statements that are being made is very confusing. It's like using a double negative.</p> <p>Aren't we highly certain about the support statement, based on the quality of the data available?</p> <p>Is there another way to phrase this idea so that it is clear that the data set used to make the support determination statement was reliable and we should have a higher degree of confidence in support statements being made?</p> <p>Rob responds saying this was an attempt to stay consistent- in order to make comparisons between reaches. Kristy suggests that maybe explaining the definitions of these ‘terms’ in the watershed chapters- maybe include these explanations in the chapter describing assessment framework and whole approach.</p> <p>Rob suggests changing the uncertainty rating to a lettering system instead of the 1-4 system. Trish suggests qualifying data based on ‘certainty’ rather than ‘uncertainty’. Geoff suggests the opposite- stick with uncertainty rating terminology, as most scientists refer to degrees of uncertainty not certainty. A resolve was reached; ‘A’ will be designated as ‘most uncertain’ in the tables. In the text, the rating terms used will be more user-friendly, using “high level of certainty” instead of “low level of uncertainty”.</p>	<p>The uncertainty rating scale has been changed from numeric (1-4) to alphanumeric (A-D) with A corresponding to the former 4 (most certain)(note error in comment column). The term “uncertainty” is retained; a description of the uncertainty scale should be added to Chapter 3.</p>

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
12	Larry Johann-GCRCD	General Comments for Chapter 4	<p>The description of the various waterbodies in the watershed should be more detailed and consistent. For example the drainage area is described in some detail for Los Gatos and Alamitos Creeks but not for the Guadalupe River or Guadalupe Creek. The report does not provide much detailed history of the watercourses or how they became degraded to their current state. Many tributaries are not even listed. Although some species are listed for some of the watercourses others are not. The condition and health of the riparian corridor or general condition of the river channel is not detailed. This is of critical importance in any assessment of the watercourse. The importance of urban riparian areas is not addressed, especially for native and rare species. For the most part, the text section of the report seems to be an abbreviated duplication of the information presented in the Characteristics Report. The assessment report should be far more detailed.</p> <p>The report contains numerous inaccurate statements and errors in addressing the beneficial uses and detailed comments on most of these have already been formally documented and submitted. Most of the figures referenced in the report could not be located so it is impossible to specifically comment on these, although I assume the figures are the actual assessment pages I have already provided comment on. I am still waiting on a satisfactory resolution for the issues raised.</p> <p>Sarah says that they were avoiding redundancy in the waterbody descriptions. Larry responds by saying that riparian zones and channel morphology aspects should be described – so as to capture the state of these reaches.</p> <p>Rob explains that they were avoiding ‘borrowing’ too much information from the Characteristics Report- especially since some of THAT info. Is no longer accurate.</p> <p>Sarah adds that ‘this is not a habitat assessment and we can not get into that type of detail here’.</p> <p>Larry is concerned that by focusing only on beneficial uses and not involving the basic physical description of these streams- the purpose of the assessment will be lost- i.e. The ability to discern limiting factors later on in the assessment.</p> <p>Lori suggests resolving this issue by summarizing the watershed characteristics</p>	<p>Information concerning the state of the riparian corridor throughout the Guadalupe watershed has been added to the text. Most of this information was provided by Larry Johann. An attempt was made to provide a consistent set of information for each reach/waterbody where possible. Thus, some of the detail of the first draft has been removed where a similar level of detail could not be included for all reaches. The primary thrust of Chapters 4-6 is to explain the results of the pilot assessments. Complete, detailed descriptions of each subwatershed and waterbody were provided in the WCR. The WAR will not supplement this information except where warranted by the pilot assessment findings and local knowledge comments from stakeholders.</p>

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
			<p>from WCR- and addressing the suggested need to provide a more detailed assessment (including riparian zone descriptions, etc.) in the future. Let's also clarify/emphasize that it is made clear in the report that the assessment is focused primarily on the BU/interest data only. Sarah suggests allowing Larry to submit riparian info. And have it be included as an appendix to the report.</p> <p>Larry is happy if WAC can provide a general description of what riparian habitat and channel morphology is. Larry consents to assist WAC here and the issue is resolved. Let's make it clear in the report that this is not THE watershed assessment report- but rather a pilot process with many lessons learned.</p>	
27	City of Sunnyvale	All Watershed Tables	<p>Generally, the format of these tables needs to be changed enough so that words at the ends of boxes aren't cut off at the ends of sentences.</p> <p>Also, all assessment comments should start with a capital letter. The way things look now, sentences or words may be being cut off by the formatting of the tables and there is no way to tell that, if you don't start all your sentences or lists with capital letters.</p>	This formatting issue has been addressed. This was a problem with Adobe Acrobat's PDF file format and has been remedied by printing directly from MS Access.
28	Trish Mulvey (Reach Assessment comment number 1)	All watersheds	<p>In early February, I provided RPT and WAC a sample format for the reach assessment tables. It includes fields for each use/interest for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • local knowledge comments • data gap(s) and priority • limiting factor(s) and suspected cause(s) <p>In order to capture all the useful information in one place, once we have seen the data gaps and limiting factors tech memos, I really hope we can consider reformatting the reach assessment table template, and integrate all the reach specific information on each page.</p> <p>Trish handed out a suggested format for separating and capturing all the data introduced to the assessment from Local Knowledge. She agrees it all should be included – but that we should 'protect' the methodology of the data collection process- by segregating this data from the existing data 'data box' data.</p> <p>Sarah says that they could easily separate out the local knowledge data into separate data sheets.</p> <p>Michael re-states these concerns as: let's incorporate all applicable data but 'bring a wall down' in between data types. Geoff suggests blending all the data</p>	The format drafted by Trish Mulvey has been adopted in the revised reach summary tables in Appendix 4-B. Local knowledge comments are kept separate from the data considered in the assessment. None of the assessment results have been revised based on either local knowledge or additional data that became available after completion of the pilot assessments.

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
			‘keep the wall up’ and give equal weight to both data in assessment support determination- and clearly show the distinction between the data.	
29	Trish Mulvey (Reach Assessment comment number 2)	All watersheds Chapter 4 p.11; section 4-3-1 Chapter 5, p.7; section 5-3-1 Chapter 6, p.6; section 4-6-1	If a field for local knowledge comments is provided on the reach assessment tables as requested above, the local knowledge comments from the chapters x.3.1 sections should be transcribed.	All local knowledge comments have been included in the revised reach summary tables. Several of them are also discussed in the text under the appropriate waterbody and/or use discussion.
30	Trish Mulvey	All watersheds	Need a “table of contents” for each reach assessment table listing the waterbody, reach code, and page. Need advice from the Captains about whether it should be in order by page number or alphabetically by waterbody (or both)	This list has been added to the front of Appendix 4-B.
31	Trish Mulvey	All watersheds	As previously requested, please include perennial pools in the “flow regime” field when the information is known, so I don’t have to read the assessment comment details.	Because it would necessitate revising the stream segmentation memo and tables and because the presence of pools in a reach (during summer) will vary from year to year, this comment was not adopted. Instead, reaches where such pools are commonly present (based on the data available) are referenced in the assessment comment column under the COLD use. For easier reference, the “pools present” notation is now the first entry under this column in these reaches.
32	City of Sunnyvale	Watershed Tables (All)- General comment	How is the support status “Unable to determine” going to be handled in the final report? Will there be a listing or table of all these reaches/uses where data needs to be collected in order to make future support statements? Will there be a discussion somewhere in the assessment that identifies these areas and provides some prioritization as to which data are a higher priority to gather for further refinement of these assessments? It would be helpful to the stakeholders to see where essential data gaps are and then use that information to develop future monitoring priorities. Rob will be discussing comments unable to address in some kind of section. Maybe an introductory portion in the Data Gaps memo? Sarah agrees this would be an appropriate location- and maybe also in the beginning of each Chapter-	A list of reaches for which insufficient data were available for ALL evaluated uses is included as the last page of the reach summary tables in Appendix 4-B. The Data Gaps TM includes tables listing the data gaps for these reaches. Reach summary tables for all other reaches, including those where insufficient data were available for up to 4 of the 5 uses, are included in Appendix 4-B. Data gaps are also listed in these tables. The Data Gaps TM is now referenced in the chapter. The issue of prioritizing data gaps is addressed in Section 4.4 as well as in the Data Gaps TM.

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
			<p>showing the links to data gaps in other chapters and other TMs/appendices. Also, in the tables themselves these data gaps could be captioned (appendix F).</p>	
33	City of Sunnyvale	Watershed Figures “Support by Reach” general comments	<p>These figures are still very confusing and desperately need captions to state what is being shown. The caption should include information as to what it means when there is no “box” present for a particular creek or reach. Does it mean that we were unable to determine any statements regarding support for the various beneficial uses for those creeks/reaches? If so, then it should be stated.</p> <p>The codes for the fill lines in the boxes need to be bigger. It’s hard to tell what the various line directions are from the tiny presentations here.</p> <p>Rather than having the numbers listed for each beneficial use determination category, simply listing one series for non-support (-1), Unable to determine (0), Potential Support (1) Partial Support (3) and Fully supported (5). This would be sufficient and it’s not necessary to list form for each beneficial use.</p> <p>Also, it would be very helpful to have a nearby appendix or table showing the codes and the various creek names/reaches that they represent, so that one doesn’t have to keep flipping back to the text of Chapters 4-6 or through the tables to figure out what each creek code name means.</p> <p>Trish suggests that the stream segmentation maps be used for showing support by reach. For example, instead of the bar graphs.</p> <p>Rob is concerned that the uncertainty levels associated with certain support statements (i.e. with high uncertainty) would be lost in visually- easy graphics.</p> <p>The motion was to move forward with the segmentation maps- but rather with color-coding, using hash and stippled line codes to distinguish between uncertainty levels. A suggestion to retain all the bar graphs-(except for USE certainty bar graphs) and to supplement with maps.</p> <p>Kristy’s suggestions for modifying the existing bar charts based on this #33 comments. Rob will review these suggestions.</p> <p>It was discussed whether or not videos and picture-type data could be added to</p>	<p>A note is now included on the charts explaining why there are no bars above some reaches and why other reach bars do not show all uses. The legend has also been increased in size. One scale is now provided for all uses. A listing of all streams/waterbodies and their associated reach ID is now contained at the front of Appendix 4-B.</p> <p>The maps suggested in the comments have been created and are included in Chapter 2 and referenced extensively throughout Ch. 4. The bar graphs have been revised per this comment and are now included in Appendix 4-A.</p> <p>Local knowledge comments are now included in the reach summary tables in Appendix 4-B. They are also referenced in the text, though less comprehensively. Additional data that has become available since the completion of the pilot assessments are briefly described in the text but are not detailed in the reach summary tables. Assessment results are only based on data that was included in the assessment and not subsequently available data or local knowledge.</p>

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
			<p>the assessment data- Rob explains that this is viable data- but there are protocols for identifying qualifying data and this would hugely delay the assessment to enter in new data. Why didn't this data come forward earlier?</p> <p>Laura comments that this might be upsetting to the framework that was established originally for the process.</p> <p>Geoff: "Let's emphasize data citations saying "do not cite or quote" so that we make sure that this local data is not used inappropriately."</p> <p>Lori mentions that any and all text referring to 'local knowledge' in the report needs to be consistent. Luisa responds by saying that all this local knowledge data will not be consistent because of the nature of each watershed. She adds that instead of Larry viewing the Guadalupe data as "wrong/incorrect" he should view them as data gaps and accept that this pilot assessment is very limited WRT data collection/comprehensiveness.</p> <p>Let's accept the data limitations and add disclaimers to the report so that this data isn't 'misused'.</p> <p>Let's define local knowledge as data that has not passes through the QA/QC process. Geoff suggests that this local data which has not yet been filtered through this quality control process- should not even be included in the assessment- but it should be attached as appended tables. Consensus reached here.</p>	
34	City of Sunnyvale	General Comment - Support and Uncertainty Tables for all watersheds	<p>These tables are also in desperate need of captions to explain what is being shown. Also, using fill patterns for the boxes showing the various uncertainty levels that are similar to patterns used for the tables showing the support by reach is somewhat confusing. We suggest selecting another fill pattern or shading scheme for the Uncertainty tables.</p> <p>Please refer to the response to comment #11 of this table and #35 of the consolidated comment table for the Lessons Learned memo.</p> <p>Additionally, it was suggested that the WAC include the local knowledge data in the tables and reference this local knowledge data, clearly explaining that it was not included in the Assessment process and therefore not given weight in support</p>	<p>The shading scheme for showing uncertainty has been changed to differentiate between the two types of charts. The size of the bars has also been changed so that bar height refers to level of support and the shading of the bar (or lack thereof) refers to uncertainty.</p> <p>See previous response for the local knowledge comment.</p>

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
			determinations. Also, 'local knowledge' should be clearly defined as data that did not pass through the quality assurance/quality control process.	
35	City of Sunnyvale	Guadalupe Watershed figure, Support by Reach, p. 3 of 3	Reach GR/AC-4 doesn't show the graphic for the non-support for COLD, as was stated as one of the two descriptions for Beneficial Uses on p. 63 of the Watershed Tables. The graphic representing this information on the table for this creek/reach needs to be checked for accuracy.	This has been remedied.
36	City of Sunnyvale	Watershed Table Reach GR-5, p. 7	In the support status box for COLD, there is a phrase "error D 201 below" What does this mean?	This has been remedied.
37	City of Sunnyvale	Watershed Table Reach GR/GC-1 p. 9	The formatting for this whole table is off and headings are covering up some of the comments listed for COLD.	This has been remedied.
38	City of Sunnyvale	Watershed Tables, Reach GR/AC-4, p. 63	<p>Why are two determinations for beneficial uses listed for Santa Teresa Creek? Is this for more than one reach? There is no discussion what this means in Chapter 4.</p> <p>If so, then the reaches should be identified. This is very confusing as COLD is listed as Unable to Determine and Non- Support. PFF is listed at Full Support and non-support? RARE is listed as both non-support and potential support. Also, the information presented here doesn't match what is shown the figure showing support by reach.</p>	This was an error and has been remedied.
From WIM	Trish Mulvey	General	Question as to the possibility of using SCVWD percolation pond data as a surrogate for stream data in the MUN assessment. Question about lack of data from San Jose and Cal Water Service Co.	<p>Percolation pond quality data was not used for MUN as this is more appropriate for assessing the GWR use. Additionally, there is not great certainty in relating off-stream percolation pond water quality with instream water quality. This would need to be investigated before a decision is made to use such data.</p> <p>Attempts were made to obtain data for Lake Elsman (San Jose) and Bear Gulch (Cal Water); no response was received from the former and the latter does not collect such data.</p>

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
From WIM	Larry Johmann	General	January 21, 2002 memo outlining concerns about the Guadalupe preliminary assessment results.	Many of the comments were addressed in the revised stream segmentation memo and the revised pilot assessment results. All of the comments specific to waterbodies or reaches are now included as local knowledge in the reach summary tables in Appendix 4-B and discussed in the text. Concerns about the overall process are addressed in Chapter 2 and the Lessons Learned TM.
Data Gap TM 1	Frances Brewster, SCVWD	Data Gap Tables	Why does the list of MUN indicators change from reach to reach?	This has been remedied in both the Data Gaps TM and the reach summary tables in Chs. 4-6.
Data Gap TM 11	Geoff Brosseau, Watershed Captain	Data Gap Memo	It would be instructive to see a list of the data that were of “good” quality in each reach.	This information has been added to Chs. 4-6 in Appendix C to each chapter. By cross-referencing the data set ID number in the reach summary tables (in Appendix B to each chapter) with the list in Appendix C, one will have information concerning all of the data sets judged to be of use in developing the assessment results. This comment is addressed in Chs. 4-6 and NOT in the Data Gaps TM.
Data Gap TM 13	Paul Randall, SCVURPPP	Data Gap Memo	It would be useful to be able to track which data set and associated data types were used to make a support statement, either as a separate table or within the MDDB.	This information has been added to Chs. 4-6 in Appendix C to each chapter. By cross-referencing the data set ID number in the reach summary tables (in Appendix B to each chapter) with the list in Appendix C, one will have information concerning all of the data sets judged to be of use in developing the assessment results. This comment is addressed in Chs. 4-6 and NOT in the Data Gaps TM.
Lessons Learned TM 15	Trish Mulvey	Lessons Learned Memo	<p>Probably my suggestion is that the Assessment by Reach tables should have an expanded set of use support categories. Then we could acknowledge “Mother Nature at work” where appropriate based on WAC expertise instead of “non-support”. I would rather see “non-support” statements limited to findings where management actions can make a difference. The lesson here: not every BU can be supported in each reach.</p> <p>The group agreed that this should be addressed in the respective watershed chapter, instead of in LsLed memo. A suggestion was made to address this issue in future assessments by first researching WHAT uses should be assessed for each stream. (Instead of first setting out to determine support for ALL BUs.) Trish gave an example of a stream segment immediately downstream from a waterfall as an obvious reach-type that wouldn’t require COLD ben. use asmt. Fish can’t jump these, therefore they would be an example of a special circumstance- supporting the utility of Trish’s suggestion.</p>	Where local knowledge comments indicated that a use could not be supported in a given reach based on the natural characteristics of the reach, this information is noted in the text as well as the reach summary tables (under local knowledge comments). There may, however, be other reaches where this is true as well but no stakeholder input was received. This would need to be assessed during field reconnaissance or future “ground-truthing”.

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
			<p>Geoff suggested that screening initially for applicable uses for ALL streams may be a waste of time/\$ because it will be a rare exception that pre-screening for applicable uses would be useful.</p> <p>Rob said that prescreening for BU applicability could streamline the process some- but that this part of the process was not a huge ‘time sink’. Rob definitely agrees that Watershed Captains being present in the initial data review process would be very useful in guiding the assessment.</p>	
<p>Lessons Learned TM</p> <p>31</p>	Trish Mulvey	Lessons Learned Memo	<p>This is our report not an EPA document. Let’s adopt the recommended A to D certainty ranking and make the changes in the Assessment chapters and reach tables needed to make this as user friendly as we can.</p> <p>It was agreed that the current 1-4 ranking system is a bit counterintuitive and that A-D will be used instead with A being assigned to the “most certain”. Also, when describing support statements as “Low degree of uncertainty” they should instead be referred to as “High Certainty” to avoid confusion.</p> <p>Rob explained that WAC maintained these labels for the sake of consistency- but he agrees that more ‘user-friendly’ terms could be used. He will address this concern.</p>	The uncertainty scales have been changed; explanation of the scales will need to be included in Ch. 3. The term “uncertainty” has been retained for referring to the overall analysis step but, in general, “high certainty” is now used in the text in place of “low level of uncertainty”.
<p>Lessons Learned TM</p> <p>34</p>	Trish Mulvey	Lessons Learned Memo	<p>For the documents used in the assessment, the WAR needs to include the bibliographic metadata and data set numbers suggested. I would still like to see titles instead of document numbers on the reach assessment pages, but if that is too much, at least provide the references in an appendix.</p> <p>Rob will look at it and see if it is possible/feasible. If it is to be done, should it be done by Letter or document title? Rob will think about the feasibility of this suggestion and somehow, he will arrange a Bibliography with clear references to it in the body of the report.</p>	A “bibliography” of sorts, in the form of a list of the data sets used in the assessment (eliminating those reviewed but rejected as not being useful) is now included in Appendix C to each of the watershed chapters (4, 5, 6). This list is sorted by data ID number in ascending order and can be cross-referenced to the reach summary tables in Appendix B of the watershed chapters. The list of data sets used for each reach/use is now part of the reach summary tables.
<p>Lessons Learned TM</p> <p>35</p>	Trish Mulvey	Lessons Learned Memo	We still need to work on the bar charts. I liked the WIM suggestion of just having the support status bar and include the certainty code at the end of the bar. If we keep the current coding of partially filling the bars to denote certainty, I would like to see what just plain black and white looks like without the various shading symbols.	The bar charts have been revised and the partial filling of bars to denote level of uncertainty has been removed. The uncertainty level is now indicated solely by the type of shading for the bar. Shades are now solid rather than line patterns.

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
Lessons Learned TM 55	Larry Johmann	Lessons Learned Memo	It is known that many of the support statements provided for the Guadalupe River and its three major tributaries are wrong and I have already formally identified them. The majority of the segments in the four watercourses without question provide limited support for Rec-1, Cold and Rare. The critical issues that must be identified are the factors, which are limiting or have the potential for limiting and/or degrading the uses. The degree of limitation for each of the uses also needs to be identified and it will be different for each markedly different segment of the watercourse.	The support statements for the Guadalupe River are correct insofar as they are based on the data that was available to the assessment teams. There is additional data that has since become available (FAHCE) as well as other data that Larry Johmann has. A thorough review of this data may result in changes to the support statements for Guadalupe reaches. For the time being, however, Larry’s detailed comments have been included under the “local knowledge” heading as no data to support his comments was reviewed by the assessment team, nor has any field-checking or ground-truthing of the assessment results been performed.
Lessons Learned TM 56	Larry Johmann	Lessons Learned Memo	It is recognized that the Basin Plan only assigns a beneficial use to each major water body but it is inconsistent in doing so and in many cases not only are the beneficial uses incorrect, the water body is even listed in the wrong watershed. The WMI assessment effort needs to correct these problems so the Basin Plan can be updated in the future with accurate information. It will remain the option of the Regional Water Quality Control Board whether to list the identified uses by watercourse segment or list only the most comprehensive set for the entire watercourse. In order to establish beneficial use protection and or restoration plans/actions detailed information about each of the uses in each unique segment needs to be available.	Table 4-1 (and 5-1 and 6-1) outline the current Basin Plan designations for watershed waterbodies (vis a vis the four beneficial uses evaluated in the pilot assessments). Also included in these tables is input from WMI stakeholders concerning suggested revisions to these designations. In addition, revisions based on results of the pilot assessments are suggested and shown in these tables.
Lessons Learned TM 59	Larry Johmann	Lessons Learned Memo	I feel it is unacceptable to use fish consumption as criteria for this use (REC-1). I have no objections if the WMI wants to evaluate "Fish Consumption" as another stakeholder interest; however, it must be evaluated in the proper context. It is unacceptable to lump this interest with the Rec-1 beneficial use and then attempt to define support/non-support for Rec-1 using non-relevant criteria.	Based upon input from Richard McMurtry of the Regional Board, the fish consumption component of the REC-1 evaluation has been removed from the report. The analysis is available if future interest warrants its use, but the assessment results no longer appear in the text or tables.
Limiting Factors TM 12	Scott Akin, SCVWD	Limiting Factors Memo	Suggestion to take out text describing diversions from Los Gatos Creek and Guadalupe Creek artificially reducing the summer flow contributing the poor cold habitat conditions downstream. This isn’t true. SCVWD water rights don’t permit diversion after 5/1. District operations put more water in streams than occurs naturally during summer. Upper Pen, Los Gatos, Guadalupe, Calero, and Alamitos all have greater stream flow as a result of District operations.	This information is no longer part of the Chapter 4 text and the reach summary tables. Revisions have also been made to the Limiting Factors TM.
Limiting Factors TM 13	Scott Akin, SCVWD	Limiting Factors Memo	What about SJWC facilities being impassable barriers limiting the upstream migration of salmonids within the Guadalupe watershed? 13 diversions upstream of Lexington eliminate access to the tributary headwaters of Los Gatos Creek which contain the best habitat in the system.	This information has been incorporated into the Chapter 4 text and the local knowledge portion of the reach summary table.

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
Limiting Factors TM 28	Larry Johmann, Watershed Captain	Limiting Factors Memo	The stream segmentation for the GW is not realistic. Reaches lumped together have vastly different physical properties and are substantially different so the limiting factors or suspected causes are not accurate.	Larry’s suggestions for a more refined segmentation of a few of the Guadalupe stream reaches are included under the “local knowledge” section of the reach summary tables and are discussed in the text.
Limiting Factors TM 31	Larry Johmann, Watershed Captain	Limiting Factors Memo	The limiting factors and suspected causes indicated for this reach are grossly inaccurate. All but one section of the GR support Chinook salmon and steelhead to some degree so the support is more than potential. "Seasonal" needs to be defined. Chinook and/or steelhead have been documented in various sections of the GR most months of the year. Temperatures in GR-1 either do not exceed Chinook and steelhead temperature criteria or the temperature criteria are not correct. GR-1 is a tidewater area and temperatures in this section rarely exceed 72 degs. F and average below 70 deg. They are primarily affected by and related to bay temperatures so they do not fluctuate as much as they do in other reaches of the river. Salmon and steelhead have been documented in the river and bay and there are no known cases where high temperatures have killed or stressed them. Freshwater macroinvertebrate criteria are not appropriate or applicable for this section of river as it is a brackish tidewater reach. Small flows released by reservoirs have little, if any, impact in this reach. Except for the upper few hundred yards of this reach, the river has no shade cover. Salmonids do not spawn in tidewater so this reach would not support spawning. However, this reach is critical for the further rearing of smolts. According to salmonid experts, outmigrating salmonids in short river systems spend a significant amount of time rearing in estuary waters prior to going to sea. This reach of the river has a relatively smooth muddy bottom, as expected for a tidewater area. There are no riffle areas and none are expected. Food availability is probably high, as it is in most estuary areas. FAHCE information, which indicates different conditions is flawed. The real limiting factor for this reach is proper stream morphology. The river has been straightened and its floodplain is confined by levees. This has negatively impacted channel stability, efficiency and most beneficial uses.	Larry’s comments are included under the “local knowledge” section of the reach summary tables and are discussed in the text, along with some general conclusions from the FAHCE data. The assessment results, however, have not been altered to address these comments.
Limiting Factors TM 32	Larry Johmann, Watershed Captain	Limiting Factors Memo	The limiting factors and suspected causes indicated for this reach are inaccurate. The valid segmentation for this reach is from Trimble Ave. to Montegue Exp., as it is vastly different and has completely different physical properties than the reaches above or below it. This affects the level of use support and the limiting factors and causes for all uses. The main river channel in this area, for the most part, is densely shaded and isolated, contrary to the reaches up and down stream. However, the main channel is confined by an inner corridor berm and there is a bypass channel down right side of the river. This reach has riffles and pools and	Larry’s comments are included under the “local knowledge” section of the reach summary tables and are discussed in the text, along with some general conclusions from the FAHCE data. The assessment results, however, have not been altered to address these comments.

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
			<p>decent spawning gravel. Temperatures in the spring and summer are marginal but adequate for adult salmonids and temperatures in the late fall and winter are adequate for salmonid spawning. Although macroinvertebrates may be absent from the area it has plenty of food sources from instream and overhanging plants, leaf and woody debris and associated insects. Just downstream is the brackish water area rich with brackish water organisms. Steelhead would most likely not use the area for spawning but Chinook salmon do and so would chum salmon as chum traditionally spawn just above tidewater. If FAHCE information for this reach is the same as for GR-1 then it is flawed as the reaches are in no way similar. Limiting factors in this reach are flow rates, warm water from problems upstream, channel morphology (a unnaturally confined river channel) and pulse flows from upstream outfalls. Since the bypass channel effectively widens the river it has become a depositional area and this has wiped out most riparian mitigation planted on the left side of the bypass. Levees confine the riverine corridor and thus flood flows and river meander patterns.</p>	
<p>Limiting Factors TM 33</p>	<p>Larry Johmann, Watershed Captain</p>	<p>Limiting Factors Memo</p>	<p>The segmentation for this reach should be from Trimble Ave. to I-880. This reach is vastly different and has completely different physical properties from sections both up and down stream. This section of the river has little shade cover and there is no main channel bypass. The main channel was straightened in the past and there are high levees confining the corridor. This reach has marginal temperatures but they are marginally adequate to support adult salmonids throughout the year and temperatures in the late fall and winter are adequate to support salmonid spawning. Adult Chinook and steelhead have been documented in this reach from late June thru January and steelhead migrating in the upper section of the river in the Feb. to April period must pass through this reach. Limiting factors in this reach are inadequate low flow rates, excessive velocities at high flows, warm water from problems upstream, warm water and/or flash flows from outfalls, in channel rubble, improper channel morphology, lack of shade/hide cover. Concrete weirs and mats at the upstream end of the reach causing downcutting immediately below them creating fish passage problems. This area has many area with upwelling water which is likely cooler than surface flows. This reach would probably not likely be used as rearing habitat by steelhead. The absence of macroinvertebrates in the summer is not a limiting factor for salmon as there are likely no juvenile salmon in the reach in the summer.</p>	<p>Larry’s comments are included under the “local knowledge” section of the reach summary tables and are discussed in the text, along with some general conclusions from the FAHCE data. The assessment results, however, have not been altered to address these comments.</p>

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
<p>Limiting Factors TM 34</p>	<p>Larry Johmann, Watershed Captain</p>	<p>Limiting Factors Memo</p>	<p>The segmentation for this reach should be from I-880 to Coleman Ave. This reach has for the most part a narrow well shaded channel. The reach is vastly different and has completely different physical properties from sections both up and down stream. This reach of stream has a bypass corridor to the left of the river but there have been repetitive expensive attempts to confine the straightened channel and prevent it from accessing its floodplain. High velocities in the main channel are causing it to down cut. A secondary channel has been constructed down the bypass corridor in an apparent attempt to provide water to the bypass area so riparian credit could be claimed for vegetation that was planted outside the riparian zone. The secondary channel is eroding both vertically and horizontally and cutting around blocked culverts. Its temperature has been measured between 6 to eight degrees warmer than the main channel and it is filled with small fish. The channel is thus causing sediment and thermal pollution of the main channel and poses a threat for trapping fish. The riparian vegetation planted in the non riparian area is not doing well as many of the trees root systems reportedly can't penetrate the clay layer to get water. At the upstream end of the reach concrete mats and weirs are currently accelerating flows in the main channel and the river is attempting to narrow itself. When the mats and weirs were first installed the channel was far too wide which caused a large sedimentation problem and a blockage for fish migration. Salmon are known to spawn in this reach and steelhead/rainbow trout have been documented living in the area all summer. The area is used by vagrants and poachers to trap salmon. There is a lot of upwelling water in the lower end of this reach. Limiting factors are improper stream morphology, low dry season flows, elevated water temperature, poaching, bank and in-channel rubble, bank hardscape, concrete weirs at the upstream end of the reach. The eroding, elevated temperature secondary channel is also a severe impairment. The absence of macroinvertebrates in the summer is not a limiting factor for salmon as there are likely no juvenile salmon in the reach in the summer.</p>	<p>Larry's comments are included under the "local knowledge" section of the reach summary tables and are discussed in the text, along with some general conclusions from the FAHCE data. The assessment results, however, have not been altered to address these comments.</p>
<p>Limiting Factors TM 35</p>	<p>Larry Johmann, Watershed Captain</p>	<p>Limiting Factors Memo</p>	<p>The segmentation for this reach should be from Coleman Ave. to I-280. This reach has for the most part a narrow well shaded channel but it is confined and incised. The reach is vastly different and has completely different physical properties from sections both up & downstream. The reach contains a number of obstructions only passable at moderate to high flows. Large sections of the channel are lined with gabions and there are asphalt pedestrian trail/maintenance roads along some sections of the reach. Large office buildings have been built almost on top of the river bank and more construction is scheduled. Large bypass culverts are being constructed & more are scheduled for construction in</p>	<p>Larry's comments are included under the "local knowledge" section of the reach summary tables and are discussed in the text, along with some general conclusions from the FAHCE data. The assessment results, however, have not been altered to address these comments.</p>

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
			<p>this area. When finished the bypass culverts are supposed to convey high flow around the downtown area but this will surely cause sediment problems at the entrance to the culverts as the river has been overly widened. Severe erosion will surely be caused downstream where the culverts return flows to the river. When this happens velocities will be high and the water will be sediment starved, having dropped much its load before entering the culverts. Los Gatos Creek, one of the river's largest tributaries joins the river in the middle of this reach. Salmon and lamprey eels are known to spawn in this reach and steelhead/ rainbow trout are known to frequent the area, even in summer months. The absence of macroinvertebrates in the summer is not a limiting factor for salmon as there are likely no juvenile salmon in the reach in the summer. Limiting factors are improper stream morphology, low dry season flows, high velocity high flows, elevated water temperature, poaching, bank and in-channel rubble, bank hardscape, concrete weirs, vagrant encampments and trash garbage and human waste and urban construction on top of the river banks with little to know riparian buffer.</p>	
<p>Limiting Factors TM 36</p>	<p>Larry Johmann, Watershed Captain</p>	<p>Limiting Factors Memo</p>	<p>The segmentation for this reach should be from I-280 Ave. to Curtner Ave. This reach has for the most part a narrow well shaded but incised channel. The reach is vastly different and has completely different physical properties from sections both up & downstream and is quite isolated with limited access. Water temperatures in this area tend to decrease from the warmer temperatures recorded upstream because of the shaded channel. Salmon are known to use sections of this reach for spawning. The absence of macroinvertebrates in the summer is not a limiting factor for salmon as there are likely no juvenile salmon in the reach in the summer. Limiting factors are improper stream morphology, low dry season flows, high velocity high flows, elevated water temperature, bank and in-channel rubble, bank hardscape, and development directly adjacent to the top of the banks.</p>	<p>Larry's comments are included under the "local knowledge" section of the reach summary tables and are discussed in the text, along with some general conclusions from the FAHCE data. The assessment results, however, have not been altered to address these comments.</p>
<p>Limiting Factors TM 37</p>	<p>Larry Johmann, Watershed Captain</p>	<p>Limiting Factors Memo</p>	<p>The segmentation for this reach should be from Curtner Ave. to Gage Station 23B. This reach is open and unshaded with fairly easy access. The channel was straightened and widened and the banks lined with gabions. The reach is vastly different and has completely different physical properties from sections both up & downstream. Canoas Creek enters the river at the lower part of the reach. The channel has attempted to narrow itself in the area and reestablish a meander pattern. Trees attempting to reestablish themselves in this area have been killed off with herbicide. This area contained good spawning gravel and salmon used it heavily in the past. Steelhead have also been observed in the area during winter months so it is a potential area for steelhead spawning. The absence of</p>	<p>Larry's comments are included under the "local knowledge" section of the reach summary tables and are discussed in the text, along with some general conclusions from the FAHCE data. The assessment results, however, have not been altered to address these comments.</p>

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
			<p>macroinvertebrates in the summer is not a limiting factor for salmon as there are likely no juvenile salmon in the reach in the summer. However, juvenile Chinook salmon have been captured in fisherman's minnow traps in the lower end of this reach in the early spring. Limiting factors are improper stream morphology, low dry season flows, elevated water temperature, bank hardscape, lack of riparian vegetation (shade/hide cover) flash flows from development and Canoes Creek, which was turned into a concrete ditch by flood control projects. Vagrant encampments are common under the Almaden Expressway Bridge at Lincoln Ave., which add trash, garbage and human waste to the river. They also pose a poaching threat to fish and wildlife.</p>	
<p>Limiting Factors TM 38</p>	<p>Larry Johmann, Watershed Captain</p>	<p>Limiting Factors Memo</p>	<p>The segmentation for this reach should be from Gage Station 23B to Branham Lane. This reach is a relatively shaded but incised channel with limited access. The channel was straightened and lined with concrete rubble. The reach is vastly different and has completely different physical properties from sections both up & downstream.</p> <p>Chinook salmon and lamprey eels used to spawn in the area from Gage 23 B to the old Hillsdale Ave. drop structure. Many salmon died trying to jump the structure, as it was impassible below moderate flows. Salmon making it over the Hillsdale structure could also spawn upstream. The SCVWD removed much of the concrete rubble in the area and installed a series of rock weirs in 1998 but they were improperly designed and installed so they do not provide low flow passage and are failing. A low flow road crossing was also a migration barrier at Bryan Lane. This structure was also replaced with rock weirs in 1998 but they were also designed and installed wrong and are failing. However, the rock structures are far superior to the concrete rubble and structure that they replaced. A steelhead/rainbow trout was observed swimming normally during the summer months in this area. Water temperatures in this area tend to be fairly high due to the lack of shade, overly widened channels upstream and low dry weather flows. Ross Creek enters the river just upstream of Bryan Lane. This straightened, unshaded dirt ditch elevates temperatures in the river when it has dry weather flows. Limiting factors are improper stream morphology, low dry season flows, elevated water temperature, bank hardscape, marginal riparian vegetation (shade/hide cover) flash flows from development and Ross Creek. Vagrant encampments are common under the bridges and below the Hillsdale drop, which add trash, garbage and human waste to the river. They also pose a poaching threat to fish and wildlife.</p>	<p>Larry's comments are included under the "local knowledge" section of the reach summary tables and are discussed in the text, along with some general conclusions from the FAHCE data. The assessment results, however, have not been altered to address these comments.</p>

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
Limiting Factors TM 39	Larry Johmann, Watershed Captain	Limiting Factors Memo	The segmentation for this reach should be from Branham Lane to the Blossom Hill Drop structure. This reach was a wide unshaded reach but the river is attempting to restore itself. The reach is vastly different and has completely different physical properties from sections both up & downstream. The SCVWD used much of this area for instream recharge up until 1995. Instream gravel/dirt dams were installed during the dry season yearly. These dams drown vegetation upstream and dewatered the down stream area so there was no riparian habitat. In the late fall and winter when the dams were removed the channel was straight with no aquatic habitat and was mostly silted up from the dams. Since the SCVWD lost their permits for the dams the river has been attempting to restore itself. The channel has narrowed and is starting to meander and form riffles and pools. Trees and vegetation are establishing themselves so in a few years it may be a productive spawning area, if not destroyed by the upper GRFCP or "Stream Maintenance." Chinook salmon and steelhead are known to use the area up to the dam, which has recently been laddered for fish passage. Limiting factors are improper stream morphology, low dry season flows, elevated water temperature, lack of riparian vegetation (shade/hide cover) flash flows from development, Blossom Hill drop structure.	Larry's comments are included under the "local knowledge" section of the reach summary tables and are discussed in the text, along with some general conclusions from the FAHCE data. The assessment results, however, have not been altered to address these comments.
Limiting Factors TM 40	Larry Johmann, Watershed Captain	Limiting Factors Memo	The segmentation for this reach should be from the Blossom Hill Drop structure to Lake Almaden. The reach is vastly different and has completely different physical properties from sections both up & downstream. This reach is wide with no riparian habitat or shade cover. In dry months the SCVWD floods the area with a flashboard dam placed on top of the Blossom Hill Drop. The water temperature is very high in this area, as the area, the lake above it and the lower portions of the streams feed it are relatively shallow and unshaded. Water temperatures in lower Guadalupe Creek have been measured in the upper 80's in the summer, which is lethal for salmonids. This reach has no salmonid habitat and would not support salmonids especially in the summer and fall months. There is currently no Chinook salmon habitat above the dam but steelhead may be able to make it to the upper Alamitos and Guadalupe Creeks to suitable habitat in the upper watershed during high winter flows.	Larry's comments are included under the "local knowledge" section of the reach summary tables and are discussed in the text, along with some general conclusions from the FAHCE data. The assessment results, however, have not been altered to address these comments.

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
Limiting Factors TM 41	Larry Johmann, Watershed Captain	Limiting Factors Memo	The 1 st segment of the Creek should run from it's confluence with the GR to Auzerias St. This section of the creek always has water in it so it has very different physical properties from the section upstream. It generally has a well shaded but incised channel. Although higher flows depend on reservoir releases the creek still has flowing water in it when reservoir water is shut off or all diverted out of the creek upstream. This factor is most likely due to outfalls and subsurface flows upwelling in this reach. This reach is known to support salmon spawning and steelhead/trout throughout the year. As a result of the GCRCD's Water Rights Complaint the chances that future flows will be improved as the law requires owners of dams and diversions to provide enough water downstream to keep fish in good condition. Limiting factors are improper stream morphology, low dry season flows, high velocity storm flows, elevated water temperature, bank and in-channel rubble, bank hardscape, vagrant encampments, poaching trash, garbage and human waste and construction on top of the river banks with little to no riparian buffer.	Larry's comments are included under the "local knowledge" section of the reach summary tables and are discussed in the text, along with some general conclusions from the FAHCE data. The assessment results, however, have not been altered to address these comments.
Limiting Factors TM 42	Larry Johmann, Watershed Captain	Limiting Factors Memo	The 2 nd segment of the Creek should run from Auzerais St. to Lincoln Ave. In the past this segment of the creek usually dried out in the dry season due to water being shut off or diverted by the SCVWD. This segment has very different physical properties from up or downstream reaches. As a result of the GCRCD's Water Rights Complaint the chances that future flows will be improved as the law requires owners of dams and diversions to provide enough water downstream to keep fish in good condition. Limiting factors are improper stream morphology, no dry season flows, high velocity storm flows, elevated water temperature, poaching, bank and in-channel rubble, bank hardscape, vagrant encampments and trash garbage and human waste and construction on top of the river banks with little to no riparian buffer. The concrete weir at Lincoln Ave may pose a migration barrier at lower flows.	Larry's comments are included under the "local knowledge" section of the reach summary tables and are discussed in the text, along with some general conclusions from the FAHCE data. The assessment results, however, have not been altered to address these comments.
Limiting Factors TM 43	Larry Johmann, Watershed Captain	Limiting Factors Memo	There should be a separate segment of stream from Lincoln Ave to Leigh Ave. This segment of stream always has water unless it is shut off or all diverted by the SCVWD operations. It has a well shaded channel and is know to support Chinook salmon spawning in the fall and winter. This segment has very different physical properties from up or downstream reaches. As a result of the GCRCD's Water Rights Complaint the chances that future flows will be improved as the law requires owners of dams and diversions to provide enough water downstream to keep fish in good condition. Limiting factors are improper stream morphology, low dry season flows, high velocity storm flows, elevated water temperature, poaching, bank and in-channel rubble, bank hardscape, vagrant encampments and trash garbage and human waste and construction on top of the	Larry's comments are included under the "local knowledge" section of the reach summary tables and are discussed in the text, along with some general conclusions from the FAHCE data. The assessment results, however, have not been altered to address these comments.

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
			river banks with little to no riparian buffer.	
Limiting Factors TM 44	Larry Johmann, Watershed Captain	Limiting Factors Memo	There should be a separate segment of stream from Leigh Ave. to Camden/San Tomas Expressway. This segment of stream always has water unless it is shut off or all diverted by the SCVWD operations. It has been poorly shaded, as most riparian vegetation was destroyed by instream gravel/dirt spreader dams operated by the SCVWD until 1995. The area is now starting to restore itself as the channel is narrowing itself and developing a meander and trees are establishing themselves along its banks. This area has become one of the prime Chinook salmon spawning areas in the fall and winter, as the gravel is excellent. Steelhead have also been observed spawning in the area in the winter months. This segment has very different physical properties from up or downstream reaches. As a result of the GCRCD's Water Rights Complaint the chances that future flows will be improved as the law requires owners of dams and diversions to provide enough water downstream to keep fish in good condition. Limiting factors are improper but improving stream morphology, low dry season flows, high velocity storm flows, elevated water temperature, bank and in-channel rubble, bank hardscape and trash. There is a drop structure at Campbell Ave., which serves as fish migration barrier at low to moderate flows and the dam at Camden/San Tomas Exp. is a migration barrier at all flows.	Larry's comments are included under the "local knowledge" section of the reach summary tables and are discussed in the text, along with some general conclusions from the FAHCE data. The assessment results, however, have not been altered to address these comments.
Limiting Factors TM 45	Larry Johmann, Watershed Captain	Limiting Factors Memo	There should be a segment from San Tomas to Lark. This reach is vastly different from reaches above or below it. The reach contains no riparian habitat and is distinguished by a series of instream dams, which prevent fish migration and serve to heat up the water as it bakes in the sun. There is no cold water fish habitat so this section would not support cold water species or permit their upstream migration.	Larry's comments are included under the "local knowledge" section of the reach summary tables and are discussed in the text, along with some general conclusions from the FAHCE data. The assessment results, however, have not been altered to address these comments.
Limiting Factors TM 46	Larry Johmann, Watershed Captain	Limiting Factors Memo	There should be a segment from Lark to Vasona Reservoir. This segment has different properties from the down stream reach as it is well shaded and has a defined meandering channel. It has the potential for supporting rainbow trout that may enter the area from upstream but fish migrating up the river are unable to reach the area due to downstream dams.	Larry's comments are included under the "local knowledge" section of the reach summary tables and are discussed in the text, along with some general conclusions from the FAHCE data. The assessment results, however, have not been altered to address these comments.
Limiting Factors TM 49	SCVWD-Water Quality Unit	Limiting Factors Memo	Why is there no support/non-support statement for MUN use in Almaden, Lexington and Vasona Reservoirs? We submitted the same data set for those reservoirs as for Guadalupe Reservoir.	This error has been corrected. The analysis was conducted based on the SCVWD data but was mistakenly left out of the previous draft.

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
Limiting Factors TM 50	SCVWD- Water Quality Unit	Limiting Factors Memo	Calero Reservoir MTBE has not exceeded the Action Level of 5 ug/l since 2000 when we developed an MTBE management strategy with the Parks Department.	Comment added to text for Calero Reservoir. Earlier samples did exceed criterion, however.
Limiting Factors TM 54	Larry Johmann, GR Cocaptain	Limiting Factors Memo	Most all segments of waterbodies in the GW support at least some form of REC-1 on a limited basis as already noted in my January 21, 2002 comments letter. The support status listed in the table is incorrect. The limiting factors and suspected causes are incorrect and have nothing to do with REC-1. Limiting factors are waterborne pathogens, access, instream blockages/ structures, low or extremely high flows, rubble, debris and garbage and vagrant encampments	Larry’s comments are included under the “local knowledge” section of the reach summary tables and are discussed in the text, along with some general conclusions from the FAHCE data. The assessment results, however, have not been altered to address these comments.
Limiting Factors TM 56	GCRCW WWCC GR Cocaptain	Limiting Factors Memo	Some segments noted above, currently support PFF even as inappropriately defined, so there are inaccuracies associated with this interest as well.	Larry’s comments are included under the “local knowledge” section of the reach summary tables and are discussed in the text, along with some general conclusions from the FAHCE data. The assessment results, however, have not been altered to address these comments.
Limiting Factors TM 57	GCRCW WWCC GR Cocaptain	Limiting Factors Memo	This use has similar problems identified for Cold as previously identified in my January 21, 2002 comments letter.	Larry’s comments are included under the “local knowledge” section of the reach summary tables and are discussed in the text, along with some general conclusions from the FAHCE data. The assessment results, however, have not been altered to address these comments.
Limiting Factors TM 58	City of Sunnyvale	Limiting Factors Memo	What is a “salmonid redd”? This was listed in the assessment comments for this reach in the tables for Chapter 4 as well. It should be corrected to whatever salmonid we are talking about. Also, as a general note, the way common names are capitalized should also be addressed in a consistent manner throughout the tables. It’s very inconsistent (and incorrect in some cases) the way that it is now.	A salmonid redd is a “nest” . This explanation has been added to the reach summary tables in Appendix 4-B. Consistent capitalization formats have been applied.
Post-WAR Workshop	Scott Akin, SCVWD	Limiting Factors Memo	I have taken a look at the comments that Larry Johman has provided and I am not sure where to begin. There are some obvious philosophical differences that drive Larry to these conclusions. In general there seem to be a couple of keys: -FAHCE collected data and developed its conclusions based on the existing habitat. Our charge isn't to re-engineer the entire watershed, but rather optimize the management of existing resources within the watershed. Our mission has been to engineer the channels in some reaches for flood protection. Development has occurred and we now have highly altered streams. The types of hydrologic and geomorphic processes that Larry is referring to	Portions of the comment have been added to the discussion of the FAHCE process in Chapter 4. The comment is addressed more fully in the revised Limiting Factors TM.

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 4 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
			<p>as the true limiting factors is straight out of the Rosgen Text. Does WMI think that it is going to try and install these functions post facto? It takes restoring the complete flood plain to create the conditions that Larry is referring to. In absence of this, the stuff that FAHCE identified is on the mark.</p> <p>-The study area for the FAHCE Limiting Factors Analysis didn't extend into the tidally influenced zone of the stream. We did this for two reasons; 1) water supply operations have minimal impact in this reach and 2) budget constraints.</p> <p>-Larry has enjoyed the belief that the Lower and Downtown reaches of the Guadalupe support all life stages of steelhead and salmon. This belief is enforced by earlier concession that the District made in the flood control projects in these areas. Absent better info about how the watershed functioned, we conceded this point in each of the projects. The legacy of this decision is well known and frequently observed. Since then we have made 13 more miles of stream available for spawning and would prefer to manage the mainstem as a passage corridor. There will always be stray fish and other critters that don't stay where they should. Seeing a fish in a stream reach doesn't provide the basis for a management plan.</p> <p>-As we have discussed, WMI and FAHCE don't share the same criteria for suitability. WMI adopted a more liberal criteria that allows more habitat to be described as suitable for coldwater resources. We had to accept the criteria that NMFS and CDF&G set for us. We will be required to use those criteria in the on going management of the system.</p>	