Note: This table includes all comments pertaining directly to Chapter 5 of the WAR. Listed first are comments on Draft A of Chapter 5, 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 5. 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
7.5	Terry Neudorf, SCVWD Guadalupe River Watershed Captain	Chapter 4 related?? No clear reference provided	Searsville: that may be too small to support trout vis a vis late summer conditions, temperature, etc. 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?	The first part of the comment has been added to the local knowledge section of the reach summary table in Appendix 5-B and is referenced in the text. 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 outlined in the text of the chapter, but no pilot assessment results have been changed in light of this data.
13	City of Sunnyvale	Chapter 5, section 5-1-1, Page 2, second paragraph.	"Fish collected in San Francisquito watershed include six other native species and seven non-native species." What are the "other" native species? The "other native fish" listed in the next sentence do not include Steelhead. However, Steelhead are listed as being present in the discussion under RARE in the Bear Creek Subwatershed on p. 5. Why isn't Steelhead listed among the native species fish list for San Francisquito, even though they are rare? Data clearly shows that Steelhead are present, but in the report it can be iterated that steelhead are present. General suggestion to check all tables with reference to the text, to ensure that they agree with one another. WAC will respond to this.	The text in question has been removed from the section of Chapter 5 describing the watershed streams in general. This information was not consistently available for all streams and is better discussed in the context of the assessment results in Sections 5.2 and 5.3.

Order Number of Comment from WAR Workshop	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
13.5	Terry Neudorf, SCVWD Guadalupe River Watershed Captain	Chapter 5 related. No clear reference provided	The common name "squawfish" for Ptychocheilus grandis is now more (PC) correctly identified as "Sacramento pike minnow". There is probably a lot more that could be spent on interpreting the presence (or absence) of this species in San Francisquito Creek since (and regarding) Snyder's (1905) record. How much detail is warranted?	The text in question has been removed from the section of Chapter 5 describing the watershed streams in general. This information was not consistently available for all streams and is better discussed in the context of the assessment results in Sections 5.2 and 5.3.
14	Trish Mulvey	Chapter 5, p.2; section 5-1-1, last sentence	Delete "may" in "other passage obstructions and barriers MAY exist…". Other passage obstructions and barriers DO exist and are described in "Adult Steelhead Passage in the Bear Creek Watershed", July 2001, San Francisquito Watershed Council	Revision adopted.
15	Trish Mulvey	Chapter 5, p.4; Table 5-1	The San Francisquito Watershed Council never reviewed or approved this table. In fact, as far as I know, no one knew it was being prepared until it was in the Watershed Characteristics Report final drafts. It is not what local stakeholders would consider complete or correct. Since we are still finalizing supplementary information pages for the WCR, we could fix it now, so it would appropriately be used in the WAR. If that can't happen for some reason, I would recommend that the Co-Captains recommend deleting the table in the WAR. (Note: the equivalent table for the Guadalupe is probably fine as it is.) Rob explained that they did not add to the tables any additional information that was logically clear- and not supported in WCR.	It is acknowledged that this table does not contain input from several San Francisquito Creek stakeholders. Pre-assessment recommendations for basin plan designation revisions are from the Water District. The table remains in the chapter for this draft to allow the San Francisquito Watershed Council to review it and supplement it with additional revision proposals prior to it being included in the final WAR. The table may still be removed prior to publication of the WAR.
16	Trish Mulvey	Chapter 5, p.4; section 5-1-3	Where is Figure 5-1? Rob explained that this map is a GIS map too large to fit on a CD- let alone an email. He will filter out some layers of this map to reduce its size. Kristy suggested that in the future drafts- WAC include in the text of the draft chapters what figures are missing and what will be distributed later. Rob agrees and says that somehow- in the next draft- all the figures will be distributed for review.	Reference to an old numbering system – the figure in question is now in Chapter 2 with all of the watershed maps.
17	Trish Mulvey	Chapter 5, p.8; section 5-3-2 and SF/BC4	At least mention that the Bear Gulch diversion dam provides water for a municipal drinking water supply owned by California Water Service	Revision adopted.

18	Trish Mulvey	Chapter 5, p.8; section 5-3-3 and SF1	It is my understanding that the February 1998 flood event was NOT considered a 100-year event (but more like a 70-year event). Please confirm with SCVWD, and revise if needed. Also, the SCVWD hydraulic model data mentioned at the end of the first paragraph is complete and has been available for some time.	The 1998 flood event did approximate the 100-year flood (estimates vary on precisely what that is). The hydraulic model information was not made available either during initial data compilation or after it was requested following the WIMs. In any case, it was not necessary in order to reach certain support statements for the applicable reaches. Text revised to indicate that it should be obtained and used in future assessment work.
19	Trish Mulvey	Chapter 5, p.10; section 5-3-4	In the third sentence, change "mice" to "mouse".	Revision adopted.
20	Trish Mulvey	Chapter 5, p.12; section 5-4 MUN	It is my understanding that Stanford uses water from Felt Lake (SF/LT1 and SF/FL) and from Lake Lagunita (SF/LL) and historically used water from Searsville Lake (SF/SL) for irrigation and groundwater recharge for wells used for non-potable purposes. Accordingly, consider deleting the second "drinking" in the MUN sentence.	Information added to local knowledge comments for the applicable reaches in both the text and Appendix 5-B and revision adopted.
21	City of Sunnyvale	Chapter 5-4, p. 12 last bulleted item	It is stated here that a priority for the collection of data for the preferred indicators for REC-1 is needed so that support statements can be developed for the "key recreation-intensive reaches" in the watershed. Where are these "key recreation- intensive reaches" in the San Francisquito watershed? It is not clear from the assessment information presented here where these areas might be. In order for stakeholders to work toward getting the additional information discussed here, those areas need to be identified somewhere.	As discussed in the Lessons Learned Memo, one of the tasks of stakeholders prior to future assessment work for REC-1 is to identify recreation locations within the watersheds. The data compiled for the pilot assessment does not contain this information. Some of these locations will be obvious but others may only be part of local "neighborhood" knowledge. The term itself must also be defined – must such a location be open to the public or can it be private, for example? Guidance from the Regional Board as to the intent of the REC-1 use will aid this process.
27	City of Sunnyvale	All Watershed Tables	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. 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.	Revision and formatting adopted. 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	In early February, I provided RPT and WAC a sample format for the reach assessment tables. It includes fields for each use/interest for: • local knowledge comments • data gap(s) and priority • limiting factor(s) and suspected cause(s) 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.	The format drafted by Trish Mulvey has been adopted in the revised reach summary tables in Appendix 5-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.

			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. Sarah says that they could easily separate out the local knowledge data into separate data sheets. 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 '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 (or as detailed in Matt Stoecker's "fish found here" table.) For Upper Pen, include grazing. Please refer to response above. Additionally, WAC will investigate the suggestion to include grazing for Upper Pen.	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 5-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	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 5-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

			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- 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). This issue will be re-visited at the next workshop.	Appendix 5-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 Sectioin 5.4 as well as in the Data Gaps TM.
33	City of Sunnyvale	Watershed Figures "Support by Reach" general comments	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. 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. 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. 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. Trish suggests that the stream segmentation maps be used for showing support by reach. For example, instead of the bar graphs. Rob is concerned that the uncertainty levels associated with certain support statements (i.e. with high uncertainty) would be lost in visually- easy graphics. 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. Kristy's suggestions for modifying the existing bar charts based on this #33 comments. Rob will review these suggestions.	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 5-B. The maps suggested in the comments have been created and are included in Chapter 2 and referenced extensively throughout Ch. 5. The bar graphs have been revised per this comment and are now included in Appendix 5-A. Local knowledge comments are now included in the reach summary tables in Appendix 5-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.

			It was discussed whether or not videos and picture-type data could be added to 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? Laura comments that this might be upsetting to the framework that was established originally for the process. 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." 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. Let's accept the data limitations and add disclaimers to the report so that this data isn't 'misused'. 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.	
34	City of Sunnyvale	General Comment - Support and Uncertainty Tables for all watersheds	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. Please refer to the response to comment #11 of this table and #35 of the consolidated comment table for the Lessons Learned memo. 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 determinations. Also, 'local knowledge' should be clearly defined as data that did not pass through the quality assurance/quality control process.	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. See previous response for the local knowledge comment.

39	Trish Mulvey	SF/LT1,2,3	Amend reach limits for SF/LT1&2 to "Buckeye Creek" instead of South Branch. Amend SF/LT3 PFF Assessment Comment to Buckeye Creek. Also, it is my understanding that the problematic culvert that floods is outside the Foothill Park boundary. Please confirm and revise text. (Note misspelling of "strom" in last sentence of PFF.)	Revisions adopted.
40	Trish Mulvey	Reach Assessment Table – RARE and COLD	How was the "fish found here" table provided by Matt Stoecker after the San Francisquito WIM used? I thought we were going to make provision for "local knowledge" comments without compromising what could be gleaned from the data box. (See Trish's other reach assessment comments 1 & 2) This issue was resolved per the discussion and agreed upon response for handling the local knowledge databox (refer to responses to comments #28 and 29).	Matt Stroecker's data was added to the local knowledge comments for the time being, though it should eventually be added to the actual "data box" for future assessment work. His findings are listed both in the reach summary tables and in the text.
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.	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. 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.
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	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. 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 assmt. Fish can't jump these, therefore they would be an example of a special circumstance- supporting the utility of Trish's suggestion. 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. 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.	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".
Lessons Learned TM **31**	Trish Mulvey	Lessons Learned Memo	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. 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. 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.	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".
Lessons Learned TM **34**	Trish Mulvey	Lessons Learned Memo	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.	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

			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.	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.
Lessons Learned TM **35**	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.
Limiting Factors TM **55**	Trish Mulvey	Lessons Learned Memo	The car body in Squealer Gulch should be referred to as "illegal dumping", not "illicit discharge".	This change has been made.
Post-WAR Workshop	Trish Mulvey	General on Chapter 5	Non-support of the COLD beneficial use was identified with certainty in three ephemeral reaches: San Francisquito between 101 and University (SF-2), and two small tributaries to West Union Creek - Appletree Gulch and Tripp Gulch (SF/WU-3&4) *Local Knowledge Comment – These findings are an artifact of a methodology that presupposes that all four beneficial uses apply to all reaches.* Partial support of the COLD beneficial use was identified with certainty in eight additional reaches. Groundwater pumping was identified as a suspected cause in San Francisquito between Sand Hill Road and Los Trancos (SF-4), Bear Creek (SF/BC-1), and the main stem of West Union Creek (SF/WU-1&2). *Local Knowledge Comments - The San Francisquito Watershed Council is currently corresponding with the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors regarding low flows in West Union Creek.* Barriers are identified as a suspected cause in the main stem of San Francisquito between 101 and University (SF-2), Bear Creek (SF/BC-1), Dry Creek (SF/BC-2), the Bear Gulch Diversion Dam (SF/BC-3), and the main stem of West Union (SF/WU-1&2). *Local Knowledge Comments - The Clarke Street barrier between 101 and University was notched by the San Francisquito Watershed Council in 2000 (confirm date) and is no longer considered a significant problem.* *The Watershed Council has been awarded a grant by the California Department of Fish*	The local knowledge comments have been added to the reach summary tables in Appendix 5-B and referenced in the text discussion of each waterbody as well, though less comprehensively.

			and Game to remediate two of the three Bear Creek high priority sites identified in the report "Adult Steelhead Passage in the Bear Creek Watershed" (Bear dams #1 and #3). The third high priority barrier is Woodside's bridge apron (#10) at the Fox Hollow Road crossing. Woodside has no capital improvement scheduled, so the Steelhead Taskforce will evaluate an alternative of a series of weirs downstream of the bridge. *At the time fieldwork was done for the steelhead passage report, landowner permissions were not obtained for access to Dry Creek.* *Discussions with Cal Water about the Bear Gulch Diversion Dam are being explored by the Watershed Council, the California Department of Fish and Game and the Department of Water Resources. The dam is considered a high priority for remediation.* *The steelhead passage report assigns low to moderate priority for remediation to the barriers in West Union Creek with the CalTrans bridge apron (#17) at Highway 84 deemed the most important. At this time, CalTrans has no maintenance improvement planned at that site.* Lack of benthic macro invertebrate data is the reason five reaches are not rated as full support with certainty: Bear Creek (SF/BC-1), Bear Gulch above the diversion dam (SF/BC-4), main stem West Union (SF/WU-1&2), and Squealer Gulch (SF/WU-5). *Local Knowledge Comment - rationale for considering lack of data as a "suspected cause" instead of a "data gap" should be explored with WAC.* Non-support of PFF was identified with certainty in the lower three reaches of San Francisquito: Bay to largely downstream of Waverley Street (SF-1,2,3). Suspected causes are disconnection of the channel from the natural floodplain and encroachment of urban commercial and residential development. *Local Knowledge Comments - These segments are a priority focus for the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority which has recently been notified of approval from Congress for an Army Corps of Engineers Reconnaissance Study.* *Need WAC clarification on non-support certainty for Buckeye (SF/LT-3).* Partial support of PFF was identified with certainty for two tributaries to Searsville Lake - Corte Madera Creek (SF/CM-1) and Sausal Creek (SF/SC-1). In both cases, suspected causes include residential encroachment into the natural channel floodplain and undersized crossing structures at Family Farm Road. Additionally, discharges to a large willow swamp at the upstream end of Searsville Lake could back up to the Family Farm	

			Road community. *Local Knowledge Comment - These issues are part of continuing discussions between the residents and Stanford University. Studies are also currently underway about options to address the continuing siltation of Searsville Lake as only about twelve feet (confirm) of freeboard now remain at the 64-foot high 110-year old dam.* WAC notes in the Assessment of San Francisquito Watershed (WAR 3/29/02 draft Chapter 5): "More so than perhaps any of the other uses/interests, the RARE assessment was hampered by the reliance on existing data. Biological field surveys are really needed to assess habitat conditions within the subwatersheds for the species on the list. …most of the support statements for RARE were based on species observations rather than habitat conditions." *Local Knowledge Comments: A table was provided to WAC of additional locations where steelhead are known to occur. These data will be used to supplement the individual reach assessment pages* *There were no data in the data box to make a finding of non-support for RARE for any reason (including pesticides or siltation). Fieldwork associated with the sediment TMDL by the JPA and complementary habitat assessment by SCVWD will enable refinement of the RARE assessment.* Non-support for the MUN beneficial use was found with certainty for two reaches: San Francisquito between Los Trancos and Searsville (SF-5) and lower Los Trancos between San Francisquito and Buckeye. Both are attributed to groundwater sources of total dissolved solids (TDS) and erosion and local geologic conditions. No management actions are suggested. *Local Knowledge Comment - assessment data for water supply reservoirs were not made available to WAC for the Stanford University lakes or the Cal Water diversion dam.* Non-support for the REC1 beneficial use was made with certainty for only one reach in the watershed: Squealer Gulch (SF/WU-5). The suspected cause was identified as a car body described by the California Department of Fish and Game in "Field Observations and Photos of the San Francisquito Watershed" from March 1988 to March 1995 (DO452). *Local Knowledge Comments - stakeholders will investigate to see if the car body has been removed or if any management action is still needed.*	

			Assessment data for current or historic recreational uses at Lake Lagunita and Searsville were not made available to WAC.	