12.5 Citizens
## CITIZENS

### CITIZENS WHO SUBMITTED COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT PEIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Letter Format</th>
<th>Comment Letter ID</th>
<th>Name of Commenter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PH Palo Alto</td>
<td>C_AdamsA</td>
<td>Amy Adams</td>
<td>12.6-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Agarw</td>
<td>Sambhu Agarwala</td>
<td>12.5-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_AllenC</td>
<td>Casey Allen</td>
<td>12.5-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_AllenT</td>
<td>Thomas Allen</td>
<td>12.5-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Allis</td>
<td>Rita Allison</td>
<td>12.5-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Alter</td>
<td>Grudy Alter</td>
<td>12.5-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Arons</td>
<td>Eric Arons</td>
<td>12.5-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Bail</td>
<td>Christopher Bail</td>
<td>12.5-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Barbe1</td>
<td>John Barbey</td>
<td>12.5-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH SF1</td>
<td>C_Barbe2</td>
<td>John Barbey</td>
<td>12.6-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Barsa</td>
<td>Cris Barsanti</td>
<td>12.5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Palo Alto</td>
<td>C_Beauj</td>
<td>Cedric De La Beaujardiere / Susan Stansbury</td>
<td>12.6-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Berg</td>
<td>Bonnie Berg</td>
<td>12.5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Berk</td>
<td>Allan Berkowitz</td>
<td>12.5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Berli</td>
<td>Gabie Berliner</td>
<td>12.5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Bevia</td>
<td>John Beviacqua</td>
<td>12.5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Bigos</td>
<td>Marty Bigos</td>
<td>12.5-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand-delivered, PH</td>
<td>C_Blake</td>
<td>Martin Blake</td>
<td>12.5-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Bourk</td>
<td>Sean Bourke, MD</td>
<td>12.5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Sonora</td>
<td>C_BoutiD</td>
<td>Dolores Boutin</td>
<td>12.6-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Sonora</td>
<td>C_BoutiF</td>
<td>Fred Boutin</td>
<td>12.6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_BramlD1</td>
<td>Darryl Bramlette</td>
<td>12.5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_BramlD2</td>
<td>Darryl Bramlette</td>
<td>12.5-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Sonora</td>
<td>C_BramlD3</td>
<td>Darryl Bramlette</td>
<td>12.6-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Modesto</td>
<td>C_BramlD4</td>
<td>Darryl Bramlette</td>
<td>12.6-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Brand</td>
<td>Jobst Brandt</td>
<td>12.5-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Breso</td>
<td>Mark Bresolin</td>
<td>12.5-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>C_Britt</td>
<td>Beverly Britts</td>
<td>12.5-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_BrookL</td>
<td>Liz Brooking</td>
<td>12.5-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CITIZENS WHO SUBMITTED COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT PEIR (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Letter Format</th>
<th>Comment Letter ID</th>
<th>Name of Commenter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Bryan</td>
<td>Louis Bryan</td>
<td>12.5-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Bucki</td>
<td>Keith Buckingham</td>
<td>12.5-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH SF1</td>
<td>C_Bug</td>
<td>June Bug</td>
<td>12.6-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Byron</td>
<td>Juan Byron</td>
<td>12.5-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Fremont</td>
<td>C_Cant</td>
<td>John Cant</td>
<td>12.6-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Caugh</td>
<td>Robert Caughlan</td>
<td>12.5-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Chase</td>
<td>Birgit Chase</td>
<td>12.5-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Chiap</td>
<td>Lynn Chiapella</td>
<td>12.5-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH SF1</td>
<td>C_Chode</td>
<td>Bernie Chodeu</td>
<td>12.6-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Clar1k</td>
<td>Ann Clark / Katherine Howard</td>
<td>12.5-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH SF1</td>
<td>C_Clar2k</td>
<td>Ann Clark</td>
<td>12.6-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Closs</td>
<td>Gary Clossman</td>
<td>12.5-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Cole1m1</td>
<td>Caroline Coleman</td>
<td>12.5-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Cole2m2</td>
<td>Caroline Coleman</td>
<td>12.5-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Coll</td>
<td>Robert Collin</td>
<td>12.5-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Dahl</td>
<td>Leland &amp; Shirley Dahlin</td>
<td>12.5-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Davey</td>
<td>Mary Davey</td>
<td>12.5-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_David</td>
<td>Joel Davidson</td>
<td>12.5-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Sonora</td>
<td>C_DayJ</td>
<td>Joseph Day</td>
<td>12.6-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_DayL</td>
<td>Lisa Day</td>
<td>12.5-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Palo Alto</td>
<td>C_Dippe</td>
<td>Dan Dippery</td>
<td>12.6-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH SF1</td>
<td>C_Dough</td>
<td>Denise Dougherty</td>
<td>12.6-101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Dulma</td>
<td>Diane Dulmage</td>
<td>12.5-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Duper</td>
<td>Fred Duperrault</td>
<td>12.5-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Eddy1</td>
<td>Jeb Eddy</td>
<td>12.5-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Palo Alto</td>
<td>C_Eddy2</td>
<td>Jeb Eddy</td>
<td>12.6-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Elbiz</td>
<td>Elaine Elbizri</td>
<td>12.5-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Palo Alto</td>
<td>C_ElliC</td>
<td>Claire Elliott</td>
<td>12.6-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Sonora</td>
<td>C_ElliP</td>
<td>Patricia Elliott</td>
<td>12.6-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Fremont</td>
<td>C_Ellis</td>
<td>Dave Ellison</td>
<td>12.6-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Farnu</td>
<td>Benjamin L. Farnum</td>
<td>12.5-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Fenwi</td>
<td>Jan Fenwick</td>
<td>12.5-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Field</td>
<td>David Fielding</td>
<td>12.5-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Fiore</td>
<td>John and Janet Fiore</td>
<td>12.5-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Flani</td>
<td>M. Flanigan</td>
<td>12.5-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Flemi</td>
<td>E. Fleming-Hasegaue</td>
<td>12.5-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Flynn</td>
<td>Kirsten Flynn</td>
<td>12.5-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Letter Format</td>
<td>Comment Letter ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Fox</td>
<td>Peter Fox</td>
<td>12.5-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Sonora</td>
<td>C_Gado</td>
<td>Jimmy Gado</td>
<td>12.6-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Garba</td>
<td>Caroline Garbarino</td>
<td>12.5-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Garci</td>
<td>Ruben Garcia</td>
<td>12.5-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Sonora</td>
<td>C_Gelma</td>
<td>Robert Gelman</td>
<td>12.6-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Geno</td>
<td>Marylyn Genovese</td>
<td>12.5-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Goite</td>
<td>Ernest Goitein</td>
<td>12.5-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH SF1</td>
<td>C_Goken</td>
<td>Shawna Gokener</td>
<td>12.6-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Goldf</td>
<td>Kathleen Goldfein</td>
<td>12.5-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Gooid</td>
<td>Rebecca Goodman</td>
<td>12.5-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Grave</td>
<td>Ben Graves</td>
<td>12.5-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_GreenD</td>
<td>David Greene</td>
<td>12.5-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_GreenK</td>
<td>Katherine Greene</td>
<td>12.5-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Sonora</td>
<td>C_GrinnD</td>
<td>Doris Grinn</td>
<td>12.6-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Sonora</td>
<td>C_GrinnJ</td>
<td>Jim Grinnell</td>
<td>12.6-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Gross</td>
<td>Andrew Gross</td>
<td>12.5-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Hacka1</td>
<td>Bob Hackamack</td>
<td>12.5-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Hacka2</td>
<td>Bob Hackamack</td>
<td>12.5-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Hall</td>
<td>Diana Hall</td>
<td>12.5-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Hamil</td>
<td>Kimberly Hamilton-Lam</td>
<td>12.5-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Hanke</td>
<td>Carol Hankermeyer</td>
<td>12.5-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH SF1</td>
<td>C_Hasso</td>
<td>Tomer Hasson</td>
<td>12.6-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Helld</td>
<td>Alex Helldoevker</td>
<td>12.5-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Henry</td>
<td>Leah Henry</td>
<td>12.5-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_HerroK</td>
<td>Kristin Herron</td>
<td>12.5-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Hest</td>
<td>Christopher Hest</td>
<td>12.5-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Higgi</td>
<td>Sidney Higgins</td>
<td>12.5-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Hoel</td>
<td>Jeff Hoel</td>
<td>12.5-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Hoffm</td>
<td>Jeff Hoffman</td>
<td>12.5-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Hsiun</td>
<td>Pei-Lin Hsiung</td>
<td>12.5-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Sonora</td>
<td>C_Hughe1</td>
<td>Noah Hughes</td>
<td>12.6-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Modesto</td>
<td>C_Hughe2</td>
<td>Noah Hughes</td>
<td>12.6-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Ikemo</td>
<td>Kile Ikemoto</td>
<td>12.5-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Isaac</td>
<td>Marian Isaac</td>
<td>12.5-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Izmir</td>
<td>Richard Izmirian</td>
<td>12.5-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_JohnM</td>
<td>Mitchell Johnson</td>
<td>12.5-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_JohnSie</td>
<td>Sieglinde Johnson</td>
<td>12.5-51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CITIZENS WHO SUBMITTED COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT PEIR (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Letter Format</th>
<th>Comment Letter ID</th>
<th>Name of Commenter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PH SF1</td>
<td>C_JohnsSil</td>
<td>Silvia Johnson</td>
<td>12.6-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Joye</td>
<td>Lindsay and Ken Joye</td>
<td>12.5-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Kahn</td>
<td>Mike Kahn</td>
<td>12.5-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Kalin</td>
<td>Gwynn Kaliner-MacKellen</td>
<td>12.5-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH SF1</td>
<td>C_Kalma</td>
<td>Emeric Kalman</td>
<td>12.6-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Keebr</td>
<td>Suzanne Keebra</td>
<td>12.5-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Kelle</td>
<td>Michael Kelleher</td>
<td>12.5-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Kim</td>
<td>Michelle Kim</td>
<td>12.5-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_KingC</td>
<td>Carl King</td>
<td>12.5-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_KingD</td>
<td>David King</td>
<td>12.5-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_KingK</td>
<td>Kenneth King</td>
<td>12.5-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand-delivered, PH</td>
<td>C_Krame1</td>
<td>John Kramer</td>
<td>12.5-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Krame2</td>
<td>John Kramer</td>
<td>12.5-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Lee</td>
<td>Aldora Lee</td>
<td>12.5-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Leeet</td>
<td>Ben Leet</td>
<td>12.5-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Lewin</td>
<td>Linda Lewin</td>
<td>12.5-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Palo Alto</td>
<td>C_Lieber</td>
<td>Sidney Liebes</td>
<td>12.6-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Lim</td>
<td>Kingman Lim</td>
<td>12.5-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Look</td>
<td>Carissa Look</td>
<td>12.5-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_LoVuo</td>
<td>Judith LoVulo-Bhushan</td>
<td>12.5-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Lowry</td>
<td>Janet Lowry</td>
<td>12.5-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand-delivered, PH</td>
<td>C_Lubin</td>
<td>Sheri Lubin</td>
<td>12.5-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Lundb</td>
<td>Erik Lundberg</td>
<td>12.5-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Maddo</td>
<td>Tyana Maddock</td>
<td>12.5-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Palo Alto</td>
<td>C_Madou</td>
<td>Ramses Madou</td>
<td>12.6-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Magol</td>
<td>Nick Magol</td>
<td>12.5-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Palo Alto</td>
<td>C_Marcu</td>
<td>Mary Jane Marcus</td>
<td>12.6-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Palo Alto</td>
<td>C_Margo</td>
<td>Elliot Margolies</td>
<td>12.6-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Marsh</td>
<td>James Marshall</td>
<td>12.5-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_MartIM</td>
<td>Michael Martin</td>
<td>12.5-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_MartIS</td>
<td>Sofia Martinez</td>
<td>12.5-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Palo Alto</td>
<td>C_Mater</td>
<td>Len Materman</td>
<td>12.6-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_McCle</td>
<td>Jonathan McClelland</td>
<td>12.5-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_McCol</td>
<td>Karl McCollom</td>
<td>12.5-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_McCon</td>
<td>Mike McConnell</td>
<td>12.5-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_McFar</td>
<td>Keith &amp; Luella McFarland</td>
<td>12.5-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_McKee</td>
<td>Julie McKee</td>
<td>12.5-68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CITIZENS WHO SUBMITTED COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT PEIR (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Letter Format</th>
<th>Comment Letter ID</th>
<th>Name of Commenter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hand-delivered, PH</td>
<td>C_Means1</td>
<td>Robert Means</td>
<td>12.5-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Fremont</td>
<td>C_Means2</td>
<td>Robert Means</td>
<td>12.6-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>C_Melna</td>
<td>Christina &amp; Chet Melnarik</td>
<td>12.5-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>C_Mensi</td>
<td>Bill Mensing</td>
<td>12.5-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Menuz</td>
<td>Karen Menuz</td>
<td>12.5-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Merlo</td>
<td>Steven Merlo</td>
<td>12.5-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Mijac</td>
<td>Ivo Mijac</td>
<td>12.5-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Mille</td>
<td>Eric Millette</td>
<td>12.5-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_MindeN</td>
<td>Naomi Mindelzun</td>
<td>12.5-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_MindeR</td>
<td>Robert E. Mindelzun</td>
<td>12.5-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Neal</td>
<td>Peter Neal</td>
<td>12.5-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Nore</td>
<td>Erna Nore</td>
<td>12.5-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Fremont</td>
<td>C_Noren1</td>
<td>William Noren</td>
<td>12.5-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Noren2</td>
<td>William Noren</td>
<td>12.6-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Okuzu</td>
<td>Margaret Okuzumi</td>
<td>12.5-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH SF1</td>
<td>C_Olsen</td>
<td>Jenna Olsen</td>
<td>12.6-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand-delivered, PH</td>
<td>C_Oneil</td>
<td>Kay O’Neill</td>
<td>12.5-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Sonora</td>
<td>C_Owen</td>
<td>Ellie Owen</td>
<td>12.6-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Pagli</td>
<td>Anne Pagliarulo</td>
<td>12.5-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Parke</td>
<td>Doug Parkes</td>
<td>12.5-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Perl</td>
<td>Kathy Perl</td>
<td>12.5-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Sonora</td>
<td>C_Picku</td>
<td>Ron Pickup</td>
<td>12.6-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Poult</td>
<td>J. Poulton</td>
<td>12.5-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Raffa</td>
<td>Paul Raffaeli</td>
<td>12.5-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Raube</td>
<td>David Raube</td>
<td>12.5-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Reedy</td>
<td>Mark Reedy</td>
<td>12.5-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand-delivered, PH</td>
<td>C_Reich</td>
<td>Stefani Reichle</td>
<td>12.5-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Richa</td>
<td>Matthew Richardson</td>
<td>12.5-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Palo Alto</td>
<td>C_Roger</td>
<td>Leah Rogers</td>
<td>12.6-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Ross</td>
<td>Jim Ross</td>
<td>12.5-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Rowe</td>
<td>Trish Rowe</td>
<td>12.5-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_SchmiR</td>
<td>Ron Schmidt</td>
<td>12.5-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Schri</td>
<td>Judy Schriebman</td>
<td>12.5-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Schul</td>
<td>Urs Schuler</td>
<td>12.5-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Shea</td>
<td>Kelly Shea</td>
<td>12.5-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Simpk</td>
<td>John Simpkin</td>
<td>12.5-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand-delivered, PH</td>
<td>C_Sloan</td>
<td>Ann Sloan</td>
<td>12.5-87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CITIZENS WHO SUBMITTED COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT PEIR (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Letter Format</th>
<th>Comment Letter ID</th>
<th>Name of Commenter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_SmithE</td>
<td>Evan Winslow Smith</td>
<td>12.5-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_SmithP</td>
<td>Paul Smith</td>
<td>12.5-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Sprin</td>
<td>Cindy Spring</td>
<td>12.5-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Stein</td>
<td>Peter Steinhart</td>
<td>12.5-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Sonora</td>
<td>C_Sturt</td>
<td>Jon Sturtevant</td>
<td>12.6-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Sugar</td>
<td>Marc Sugars</td>
<td>12.5-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Sundb</td>
<td>Karen Sundback</td>
<td>12.5-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Symon</td>
<td>Barbara Symons</td>
<td>12.5-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Modesto</td>
<td>C_TayloJ</td>
<td>Jean Taylor</td>
<td>12.6-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_TayloS</td>
<td>Scott Taylor</td>
<td>12.5-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand-delivered, PH</td>
<td>C_Teves</td>
<td>M. Teves</td>
<td>12.5-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Thaga</td>
<td>Betsy Thagard</td>
<td>12.5-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Tholl</td>
<td>Julia Thollaug</td>
<td>12.5-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Thoma</td>
<td>Dennis Thomas</td>
<td>12.5-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Tooth</td>
<td>Tibor Toth</td>
<td>12.5-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Tubma</td>
<td>Marianna Tubman</td>
<td>12.5-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Tucke</td>
<td>Kristen Tucker</td>
<td>12.5-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Unreadable1</td>
<td>Unreadable commenter name</td>
<td>12.5-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Unreadable2</td>
<td>Unreadable commenter name</td>
<td>12.5-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Unreadable3</td>
<td>Unreadable commenter name</td>
<td>12.5-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Unreadable4</td>
<td>Unreadable commenter name</td>
<td>12.5-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Unreadable5</td>
<td>Unreadable commenter name</td>
<td>12.5-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Urdan</td>
<td>Matthew Urdan</td>
<td>12.5-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Vadop</td>
<td>Paul Vadopalas</td>
<td>12.5-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_VermeJ</td>
<td>Jim Vermeys</td>
<td>12.5-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_VermeJ</td>
<td>Karen Vermeys</td>
<td>12.5-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Voyik</td>
<td>Ashleigh Voyikes</td>
<td>12.5-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Vrana</td>
<td>Leo Vrana</td>
<td>12.5-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Walke</td>
<td>Patricia Walker</td>
<td>12.5-101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Walls</td>
<td>Pete Wallstrom</td>
<td>12.5-102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Weiss</td>
<td>Richard Weiss</td>
<td>12.5-102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Westc</td>
<td>Bart Westcott</td>
<td>12.5-103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Willi</td>
<td>Doris Williams</td>
<td>12.5-103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Wingf</td>
<td>Polly P. Wingfield</td>
<td>12.5-104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>C_Wolf</td>
<td>Elizabeth Wolf</td>
<td>12.5-104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>C_Zimme</td>
<td>Benita Zimmerman</td>
<td>12.5-105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: The City of S.F. 
From: C. Allen 
Date: SEP 2007 

Thank you for your time. I am writing today to prevent more water from being taken out of the Tuolumne River. This matter is before the Planning Commission today 9/20/07 Special Meeting item #21. I am unable to attend later today so here are my thoughts:

One of the many problems is the negative affects on wildlife. This will cause Bio-diversity loss, and is bad for business in that area.

Please look at alternatives like other cities. We should be leaders in protecting the environment.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
RE: Tuolumne River

Rita Allison <rallison48@sbcglobal.net>  
Tue, Aug 28, 2007 at 11:28 AM

I would urge you to reconsider diverting 25 million gallons from the Tuolumne. We need to protect the river and instead educate the public about native and drought-tolerant landscaping...homes can be attractively landscaped without acres of water-thirsty lawns. With conservation and sustainable landscaping we can protect the river.

----- Forwarded by Paul Maltzer/CTYPLN/SFGOV on 09/25/2007 09:07 AM -----

"Thomas W. Allen" <tallen@baconsulting.net>  
09/22/2007 07:05 AM

This is a bad idea. Please do not do it.

Tom Allen

Thomas W. Allen, Principal  
Bay Area Consulting Group LLC  
One Market  
San Francisco, CA 94105

Getting Business Results from IT

tallen@baconsulting.net  
Tel: 415.590.0240  
FAX: 415.634.3248  
www.baconsulting.net
More water should not be taken out of the Tuolumne River — I understand about 60% is taken out now — that's enough. Other options: recycling, more conservation & whatever "green" minds should be able to come up with...
C_Bail

San Francisco Planning Department
Draft Program Environmental Impact Report on the
SFPUC's Proposed Water System Improvement Program
Fremont, CA. September 18, 2007

Thank you for participating in tonight's public hearing on the Draft Program
Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's
proposed Water System Improvement Program (WSIP). This is also an opportunity for
you to submit written comments on the Draft PEIR for the proposed WSIP.

Written comments will be accepted through close of business on Monday, October 1,
2007. Written comments may be submitted in one of three ways:

1. Leave your written comments in the designated "Comment Box" tonight.
   These cards are provided for your convenience.

2. Mail your comments by October 1, 2007 to the San Francisco Planning
   Department, Attention: Paul Maltese, Environmental Review Officer, WSIP
   PEIR, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103.

3. E-mail written comments to wsip_peir.comments@gmail.com

CONTACT INFORMATION
Name: Christopher Bail
Affiliation: 
Address: 132 El Pasque Drive
City, State, Zip: San Jose, CA 95134
Phone or E-mail: baije@ymail.com

WRITTEN COMMENTS

I urge you to cancel plans to divert any more
water from the Tuolumne River.
If you consider the value of the river, it is
easy to see the destructive effects that further
diversion would have. The river is at the
heart of a wonderfully diverse ecosystem that
would be threatened by the loss of the water.
The river also supports recreational activity.

The fact is that 60% of the river's water is already diverted
for rural and urban uses. Also, the total volume of river-
water that the Tuolumne has is threatened by global warming.
The SFPUC's growth only model predicts increased demand
with considering the important steps that can be taken
toward mitigating the increased demand. These are increased
conservation efforts, improved efficiency in the use of water,
and recycling. If cities in Southern California are able to
mitigate their demand for water significantly using
these three factors, the SF Bay area should, as an environment-
ally minded community, be able to champion similar effort.

Faced with the reduction in river volume due to global
warming, the SFPUC should decide not to divert
even more water than the 60% that is already diverted.
As less destructive alternatives are available, one could
even consider that it may be possible to lessen the
diversion not just blindly taking water from an already
sensitive situation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Christopher Bail
To: San Francisco Planning Commission
1650 Mission Street, 4th floor
San Francisco, CA 94103-2414

Re: San Francisco Public Utilities Commission – Draft PEIR for SFPUC
Water System Improvement Program

Honorable Commissioners:

Thanks to minimal notification to the public in San Francisco (i.e., Sept. 10th print ad in the S.F. Examiner), I had not even heard of this critical Draft PEIR for the SFPUC Water System Improvement Program until the evening of September 18th 2007 by word of mouth.

SFPUC was kind enough to give me a print copy of this immense 5 volume document late Tuesday afternoon, and I have been struggling through the 4000+ pages for much of the last 5 days between personal obligations on a very busy weekend.

As you have read and perused this vast report, I hope that you have borne solemnly in mind your primary responsibility to safeguard San Francisco’s share of this water supply, and in fact to augment our city’s share in light of the large upward boom in residential & commercial construction which I expect and hope may continue for some years. The burgeoning vertical expansions South of Market are actually a very sensible and well-constructed way of expanding the residential and commercial capacity of San Francisco with as little impact to the rest of our built city as possible. The extra surge of prosperity that will ensue will allow this City to finance essential 21st Century improvements like high-speed “bullet train” interstate rail connections, and to upgrade our aging municipal infrastructure – one of the most basic elements of which is the water supply.

Hasn’t the supply capacity of our huge Hetch Hetchy Water System for ourselves & our 27 large suburban customers in the Peninsula & ‘Silicon Valley’ almost been reached? The April 2007 ‘Los Altos Hills General Plan’ (one of our suburban customers) states frankly (on page 9, subsection 321.) “Capacity limitations in the Hetch Hetchy system may be reached in 6 to 8 years, or sooner in times of drought.” And in light of the constant escalation of urban development in our area, should we not be pursuing every means possible to increase our water supply capacity?? The existing water system was not even intended to suffice forever!!

In light of the above, I was shocked to see that additional seismically-safe dams & water impoundments to augment this water storage for San Francisco to thus supply & promote additional population growth in this City, or provide alternate supply in the event of Climate (global warming) or Seismic Disaster, had long been rejected in this Water System Improvement Program (WSIP). There even seems to be some doubt about whether to design and construct a large Desalination Plant (Volume 5, page 186, Appendix H2-5). In San Francisco, we have been gambling for many decades that there may not be a repeat of the full seismic event that the City experienced in 1906, now added to this are the lively new concerns that there are in fact serious changes to Global Climate (re ‘An Inconvenient Truth,’ ‘Not A Drop to Drink,’ ‘When the Rivers Run Dry,’ etc.), which could result in serious drought years for Northern California and our San Francisco Bay Area in particular. Could SFPUC at least approve the Desalination Plant so that we have some minimal drought-proof water supply for San Francisco, so that we have a fighting chance to survive such a disaster? Remember that alternative supply could also be needed in the event of terrorist attack. Could ‘Home Security’ Funds not help with this last necessary precaution?

As we are NOT one of the most impacted areas of the United States for water supplies (consider the foreboding plight of Las Vegas, San Diego, and the rest of the Southwest for example), and are also one of the most affluent areas of the United States, national sympathy for our water problems even if there is major political change soon, may be rather limited. So, we must be very wary of our geographic & demographic challenges in the near future, and take the first steps to avoid catastrophe as soon as possible.

I was also dismayed to see a rather cavalier assumption that San Francisco customers will continue to conserve water at the present extraordinary low rates of consumption, since we have human (huge population approaching 860,000, which may exceed this) and landscaping needs that will only INCREASE if there is serious drought, or fire disaster (our city is closely built, mainly with wood). I cannot imagine that all the water-saving diligence that my fellow citizens have undertaken here in San Francisco was done with the idea that our
suburban customers should then freely squander all that we have saved. Any favoritism exposes us to grave danger, and unfair suffering.

This Draft WSIP also makes rather confident predictions about exactly how much population growth, consumption, etc will occur in our area. How on earth do they arrive at these putative figures and how reliable are they?!

Lastly, even though we are obligated to consider the rich natural environment that our Hetch Hetchy system has interfered with by the Raker Act, I certainly hope that the vast human populations of our region willing to live in some of the heaviest densities known in the United States are also considered an intrinsic part of this environment. The meticulous attention given to the problems of sport fishermen, and a not overly threatened species of trout, at the expense of the sole water supply of millions of people, seems excessive. Sorry if this sounds "anthropocentric," but Marine Biology is very advanced now in the 21st Century, and there are other methods of preserving this sturdy trout species while this vast water supply system is upgraded, retrofitted, and repaired.

Very Sincerely,

John Barbey

tel. 415-305-2012

mailing address: P.O.Box 192114, San Francisco, CA 94119

P.S. I also do not understand the "tiered rate" system for rate payers announced. What difference is there between homeowners and other property owners in San Francisco that could justify this??
Tuolumne diversion

Allan Berkowitz <esorabbie@earthlink.net>  Fri, Sep 7, 2007 at 2:38 PM

I strongly oppose the proposal to divert 25 million gallons/day of the Tuolumne River. It is simply unconscionable to place the river in jeopardy.

I register my opinion for the following steps to be taken at this time:

- The SFPUC should re-evaluate its projections for future water demand and conservation potential in light of flaws and inaccuracies in their studies.
- The SFPUC should conduct a study to determine the maximum technical potential for conservation and efficiency savings within the SFPUC service territory.
- Any additional demand should be met through increased investment in conservation, efficiency, and recycling.
- The SFPUC should adopt a policy of reducing diversions from the Tuolumne River over time.
- A comprehensive watershed study should be completed to adequately assess the environmental impacts of the WSIP.

Thank you

Allan Berkowitz
esorabbie@earthlink.net
Nurture nature...and nature will nurture you!
I am writing to urge you not to approve taking more water from the Tuolumne River. To do so would be an irreversible tragedy. We are in a time when it is urgent to protect our environment, not strip our natural resources from the face of the earth. To reduce the flow of the Tuolumne would end its wild and scenic status and undoubtedly affect much of our wildlife that depends on it. I felt that river and lake to think future generations of nature-loving folks would be deprived of that experience.

Thank you.

C_Berli

From: Gabe Berlineer
CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.
RECEIVED
SEP 20 2007
120 Commonwealth Ave.
S.F. 94118
751-3766

Dear Mr. Maltzer:

We cannot and should not divert another 25 million gallons of water daily from the Tuolumne river, especially now that the fall Chinook salmon runs are in extreme jeopardy and that the Tuolumne is an important spawning river. We must begin to look elsewhere for our water needs, principly toward conservation and recycling of existing water supplies, rather than further depleting a healthy river system. Thank you.

C_Bevia

Dear Mr. Maltzer:

We cannot and should not divert another 25 million gallons of water daily from the Tuolumne river, especially now that the fall Chinook salmon runs are in extreme jeopardy and that the Tuolumne is an important spawning river. We must begin to look elsewhere for our water needs, principly toward conservation and recycling of existing water supplies, rather than further depleting a healthy river system. Thank you.

John Bevisacqua
1306 Shelter Creek Lane
San Bruno Ca 94066
No More Diversions From The Tuolumne!

Marty Bigos <mbigos@gladstone.ucsf.edu>

To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com

Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer
Water System Improvement Program PEIR
San Francisco Planning Department

Mon, Oct 1, 2007 at 4:00 PM

Dear Mr. Maltzer:

As a resident of San Francisco and an avid hiker in the Sierras I am opposed to withdrawing any more water to support sprawl development in the Bay Area.

I support the alternatives to diversion that protect the Tuolumne. More water conservation, efficiency, and recycling are the best ways to both protect the River, and provide permanently sustainable water for the San Francisco Bay Area.

Marty Bigos
141 Fairmount St.
SF CA 94131

01

C_Bigos

Diana Sokolove <wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com>

C_Blake

San Francisco Planning Department
Draft Program Environmental Impact Report on the SFPUC's Proposed Water System Improvement Program
Sonora, CA, September 3, 2007

Thank you for participating in tonight's public hearing on the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's proposed Water System Improvement Program (WSIP). This is also an opportunity for you to submit written comments on the Draft PEIR for the proposed WSIP.

Written comments will be accepted through close of business on Monday, October 1, 2007. Written comments may be submitted in one of three ways:

1. Leave your written comments in the designated "Comment Box" tonight. These cards are provided for your convenience.

2. Mail your comments by October 1, 2007 to the San Francisco Planning Department, Attention: Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer, WSIP PEIR, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103.

3. Email written comments to wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com

CONTACT INFORMATION

Name: MBIGOS MATT

Affiliation:

Address: 141 FAIRMONT ST

City, State, Zip: SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94118

Phone or Email: mbigos@gladstone.ucsf.edu

WRITTEN COMMENTS: Write clearly and contain or box. Use multiple sheets if needed.

Take no more water
and practice conservation
and let our natural rivers
remain in the way
the heritage that belongs to
all Americans.
Tuolomne River water diversion

Sean Bourke <sbourke1@yahoo.com>
To: wsip.pier.comments@gmail.com

Writing as a concerned citizen opposed to diversion of additional 25 millions of water per day by the SFPUC from the Tuolomne River. I believe it encourages waste, jeopardizes valuable habitat, and would have a deleterious environmental impact overall.

Thank you,
Sean Bourke, M.D.
10 Tynan Way
Portola Valley, CA 94028

---

SFPUC’s WSIP

Bramlette@aol.com <Bramlette@aol.com>
To: wsip.pier.comments@gmail.com
Cc: ron@hetchhetchy.org

I was in attendance at the “Public Hearing on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission proposed Water System Improvement Program (WSIP)” on September 05, 2007 in Sonora California. I understand that this was an “Environmental Impact Meeting”. I agree with most of the environmental concerns that was presented at that meeting.

What I have failed to understand is the logic that the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission is using to support this proposed Water System Improvement Program. I do not understand how the key elements of this program can be achieved with out additional major environmental impacts on the Tuolomne River area.

I have also failed to understand why the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission has not considered using new technology to achieve all of the key elements.

Please see attached file.

Bramlette Consulting
7750 Ruth Ridge Road
Sonataen, California 95277
Phone (209) 944-1255
Cell (209) 962-8574

---

Get a sneak peek of the all-new AOL.com.
Subject: San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s (SFPUC) Water System Improvement Program

What I have failed to understand is the logic that the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission is using to support this proposed Water System Improvement Program. I do not understand how the key elements of this program can be achieved with out additional major environmental impacts on the Tuolumne River area.

I have also failed to understand why the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission has not considered using new technology to achieve all of the key elements.

One said technology would be desalination. Desalination is being used more and more around the world to provide people with needed freshwater. Most of the United States has, or can gain access to, ample supplies of fresh water for drinking purposes. But, fresh water can be in short supply in some parts of the country (and world). And, as the population continues to grow, shortages of fresh water will occur more often, if only in certain locations. In some areas, salt water (from the ocean, for instance) is being turned into freshwater for drinking.

A promising method to desalinate seawater is the “reverse osmosis” method. Right now, the high cost of desalination has kept it from being used more often, as it can cost over $1,000 per acre-foot to desalinate seawater as compared to about $200 per acre-foot for water from normal supply sources. Desalination technology is improving and costs are falling, though, and Tampa Bay, FL is currently desalinating water at a cost of only $650 per acre foot. As both the demand for fresh water and technology increase, you can expect to see more desalination occurring, especially in areas, such as California and the Middle East.

Another method is The Modular High-Temperature Gas-Cooled Reactor (MHTGR) this system can supply an adequate supply of fresh water and electric power which are the essential requirements for a high-quality of life. In many regions of the U.S., an acute need for new sources of fresh water is emerging as a consequence of sustained drought conditions, high local population growth and deterioration of existing water supplies from contamination and overuse. Although desalination has been a major water source for Middle East countries and island nations, it has not been a significant source of water in the U.S. However the need for both water and electric power is a significant problem in populous regions with high growth projections. The MHTGR is an energy source for both water and power production which has the potential to overcome barriers to using nuclear power as a prime energy source for producing fresh water. The plant is divided into three process areas: the Nuclear Island (NI), the energy conversion area (ECA), and the water production plant (WPP). High- pressure superheated steam from the NI is converted to electric power in the ECA. Reject heat from the ECA in the form of hot circulating water is supplied to the WPP as the energy source for desalinating seawater. About 20% of the seawater supplied to the WPP is converted to fresh water and the remainder is returned to the ocean as slightly concentrated brine.

Of the more than 7,500 desalination plants in operation worldwide, 60% are located in the Middle East. The world's largest plant in Saudi Arabia produces 128 MGD of desalted water. In contrast, 12% of the world's capacity is produced in the Americas, with most of the plants located in the Caribbean and Florida. To date, only a limited number of desalination plants have been built along the California coast, primarily because the cost of desalination is generally higher than the costs of other water supply alternatives available in California (e.g., water transfers and groundwater pumping). However, as drought conditions occur and concern over water availability increases, desalination projects are being proposed at numerous locations in the state. Why not in San Francisco?

Environmental impacts not addressed in the Scoping Meeting on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission proposed Water System Improvement Program:

1) The increased delivery demands on the salt water encroachment. (Several methods have been examined for the control of saltwater encroachment. These techniques have included reduction of groundwater withdrawals, repositioning of withdrawal locations, utilization of recharge basins or injection wells to artificially maintain freshwater pressure, interception of intruding saltwater through a line of pumping wells parallel to the coastline, and emplacement of a subsurface groundwater barrier between the coastline and pumping wells. Reduction of groundwater withdrawals and relocation of pumping wells are the techniques found to be most effective and economically feasible in the control of saltwater encroachment. Run-off water, river flow, to offset encroachment.)

2) The increased delivery demands on the Tuolumne River watershed. (With the majority of the San Francisco’s Water System Improvement Program based on a Hydrologic Cycle the demands will never meet the supply.)

SFPUC hearings on the draft Program Environmental Impact Report

To: Peter Dreckmeier
Bay Area Program Director
Tuolumne River Trust

Subject: San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s (SFPUC) Water System Improvement Program (WSIP)

I am saddened that with all the efforts of those who spoke, only a small number addressed the problems. "The vast majority of those who spoke – more than 90% – favored the $4.3 billion seismic upgrades to the Hetch Hetchy water system, but expressed serious concerns about the proposal to divert an additional 25 million gallons of water per day from the Tuolumne River."

The number one problem: San Francisco needs more water!

The number two problem: the increase diversion will do further harm to the Tuolumne River.

Now let’s talk about requiring more water conservation, efficiency, and recycling. This is also not an answer to lessening impacts on the Tuolumne River while promoting a sustainable water plan for the Bay Area. The projected need for water in San Francisco bay area will be far more than they can get from Tuolumne River even with more water conservation, efficiency, and recycling.

If this goes the way San Francisco Public Utilities Commission wants it to go, they also will not have a solution for either problem. The Tuolumne River and it’s environment can not give up more water.

In summary, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission should start an environmental impact report on the development of alternative sources of Water. San Francisco could be a leader in the development of desalination for California and the rest of the nation. Also by introducing reduction of groundwater withdrawals, repositioning of withdrawal locations, utilization of recharge basins or injection wells to artificially maintain freshwater pressure San Francisco could set a standard for the rest of California and the nation.

By doing the above, San Francisco and California could return to our children, grandchildren and all future generations “The Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne River”.

This is a solution to both problems!

A win-win for all!

If this response has not been directed to the correct department, please forward it. If anyone has any
Tuolumne River

Jobst Brandt <jobst.brandt@stanfordalumni.org>
To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com

24 Sep 07

Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Maltzer:

I am displeased by the packaging of improvements to San Francisco Water Department aqueducts and the diversion of water from Sierra rivers.

Put on separate ballots, I think you'll find broad support for improving the system and hardly any for taking more water from already depleted rivers. The issues are not related in kind, one being a maintenance issue, the other, water policy. Historically water policy has been made to serve real estate interests that invite growth at the expense of current residents.

Please separate these issues lest it be seen as a deception.

Sincerely,

Jobst Brandt
(650) 323 1549 res
(650) 804 5693 cel
351 Middlefield Road
Palo Alto CA 94301
jobst.brandt@stanfordalumni.org
October 11, 2007

Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Maltzer:

As a kayaker of the Tuolumne River I am concerned about your environmental review of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s plan to take more water from the Tuolumne River as it fails to adequately identify and address all of the environmental impacts to the River. Only by ensuring that healthy amounts of water continue to flow into the Tuolumne River can we protect this irreplaceable natural treasure and ensure that future generations will be able to enjoy this amazing river canyon. I urge you to undertake additional studies before finalizing this document.

As other communities in California are pursuing conservation of water resources, the SFPUC’s “preferred alternative” ignores conservation, efficiency, and recycling measures that their own studies found could eliminate the need to divert more water from the Tuolumne by at least 74%. When it comes to water conservation, the Bay Area lags far behind other metropolitan areas such as Seattle and Los Angeles that are reducing water consumption even in the face of growth. As a region known for a strong environmental ethic, the Bay Area should be a leader in water efficiency and conservation.

I support the alternatives identified in your draft document that protect the Tuolumne River from new diversions. Requiring more water conservation, efficiency, and recycling is the best way to lessen impacts on the Tuolumne River while promoting a sustainable water plan for the Bay Area.

Sincerely,

Mark W. Bresolin
8045 Telorim Park Way
Antelope, CA 95843
I understand from Mr. Wiltzer's email reply that you are assuming his duties, therefore I am forwarding you this note. Many thanks for your consideration.

Liz Brooking

====== Forwarded Message

From: Liz Brooking <lbrooking@earthlink.net>
Date: Tue, 11 Sep 2007 21:54:22 -0700
To: <yoseplanning@mpg.gov>, <psnw.emergency@fsgov.org>, <paul.wiltzer@fsgov.org>
Conversation: Please Protect the Tuolumne River
Subject: Please Protect the Tuolumne River

Dear Mayor Newsom, Mr. Paul Wiltzer and Commissioner Ryan L Brooks

We should employ a more conservative approach to our use of natural resources — and it should be a priority to educate the public as to the value of conservation.

We continue to consume water and other resources beyond what is really needed and reasonable to coexist with nature.

- Why can’t we pass laws to stop individuals and businesses from hosing down the sidewalk when a broom is usually sufficient.
- Let’s recycle and reclaim more water.
- Shouldn’t we be rationing water as a matter of course?

The Tuolumne is a beautiful place and home to many species. I urge you to meet our water needs and protect the Tuolumne River for future generations through conservation and recycling, rather than by withdrawing more water and depleting the river.

Thank you,

Liz Brooking
3045 Jackson Street #202
San Francisco, CA 94115

====== End of Forwarded Message

Please send me a copy of the CD
Dear Commission,

I am writing because of my concern for the SF Public Utilities Commission plan to withdraw more water from the Tuolumne River. I am my understanding that, while the FRC is trying to plan for growth and provide resources, the growth projections seem to be excessive. Indeed, it is my strong feeling that water conservation should be pursued more aggressively in the plan, with increasing pricing if necessary to reflect the true cost of providing water.

It is my understanding that other large metropolitan areas, such as Seattle and Los Angeles, have succeeded in planning for growth while limiting water usage. In the Bay Area, with our history of innovators and environmentally sensitive people, I hope that we may also be able to limit our water usage.

Yours sincerely,

Keith Buckingham
Conserve water, stop groundwater overdraft, restore instream fisheries & recreation

C_Byrone

Diana Sokolove <wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com>

Juan Byron <byron@sbcfoundation.org>

Wed, Sep 19, 2007 at 8:24 PM

To: Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer, WSIP PEIR, SF Planning Department
Cc: bill.young@sierradclub.org

From: Juan Byron, customer, 545 Moore Road Woodside, CA 94062-1108

Re: Please implement conservation, not Water System Improvement Program

September 19, 2007

Thank you for the opportunity to review the 5-volume proposed Water System Improvement Program. I appreciate your consideration of the following constructive criticisms:

1) The proposal documents a trend (from 1965 to now) of decreased water use per customer, yet your water demand projections conflict with historical data. My experience as a homeowner and water customer over more than 20 years is that residential and commercial customers are conserving water and can easily use 10% less water if “incentivized” to do so by increasingly tiered water rates.

2) The 82-year hydrologic record upon which the proposal is based tends to ignore earlier historical, geological and anthropologic evidence that pre-modern and modern societies thrived in your service area for hundreds of years with almost no water storage or distribution.

3) The “significant impacts” and “lesser impacts” identified for the Tuolumne, Alameda and Peninsula watersheds are all unacceptable since voluntary conservation of water is more economical and effective for both the consumer and the utility. I believe engineering best practices will allow seismic upgrade of the water distribution system without the above impacts because of the vastly redundant nature of the nine major reservoirs and multiple parallel pipelines that characterize this system.

4) Continuing overdraft of the Westside Groundwater Basin, lowering of Lake Merced’s water level, and likely contamination of drinking water due to groundwater pumping are all unacceptable impacts given that voluntary conservation of water in SFPPC’s service region would meet realistic water supply objectives. Depleting our local groundwater truly leaves us exposed to catastrophic risks, since this groundwater ought to be able to sustain life and important commerce regardless of deliveries from the Sierras. Why use up local groundwater now, when it should be a reserve? If SFPPC is truly concerned about providing adequate water quantity and quality, it would negotiate, legislate and litigate an end to salinization and selenium poisoning of nearby water sources by our “uphill” neighbors like customers in the Westlands Water District.

5) The WSIP proposal seems to be inappropriately aimed inflated growth inducement by stream diversion and groundwater overdraft. Rather than just acknowledging the substantial impacts (increased traffic, air pollution, water pollution, global warming and decreased quality of life) caused by WSIP, please implement a version of the modified WSIP with the least diversion from the Tuolumne River and the least environmental impact. The “no purchase request increase” alternative should be combined with the least environmentally impacting modified WSIP alternative. It is not right for SFPPC to encourage “Los Angeles-like” traffic jams and pollution by making more water available than the service area needs.

6) Several of your “least environmentally impacting” alternatives are seriously flawed by continuing groundwater overdraft. Please re-frame as many alternatives as possible to include aggressive conservation but exclude using groundwater at a level which draws it below maximum storage capacity.

7) The “year round desalination” alternative should be recognized as a bad idea due to direct costs and indirect costs such as from the air pollution (global warming) and water pollution (salt concentrate pumping) which will result.

8) The “regional desalination for drought” alternative deserves further study, but should be implemented cautiously so as not to harm users by global warming and increased growth. I envision plans which run as little as possible until mandatory conservation (relinquishment) has been tried for a year.

9) Please raise the rates for all water users in a tiered manner which is explicitly directed at getting everyone to conserve water.

10) Please continue to study the “remove O’Shaughnessy Dam” alternative, since you should be offsetting any loss of income (from hydropower sales) with increased water fees. O’Shaughnessy Dam impounds only a small part of the system’s water. Hetch Hetchy Valley could be restored as a national treasure within a generation. A modern Congress could be convinced to reverse the process which allowed SF to flood Yosemite National Park, especially since SF does not have the influence that it had 100 years ago.

Sincerely,
Juan Byron
C_Caugh

COMMENT CARD

San Francisco Planning Department
Draft Program Environmental Impact Report on the
SFPUC's Proposed Water System Improvement Program
Palo Alto, CA, September 19, 2007

Thank you for participating in tonight's public hearing on the Draft Program
Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's
proposed Water System Improvement Program (WSIP). This is also an opportunity for
you to submit written comments on the Draft PEIR for the proposed WSIP.

Written comments will be accepted through close of business on Monday, October 1,
2007. Written comments may be submitted in one of three ways:

1. Leave your written comments in the designated "Comment Box" tonight.
   These cards are provided for your convenience.

2. Mail your comments by October 1, 2007 to the San Francisco Planning
   Department, Attention: Paul Maltze, Environmental Review Officer, WSP
   PEIR, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103

3. E-mail written comments to wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com

CONTACT INFORMATION

Name: Robert Caughlan

Affiliation: 

Address: 1777 Basal Plac 4309

City, State, Zip: San Mateo, CA 94402

Phone or Email: RCaughlan@som.com

WRITTEN COMMENTS

Only a few people mentioned population as the driving force for all our water needs. Family planning should be one of your main public education goals!
Hetch Hetchy PEIR

To: The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
   The San Francisco Planning Department

From: Ann Clark, Ph.D.
      Katherine Howard, ASLA

Date: September 20, 2007

Subject: Review and Comments on the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR)
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Water System Improvement Program (WSIP)

This review looks at possible impacts and significant environmental issues in four areas:
1) the Hetch Hetchy Water Delivery Infrastructure Costs and Finances, 2) Drought,
   Climate Change, and Global Warming, 3) Water Use and Demand for More Tuolumne
   River Water, and 4) Mitigation Alternatives.

We support the retrofitting and renovation of the Hetch Hetchy infrastructure and the
water delivery system. We trust that the final PEIR includes recommendations that avoid
or will mitigate significant negative environmental effects for Hetch Hetchy, the
Tuolumne River and connected eco-systems and water ways.

1) Hetch Hetchy Water Delivery Infrastructure Costs and Finances

The PEIR’s $4.3 billion estimated Water System Improvement Program (WSIP)
includes the Hetch Hetchy infrastructure and water delivery system to SFPUCC’s
28 wholesale customers (primarily Peninsula, East/South Bay municipal and
private organizations) and San Francisco City and County retail customers.

According to the draft PEIR, SFPUCC wholesale customers’ water demand is
approximately 67% of the system’s water. San Francisco retail customers’ water
demand is 33%.

a) Significant Environmental Effect Issues

The $4.3 billion bond indebtedness—which can be reasonably expected to
increase over the course of the project—is a major concern.

One of the major overall WSIP goals and objectives is to “ensure cost-
effective use of funds.” 1 The environmental mitigations are an integral
legal part of the complete WSIP program and its funding. If mitigations

1 City and County of San Francisco Planning Department, 2007. Draft Program Environmental Impact
Report for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s Water System Improvement Program, Vol. 4:
Chapter 9, CEQA Alternatives, Table 9-1.
required as part of the cumulative environmental impact of the entire program are not funded, legal problems may result.2

The draft PEIR appears to indicate that San Francisco retail customers will be largely responsible for bond costs, water conservation requirements, and high water rate increases. San Francisco voters have agreed already to carry the burden of a $1.6 billion bond.

Who will pay for the remaining $2.7 billion? Unfortunately, information in the draft PEIR is insufficient to determine if there will be adequate resources for the completion of the mitigations required for the over-all system improvement program.

b) Specific Requests for Final PEIR Report Analysis and Data

To ensure adequate and sufficient financial resources to complete legally required program environmental impact mitigations, both a detailed program costs analysis and documentation of how an equitable, proportional distribution of program costs will be achieved must be included in the final PEIR. Costs for each of the wholesale and retail customers should be based on water use and mandated conservation goals.

Because the SFPUC 2009 contract will have a collective environmental impact on the water system improvement program, a detailed environmental analysis of the 2009 contract needs to be included in the final PEIR. Separating the environmental review of the program from that of the contract is an illegal partition that prevents adequate review.

Because the wholesalers are required by AB 1823 to reimburse SFPUC for the wholesalers’ share of costs, the final PEIR needs to include specific 2009 contract conditions for equitable, proportionate rates and charges for water use, including wholesale and retail incentives for water conservation requirements.

(2) Drought, Climate Change, and Global Warming

Although the draft PEIR addresses drought cycles, climate change, and global warming, the draft PEIR does not sufficiently analyze the potentially disastrous, exponential harm to the Tuolumne River brought about by the coalescing of the cumulative effects of drought cycles, climate change, and global warming.

a) Significant Environmental Effect Issues

The draft PEIR is limited and narrow in its review of climate change and global warming. The lack of adequate, up-to-date research and analysis is highly environmentally significant for the WSSIP and the draft PEIR.

2. September 11, 2007: San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Regular Meeting: Commissioners discussed a possible cost increase from $4.3 to $4.65 billion as well as possible cost-driven reductions. No decision were reached.
management strategies. East Bay MUD is cited as the first water district to join the California Climate Action Registry.

Leadership and action plans have developed across the western states in California, Arizona, Oregon, and Montana. Conservation, flexible management strategies, and coordinated regional plans have been identified as best practices. There is no excuse for the SFPUC not to develop and carry out these best management practices.

We all understand the critical importance of emergency and earthquake plans and preparedness. In the 21st century, the same is true for climate change, global warming, and drought cycles. The final PEIR must include a pro-action plan, and not a "use now and worry later" policy.

c) Specific Requests for Final PEIR Report Analysis and Data

Additional PEIR research and analysis is needed to address the exponential effects of climate change, global warming, and drought cycles as well as to protect the Tuolumne and all its eco-systems from potentially serious, significant environmental impacts. Conservation requirements, water efficiencies, and mitigations must be developed and implemented.

San Francisco’s proposed no-action policy is a red flag for environmental challenges and criticisms. No-action ignores the importance of on-going conservation activities and effective management plans to protect the river; guised the safety and reliability of the water delivery system; ensure economic growth and meet customer needs.

The final PEIR should focus on conservation, recycling, re-use, and delivery management efficiencies as water first priorities. These are proven, cost-effective strategies that protect the environment and support growth and development. There is no excuse for the SFPUC not to take action. Volume 3, Chapter 5, 5.7.6 needs to be revised with adequate mitigations developed and implemented.¹

(3) Water Use and Demand for More Tuolumne Water

At this time, 60% of the Tuolumne River is diverted for water consumption. The draft PEIR recommends that additional water be diverted from the river in order to meet the needs of wholesaler customers.

a) Significant Environmental Effect Issues

In the draft PEIR, there are major discrepancies in the assumptions, research models, and recommendations applied to the wholesalers and retail customer. The discrepancies and assumptions result in diametrically opposed policies for water use and active conservation.

A double standard is established. For example, additional mandatory conservation will not be required for wholesalers, but will be required for retail customers.

i) Double Standard: Discrepancies and Assumptions

Wholesale customers. Based on the assumption of “more growth, more water”, the draft PEIR recommends an increase in water diverted from the Tuolumne to meet the growth needs of wholesalers. Wholesale conservation goals are left to suggested methods and parameters in “respective urban water management plans”.4

As a result, the wholesale model not only offers limited incentives for water conservation, but also does not penalize additional water usage. The wholesale model produces a significant negative environmental effect—extra demand on water and less demand for conservation.

San Francisco retail customers. The assumption is “more growth, less water” for San Francisco retail customers. This model predicts a decrease in San Francisco water and an increase in growth and development. The model follows the lead of proven conservation and growth policies.

Various PEIR estimates predict San Francisco’s water will decline between 4% and 11%. The decline will occur at the same time San Francisco’s population is expected to increase by 12% and San Francisco employment by 25%.

San Francisco’s water decline is factored on a PEIR required 10 mgd conservation goal which includes groundwater supplies, recycling, and reuse. The San Francisco model produces a water first conservation priority—a positive environmental effect.

b) A Water First Conservation Priority: Effective Environmental Practice

A major over-all goal and objective of WSIP is to “improve use of new water sources and drought management including use of groundwater, recycled water, conservation, and transfers”.5


5. Ibid. Chapter 9, CEQA Alternatives: Table 9-1.
In the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, water use decreased 16% in a thirteen-year period (1990-2003). Population increased by 14%. The MWD includes Los Angeles. During a thirty-five year period, retrospective, longitudinal data indicate 2005 Los Angeles water use is close to the 1970 water use with increases in population during the thirty-five year growth period.

Other cities and water districts have reduced water use during times of growth and development. Denver, Boston, and Seattle combine conservation, recycling, reuse, and efficient water management as a means to support growth and development. These water methods are cost-effective and reliable. Moreover, they construct a systemic, long-term approach to sustainable water management and use.

There is no excuse for SFPUC not to adopt water conservation measures without delay.

c) Specific Requests for Final PEIR Report Analysis and Data

Additional research is needed for an in-depth analysis of districts and cities in California and the United States which have decreased water use and met growth needs. The analysis should look at how these areas (now and in the future) differ from the SFPUC area and how they are the same. The analysis should address how San Francisco can specifically use methods and procedures from these models to facilitate the development and implementation of water first conservation policies to meet current and anticipated growth. The analysis should also address methods and procedures that would not be effective for SFPUC, and why the methods would not be effective.

Based on CEQA requirements, additional research is needed to provide expanded regional analysis of specific wholesale project growth needs that have an impact on the San Francisco Bay Area region. Significant impacts include major residential developments, large businesses, shopping centers, commercial, hotel and motel expansions, government and educational growth, and industrial, manufacturing, and processing plants. Based on this research and analysis, the final PEIR needs to develop an environmental plan to incorporate program-based and project-specific wholesale plans and conservation methods into an integrated system of local and regional planning and environmental protection.

Expanded research is needed to analyze fully the twenty-one year plan to divert additional water from the Tuolumne. Year by year, the research must evaluate the aggregate and collateral effects of less and less river water each year on (1) the health and welfare of the river, (2) potentially endangered species and habitats, and (3) all the eco-systems, including the delta, that receive water from the Tuolumne. Based on the expanded research, the analysis needs to determine which sustainable environmental alternatives and superior mitigation methods are required in WSIP and the 2009 contract to address long-term environmental protection for the Tuolumne and all its interconnected environments. Although research is presented in the draft PEIR, this research does not address fully the overall effects of long-term river water diversions and the necessary 2009 contract requirements to ensure the future, on-going health and welfare of the river.

The mitigations in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Attachment 4-A: Mitigation Measures to Minimize Facilities Impacts; Volume 3, Chapter 5, Attachment 5-A: Mitigation Measures to Minimize Water Supply and System Operations Impacts; Volume 4, Chapter 6, Summary of all Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Tables: 6.3 through 6.15, and Chapter 9, CEQA Alternatives will need to be revised when the additional research and analysis recommended in sections 2-c and 3-c of this response are completed.

d) Equitable Conservation: Specific Request for PEIR Alternative Mitigations

To avoid the complications and challenges of disproportionate standards, inequitable costs, and questionable assumptions, the final PEIR must analyze and recommend standards in which equitable and proportionate conservation requirements are mandatory for all wholesale and retail customers.

An Example of Equitable Conservation

The draft PEIR states that SFPUC wholesale customers use approximately 67% of SFPUC water while San Francisco retail customers use 33%.

Although estimates may vary, by 2030 the wholesale customer use increases to 77%. San Francisco use declines to 23%, with 10 mgd required conservation. Equitable conservation can be factored by correlating water demand with conservation requirements (million gallons per day, mgd).

Example of Equitable Conservation Requirements to 2030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Water Demand</th>
<th>Conservation Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFPUC</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10 mgd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Providers</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>34 mgd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>44 mgd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*City and County of San Francisco Planning Department, 2007. Draft Program Environmental Impact Report for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s Water Systems Improvement Program, Volumes 1, 2, 3, 4: Chapters 4.5, 6, 9; Attachment 4-A, pp 4-10, Attachment 5-A: Tables 6.3-6.15, Table 9-3.*
An extensive list of possible water conservation measures for SFPUCC wholesale is available from the SFPUCC. 7

Equitable and proportionate conservation and efficiencies are in line with SFPUCC’s current tiered water rates, charges, policies, and practices.

Using draft PEIR data, the present level of Tuolumne water use combined with equitable and proportionate efficiency requirements and conservation are sufficient to meet growth and development needs in 2030. We can conclude that wholesale growth and development are feasible, without diverting additional water from the Tuolumne.

(4) Mitigation Alternatives

The Aggressive Conservation/Water Recycling and Local Ground Water, No Supplemental Tuolumne River Supply alternative is the environmentally superior mitigation. The draft PEIR/WSIP preferred alternative is inadequate. 8

The 21st Century and Water Challenges
San Francisco's Sustainable Environmental Responsibility

San Francisco is known for its leading edge in green projects, sustainable design, environmental protection, and global warming and climate change awareness. The final PEIR/WSIP has the responsibility to reflect San Francisco's environmental leadership.

It is important that the San Francisco PUC and the San Francisco Planning Department work closely with the San Francisco Department of Environment and the Mayor’s Office of City Greening to develop the best possible SFPUCC water system improvement program and 2009 water contract. Together, San Francisco and SFPUCC can become the leading edge in water management, efficiencies, and conservatism. There is no excuse for this not to happen.

Contact Person
Ann Clark, Ph.D.
2000 Monterey Blvd., San Francisco, CA 94127 Telephone and fax: 415 566-4729

References and Resources


9. East Bay Municipal Water District website: www.ebmwd.com
References and Resources (continued)

10. Metropolitan Water District of Southern California website: www.mwdh2o.com


Dear Mr. Maltzer,

Please do not take additional water from the Tuolumne River. Moderate conservation measures will allow the Bay Area to grow while using the same amount of Tuolumne water.

At my vacation home in Tuolumne County I watch the Tuolumne River rapids. There is no water to spare in the river.

Of course, in Palo Alto we drink Tuolumne water. I support the Hetch Hetchy system and its existing dam and diversions, however, we should take no more water from the river. Fortunately, we do not need to.

Sincerely,

Gray Clossman
Dear Commissioner Ryan L. Brooks,

How can you possibly allow the environmental degradation that would come as a result of pulling more water from the Tuolumne? As the Sierra Nevada shrinks, Sierra rivers, like the Tuolumne, will become an increasingly unreliable source of water. Pulling more water from this river for lawn watering is just ludicrous. Why give our lawns clean pure drinking water when we already have water shortages across California? We can recycle water, from our showers, sinks and use that water for our lawns. There are so many possibilities for conservation that will sustain our cities growing water needs. San Francisco is supposed to be an environmentally friendly city. Other cities like LA and Seattle have met their growing water needs through conservation. Can we do the same? Please?

Caroline Coleman
538 Anza St.
San Francisco, CA 94118
I speak as a native Californian who has rafted and backpacked in that most beautiful of God’s creations, the Sierra, and I speak in opposition to the SF Public Utilities Commission plan to increase the already glutinous amount of river water they are currently removing from this pristine waterway.

This river is not a Utility that falls into Ronald Reagan’s view of one of our natural resources—“If you’ve seen one redwood tree, you’ve seen them all”.

Desk-bound bureaucrats who dwell in the forest of numbers, never having engaged in the spiritual communion of the wilderness, do not have the right to rape our environment using false statistics which are based upon predictions of unknown origin to suit their stilted justification.

They have not addressed, with any vision, the ramifications of global warming, which has already motivated the State of California to predict that the Sierra snowpack will be increasingly reduced over the coming years-----the winter of 2006 has recently borne this out.

About 60% of the Tuolumne is already being diverted. Any more diversion will seriously affect the fresh water supply into the SF Bay and surrounding wetlands, thereby threatening the entire Bay Area ecosystem.

Many other cities have already incorporated proven conservation and recycling measures that are saving water resources. For the City that was once recognized as “The City That Knows How”---San Francisco is turning its back on leadership and innovation. Please rethink this dangerous plan of draining our rivers, and think conservation, recycling and efficiency.

Sincerely,
Robert Collin
147 Temelec Circle, Sonoma, CA 95476
As a San Francisco Peninsula resident, I am greatly disturbed by the proposal of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to divert an additional 25 million gallons of water per day from the Tuolumne River. This designated Wild and Scenic River contributes much needed freshwater to the San Francisco Bay and is a valuable asset to our watershed and the Bay Area.

Please make sure that the San Francisco Public Utility Commission re-evaluates its proposal and puts its research into finding and encouraging alternative ways of conserving water. This precious river needs to remain as it is!

Respectfully,

Mary Davey, Director Ward 2
Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District.
save the Tuolunme ecosystem + conserve

Diane <d.dulmage@earthlink.net>
Reply-To: d.dulmage@earthlink.com
To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com
Cc: Peter Drekmeier <Peter@Tuolunme.org>

Diana Sokolove <wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com>
C_Dulma

Paul Malizer, Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Paul,

The Tuolunme River already supplies water for 2.4 million people in the Bay Area. This potential increase in water intake from the Tuolunme River threatens further damage to the riparian ecosystem that includes bald eagles, spotted owls, prairie hawk and wild trout. Previous increased withdrawals reduced the chinook salmon population to less than 100 fish. Populations have rebounded back to 18,000 after more water was released into the river.

Increased withdrawals from the Tuolunme River may also decrease the amount of freshwater that flows into the San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuary. I was just on the Delta, in the growing town of Pittsburg, and the water doesn’t smell too great! Plus, the resulting change in water chemistry in the estuary may threaten the health of this ecosystem that supports 750 species, 18 of which are listed as threatened or endangered.

Solutions

Withdrawing more water from the Tuolunme River is not necessarily the only option we have to meet our water needs in the future. One way to add to our water supply is to reduce usage. Although we have already made tremendous progress in conserving water (total water use in the US is the same as it was in 1975), there is the potential for even greater water savings. A study conducted by the Pacific Institute shows that we can save 1/3 of current urban water usage with existing technologies. Simple household retrofits can save the average household 22,000 gallons of water a year. More aggressive conservation techniques can ensure that we have enough water for our ecosystem as well as the human population.

Recycled water is another option that could conserve even more water. By reusing treated wastewater for non-potable sources such as landscape irrigation, toilet flushing and other industrial uses, even less water would be required out of the Tuolunme River. Some golf courses, parks and schools have already started using recycled water for irrigation without any complaints of illness. This drought-proof resource, if expanded, could potentially provide a greater share of non-potable water uses and reduce the stress on our water system.

One intriguing new option is desalination of brackish water. Once considered cost-prohibitive, new technologies are making desalination more feasible. The Alameda County Water District recently brought a desalination plant in Newark, which receives slightly brackish water resulting from saltwater intrusion into groundwater thus decreasing the amount of salt that needed to be extracted. Feasibility studies have already been conducted and a proposed schedule has the project completed by December 2009.

Lisa Day

C_Dulma

Diane <d.dulmage@earthlink.net>
Reply-To: d.dulmage@earthlink.com
To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com
Cc: Peter Drekmeier <Peter@Tuolunme.org>

Paul Malizer, Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Paul,

The Tuolunme River already supplies water for 2.4 million people in the Bay Area. This potential increase in water intake from the Tuolunme River threatens further damage to the riparian ecosystem that includes bald eagles, spotted owls, prairie hawk and wild trout. Previous increased withdrawals reduced the chinook salmon population to less than 100 fish. Populations have rebounded back to 18,000 after more water was released into the river.

Increased withdrawals from the Tuolunme River may also decrease the amount of freshwater that flows into the San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuary. I was just on the Delta, in the growing town of Pittsburg, and the water doesn’t smell too great! Plus, the resulting change in water chemistry in the estuary may threaten the health of this ecosystem that supports 750 species, 18 of which are listed as threatened or endangered.

Solutions

Withdrawing more water from the Tuolunme River is not necessarily the only option we have to meet our water needs in the future. One way to add to our water supply is to reduce usage. Although we have already made tremendous progress in conserving water (total water use in the US is the same as it was in 1975), there is the potential for even greater water savings. A study conducted by the Pacific Institute shows that we can save 1/3 of current urban water usage with existing technologies. Simple household retrofits can save the average household 22,000 gallons of water a year. More aggressive conservation techniques can ensure that we have enough water for our ecosystem as well as the human population.

Recycled water is another option that could conserve even more water. By reusing treated wastewater for non-potable sources such as landscape irrigation, toilet flushing and other industrial uses, even less water would be required out of the Tuolunme River. Some golf courses, parks and schools have already started using recycled water for irrigation without any complaints of illness. This drought-proof resource, if expanded, could potentially provide a greater share of non-potable water uses and reduce the stress on our water system.

One intriguing new option is desalination of brackish water. Once considered cost-prohibitive, new technologies are making desalination more feasible. The Alameda County Water District recently brought a desalination plant in Newark, which receives slightly brackish water resulting from saltwater intrusion into groundwater thus decreasing the amount of salt that needed to be extracted. Feasibility studies have already been conducted and a proposed schedule has the project completed by December 2009.

Lisa Day
Underground and indoor pipelines are critical to the water supply and distribution systems of the city. However, the City has not adequately maintained these systems, leading to leaks and insufficient water supply at both the demand and supply ends. These resources may not be reliable for the present and future generations without undergoing the health and sustainability of the system. The solution to the problem is by constructing new pipelines and updating the older ones.

Best Regards,

C. Dulma

City of San Francisco
Dear Mr. Maltzer,

I attended and spoke at the public meeting in Palo Alto a few days ago.

THE CASE FOR DRAWING SO MUCH ADDITIONAL WATER from the Tuolumne River IS NOT PROVEN by the simple, almost linear projections based on estimated population growth.

YES by all means make SEISMIC protections, as soon as possible.

BUT...

WE MUST and CAN and WILL CONSERVE declining water resources, at every point, from the mountains to our fields and taps. MARKETS with PRICES, along with ranges of use, different levels of risk, and other flexible analyses and response mechanisms instead of per capita estimates are essential as we enter times of the greatest challenges man has ever faced.

I urge you to greatly reduce the proposed draw-down from the Tuolumne until revised, better quality investigation is done. If and only if a solid case is made should this option be considered further.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jeb Eddy
2579 Cowper St.,
Palo Alto, CA 94301
650-327-7091
jeb@mac.com
Statewide water droplets

by Geoffrey McQuilkin

DWP’s Nichols departs
In July, Los Angeles Department of Water & Power (DWP) Commissioner Mary Nichols was appointed by Governor Schwarzenegger to chair the California Air Resources Board. As a result she has resigned from the DWP Commission. Her leadership skills will be of great benefit in Sacramento, where her new duties include implementing California’s landmark global warming legislation.

Nichols had been the Commission’s point person on Eastern Sierra matters and the leader of conceptual discussions about how DWP landholdings in Mono County might receive a guarantee of remaining open space (see page 7 for more). Commissioner Chair David Nahai will now fill that role and continue these discussions, commenting, “We remain resolutely committed to the protection and preservation of DWP lands in Mono County, in the ongoing fulfillment of all environmental standards, and to the continuing improvement of our relationship with Mono County and its residents.”

Recycled water legislation AB 481 advances
Recycled water projects are crucial tools for Los Angeles to control water use. Important legislation (AB 481) authored by Assemblyman De La Torre would standardize permitting requirements for use of recycled water for landscape irrigation. Committee Executive Director Geoff McQuilkin testified in support of this legislation earlier this year and the bill is currently in the final stages of development in the State Senate. DWP officials hope to quickly increase use of recycled water—thus offsetting use of fresh Sierra water if the new procedures take effect.

Water Board sees recycled water as critical
The State Water Resources Control Board will be promoting use of recycled water through a new policy due out this fall. The draft policy explains why recycled water use is in the best interest of the state and how Regional Water Boards can write permits to encourage use of recycled water while assuring the public that human health and the environment will be protected. At its center, the policy proposes the development of groundwater basin management plans to determine how increasing salts from all waters, not just recycled water, will be monitored and treated.

State Water Board monitors Gary Wolff and Frances Spivy-Weber have taken the lead in developing this policy. Spivy-Weber notes that the policy is particularly important in light of recent dry conditions in the Sierra and the West, increasingly dire predictions of hydrologic uncertainty in the future due to climate change, and the rising cost of energy to deliver imported water to Southern California. Further details are available at www.waterboards.ca.gov.

Los Angeles tops four million
Los Angeles’ population grew by more than 37,000 people last year, some demographers reported this past summer. That pushed the city population to just over four million people, Los Angeles is still the country’s second largest city (New York City is first). How do all those Angelinos get their water? Mono Lake supporters will know that the Eastern Sierras provide a tremendous amount of water to Los Angeles. But take heart through cutting-edge conservation and reclamation programs, many of them advocated and supported by the Mono Lake Committee the city is using 20% of the same amount of water it did thirty years ago despite the population increase.

Geoff McQuilkin is the Committee’s Executive Director. He saw his youngest daughter Eileen off to her first day of preschool this fall.

Mono Lake water supply

Mono Lake status

Mono Lake News Letter - Fall 2007
Volume 27, Issue 10
October 2007

Monthly Meeting Information

When: THURSDAY Oct 11th 7:30pm
GRG General Meeting
Saratoga Library Community Room

Salt Pond Restoration in San Francisco Bay
Clyde Morris, Refuge Manager,
Don Edwards San Francisco Bay NWR
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Topic: The restoration of 15,000 acres of former Cargill commercial salt ponds for wildlife habitat

www.southbayrestoration.org
www.fws.gov/desfbay/AboutSF.htm

12-3-31

C_Fenwi

Farnum, Ben
1420 Phelps Av
San Jose CA 95117-3645

C_Fenwi

Diana Sokolove <wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com>

Approve PEIR

Fenwick.Jan@aol.com <Fenwick.Jan@aol.com>
To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com
Sun, Sep 30, 2007 at 11:48 PM

Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer:

Being an "environmentalist" I am very concerned about our water future and misinformation that Peter Dreikmeier and the Tuolumne River Trust are putting forth. I understand that the comment period for the PEIR closes at 5pm on Monday.

Some points below refute what the TRT is saying:

For example, the voluntary 10% water conservation program in the SFPUC service area (including BAWSCA) has achieved a 13 % reduction in water demand in the last six months according to Susan Leal, and as reported at the BAWSCA meeting last Thursday night. Dreikmeier was there. -- No mention of this in his Monday letter, because it doesn't suit his objective--- "an inconvenient truth". Also the River is not a 162 mile river that "Cascades", most of it meanders through the Central Valley, and only about 27 miles of it (in the Canyon) is designated "Wild and Scenic". Another point (not mentioned): the proposed SFPUC diversion from the Tuolumne is but 8/10 of one percent more of the average river flow." (SFPUC currently diversions about 12%). "Modesto and Turlock are the big water diversers, but TRT cannot get any traction with them and San Francisco is a much better target, and is in line with the legacy of John Muir... If we have a big recession, or if more conservation is achieved, the need may be even less. Meanwhile, if we have a big earthquake we could be out of water with catastrophic impact on a scale that matches or exceeds the Katrina impact on New Orleans. The legal challenges by NRDC and decision by Federal Judge Wanger regarding Delta pumping, places even more reliance on Hetch-Hetchy for an assured supply to the peninsula and East Bay.

Finally, he (Peter) states that the SFPUC’s plan to increase diversions will delay the seismic improvements and result in cost overruns. What he does not say is that the TRT will sue San Francisco unless it drops the diversion plan. This threat was made in the BAWSCA meeting last Thursday. The effect of a lawsuit (standard environmental practice) is to delay the program, but the intervenors have no accountability or responsibility for adverse consequences.

Thus, my concern. It has taken the SFPUC YEARS to get to this point. We MUST move forward with the seismic upgrades. Thank you! Jan Fenwick, Past Board member of the Purissima Hills Water District.

******************************************************

See what’s new at http://www.aol.com

Being Green – by Bob Groff

Water has been in the news again. Water rates are going up and the snow pack in the Sierra, where our water comes from, is going down. Using less water is becoming a must. There are some simple things you can do to save water. 'Pouring in low-flow shower heads and faucet aerators will save water and you can get them free in Santa Clara County by calling the Water Conservation Hotline at (408) 265-2607, ext 2554. You can also schedule a free Water-Wise house call in Santa Clara County by calling 1-800-548-8882. In San Benito, call (831) 637-4778 for free showerheads, faucet aerators, and appointments. San Benito will even install the devices for you. There are also rebates for replacing your water thirsty lawn with drought tolerant plants and for upgrading specific items. Call the above numbers for more information. Give it a try. It is up to each one of us.

The Loma Prieta Chapter of the Sierra Club has been actively involved in the planning process for how the salt ponds will be restored. Of particular note is the possibility of increasing tidal marsh habitat for the endangered species: clapper rail and salt marsh harvest mouse.

Calendar
Don't take more water from the Tuolumne!

David Fielding <dfielding@mindspring.com>
To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com

Please stop the draining of the Tuolumne River .... NOT necessary with proper conservation!
Thank you.
David Fielding

NO Tuolumne River destruction to sell to wasteful East Bay water hogs and sprawl

JEFiore@aol.com <JEFiore@aol.com>
To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com

San Francisco is not in the business of selling water to hogs in the East Bay. I am ashamed of my city that we would even be considering such destructive, unethical, illogical, inappropriate actions.
John and Janet Fiore

See what's new at http://www.aol.com

http://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=41cc4a954b&view=pt&q=Fiore&search=qu...
To Commissioners Ryan & Borchis, President of the SFPUC,

I understand the SFPUC plans on meting future water demand by taking more water out of the Tuolumne, a Federally designated Wild & Scenic River.

Why not meet water needs & protect the Tuolumne River for future generations through conservation & recycling?

Sincerely,

E. Fleming-Hunsicker

RECEIVED
SEP 20 2007
CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

M. Hanigan
1501 Louisiana St 412
SF, CA 94111
Thursday, September 27, 2007

Kirsten Flynn
471 Matadero Ave.
Palo Alto, CA 94306

Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Maltzer,

I do not support the current environmental review of the S.F. Public Utilities Commission’s plan to divert more water from the Tuolumne River. This river is an asset to the state as it is, offering recreation opportunities to the citizens of California, habitat to native species, and fresh water to our own Bay Delta system. Decreased snow pack from drought years is already affecting the flow of this river, we cannot afford further diversions.

However I was very pleased to see some of your alternative suggestions: requiring conservation efforts, increased efficiency and water recycling. The reality is that we will have to do these things anyway, as population grows. Let’s get our water consumptive culture thinking about conservation sooner rather than later. I would strongly support this kind of effort.

Enough is enough, it is time to prioritize the health of our Wild and Scenic rivers, and stop whittling away the water that flows through these watersheds. They are one of the legacies of this great state and should be treasured and protected.

Thank you for your attention to this letter.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

C. Flynn
Dear Planning Commission,

Please make meetings available to people, by meetings after working hours.

I want to express my opinion about taking more water from the river. I want to express my total opposition to the PUC taking additional water from the Tuolumne River!
No more water!

Respectfully, Caroline Garbarino, Technical Editor, Palo Alto, CA.

See what's new at AOL.com and Make AOL Your Homepage.
Subject: Tuolumne River

October 14, 2007

Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer
Water System Improvement Program PEIR
San Francisco Planning Department

Dear Mr. Maltzer:

Section 5.3 of the PEIR relates to the Tuolumne Watershed. The maps, tables and flow data are informative and are a great resource to get a better understanding of the complex hydrological and meteorological interactions and their effect on the biological resources in the watershed.

The additional water diversion from the Tuolumne River will have a significant effect, as is summarized acknowledged in the slide show presentation (#17, 21 & 22). Since these effects are irreversible and, since there are other means of obtaining sustainable water supply for the SF Bay Area, further diversion from the Tuolumne River is not an acceptable solution.

I urge that other means be considered. For example, conservation; water recycling/gray water use; reduced water allocation to certain agricultural crops; price structures reflecting higher cost for excessive consumption; encouraging composting toilets where appropriate; changes in the Uniform Building Code to require separate plumbing for gray water; incentives for planting drought resistant gardens. I am sure there are many more creative ideas that should be considered. The natural resource of the Tuolumne must not be sacrificed or reduced in any way. The River is our heritage.

Cordially,

Ernest Goitein
Tuolumne River environmental review

Kass <k22@yahoo.com>  Tue, Sep 25, 2007 at 11:19 AM

Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Maltzer,

I support the alternatives identified in your draft document that protect the Tuolumne River from new diversions. Requiring more water conservation, efficiency, and recycling is the best way to lessen impacts on the Tuolumne River while promoting a sustainable water plan for the Bay Area.

Please note that I believe guidance for water conservation should be in terms of absolute use as well as percentages. Recent requests to reduce water usage by 20% in the Bay Area does not adequately recognize those of us who have never stopped conservation of water since the last drought. My water usage today is almost away less than the 100 gal per day (including sprinklers) recommended at the height of the last drought, due to xeriscaping and changing personal habits to permanently reduce water usage. It is half that in the winter. If everyone did the same, then there would be no need to take more water from the Tuolumne, even if population increased.

Please do a more thorough environmental review of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s plan to take more water from the Tuolumne River. The initial review falls to adequately identify and address all of the environmental impacts to the River, the Delta and the San Francisco Bay. I urge you to undertake additional studies before finalizing this document.

Only by ensuring that healthy amounts of water continue to flow into the Tuolumne River and the SF Bay can we protect this irreplaceable natural treasure.

Best wishes,

Kathleen M. Goldfin
3163 Alma Street
Palo Alto, CA 94306

Protecting the Tuolumne River

Rebecca <arrbecca@yahoo.com>  Wed, Sep 26, 2007 at 6:00 PM

Dear Mr. Maltzer,

As an environmentally conscious San Francisco resident, I appreciate your recent review of the PUC’s plan to withdraw more water from the Tuolumne River. However, I encourage you to delve further into the issues at hand before making any final decisions.

Before taking more water out of this valuable resource, it is essential to consider both the habitats and marine life of this river. Whereas there are alternatives to increased water extraction, such as water recycling and conservation, the Tuolumne animals and habitats have no choice but to be subject to our decisions.

Please consider the big picture and make the right decision. The Bay Area is lucky to be home to some important and wonderful resources. Let’s keep it that way.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Goodman

Be a better Globetrotter. Get better travel answers from someone who knows. Yahoo! Answers - Check it out.
Tuolumne River Environmental Review

Ben Graves <bgraves@stanford.edu>  Thu, Sep 27, 2007 at 3:51 PM

Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Maltzer:

Your environmental review of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s plan to take more water from the Tuolumne River fails to adequately identify and address all of the environmental impacts to the River. I urge you to undertake additional studies before finalizing this document.

I support the alternatives identified in your draft document that protect the Tuolumne River from new diversions. Requiring more water conservation, efficiency, and recycling is the best way to lessen impacts on the Tuolumne River while promoting a sustainable water plan for the Bay Area. With some of the leading educational, social and political institutions in the US, if not the world in our area, other metropolitan areas look to San Francisco for guidance, leadership and inspiration. Let us continue to lead the way by working together to set a precedent for sustainable resource management. Any investment in the conservation of natural resources such as energy and water will pay-off in the long run and ensure our ability to compete and succeed in the world market, not to mention a healthy and beautiful place for future generations to raise their families.

Sincerely,

Ben Graves
3504 Hilcrest Dr.
Belmont, CA 94002


SFPUC proposal to divert more water from Tuolumne River

David Greene <dg@bayarearesearch.org>  Tue, Sep 11, 2007 at 1:28 PM

Dear Paul Maltzer,

A brief note in support of the environmentalists’ campaign for SFPUC to re-evaluate its projections for future water demand and conservation, and to determine the potential for conservation and efficiency savings. They should adopt a policy of REDUCING diversions from the Tuolumne River over time, not increasing them. It’s long overdue for our water management policies to take into account the impact of climate change on precipitation in the Tuolumne River watershed. Conservation and efficiency should be our primary policy focus for a more sustainable water management future.

Best regards,

---

David Greene
3144 David Avenue
Palo Alto CA 94303
phone 650-493-4425
dg@BayAreaResearch.org
Tuolumne River under consideration for further diversion

Greene, Kat <Kat_Greene@intuit.com>  Fri, Sep 21, 2007 at 2:57 PM
To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com

Mr. Malzer,

I learned that the river is being considered for further diversion for human water consumption. This deeply concerns me. Over half the water from this river is already diverted, having far-reaching consequences on the habitat it used to supply. I’d like to see reference to studies which show decreases in mammals, reptiles, and flora since the diversion began.

Please consider conservation and other methods of using what we have before taking more water away from the islands of wildlife we have left. Please revisit your study. I think there are important pieces missing.

I hope as a steward of public resources that you will represent my thoughts on this matter.

Thank you for your consideration,

Katherine Greene

C_Gross

RECEIVED
SEP 2 0 2007
CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Board of Supervisors:

I am writing today to prevent more water from being taken from the Tuolumne River. Instead I urge you to increasing water conservation and recycling programs. This is a far better alternative to allowing 60% of the River’s water to be sent to feed more towns and urban sprawl across the East Bay. By pursuing a plan to divert additional water from the Tuolumne River the SFPUC risks delaying their Capital program causing cost overruns and fail to increase the reliability of our water supply.

Thank you

Andrew J. Gross
1535 FINEST CA
TELE: 415-678-3831
ADD: 1535 FINEST CA 94109
The Planning Department Draft PEIR for the SFPUC WSIP provided much information, but not enough on five questions:

I ask that the San Francisco Planning Department to expand the discussion in the PEIR for the impacts on San Francisco’s numerous water rights on the Tuolumne River\(^2\) of the SFPUC establishing a temporary or permanent policy for reduction in diversion from the Tuolumne River every year by using other measures\(^2\) for reducing demand to the present average annual export\(^1\) to reduce the hardship of rationing on their customers during drought\(^4\).

For the same question, discuss the impact of export reduction from the Tuolumne River on the operation under the Raker Act\(^2\).

For the same question, discuss the impact of the Lower Tuolumne Diversion\(^2\) on San Francisco’s water rights.

For the same question, discuss the impact of the Lower Tuolumne Diversion\(^2\) on the operation of the Raker Act\(^2\).

For the same question, discuss the impact of the Lower Tuolumne Diversion\(^2\) on the operation of the four agreements among SF, TID, and MTD\(^2\).

Also, discuss the impact of lowered flow in the lower Tuolumne River on recreational activities of boating, duck hunting by boat, bass fishing by boat and from shore, and swimming and picnicking at the Stanislaus County parks and fishing access\(^5\).

Please note that the “improving and enlarging the Lower Cherry Aqueduct”\(^2\) may not be provided for in Raker Act documents and a full LIR is requested.

Footnotes:
1. PEIR Section 2.5.1
2. PEIR Section 9.2.4, conservation, water efficiency, recycling, ground water, conjunctive use in the service area, other than purchase; Section 8.3.3, desal in the service area or nearby; and ground water banking in counties outside the service area
3. PEIR Figure 2.4, p. 2-18, 82% of 265 mgd = 217 mgd in your base year for the PEIR of 2005
4. PEIR Figure 2.5, p. 2-19 “up to 25%”
5. PEIR Section 2.4.2 and p 2-37
6. PEIR p 9-60 through 62
7. PEIR Section 2.5.2
8. PEIR p 6.4.2, p 6-51, and 5.7-38
9. PEIR 5.7-6

Bob Hackamack P. E.
Tuolumne River Water Plan - comment

Diana Hall <dianahall3@yahoo.com>  To: wspir.comments@gmail.com

Mon, Oct 15, 2007 at 8:55 AM

Attn: Paul Maltzer

I urge you to support an environmentally sustainable plan for Tuolumne River usage that emphasizes conservation and recycling. Taking more water from the Tuolumne will be detrimental to wildlife and the natural environment as a whole.

More efficient water use and a more diverse mix of water supplies would also minimize the risks associated with a shrinking snowpack that is expected as a result of climate change.

Let’s safeguard the Tuolumne River for future generations.

Diana Hall
812 Calderon Ave.
Mountain View CA 94041
Sept. 25, 2007

Dear Mr. Maltzer,

I am strongly opposed to the plan for more water diversion from the already heavily impacted Tuolumne River. Approximately 60% is currently diverted for urban and rural use. Continuing to take more from the river seems to violate its 1984 designation as a Wild and Scenic River.

Bay Area residents need to become water conscious and realize the urgency to be much more efficient in outdoor water use. I understand that 60% of the new diversion is targeted for that purpose. We fall far behind other California metropolises in water conservation.

The Tuolumne River is the main tributary to the San Joaquin River flowing into the San Francisco Bay-Delta. The Delta is already under stress, and more diversion of fresh water could cause serious damage from the invasion of salt water, disrupting the estuarine ecosystem.

I support the alternatives proposed in your draft document that protect the river from new diversions. I urge you to protect the magnificent Tuolumne River.

Sincerely,

Carol Hankermeyer
Environmental Educator
Dear Commissioner Brooks,

Taking water that helps our wildlife thriving is a pefect idea. Taking water from the animals and plants that rely on this river as a source of life. The animals and plants along the beautiful banks of the Tuolumne River need the water more than people who need to water their lawns. The right choice would be to let the nature be. Make the right choice.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]
tuolumne river future--please save this river

Christopher Hest <kayakasia@yahoo.com>  
To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com  
Tue, Oct 16, 2007 at 12:06 PM

I write in hopes of persuading you and others to drop the plans to increase water takes from the Tuolumne. The T is already at risk of losing its unique status in California's natural heritage and I think that the evidence submitted by DFG and other concerned parties should rule out further diversions. Please let's all save this incredible resource for all Californians.

Christopher Hest
64 Carmel Street
San Francisco CA 94117

Looking for a deal? Find great prices on flights and hotels with Yahoo! FareChase.

--- Forwarded by Paul Maltzer/CTYPLN/SFGOV on 09/25/2007 09:29 AM ------

Sidney Higgins  
<stensai@gmail.com>  
09/20/2007 04:09 PM

Subject the Tuolumne

Dear Sir, Only a friggin' idiot would think of taking more water from the Tuolumne River, or from any other river. NOPE! More conservation, conservation, conservation!!!!!!! Be part of the solution, not the problem. Leave the Tuolumne alone. Sincerely, a water conserver in Los Angeles, Sidney Higgins
Draft Program EIR re SFPUC's Water System Improvement Program

Jeff Hoel <jeff_hoel@yahoo.com>        Mon, Oct 1, 2007 at 1:10 PM
To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com
Cc: jeff_hoel@yahoo.com, kcaponi@sfwater.org

San Francisco Planning Department
Attention: Paul Malzer, Environmental Review Officer
WSIP PEIR
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Malzer:

Here are my comments about the WSIP DPEIR
(San Francisco Planning Department File No. 2005.0159E,
State Clearinghouse No. 2005092026).

In general, the DPEIR is written to cover the possibilities that SFPUC's
treated water could contain either chlorine or chloramine as the residual
disinfactant, but occasionally it fails to mention both possibilities.
Is it SFPUC's intent to have covered both possibilities consistently?

Does SFPUC believe that for the WSIP described in the DPEIR, there would
be more environmental impact if chloramine were the residual disinfectant
than if chlorine were the residual disinfectant? If not, why not? If so, would SFPUC be willing to switch from chloramine to chlorine, at
least for the duration of the WSIP construction projects?

Thanks very much.

Jeff

 PS: Please see my more detailed comments and questions below. Thanks.

PPS: I became a member of Citizens Concerned About Chloramine (CCAC) on
9-26-07, and I have been attending their meetings for a while. I agree
with their point of view that SFPUC shouldn't be using chloramine as a
residual disinfectant until scientific human health studies can show
it's safe. This message is from me personally, and does not necessarily
represent the views of CCAC.

Draft Program EIR re SFPUC's Water System Improvement Program

Jeff Hoel <jeff_hoel@yahoo.com>        Mon, Oct 1, 2007 at 1:10 PM
To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com
Cc: jeff_hoel@yahoo.com, kcaponi@sfwater.org

San Francisco Planning Department
Attention: Paul Malzer, Environmental Review Officer
WSIP PEIR
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Malzer:

Here are my comments about the WSIP DPEIR
(San Francisco Planning Department File No. 2005.0159E,
State Clearinghouse No. 2005092026).

In general, the DPEIR is written to cover the possibilities that SFPUC's
treated water could contain either chlorine or chloramine as the residual
disinfactant, but occasionally it fails to mention both possibilities.
Is it SFPUC's intent to have covered both possibilities consistently?

Does SFPUC believe that for the WSIP described in the DPEIR, there would
be more environmental impact if chloramine were the residual disinfectant
than if chlorine were the residual disinfectant? If not, why not? If so, would SFPUC be willing to switch from chloramine to chlorine, at
least for the duration of the WSIP construction projects?

Thanks very much.

Jeff

 PS: Please see my more detailed comments and questions below. Thanks.

PPS: I became a member of Citizens Concerned About Chloramine (CCAC) on
9-26-07, and I have been attending their meetings for a while. I agree
with their point of view that SFPUC shouldn't be using chloramine as a
residual disinfectant until scientific human health studies can show
it's safe. This message is from me personally, and does not necessarily
represent the views of CCAC.

Detailed comments and questions:

6-29-07 (updated 7-6-07):
"Public Notice: Availability of Draft Program Environmental Impact Report"
construction impacts could result in erosion or sedimentation or discharge of construction-related pollutants to local water bodies, causing water quality effects.

Could short-term construction impacts also result in discharge of chlorinated or chloraminated water (which might not be classified as a construction-related "pollutant" per se)?

Operation of some projects could also result in the discharge of chlorinated or chloraminated water, treated stormwater, or recycled water to water bodies, causing potential water quality effects.

Why "potential"? "If" water is discharged, aren't the water quality effects actual?

I have the impression that chloraminated water would have a worse environmental impact than chlorinated water, because chlorine dissipates from water more readily than chloramine and because chloramine is typically used at a higher concentration than chlorine. Does SFPUC have that impression too? Is it relevant to the DPEIR? Did SFPUC consider the possibility of switching its residual disinfectant from chloramine to chlorine during construction (and/or subsequent operation) to minimize environmental impact of discharges, both accidental and unavoidable?

Page 4.5-32:

... the following action pertaining to dechlorination of water prior to discharge would be implemented as part of the WSIP projects...

What does this mean if the residual disinfectant is chloramine?

Page 4.5-42:

While both chlorine and chloramine are effective disinfectants for potable water,

This dependent clause is misleading. Chlorine is orders of magnitude more effective than chloramine at killing E. coli and rotavirus. <www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/dwq/SQ4.pdf>

the discharge of chlorinated or chloraminated water into natural waters can be detrimental due to the toxicity of chlorine, ammonia, and chloramine to aquatic organisms. Chlorine residuals (both free and combined) are acutely toxic to aquatic organisms at low concentration and are persistent due to their stability.

Chloramine is much more "persistent" than chlorine.

What literature supports the view that chlorine, ammonia, and chloramine are toxic to aquatic organisms? Does the literature say specifically for each of these chemicals how toxic it is to which aquatic organisms?

Are humans considered to be aquatic organisms? If not, is the DPEIR nevertheless concerned about the toxicity of chlorine, ammonia, and chloramine to humans?

The San Francisco Bay Basin Plan standard for residual chlorine is 0.0 milligrams per liter

---

C_Hoel

This document mentions four limits, all less than 0.02 mg/L but not zero: <www.tritac.org/documents/summaries/2006_05_Water_Issue_Summaries.pdf>

It is claimed that (the ionized form of) ammonia is not harmful, so that if only the chlorine portion of chloramine is removed, that's good enough. But is it really good enough? In Chapter 5, Section 5.5, it says that before chloraminated water is put into Crystal Springs Reservoir, the chlorine part is "completely" removed and "most" of the ammonia part is removed. I assume that is done because it is thought to be necessary.

---

Chapter 4, Section 4.6: <http://www.sfpw.gov/site/uploadedfiles/planning/vol2_sec4-6_wisp-dpeir.pdf>

No questions or comments.

---

Chapter 4, Sections 4.7 to 4.11: <http://www.sfpw.gov/site/uploadedfiles/planning/vol2_sec4-7_to_4-11_wisp-dpeir.pdf>

No questions or comments.

---

Chapter 4, Sections 4.12 to 4.17: <http://www.sfpw.gov/site/uploadedfiles/planning/vol2_sec4-12_to_4-17_wisp-dpeir.pdf>

No questions or comments.

---

Chapter 5, Section 5.5: <http://www.sfpw.gov/site/uploadedfiles/planning/vol3_sec5-5_wisp-dpeir.pdf>

Page 5.5.3-1:

In 2005, the SFPUC changed the method it uses to disinfect water in order to comply with drinking water standards. Formerly, the SFPUC disinfected water with chlorine; now it uses chloramine, a chemical compound that contains both chlorine and ammonia. Ammonia is a form of nitrogen that rapidly decomposes in natural waters to another form of nitrogen called nitrate. Past studies have shown that the growth of algae in Crystal Springs Reservoir is limited by lack of nitrogen and phosphorus (sic), both of which are plant nutrients; therefore an increase in the concentration of either could increase the growth of algae. To avoid the discharge of nitrogen and the possible consequent increase in algae concentration in Crystal Springs Reservoir, the SFPUC constructed dechlorination facilities at the same time it constructed chloramination facilities. The dechlorination facilities completely remove the chlorine and remove most of the ammonia from water before it is discharged into Crystal Springs Reservoir. The use of chloramine as a disinfectant has resulted in a small increase in the concentration of nitrate in Crystal Springs Reservoir (SFPUC, 2006).
Quantitatively, how much ammonia is removed -- and how much remains?
If the ammonia in chloramine is not completely removed when water enters
Crystal Springs Reservoir, must it be removed later, before free chlorine
primary disinfection can occur in the treatment plant(s) fed by Crystal
Springs Reservoir?
(In this PDF file, phosphorus is misspelled as "phosphorous" 7 times.)

Appendix A:
<http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/planning/vol5_apdx-a_wsip-dpeir.pdf>
Section 6.2.1 (page 51) says that comments have been received about topics:
... including use of chloramines for disinfection and
effect of chloramines on pipe materials.
How can I view these comments?
What pipe materials will be used in the project described by the DPEIR?
What documents the effect of chloramines on these materials?

Appendix C:
<http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/planning/vol5_apdx-c_wsip-dpeir.pdf>
No comments or questions.

Dear Mr. Maltzer:

I am strongly opposed to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s (SFPUC)
proposal to divert an additional 25 million gallons of water per day from the Tuolumne
River as part of its Water System Improvement Plan (WSIP). The SFPUC already
diverts one third of the Tuolumne’s water and 60% of the river’s water is already
diverted. Taking large amounts of water from a river is very harmful to the river, its
surrounding ecosystems, and the plants and animals that depend on the river and the
ecosystems. Too much water is already diverted from the Tuolumne River; the SFPUC
should not exacerbate these harms by taking even more water.

The San Francisco ballot initiative that authorizes the WSIP was promoted as a badly
needed repair for San Francisco’s water system. As the campaign coordinator for Sierra
Club’s “No on Prop A” campaign I was part of a coalition opposing that ballot initiative
because of the environmental harm that would be caused by taking even more water from
the Tuolumne, even though initiative proponents insisted that no additional water would
be diverted. Unfortunately, our analysis of the initiative proved to be correct: the WSIP
is as much about taking more water out of the Tuolumne in order to promote
development of open space, which will cause further environmental harm, as it is about
repairing our aging water system. I find the dishonest tactics of the proponents of this
project to be rather egregious.

The large majority of us in San Francisco are strong proponents of protecting the
environment. Unfortunately, the SFPUC promotes several projects outside of San
Francisco, such as this one, that are very environmentally destructive. The actions of the
SFPUC outside of San Francisco are in direct opposition to the will of the residents of our
city. Please reconsider this ill advised plan to do further harm to the Tuolumne River, its
ecosystems and wildlife by taking even more water from this river. The environment
deserves better and the residents of San Francisco deserve actions from the SFPUC that
are in harmony with our environmental concerns, not actions that are opposed to them.

Sincerely,

Jeff Hoffman
132 B Coleridge Street
San Francisco, CA 94110-5113
Comment on Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR)

Pei-Lin Hsiung <plhsiung@stanford.edu>
To: wsp.peir.comments@gmail.com
Cc: bill.young@sierracub.org

Fri, Oct 12, 2007 at 9:40 PM

Dear Mr. Maltzer:

Your environmental review of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's plan to take more water from the Tuolumne River fails to adequately identify and address all of the environmental impacts to the River. I urge the SFPUC to undertake additional studies to determine the maximum technical potential for conservation and efficiency savings before finalizing this document.

I strongly believe that requiring more water conservation, efficiency, and recycling is the best way to lessen impacts on the Tuolumne River. When it comes to water conservation, the Bay Area lags far behind other metropolitan areas such as Seattle and Los Angeles that are reducing water consumption even in the face of growth.

As a region known for a strong environmental ethic, the Bay Area should be a leader in water efficiency and conservation. The SFPUC should adopt a policy of reducing diversions from the Tuolumne River over time, with additional demand met through increased investment in conservation, efficiency, and recycling. Only by ensuring that healthy amounts of water continue to flow into the Tuolumne River can we protect this irreplaceable natural treasure.

Sincerely,

Pei-Lin Hsiung
397 College Ave, Apt C
Palo Alto, CA 94306

---

Dear Community Members,

How can we even think about making water from the Tuolumne river free and giving it to people that don't even want to water their lawn? They say they want us to save water. I say no, they don't want to save water, they want water if they are going to use it. We shouldn't penalize people that want water from the river. There are many more different things the city could do.

Kyle Ikemo
Tuolumne River plan

Marian Isaac <Mlsaac01@att.net>
To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com
Fri, Sep 28, 2007 at 2:25 PM

Dear Mr. Maltzer,

I hope you will move San Francisco to developing water conservation, recycling and development of desalination to procure water for the Bay Area.

Taking more from the Tuolumne, which is already an overworked river, will be destructive to all of the wildlife, and the lands that live because of the river.

I was born and raised in San Francisco, and am very disappointed, actually stunned, that San Francisco would try for such an anti-environmental grab. Such an action is disgusting.

California is facing environmental disasters. Depleting one of the few remaining rivers is the wrong thing to do. The alternatives I mention above are the only reasonable and ethical courses to take.

Sincerely,

Marian Isaac
Modesto CA.
Mlsaac01@att.net

---

Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: WSIP PEIR

Dear Mr. Maltzer:

I have reviewed Section 5.5 in volume 3 of the referenced document, with regard to the impacts of the project on San Mateo Creek and Pilarcitos Creek, both in San Mateo County.

The document states that San Francisco PUC is not required to release water past its dams in these two important watersheds. The document does not explain why it believes it is exempt from Section 5937 of the State Fish and Game code, or why it believes that NOAA requirements and the Federal Endangered Species Act do not apply.

The document goes on to say that SFPUC does not release water into the stream beds downstream from the dams to maintain adequate streamflow for fish, and that it will not do so.

The PEIR then asserts that because the actions of the Water Department have made the creeks intermittent, this is the baseline condition for analyzing impacts. The baseline condition should be an approximation of the historic flow before dam construction.

This section of the PEIR should be re-written to recognize the SFPUC’s responsibility to release adequate flows downstream of its dams, and fully describe the benefits of meeting those responsibilities.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Sincerely,
Richard Izmirian
Promote water efficiency - don't take more water from the Tuolumne

Lindsay_Joye <ljoye@pacbell.net>
To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com
Reply-To: ljoye@pacbell.net

Tue, Sep 11, 2007 at 7:32 PM

Dear SFPUC,

Our family had the great pleasure of spending three days on the mighty "T" this summer and are dismayed to learn that the SFPUC is planning to take even more water from the Tuolumne.

Please look at other progressive water agencies to model their conservation programs before taking this step. Incentive programs coupled with new landscape standards can make a large impact on Bay Area water usage. A comprehensive watershed study should be completed to adequately assess the environmental impacts of this proposed Water System Improvement Program.

Thank you,
Lindsay & Ken Joye
3783 Park Blvd.
Palo Alto, CA 94306

----- Forwarded by Paul Maltzer/CTYPLN/SFGOV on 09/25/2007 09:30 AM -----
"Sieglinde Johnson" <njjiggy@cox.net>
09/20/2007 05:39 PM

To: <paul.maltzer@sfgov.org>
Cc: Tuolumne River Diversion

Subject: Tuolumne River Diversion

Dear Mr. Maltzer,

I am very much opposed to further diversion of the Tuolumne River. A healthy river system has many environmental benefits. Conservation and recycling programs should be instituted, first.

Sieglinde Johnson
610 Mystic View
Laguna, Beach, CA 92651
Tuolumne - more conservation

Dear Mr. Maltzer and SFPUC,

Please strongly consider increased efforts in water conservation and water recycling instead of taking more water from the Tuolumne, or any other water source for that matter. Water is only going to become more precious in the future and we need to start reducing consumption instead of sucking all our resources dry.

Thank you,
Mike Kahn

511 Walker Dr., #4
Mountain View, CA 94043
(for identification only, do not send any mail)
650-269-1264 cell
mike@kahnicous.net

It is inexcusable to withdraw more water from our natural treasure, the Tuolumne River in Yosemite, when we have the means to meet our water needs already. Grey water systems, native plants, educational campaigns & incentives to encourage conservation, water-saving appliances, and many other options are currently available to provide enough water for the Bay Area's growing population. Our rivers are already in danger because of climate change. Think about the future of California. Golf courses are not the future. Protect the Tuolumne.

Thank you,

Guyan Kaliner-Mackellen

143 Front St
San Francisco, CA 94112
925-323-4047
Thank you for participating in tonight’s public hearing on the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s proposed Water System Improvement Program (WSIP). This is also an opportunity for you to submit written comments on the Draft PEIR for the proposed WSIP.

Written comments will be accepted through close of business on Monday, October 1, 2007. Written comments may be submitted in one of three ways:

1. Leave your written comments in the designated “Comment Box” tonight. These cards are provided for your convenience.
2. Mail your comments by October 1, 2007 to the San Francisco Planning Department, Attention: Paul Malzen, Environmental Review Officer, WSIP PEBR, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103.
3. E-mail written comments to wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com

CONTACT INFORMATION
Name: Suzanne Keeler
Affiliation: Oceana
Address: 1276 Cume St
City, State, Zip: Palo Alto, CA 94306
Phone or E-mail: 650 498 1563

There are two areas to concern:

1. To reduce the black water – you do it at home!

2. The Environment issue – should be a part – we must come to accept water – do not take more out.

If we take care of the Earth, will we take care of the Earth? People need the truth – we cannot for the good of us if we can.

Grandchildren’s future depends on it.

Water quality is needed in many places – new homes should be built with respect to making it easy to use grey water for the garden etc.

It is time to wake up
All of us – Thank you for Putting Earth First!

Suzanne Keeler
Tuolumne

Michael Kelleher <michael.kelleher@gmail.com>
To: wsp.pier.comments@gmail.com
Mon, Oct 1, 2007 at 7:40 PM

To:
Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer
Water System Improvement Program PEIR
San Francisco Planning Department

Dear Mr. Maltzer:

I write you in response to the approval for diverting additional water from the Tuolumne River for sale by the SFPUC. My background in ground and surface water hydrology, consumer finance, and raising children in San Francisco allows me to appreciate the complexities, economics, and long-term impacts of decisions such as this one. Further, I am an Eagle Scout, avid fly-fisher, and have been enjoying California (and drinking her waters) since 1976.

I imagine that, while you appreciate public concern and applaud the effort of people such as myself to voice them, your decisions are most heavily driven by your view of the economics of the situation with respect to the legislated environmental constraints such as EIRs. The time frame of such economic decisions is critically important. Money certainly has time-value, but our natural resources have an inverse value. To me it seems the longer we protect them, the better we understand them, and the more value we can derive from them in the future. Once gone, they are prohibitively expensive to recreate.

Margaret Thatcher said, “I never make a decision until I have to.” As you have cleared the constraint of the commission, you are perhaps not obligated to divert or sell the waters. Please give careful consideration to the recommendations you get from all sides and make a decision that will benefit Californians in perpetuity.

In gratitude for you consideration of my voice,

Michael Kelleher
Culano's Hounds
http://www.efhounds.com
http://www.MySpace.com/efhounds
http://www.cdbaby.com/cdb/michaelkelleher

---

Michelle Kim
3591 19th St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Dear Council,

I am writing to you today to implore you to take another look at the planned redirection of 25 million gallons of water from the Tuolumne River to the Bay Area commercial interests.

In the interest of California wildlife and conservation, I truly believe this action is an outdated response to our water needs. We have seen water needs in other urban centers such as Los Angeles and Seattle put through with recycling and conservation. I believe that San Francisco and the Bay Area should be a leader in these issues, and am disappointed to learn of our government’s current plans. We need a long term, sustainable solution to our growing water demands, and the solution must be found by sound science, research and projections of our own water demand. Please reevaluate the environmental and economic consequences of your decision. Thank you for your time.

Michelle Kim
To Whom It May Concern,

I believe that the plan to divert significant additional flows from the Tuolumne River does not provide adequate consideration of the unique recreational benefits of this Wild and Scenic river, nor to the need to keep its flow is reserve for future contingency in the event of short- or long-term reduction in Sierra snow pack. Please emphasize conservation over additional diversions.

Regards,

Carl King

2351 Santa Catalina Street
Palo Alto CA 94303
Draft PEIR: SF needs to conserve first!

ken king <exeditor2003@yahoo.com>  Mon, Oct 15, 2007 at 11:27 AM
To: wsp.peir.comments@gmail.com
Cc: bill.young@sierracclub.org

Dear Paul Maltzer,

As a Californian born and raised here, I want to weigh in and say that conserving our natural resources, limited thought they might be, is vastly more important than engineering short term solutions that are costly and environmentally destructive. Therefore it is absolutely imperative that San Francisco pursue sustainable alternatives to diverting more water from the Tuolumne River.

I have read the draft and the arguments pro and con and know that you don't need to have them recited back, but I hope that you and your agency will go the extra distance to think creatively and economically, not to mention environmentally, in imagining the impact of your decision fifty and even one hundred years from now.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments,

Kenneth King
633 Terrace Avenue
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
650 726 4288

Need a vacation? Get great deals to amazing places on Yahoo! Travel.
Re: Comment period extended for DRAFT PEIR for SFPUC's Water System Improvement Program

John Howard Kramer <johnhkramer@gmail.com>

To: Diana Sokolove <wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com>

Thu, Oct 11, 2007 at 10:14 PM

How convenient of you to provide this method of submitting a comment to the SFPUC. My comment is that this is a blatant water grab that has severe consequences for Tuolumne County, the rafting industry and ranchers. Have you adequately addressed and balanced the environmental impacts that will result from the economic stagnation brought about by this export of the water from the foothills? How can the fisheries survive? How can we continue to meet downstream commitments for healthy flows low in fall? The water you propose to take is put to maximum beneficial use now. Why have you chosen a preferred alternative that is sure to encumber the project in legal wrangling, slowing the implementation of vitally needed seismic retrofits of the water delivery system?

John H. Kramer, PhD
4253 Red Hill Rd Box 400
Vallejo, CA 95725
johnhkramer@gmail.com

On 10/8/07, Diana Sokolove <wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com> wrote:

ATTENTION!

THE COMMENT PERIOD FOR THE DRAFT PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT ON THE SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION'S WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM HAS BEEN EXTENDED.

WRITTEN COMMENTS MAY BE SUBMITTED TO THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT UNTIL:

5:00 P.M. ON OCTOBER 15, 2007.

AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION AND HEARING TO RECEIVE THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S AND THE PUBLIC'S COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT WILL BE HELD ON

OCTOBER 11, 2007 AT 1:30 PM OR LATER.

THE HEARING WILL BE HELD AT SAN FRANCISCO CITY HALL IN ROOM 400, 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS PROVIDED BELOW.

A Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (Draft PEIR) has been prepared by the City and County of San Francisco Planning Department in connection with this program. A summary presentation of the contents of the Draft PEIR is available online, and the complete document can be viewed at the following locations:

Online at:
www.sfgov.org/site/planning/nea  (or by linking to this site from http://PEIR.sfwater.org)

In print at:
San Francisco Planning Department, 1660 Mission Street, 1st Floor, Planning Information Counter (copy of Draft PEIR only is available).

By appointment at the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission by calling 1-866-231-1337 or e-mailing PEIRappointments@sfwater.org (copy of Draft PEIR and associated reference materials are available).

Any of the libraries listed at the end of this e-mail (copy of Draft PEIR and key reference materials are available).

You may submit comments to the Planning Department using any of the following means:

Provide oral or written comments at any of the five public hearings

Mail written comments to the San Francisco Planning Department,
Attention: Environmental Review Officer, WSIP PEIR, 1660 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103

E-mail written comments to wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com;

The San Francisco Planning Department will prepare written responses to comments received during the public review period in a Comments and Responses document. If you have any questions about the environmental review of the WSIP, please leave a message for the Planning Department at:

1-866-231-1337.

LIBRARIES WHERE YOU CAN VIEW THE DRAFT PEIR:

Alameda County:
Alameda County/City of Fremont Library: 2400 Stevenson Boulevard, Fremont
San Francisco County:
San Francisco Main Library: 100 Larkin Street, San Francisco
San Joaquin County:
Stockton - San Joaquin County Public Library: 605 North El Dorado Street, Stockton
San Mateo County:
City of San Mateo Main Library: 55 West 3rd Avenue, San Mateo
Santa Clara County:
San Jose - Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Library: 150 East San Fernando, San Jose
Stanislaus County:
Modesto Library: 1500 1 Street, Modesto
Tuolumne County:
Tuolumne County Library: 480 Greenley Road, Sonora

If you would like to be removed from this distribution list, please respond with UNSUBSCRIBE in the subject line.
Thank you for participating in tonight’s public hearing on the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s proposed Water System Improvement Program (WSIP). This is also an opportunity for you to submit written comments on the Draft PEIR for the proposed WSIP.

Written comments will be accepted through close of business Monday, October 1, 2007. Written comments may be submitted in one of three ways:

1. Leave your written comments in the designated “Comment Box” tonight. These cards are provided for your convenience.

2. Mail your comments by October 1, 2007 to the San Francisco Planning Department, Attention: Paul Malzer, Environmental Review Officer, WSIP PEIR, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103

3. E-mail written comments to wsp.peir.comments@no.com

CONTACT INFORMATION

Name: Alice Lee, PhD
Affiliation: —
Address: 745 Muelo Ave. #4
City State Zip: Menlo Park, CA 94025

Phone or E-mail:

WRITTEN COMMENTS: Write clearly and continue on back. Use multiple sheets if needed.

SEE ATTACHED.

Written comments:

The focus of this report should be on seismic safety considerations. Seismic safety upgrades need to be undertaken ASAP.

The evidence for taking an additional 25 million gallons of water per day is not warranted by the analysis presented. The current recommendations have many negative long-term environmental impacts.

Statistical time-series analyses used to forecast future needs can be simple or nuanced. The data analysis does not sufficiently take into consideration relatively recent developments in water conservation and recycling. Also, the impact of global warming, which affects the annual snow pack which feeds our Sierra rivers and streams, is absent.

It appears that the equivalent of a butter knife, rather than a scalpel, has been used in the projections prepared. The planners should require more sophisticated data analyses, on which to base recommendations.
In 2002 I backpacked the Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne from White Wolf to Tuolumne Meadows. Three days and two nights. We did it too fast. I have not been back, but wish I would. That canyon --- !!!
Every year thousands go up there and have such a rich experience.
I have been to Kibbe Lake three times, and to Cherry Lake a few more than that. I may go this year to hike around Lake Eleanor.
I know you plan to divert below the dams below Hetch Hetchy and Cherry Lake Reservoir. I think Cherry Lake area is dramatically underdeveloped!
Sierra Club might not like to hear that, but it is greatly under-utilized for recreation. You might think of developing more of Cherry Lake, and drawing less water from it and the Tuolumne River.

Yosemite is marvelous, but it is too overused. Cherry could be a mecca of vacationers who want the boat, fish, hike, relax experience. It needs trails, and a lodge for visitors, and more camping areas north of the only camping area on the lake. One friend of mine took a kayak across the lake one year to camp with a group on the far shore and hike up the canyon.

I urge you to use conservation techniques for conserving water in the city of San Francisco. Also, let me throw in a wild card, I urge you to vote for a tax on wealth in the U.S. A. This is the fairest, quickest method to establish aggregate demand (purchasing power) and keep our economy going. Fair distribution of wealth will do much to decrease the drain on our resources. Today, while riding my bike around Lake Chabot in San Leandro I thought of a plan for a general strike once a month, 12 times a year, with the purpose of studying our community. We would stop forging ahead in the wrong direction so quickly, develop informed democratic programs, distribute income and wealth more equitably, and have more inclination to travel to Hetch Hetchy and beyond. What wilderness will do for one’s imagination. Send me a note, I’ll send you an essay on A Wealth Tax to Eliminate Poverty. (See Milken Institute Review, 3rd Quarter, 2003, article by professor Edward Wolff, Where Has All the Money Gone?)

Ben Leet
14377 Bancroft Ave. #18
San Leandro, CA 94578
benleet@earthlink.net
please do not divert water for SFPUC

Kingman Lim <kingmanl@fastmail.fm>
To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com
Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Please do not allow any additional water to be diverted from the Hetch Hetchy system! I support water conservation. The water in Tuolumne should stay there for the trees, animals, and plants that rely on them for survival. Thank you.

Kingman Lim
2147 Parker St
Berkeley, CA 94704

kingmanl@fastmail.fm
Dear Mr. Maltzer,

Protecting our rivers in California is a high priority. The Tuolumne River is threatened by the proposed increase in water diversion. The riparian habitat and pure water needed by wildlife and people can best be protected by increasing conservation efforts. There are many concerned environmentalists who want to work with you to find a win win solution to our shared concerns about water supply in this state.

One in particular, Peter Drekmeier, past founder of Bay Area Action (now Acterra) is one person who is thoughtful and willing to give you time, effort and assistance to bring about a conservation plan that will save the river, and bring ample water supply to our communities. I hope you will work cooperatively with Mr. Drekmeier and his associates to the benefit of the California riparian habitat, and cities and town that rely on an adequate water supply.

Thank you,

Judith LoVuo-Bhushan
3838 Mumford Place
Palo Alto, CA. 94306
415-412-3011

I support alternatives that protect the Tuolumne from any new diversions. More water conservation, efficiency, and recycling are the intelligent and ethical ways to protect the Tuolumne and provide sustainable water for San Francisco and anyone to whom we sell water. Stop the sprawl, conserve, use intelligent means to retain local rainwater, and we and the East Bay would have enough water.

We can do much, much better than destroy the Tuolumne.

Janet Lowry
1859 9th Ave.
San Francisco, Calif. 94122

-------------

See what's new at AOL and Make AOL Your Homepage.
I am in full support of saving our water by replacing lawns with native plants that require significantly less water and no chemical fertilizers. Water recycling should be mandatory for both residential, business and agricultural purposes. In this time of climate change we need sustainable plans for water usage—not dams. We should bethinking outside the box and replacing lawns with low or no water use landscaping.
Against Increasing Flows on the Tuolumne River

Erik Lundberg <erik@addrv.com>
To: wisp.peir.comments@gmail.com

Wed, Sep 19, 2007 at 9:52 PM

I strongly oppose increasing flows on the Tuolumne River. It is a fragile ecosystem and I enjoy taking my children up there for fly fish. Please do not destroy this wonderful river by pumping up the flows. There are other alternatives.

01

Spare the Tuolumne!

Tyana Maddock <tmaddock@friendsotheriver.org>
To: wisp.peir.comments@gmail.com

Tue, Sep 18, 2007 at 1:17 PM

Please do not further damage the Tuolumne by diverting an additional 25 million gallons per day! We love and depend on this river. Thank you for your consideration.

Tyana Maddock
1133 Normal Ave.
Chico, CA 95928

"If there is magic on this planet, it is contained in water." - Loren Eiseley
I am writing today to voice my strong opposition to the proposed water development plan, which is projected to withdraw 25 million gallons of water from the Tuolumne River. I urge you to act as an example in water conservation, as we are facing an existential environmental crisis, and it is time that we create innovative ways to contribute to a sustainable solution rather than perpetuate the problem.

Sincerely,

James H. Marshall
Michael Martin, Ph.D.
P.O. Box 2216
Mariposa, CA 95338
September 26, 2007

Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer
Water System Improvement Program PEIR
San Francisco Planning Department

Dear Mr. Maltzer:

I am a home owner in Tuolumne County, specifically in the Hetch Hetchy Subdivision, Block 5, Lot 2, Groveland. My home is on the Middle Fork of the Tuolumne River. I am a flyfisherman, as well as a professional fisheries biologist.

Your environmental review of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s plan to consume (divert) more water from the Tuolumne River fails to adequately identify and address all of the potential environmental impacts to the River, specifically how 14% more diversions in the upper Tuolumne River basin with affect critical habitat in the lower Tuolumne River, specifically spring-run Chinook salmon, fall-run Chinook salmon, and Steelhead trout, along with potential impacts to the upper Tuolumne River watershed. These federally recognized “threatened” or “species of concern” - designated populations (ESU) will arguably require more water than less in future years. I urge you to undertake additional studies of the lower Tuolumne River to provide protection and enhancement of these depleted fisheries, before finalizing this document. There should be no more diversions of the Tuolumne River at the expense of the San Joaquin River Delta receiving water environment, period.

Your report shows that the majority of the potential future demand resides outside of San Francisco. I recommend that you let those entities solve their water demand problems by other means. Over ½ of the demand is outdoor water use and is a major cause for the increased demand. Water conservation and efficiency measures, along with recycling, should eliminate the need for additional future water supplies. There is uncertainty regarding future increases in demand, as several demand factors in the analysis such as projected growth, may have major challenges or be reduced because of economic difficulties. As an owner in the upper river watershed, and I am concerned that increased water diversions will reduce my property values, as well as my own, as well as tourists, recreational opportunities. I am also concerned with the potential effects of atmospheric shifts, such as global warming, and how that will affect (reduce) water supply. In California, history has demonstrated how during critical water short years, full wet weather deliveries continue for municipal and agricultural users, while natural resources take the short end of the deal and brunt of the injuries and damages. Your feasibility studies must include an analysis of the effects of drought and water shortage, and how

San Francisco proposes substitute water demand (=supply) (i.e., reduced diversion from the Tuolumne River) during those critical times. It is very clear that reduced water flows in the San Joaquin River basin has resulted in seriously depressed recruitment of anadromous Salmonid populations in the basin rivers.

I support all of the alternatives identified in your draft document that protects the Tuolumne River from new diversions in future years. Requiring more water conservation, efficiency, and recycling at the demand source is the best way to lessen impacts to the Tuolumne River while promoting a sustainable water solution for the San Francisco Bay Area. This will also afford more protection to the upper Tuolumne River watershed fisheries and recreational usage. The San Francisco water scheme and power generation operations have degraded the integrity of the downstream Tuolumne River watershed. Further diversions will certainly maintain that degradation, and greatly limit opportunities for restoration of those resources that depend upon the river. Your EIR lacks sufficient description of the potential impacts upon the lower Tuolumne River, especially with respect to anadromous fish populations, Chinook salmon and Steelhead trout. It also fails to address consistency with on-going State and Federal resource agency activities, studies, and actions that may be compromised by additional water diversions in the upper Tuolumne River. I recommend that additional feasibility studies and mitigation evaluation (and implementation where necessary) be included in your EIR analyses, prior to adoption of the proposed water plan.

Only by reducing diversion and off-stream uses of water can we protect the anadromous fishes of the lower Tuolumne River and other San Joaquin River reaches, along with protecting the existing recreational fisheries of the upper Tuolumne River Watershed.

Sincerely,

Michael Martin, Ph.D.
C_MartiS
RECEIVED
CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.
SEP 20 2007
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

AUGUST 18, 2007

DEAR COMMISSIONER BELLIS:

WHEN I FIRST HEARD THAT PEOPLE
WANTED TO TAKE TWIN RIVER WATER
FROM THE TWINME RIVER TO USE FOR THEIR
LAWNS I WAS ASTONISHED I CANNOT BELIEVE
THAT YOU AND OTHERS ARE ACTUALLY
CONSIDERING TO TAKE TWIN RIVER WATER.
WHY GIVE LIDWELL DRINKING WATER
WHEN WE ALREADY HAVE WATER
SHRINKAGES AND CONTINUE TO HAVE WATER
ISSUES? WHY DON'T WE TRY TO
FIND BETTER SOLUTIONS FOR THIS WATER
ISSUE. RECYCLING WATER IS A FIRST WAY
TO SAVE THIS PROBLEM. LAWNS WILL STILL
BE WATERED AND THE TWINME RIVER
CAN STILL STAY IN A NATURAL STATE.
WE NEED TO LOOK IN THE FUTURE
WE NEED TO MAKE SURE WE
KEEP THIS RIVER AS A WATER
SOURCE.

Sincerely,
CASA MARTINEZ

Paul Mulkey, Environmental Review Office
San Francisco Planning Dept.
1650 Mission St, Ste. 400
San Francisco, CA, 94103

RECEIVED
OCT 01 2007
CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.

Paul Mulkey, Environmental Review Office
San Francisco Planning Dept.
1650 Mission St, Ste. 400
San Francisco, CA, 94103

Dear Sir,

I am writing to you about the upcoming review
of the Hetch-Hetchy water system. Current operations are
already a heavy burden on the Tuolumne River system. It
would be unsensical to consider any further withdrawals
from the river without first implementing all possible
conservation measures which should include, waterless urinals
in all public buildings, a collection system for rain off falling
on all impervious, non-paved surfaces, and a system that rewards
residents and businesses for conserving more than the mean usage.

Our rivers are treasures that are worth far more than
their "usable" water. California's rivers are already heavily
degraded by the projects of the 20th Century. San Francisco
has a reputation as one of the more environmentally conscious
metropolitanities. It would be a shame to tarnish that by
further degradation of the Tuolumne.

Please enter this letter into the official comments.

Sincerely,
Jonathan McClelland
3710 Hill Rd.
El Dorado, CA 95620

Sincerely,
Ginnette McClelland
Santa Rosa, CA 95401
November 7, 2007
Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Maltzer,

The environmental review performed by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to take more water from the Tuolumne River does not identify and address the environmental impacts of the river. There is a lack of information regarding the impacts of taking more water from the Tuolumne River. A lack of adequate baseline data of the Upper Tuolumne River does not provide an accurate picture of the outcomes of dewatering the Tuolumne. A new study was begun in 2006, however it was not completed in time to be part of the review process. Please take additional studies before finalizing this document.

Instead of taking water from the Tuolumne, I encourage you to take the alternatives in your draft document that protect the Tuolumne River from new diversions. These include more water conservation and water recycling. San Francisco is the leader in environmental action and your plan should parallel this trend. 60% of the Tuolumne River is already diverted for urban and rural uses and increasing diversion will do further harm to the river. Requiring more water conservation, efficiency, and recycling is the best way to lessen impacts on the Tuolumne River while promoting a sustainable water plan for the Bay Area.

Please protect this national treasure and make sure adequate water flow to the "T" keeps flowing.

Sincerely,

Karl McCollom
4670 Indian Peak Rd.
Mariposa, CA 95338

---

San Francisco Planning Department
Draft Program Environmental Impact Report on the SFPUC's Proposed Water System Improvement Program
Sonora, CA, September 5, 2007

Thank you for participating in tonight’s public hearing on the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's proposed Water System Improvement Program (WSIP). This is also an opportunity for you to submit written comments on the Draft PEIR for the proposed WSIP.

Written comments will be accepted through close of business on Monday, October 1, 2007. Written comments may be submitted in one of three ways:

1. Leave your written comments in the designated “Comment Box” tonight. These cards are provided for your convenience.
2. Mail your comments by October 1, 2007 to the San Francisco Planning Department, Attention: Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer, WSIP PEIR, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103.
3. E-mail written comments to wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com

CONTACT INFORMATION
Name: Mike McConnell
Affiliation: Tuolumne County Resident
Address: 21436 Green Oaks Ct.
City, State, Zip: Sonora CA 95370
Phone or E-mail: Filter McConnell.com

WRITTEN COMMENTS: Write clearly and continue on back. Use multiple sheets if needed.

I am a 33 year resident of Tuolumne County and I'm a licensed General Engineering Contractor. The trend of growth and waste must be curbed. Taking more water from the Tuolumne is not the solution. It's time to conserve and use what you have.
Dear Paul,

Although population problems pressures are the underlying cause of most environmental degradation, everything possible must be done to preserve the quantity and quality of our rivers.

We hope you will do everything possible to preserve the integrity of the Potomac River.

Thank you,

Keith H. McFarland
Thank you for participating in tonight's public hearing on the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's proposed Water System Improvement Program (WSIP). This is also an opportunity for you to submit written comments on the Draft PEIR for the proposed WSIP.

Written comments will be accepted through close of business on Monday, October 1, 2007. Written comments may be submitted in one of three ways:

1. Leave your written comments in the designated "Comment Box" tonight. These cards are provided for your convenience.
2. Mail your comments by October 1, 2007 to the San Francisco Planning Department, Attention: Paul Maltese, Environmental Review Officer, WSIP PEIR, 1850 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103.
3. E-mail written comments to wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com

CONTACT INFORMATION
Name: Robert Means
Affiliation:
Address: 1421 Yellowstone Ave.
City, State, Zip: Milwaukee, WI 53203
Phone or E-mail: rob.m means@electric-bikes.com

Written comments:

As with our need to address carbon emissions, we can best address our water needs through conservation. See "The 11th Hour" for reasons why so we must act boldly to preserve our environment.

My husband and I have spent a great deal of time hiking, rafting and kayaking in and along the Tuolumne River (the "T"). We have introduced our children to this miraculous river - both in the Yosemite back country, the Tuolumne Meadows, and at sites we outside park boundaries.

(Love)
This river is vital to a healthy ecosystem in Northern California.

The impact of diverting extra water from this river on the surrounding ecosystem far outweighs the benefit that may be derived from the additional water to bay area residents.

The bay area water districts should be a model of conservation, grey water reuse, and recycling methods.

We have taught and will continue to teach our children how to reuse, recycle, and conserve. We want our utilities commission to be equally dedicated to preserving and wisely using our natural resources.
Dear Paul Matty,

I am strongly opposed to taking more water from the Tuolumne River. Industries will use all the water given to them, creating a never-ending demand for more water. Directed by humanity, those same resources can be encouraged to pursue water-saving devices.

California's rivers need water to maintain natural environments. It is time to make a sustainable plan, instead of always trying to hole more water we already have.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Vera Menz

C_Merlo

20 Sept 2007

I came to the Planning Commission meeting today to address the issue of taking even more water from the Tuolumne River. Since the item was moved on the agenda from 1:30 until 5:00, I am not able to speak.

Please consider this issue very carefully. 60% of the river's water is already being diverted. This leaves only 40% for what is referred to as "Public Water." There is an amazing wilderness below the Hetch Hetchy Dam and the San Joaquin River. You need to be at least as concerned about that wilderness as you are for future construction in the Bay Area. We as citizens can, and should, do more, too much more, to use that 60% of the river's water more efficiently.

Let the wilderness keep its 40%!

RECEIVED
SEP 20 2007
CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Stephen Merlo
701 Beach St.
S.F. CA 94111
415-554-9660
Dear Mr. Maltzer:

Your environmental review of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's plan to take more water from the Tuolumne River fails to adequately identify and address all of the environmental impacts to the River. I urge you to undertake additional studies before finalizing this document.

I believe we need to implement a mandatory landscaping policy that requires the installation of only native vegetation and drip irrigation technology to all new commercial projects going forward and provide tax credits for existing commercial operations to change over to native vegetation. Google Inc. recently installed native plants in their corporate headquarters, so their project would provide a good case study for others to learn and model after.

Here are the benefits of Native Plants:
- Drought resistant
- Deer and bug resistant
- Disease resistant
- Requires less energy inputs
- Lower maintenance costs than traditional non-native landscaping

And here are some reasons why we cannot continue business as usual:
- Decreasing snow pack is predicted for the future due to global warming, which amounts to less water for drinking and irrigation for all Californians
- The state had its lowest water supplies this past year/winter
- The drought in Southern California will further exacerbate the potential water crises by diverting more water from the Sierra’s.

Some ideas to ponder….

When people deal with reality
- We have many options and choices to work with
- We have time to be proactive
- We can implement conservation and efficiency
- We have economic stability

When reality deals with people
- We have little or no options/choices
- There will be hard, difficult, sacrifices, shortages and severe economic consequences/hardships
- We have no time to be proactive; we can only be reactive

I support the alternatives identified in your draft document that protect the Tuolumne River from new diversions. Requiring more water conservation, efficiency, and recycling is the best way to lessen impacts on the Tuolumne River while promoting a sustainable water plan for the Bay Area.

Only by ensuring that healthy amounts of water continue to flow into the Tuolumne River can we protect this most irreplaceable natural treasure.

Sincerely,

Ivo Mijac
1611 Washington Street, #2
San Francisco, CA 94109-3111
415.567.8801
keep the water in the Tuolumne River

Eric Millette <eric@ericmillette.com>
Mon, Oct 1, 2007 at 12:43 PM
To: wisp.peir.comments@gmail.com

To: Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer Water System Improvement Program PEIR San Francisco Planning Department

Dear Mr. Maltzer:

Please don’t take any more water out of our Sierra Rivers!

Let’s get more conservation measures in place instead!

Thank you,

Eric Millette
656 2nd Ave
San Francisco, CA 94118

Tuolumne River

Bob Mindelzun <mindelzu@stanford.edu>
Sun, Sep 23, 2007 at 2:02 PM
To: wisp.peir.comments@gmail.com

Paul Maltzer
Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department

Dear Sir:

Like so many of my fellow citizens, I am extremely concerned about the SFPUC proposal to divert the 25 million gallons of water per day from the Tuolumne River.

Rather than diversion, this issue needs conservation and use of maximal efficiency for solution.

I urge you to support a reduced diversion from this Wild and Scenic River, a California Natural Treasure.

Thank you for your attention.

Professor Robert E. Mindelzun MD
Stanford University


**Tuolumne River**

Bob Mindelzu <mindelzu@stanford.edu>  
To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com  
Thu, Sep 20, 2007 at 6:11 PM

from Naomi Mindelzu:

I am extremely concerned about the SFPUC proposal to divert the additional 25 million gallons of water per day from the Tuolumne River, and urge you to re-evaluate the SFPUC projections, and instead adopt a policy of reducing diversions from the river over time. Please do not ignore conservation and efficiency measures in regard to this issue.

Thank you.

---

**Comments on WSIP PEIR**

Peter Neal <pneal1@mindspring.com>  
Reply-To: pneal1@mindspring.com  
To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com  
Fri, Sep 21, 2007 at 1:20 PM

Dear Mr. Paul Maltzer,

I wholeheartedly support the seismic upgrades and water system delivery improvements in the WSIP. These are necessary and urgent projects that need to be addressed without delay.

However, I am very opposed to the plan to divert more of the Tuolumne River, and I do not believe the report adequately addresses the impact of this action. Nor have water conservation measures been properly evaluated and factored in to the plan to divert more Tuolumne water. This beautiful wild river and its ecosystem should not be sacrificed to support water-hungry lawns, golf courses, and commercial landscaping. In fact, it seems incongruous and illogical to even include this recommendation in the WSIP. It is a conservation issue, not an infrastructure issue.

I strongly suggest that you decouple the Toulumne diversion plan from the rest of the WSIP. To include it is akin to throwing out the baby with the bath water.

Peter Neal  
3880 El Centro  
Palo Alto, CA 94306
Thank you for participating in tonight's public hearing on the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's proposed Water System Improvement Program (WSIP). This is also an opportunity for you to submit written comments on the Draft PEIR for the proposed WSIP.

Written comments will be accepted through close of business on Monday, October 1, 2007. Written comments may be submitted in one of three ways:

1. Leave your written comments in the designated “Comment Box” tonight. These cards are provided for your convenience.

2. Mail your comments by October 1, 2007 to the San Francisco Planning Department, Attention: Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer, WSIP PEIR, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103

3. E-mail written comments to wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com

CONTACT INFORMATION
Name: Enna R. Nore
Affiliation: Tuolumne River Trust
Address: 700 Mission St.
City, State, Zip: Milpitas, CA 95035
Phone or E-mail:

WRITTEN COMMENTS: Write clearly and continue on back. Use multiple sheets if needed:

Thank you for providing this public hearing. As a Milpitas resident and consumer of Tuolumne River water I appreciate the need to update the system. As a hiker in the Sierra I also appreciate wild, natural places. I hope the Tuolumne River will be kept in a healthy condition that will benefit fish, other wildlife ++
Tuolumne River water usage

Your environmental review of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's plan to take more water from the Tuolumne River does not adequately identify and address all of the environmental impacts to the River. I urge you to undertake additional studies of the Tuolumne River before finalizing this document.

I support the alternatives identified in your draft document that protect the Tuolumne River from new diversions.

Requiring more water conservation, efficiency, and recycling is the best way to lessen impacts to the Tuolumne River while promoting a sustainable water solution for the San Francisco Bay Area.

The public should have been steered down the conservation/sustainable use road long before this. Personally, I think that agribusiness wastes a whole lot more water than the cities do; however, I think the usage by the city requires more energy resources to transport it to the tap, heat it for use, and then clean it before disposal. Therefore the issue must be addressed on two fronts, personal/company use and agribusiness use.

In this day and age of technology, there are several major water savers that have not been implemented in society. Those along with cutting out the pork waste in agribusiness would go a long way towards easing up the burden on our limited water resources so that in the future, the only options left for water management are not negative ones.

In the mean time, by ensuring that healthy amounts of water continue to flow into the Tuolumne River can we protect this irreplaceable natural wonder.

Please move water conservation to the top of the priority list where it should be!

Sincerely,

William W. Noren
37878 2nd Street
Fremont, CA 94536
510-744-0884
San Francisco Planning Department
Draft Program Environmental Impact Report on the
SFPPUC's Proposed Water System Improvement Program
Palo Alto, CA, September 19, 2007

Thank you for participating in tonight's public hearing on the Draft Program
Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's
proposed Water System Improvement Program (WSIP). This is also an opportunity for you to submit written comments on the Draft PEIR for the proposed WSIP.

Written comments will be accepted through close of business on Monday, October 1, 2007. Written comments may be submitted in one of three ways:

1. Leave your written comments in the designated "Comment Box" tonight. These cards are provided for your convenience.


3. Email written comments to wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com

CONTACT INFORMATION
Name: KAY O'NEIL
Affiliation: CITIZEN - WATER USER
Address: 485 NINTH AVE
City, State, Zip: MENLO PARK, CA 94025
Phone or Email: KAYO'NEIL@MINOSPRING.COM

WRITTEN COMMENTS: Write clearly and continue on back. Use multiple sheets if needed.

DO NOT TAKE PRECIOUS WATER FROM OUR RIVERS. THIS IS A SHORT SIGHTED SOLUTION TO A MUCH LARGER PROBLEM. AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL USE SHOULD BE REVISED AND NOT SUBSIDIZED. LOOK AT THE MARKET, NOT JUST THE DEMAND. ENFORCE CONSERVATION VALUE OUR WATER RESOURCES.
Dear Mr. Maltzer:

I write as a concerned citizen as it relates to the Water Improvement Program (WIP) Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR). While the seismic upgrades are critical to maintaining the water delivery infrastructure, I feel that the plan to divert additional water from the Tuolumne River is premature. Given this clear distinction in the plan between the seismic upgrades and the amount of water being distributed, it would be ideal to have the WIP split out in a way which will provide an opportunity to approve each separately. This will allow for the seismic upgrades to commence as soon as possible, while the environment impacts of additional diversions to meet demand can be researched further.

Regarding the demand estimates and the plan to divert additional water from the Tuolumne, the forecast seems to pay little attention to conservation measures as well as affects of price changes on demand. It’s surprising that only 4% of the demand is expected to be met with conservation measures in light of the fact that an increase in consumer use is expected, with outdoor use contributing 60% of the increase. This is counter to the trend in other metropolitan areas, as well as the trend in the energy market to conserve. I encourage the SFPUC to challenge their constituency to invest in conservation and recycling programs, similar to the drive in the energy market. Why can’t water supply and demand be managed in a similar way? Rebates, education programs, scaled water rates that discourage waste, water credit trading, tax credits, recycling programs etc., can all be effective tools to meet demand, and should be the focus of SFPUC investment, not the diversion of more water from an already exploited resource. In addition to unconvincing demand projections, there seems to be little known about the affects of additional diversions on the Tuolumne River drainage ecosystem. A comprehensive study should be required before additional diversions are approved.

I encourage the SFPUC to protect and restore our natural resources by exploring other options for meeting future water demand, rather than increasing diversions on the Tuolumne River.

Sincerely,

Doug Parkes
1036 High St
Palo Alto, CA 94301
C_Poulton

Diana Sokolove <wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com>

**Water Conservation and the Tuolumne River**

jcpoulton@comcast.net <jcpoulton@comcast.net>  
To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com  
Wed, Sep 26, 2007 at 12:34 PM

Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer  
San Francisco Planning Department  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400

Dear Mr Maltzer:

I believe that your environmental review of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s plan to take more water from the Tuolumne River is flawed. It appears that all you want is more water, not taking into question the impact on the river or the people that live on or near its banks. There appears to be no conservation in your plans. I urge you to take time for additional studies before implementing or finalizing this document.

I support the alternatives identified in your draft document that protect the Tuolumne River from future diversions. We need more consideration of ways to better and more efficiently use the water we have now.

Sincerely,

J. C. Poulton  
2010 Palmer Drive  
Pleasanton, CA 94568

---

C_Raffa

"Paul Raffaele"  
<PaulRaffaele@synnex.com>  
10/01/2007 04:12 PM  
To: paul.maltzer@sfgov.org  
cc:  
Subject: FW: Save the Tuolumne

Hello Bill,

Please see below message.

Thanks,

Paul

From: Paul Raffaele  
Sent: Monday, October 01, 2007 10:39 AM  
To: paul.maltzer@sfgov.org  
Subject: FW: Save the Tuolumne

Paul,

These points below are well outlined and well founded. Please do not push to divert any more water from the "T". Conservation is the way to go.

Thanks,

Paul Raffaele  
3937 Braeburn Ct.  
San Jose, CA 95130.

*******************************************************************************

Don't Let San Francisco Suck The Wild Tuolumne Dry!

Write a letter today to encourage the SFPUC to drop its proposal to divert more water from the Tuolumne and focus on water use efficiency and recycling to meet future water needs.

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) is pushing a "Water Improvement System Program" that proposes to divert an additional 25 million gallons of water daily from the Tuolumne Wild & Scenic River. San Francisco already diverts 60 percent of the river’s water. The SFPUC “Improvement Program” could significantly reduce flows in the Tuolumne, which is one of the most popular whitewater and wild trout rivers in California. The SFPUC is using a flawed analysis that inflates future water needs, while underestimating how future needs could be met by increased water use efficiency and water recycling.

Please read the Key Points below, cut and past what you wish, add your own words, and send your letter to:

Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer
C_Raffa

Water System Improvement Program PEIR
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103
paul.miller@sfgov.org
Fax 558-6409

Key Points

Background
- From its headwaters in Yosemite National Park, the Tuolumne River cascades 162 miles before joining the San Joaquin River and flowing into the San Francisco Bay-Delta.
- The Tuolumne River supports a diverse biological community, including migratory waterfowl, raptors (including peregrine falcons and bald eagles), mule deer, black bears, foothill yellow-legged frogs, Sierra Nevada red fox, rainbow trout, steelhead and Chinook salmon.
- As the largest of three major tributaries to the San Joaquin River, the Tuolumne River contributes much-needed freshwater to the San Francisco Bay-Delta.
- The Tuolumne River offers unparalleled outdoor recreation opportunities, hosting thousands of hikers, whitewater boaters, anglers, and family campers each year.
- The Tuolumne was designated a Wild and Scenic River in 1984.

The Threat
- In total, about 60% of the Tuolumne River is already diverted for urban and rural uses, and increasing diversion will do further harm to the River.
- As part of its Water System Improvement Program (WSIP), the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) has proposed diverting an additional 25 million gallons of water per day from the Tuolumne River.
- The SFPUC already diverts one-third of the Tuolumne River as it flows through Yosemite National Park.
- Outdoor water use alone is driving 50% of the anticipated increase in water demand.

Inadequate Studies/Flawed Analysis
- The Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) used flawed modeling to determine the anticipated increase in water demand, thus inflating projected future needs.
- In contrast to other metropolitan areas that have managed to reduce water demand in the face of growth, the anticipated 14% increase in demand projected by the SFPUC is large and out of step for the Bay Area.
- The PEIR fails to properly identify and address all of the impacts of taking more water from the Tuolumne River. This failure largely stems from the lack of an adequate baseline study of the Upper Tuolumne River; a comprehensive study has not been conducted in over 15 years. A new study was initiated in 2006, but will not be completed in time to inform the environmental review process.
- The PEIR does not take into consideration the impact of climate change on precipitation in the Tuolumne River watershed. The State of California predicts that global warming could reduce the Sierra snowpack by 5% by 2030 and as much as 33% by 2060.

Conservation, Efficiency and Recycling
- Water conservation and efficiency measures are the cheapest, easiest, and least destructive ways to meet demand and extend supply.
- The SFPUC's "preferred alternative" ignores conservation, efficiency, and recycling measures that their own studies found could eliminate the need to divert more water from the Tuolumne by at least 74%.
- Per capita water use is projected to increase for wholesale customers, indicating they lack effective conservation programs.
- When it comes to water conservation, the Bay Area lags far behind other metropolitan areas such as Seattle and Los Angeles that are reducing water consumption even in the face of growth. As a region known for a strong environmental ethic, the Bay Area should be a leader in water efficiency and conservation.

Other Points
- Decreasing reliance on the Tuolumne is critical not only for protecting the health of the River, but also for preparing for the future uncertainty of the Sierra snowpack as a result of global warming.
- By pursuing a plan to divert additional water from the Tuolumne River, the SFPUC risks delaying their capital program, causing cost overruns and failing to increase the reliability of the water supply.

Recommendations
- The SFPUC should re-evaluate its projections for future water demand and conservation potential in light of flaws and inaccuracies in their studies.
- The SFPUC should conduct a study to determine the maximum technical potential for conservation and efficiency savings within the SFPUC service territory.
- Any additional demand should be met through increased investment in conservation, efficiency, and recycling.
- The SFPUC should adopt a policy of reducing diversions from the Tuolumne River over time.
- A comprehensive watershed study should be completed to adequately assess the environmental impacts of the WSIP.

Learn More
- Visit the Tuolumne River Trust website at http://www.tuolumne.org/
- The Draft EIR is available at www.sfwater.org/sites/planning_index.asp?id=3762 (Scroll down to "Public Utility Commission (PUC) Projects: SF PUC Water System Improvement Program (PEIR)."
- For more information, contact the Tuolumne River Trust at peter@tuolumne.org or (415) 292-3531.
C-Raube

Comment Card

San Francisco Planning Department
Draft Program Environmental Impact Report on the
SFPUC's Proposed Water System Improvement Program
Modesto, CA. September 8, 2007

Thank you for participating in tonight’s public hearing on the Draft Program
Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s
proposed Water System Improvement Program (WSIP). This is also an opportunity for
you to submit written comments on the Draft PEIR for the proposed WSIP.

Written comments will be accepted through close of business on Monday, October 1,
2007. Written comments may be submitted in one of three ways:

1. Leave your written comments in the designated “Comment Box” tonight. These cards are provided for your convenience.

2. Mail your comments by October 1, 2007 to the San Francisco Planning Department, Attention: Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer, WSIP PEIR, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103

3. E-mail written comments to wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com

Contact Information

Name: David Raube
Affiliation: Grape grower
Address: 4455 Roeding Road
City, State, Zip: Carmel, CA 95032
Phone or E-mail:

Written Comments: Write clearly and continue on back. Use multiple sheets if needed.

Without a doubt SF will need more water for a growing diverse population. However, there is a limit to how much can be drawn from the Tuolumne & still have a river. So plans for more water conservation including desalination & reclaiming waste water which is much less expensive. No more river water!
Hello,

My comments are simple:

1. no increase in water removal from the Tuolumne river.

2. increase marketing/public awareness programs to reduce/conserve water use (current programs are insufficient)

3. increase water recycling

4. NO new dams in California - old technology, and there isn’t enough water in the rivers anyway

5. if you’re wanting reliability - it’s time for De-sal

Thank you,

Dr. Richardson
Doctor of Physical Therapy

Matthew J. Richardson, PT, DPT
Saint Francis Memorial Hospital
Center for Sports Medicine
900 Hyde Street
San Francisco, CA 94109
415-353-6400
www.saintfrancismemorial.org
Dear Paul,

I sincerely appreciate you taking the time to understand the possibilities of enough water for everyone be they SF area customers and river users both human and fish. It is a disgrace that San Francisco has rested on it’s laurels of Hetch Hetchy and the Tuolumne and now lags behind the nation in even minimal water conservation. More, more, more is not the answer...we are past that point of simplistic thought in environmental concerns. I urge you to Step Up to a new world of possibility and responsibility.

Background
- From its headwaters in Yosemite National Park, the Tuolumne River cascades 162 miles before joining the San Joaquin River and flowing into the San Francisco Bay-Delta.
- The Tuolumne River supports a diverse biological community, including migratory waterfowl, raptors (including peregrine falcons and bald eagles), mule deer, black bears, foothill yellow-legged frogs, Sierra Nevada red fox, rainbow trout, steelhead and Chinook salmon.
- As the largest of three major tributaries to the San Joaquin River, the Tuolumne River contributes much-needed freshwater to the San Francisco Bay-Delta.
- The Tuolumne River offers unparalleled outdoor recreation opportunities, hosting thousands of hikers, whitewater boaters, anglers, and family campers each year.
- The Tuolumne was designated a Wild and Scenic River in 1984.

The Threat
- In total, about 60% of the Tuolumne River is already diverted for urban and rural uses, and increasing diversion will do further harm to the River.
- As part of its Water System Improvement Program (WSIP), the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) has proposed diverting an additional 25 million gallons of water per day from the Tuolumne River.
- The SFPUC already diverts one-third of the Tuolumne River as it flows through Yosemite National Park.
- Outdoor water use alone is driving 60% of the anticipated increase in water demand.

Inadequate Studies/Flawed Analysis
- The Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) used flawed modeling to determine the anticipated increase in water demand, thus inflating projected future needs.
- In contrast to other metropolitan areas that have managed to reduce water demand in the face of growth, the anticipated 14% increase in demand projected by the SFPUC is large and out of step for the Bay Area.
- The PEIR fails to properly identify and address all of the impacts of taking more water from the Tuolumne River. This failure largely stems from the lack of an adequate baseline study of the Upper Tuolumne River; a comprehensive study has not been conducted in over 15 years. A new study was initiated in 2006, but will not be completed in time to inform the environmental review process.
- The PEIR does not take into consideration the impact of climate change on precipitation in the Tuolumne River watershed. The State of California predicts that global warming could reduce the Sierra snowpack by 5% by 2030 and as much as 33% by 2060.

Conservation, Efficiency and Recycling
- Water conservation and efficiency measures are the cheapest, easiest, and least destructive ways to meet demand and extend supply.
- The SFPUC’s “preferred alternative” ignores conservation, efficiency, and recycling measures that their own studies found could eliminate the need to divert more water from the Tuolumne by at least 74%.
- Per capita water use is projected to increase for wholesale customers, indicating they lack effective conservation programs.
- When it comes to water conservation, the Bay Area lags far behind other metropolitan areas such as Seattle and Los Angeles that are reducing water consumption even in the face of growth. As a region known for a strong environmental ethic, the Bay Area should be a leader in water efficiency and conservation.

Other Points
- Decreasing reliance on the Tuolumne is critical not only for protecting the health of the River, but also for preparing for the future uncertainty of the Sierra snowpack as a result of global warming.
- By pursuing a plan to divert additional water from the Tuolumne River, the SFPUC risks delaying their capital program, causing cost overruns and failing to increase the reliability of the water supply.

Recommendations
- The SFPUC should re-evaluate its projections for future water demand and conservation potential in light of flaws and inaccuracies in their studies.
- The SFPUC should conduct a study to determine the maximum technical potential for conservation and efficiency savings within the SFPUC service territory.
- Any additional demand should be met through increased investment in conservation, efficiency, and recycling.
- The SFPUC should adopt a policy of reducing diversions from the Tuolumne River over time.
- A comprehensive watershed study should be completed to adequately assess the environmental impacts of the WSIP.

Learn More
- Visit the Tuolumne River Trust website at http://www.tuolumne.org/
- The Draft EIR is available at www.sfpuc.org/storpears_index.asp?sys=37672 (Scroll down to “Public Utility Commission (PUC) Projects. SF PUC Water System Improvement Program DPEIR.”)
- For more information, contact the Tuolumne River Trust at peter@tuolumne.org or (415) 292-3531.

I appreciate your support of our environment.

Smiles,
Jim

Playmester: The Creator Network
(no subject)

Trish Rowe <trowe@earthlink.net> Thu, Oct 11, 2007 at 1:36 PM

To: wsppeir.comments@gmail.com

Dear SFPUC,

I was born in San Francisco, raised in San Carlos, educated at UC Davis, and have worked and lived in Tuolumne County since 1976. I lobbied against the New Melones Dam Project not because I do not believe in hydropower, but for all of the ill-fated and unsubstantiated reasons attached to that project. Thousands of people in and around Tuolumne County ache from the loss of an incredible river flow, with accompanying educational, recreational and functional resources. I said then and I will say again, let us look at how we manage water — usage and conservation, lifestyle, appropriate-for-the-environment/climate residential and commercial landscape, and local and statewide community policy addressing these vital-to-our-lives concerns. I wholeheartedly concur with the statement provided you by the California Department of Fish and Game:

"...it is irrefutable that the actions of the SFPUC on the Tuolumne River at Early Intake, Cherry Valley Dam, and Hetch Hetchy, and Lake Eleanor reservoirs influence the water releases from the New Don Pedro Dam. Increased diversion of waters from a river system which currently lacks sufficient flow to support sustainable anadromous fisheries (including Federally Threatened steelhead) should be considered a significant cumulative impact...In this context we believe the WSIP has the potential to cause anadromous fish populations to drop below self-sustaining levels and further reduce the number and restrict range Federal Threatened Central Valley steelhead – thereby requiring a finding of significant effect [CCCR Title 14, section 15065 (a)(1)]. Given the dramatic decline in Tuolumne River salmon adult escapement between 2000 and 2006; we believe that if implemented as proposed, the WSIP would only exacerbate the current decline of anadromous fisheries in the Tuolumne River. Consequently, we respectfully request that the SFPUC use alternative water sources other than the Tuolumne river system or implement water conservation measures to meet drought year demands and 2030 purchase requests..."

Respectfully,

Trish Rowe

---

Save the Tuolumne ...

Ron Schmidt <ronstreehouse@earthlink.net> Tue, Sep 11, 2007 at 3:19 PM

To: wsppeir.comments@gmail.com

Stop the PUC plan to divert an additional 25 million gallons of water per day from the Tuolumne River in the Hetch Hetchy upgrade effort. Such egregious interference with the fragile ecosystem is criminal and will distort whatever vulnerable balance remains. SAVE THE TUOLUMNE

---

Ron Schmidt
515 John Muir Dr., A501
San Francisco, CA 94132
Dear Mr. Maltzer:

It has come to my attention that the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) is pushing a "Water Improvement System Program" that proposes to divert an additional 25 million gallons of water daily from the Tuolumne Wild & Scenic River. San Francisco already diverts 60 percent of the river's water. The SFPUC "Improvement Program" could significantly reduce flows in the Tuolumne, which is one of the most popular whitewater and wild trout rivers in California. The SFPUC is using a flawed analysis that infers future water needs, while underestimating how future needs could be met by increased water-use efficiency and water recycling.

The Tuolumne was designated a Wild and Scenic River in 1984. Surely this plan will severely impact it and the wildlife that depend upon it. The proposal assumes more in keeping with the thinking of the 50's than current times, which look for recycling and water efficiency use to lessen the impact on our free ranging rivers.

I urge you to focus on these last means to provide water to your residents, rather than drawing off more water and threatening this magnificent river. Reclamation and reduced usage are what we are successfully using in our area to meet our water needs, as river flows are needed more and more to protect habitat and fish populations.

Sincerely,

Judy Schriebman

Judy Schriebman for LGVSD
415-472-3345
http://www.electjudys.org/

Please Vote on Tues. Nov. 6!
It is an honor to serve the residents of San Francisco as your representative. As a long-time resident of this city, I’ve always been proud of our city’s commitment to sustainability and the environment. I believe it is our responsibility to conserve and wisely use our resources.

Sincerely,

John Simpk
Thank you for participating in tonight's public hearing on the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's proposed Water System Improvement Program (WSIP). This is also an opportunity for you to submit written comments on the Draft PEIR for the proposed WSIP.

Written comments will be accepted through close of business on Monday, October 1, 2007. Written comments may be submitted in one of three ways:

1. Leave your written comments in the designated "Comments Box." These cards are provided for your convenience.

2. Mail your comments by October 1, 2007 to the San Francisco Planning Department, Attention: Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer, WSIP PEIR, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103

3. E-mail written comments to wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com

CONTACT INFORMATION
Name: C. Sloan
Address: 23949 Squaw Creek
City, State, Zip: 23949 Squaw Creek 23949
Phone or E-mail: 209 566 2635, schielc@bluebear.com

WRITTEN COMMENTS: Write clearly and continue on back. Use multiple sheets if needed.

We are totally against giving away our water to any county. We do not have sufficient water for our growing population or for our acres of fruit lands at risk of fire, nor our need to grow. We are going to stand up about this so we can successfully fight!

September 26, 2007

Evan Winslow Smith

Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Maltzer,

I am writing to urge you to address the environmental impacts of diverting water from the Tuolumne River.

As a resident of the Bay Area for over 45 years, I grew up drinking Hetch Hetchy water and I understand both its quality and value. As a youth I saw the Tuolumne River firsthand, by raft and foot, and know it as a raw and wild scenic treasure that would likely suffer irreparable damage from additional water diversion. As a former park ranger in Yosemite National Park, I understand the need for a wise use policy that balances the needs of people and the requirements of healthy ecosystems.

I cannot, in good conscience, allow the Tuolumne River's natural wonders and resources to be lost due to lack of foresight, for my daughter and all generations to come. Enjoying natural places like the Tuolumne River are what we live for, using them wisely is how we protect them. Let's not waste its water on unsustainable and inappropriate uses.

While I support the need for seismic upgrade to Hetch Hetchy Dam, I implore you to further study the potential to the Tuolumne River and commit to water conservation, recycling, and efficient use as the best solution to creating a sustainable water plan for the SF Bay Area.

Sincerely,

Evan Winslow Smith

1625 Ewing Road, Redwood City, California 94062 (650) 359-4590 evanws@earthlink.net
Tuolumne River Water Theft

Mjandpasmith@aol.com <Mjandpasmith@aol.com> Sun, Sep 30, 2007 at 12:52 AM
To: wsp.peir.comments@gmail.com, letters@mercurynews.com, grmjam@goldrush.com, mike.honda@mail.house.gov, senator@boxer.senate.gov, Feinsteinpress@
Cc: Mjandpasmith@aol.com

Cut the waste! Especially, cut the tremendous waste by agribiz that exceeds all other water wastage combined, even as they use a majority of California’s water. Right now the plan is to give them the Tuolumne River, as we’ve done with other rivers in the past and more to come.

We don’t have to shut down the truck farms or orchards. Just stop growing rice and cotton and alfalfa where it should not be grown. Do that by charging farm water rates that are closer to real costs, and not a huge subsidy carried on the backs of industry and California’s householders.

Look, farmers are a tiny minority of Californians and get laughably minute productivity from water they use, compared to business, industrial, and residential users. Start wearing the handful of millionaire farmers from the taxpayers’ teats. They could be encouraged to grow a different crop mix in a less wasteful way and still make their millions. But they won’t do that if we just roll over and give them a bigger share of the water while they waste enough water to wash every CA car and driveway daily.

Please, don’t just pee away the Tuolumne to further enrich the alfalfa barons.

Paul Smith, Los Gatos and Twain Harte

---

See what's new at AOL.com and Make AOL Your Homepage.

Tuolumne River

Cindy Spring <spring5@mindspring.com> Tue, Sep 25, 2007 at 12:00 PM
To: wsp.peir.comments@gmail.com

Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Maltzer,

I urge you to take into account all the environmental factors involved in the proposals regarding the Tuolumne River. My chief concern is the protection of habitat for the fish and other wildlife that depend for their lives on the river.

I believe we have barely begun to learn how conservation measures can be used to provide more water for humans.

Please keep me abreast of the EIRs that pertain to this matter.

Thank you.

Cindy Spring
6886 Pinehaven Rd.
Oakland, CA 94611
Dear Mr. Maltzer,

I am writing to comment on the Draft PEIR for the WSIP. I take no issue with the analysis of the proposed seismic upgrades. But I see no need to bundle into this upgrade program a proposal to increase diversions from the Hetch Hetchy System. And in rushing to tack onto the retrofit an additional diversion, I believe the Environmental Impact Report falls short of what is necessary. I believe the report uses flawed modeling to inflate future water demands and understates the efficacy of conservation. The PUC’s own studies show that conservation measures could easily eliminate three-quarters of the need for any increased diversion. And I believe the discussion of potential impacts of global warming on the Tuolumne’s future flows is inadequate. The discussion defers global warming impacts to a period beyond the purview of the project and shrugs off impacts as being “within the same range that occurs under both the existing and proposed operations and management of the system” – a range which includes of course drought year levels which, spread out over years or decades by global warming, would have devastating impact on fish and wildlife. More study of the upper Tuolumne River is needed before effects can be adequately assessed. Climate change could also cause increased diversions from the Tuolumne to have significant impacts on the health of the Sacramento Delta and San Francisco Bay.

Sincerely,

Peter Steinhart

---

Regarding PEIR of SFPUC Tuolumne River plan

Marc Sugars <tm_sugars@yahoo.com>  
To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com  
Wed, Sep 26, 2007 at 10:59 AM

Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer  
San Francisco Planning Department  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400  
San Francisco, CA 94103

September 26, 2007

Dear Mr. Maltzer:

I am writing you in regards to the environmental review of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's plan to take more water from the Tuolumne River. I urge you to carry out additional studies before finalizing this report so that all of the environmental impacts of this plan are taken into account.

Diverting additional water will have serious impacts on the ecology of the Tuolumne River watershed. More efforts should be focused on exploring more sustainable alternatives mentioned in your report such as water conservation, efficiency, and recycling. These methods have been shown to help reduce water demand in other metropolitan areas. Not only will this help protect this valuable and awe-inspiring watershed but it will also help us decrease our reliance on a water source that may not provide the amount of water it once did due to global warming.

Thank you for your time,

Marc Sugars  
2332 18th Ave.  
San Francisco, CA 94116
Tuolumne River

1 message

Karen Sundback <sundback@sbcglobal.net>  Mon, Oct 1, 2007 at 8:24 AM

To: Paul Maltzer <wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com>

Mr. Maltzer,

The Tuolumne River Diversion Debate is a tough one. Presently this portion of Tuolumne River feeds the Delta. California voters rejected a peripheral canal around the Delta in 1982. Now that Governor Schwarzenegger is taking a different approach from his own blue ribbon water panel and is supporting the peripheral canal, who gets water rights to this portion of the Tuolumne River if the peripheral canal gets the okay?

Many of us would like to save the Tuolumne River. However, with the peripheral canal looming in the background, this becomes a more difficult issue.

Thank you for your consideration.

Karen Sundback

SFPUC’s WSIP DPEIR

new.leaf <new.leaf@earthlink.net>  Thu, Sep 20, 2007 at 1:04 PM

Cc: Barbara Symons <new.leaf@earthlink.net>

Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Dept.
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

September 20, 2007

Paul Maltzer,

I do NOT want the SFPUC to accept the current Draft PEIR for SFPUC’s Proposed Water System Improvement Program. I was at the Public Hearing on this issue in Palo Alto last night, September 19, 2007, and am strongly opposed to this Draft PEIR.

I demand the SFPUC separate two issues that are now combined in the current Draft PEIR. Separate:

1) Seismic Upgrades of the water delivery system, which is obviously needed, from

2) The plan to divert an additional 25 million gallons per day more of the Tuolumne River, which has NOT been accurately studied, planned, and addressed and is environmentally unsound.

The above are two separate environmental issues inappropriately joined into one single Draft Program Environmental Impact Report.

I demand that the SF Public Utilities Commission:

1) Reject the current Draft PEIR.

2) Separate these two SF water supply issues: Seismic Upgrades and Increased Tuolumne River Usage.

3) Create two new Draft PEIRs, one for each issue.

4) Have two NEW public hearings on each separate issue.

SFPUC, Reject this Draft PEIR!

N. L.
Resident of Ten Years
Palo Alto Area, CA
Scott Taylor
3451 E. 12th Street
Oakland, CA  94601
ph (510) 535-3511
fax (510) 535-4301
STaylor@laclinica.org

From: Scott Taylor [mailto:staylor@laclinica.org]
Sent: Monday, October 01, 2007 9:11 AM
To: 'wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com'

Subject: SFPUC Water System Improvement Program

To Whom It May Concern:
I am writing you concern the Water System Improvement Program. While all would agree that the system needs a major upgrade, I would strongly urge not to take more water from the Toulumne River. We need to take the step to conserve and reuse water instead always taking more. Our rivers are already being sucked dry. No more water from the Toulumne.

Thanks,
Scott Taylor

Scott Taylor
3451 E. 12th Street
Oakland, CA  94601
ph (510) 535-3511
fax (510) 535-4301
STaylor@laclinica.org

http://mail.google.com/mail/?tf=1&ui=2&ik=41cc4a954b&view=pt&q=Taylor&search=...  11/16/2007
C_Tholl

Diana Sokolove <wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com>

Tuolumne

Julia Thollaug <feelinggroovy1018@yahoo.com> To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com

Tue, Sep 11, 2007 at 2:36 PM

Dear Sir/Madam,

I recently was informed of the SFPUC’s plan to divert 25 millions gallons of water per day from the Tuolumne. I think this plan would be extremely detrimental to our state’s ecosystem and I hope that you will refuse this request. We drain too much water from our watersheds already. Please do not divert more water from the Tuolumne.

Sincerely,

Julia Thollaug

Check out the hottest 2008 models today at Yahoo! Autos.

C_Thaga

Paul Maltzer/CTYPLN/SFGOV

09/25/2007 09:28 AM

To: Diana Sokolove/CTYPLN/SFGOV

cc

bcci

Subject: Tuolumne River “Improvement Program”

----- Forwarded by Paul Maltzer/CTYPLN/SFGOV on 09/25/2007 09:27 AM -----

"Betsy Thagard" <betsythagard@yahoo.com>

09/20/2007 02:06 PM

To: <paul.maltzer@sfgov.org>

Subject: Tuolumne River “Improvement Program”

Dear Sir:

I am writing to urge the SFPUC to drop its proposal to divert more water from the Tuolumne River.

Decreasing reliance on the Tuolumne is critical not only for protecting the health of the river, but also for preparing for the future uncertainty of the Sierra snowpack as a result of global warming. Instead of proposing more water withdrawals from the Tuolumne, the SFPUC should adopt a policy of reducing diversions from the Tuolumne River over time.

In adopting such a policy, the SFPUC should conduct a study to determine the maximum potential for conservation and efficiency savings within the SFPUC service territory. Any additional demand for water within its territory should be met through increased investment in conservation, efficiency, and recycling.

Thank you for working to protect the Tuolumne River by reducing water withdrawals over time.

Betsy Thagard

1937 Carleton Street

Berkeley, CA 94704
May 2, 2007

Ryan Brooks  
SF PUC  
c/o Sierra Club Bay Chapter  
2530 San Pablo Ave.  
Berkeley, CA 94702

Dear Ryan Brooks,

I join with the Sierra Club in urging the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to protect the federally designated wild-and-scenic Tuolumne River from any additional diversions of water.

Meet future needs of water through conservation and recycling as other regions in the West have done such as the Seattle regional water system and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

Sincerely,

Dennis Thomas  
147 St. Germain  
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

I am writing to express my concern over taking more water from the Tuolumne river to pursue more water for the Bay Area.

While I understand the need to provide fresh water to a growing community, there is also the responsibility of the community to get the water with a minimal impact to the environment in a sustainable fashion. The bottom line is the Delta and River basin has long suffered from a lack of water which has resulted in high salt levels in the Valley. The delicate balance in one of the world’s most productive farming community is being hurt by the urban sprawl which has outgrown its natural resources.

A better and sustainable, although more expensive, solution is to use membrane technology to use sea water for fresh water. This technology has been well proven and is economically feasible with an increase in use tax for the people that need the water in the Bay Area. The energy to run the pumps can be utilized from wind and tide power that is also locally available and renewable. This forces the Bay Area communities to see where their water is growing instead of just relying on taking the snowfall in the Sierra’s. And remember, if there’s a drought in the Bay Area, there’s the same drought in the Sierra’s. Stealing from the Tuolumne River is not a solution, it’s a bad environmental loan.

You can not continue to steal the water from the Delta so you don’t have to pay as much money to fuel the Bay Area’s growth. The Bay Area is a huge economic power - use that power to invest in their own water. Countries all over the world use thousands of membrane units to deliver clean water. There is no reason that the Bay Area shouldn’t do the same.

Tibor Toth  
2120 Carleton Drive  
Turlock, CA  
209-656-2205
Dear Paul / Environmental Review (SFPCU),

I'm a resident and homeowner in unincorporated Redwood City, and I'm writing to ask you to improve SFPCU's Water Supply Improvement Plan. Thanks for working on this, thinking ahead and preparing a draft Environmental Impact Report. However SFPCU's water plan is based on inflated projections, and does not do enough to protect the Tuolumne River and other watersheds.

Please make plans for more conservation and creative reuse of water, and rely less on drawing water from the Tuolumne River. As we can see this year already, the snow pack is likely to be more variable due to climate change and the ecosystems in the mountains and in the Bay Area will be more stressed by climatic extremes. The fish and the plant life (which protect the watersheds and help filter rainwater) need the water more than we do. The correct response is more conservation and careful use of water, not higher use of river water. A more diverse mix of supplies will reduce risk for us and reduce stress on ecosystems.

I don't believe that the population will increase significantly in this area because the housing prices are too high, and salaries are not keeping up. I can only afford my house because we bought 10 years ago. Those who do move here are likely to be in more dense housing which won't need so much water for landscaping.

There is much that can be done by individuals, businesses and municipalities to conserve water. I'm happy that Redwood City has taken proactive steps such as offering low-water toilets free. I urge you to use your clout by insisting on aggressive water conservation measures and watershed protection, now - before climate change worsens the situation. This will also save money for everyone.

Sincerely,

12.5-94
I am writing today in response to the proposal to take vast volumes of water from the Tuolumne River. The idea that we will dry up this wild and scenic river to feed the East Bay sprawl is appalling. The cities of the East Bay can supply their water needs through conservation and improved engineering.

Other cities such as Seattle and Los Angeles have done this. They have achieved growth rates the East Bay desires while keeping water usage flat. There is no reason that an area as innovative and rich as the Bay Area cannot do the same. We are every bit as smart, sensible, and resourceful as they are.

Instead we are proposing to drain down one of the very natural wonders that draws people to this area of the country. We are choosing to do so at a time when our snow pack is being depleted and flows will be declining. We can make a wiser choice. We can choose to preserve, conserve and apply sound engineering to preserve the river for our own old age, for our children's lives, and for future residents of this region. We are not consumers of today. We are guarantors of tomorrow's future.

DEAR COMMISSIONER BROOKS

I WRITE THIS LETTER IN ORDER TO PLEASE ASK YOU TO NOT ALL OUT ANY MORE WATER FROM THE TULUMNE RIVER. THINK ABOUT YOUR FAMILY AND FRIENDS, WOULD YOU LIKE TO LIVE IN A CITY OR COUNTRY WHERE YOU HAD BARELY ANY WATER? I DON'T THINK SO, SO THINK ABOUT IT AND DON'T DO IT.

SINCERELY,

P.S. ... SEE YOU AT THE HEARING!!
Dear Commissioner Brooks,

The seemingly endless nature of water use is demanded by residents. The Tuolumne River is one of the most important water sources and many to ripping more water out of it, especially for a reason, such as watering lawns and their yards, is absolutely absurd. People who 'need' water perfectly good drinking water to water their lawns obviously don't appreciate the people around us and our environment.

I recently was informed of the plan to take 65 million gallons of water out of the Tuolumne River. I feel this is such an absurd plan due to the fact that the water will not be used for drinking but to water lawns in four counties. There are so many other ways we can save water such as using recycled water, with such a huge water crisis at hand in California, I do not feel pulling out more water is the answer. I strongly oppose this plan.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

RECEIVED
SEP 2 0 2007
CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
M.E.A.
Tuolumne River

msurdan@aol.com <msurdan@aol.com>

To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com

September 27, 2007
Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Maltzer:

I am a whitewater rafter who travels to California every May and August to take advantage of the unequaled recreational opportunities of the Sierras, California’s National Parks, and of course, Yosemite and the Tuolumne River. My love for the Tuolumne goes back over 30 years when my family took a vacation to Yosemite and we drove to Tuolumne Meadows. Even back in the summer of 1975 when I was only 10 years old, I was struck by the river’s beauty in this beautiful meadow. One of my strongest memories of childhood family vacations is stepping into the gentle waters of the Tuolumne as it meandered across the highway while waiting for my father to secure backcountry hiking permits for us before our week long hike along its banks to its source.

I have returned often to that special place known as Tuolumne Meadows, and often I have repeated that backcountry hike. More recently, I have become a whitewater enthusiast. I have rafted the Tuolumne over a dozen times, including the Class V Cherry Creek Section. The Tuolumne River is a very special river to me, as it is to millions of others who have visited it and to those countless millions who depend on it to provide them with drinking water. However, I don’t believe the Tuolumne can support any more than it already does.

Your environmental review of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s plan to take more water from the Tuolumne River fails to adequately identify and address all of the environmental impacts to the River. I urge you to undertake additional studies before finalizing this document.

I support the alternatives identified in your draft document that protect the Tuolumne River from new diversions. Requiring more water conservation, efficiency, and recycling is the best way to lessen impacts on the Tuolumne River while promoting a sustainable water plan for the Bay Area.

Only by ensuring that healthy amounts of water continue to flow into the Tuolumne River can we protect this irreplaceable natural treasure.

Even though I currently live in North Carolina, I am a member of the Tuolumne River Trust Organization, and I hope you take my comments into consideration as seriously as those who live in San Francisco, the Bay Area, and the rest of California.

Sincerely,

Matthew S. Urdan
13077 Highway 19 West
Bryson City, North Carolina 28713

Email and AIM finally together. You’ve gotta check out free AOL Mail!
Comment on SFPUC's Proposal

Paul Vadoparas <paulvadoparas@california.com>
To: wsp.peir.comments@gmail.com

Mon, Oct 1, 2007 at 3:33 PM

I attended Public Hearing on September 19, 2007 in Palo Alto at Avenidas.

My comments are:

Given the projected population growth, requirements for additional water will never cease. The availability of water is limited. We do not have the ability to create glaciers or snow-packs in the Sierras. We cannot dam more rivers, or pump more water from the existing water table without hurting or destroying our ecological system and economic base. The only way to produce drinkable water is by building desalination plants. This is the reality all public utilities in California will face.

Let's leave the few remaining untamed rivers alone, and apply technology to solve our projected water shortage problems.

Respectfully,

Paul Vadoparas
629 Northampton Dr.
Palo Alto, CA 94303


Tuolumne River water plan

Jim Vermeys <jimmyjay@ps.net>
To: wsp.peir.comments@gmail.com

Sun, Sep 30, 2007 at 11:01 AM

Dear Mr. Maltzer:

I have been enjoying benefits of the Tuolumne River my entire life (46 years). I have fished, camped, rafted, watched my brother get married standing next to it, swam, hiked, lived and loved in, on and around that river. I urge you to take a better look at the environmental impact your plan would have on my favorite river.

Please consider better water conservation, efficiency and an improved recycling program rather than take water from the Tuolumne.

Thank you.

Jim Vermeys
Martinez, CA
Tuolumne River

Karen Vermeys <kvermeys@sbcglobal.net>

To: wsp.peir.comments@gmail.com

We are annual campers of Berkeley Tuolumne Camp, and in all the many, many years I’ve been a Tuolumne camper, I have never seen our river so low!

Therefore, I am very much against using water from the Tuolumne River. Please reconsider to ensure that the water level will go no lower than it is now (which actually would be dry!).

Thank you,

Karen Vermeys

C_VermeK

Mon, Sep 24, 2007 at 4:45 PM

C_Voyik

Dear Commissioner Fox,

With all of the water problems throughout the state of California, why would you let this plan pass? Just imagine - if you pass this plan, our clean drinking water will be used on something that would not be affected by recycled water. People need clean water, not plants. Do not get me wrong, plants need clean water to an extent, but not as bad as humans. Just think - you don’t want to be worrying about your water! Think about it! If you expand more water from the Tuolumne, it will be left dry eventually. Don’t do it! Be the bigger man!

Sincerely,

Ashleigh Voyik

C_Voyik

August 19, 2007
To whom it may concern:

I am writing today to express my opposition to the Public Utilities Commission’s plans to take more water out of the Tulocay River. I feel these plans are not in our best interest for several reasons, but I wish only to express two of them in writing.

First, we are facing the very real possibility of a drought, and as such, we have the responsibility to the future not to increase water consumption. We should instead focus more energy toward water conservation and water recycling. If Seattle & Los Angeles can meet their increased water demand without using more water, so should we here in the Bay Area.

Secondly, this river is beautiful, and home to diverse wildlife. We should not do anything to harm this area.

I hope you will take the proper steps to make the Bay Area a leader in water conservation.

Sincerely Yours,
Leo Vrana
Leo Vrana
415-260-2180
48th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

RECEIVED
SEP 20 2007
CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
October 13, 2007
Paul Maltzer
Environmental Review Officer, WSIP PEIR
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Maltzer:

The purpose of this letter is to comment on proposals to increase water supplies as part of the seismic upgrade to the Hetch Hetchy system.

I live in Menlo Park and am a user of Hetch Hetchy water. I also spend significant time walking and birdwatching around the San Francisco Bay and hiking and backpacking in California’s mountains and wilderness areas.

I have been aware for a long time that the SFPUC is many years overdue in maintaining and upgrading the Hetch Hetchy delivery system infrastructure, and I applaud the PUC for embarking on the seismic upgrade so necessary to ensure a reliable water supply. However, I am concerned that the PUC is considering additional projects, i.e., stream diversion and increasing water supplies, as part of the seismic upgrade and maintenance project. Developing new sources of drinking water as part of this project is ill-advised.

The draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) is flawed in many respects, including:

- Additional water supplies are outside of the scope of the long overdue maintenance project. We the water customers do not want any further delays on the maintenance project.

- Water customers will be incurring significant increases in water bills for the purpose of securing and maintaining the present source of water. We do not want to pay for legal battles to be incurred because the PUC is adding an additional task of diverting more water from a wild and scenic river.

- It is no longer disputed that global climate change is occurring and that citizens and government agencies must take immediate action to adjust to that reality. It is not disputed that last winter’s rains were below average. This reality requires SFPUC to undertake immediate conservation measures.

- Even without global warning and the current low rainfall concerns, California should have been implementing strong water conservation measures since the last drought. Significant areas of California have a desert climate, but Californians use water as if it were an unlimited resource—lawns, tropical flower gardens, flood irrigation, large-scale commodity agriculture instead of food production. Californians have shown a lack of political will with regard to mandatory water conservation measures. The SFPUC must take the lead to reduce water demand within its service area.

- The PEIR fails to address the many environmental impacts of increased diversion of water from the Tuolumne River, including the impact on the watershed and the projected reduction of the volume of water in the Tuolumne due to reduced snowpack.

- Water conservation and efficiency measures are the cheapest, easiest, and least destructive ways to meet demand and extend supply.

- The PEIR does not address the potential increase of water supplies by water recycling. The State Water Resources Control Board and the Regional Water Resources Control Boards are currently considering water recycling programs and standards. The PEIR does not take these programs into account.

I urge the SFPUC to perform the seismic upgrades to the Hetch Hetchy infrastructure without diverting additional water from the Tuolumne River or any other watershed. Instead, the SFPUC should immediately undertake water conservation measures to reduce diversion from our stressed watersheds.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Patricia L. Walker
Comments on the PEIR for the WSIP.

Dear Mr. Maltzer:

As both a frequent visitor and huge fan of both the Tuolumne River and San Francisco I urge you to take another look at your environmental review of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s plan to take more water from the Tuolumne River before finalizing it.

The Tuolumne is an irreplaceable natural treasure, one of the most beautiful and unique rivers in the world. Alternatives requiring more water conservation, efficiency, and recycling are the best way to lessen impacts on the Tuolumne River, and reduce long-term infrastructure costs. Other cites have managed to grow while reducing water consumption. The Bay area is known for having a strong environmental ethic and I have no doubt that the area could easily become a leader in water conservation.

Around 60% of the water in the basin is already diverted. Good flows in the Tuolumne River are critical to protecting the river as one of our natural treasures and as a unique recreational playground.

Kind Regards,

Pete Wallstrom
1257 Siskiyou Blvd #1178
Ashland, Or 97523

---

(no subject)

Dear Mr. Maltzer:

I have hiked and rafted much of the Tuolumne river from Tuolumne Meadows to New Don Pedro Reservoir. Its beauty and environmental value are unmatched in Sierra, indeed, in California. I also work in San Francisco and appreciate the high quality of the water there.

Your environmental review of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s plan to take more water from the Tuolumne River fails to adequately identify and address all of the environmental impacts to the River. I urge you to undertake additional studies before finalizing this document.

I support the alternatives identified in your draft document that protect the Tuolumne River from new diversions. Requiring more water conservation, efficiency, and recycling is the best way to lessen impacts on the Tuolumne River while promoting a sustainable water plan for the Bay Area. Using pristine water from the Tuolumne to flush our toilets and water our lawns just doesn’t make sense.

Only by ensuring that healthy amounts of water continue to flow into the Tuolumne River can we protect this irreplaceable natural treasure.

Sincerely,

Richard Weiss
Mikeavergs@richard.weiss.name
615 Santa Ray Avenue
Oakland, CA 94610

Ask me how to become a river guide and help save California rivers.
C_Willi

Diana Sokolove <wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com>

protect Tuolomne river

doris.sings@mindspring.com <doris.sings@mindspring.com>
Reply-To: doris.sings@mindspring.com
To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com, bill.young@sierraclub.org

Tue, Sep 25, 2007 at 11:55 AM

Dear Mr. Maltzer,

Mr. Paul Maltzer
Environmental Review Officer, WSIP PEIR
San Francisco Planning Department

Dear Mr. Maltzer,

Please act to protect the Tuolomne River for future generations by requiring water conservation, efficiency, and recycling, instead of taking more water from this river.

The PEIR uses flawed modeling to determine the anticipated increase in water demand, thus inflating projected future needs. Other metropolitan areas (especially Seattle and Los Angeles) have managed to reduce water demand even in the face of growth.

The PEIR fails to properly address all of the impacts of taking more water from the river because it lacks an adequate baseline study. A comprehensive study has not been done for 15 years, and a current study will not be completed in this review period.

The PEIR does not take into consideration the impact of climate change on precipitation in the Tuolomne River watershed.

Decreasing reliance on the Tuolomne is critical not only for protecting the health of the River, but also for preparing for the future uncertainty of the Sierra snowpack due to global warming.

Water conservation and efficiency measures are the cheapest, easiest, and least destructive ways to meet demand and extend supply.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Doris Williams
Member of Sierra Club, Acterra, Audubon Society
Save the Tuolumne!!!!!

ppwing@aol.com <ppwing@aol.com>
To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com

Dear Sirs:
Please don't be short sighted and allow this river to be drained!
Please help protect this national treasure!
Thank you,
Poly P. Wingfield
6 Elder Ct
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Email and AIM finally together. You've gotta check out free AOL Mail! - 
http://mail.aol.com
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Our beautiful Tuolumne River

Elizabeth Wolf <elizabeth@thewolfs.info>
To: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com

Paul Maltzer, Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Maltzer:

I really hope you'll do more research before you finalize your documents. It is very necessary to know the facts before we get into a really sad situation. I have been on the periphery of the SF Public Utilities Commission, so I am only just beginning to learn about the importance of this commission. I urge you not to be hasty in your decision-making.

The Tuolumne River is such a gorgeous place. Please treat it kindly.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Wolf

--
01
September 28, 2007

Mr. Paul Maltzer
Environmental Review Officer
1650 Mission Street; Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Protect the Tuolumne River

Dear Mr. Maltzer:

I am writing to you as a native San Franciscan who is concerned about the fate of one of our most valuable natural resources, the Tuolumne River. The river provides not only beauty but is a natural habitat to many fish as well. The conservation of the Tuolumne River is of the utmost important issue at hand right now.

I urge you to support a sustainable water plan that will protect our watersheds in the Bay Area and Sierras before this irreplaceable natural treasure is gone forever. We must conserve the river rather than increase water diversion. The results will be disastrous if we don’t take action to preserve the Tuolumne River. Right now they are diverting close to 60% of the Tuolumne and any more diversion will threaten the entire ecosystem in the Bay Area.

Thank you for taking serious action to conserve and recycle this most precious natural resource for us now and for the future generations.

Sincerely,

Annita Zimmerman
1812 Devereaux Drive
Burlingame, CA 94010

(650) 259-7797