

## **APPENDIX 8B**

---

Summary of Comments: Public Draft SWRP



## **TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM**

DATE: July 24, 2018  
TO: Angela Spain  
CC: Brandon Davison  
FROM: Doug Moore, PE, RCE #58122  
REVIEWED BY: Natalie Muradian, PE, RCE #84895  
SUBJECT: City of Chico (Big and Little Chico Creeks) SWRP – Response to Comments on Public Draft of SWRP

Project No.: 755-10-17-01  
SENT VIA: EMAIL

This Technical Memorandum presents the summary of the review/comment solicitation and the responses to comments received on the Public Draft of the City of Chico (City) Big Chico Creek and Little Chico Creek Storm Water Resource Plan (SWRP).

### **REVIEW/COMMENT SOLICITATION**

The Public Draft SWRP was made available for review from June 21, 2018 to July 12, 2018 to the public, Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and Stakeholders through the City's SWRP website, and a paper copy was available at the City Hall's front desk. The website was: [http://www.chico.ca.us/building\\_development\\_services/sewer/SWRPWorkProducts.asp](http://www.chico.ca.us/building_development_services/sewer/SWRPWorkProducts.asp)

The solicitation included:

- An email to the SWRP interested public and stakeholders, the SWRP TAC, and the City's contact with the Regional Water Board were sent June 21, 2018.
- Notification was posted on the Keepchicoclean.org website with a link to the SWRP website home page on June 21, 2018.
- Press Release was sent to All-City Emails, All-City Council, Media – Chico Enterprise Record, Chico News & Review, KPAY/KHSL Radio, KNVN/KHSL TV, KALF/KFMF, KIXE/KCHO, KZFR, KBQB/KCEQ/KRQR/KTHU, and KRCR TV, and Butte College Facilities on June 21, 2018.

- Flyers were distributed and posted at City Hall – 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, City Hall – Building Counter, City Hall – internal bulletin boards, Butte County Library, Chico Natural Foods, Butte College – Chico Center, Cal Java, Kona's, Tin Roof Bakery, Upper Crust Bakery, and Pita Pit on June 21, 2018.
- A post on the City's Facebook page on June 21, 2018.
- A post on NextDoor on June 21, 2018.
- An email to the Chico and Butte County representatives on the North Sacramento Valley Integrated Regional Watershed Management Plan, sent on June 27, 2018.
- A front-page article in the Chico Enterprise Record, published on July 10, 2018.
- An interview with Channels 12 and 24, local news stations, aired July 11, 2018.

## **RESPONSES TO COMMENTS**

Table 1 presents the comments received and the responses to the comments.

## **DISCLAIMER STATEMENT**

Funding has been provided in full or in part through an agreement with the State Water Resources Control Board using funds from Proposition 1. The contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the foregoing, nor does the mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

This document is the work product for Task 4.9 of Grant Agreement No. D1612613 between the City of Chico and the California State Water Resource Control Board.

**Table 1. Response to Comments on Public Draft SWRP**

No.	Name	Comment	Response
1	Patti P.	I cannot comment on this lengthy book of words that only make sense to those who wrote it.	The document length is a result of providing sufficient information to meet multiple State requirements. The executive summary of the document was written to provide a relatively concise summary of the key aspects of the SWRP. The executive summary also was organized to direct the reader to the related section in the body of the report, if the reader is interested in more detail.
2	Eric Ginney	As related to Appendix 5C. Under Evaluation Criteria: "Flood Mgt. Benefit Category", "Enhance natural floodplain for improved conveyance" – Including only "conveyance" limits these criteria, and the ecosystem category similarly misses other benefits in those criteria. Recommend that this criteria be expanded to include floodplain storage of floodwater and other related ecosystem benefits of floodplain attenuation. Recommended wording: "Enhance natural channels and floodplains for improved conveyance, storage, and other natural ecosystem functions" (Note, these functions include generation of food for the aquatic foodweb and creation of rearing habitat for juvenile fish, specifically threatened and/or endangered salmonids).	The Flood Management Benefit Category includes evaluation criteria that are specific to flood management only, which is why the criteria "Enhance natural floodplain for improved conveyance" is specific to conveyance. Ecosystem benefits that result from floodplain attenuation were included under the Environment Benefit Category. The criteria "Improved wetland/riparian habitat" was used to recognize the improvements in habitat that result from the project.
3	Eric Ginney	[As related to Appendix 5C.] Under Evaluation Criteria: "Flood Mgt. Benefit Category" - recommend the addition of a criteria that addresses flood system operations and maintenance. Recommended wording: "Reduce flood O&M and/or integrates multiple-benefit opportunities for ecosystem enhancement and resiliency."	These evaluation criteria were provided to the TAC on February 2, 2018 and it is not possible to incorporate additional criteria at this time. These recommendations could be considered in a future update of the SWRP.  Reducing flooding infrastructure O&M would be a helpful evaluation criterion.  Ecosystem benefits that result from floodplain attenuation were included under the Environment Benefit Category. The criteria "Improved wetland/riparian habitat" was used to recognize the improvements in habitat that result from the project.
4	Eric Ginney	[As related to Appendix 5C.] Under Evaluation Criteria: "Environmental Benefit Category", - Recommend the addition of a criteria that reads "Creates or enhances natural channel and/or floodplain functions." The purpose is to include criteria for benefits other than just instream flow and riparian/wetland habitats. Many project opportunities may provide such benefits but would not be represented without this added criteria.	These evaluation criteria were provided to the TAC on February 2, 2018 and it is not possible to incorporate additional criteria at this time. These recommendations could be considered in a future update of the SWRP.
5	Eric Ginney	[As related to the above comments:] Metrics, methods for analysis, and other details to support these recommended edits and additions in the final plan can be found in the 2017 CVFPP Conservation Strategy <a href="https://water.ca.gov/Programs/Flood-Management/Flood-Planning-and-Studies/Conservation-Strategy">https://water.ca.gov/Programs/Flood-Management/Flood-Planning-and-Studies/Conservation-Strategy</a> and by using the HQTs found here: <a href="https://www.edf.org/sites/default/files/hqt_california-central-valley.pdf">https://www.edf.org/sites/default/files/hqt_california-central-valley.pdf</a>	Thank you for providing links to these resources.
6	Eric Ginney	As related to the "5 MILE AND LINDO CHANNEL DIVERSION STUDY (SWRP PROJECT 44) Project:  While I understand the comment period for the specific projects has closed, I want to point out that under the "Benefits Resulting from this Project" section, the existing project description is missing a key benefit from revised management of Big Chico Creek's (BCC) distributary system: increased aquifer recharge. Because BCC and Lindo Channel flow across a relatively-porous alluvial fan, and because local groundwater conditions are conducive to infiltration, flow across these stream channels can be a source of managed aquifer recharge. Thus, Water Supply would be expected to change, and change positively. Indeed, this should be a key multiple benefit for any such project.	Project 44 was assessed to not result in significant groundwater recharge because: 1) This project would only result in changed flow conditions during large, infrequent flow events, since the primary purpose of this study is to optimize operations to prevent flooding. 2) Both currently and with this project, during the large flow events, there will be significant flow in all the flood control channels, and the project will only result in a change in the ratio of the total flow that is conveyed by the individual channels. Thus, the project is unlikely to result in significant change in groundwater recharge.
7	Eric Ginney	[As related to the "5 MILE AND LINDO CHANNEL DIVERSION STUDY (SWRP PROJECT 44) Project:]  The benefits stated for "Environmental" and "Water Quality", related to sediment, are not entirely accurate and conflate problems that to my knowledge are not well defined or even identified as problems. In fact, a systematic examination of flow, sediment supply and erosion has never been completed. A comprehensive understanding of this would inform such a study, as proposed, and should be included. Recommend that any such study be more-accurately scoped.	The scope of Project 44 includes only adjusting the settings of the Lindo channel gates. The scope of Project 44 was established by the project proponent when the project was submitted and did not include an evaluation of sediment and scour.  However, the Lindo Channel Diversion is located in the Big Chico Creek watershed. Project M, the Big Chico Creek Management Plan, includes a comprehensive gravel, erosion, and sediment management evaluation for the Big Chico Creek watershed. Similar evaluations are included in for the Little Chico Creek (Project O) and Comanche Creek (Project P) watersheds. These studies will help provide the comprehensive understanding of flow, sediment supply, and erosion.
8	Eric Ginney	[As related to the "5 MILE AND LINDO CHANNEL DIVERSION STUDY (SWRP PROJECT 44) Project:]  I note that SWRP Project 8, related to Lindo Channel infiltration---a full description of which is not easily found on the website but is referenced in appendices and the draft plan---is: 1) limited in geographic scope as currently described, although the concept could be applied across larger areas, increasing the benefits and magnitude of benefits; and 2) is directly related to this study/project and should be considered and coordinated accordingly. Further, the ranking of Projects 8 and 44 seem biased by the erroneous omission of key benefits that coordinated flood and stormwater management opportunities hold for managed aquifer recharge and commensurate water quality and habitat improvements.	Project 8, Lindo Channel Infiltration Enhancement, was not ranked individually, but was included into Project M, the Big Chico Creek Management Plan. Project M includes evaluation of implementing groundwater recharge, not just at Lindo Channel, but throughout the Big Chico Creek watershed. Project M scored a Medium for water supply.

**Table 1. Response to Comments on Public Draft SWRP**

No.	Name	Comment	Response
9	Eric Ginney, ESA Associates	These comments are on specific instances, as referenced and noted above [in comments 2-8]. The intention and implications of these comments are for those referenced instances but are also intended to be translated throughout the plan itself, as applicable.	The Technical Advisory Committee has already adopted the project descriptions and has reviewed the evaluation criteria for this SWRP, and these revisions can't be addressed at this time. However, these recommendations could be considered in a future update of the SWRP.
10	Susan Mason	Page ES-7 ES.4.1 Shouldn't it be 17 grouped/consolidated projects, not 18	The text was changed to 17.
11	Susan Mason	Page I-3 1st paragraph Only the portion of Little Chico Creek that is diverted into a bypass to Butte Creek at Stilson Canyon flows into the Sacramento River.	The first paragraph on page 1-3 will be replaced with the following: "Rock Creek, Mud Creek, and Big Chico Creek all flow into the Sacramento River just west of the City. The water from Little Chico Creek and Comanche Creek flow into poorly defined channels/sloughs that wind southwest through miles of agricultural land southwest of the City."
12	Susan Mason	Page I-5 1.4.1.1.4 The flashboard dam at Sycamore Pool was replaced by an inflatable dam about 10 years ago.	The text has been added to Section 1.4.1.1.4 ".....with a flashboard dam, which was replaced with an inflatable dam around 2008."
13	Susan Mason	Page I-13 City of Chico responsibility for Lindo Channel maintenance ends about 400' downstream of H32, not at H32.	The text has been added to page 1-13: "...to 400 feet downstream of Highway 32."
14	Dick Corey	Today's Enterprise-Record ([7/10/18]) mentioned several proposals being considered. Although the swales and water retention gardens and a picnic area have merit, I believe the Teichert Ponds Restoration and management would be of greater need and value for storm water management.  Following the Bureau of Land Management credo, "the greatest good for the greatest number without doing harm." Teichert Ponds stands above the rest.  Need and value should be the determinants.  As I have noted before, the cattails overgrowing pond # 2 and 3 will soon clog the ponds with plants and dirt, further restricting healthy flow. These two ponds are becoming stagnant water bogs.  Huell Houser in a recent California Gold TV program showed the value of cattails in absorbing pollutants in an L.A. area pond. Floating barges containing clumps of this plant provided "islands" of rest while cleaning the water.  I can't deny that this might be of value if located in pond #1, if the plants were not allowed to proliferate as the cattails have next to the freeway. This might complement the master plan for the ponds adopted in 2008.	The Teichert Ponds project is included in the SWRP, and therefore it is eligible for grant funding from the State in the future. The TAC selected the three highest ranked projects for 30% design (Teichert Ponds was ranked 10 <sup>th</sup> ); but, this does not preclude the Teichert Ponds project from moving forward in the future.
15	Brian Adams	I couldn't get your link to your plan to work if there was one there.  I would say keep in mind that these areas that you intend to use for bio swales and detention/retention/infiltration etc. when they exceed their respective maximum for infiltration you will have run off and these areas will be deep enough that folks won't want to walk or use these areas. And they will exceed those maximums during heavy prolonged rain events and possibly stay soggy for quite some time. So maybe not so appropriate for schools and play areas. Infiltration vaults have been used successfully. Infiltration basins are also good, but you need the space and you have to expect they will be full of water sometimes, however, built correctly they can remove a lot of fine material which could be cleaned out with a front end loader. I see many housing developments that have included some of these ideas. Some food for thought.	Thank you for your input. Your concerns will be addressed as projects progress through design and implementation.
16	Cathleen Coolidge	These changes will likely produce some benefits, but at what cost? Where is the estimated costs of these projects, not just to the city, but to all taxpayers?	Initial and total capital cost estimates for each project are provided in Chapter 5. For the implementation projects, annual operation and maintenance cost estimates were also provide in Chapter 5.  Project funding will likely come from two potential sources, including the City and grant funding from the State. City funding of these projects will be through the City's normal budgeting process, in which the funding and benefits of these projects will be weighed against the various other needs of the City.  Potential State grant funding would be through a competitive grant application process. The States competitive grant process should ensure the best projects are funded at a State-wide level.



**Table 1. Response to Comments on Public Draft SWRP**

No.	Name	Comment	Response
17	BEC	I would like to request that a Public Meeting is held to review the SWRP before the document is finalized and presented to City Council to allow for greater public understanding and offer additional opportunities for feedback.	<p>Unfortunately, the State's grant contract has very tight timeline for completing the SWRP, so an additional public meeting cannot be provided. The public draft SWRP was available for public review from June 21, 2018 to July 12, 2018.</p> <p>Also, three public meetings were held during the development of the SWRP to inform the public and stakeholders about the SWRP and receive public and stakeholder input. Five TAC meetings were also held during the SWRP development, and at each of the TAC meetings the public was provided an opportunity to provide input for TAC consideration. Also, all work products leading to the Public Draft SWRP were available for public review and comment. Public and stakeholder input could also be provided throughout the SWRP development via the SWRP website and via email or phone calls.</p> <p>The State's grant contract required specific opportunities for public involvement and the contract requirements have been met and exceeded.</p>
18	BEC	Butte Environmental Council (BEC) is not listed in Table 2-4, but BEC did receive and distribute notice of Public Meetings for the SWRP.	<p>BEC was considered a stakeholder, and therefore was listed in Table 2-3.</p> <p>Table 2-4 was revised to not include individuals or organizations that are included in Table 2-3.</p>
19	BEC	In Chapter 2 the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is described as having 11 members, however in reality the TAC only consisted of 8 members, as Mike Alonzo replaced Richard Perrelli, and two of the listed members never committed to, responded about, or participated on the TAC. Individuals whom did not commit or participate should not be listed as TAC members.	<p>The text in Section 2.2 was revised to say, "An eight-member TAC was formed..."</p>
20	BEC	Project ranking and prioritization did not provide an opportunity for all implementation projects included in the SWRP to be evaluated equally. Grouping of project submissions allowed for inclusion of all project submissions but did not allow for each project's benefits to be compared. For example, in the initial project submissions projects 4 and 5 address specific water quality and flooding issues, but the benefits of these projects were not compared to the Projects considered in the ranking and prioritization process, because they were combined in a larger planning project. Please consider evaluation of all implementation projects to identify and prioritize the projects that have the greatest value to the community.	<p>A total of 84 initial projects were submitted by the public, stakeholders, and TAC members. The funding for the SWRP development allowed for a screening evaluation of up to 50 initial projects, but all 84 projects were screened any way. The funding for the SWRP development allowed for a more detailed evaluation of up to 16 "SWRP" projects. To ensure that 68 of the initial projects were not eliminated from further evaluation, the TAC elected to group 72 of the projects into a total of 17 SWRP Projects. The Projects that were not grouped were either duplications of other projects or lacked a sponsor. All 17 of the SWRP Projects were evaluated. Although the individual benefits of initial projects that were grouped into the SWRP Projects are not individually evaluated, the benefits of the initial projects were included in the evaluations of the 17 grouped SWRP Projects. Additional project evaluations are beyond the scope of the SWRP development and cannot be performed at this time. However, additional evaluations of projects could be implemented during a future update of the SWRP.</p>
21	Stream Team	<p>Page 18 ES-5</p> <p>Please consider adding language to the bullet list at top of page to recognize the few dedicated stakeholder organizations (BEC, The Stream Team, and a few others on email and sign-in sheets) that volunteered many hours of their time to participate in the development process. Could be listed as a separate bullet as watershed stakeholder groups, or combined into one of the existing bullet groupings? Might also be great to give some sort of recognition in this document regarding The Stream Team's volunteer work promoting and landing the grant that funded the SWRP development. We need recognition that the projects/grants we help promote are valued by the entities that we help land funding, so that the organizations that provide small amounts organizational support (Rose Foundation, SWRCB, etc.) understand that our efforts provide useful services to our community.</p>	<p>We added a bullet that says: "Non-profit organizations, such as Butte Environment Council and The Stream Team, provided valuable input and support for the development of this SWRP and distributed meeting flyers and project updates to their members. Additionally, the Stream Team was instrumental in securing the grant funding used for the preparation of this SWRP."</p>
22	Stream Team	<p>Page 18 ES-5</p> <p>The 2nd to last paragraph starts with, "Despite this extensive outreach....". Please include the real reasons why the public expressed concern.... 1) less than 1 week notice provided for initial outreach meeting in May; 2) there was no meeting materials posted or provided prior to the first public meeting, which limited the ability of the public to participate in a meaningful way. In addition to requesting more public outreach then originally planned, we requested SWRP information be posted on the City's website and an announcement be distributed to let the public know where to access the info.</p>	<p>Public meeting 1 was on 5/17/17. Public outreach started on 5/8/17 and continued through a variety of media outlets until the 5/17/17, so 11 days of notice was provided for Public Meeting 1.</p> <p>For Public Meeting 1, the meeting materials were not published prior to the meeting to avoid possible confusion about the materials until the SWRP development process had been introduced to the public at Public Meeting 1. For every subsequent meeting, meeting materials were published before the meeting.</p> <p>After public meeting 1, SWRP information was provided on the City's website and emailed to the SWRP email list.</p> <p>The discussion of Public Meeting 1 will be revised to include the information above.</p>
23	Stream Team	<p>Page 20</p> <p>ES-4.1 A google form is mentioned, which infers that it could be accessed and filled out on-line, to guide and encourage public participation, which I don't believe occurred. Although the form is now a working google form, at the time it was originally posted, I believe it had to be printed, and submitted via email.</p>	<p>Originally, the form was a paper form for use at Public Meeting 1. After Public Meeting 1, the form was converted into a working Google Form that could be accessed and submitted online via the SWRP web site.</p> <p>No revisions to the SWRP were made in response to this comment.</p>

**Table 1. Response to Comments on Public Draft SWRP**

No.	Name	Comment	Response
24	Stream Team	Pages 21, 22 ES-9 The tables are hard to read- print is very small.	Assuming this comment refers to Tables ES-2 (following page ES-9) or ES-10, the small font was needed to fit these tables on two pages. The SWRP is available electronically on the City's SWRP web site, and the tables can be enlarged on-screen to make them easier to read.  No revisions to the SWRP were made in response to this comment.
25	Stream Team	Page 25 ES-12 The first paragraph mentions the prioritization process used to rank the State's benefit categories. Please include the number of inputs that were used to prioritize the issues of greatest concern to the public and the TAC. I believe there were less than 20 forms (how many from public, and how many from TAC?).	The following text was added to both page ES-12 and page 5-2. "The TAC submitted five surveys and the public submitted 27 surveys, for a total of 32 surveys. The resulting values were averaged for the prioritization of both State and community-identified benefits...."  Appendix 5E (the letter describing the survey process and results) was added to Chapter 5.
26	Stream Team	Page 26 Last paragraph is confusing and mentions that project 77 is a planning project, which was not the intent of the project as submitted. Please change plan to implementation project, as is required for Prop. 1 funding.	Project 77, as submitted, included multiple, varied elements and projects on 25 different campuses. In order to effectively and cost efficiently implement such an extensive project, as submitted, would require planning and prioritization of the LID improvements at the various campuses. Consequently, Project 77 was categorized as a planning project.  Nevertheless, LID improvements for three campuses were selected by the TAC for preparation of 30 percent designs, and these three LID projects are implementation projects.  No revisions to the SWRP were made in response to this comment.
27	Stream Team	Page 27 Project 77 costs seem high. Please consider including the figures discussed at the last TAC meeting and/or previous emails regarding this point.	The cost estimate for project 77 was based on the project description. The estimated costs are based on what the project includes, not on what the sponsor potentially has available. However, the cost estimate does not include savings that could result from use of volunteer labor. The figures discussed at the last TAC meeting were funds the sponsor potentially has available.  No revisions to the SWRP were made in response to this comment.
28	Stream Team	Page 28 ES-6.2 Please remove language from bullet #1 suggesting that project 44 "should be completed prior to Project M". The TAC confirmed the timeline is arbitrary, and based mostly on the City's capital and O & M projections for the projects they would like to pursue. This language is confusing and suggests that the timeline is binding, which may limit support for projects pursued by entities other than the City.  Please also add an additional bullet describing that projects that were lumped into plans may seek funding as it becomes available and do not have to wait until the plan they were lumped into is developed.	The TAC did not confirm that the timeline is arbitrary. However, the schedule is not binding, it is only a plan based on the factors discussed in Chapter 6.  Following the project interdependencies increases efficiency and effectiveness. The project interdependencies do not have to be followed, but represent a logical progression of project implementation.  The following text was added to section ES6.2 and Section 6.8: "Funding for individual project elements that were grouped into larger planning projects may pursued at any time, and do not have to wait until the plan is complete."  The following text was added to Section 6.10: "Following project interdependencies is not essential but increases cost effectiveness and efficiency. Development of the project schedule assumed project interdependencies were followed."
29	Stream Team	Page 28 ES-6.2 Also, the 2nd to last paragraph contains quite a lot of detail about the implementation schedule for Project 77, which should be removed, and the paragraph language kept more general and not specific to project 77.	The point of including that detail on Project 77 was because it had a more complicated schedule than the other projects. This text explains the assumptions used in developing the Project 77 funding schedule. The current text also explains that there is flexibility in the timing and grouping of the implementation of the LID projects at the various campuses. The text remains, but has become a separate paragraph.
30	Stream Team	Page 28 ES-6.2 Last paragraph states that Project 33 was not included in the SWRP, as The Stream Team would not sponsor the development of the plan that the original project idea was lumped. We missed understanding that this decision was made, and request that Project 33 be included in the SWRP. It could be lumped under Project M (as the sub-watersheds are tributary to Bid Chico). The project ideas submitted was intended to be a place holder for Rock Creek Reclamation District and others that may want to pursue stormwater related funding in those watersheds. Why not include Mud and Rock Creek projects in the SWRP, since those watersheds are listed in the SWRP as main surface water bodies. Projects pursued in those sub-watersheds could also improve runoff issues near the municipal airport.	Project 33 was not included in the Implementation Plan, but still remains in the SWRP. Similar to the other projects that were grouped but were not evaluated individually, the project can be implemented once funding becomes available and is not dependent on being included in the implementation schedule.  No revisions to the SWRP were made in response to this comment.

**Table 1. Response to Comments on Public Draft SWRP**

No.	Name	Comment	Response
31	Stream Team	<p>Page 31 Implementation Schedule- The schedule was discussed at the last TAC meeting, as basically an arbitrary wish list, and minor changes were suggested, one of which was to provide a more reasonable timeline for developing the Big Chico Creek 21st Management Plan (which we believe could be developed in phases targeting implementation projects that address specific issues (such as trash, landscape overwatering), easily and cheaply, and that there are diverse sources of funding that can be pursued, and the timeline should not be limiting or based on the City's mandates and capital and O&amp;M projections. One of the main frustrations we expressed many, many times, had to do with the arbitrary lumping of implementation projects that were submitted into plans, with a blanket response from the City indicating they did so in order to ensure all projects submitted were included in the SWRP (and the consultant determined they would need significant planning, which is a false assumption as many of the ideas have been implemented in other communities and plans already exist that can be easily adapted, and because they did not have a sponsor, which is also invalid). Lumping implementation projects into plans has virtually buried all of the ideas submitted by The Stream Team, and the implementation schedule further delays opportunities for these projects to be implemented by suggesting that projects can't be implemented until after the plans they were lumped into are developed (2028-10 years from now, which does not support existing and ongoing stormwater efforts in the SWRP watershed).</p> <p>Please consider changing the timeline for all of the projects and plans to have an arbitrary start date of 2019-???, with a tentative date where possible, and explain that the timeline is not binding (as the TAC confirmed), and is at best a wish-list and no funding has yet been confirmed. This will allow all project proponents (even those where their project ideas were lumped into plans) to pursue funding for projects that support their existing stormwater protection efforts that are focused to reduce the impacts of stormwater pollution in the SWRP watershed beyond the City's efforts. The SWRP was intended to guide all stormwater work in the entire watershed beyond what the City is willing to support, and the timeline should not limit potential work by others, should funding become available.</p>	<p>The following text was added to the section ES.6 and 6.8:</p> <p>"The implementation schedule discussed below is not binding, but offers an efficient/logical way to implement the projects per the project descriptions. The proposed project schedule is not binding and if funding for a specific project or project element becomes available prior to its scheduled timeline, then either the project can be implemented out of sequence with the schedule or the schedule can be updated."</p>
32	Stream Team	<p>Page 35</p> <p>First Bullet on page 35 talks about SWRP effectiveness monitoring. It seems the language referring to comparing to implementation schedule should be removed, as the timeline is a wish list and the language infers the timeline is binding. Also, specific language about monitoring trash was included, and we request that you also include language to include water quality data available from existing citizen monitoring and stormwater protection efforts. The City has received funding since 2004 to support citizen monitoring efforts, and the SWRP it seems should reflect a commitment to continue building on these efforts including the use of data documenting water quality trends. The SWRP is ultimately all about protecting water quality, and the use of citizen monitoring data should be valued. Additionally there are existing stormwater outreach and education efforts that are ongoing and beyond the City's efforts that have an additive impact on preventing pollution that should also be evaluated, utilized, valued, and mentioned in this section.</p>	<p>The bullet on page ES-23 was changed to read: "To assess the effectiveness of SWRP implementation on a watershed basis, implementation of projects and various project elements should be monitored and documented annually. The amount of trash collected by the projects should be monitored and documented, along with other water quality data. Organizations that provide storm water outreach and education can self-monitor their activities and submit the self-monitoring results for inclusion in a future revision of the SWRP."</p>
33	Stream Team	<p>Page 39</p> <p>1.3 Please add a bullet listing the NGO entities that focus on water that are located within the watershed.</p>	<p>The purpose of Section 1.3 is to identify the agencies within the watershed that own/maintain water infrastructure, water suppliers, and water users. NGOs are listed in Chapter 2, specifically Section 2.3 and Table 2-1.</p> <p>No revisions to the SWRP were made in response to this comment.</p>



**Table 1. Response to Comments on Public Draft SWRP**

No.	Name	Comment	Response
34	Stream Team	<p>Page 40</p> <p>Please include a mention of the citizen monitoring efforts that exist in the SWRP watershed, and the useful water quality data that has been collected in association with many restoration and stormwater protection project grants previously awarded to the City. The data is currently being quality control checked and will be uploaded to CDEN very soon. Again, the City has received lots of funding to support citizen monitoring efforts, which provided the effectiveness monitoring for the grants the City received that were intended to reduce stormwater impacts and improve riparian habitat. It seems that the water quality monitoring conducted through these efforts should be mentioned and the plan should explain how it will build on these existing efforts including how the water quality data collected through these efforts will be utilized. The intent of all the previous funding the City received was provided to continue and build the efficacy of citizen efforts to assist the City in meeting their stormwater mandates. Please include language in the water quality section that recognizes the value of existing citizen monitoring efforts, how the data collected will be used, and how citizen monitoring efforts will be utilized to assist with SWRP effectiveness monitoring. There is no doubt regarding the additive impact on the outcomes of the City's stormwater and resource protection efforts the citizen monitoring efforts have had, and the SWRP should utilize this effort as appropriate to track SWRP project effectiveness, and state a commitment to supporting and utilizing citizen monitoring efforts as appropriate.</p>	<p>The following was added to the SWRP</p> <p>"1.4.1.3 Stream Team has organized and conducted citizen-based surface water quality monitoring for several years. When the data has been successfully reviewed and the data quality confirmed, this water quality data could be used to help plan and design storm water projects"</p> <p>Additionally, the Stream Team's past and anticipated future contributions to the improving storm water quality in the PAW were recognized in Section 6.7 of the SWRP.</p>
35	Stream Team	<p>Page 64</p> <p>2.1 Please include the names of the watershed groups that participated including BEC, The Stream Team, and the few others.</p>	<p>The watershed groups that participated in the SWRP development process were already included in Section 2.5, Table 2-3.</p> <p>No revisions to the SWRP were made in response to this comment.</p>
36	Stream Team	<p>Page 69</p> <p>Table 2-4 should include The Stream Team and BEC under the organization column.</p>	<p>The Stream Team and BEC were considered stakeholders, and consequently were listed in Table 2-3.</p> <p>No revisions to the SWRP were made in response to this comment.</p>