

Note: This table includes all comments pertaining directly to Chapter 6 of the WAR. Listed first are comments on Draft A of Chapter 6, 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 6. 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	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
22	Lucy Buchan, SCVURPPP	Chapter 6, p. 2	Endorse the approach to subdivide reach UP-2 into 3 segments for the purpose of evaluating COLD due to the differences in available data that warranted distinct support statements within the reach.	No change made.
23	Lucy Buchan, SCVURPPP	Chap. 6, p. 2	The necessity of subdividing reach UP-2 to develop support statements supports a statement made in the Lessons Learned document that the stream classification method used for the WMI assessment should be refined to reflect stream processes.	No change made.
24	Lucy Buchan, SCVURPPP	Chap. 6, p. 2	There seems to be an error in the narrative description for subreaches 2A and 2B. Should the division between these two subreaches be Nobel Ave Diversion instead of Maybury?	Revision adopted.
25	City of Sunnyvale	Chapter 6, Cherry Flat Reservoir, p. 2	Doesn't the City of San Jose own the Cherry Flat Reservoir, and then the City of San Jose, Conventions, Arts, and Entertainment Department operate it? The way the last sentence reads now, the Conventions, Arts and Entertainment Department owns the reservoir.	Text simplified to refer to the "City of San Jose" as both owner and operator.

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 6 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
26	City of Sunnyvale	Chapter 6 Section 6-3-3 p. 5, second paragraph	<p>It looks like this paragraph was copied directly from the San Francisquito PFF section in Chapter 5. There is a reference in the center of the paragraph “Additionally, another data set indicated that 100% build out of all remaining undeveloped (and developable) land in the San Francisquito watershed would not result in any significant change to the 100-year flood flow (San Francisquito Creek CRMP, 1998).” It is not clear what this statement means to a discussion for the PFF for Upper Penitencia.</p> <p>The way this citation is presented is confusing. If it is being used as an example to show that buildout has a limited impact on the PFF designation, then it should be listed as a citation to support that thought, as well as the other literature reviewed to support it, but not given a citation in this section. (e.g., “Other literature reviewed by the team supported this statement, though none were specific to Upper Penitencia Creek.” - no literature citations listed)</p>	This citation has been removed from the text.
26.5	Terry Neudorf, SCVWD Guadalupe River Watershed Captain	Chapter 6 related. No clear reference provided	May want to call out the natural waterfalls in ARP in relation to anadromous fish occurrence as an indicator of beneficial use. There is also a (artificial) passage barrier in ARP that was created during the course of stream bank protection work in 1999, or so. That may compromise direct interpretations of steelhead occurrence.	This information has been added to the local knowledge section of the reach summary table in Appendix 6-B and is referenced in the text.
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.
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</p>	The format drafted by Trish Mulvey has been adopted in the revised reach summary tables in Appendix 6-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 6 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
			<p>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 ‘keep the wall up’ and give equal weight to both data in assessment support determination- and clearly show the distinction between the data.</p>	
29	Trish Mulvey (Reach Assessment comment number 2)	<p>All watersheds Chapter 4 p.11; section 4-3-1</p> <p>Chapter 5, p.7; section 5-3-1</p> <p>Chapter 6, p.6; section 4-6-1</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Please refer to response above. Additionally, WAC will investigate the suggestion to include grazing for Upper Pen.</p>	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 6-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.

Order Number of Comment	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
32	City of Sunnyvale	Watershed Tables (All)- General comment	<p>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?</p> <p>It would be helpful to the stakeholders to see where essential data gaps are and then use that information to develop future monitoring priorities.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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 6-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 6-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 6.4 as well as in the Data Gaps TM.</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>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 6-B.</p> <p>The maps suggested in the comments have been created and are included in Chapter 2 and referenced extensively throughout Ch. 6.</p> <p>The bar graphs have been revised per this comment and are now included in Appendix 6-A.</p> <p>Local knowledge comments are now included in the reach summary tables in Appendix 6-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 6 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
			<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 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>	

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 6 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
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 determinations. Also, 'local knowledge' should be clearly defined as data that did not pass through the quality assurance/quality control process.</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>
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.	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.
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

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 6 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
				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 MDDDB.	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 assmt. Fish can’t jump these, therefore they would be an example of a special circumstance- supporting the utility of Trish’s suggestion.</p> <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>	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 6 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
<p>Lessons Learned TM</p> <p>31</p>	<p>Trish Mulvey</p>	<p>Lessons Learned Memo</p>	<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>	<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>
<p>Lessons Learned TM</p> <p>34</p>	<p>Trish Mulvey</p>	<p>Lessons Learned Memo</p>	<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>	<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>
<p>Lessons Learned TM</p> <p>35</p>	<p>Trish Mulvey</p>	<p>Lessons Learned Memo</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Limiting Factors TM</p> <p>12</p>	<p>Scott Akin, SCVWD</p>	<p>Limiting Factors Memo</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>This information is no longer part of the Chapter 6 text and the reach summary tables. Revisions have also been made to the Limiting Factors TM.</p>
<p>Limiting Factors TM</p> <p>24</p>	<p>Scott Akin, SCVWD</p>	<p>Limiting Factors Memo</p>	<p>Re UP-1 statement that augmented summer streamflow does not usually extend downstream to this reach. What about Cherry Creek Reservoir?</p>	<p>Releases from Cherry Flat Reservoir do augment natural flow in Upper Penitencia Creek through Alum Rock Park, but generally infiltrate by the time they reach the lower portion of the creek. This will vary by year.</p>

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 6 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
Limiting Factors TM 25	Scott Akin, SCVWD	Limiting Factors Memo	Re UP-1 statement that stream may be too warm for Chinook spawning and rearing. No evidence that Chinook use Upper Pen.	While no data exist to indicate Chinook presence in the subwatershed, the COLD logic diagram requires that suitability for use by Chinook be evaluated where the data allow.
Limiting Factors TM 29	City of Sunnyvale	Limiting Factors Memo	What is the role of Cherry Flats Reservoir in keeping water in the stream, especially augmenting low flow times? No mention is made of this being a possible mechanism to add to flows when needed.	Releases from Cherry Flat Reservoir do augment natural flow in Upper Penitencia Creek through Alum Rock Park, but generally infiltrate by the time they reach the lower portion of the creek. This will vary by year. Due to a lack of data on Cherry Flat Reservoir, it is not known whether there is potential for additional release for flow maintenance farther down Upper Penitencia Creek.
Post-WAR Workshop	Scott Akin, SCVWD	Limiting Factors Memo	<p>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:</p> <p>-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 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</p>	Portions of the comment have been added to the discussion of the FAHCE process in Chapter 6. The comment is addressed more fully in the revised Limiting Factors TM.

QA/QC Worksheet for WAR Chapter 6 – Draft B

Order Number of Comment	Subgroup or Group providing comment	Page(s) / Paragraph(s).	Text Suggested or General Comment	Response to Comment
			<p>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>	