

APPENDIX F: RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Patrick Sweetland	Daly City		Grande Canal Project - is it fully covered in the SRP?	Yes, the project is referenced in the SRP with the project description included within Appendix D. The project parcels are referenced in the Prioritization Results in Table B-3 in Appendix B. See parcel numbers (APN) "002012050" and "002012060" on pages B-40 and B-50.
Beth Payne	Storm Water Planning Unit, Division of Water Quality, State Water Resources Control Board	Section ES.1 page v	The first sentence states that the Plan was not based on county lines, but this is not accurate. The maps and evaluated areas include only areas that are within the County. If the Plan was based on watershed boundaries, then the evaluated areas and potential projects would extend beyond the County's boundaries.	Projects are only identified within San Mateo County (no projects fall outside of boundary lines), however, they are determined based on hydrologic boundaries and watershed characteristics. This fact was included in ES.1, and we added information to further clarify this point. This section also discusses the ways in which watersheds were used to identify projects and aid in the prioritization process, instead of political boundaries.
Beth Payne	Storm Water Planning Unit, Division of Water Quality, State Water Resources Control Board	Section 4.2 pages 70-71	What are the expected load reductions compared with the required load reductions per the TMDLs? As written, required load reductions for PCBs and Hg are kg units (Tables 2-7, 2-8), while the expected load reductions are in mg units (Table 4-6), which makes it difficult for the reader to compare. We suggest including additional columns in Table 4-6 to include the proportion of load reduction each project would contribute.	Added footnote to Table 4-6 that compares to the load reduction in Table 2-8. The footnote is reported in mg for easy comparison in Table 4-6. Note that aggregate load reductions reported in Table 2-8 are resulting from green infrastructure for all MRP Permittees, and only phased reductions reported in the MRP for 2020 included specific reductions for San Mateo County. For this reason, the 2020 load reductions for the County were included in the Table 4-6 footnote to provide relative comparison.
Beth Payne	Storm Water Planning Unit, Division of Water Quality, State Water Resources Control Board		It's clear that local agencies were consulted with in the Plan's development, but it is not clear if any NGOs were contacted or consulted with, or if there are any plans to do so in the future.	As part of the public engagement process, effort was made to receive input from NGOs on the draft SRP. At the time of the commenter's review of the draft, the public review process was not complete. The final SRP includes additional discussion in Section 3 that summarizes outreach to all stakeholders, including NGOs.

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Beth Payne	Storm Water Planning Unit, Division of Water Quality, State Water Resources Control Board	Sections 5.2, 5.2.5	How will data from Plan and project implementation be accessed by the public?	Section 5.4 discusses a number of database and data visualization tools that were developed through the SRP planning process. These tools will continue to be updated through the adaptive management process discussed in Section 5.3, which includes the parallel/ongoing efforts of the reasonable assurance analysis and green infrastructure planning to meet requirements of the MRP. As these tools are more fully developed, they will be accessible through C/CAG, the Countywide Program, and agency websites.
Beth Payne	Storm Water Planning Unit, Division of Water Quality, State Water Resources Control Board	Section 4.2.1 page 54	Page 54: "Several assumptions were made in determining the representative drainage area:...(2) the estimated drainage area is 250 times the area of the project footprint." How was assumption (2) determined?	Project drainage-to-footprint ratios were determined by taking a sample of other regional capture projects designed in the Los Angeles region. Text was added in Section 4.2.1.1 to explain the determination of that assumption.
Beth Payne	Storm Water Planning Unit, Division of Water Quality, State Water Resources Control Board		It's not entirely clear from the Plan how the subset of projects were selected after they were scored. What were the scores of the selected projects? Also, the projects in Table 5-1 are not easily cross-referenced with the list in Appendix B (Table B-1 has no project names).	Text was added in Section 4.2.2 to explain how projects were selected. Rather than basing selection on scores, projects were selected based on co-location with projects that are already being planned or by request from the jurisdiction. This maximized the value of the concepts by selecting projects that will likely be among the first to be implemented. The scoring system is meant as a tool to aid jurisdictions in planning/selecting projects to implement but does not necessarily reflect the order that projects will be implemented. The Appendix was updated to include names of the selected projects.

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Beth Payne	Storm Water Planning Unit, Division of Water Quality, State Water Resources Control Board	Section 5.2.1 page 87	The Plan indicates that the initial projects will be submitted to the IRWM group, but the Water Code requires that any project funded by Prop 1 grant funds be in a Plan that was submitted to the local IRWM group.	The SRP will be submitted to the IRWM group once it is finalized and approved by C/CAG and the State Water Board.
Beth Payne	Storm Water Planning Unit, Division of Water Quality, State Water Resources Control Board	Section 5.4 page 92	Page 92 of the SWRP identifies a "Database Summary" in Appendix B. However, Appendix B is the "Results of Quantitative Prioritization Projects," and there doesn't appear to be a database summary included in the document.	The tables in Appendix B "Results of the Quantitative Prioritization Method" are only a summary of the Project Database. Parcels and street segments in those tables are the projects that have been identified by the SRP. The Project Database will exist as an online tool that will eventually be available to the public to easily track project information. Text was modified in Section 5.4 for clarification.

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Adina Levin	Menlo Park/public		<p>Green Streets suggestions: 1) to create a toolkit for cities to consider green streets features that could be implemented simultaneously with a variety of complete streets/traffic calming initiatives</p> <p>2) to incorporate into funding cycles for complete streets and active transportation projects scoring criteria that add weight and value to projects that incorporate green streets features, and to enrich funding sources for these complete streets/active transportation projects with funding intended to deliver green infrastructure</p> <p>3) to incorporate "green streets" funding in potential upcoming county transportation measures, and to promote the benefits of neighborhood attractiveness, quality of life, and cost savings associated with green streets projects</p> <p>More info: http://www.cityofsanmateo.org/DocumentCenter/View/51272 http://www.cityofsanmateo.org/DocumentCenter/View/51273</p>	<p>We appreciate this input, which will be considered in ongoing/parallel green infrastructure planning efforts. Approaches for addressing green street implementation, incorporation within transportation projects, and funding will be further investigated during green infrastructure planning efforts from 2017-2019. This will result in model plans that can be adopted by each C/CAG member agency. This parallel planning effort is a component of the SRP's adaptive management process discussed in Section 5.3, and will result in additional information that can be incorporated within future updates to the SRP over time. There are additional efforts occurring at the regional level in the Bay Area to explore opportunities for better integration between stormwater and transportation, and successes in those efforts will feed into implementation of local green infrastructure plans.</p>
Kellyx Nelson and Brittani Bohlke	San Mateo County Resource Conservation District	Section 1.3.2 page 6	<p>The Fitzgerald ASBS Pollution Reduction program does not mention that the program included LID projects on private properties. Suggested language: "which implemented stormwater BMPs on public property and private residences in partnership with the RCD". It is also suggested that the ASBS Compliance Plan be included here.</p>	<p>Edited language to reflect BMPs on public property and private residents and mentioned the Compliance Plan.</p>
Kellyx Nelson and Brittani Bohlke	San Mateo County Resource Conservation District	Section 1.3.3 page 7	<p>Consider mentioning the Pilarcitos Integrated Watershed Management Plan and the Pillar Point Harbor Source Identification Project Final Project Report</p>	<p>Added Pilarcitos Integrated Watershed Management Plan in the overview, and the Pillar Point Harbor Source Identification Project to Section 1.3.3.</p>

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Kellyx Nelson and Brittani Bohlke	San Mateo County Resource Conservation District	Section 2.2.2 page 19	At the end of the first paragraph it is suggested that "on both public and private lands" be added to the last sentence.	Made this addition to the paragraph.
Kellyx Nelson and Brittani Bohlke	San Mateo County Resource Conservation District	Section 3.1 page 45	Solicit information about existing programs, planned projects, and project concepts for unincorporated areas of the County from other organizations and agencies instead of just from the County. Or add to the second sentence in the second paragraph: "C/CAG did not solicit GIS information or planned projects for unincorporated areas of the County from any local agencies or organizations for inclusion into the plan".	Used this language to address this section: "For unincorporated areas, GIS data layers and other electronic information on planned public projects were obtained from the County."

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Kellyx Nelson and Brittani Bohlke	San Mateo County Resource Conservation District	Section 4	<p>Private properties should not be screened out during the prioritization process. The types of impairments on the coast (bacteria and sediment) do not lend themselves to stormwater capture projects on public parcels and public rights of way only. These types of impairments require pollution prevention activities throughout the community in addition to green infrastructure and LID on private ranches, residences and agricultural lands. This is particularly true in the residential areas surrounding the Fitzgerald Marine Reserve and Pillar Point Harbor in addition to the several large ranching and agricultural operations in Pescadero. Further, for the On-Site LID Retrofit Project category, slope and hydrologic soil group are used as prioritization metrics and exclude areas with steep slopes and soils with poor infiltration. In combination with exclusion of private properties this excludes what appears to be about 90% of coastal San Mateo County that flow directly to the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS). Given that steep slopes and poor soil infiltration exacerbate stormwater issues it does not seem like these areas should be excluded.</p>	<p>It is understood that stormwater capture projects on private property represent a significant opportunity for stormwater capture. It was not determined feasible to include privately owned parcels in the screening process without consulting with individual owners of those properties. Consideration of privately owned parcels would result in the inclusion of individual privately owned parcels within the project database, which are organized by parcel number. However, additional text was provided within Section 4 that discusses the value of LID on private property, and recognition that any such project identified in the future would meet the overarching goals of the SRP. Note that slope is included in the screening of public parcels (Section 4.1.1) to prevent design challenges for stormwater capture projects. Additional considerations for both slope and hydrologic soil group were included in the prioritization process (Section 4.2.1.1) which did not result in exclusion of project opportunities, but rather provided a scoring and prioritization of opportunities to potentially guide project selection for implementation. All projects resulting from the prioritization process are subject to selection and implementation, regardless of their prioritization score, depending on the interest of agencies or stakeholders.</p>

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Kellyx Nelson and Brittani Bohlke	San Mateo County Resource Conservation District	Section 4.2.1.5 page 57	It is suggested that the title of the section be changed to "303(d) listed waterbodies." This section indicates that priority is not only given to TMDLs rather than 303(d) listed waterbodies in general but that the TMDL prioritization only applies to Bay TMDLs. This automatically lowers the priority of all work in the San Francisco Coastal Watershed even though there are more waterbodies on the 303(d) list than the Bay Watershed and with listings occurring for beaches or creeks that flow directly to the MBNMS and that result in beach closures.	Priority was given to TMDLs, specifically those addressing PCBs and mercury for San Francisco Bay, because associated TMDL implementation requirements in the MRP specifically require green infrastructure to provide a specified portion of the pollutant load reductions over time (Table 2-8). Compliance with the MRP and TMDLs are therefore contingent upon implementation of green infrastructure over time to provide the necessary reductions of PCBs and mercury to the Bay. However, recognizing that stormwater capture projects can benefit water quality improvement for all watersheds and other 303(d) listed waterbodies, project opportunities were identified throughout the county, including the San Francisco Coastal Watershed. As a result, the SRP includes a list of project opportunities within the San Francisco Coastal Watershed that can be further explored for funding opportunities and implementation, which will not be influenced by the number of project opportunities identified for the San Francisco Bay Watershed. Examples include project concepts in Pacifica (Rosita Road green street) and Half Moon Bay (LID for City Hall Parking Lot). Note that the scoring method used in the prioritization is meant to aid jurisdictions in selecting projects to implement but does not necessarily represent the order in which projects will be implemented. All projects included in the SRP are eligible for grant money increasing the likelihood that these projects may be implemented.

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Kellyx Nelson and Brittani Bohlke	San Mateo County Resource Conservation District	Section 5.2.4 page 88	The community participation strategy involves giving tours and demonstrations about projects that would only be funded on public parcels. The community would be informed of these practices when there is no incentive or mechanism for them to participate. In order for the community to really be engaged, understand stormwater issues, and how they can be a part of the solution over the long term, green infrastructure/LID on private property would need to be considered.	Yes, the demonstration projects represent only one mechanism for educating the public on the benefits of stormwater capture projects. We recognize that additional public incentive programs and similar public awareness projects are needed to further public understanding of the purpose and benefits of LID on private land. Additional discussion was added to Section 5.2.4 to describe these types of community engagement projects that include LID incentive programs or pilot projects on privately owned parcels.
James O'Connell	Redwood City, Community Development Department		One of the things that we thought was a potential missed opportunity was smaller retrofit areas with excessive ponding or drainage issues. It seems like it would be good to acknowledge these areas for green infrastructure as a potential fix. This might be a little premature given that they haven't developed the sizing criteria required by the green infrastructure section, but long term we think it would help a lot of jurisdictions on a smaller scale. We think that it would also help by packaging a dozen or so of these types of projects together to go after grant funding, and especially if there are matching contribution requirements where the City had already had some money set aside for the fix.	The data on localized flooding areas is limited and so could not be identified or included in the prioritization. Language was added in the Green Street/LID sections to acknowledge these areas and suggest green infrastructure as a viable solution.

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
James O'Connell	Redwood City, Community Development Department		One of the other things that we wouldn't expect to be in the plan but are curious what the County was thinking, is how often do you expect to update the plan and especially with the projects.? Since Redwood City has already received grant funding, we would like to know when we should look to have new projects to include with the next round.	Note that project conceptual designs do not need to be included within the SRP for the projects to be eligible for grant funding. Rather, all project opportunities included within Appendix B are eligible for funding, and can be further developed for inclusion of information within grant applications. These represent all publicly owned parcels and street rights-of-way that were screened for viable opportunities for stormwater capture projects, and subject to the prioritization process. However, if additional project opportunities are later identified that are not included within Appendix B, there are future opportunities through the adaptive management process (discussed in Section 5.3) to include these opportunities within the SRP over time. As discussed in Section 5.3, the anticipated schedule for the next update of the SRP is 2020-2022.

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Charles Ice	San Mateo County Environmental Health (Groundwater Protection)		<p>In the Plan, references are made to infiltration galleries, trenches, chambers, and systems. While most of these may still be dealing with infiltration starting at the surface, there may be some that try to bypass surficial soils that limit the rate of infiltration. Any bypassing of surficial soils could be viewed as a preferential pathway for contaminants, both captured within stormwater or accidentally released at the surface, to reach groundwater sooner than if it had passed through the natural vadose zone soils above groundwater. This issue is exacerbated in areas with very shallow groundwater typically near the Bay where agencies are already dealing with sewer overflows from large quantities of groundwater infiltrating sewer systems. Therefore, an additional screening criteria, either on its own or in conjunction with one of the existing criteria such as soil group, might need to be distance to groundwater from anticipated injection depth of potential projects. This could be seen as aligning any potential project with the Regional Water Quality Control Board's Basin Plan objective of not degrading water quality, specifically groundwater.</p>	<p>Thank you for the input. Because project details, and therefore injection depth, are yet to be developed for most projects, the separation between groundwater and infiltration facilities must be considered on a site-specific basis. Feasibility assessments should be performed before design of infiltration projects to explore risk of potential groundwater contamination. Regional data on groundwater level is limited, making it difficult to consider on a regional level and at the scale of the SRP. Text was added in the "Groundwater Recharge" subsection in Section 4.2.1.6 to explain this as an important consideration that must be addressed as projects are considered for design and implementation.</p>

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Arthur G. Scott, Cindy Sumida-Scott	Property owners at 8 Athlone Way, Menlo Park, CA	Section 4.3.1 pages 74-77	<p>HOLBROOK-PALMER PARK (ATHERTON, CA)-- "high opportunity project for regional stormwater capture...The project would capture a large portion of the upper Atherton Creek watershed and would alleviate downstream flooding issues, as well as reduce pollutant loads to the creek and its receiving water, San Francisco Bay."</p> <p>COMMENT: We rank this project as #1 priority because it will lessen the amount of stormwater that FLOODS the HOMES on Athlone Way in North Fair Oaks (unincorporated area adjacent to Marsh Road and the Atherton Channel). The flooding is NOT minor nuisance flooding. Residents have been flooded OUT OF THEIR HOMES. This flooding is a PUBLIC SAFETY ISSUE.</p>	The Holbrook-Palmer Park stormwater capture project received a score in the "High Priority" category. Note that the scoring method is meant to aid jurisdictions in selecting projects to implement but does not necessarily represent the order in which projects will be implemented. All projects included in the SRP, including this one, are eligible for grant money increasing the likelihood that these projects may be implemented.
Arthur G. Scott, Cindy Sumida-Scott	Property owners at 8 Athlone Way, Menlo Park, CA	Appendix C pages C-7 - C-8	<p>Concept for a Multi-jurisdictional Regional Stormwater Capture Project</p> <p>Site: Holbrook-Palmer Park (Town of Atherton)</p> <p>COMMENT: Please see above comment</p>	See above response.
Arthur G. Scott, Cindy Sumida-Scott	Property owners at 8 Athlone Way, Menlo Park, CA	Section 1.3.2 pages 5	<p>BAYFRONT CANAL / ATHERTON CHANNEL FLOOD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT</p> <p>COMMENT: We rank this project as #2 priority because when implemented, the stormwater that FLOODS the HOMES on Athlone Way in North Fair Oaks (unincorporated area adjacent to Marsh Road and the Atherton Channel) will be absorbed by the improved system.</p> <p>Background: Currently the 35 cfs Athlone Pump at Marsh Manor is inadequate to remove home-flooding stormwater from Athlone Way. Public Works has informed us that a higher-capacity pump would help, but cannot be installed because doing so would cause downstream flooding due to Bayfront Canal's inability to absorb even the current amount of stormwater.</p>	The Bayfront Canal/Atherton Channel Flood Improvement Project received a score in the "Medium Priority" category. Note that the scoring method is meant to aid jurisdictions in selecting projects to implement but does not necessarily represent the order in which projects will be implemented. All projects included in the SRP, including this one, are eligible for grant money increasing the likelihood that these projects may be implemented.

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Arthur G. Scott, Cindy Sumida-Scott	Property owners at 8 Athlone Way, Menlo Park, CA	Appendix D1-4: 12-13	See above comment	See above response.
Arthur G. Scott, Cindy Sumida-Scott	Property owners at 8 Athlone Way, Menlo Park, CA	Appendix D, 1. Paragraph 3 page 1	<p>To the sentence "The proposed project will mitigate the chronic and widespread flooding which occurs in the East Bayshore area of Redwood City, adjacent to the Bayfront Canal"</p> <p>COMMENT: Please ADD: ", and on Athlone Way and other areas of North Fair Oaks (unincorporated San Mateo County) west of the Bayshore freeway and adjacent to Marsh Road and the Atherton Channel."</p> <p>NOTE 1: The purpose of this comment is to have the SRP and its related documents recognize and explicitly state that Athlone Way is severely affected by flooding due to stormwaters draining from surrounding areas.</p> <p>NOTE 2: Probably could also include the Friendly Acres neighborhood in Redwood City west of the Bayshore freeway and areas of Atherton and Menlo Park, but we have personal experience only with home flooding on Athlone Way.</p>	Appendix D is an attachment of a separate report from the SRP and so cannot be modified. Language was added in Section 1.3.2 of the SRP to acknowledge the unincorporated areas that may benefit from this project.

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Arthur G. Scott, Cindy Sumida-Scott	Property owners at 8 Athlone Way, Menlo Park, CA	Appendix D, 3.1/ page 4, paragraph 1	<p>To the sentence: "One of the goals of the Project is to mitigate the chronic and widespread flooding which occurs in the East Bayshore area of Redwood City, adjacent to the Bayfront Canal"</p> <p>COMMENT: Please ADD: ", and on Athlone Way and other areas of North Fair Oaks (unincorporated San Mateo County) west of the Bayshore freeway and adjacent to Marsh Road and the Atherton Channel."</p> <p>NOTE 1: The purpose of this comment is to have the SRP and its related documents recognize and explicitly state that Athlone Way is severely affected by flooding due to stormwaters draining from surrounding areas.</p> <p>NOTE 2: Probably could also include the Friendly Acres neighborhood in Redwood City west of the Bayshore freeway and areas of Atherton and Menlo Park, but we have personal experience only with home flooding on Athlone Way.</p>	Appendix D is an attachment of a separate report from the SRP and so cannot be modified. Language was added in Section 1.3.2 of the SRP to acknowledge the unincorporated areas that may benefit from this project. In addition, the SRP includes projects in these affected areas opening them up to potential grant funding.
Arthur G. Scott, Cindy Sumida-Scott	Property owners at 8 Athlone Way, Menlo Park, CA	Section 4.3.2/ page80 (example)	<p>We propose a "Green Street Retrofit for Stormwater Capture" project for 14th Avenue at Athlone Way in North Fair Oaks (unincorporated San Mateo County, adjacent to Marsh Road and the Atherton Channel), using the existing green curb strip along the Hetch Hetchy right of way.</p> <p>Please see file attachment SCOTT_CCAG SRP Comment #7 detail.jpg for Google Map with details.</p> <p>Benefits: Reduce home flooding by capturing stormwater flow upstream from Athlone Way so that the 35 cfs Athlone Pump Station is not overloaded with stormwater that is cannot handle, reduce pollutant loads to waters flowing to San Francisco Bay, restore groundwater.</p>	The proposed location is included in the prioritization results. See Table B-8 on page B-258, GSID 16250. Because it is included in the SRP, this project would be eligible for grant money.

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Esther Nigenda	Palo Alto		<p>With sea level rise, groundwater levels will rise also. This article says that</p> <p>"Direct marine inundation likely will be the dominant mechanism of inundation in low-lying areas of the California Coast, but areas with coastal aquifers less than 4 m [13 feet] from the ground surface should be considered for their potential to contribute to SLR impacts via groundwater emergence and shoaling, and existing underground infrastructure such as basements, pipes, and tunnels will be increasingly vulnerable to flooding as sea level rises (Bjerkli et al., 2012)."</p> <p>Groundwater levels are not explicitly considered in your matrices. Is this something that would be important enough to include?</p> <p>Land use, yes. What about amount of underground construction? Another factor to consider? I realize you can't add every single variable to the model.</p>	<p>We appreciate this input. Regional data on groundwater depth is limited and so is difficult to implement in the prioritization at the scale required by the SRP. This is something that must be considered on a site-specific basis. Feasibility assessments will need to be performed before infiltration facilities are selected for design. Text was added to Section 4.2.1.6 under "Groundwater Recharge" to explain this as an important consideration that must be evaluated before design.</p>
Jane Stahl	Millbrae	Section 2.8.1 page 40	<p>A simple solution to trash - educate homeowners and business owners of the value to water quality of sweeping sidewalks & gutters, and picking up trash before it becomes part of the sewage system. Encourage through awards for "neatest street," etc. given by cities. I see a lot of trash (and leaves right now) in the gutters that could easily be cleaned up.</p>	<p>This is a good, simple solution. Section 2.8.1 summarizes contributors to pollution and does not necessarily tackle solutions. Note that the purpose of the SRP is to identify and prioritize opportunities for stormwater capture, and does not address many of the separate programmatic needs to control pollutant sources. Separate planning efforts of the Countywide Program includes planning efforts to address trash.</p>

Sandy Lee	Menlo Park	Section 2, Figure 2-3	<p>The O'Connor Water Tract Co-op is not shown on the Map or discussed. Our Co-op covers about 80 acres, has 343 connections and serves about 3100 customers from two deep private wells since 1921. There is one storm drain near our facility, but I am not aware of further storm drains in other parts of our water Co-op community. Our Co-op is about a block from my house and my street does flood, when the San Francisquito Creek overflows or we have excessive rains (last time was winter 2004.)</p> <p>The Co-op is located in Menlo Park but is a separate water supplier and our plant and customers are located between East Palo Alto Water District and Menlo Park Municipal Water Department. We are one of two private water cos. left. (The other private water co. is Palo Alto Park Mutual Water Co. with 5 wells, located in East Palo Alto and also separate from the East Palo Alto Water District.) Both our Co-op and Palo Alto Park Mutual Water Co. have websites which give our history.</p> <p>Please recognize us and show us on your Map. Our sewer is handled by East Palo Alto Sanitary District. You can see our physical location and that of the Palo Alto Park Mutual Water Co. location on the Menlo Park Municipal Water District website home page which shows all the neighbor water districts and tie-ins for emergency purposes.</p> <p>We periodically flush our mains and provide various required reports on water production, usage, quality, etc. to the State Water Resources Control Board as our water source is 100% groundwater. We are considering treating our water for manganese.</p> <p>I am a member of the O'Connor Water Tract Co-op. I am also interested in understanding how our Co-op activities affect the watershed (and subwatersheds).</p>	Added the O'Connor Water Tract Co-op to the map.
-----------	------------	--------------------------	---	--

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Sandy Lee	Menlo Park	Section 2.8.2 and 3 pages 41, 45	<p>Please note that this storm water management plan stops at the San Mateo County line and its purpose is to take a global look at storm water rather than the many individual agencies that have done so in the past. However, East Palo Alto Sanitary District (which is addressed in this document and is within the San Francisco watershed) actually sends its waste to the Palo Alto Regional Water Quality Control (which is located in Santa Clara County) for treatment, and it has similar permits for dischargers, etc.. So stormwater and pollutants from activities in SM County going into the storm drains would be transported to Palo Alto in SC County. And there is a definite boundary issue here.</p> <p>Is there any way to mention something about this (e.g., to check with the adjacent Count(ies)) for similar discharge permit requirements? Is there any coordination going on by or planned with Santa Clara County? (For example, our Co-op oversight is provided by the Santa Clara County State Water Resources Control Board). The watersheds and subwatersheds are impacted by how the storm water reaches them - so neighbor County's storm water management practices can counter or negatively impact whatever this document and management plan is trying to do.</p> <p>Another example - the O'Connor Water Tract Co-op would get it's discharge permit from East Palo Alto Sanitary District and the Palo Alto Regional Water Quality Control (the two cities have an agreement).</p>	<p>The Santa Clara Valley Water District was recently awarded a Proposition 1 Storm Water Planning Grant by the State Water Resources Control Board to develop a SRP for the Santa Clara Basin in Santa Clara County. As the District begins development on its SRP, we plan to coordinate and provide advice on the successful planning approaches that were used in the San Mateo SRP. San Mateo County was the first to create a SRP with the awareness that an additional plan would be developed for Santa Clara County soon after. For those watersheds bordering the two counties, there will be a collaborative effort between the county jurisdictions as well as local watershed management groups and water districts. In order to effectively implement stormwater capture projects in each SRP, there will be collaborative efforts irrespective of jurisdictional boundaries.</p>

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Sandy Lee	Menlo Park	Section 3.2 pages 46-47	Suggest also posting in neighborhood blogs such as Nextdoor in the Willows - this blog covers 17 neighborhoods in the Menlo Park area and is widely read. Other cities have similar neighborhood blogs as not everyone has joined Facebook or Twitter. Also, in Menlo Park, Atherton, Palo Alto, etc. The Almanac newspaper is widely read.	Thank you for this suggestion. See the updated discussion for Section 3 and 6 that provide an overview of methods used to engage the public.
Sandy Lee	Menlo Park	See Above	<p>If a large landowner (e.g., construction of a new school) changes the grade (slope, height, etc.) of its field, this can negatively impact all the surrounding neighbors whose property levels run with the original slope of the land. This is currently occurring in MP. Historically, a long-term resident told of flooding waters crossing the (old) school field and water settling in it as it was natural the "low" point. Now, with a new fence surrounding the field, and the grade being changed, no one really knows how this change will impact the overall neighborhood. Is there some way to address construction considerations in connection with storm water management provisions? I think it's just something that had no existing rule or ordinance governing it. I suppose if the drought ever ends, and we should be so lucky to have too much water on the ground again, is when it might become an issue for the neighbors!</p> <p>Also, I have no further comments except to say WELL DONE and something that's been needed for a long time.</p>	Comment is noted, this is an important consideration for project designs and construction. These considerations will be important for the next stages of project feasibility analysis and design, which will be performed on a project-by-project basis by individual C/CAG member agencies.
Tom Mattusch	El Granada		The San Mateo County Harbor District should be on the stakeholder list.	The Harbor District was added to the stakeholder list in Appendix E and will be included in future emails regarding the SRP.

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Tom Mattusch	El Granada		It is extremely important to capture and treat stormwater drain runoff that flows to Pillar point Harbor and to Surfers Beach area.	Thank you for your input. Half Moon Bay and surrounding unincorporated county areas do have project opportunities identified in the project database that could be eligible for grant funding. See Appendix B for all project locations identified throughout the county. Additionally, a concept for a stormwater capture project has been developed for Half Moon Bay in Appendix C.
Tom Mattusch	El Granada		I would like to see Coastside County Water District, Granada Community Services District, the City of Half Moon Bay, Montara Water & Sanitary District, SAM and San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program develop plans to inspect creeks and contribute money to the Resource Conservation District to aid in more specific testing of bacterial contamination and other sources of contaminants. Contribution levels per agency should start at \$50,000, similar to what SMCHD gives to the RCD, along with a boots on the ground plan to examine sources of point pollution.	Thank you for your comment. The SRP is focused on the identification and prioritization of stormwater capture projects, and therefore does not address studies and funding needed for creek inspection/assessment or monitoring. Separate discussions are suggested with C/CAG and individual agencies regarding involvement and partnering on these efforts.
Dona Rossignoli	North Fair Oaks (Menlo Park)		I would definitely endorse this project to ameliorate flooding in North Fair Oaks. It would help create and sustain new marsh land as well as help with street flooding, a win- win situation.	Thank you for your comment.
Dona Rossignoli	North Fair Oaks (Menlo Park)		Again, I think this project would be very helpful in our area to ameliorate flooding, it seems very smart to capture excess water for future use or for aquifers replenishment. I would support it.	Thank you for your comment.
Dona Rossignoli	North Fair Oaks (Menlo Park)		I can't comment on other projects since I'm not familiar with areas of concern, but I would support any of these projects if they, apart from fixing the problem, would also help wildlife in general by creating more habitat for it.	Thank you for your comment. Many of these projects do have auxiliary benefits to wildlife, discussed in Section 4.2.1.6.

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Bayfront Canal project	North Fair Oaks (Menlo Park)		I was dismayed to find the Bayfront Canal Project downgraded to priority #36. This is not acceptable since a lot of work and study has gone into this project in the past, and in fact it was, according to the pamphlet, ready to be started and supposed to be completed by 12/31 2015. This project would complement the Holbrook-Palmer basin project and probably make a real difference in the flooding that occurs in North Fair Oaks, because we receive so much water from Atherton and Redwood City. Also the problem of rising sea level is only going to worsen the situation in the near future and the fact that the current Flood Slough cannot handle the massive amount of water from extreme weather remains the most obvious reason for the Marsh Canal to spill over into our neighborhood. This project needs to be #2 on the list, not #36.	The scoring method is intended as a tool to aid jurisdictions in selection of projects but does not necessarily reflect the order in which they will be implemented. Also note, all projects on the list will be eligible for grant money since it is included in the SRP. While the prioritized list is countywide, selection of projects will still be the responsibility of each jurisdiction. It is possible for a project that is further down on the countywide list to be near the top for a specific jurisdiction.
Marjorie Robinson	San Mateo CCL		I do not know the section, but I found the whole presentation very informative.	Thank you for your comment.
Richard K. and Carol D. Barner	28 Athlone Way, Menlo Park, CA (North Fair Oaks neighborhood)	Appendix B page B-13	We feel that the Bayfront Canal and Atherton channel project should have a much higher priority than "35." In addition to the neighborhoods east of Hwy 101, this project will also positively effect quality of life in the North Fair Oaks neighborhood which has historically experienced street and structure flooding when storm water has no adequate outflow to the bay via the Bayfront Canal and Atherton Channel system. This plan has been in process for years and it would be wonderful to see it finally implemented. In addition, it will offer positive benefit to wetlands environment in and around Bedwell Park.	The scoring method is intended as a tool to aid jurisdictions in selection of projects but does not necessarily reflect the order in which they will be implemented. Also note, all projects on the list will be eligible for grant money since it is included in the SRP. While the prioritized list is countywide, selection of projects will still be the responsibility of each jurisdiction. It is possible for a project that is further down on the countywide list to be selected early for implementation.

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Richard K. and Carol D. Barner	29 Athlone Way, Menlo Park, CA (North Fair Oaks neighborhood)	Appendix D	You mention neighborhoods effected by this project as the East Bayshore area of Redwood but this project will also positively effect North Fair Oaks - Athlone Terrace neighborhood west of Hwy 101, bounded by Middlefield Road and Marsh Road in Menlo Park.	Appendix D is an attachment of a separate report from the SRP and so cannot be modified. Language was added in Section 1.3.2 of the SRP to acknowledge the unincorporated areas that may benefit from this project.
Richard K. and Carol D. BarnerE:E G61A:F	30 Athlone Way, Menlo Park, CA (North Fair Oaks neighborhood)	Appendix C	Wholeheartedly support this project and its high priority status in the overall plan. Controlling flood waters and diverting water for storage and groundwater replenishment is a win/win situation. The Atherton Channel flood of 1998 was disastrous for many in the North Fair Oaks community.	Thank you for your comment.
Richard K. and Carol D. Barner	31 Athlone Way, Menlo Park, CA (North Fair Oaks neighborhood)	Appendix C	Would like to see Low Impact Retrofit projects in the south end of North Fair Oaks neighborhood of Menlo Park - Standing water and flooding occurs after minor rains. The existing storm drain system is inadequate for more run-off. So, to keep the water and let it filter into permeable curbs would be a great improvement.	All projects on the list (Appendix B) will be eligible for grant money since it is included in the SRP. Sites in Menlo Park and North Fair Oaks are considered in this list.
Rinaldo Veseliza	Alisto Engineering Group/ San Mateo	Appendix A	General description of imperviousness should include roads, streets and parking lots.	Appendix A is an attachment of a separate report from the SRP and so cannot be modified. Language in the SRP, however, acknowledges roads and parking lots as contributing to imperviousness.
Rinaldo Veseliza	Alisto Engineering Group/ San Mateo	Appendix C	There needs to be a larger review of roads, parking lots and opportunities to have pervious surfaces to remove water vs. drains.	Permeable pavement is considered as a possible improvement for green street and LID projects identified by the SRP. The green street prioritization method identified potential street segments that are conducive to green infrastructure retrofits, including permeable pavements. These types of projects will certainly be considered at these project locations.

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Rinaldo Veseliza	Alisto Engineering Group/ San Mateo	Appendix D	use of phytoremediation should be considered as one added option.	Appendix D is an attachment of a separate report from the SRP and so cannot be modified. Text was added to include phytoremediation as a potential improvement of green infrastructure in Section 4.1 under "Green Streets".
Walter Ruzzo	Gilead Sciences, Inc. - Foster City	Section 1.1 page 2	There has been a great deal of research recently on how the water cycle affects climate and subsequently climate change. This work is beginning to show that soil moisture plays important role in maintaining the earth's natural air-conditioning system. We have impacted this relationship between soil moisture and climate through deforestation, intensive agriculture and urbanization. As cities and suburbs have expanded, more and more water is directed off the land through gutters, culverts, pipes and canals and is unable to soak into the ground. By doing so, we are taking away from soil moisture's ability to act as a heat-regulating mechanism. I would point you to a excellent book on the subject entitled "Water for the Recovery of the Climate: A New Water Paradigm." While you reference climate change by name in this section, there is no explanation of how the Stormwater Management Plan by adding to soil moisture can be a significant factor in addressing climate change. To me, this is a very important reason for the implementation of stormwater management measures that put stormwater back into the soil.	On page 2 of the SRP, green infrastructure is discussed as a method of combatting climate change through capture and treatment of stormwater and dry weather runoff. In addition, pages 36 and 37 discuss imperviousness and display maps of impervious cover that portray the negative impacts imperviousness have on local waterways, causing flooding, higher surface runoff volume, erosion and sedimentation...etc. When discussing rainfall patterns, it is also mentioned that climate change scenarios may be looked at in tandem with precipitation modeling.
Margaret Goodale	Pacifica Resident		Need better way to locate properties, more identification on Quantitative prioritization lists. It would be helpful to group a city's acreage together rather than requiring perusal through all 116 pages.	The Appendix is only a summary of the project database. Online tools are under development to facilitate tracking of project information and are discussed in Section 5.4. These tools will eventually be accessible to the public and will be continually updated as the Plan evolves and projects are added, providing an easier way to look up information than the current tables provided.

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Margaret Goodale	Pacifica Resident		The steep watersheds in Pacifica should not disqualify the city from higher prioritization.	The scoring method is intended as a tool to aid jurisdictions in selection of projects but does not necessarily reflect the order in which they will be implemented. Also note, all projects on the list will be eligible for grant money since it is included in the SRP. While the prioritized list is countywide, selection of projects will still be the responsibility of each individual jurisdiction. It is possible for a project that is further down on the countywide list to be selected early for implementation.
Margaret Goodale	Pacifica Resident		We have just been through flooding and sewage spills, but the City has no money to do what are often seen as cosmetic changes. Aid from grants that do not require matching funds would be very helpful.	One of the goals of the SRP is to identify projects so that they may be eligible for the State Proposition 1 grant. This grant, however, does require matching funds. A concept design was developed for Pacifica (Appendix C) that can be used to pursue other funding sources as well. Many project opportunities were identified for Pacifica (Appendix B) in the SRP, and these projects will be eligible for future grant funding.
Jill Bicknell	Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program	Page 54	For regional projects, the representative drainage area was assumed to be 250 times the area of the project footprint. Is it supposed to be <u>25</u> times (per the 4% sizing method)? Or if not, what is the rationale for 250 times?	Project drainage-to-footprint ratios were determined by taking a sample of other regional capture projects designed in the Los Angeles region. The ratio for regional projects is much higher than the 4% method prescribed for green infrastructure because they can be built deeper and there is no media in the storage component. Text was added to Section 4.2.1.1 to explain the determination of that assumption.
Jill Bicknell	Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program	Pages 60-62	Suggest putting Tables 4-3, 4-4, and 4-5 in order of discussion of project types in the text, i.e., green street project prioritization factors should be in Table 4-4 and onsite LID retrofit project factors should be in Table 4-5.	Corrected.

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Jill Bicknell	Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program	Pages 60-62	In Tables 4-3, 4-4, 4-5, for the Imperviousness scoring, shouldn't the criteria for getting 4 points be " <u>70</u> < X < 80"?	Corrected.
Jill Bicknell	Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program	Pages 60-62	In Tables 4-3, 4-4, 4-5, for the Hydrologic Soil Group scoring, why is "Unknown" worth more points than a "D" soil? This should be explained in the text.	Unknown is assumed to be Group C, since it is the dominant soil group throughout surrounding areas. However, since the type is still Unknown, it was given lower priority than Group C but higher priority than Group D. Text is added in Section 4.2.1.1 to explain this assumption.
Jill Bicknell	Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program	Page 80	One page fact sheets on projects are very nice. I am curious as to the source of the unit costs used on the fact sheets. Can this be documented in the report?	The cost estimates were determined through a survey of typical project costs in concept designs across the Los Angeles region. Line item costs were further refined through discussions with various cities in San Mateo County. Total capital costs were compared to cost functions used in Los Angeles project planning efforts as validation. A footnote was added to Table 5-1 to explain the source of cost assumptions.
Jill Bicknell	Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program	Page 86	Text can be updated to describe the Prop 1 implementation grants awarded to San Mateo and Redwood City.	Additional text was included to inform about the Prop 1 grants that have been awarded so far as a result of this effort.
Jill Bicknell	Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program	Pages 88-89	The cost distributions shown in Table 5-2 are not the same as the cost assumptions on the fact sheets. Shouldn't they be consistent, or some explanation provided? Also, the source of the percentages should be stated (see comment #5).	The cost distributions in Table 5-2 are an example approach referenced from the 5-year CIP for City of Los Angeles. A similar approach was used for the concepts but differ based on input from several cities in San Mateo County. Text was added to page 90 for clarification.

<p>Keith Mangold</p>	<p>Resident</p>	<p>A major issue with the San Mateo Stormwater Plan is the omission of Pilarcitos Creek, the 3rd largest coastal stream and, arguably, one of the highest health impact streams in the county due to the heavy utilization of State Park Beaches located downstream.</p> <p>The main tributary of Pilarcitos originates south of Montara Mountain, in a pristine area with little pollution, but a high incidence of landslides and erosion, especially during flood stage. Sediment from the erosion travels down the creek, degrading aquatic habitat and threatening the existence of the Pilarcitos Creek steelhead population at the mouth. Steelhead Trout “captured” by sediment at the mouth of Pilarcitos Creek.</p> <p>The creek travels through ag lands along the Highway 92 corridor, where it has been channelized and diverted, but usually with relatively low pollution impact except for drainage from Highway 92. The major risk of future pollution along the Highway 92 corridor is the Ox Mountain Landfill where PCB’s, pesticides, toxic metals and other potential pollutants are buried. The containment structure is a clay liner that, if compromised by age, earthquake or groundwater, could become a major, long lasting source of severe pollution for the creek and downstream beaches.</p> <p>From Stone Pine Village through downtown Half Moon Bay the creek picks up significant amounts of surface pollution from runoff, which includes various pollutants including animal waste as highlighted in the annual Snapshot Day monitoring program conducted by the Monterey Bay Marine Sanctuary. Strawflower Shopping Center is another source of polluted storm water which impacts areas of the creek during the low summer flows. The next major impact is the transient population living in the creek corridor along Strawflower. Some of the transient population use the creek as an open sewer to remove human waste, which affects water quality at Kelly State Beach when the creek is flowing at the mouth. Another potential pollution contributor</p>	<p>Pilarcitos Creek and other waterbodies in the San Francisco Bay South watershed are indeed plagued by large amounts of sedimentation as well as increasing urban runoff from major cities in the watershed. Additional discussion of impacts affecting Pilarcitos Creek has been added to Section 2.7.3 and reference to the Pilarcitos Integrated Watershed Management Plan (IWMP) has been added. The IWMP outlines the range of issues facing the creek and watershed as a whole, in addition to the work that continues to be done to combat the negative effects of stormwater and human activity in the watershed. Pilarcitos Creek provides an important example of point and non-point source pollution impacts within the San Francisco Coastal South Watershed.</p>
----------------------	-----------------	---	--

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
			downstream of Highway 1 is the Sewer Authority MidCoast, where a sanitary sewer overflow, though very rare, can have a catastrophic effect on the water quality of our beaches. The solution to managing Pilarcitos storm water is multijurisdictional with private landowners, City of Half Moon Bay, California State Parks, San Mateo County, Sewer Authority MidCoast and even possibly the San Francisco Public Utility Commission having roles in a favorable outcome. Private landowner participation is also a very important factor, as recognized in the Resource Conservation District projects such as the Fitzgerald Marine Reserve Pollution Reduction Project.	
Ann Stillman	County of San Mateo	Page 9	"managed"	Changed from "manage" to "managed."
Ann Stillman	County of San Mateo	Figure 2-3	East Palo Alto Co. Water District no longer a county district	This area will instead be labeled the City of East Palo Alto water system since it is run by the city (and operated by American Water Enterprises). A couple of private companies have now also been listed.
Ann Stillman	County of San Mateo	Page 10	"an" changed to "and"	Corrected.
Ann Stillman	County of San Mateo	Figure 2-4	Take out South Bayside Waste Management Authority	Removed South Bayside.
		Page 19	Fix footer	Corrected.
Ann Stillman	County of San Mateo	Page 20	Take out comma	Corrected.

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Ann Stillman	County of San Mateo	Page 21	Is this saying that the airport and marsh use this much water?	Altered the wording to make this clearer. This is the estimated usable groundwater in storage for both the airport and marsh area, not necessarily the amount used per year.
Ann Stillman	County of San Mateo	Page 21	I thought Montera water pumps water from airport property?	Sources of groundwater information come from the CA DWR factsheet. Half Moon Bay information is located here: http://www.water.ca.gov/groundwater/bulletin118/basindescriptions/2-22.pdf
Ann Stillman	County of San Mateo	Page 24	Change "District and"	Corrected.
Ann Stillman	County of San Mateo	Page 24	nine water districts are in the San Francisco Coastal watersheds, including.... "Is the EPA water district in SF Coastal South?"	No, this is in San Francisco Bay Watershed. Removed from this map.
Ann Stillman	County of San Mateo	Page 26	Why are Coyote Park and Flood Park included in other park descriptions?	Separated two parks into their own section.
Ann Stillman	County of San Mateo	Page 26	Change "Country" to "County"	Corrected.
Ann Stillman	County of San Mateo	Page 35	"absorb?"	Instances of "sorb" were replaced with "adsorb" to specify that contaminants can attach to the surface of soil particles through the process of adsorption.
Ann Stillman	County of San Mateo	Page 45	add space between "address" and "other"	Corrected.
Ann Stillman	County of San Mateo	Page 51	Move Table 4-1 to the next page	Moved table to next page.
Ann Stillman	County of San Mateo	Page 57	"Projects" to "project"	Corrected.

Name	Affiliation	Section/ Page Number	Comment	Response
Ann Stillman	County of San Mateo	Section 4.2.1.8 page 63	"Prioritization scores were categorized...." Need to connect to numbers on maps, i.e. as high (red 38-49), medium (orange - 30-37)...etc	The criteria to establish the score categories, rather than the actual score ranges, were included. This is because the sentence applies to all three project types, which have different score ranges. The score ranges were established using above 90th percentile for high, above 60th percentile for medium, and below 60th percentile for low.
Ann Stillman	County of San Mateo	Figure 4-4	Edit legend top add Low Priority, Medium, and High Priorities	Priority category label was added to the legends of Figures 4-4 through 4-9.
Ann Stillman	County of San Mateo	Page 70, Table 4-6	Hg introduced but where is it defined for the readers? Why not just use the word mercury?	Corrected.
Ann Stillman	County of San Mateo	Page 94	"(stressor/source identification..." Need end parentheses	Corrected.